

A Defense

Papers or Principles—Which?

THOSE who are acquainted with the journals of this religious movement whose purpose is to restore to the world the Church of the First Century, know that there has been considerable friction among them. This is noticeable on the part of the Apostolic Review on the one hand, and the Christian Leader, Gospel Advocate, Firm Foundation, Christian Companion, and some smaller journals on the other hand. The managers of the latter class of papers have tried to make their readers believe that it is a mere matter of jealousy on the part of the Review, and some have come to believe that from their speech. While the managers of the Review do not for a moment claim perfection for it, and do not try to defend the wrong spirit which may have been manifested by some of its writers, yet it strongly contends that the friction is caused nearly altogether by its strict advocacy of what it believes to be Gospel principles; and it now undertakes to show, in 'defense of itself and in defense of the Church for which our Savior died, that the friction is not caused by mere papers as such, but by principles of vital importance to the purity of the doctrine and practice of the Church of Christ.

In order for us to get at the foundation of the matter, it is necessary for us to go back a little in the history of this Restoration. The American Christian Review was established by Benjamin Franklin in 1856. After the death of Alexander Campbell in 1866, the Review was undoubtedly the most influential paper in the Restoration movement, and Benjamin Franklin was the most influential man. The same year that Campbell died (1866) the Christian Standard

was started. Franklin was a plain man, standing solidly for the simplicity *in* Christ, and the Standard was founded to lead the people away from that simplicity to more progressive ways. An old man in Cleveland, O., told one of the managers of the Review, in December, 1914, that his father was in the company of men that met to start the Standard, and says that after the full arrangements had been made, Isaac Errett, the chief man in the Standard movement, turned to him and said in substance, "Now, what will old Ben do?" The Standard stood for missionary societies and instrumental music, and the Review stood opposed to such. Then began a mighty, long and severe theological discussion.

Associated with Franklin for several years was a fluent writer who was ambitious to become editor of a paper controlled entirely by himself, and who, as his teaching showed, was trying to occupy a position between that of the Review and the Standard. He was a regular contributor to the Standard for a short while, says his biographer. In other words, he was a compromiser of the position occupied by Franklin in such matters as were then being agitated in the Restoration movement.

Franklin died in 1878. In the meantime the Review fell into the hands of an outsider, still retaining this fluent writer as one of its editors, who still held his ambition to be the publisher of a paper controlled entirely by himself. So says F. M. Green, his biographer, on page 71 of his work. He tried several times to get a certain brother of considerable means, who is now an elder of a church in Ohio, to finance a new paper, saying that he had a copy of the subscription list of the Review, and could start a paper when ever he wished to. This brother, whose veracity in the matter we have no reason to question, has stated this to different ones of the Review managers at different times, and they have his statement in black and white on file in the Review office. That this writer did start a new paper, which he called the "Christian Leader," on the subscription list of the Review, is evident from this fact and from

the fact that when it was started the readers of the Review received the Leader for a certain length of time. This charge was made against the Leader that it was founded on the subscription list of the Review, and the Leader never denied it! Now every one knows, or may know, that the subscription list is the main part about a paper, especially a religious paper, and when one would take such and start one of his own he would be guilty of dishonesty. This mentioned writer had no more right to take the subscription list of the Review and start a paper than he has to take a man's pocket-book with thousands of dollars in it, which he intrusted to him to keep for a little while, and then use the money for his own good. The matter was put before about twenty-five influential secular papers of the country at the time, and they designated it as "dishonesty," "stealing," "highway robbery," and several said that "one guilty of such an offense should be behind the bars."

Seeing that this writer, whom we shall henceforth call "the founder of the Leader," was trying to hammer the Review to death, the present managers, who were then publishing a 16 page semi-monthly called "The Octograph," purchased the Review for \$12,000, to save it from ruin, and combined the two and called the combination Octographic Review. Since that time the name has been changed again, and it is now called Apostolic Review.

Lest some one may *any* that we should not refer unfavorably to the mistakes of a dead man, we answer, that the Bible is our guide on this subject as well as on all others. Besides, when a dead man's evil influence is continued we need to trace that influence to its origin in order to expose it aright.

THE SAND CREEK MOVEMENT

Many have been the questions discussed in this Restoration movement. Chief among these at the beginning were those respecting instrumental music in the Christian's worship, and the use of organizations of missionary societies in which to do missionary work. At first Franklin was

somewhat favorably disposed toward the missionary society, but he soon saw the evil fruits of it, and on closer investigation saw the unscripturalness of the whole scheme. From that time on he opposed the societies with all his might along with instrumental music in the worship. Much confusion was wrought among the churches over the societies, and many churches were divided over the introduction of instrumental music into the worship. The fact in that hundreds of churches have been divided by those devices, and some of them were ruined.

Many good brethren saw that something must be done to check this innovation movement or else there would be no disciples left worshiping God according to the New Testament. Some of them decided that the only thing to do was to refuse to have fellowship with those churches which were tolerating such things, and to refuse to endorse preachers who were advocating such. Accordingly prominent brethren from different churches met at the annual meeting of the Sand Creek church, near Windsor, Shelby Co., Ill., in the grove, and made their "Declaration" to the several thousand people who were present. Daniel Sommer delivered the discourse on the occasion, which was in harmony with the Declaration which was to be made at its close. The discourse considered in detail the principles of this Restoration movement, and showed that many had departed from its principles and from the Bible, when they used instrumental music in the worship, and societies, festivals and shows, etc., in the work and government of the Church. The concluding remarks of the address run thus:

What, then, must be done by those who are determined to remain loyal to Christ? Shall we be longer held responsible for the misconduct, and in many respects shameful misconduct, of our erring brethren who refuse to be admonished? When they determined to have their devices, if they had only left the established congregations in peace and had gone out into new fields and built up churches, they would have acted with some honor. But, instead of so doing, they have thrust their devices upon congregations established upon primitive simplicity, and thus they have become usurpers of other men's labors. We were once a happy and

a peaceful and a prosperous people, and for peace we pled,, We entreated them for God's sake and for the love of heaven not to thrust their devices upon us, but they would not hearken. What then must be done? In the "language of the apostle I answer: "THE TIME IS COME THAT JUDGMENT MUST BEGIN AT THE HOUSE OF GOD."

Elder P. P. Warren then took the stand and addressed the audience substantially as follows:

My Brethren—I come before you today with thoughts AND feelings different from what I have ever before had in addressing you. For about forty-years I have stood in this and adjoining communities as a proclaimer of the Gospel. I took up the work in company with those who Were pioneers of this country. We started on the platform of the Bible, the whole Bible, and nothing but the Bible. The New Testament we took as the rule of our faith and practice. "Where the Bible speaks, we speak, and where the Bible is silent, we are silent," was our watchword. Then we prospered and became, as our brother who has preceded me has shown you, a great and a mighty people. For a continuation of this order of things we hoped and labored and prayed. But there have arisen men among us who have shown themselves unsatisfied with what is written. They have introduced thing which our King has never authorized, and as a result have made us a divided and unhappy people. We pled and entreated that we might have the peace of the Gospel, but they would not hear our entreaties. Therefore, after much earnest thought on the part of loyal brethren, it was decided that something should be said and done which would relieve those who intend to be true to the Lord Jesus Christ from responsibility for the misdemeanors of those who are not satisfied with what is written in the Word of God. That is to say, these brethren decided that those who are loyal to Christ should no longer have thrust in their faces by worldlings and their religious neighbors, such taunts as this: "Why, your people have fairs, your people have festivals, and your people have a good many things which Christ never authorized!" As a result, a goodly number of churches sent prominent brethren, and we met yesterday, August 17, in the Sand Creek house of worship and decided upon the following documents which I will read:

ADDRESS AND DECLARATION

By the Congregations Represented by Their Respective Church Officers in a Mass Meeting Assembled at Sand Creek, Shelby Co. Ill., Aug. 17, A. D., 1889.

To All Those Whom it May Concern, Greeting:

Brethren—You doubtless know that we as disciples of Christ (with scarcely an exception; many long years ago took the position that in matters of doctrine and practice, religiously, that " where the Bible speaks we speak, and where the Bible is silent we are silent;" and further, we held that nothing should be taught, received or practiced, religiously, for which we could not produce a "thus saith the Lord." And doubtless many of you also know that as long as the above principles were constantly and faithfully observed, that we were a happy and prosperous people. Then we were of one heart and of one soul; we lived in peace and prospered in the things pertaining to the Kingdom of God and the name of our Lord Jesus Christ. Then what was written as doctrine and for the practice was taught and observed by the disciples. And, it may not be amiss in this connection to say, that many, yea, very many in the sectarian churches saw the beauty, consistency and wonderful strength and harmony in the plea, as set forth by the disciples, for the restoration of primitive or apostolic Christianity in spirit and in practice; and so came and united with us in the same great and godly work. It is, perhaps, needless for us to add in this connection, that we, as a people, discarded all man-made laws, rules, disciplines, and confessions of faith, as means of governing the church. We have always acknowledged and do now acknowledge the all-sufficiency of the Holy Scriptures to govern us as individuals and as congregations. As an apostle has said, "All scripture is given by inspiration of God; and is profitable for doctrine, for reproof, for correction, and instruction in righteousness, that the man of God may be perfect, thoroughly furnished unto all good works."

And, now, please allow us to call attention to some painful facts and considerations. There are those among us who do teach and practice things not taught nor found in the New Testament, which have been received by many well-meaning disciples, but rejected by those more thoughtful and, in most instances, better informed in the Scriptures, and who have repeatedly protested against this false teaching and these corrupt practices among disciples. Some of the things of which we hereby complain, and against which we protest are the unlawful methods resorted to in order to raise or get money for religious purposes, namely, that of the church holding festivals of various kinds in the house of the Lord or elsewhere, demanding sometimes that each participant shall pay a certain sum as an admittance fee the select choir to the virtual, if not the real, abandonment

of congregational singing; likewise the man-made society for missionary work, and the one-man, imported, preacher-pastor to take the oversight of the church. These with many other objectionable and unauthorized things are now taught and practiced in many of the congregations, And that to the great grief and mortification of some of the members of said congregations.

And now, brethren, you that teach such things, and such like things, and those who practice the same, must certainly know that they are not only not in harmony with the Gospel, but are in opposition thereto. You surely will admit that it is safe, and only safe to teach and practice what the divine record enjoins upon the disciples. To this none can reasonably object, and this is exactly what we want and for which we contend. And, now, we say that we beg of you to turn away speedily and at once from such things, and remember that though we are the Lord's freemen yet we are bound by the authority of our Lord Jesus Christ. You know that it is by keeping His commandments and not the commandments of men that we have the assurance of his approval. Therefore, brethren, without addressing you further by using other arguments, ami without going further into detailing these unpleasant, and, as we see them, vicious things, you must allow us in kindness, and in Christian courtesy, and at the same time with firmness, to declare that we cannot tolerate the things of which we complain; for if we do, then we are (in a measure at least) blameable ourselves. And, let it be distinctly understood, that this "Address and Declaration" is not made in any spirit of envy or hate, or malice or any such thing. But we are only actuated from a sense of duty to ourselves and to all concerned; for we feel that the time has fully come when something of a more definite character ought to be known and recognized between the church and the world. Especially is this apparent when we consider the scriptural teachings on the matters to which we have herein referred —such for instance as the following: "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."

It is therefore, with the view, if possible, of counteracting the usages and practices that have crept into the churches, that this effort on the part of the congregations hereafter named is made. And, now, in closing up this address and declaration, we state that we are impelled from a sense of duty to say, that all such as are guilty of teaching, or allowing and practicing the many innovations and

corruptions to which we have referred, that after being admonished and having had sufficient time for reflection, if they do not turn away from such abominations, that we can not and will not regard them as brethren. (Signed)

P. P. Warren, A. J. Nance, Daniel Baker, Peter Robinson, J. K. Rose, James Warren—Sand Creek Church.

Randolph Miller, Charles Erwin, W. K. Baker, Wm. Cozier—Liberty Church.

Wm. Storm—Ash Grove Church. J. H. Hagen—Union Church. Isaac Walters—Mode Church.

Thus do we have before us the Sand Creek Declaration and Address, a document about which many of our reader have heard much. In order to save the Church of Christ from open reproach and from utter corruption, this stand against innovators and innovating churches was taken. From that time on, more than ever before, the Review advocated the drawing of the line between those who held to "the old paths" and those who were determined to have innovations. This it believed to be commanded by Paul when he said, "Mark them that are causing the divisions and occasions of stumbling, contrary to the doctrine which ye learned, and turn away from them." (Rom. 16: 17.)

It is hard to conceive the influence the Sand Creek Declaration and Address has had on tens of thousands of disciples. The brethren in sympathy with it began to avoid these innovators, and turn away from them, as the Scriptures command. The introduction of these innovations continued without abatement, but in many places brethren who were opposed to them, when they saw they had to submit to them or get out, went out and built other meeting houses where they could worship God without the inventions of men being used at the same time. As a result of the Sand Creek Declaration and its advocacy, many congregations have sprung up which will have no fellowship at all with those who have corrupted the Church of God and have driven their brethren away from them. Many discerning brethren have said that if the principles of the Sand Creek Declaration had not been impressed on the minds of the people, it is doubtful whether there would now be any considerable number

of loyal churches in the North opposed to these innovations. It was a desperate case, for the whole body had become diseased, and it was necessary to perform the operation of refusing to have fellowship with those preachers who were dividing the churches over things which they themselves admitted were not necessary to salvation.

The Review stood alone of the papers of the Brotherhood in the radical step of drawing the line on the innovating churches and preachers. The Gospel Advocate criticized severely the Sand Creek Declaration and the position of the Review on the matter. But who of the preachers and writers of the Advocate do not now practically stand for the same thing respecting the missionary societies and instrumental music and those who advocate them. Do the churches in Nashville which oppose these innovations call upon preachers to hold their meetings who advocate them? Do the churches there which oppose instrumental music and those which have such join together in worship? Do they not rather try to keep these innovators out of the churches which are opposed to these things! They may call these innovators "brethren" in common parlance, but do they really treat them as brethren and as in good standing with the true Church of Christ? The Review was simply a couple of decades ahead of the Advocate in this matter of "marking them who are causing the divisions and occasions of stumbling contrary to the doctrine we have learned, and avoiding them." The Review, being in the front rank of the battle against the " digressives," has borne the brunt of the attack.

The founder of the Christian Leader was likewise opposed to the principles of the Sand Creek Declaration. His biography was written under the oversight of the present publisher of the Leader, who is a son of the former publisher, and it was written by F. M. Green, a rank "digressive." Green said concerning the founder of the Leader, that "it was impossible for him to find any place for . . . Sand Creek fads." (Page 171.) In other words, he was opposed to "marking them who are causing divisions and occasions

of stumbling contrary to the doctrine we have learned and avoiding them."

The founder *of* the Leader wrote thus in 1878:

Here, for example, is the question of church independency. IN every church, in its own individual acts, independent of every other church Some say, Yes. Well, then, what right has any individual or church to dictate to an independent body? If any congregation of Disciples assumes independent action, not conflicting with the law of the kingdom of Christ, and only acts in fear of the great Head of the Church, what right have I or anyone else to interfere with the action of that congregation? I voluntarily take membership in a congregation where an organ is in use, and has been in use for a series of years. The organ has been introduced as an independent act of this particular church.. This church is unanimous in this act, and is I satisfied. Now, then, though I am conscientiously opposed to the organ in the house of worship, and regard it as a gross innovation, have I a right to interfere with the independent act of said church, and does the constitution of the kingdom of Christ allow me to break the peace of that church and throw it into confusion? Or has any one, as a member of some other independent church, or as an independent editor, the right to dictate the policy of that church? (pp. 88, 89.)

This is strange reasoning. The writer speaks of acts "not conflicting with the law of the kingdom of Christ," and then goes on to show that though he was "conscientiously opposed" to instrumental music in worship, it belongs to the class of things "not conflicting with the law of the kingdom of heaven," for one should not oppose it if the rest of the church is satisfied with it. The writer of this paragraph opposes himself in order to sustain his compromised position! He further says in the same article:

Where an organ is in use, placed in position by an act of the church in advance of our visit, we regard it as beyond our province to interfere with that act; but in every case where there is no organ in use, and our advice is sought as to the propriety of introducing the instrument, we invariably advise the brethren to keep it out of the regular worship, and at the same time warn them of the consequences of such an act. (Page 91.)

I suppose, then, that if Timothy had gone to a church

where they were all satisfied in some error, Timothy should not "reprove and rebuke" them as Paul commanded him *In do, though* he might have been "conscientiously opposed" to their corruption! How could any reformation ever be wrought by following such a policy as this! It was only by "conscientiously opposing" that which they saw was not in harmony with the New Testament, regardless of consequences, that led the Campbells to inaugurate the present Restoration. No one but a compromiser could use the language copied above.

The biographer of the founder of the Leader quotes freely from his writings respecting what he calls his "well-matured views" on the subject of instrumental music, of which the following are a few extracts, with emphasis ours:

We are ready to concede that this vexed question is no nearer solution than it was twenty-five years ago, and that, too, after unlimited discussion pro and con, by able men. In our opinion the end sought for was defeated because certain pleaders denounced the use of instrumental music as a crime, instead of regarding it as a mistake, an imprudence, The protestors against its use also made a grievous mistake by denouncing and disfellowshipping every congregation where the instrument was used. As a logical and inevitable consequence, a deep indignation was aroused against the anti-organ party, and the reaction has told with fearful odds against them. It is a hazardous undertaking, and one fraught with untold disaster to the churches, to arraign men as heretics and consign them to infamy, not because they have committed a crime, but because they have disarranged and modified the form of worship. [For instance, like Cain, Nadab and Abihu, also David with his new cart!! Review Managers.] It should have been argued and pleaded that certain churches have made a great mistake by introducing , an innovation which has "marred the peace and harmony of many churches. . . .

If a small organ—oh, ye heavens! not a pipe organ!—were used as a tuning fork IS used, to pitch the tune and keep the time, and be made wholly subordinate or tributary to congregational singing. I, for one, would urge no objection.

If the elders themselves, or by a committee of their own appointment, would select the kind of hymn-book to be used by the congregation, and exclude sectarian song-books, and would select a competent, religious member of the

congregation to play the organ, as a man plays his tuning fork _.(for the organ is but an enlarged tuning fork), and the elder or preacher, or any member, select such music as all, old and young, scientific and unscientific, could vigorously and devoutly participate" in, I would make no objection. Bring it down to that point and the vexed question is practically solved.

... . . Let the elders, as representatives of the wisdom of the congregation assert their delegated Scriptural rights, drive out the choir, stop the voting of immature boys and girls, restore congregational singing, and then conduct the singing as we have suggested, keeping pitch and time with a small organ, and in our humble opinion, the everlasting discussion will, to a large extent, cease to molest the congregations. Here I only speak for myself and not for others, (pp. 84-86.)

Of course, such principles as these, advocated in the Leader, brought a storm of protest from those disciples who were not compromisers on these matters. In reply to these, the founder of the Leader wrote thus among other things (emphasis ours):

I have in my lifetime settled many church troubles, and healed many divisions, but I never had a church trouble of my own. I never divided a church, and never intend to divide one. I propose not to be held responsible for such an act. I belong to the body of Christ, and if I choose to take membership in a congregation where an organ is used, I alone take the responsibility. ...

When I moved my family to the suburbs of Cincinnati, we could not find a church within a radius of fifteen miles where an organ was not used, so we either were compelled to take membership in a congregation where an organ was used, or remain out of fellowship with a church of Christ. Consequently we took membership with a church of Christ at Carthage, ten miles out from Cincinnati, a congregation set in order by Walter Scott sixty years ago, a congregation composed mostly of mechanics, clerks and laboring men. Here an organ was used for the benefit of the congregation, but there was no choir. In the year 1865, I organized a church of eight members in Corry, Pa., which in one year increased to a membership of one hundred and fifty. G. W. N. Yost, now deceased, had built a chapel capable of seating six hundred people; he also built a parsonage, both buildings erected at his own expense. I was employed to preach on a salary of \$1,200,

besides having free use of the parsonage. As a majority of the members were Eastern people, accustomed to the use of an organ in public worship, the question of introducing one was soon sprung, the wife of Bro. Yost assuming to lead in that direction. At first I was stoutly opposed to the project, but finally agreed [compromised!—Review Managers] that if they would place an organ in front of the pulpit, several seats back in the audience, and have some Christian woman play the instrument, so as to pitch the tunes and keep the time, and make the organ tributary to congregational singing, without the aid of choir, I would let my objection pass.

... At the expiration of ten months I resigned, not chiefly because of the organ, but because of the miserable choir, who had made a play-house in the house of God. During this year, Bro. Franklin was invited to come and hold a meeting. In deference to his findings, the organ was set aside. . . .

[Hence, it is evident that your position on the organ was different from Franklin's, also they would have " set it aside " for you too.—Review Managers.]

I speak for myself and for no one else, by saying that, as much as I despise an organ in public worship, and as much as I deplore division caused by the innovation, I can go forward and perform my Christian duties, and accomplish great good, and lead a comparatively happy life— in spite of the organ. T do not intend to spoil my usefulness by eternally haggling over a thing for the creation and perpetuation of which I am not in the least responsible. Here I fix my Jacob's staff, and here I stand, as I shall answer to God and not to man. Strike, but hear me: By tho grace of God, I am determined not to be held responsible for the division and alienation of God's people by fighting over an organ 1 [so will submit to that to which I am "conscientiously opposed," and will thus go contrary to my conscience! But the Bible says, "Whatsoever is not of faith is sin" [—Review Managers.] Place me where you will, among friends "or foes, neither an organ nor a choir, nor feast nor famine, nor men nor demons, nor all the devices of men, shall, God being my helper, be allowed to destroy my usefulness in life. (pp. 98-103.)

All of our readers know the position of J. B. Briney on instrumental music in worship, and know that any position which he would commend would be unsound from the stand-

point of those brethren who call themselves "loyal" to the New Testament, and to the principles of this Restoration. To these utterances of the founder of the Leader, he wrote:

Moberly, Mo., Jan. 30, 1896.

Dear Bro.—I have just read your "declaration of independence" in the Leader of the 21st inst., and I want to shake hands with you on it. The position you take is the only one on which our plea can live, and your manly and dignified utterances are timely, and will do much toward unifying our brethren. [In other words, much toward making them all "digressives."—Review Managers.] Of course, "small men" will rise up to read you out of the kingdom of God, but they will only merit your pity. Fight it out on this line, my brother, and you will grow in favor with God and men. [Popularity, eh!—Review M.] "Let us have peace." Fraternaly, — J. B. Briney. (Page 104.)

This is one of many letters which the Leader's founder received from "digressive" such as Briney, showing that they regarded him as standing with them. Green, his "digressive" biographer, said:

Better perhaps than he anticipated, this last editorial of the editor of the Leader was the "end of the endless controversy." A few men and papers yet chatter and [snap](#) over the matter, but the argument is exhausted, and the facts have gone to the only jury that can settle such questions. (Page 104.)

In other words, Green thought that the last writings of the founder and editor of the Leader did much to pacify those who were opposed to instrumental music in the worship, and to make them compromisers and [submissionists](#) in the matter. And he was right. Some said, "If Bro. ———— can endure a small organ, I'll risk the big one," and on to the "digressives" they went.

Green further said concerning the Leader's founder:

When the "Board of Ministerial Belief of the Christian Church" was created by the American Christian Missionary Society, its purpose appealed to his own heart, and he supported it with voice and pen until he died. (Page 173.)

To sum up the position of the founder of the Leader on the subject of instrumental music in the worship, we have this: He opposed the use of it some, yet he preached

for years at different places where they used such, and according to his own statements he said nothing against it. He had his membership with a church which used an organ when he was publishing the Leader, and only a short time before his death he took his membership to a little church which had none, evidently, it seems from other sources, because his readers were going after him so strongly for his compromising position! And he was opposed to any man's going into a church where they had an organ and so teaching that some would create a disturbance by trying to purify the worship.

Thus the founder of the Leader was a compromiser all the way through on the subject of instrumental music in Christian worship, and actually took his stand for it when he sanctioned the "little organ "

Besides, he endorsed the "Board of Ministerial Belief of the Christian Church," and "supported it with voice and pen until he died." So said his biographer, and this means that the Leader's founder endorsed and advocated an organization unknown to the New Testament, and which was established by the "digressives"!

What would have been the result to Apostolic simplicity if his principles had been carried out? There would have been few, if any, loyal churches here in the North, for nearly all our churches are made of those who refused to submit to those innovations, as the founder of the Leader taught we should do rather than cause division; and we have come out from among them as he said we should not do. If his principles had been followed in Detroit, the brethren there would have submitted to the "digressives" rather than cause division by refusing to tolerate instrumental music, etc., and the result would have been that there would not now be a Plum Street church opposed to these innovations; and if no Plum Street church there would probably have been no others there opposed to them. And if the Leader's principles had been carried out, there would today be no loyal church at Bloomington, Ind., nor in Bedford, Ind., nor in hundreds of other places.

For years the Review stood practically alone in refusing: to submit to these innovations and innovators, at least in the Eastern, Northern, Central and Western States. And when the lines were drawn at Sand Creek, Ill., the Review was opposed by the chief paper of the Brotherhood in the South, if not by all others there. It has had to oppose, not only the Christian Standard in the matter, but even the Christian Leader for its compromising position which was more treacherous to Apostolic simplicity than even the open "digressive" position of the Standard. The Review has educated thousands against this submission until now many of the readers of the Leader will not submit to innovations as the founder said they should do when division was caused by opposing them. If the Leader has any true Gospel principles on this subject of instrumental music, it is certainly not because it is following the principles of the founder; but because men, influenced to a great extent by the Review, have been using their influence to straighten it out. But the Review has borne the brunt of the battle, and was opposed in the matter by the Leader's founder, and the Leader with its modified principles is coming along in the rear to obtain what benefits it can—from the battles fought and won by the Review.

HOBBIES

The subject of "Christian Liberty" has been one of controversy, and there are two extremes on the matter. The "Christian church," under the plea of "Christian liberty" in doing many things which are not in harmony with the New Testament. But, on the other hand, some have refused Christian liberty where the Lord has undoubtedly given it, and have made themselves sticklers for certain points. The command to do a thing implies everything necessary to obey that command, and also everything helpful in obeying that command, If it is in harmony with the rest of the New Testament. Right Hands of Fellowship—In the New Testament we learn the disciples are to band themselves together into a

"flock," as it is called, with shepherds called "bishops," or "elders," to look after them. This flock is called a "church," as for instance, "the church of God at Corinth." When one is baptized into Christ he is baptized into the Church universal, which refers to Christians and churches everywhere and in all time. The word "church" is used in this sense when it is said that Christ died for the Church, But when one is baptized into Christ that does not necessarily make him a member of any particular "flock." Now the Lord has not told us how to become a member of a particular flock, hence he has left that to our wisdom. Preachers offer the invitation to immersed believers from other places to come forward if they wish to be identified with that particular flock. Some churches have adopted the custom of merely stating it then to the church that such a one wishes to become a member of that congregation. Other churches pass around and acknowledge them as members with them by formally extending the right hands of fellowship, or partnership, recognizing such in this warm way as members with them. In Galatians 2nd chapter, certain brethren are mentioned as giving to Paul and Barnabas "the right hands of fellowship" in the common work of the Lord. So brethren recognize the common partnership which exists among them at a certain place by formally extending the right hand of fellowship. Perhaps the former method is to be preferred when the church is large and additions are frequent. Most of the churches have practiced the right hands of fellowship from the beginning of their existence. The Review has contended that this is a matter of liberty, and that a church practicing either one should not be disturbed.

But the Christian Leader has been much against formally extending the right hands of fellowship. One Of its editors in particular made a hobby of the matter, and spent much good space in the paper opposing the practice. Other writers stood with him. The result has been that they have thrown many churches into confusion on the matter. There is, at least, just as much authority in the New Testament for formally extending the right hands of fellowship as we

have mentioned, as there is in formally having such people *Come forward and formally* making the statement publicly that such a person wishes to become a member of that congregation. It is a matter of liberty, and those who throw churches into confusion on such a matter should be regarded as disturbers of Israeli We should look at such papers in the same way.

Question of Providence—The Leader has likewise through one of its editors, made a hobby of what it calls "special divine providence,"—that God is looking after his people and providing for them now just as he promised to look after the Apostles when he first sent them out. One of the editors seemed to think his salvation depended on getting all the readers to adopt the same notions, and thus many people have been thrown into confusion. This was all wrong!

Laying on of Hands—Another point which the Leader has enforced to the confusion of the brethren, is that of laying on of hands in the appointment of officers of the church. There is not a clear case in the New Testament where hands were laid on any one to place him into office. There are, however, several cases where men received special gifts by the laying on of hands, and where it accompanied an appointment unto a special work by the direct command of God. Paul preached for years, it seems, before any hands were laid on him (except when he received his sight), and then it was for a special work unto which the Lord had directly called him. In view of the fact that the laying on of hands is, in the so-called Christian world, associated with a clergy, the same act among us would leave a wrong impression on the minds of many people. In view of this wrong impression which is made, and in view of the fact that there is not a clear case of such performance being practiced as it is practiced today, it should be avoided. But one of the editors of the Leader has been emphatic on this matter, and the paper has thrown many brethren and churches into confusion by its long agitation of the matter.

Rebaptism—The question as to whether people who

come to us from the different denominations should be baptized again, has been warmly agitated by some who have been great haters of "the sects," They contend that one must know that baptism is for the remission of sins, before it is valid. Because there is some error about baptism in the minds of those who are immersed by the denominations, they contend that they should be baptized again. But baptism is for many things, and who of us at the time understood that it was for: the answer of *a* good conscience toward God, to get into Christ, to put on Christ, etc.? Perhaps some of us understood all that baptism is for, and if we must understand one thing it is for in order to its validity, we must understand all it is for. Because a man who is married to a woman misunderstands at first some of the blessings of the marriage state, should he later be married to her again? When we are immersed "because Christ commands it," then is not that sufficient, though one may not understand all about the rite? The remission of sins is not part of the command, "Repent and be baptized unto the remission of sins," (Acts 2; 158, R, V.),—it is simply part of the blessings to be obtained. If we perform the act which the Lord commands because he commands it (and there could be no higher motive), then the Lord will certainly do his part, and we are baptized into Christ. The mistake is then made in taking up with the doctrines of men, and we should simply ask them to give these up, and to come out of "Babylon" (confusion). Sometimes a man says he was baptized "to get into a certain church," believing of course that that church is the one of the New Testament. Does even this error in his mind still leave him out of the Church of Christ, though he has done what the Lord told him to do to get into the Church, and done it too because the Lord has commanded it? But the Firm Foundation makes a specialty of this matter, and in almost every issue from its beginning has had something to say against what it calls "sect baptism," though a baptism which is immersion and which is done by the authority of the Lord into the name of the Father, Son and Holy Spirit. Wherever

that paper is circulated it has filled the Brotherhood with a discussion of that matter. It is a matter which should be left with the person himself, anyway, it is a matter of motives and not command; and "what man knoweth the things of a man, save the spirit of the man which is in him?" The Christian Leader has helped to throw the brethren into confusion on this question by much in its columns, and also by publishing a tract, by Herndon, which practically takes the position occupied by the Firm Foundation.

Church Government—This whole Brotherhood has taught from the beginning that the New Testament reveals that each church should be governed by elders and deacons. The Leader, however, has published a book for J. E. Thompson, whose sole object is to show that elders and deacons of the New Testament were inspired men, and that as the inspired men have passed away we should not now have official elders and deacons. The title-page of his book runs thus:

SPIRITUAL GIFTS, Their Purposes and Works, Versus the Modern Ecclesiastical Ruler. (An Exposition of the author's faith in the all-sufficiency of the Word of God, with his declaration of aversion to all claims of, and to, a higher place in the Kingdom of God than that of a faithful Christian. Common sense, guided by the Word of God, is and has been the only ruler found in the Kingdom of God since the age of inspiration. It cannot be dominated by any modern church official, no appointment can confer these abilities; they came from and abundantly exist in the Kingdom of nature and grace.—F. L. Rowe, Publisher.)

Such teaching, if carried out, will destroy all church government and discipline, and will bring anarchy to the Church of God! It is rank heresy!! Yet the Leader seems to have no scruples about sending such doctrine out among the brethren—for money. The publisher has been pressed so hard for sending out such rank heresy that he has had some brother write a reply to it. Thus he sends out the poison—for so much money; and offers the antidote—for so much money! Of course, it brings more money to a "publisher" to send out a poison to the Brotherhood—for a certain sum, and then tell them if they will send a certain amount he will send the antidote; but it is pretty hard on

the Brotherhood! The publisher of the Leader is responsible to a great extent for the trouble caused in the Brotherhood because of the doctrines of this book!

Is it not about time that the Leader be put into the hands of some one who will run it on Gospel principles? The very fact that this book has been put out by the publisher of the Leader, and is advertised by him in his catalogue of books, has caused people who had confidence in him to think that the book is all right. A certain sister who is a warm friend of the Leader said, when she had sent for the book, supposing that it was all right because it was published by the Leader, "Why does Bro. ——— print such books?" How long will the brethren stand to have such divisive and heretical literature thrust into their hands by a religious paper which takes as its motto that it "speaks where the Bible speaks"? The Review has more interest in the Brotherhood than in its own pocketbook, and will not send forth such unscriptural and divisive notions; and when it tries to rectify the evil done, and stop the overflow of filth, it is branded as "jealous," and as "causing disturbance."

An Infidel Volume—Another book has been advertised by the Leader, bearing the imprint, "F. L. Rowe, Publisher," which bids fair to work more dissension among the brethren. It is called, "The Indictment of Eternal Torment, (The Self-Negation of a Monstrous Doctrine)." The object of the book is to show that "eternal torment" is "a monstrous doctrine." Now there are many questions about which brethren may differ, without any harm being done as far as the Church and salvation is concerned. Men may have speculative ideas about certain things in the Bible which one does not have to know and obey in order to salvation; yet so long as they are willing to do just what the Lord commands, and do not try to force their ideas on others to the confusion of the brethren, we have little to say. But when some people get ideas different from others, their conceit often pushes them to work division over them, even though they are not matters of vital importance. We

always try to get the brethren to confine themselves in their public teaching to subjects of importance, that the disciples may be stirred to greater activity, and sinners may be brought to Christ.

If this were simply a matter of "eternal torment," as the writer of the book is pleased to call it, we would have little to say, unless the writer were causing confusion among the brethren on the subject. And that he has started in as a reformer and an iconoclast, is evident from the way he writes against such men as Campbell, McGarvey, Denney, Sommer, Morris, Nichols, etc, But in order to get rid of "eternal torment," he must deny the immortality of the soul,—one of the most precious doctrines of the Bible. But if it were, simply a matter of soul-sleeping respecting man (that man is annihilated at death, and that his hope rests entirely on the resurrection), we might pass it by, if confusion, were not raised among the brethren on the subject. But, in order to make himself consistent, the author must apply the doctrine of soul-sleeping to Christ himself, and have him entirely unconscious, and his soul (or spirit) annihilated between his death and his resurrection. On page 134 of his book he says of Christ, "He laid aside immortality for the glory God set before him, and took the robe of flesh for a season, and was destroyed, was utterly excluded from life, from the moment of death to the moment of the resurrection, when God brought him forth again. . . Hence, to be consistent, we must infer that the death of Christ was the cutting off of life as with ourselves." In other words, when Christ died on the cross, not only his body died, but his personality, his spirit, his soul, died, too! The soldiers, then, not only killed the body but the soul also of Him who said, "Be not afraid of them that kill the body but ARE NOT ABLE to kill the soul." (Matt. 10:28.) John says of Christ, "In the beginning was the Word, and the Word was with God, and the Word was God." (John 1: 1, 2.) When it says that he was God, it means that he was deity. "In him [Christ] dwelleth all the fulness of the godhead bodily." (Col. 2:9.) There

are many such scriptures showing the divinity of Christ. Now the author of this book will have to take the position that Christ was a mere man, or that he was deity, (as the Bible teaches), and that this deity was annihilated in personality between Christ's death and resurrection, and then raised again. If the author says that Christ was mere man, he is a self-confessed Unitarian, and thus an infidel, for he denies the fundamental truth of the gospel that Christ is the Son of God. If he says that Christ was deity, yet was unconscious between his death and resurrection, he annihilates deity, he annihilates part of the Godhead. A doctrine which annihilates, for three days and nights, one of the persons of the Godhead (the Son of God) is one which affects the vitals of Christianity!

But "F. L. Rowe, Publisher", seems to think it a small matter to annihilate the deity of Christ for three days, and so puts his imprint, and thus much influence, on the book which he has printed. If he had wished to publish this book merely as a business proposition, leaving his imprint off, and thus much of his influence off of it, that would have been a different matter; but does he not know that his imprint to the book is an inducement to many religious people to read it, in view of the fact that he is publisher of the Christian Leader?

But, besides the imprint, he puts the following advertisement in the Leader:

THE INDICTMENT OF "ETERNAL TORMENT"

The trial and impeachment of the "theory" by the "admissions, arguments" and "self confessions" of its champions and staunchest supporters. Will be off the press about Dec. 1, 1914.

READ IT WITHOUT RISK— Your money will be cheerfully refunded, if you return the book saying, ' "ALL DOUBTS HAVE NOT BEEN DISSIPATED." We do not want your money if, after you read it carefully YOU STILL AFFIRM THAT "ETERNAL TORMENT" IS A BIBLE FACTOR, AND BELONGS TO THE SCHEME OF

INSPIRATION. IT IS A DOCTRINE OF MEN, AND WE WANT YOU TO KNOW IT.
Over 300 pages, Price \$1, prepaid.

When the Publisher of the Leader is taken to task by some of his readers for encouraging such doctrine, he publishes an endorsement of the author as a Christian in good standing in his home church, and an endorsement of the book by a young brother who has not studied the question, and by another man who is unknown to the church in the city where he lives!—thus encouraging the propagation of such doctrine! We suppose, then, that it is all right for him and any other Christian to encourage the brethren to read, as he has done, any old hobby, or speculative and divisive notion, merely on the ground that there are NO charges yet against the author in his home church! The Leader has done much of that already, and confusion and division reign in many places as a result, the Leader's publisher confessing it even himself. So far as the Leader is concerned, it is not a question of whether a man has a right to express his opinions, but it is whether the Leader has the right to encourage before its readers a doctrine which denies the immortality of the soul, and which annihilates the divinity of our Savior, and thus one Person in the Godhead, for three days and nights!!

We suppose that now the publisher *of* the Leader will have some of its writers to put out an answer to this book, that it may put into the hands of the brethren the "antidote" as well as the "poison"! Because, forsooth, there is more money in poisoning the brethren spiritually (for so much money) and then trying to cure them (for so much money) than there is in trying to keep out such poison in the first place, as the Review is striving earnestly to do. We have to go behind the Leader and spend valuable time, energy and money, which should be spent in aggressive work, in doctoring the sick brethren and churches which have been poisoned by such venomous stuff as the above, which it dishes out to the brethren. The confusion which may come among the brethren because of the heretical

teachings of this book, will be justly chargeable in part to the Christian Leader; and as now in law they are holding the heads of corporations PERSONALLY responsible for evil, so this confusion can be justly chargeable to "F. L. ROWE, PUBLISHER," of this book, and of the Leader which has advertised it!

The Woman Question—"The woman question" has been much agitated among the brethren. Some take the extreme position that a woman should not, open her mouth in public to say anything. They settle down on the scriptures which say for a woman not to speak or usurp authority over the man, but pay no attention to the one where the same apostle regulates the head-gear of the women when they prayed and prophesied, evidently in the presence of men, for the regulations would be ridiculous if they referred to women when they were alone. (See 1st Cor. 11.) Evidently when the apostle condemns women's speaking and teaching, he has reference only to their leading the church and dictating what shall be done, etc., for the Holy Spirit was poured out on the daughters as well *as* the sons, and they prophesied. But, after all, this is a question which has to be settled by the local church. To continue to agitate such a question in a religious paper, and keep the churches stirred over it, is wrong! The Leader has in times past acted as if the salvation of the world depended on its agitation of this question. Several years ago it was agitated in from one to several columns each week, for many months, that in many places where the paper was taken generally and considered seriously there was an agitation of the matter. The publisher of the Leader said publicly at the Moundsville (W, Va.) Mass-meeting in 1914, that a sister "begged" him to stop the agitation of the question, for it had divided her home church! What was true in this church was no doubt true in many others, though an open rupture may not have been made.

It seems that the publisher of the Leader has no well-defined principles guiding him in the putting out of his paper. He makes his paper an open forum for any sort of a

doctrine to be discussed by almost any sort of a man. Every preacher, no matter how bad a man he may be or how much *of* a hobbyist, has some influence; and it seems that under the plea of "a square deal" the publisher has opened his columns to these men to *gain* their influence, with the result that bad men and divisive doctrines have been encouraged, and the brethren in many places disgraced and divided. Then the man that is capable of exposing such men and doctrines is generally shut out of the paper] A religious paper which has no well-defined principles, but opens its columns to a discussion continually of all these questions, is a detriment rather than a benefit to the cause of Christ, especially if the one that could correct these errors is excluded from its columns. The question is, How long will brethren who love the peace and purity of Zion continue to permit a peace-destroyer to come into their homes?

So-called "Evangelistic Assumption"—The Review contends that all persons in the Church are subject to trial and discipline, elders as well as evangelists. An evangelist who is not an elder is subject to the elders of the church where he has his membership. But how about the elders? Some contend that under no circumstances should a church go on the outside of its own membership for anything pertaining thereto. Suppose a church has only one elder, how would he be tried? Suppose there were two elders, and charges should be preferred against both of them, how would one be tried? Suppose there are two elders, and charges should be preferred against one, could he be tried by the other, as some demand? In cases of this kind the accused elder could say, "I will not be^e tried by my brother elder, for he has heard much testimony, and has already made up his mind." The same could be said if there were two or more elders. The natural course which suggests itself is to try to get some one who has had nothing to do with the matter to hear the charges against the elder, hence they would have to go to the outside of that congregation, "Who would be more qualified

than experienced evangelists who had spent their days working among the churches? The accused and the accuser could both agree on one such impartial man, or each could choose one, and these two choose another, and these three could act as judges to hear the testimony and decide as to the guilt. The brethren would then have to act or not act, on the decision of these men. This method seems to be substantiated by the statement of Paul to Timothy, an evangelist, "Against an elder receive not an accusation, except at the mouth of two or three witnesses." (1st Tim. 5: 19.) What is there dangerous and unscriptural about this? This is what the Review contends for. But some have arisen against this. They say that elders should be tried only by those in the congregation. As stated above, the accused could in nine cases out of ten say, and with justice too, that he would not be tried by brethren in that church because they had already made up their minds in the matter. Thus this leaves an elder untried and untriable, exempt from trial, so far as this world *is* concerned, and this would mean "once an elder always an elder," if the accused elder would be perverse, or stubborn. Elders might then be in the class with the German emperor, who thinks that for the administration of his empire he is responsible to God alone, and does not have to answer to man. These people charge the Review with "popery," out this is the worst form of popery, for it practically leaves one class of men in the Church free from all responsibility to any one on earth. The Christian Companion, Christian Leader, Firm Foundation and some minor journals, have arisen with ire against the position of the Review, calling this "evangelistic assumption." They have said that this lays the churches at the feet of the evangelists. They have made some people believe that the position of the Review is that an evangelist can go to a church, grab it by the back of the neck, shake it, and do with it as he pleases, whether he is called there or not. These papers have had the teaching of the Review before them, and our only conclusion can be that they have wilfully and

deliberately misrepresented the Review on the matter. The Review teaches no such doctrine as they ascribe to it, and they cannot find in all its teaching such a doctrine taught!

The Review simply stands for order, and contends that all in the Church are subject to discipline; while these papers mentioned contend for a system which will not work once in ten times,—which leaves one class of men in the Church practically exempt from discipline, and one for which system there is not one fragment of Scripture! Thus the confusion which has been raised in the Brotherhood over this matter involves the principle of order as advocated by the Review, and that of disorder which must result in almost every instance from the plan advocated by these other papers.

The founder of the Leader said, "I have in my lifetime settled many church troubles, and healed many divisions, but I never had a church trouble of my own." (His Biography, p. 98.) Now these troubles which he settled were certainly not where he held membership, and notice that he does not say that he helped to settle them, but that he "settled" them, showing that the affair must have been put into his hands entirely, though he was not a member of the congregation. The pioneers of this Restoration were strongly in favor of local church government, yet they saw with this writer nothing inconsistent in an evangelist's being called to "settle church troubles." But that same Leader, whose founder spoke thus, when evangelists are called by letter and telegram from both sides of a church trouble, to come and help them settle the matter, rises in its fighting clothes and commences a war on the Review for advocating the same thing which the founder of the Leader said he did "many" times! It seems to be the policy of the Leader to find what the position of the Review is on many matters which arise among the brethren, and then always take the opposite, even without any investigation, and then—rule out correction!!

BAD MEN

Bad men will arise among the true churches of Christ, just as they arise among the apostate churches. It is the business of a church to exercise discipline on such when it has the testimony against them. But many churches never exercise discipline, and thus they are "taking from" what the Lord has given, as much as those who use instrumental music "add to" what is written. A man who goes out and preaches may be connected with such a church, against whom there may be charges. If the churches do not do their duty, then some one must warn the churches against evil workers. This then falls on workers for Christ who love the purity of the Church of God. When bad men, either in their moral life or teaching, have arisen, the Review has tried to help the brethren protect themselves, and as a result has brought upon itself the wrath of all evil-doers who wish to prey upon the churches.

But with the Christian Leader it has been different! A couple of instances will suffice to show the difference between the two papers in this respect. Over in eastern Ohio there was a certain preacher who was excluded from his home church for bad conduct. Since that time he has been preying upon the churches. The Review published the man years ago, and refused to have anything to do with him. But the Leader has held him up for years! He was permitted to advertise himself in the Field Reports, and thus open the way for him to do more of his evil work. In many communities where he has gone, he has insulted one, or several, of the sisters! He served a sentence in jail at one place—for insulting a woman!! His family is not living with him!!! HE BEHAVED AS IF HE WERE A LIBERTINE, and he had no church membership. Documentary evidence was sent to the Leader office against his conduct. This same evidence was used against him at another place where he had caused trouble—because of the women. Yet while the Leader had this evidence against him on its files, it was permitting him to advertise himself in its columns! It was probably upholding this man on the endorsement of some of its writers who

themselves were not blameless in just such matters! Shall we have to conclude that "birds of a feather flock together"! This name evil character has almost *destroyed* some churches, and is working division over his evil conduct now in others; and we believe that most of his influence to do this evil has been brought about by liberty he has been given through the Leader. If the Leader had thrown this reprobate aside, as did the Review, several churches would have been saved from disgrace, and some from almost entire destruction. **HOW LONG WILL THE BRETHREN TOLERATE THAT WHICH FOSTERS SUCH EVIL CHARACTERS!** And there are others. We do not say that the Review has been able to free itself at all times from such characters, yet when good reliable testimony is brought us, we govern ourselves accordingly.

FACTIONS

The New Testament condemns factions, yet the Leader has been free to open, its columns to factionists, even when it knew nothing of the circumstances. It seems that in such matters it has gone on the principle that the Review is always wrong, and so has adopted the opposite side. One case will be sufficient for a sample of their principles in such matters. In a certain town trouble arose in a church because of alleged familiarity between a brother and sister in the church, and the church was divided. A certain preacher was one of the main ones in the faction which withdrew to a hall because the church would not exclude these people when they did not have any reliable testimony against them even after investigation of the reports. This excitable preacher and his crowd continued to circulate their slanderous reports till they were compelled to sign libelous documents, denying the truth of the very reports over which they had divided the church! Both sides in the matter had called two evangelists to settle the affair, and signed statements that they would abide by their decision; but the faction refused to abide by their agreement when they saw that the decision went against them. All the leaders were then excluded from the church.

A representative of the Review talked to both sides, and though all parties were friends to it, truth demanded that he take his stand against the faction and the preacher helping to lead it, and he was published to the Brotherhood—to protect it. When the elders of a certain church learned that their preacher was endorsing this faction, they went to the town, investigated the matter thoroughly for their own benefit, and refused to have anything more to do with said preacher. The Christian Leader, without making any investigation of the matter itself, immediately opened its columns to this excluded preacher and those who stood with him, and then refused the church the privilege of giving its readers a statement of the affair as found on the church record, though it permitted the faction freely to defend itself! THIS IS AN OUTRAGE ON THE DISCIPLINE OF THE CHURCHES OF CHRIST, and discourages all churches from exercising discipline. If the Leader had not espoused the cause of this faction, no doubt it would have been dead by this time. There are now two bodies in the town, and thus the body of Christ, we may say, is torn and bleeding, and the brethren there believe, and it is no doubt true, that the Christian Leader is to blame greatly for a continuance of the division.

These are only two of many cases where the Leader has allied itself with factionists and other bad men. Several of its writers are refugees from the Review who cannot stand its plain teaching against all evil. One of them, who stands under the censure of the church to which he properly belongs and who would have been excluded by the elders if it had not been for the lenient words of Daniel Sommer, in his behalf, manifested the spirit of some of the rest of them when he said, "I have seen the time when if it had not been for the law and the fear of losing my own soul, I could have shot Daniel Sommer down." This is the way the Jews acted toward Christ and the Apostles when they condemned their evil ways. The Leader has gathered together many whose names appear well in print but who are in their actions spiritual anarchists. How long will the brethren endure such mutilating of the body of Christ?

BIBLE SCHOOLS AND COLLEGES

There has been much friction between the Review and other papers on this subject. The Review has taken the position that they are unscriptural, and that they should be opposed as innovations on the New Testament Church. It believes that they are unnecessary, unscriptural and unsafe.

Why should we have these schools for religious purposes, in the first place? Are not the Family and the Church the only institutions they had in Apostolic days, and why should we demand other institutions now to do work which belongs to them! The plea is made that infidelity is taught in the secular schools, and that we should have schools where it is not taught and where a Christian influence will be thrown around the young people. But is not the family the place above all others where the young should have the good influence around them? Think you that a young man has a greater inducement to do right away from the guiding care of father and mother, and in the hands of strangers, than in going to a high school at home under their care? If so, then there is something radically wrong with that family. Our children will encounter evil teaching wherever they go, and the influence of the Christian family and the Church is supposed to hold them to the right way. They did not have such schools in the First Century, but Christians had to attend heathen schools, if they went to any, yet they made advancement. With the high schools and normal schools at hand, where children can get a good education and at the same time stay under the guiding care of father and mother, they are far better off than among strangers, even though such profess to be Christians. Especially is this true when we hear such words of warning as the following coming from a preacher named Nay, a strong Bible college advocate:

I am a friend and well-wisher of every honorable "Bible College," and believe that we have many noble Christians presiding, but even with this confidence they are not above our careful and daily scrutiny. ... I am constrained to believe that the founding of "Bible Colleges" . . . has

become an educational "fad" with some who apparently seek *for* notoriety.

As a warning to the inspecting Christians who are seriously thinking of leaving home to enter a "Bible College" for better influence and safer surroundings, let me speak to you a word of timely need. First, investigate and ascertain the spiritual character of the college faculty, and be sure and ascertain if it is working in peace and harmony with the local church of Christ. See if its teaching and deportment is strengthening the spiritual unity in the vicinity in which the school is located. If the answer is in the negative then be wise, for there is a cause. I have not drawn from my mind an imaginary picture of alarm, but speak words of truth and soberness.

But for an institution of learning to be labeled "Bible College," or "a school in which God's holy Word is taught and studied," does not necessarily make such a school a suitable place for us to patronize, much less to advertise it as a safe custodian of the morals and spiritual characters of young tendrils of the Lord 's family,

If we are not holding our children to the right way, it is the fault of parents more than any one or anything else, and they are simply shifting to some one else work which they themselves should do, when they send their children away from home to school "that they may be under a good influence." Let us give God's plan a trial before we organize another institution to do work which belongs to the Divine organizations.

Besides, these schools are dangerous! In fact, any human organization linked with the Church in any way, is dangerous! The greatest curse in the Christian world is the clergy, and the school attached to the Church to teach religion has been the hot-bed of the clergy. Now, in many of the very schools which were established to teach the Bible as the Word of God, the Bible is torn to pieces! Harvard, Yale, Chicago University, etc., were schools established to teach the Bible, but they now are hot-beds of infidelity. WHAT IS TO HINDER NASHVILLE BIBLE SCHOOL AND HER DAUGHTERS FROM BECOMING

THE SAME IN THE COURSE OF TIME? There is no part of the Bible to govern such organizations, and hence, as their guidance rests in the wisdom of the men at the head, and *AS THE men there may in a few years* have different sentiments from those now there, we see the possibilities for evil that may result. No one stood more staunchly for the inspiration of the Bible and against the destructive criticism than J. W. McGarvey did, yet the very chair which he occupied in defending the Bible is now filled with one who is destroying it! Even iron-clad deeds amount to little when there is a strong sentiment in favor of a change.

No one was more against the clergy than Alexander Campbell was, yet when he built Bethany College he opened the way for a clergy. Young men came to school to study to preach, just as they did to learn any other profession. Then they went forth from the College with their diplomas in their hands, looking for a flock to fleece. The God-given elders were thrust into the back-ground and the pastor was installed. The result is that there is in the "Christian church" as much of a clergy as there is in any of the other denominations. Regardless of the fact that the Nashville Bible School and others state emphatically that they are not "preacher-factories," still some prominent men among those who favor them admit that many young men attending them are getting the ideas and feelings of the clergy. A.B. Lipscomb, One of the editors of the Gospel Advocate, and a man who ought to know what he is talking about, in an announcement of "Special Numbers of the Gospel Advocate During 1915", says concerning the "Bible School Number": "The work and influence of such schools during the past fifteen years have surpassed all expectations. If properly encouraged, these schools will become more and more useful for the dissemination of truth through the education of young men for the ministry and the preparation of boys and girls for the serious duties of life." In other words, not only in the future, but also the past, they have been engaged in the "education of young men for the ministry", for they are becoming "more and more useful" in that work. In other

words, these schools are theological seminaries In part. What is, then, the difference between these theological seminaries and those of our denominational friends? Do they not have courses for those who are not theological students, just the same as these "Bible schools" do? In other words, these Bible schools are theological seminaries in part, and they are gradually raising up a new order of clergymen among those who claim to be Apostolic.

Besides this, these schools are unscriptural. They are human organizations, and are established to teach the Bible,—a work which belongs to the Church; while Paul says, "Unto him [God] be glory in the Church." (Eph. 3: 21.) In "the original subscriptions to build the [Nashville Bible] School", we have the following: "The supreme purpose of the School shall be to teach the Bible as the revealed will of God to man and as the only and sufficient rule of faith and practice, and to train those who attend in a pure Bible Christianity," etc. In other words, these schools are human organizations, and they were established "to teach the Bible" and "pure Bible Christianity", work which belongs to the Church, What is the difference between them and the missionary society, in their fundamental principle? The missionary society is a human organization, and so is the Bible college, according to their own admissions. The missionary society teaches the Bible, and so does the college. This is sufficient to show that one cannot justly oppose the missionary society in its fundamental principle of organization and at the same time endorse the college! But they are alike in another respect,—each is begging money from brethren ami churches—because of the "good" it is doing. But even if the colleges would cut out the begging they would still be in the same catalogue with the societies. Any human organization established by Christians to do work which belongs to the Church, is unscriptural. Unto God "be glory in the Church."

In view of the fact that these colleges are unnecessary, unsafe and unscriptural, the Review has opposed them almost from the beginning. Benjamin Franklin during his

last years was opposed to these colleges, and raised his voice against them. But the Gospel Advocate, Firm Foundation, Christian Leader, Christian Companion, and certain smaller journals, have all vigorously advocated these schools, and denounced the Review as "a trouble-maker." These papers also endorse orphan schools, old peoples' homes, etc.—• other human organizations for which there is no more authority than for an aid society! As individual Christians and as churches we should take care of the widows and orphans in their affliction. They did all this kind of work in the days of the Apostles without human organizations, and they did it well. The simple fact is that these papers which endorse these human organizations to do work which belongs to the one Divine organization of the Church, are "digressive"!

The Christian Leader has favored these colleges from the beginning. Of its founder, his biographer says on page 85:

On the question of colleges where the Bible was made + a daily study, and young men prepared for the ministry, he was always open and strong in their favor.

The Christian Leader still stands for these human organizations to do work which God commanded to be done through the Church, and thus it is helping to rob the Church of that glory which belongs to it. Its editors all stand for these colleges as they are, with possibly the exception of one. Its writers have advocated the colleges for years in its columns, and condemned most vigorously the position of the Review on the matter, thus hindering us in our work of exalting the Church as the only organization through which Christians as Christians should be doing the work of the Church, When one of its writers presumed to question in its columns, not the scripturalness, but the usefulness of these schools, the publisher soon put a stop to the investigation. It has been advertising these schools for years in its columns, and urges parents to send their children to these schools. Thus by its teaching it is helping to rob the Church of its glory, and is helping to divide the churches by pushing these schools upon the Brotherhood!

CONCLUSION

And now the reader sees the real cause of the friction between the Review on the one hand and these other journals on the other. It is not a question of mere papers, but it is a question of principles! The reader sees for what the Review stands, and for what these other journals stand. It stands unflinchingly for the truth of the New Testament. It stood squarely against instrumental music in the worship, and the societies, when the other journals were "on the fence," or before they had come into existence. It has stood against these hobbies when the Christian Leader, Firm Foundation, and some other journals have opened their columns to a frequent, if not continual, discussion of them, bringing confusion among the brethren. It has stood for the purity of the Church, and has done what it could to protect the discipline of the churches and to warn the brethren against "wolves" when the churches failed to exercise discipline; while the Leader has pursued a course which has thrown and is still throwing churches into anarchy! And it has stood against any human organization of a Bible college being established to do work which belongs to the Church, while all these other journals have strenuously opposed its position and have contended for this human organization to deprive the Church of glory and strength which belong to it. For its contention against all this technical reasoning and "digressionism", it has brought upon itself the charge by these other papers that it is "jealous." Yes, its managers are jealous for the simplicity that is in Christ; and they will not stand idly by and permit the professed friends of the Lord to disrobe of her glory the Lamb's Bride (the Church), and leave her naked in the presence of her enemies!

We have no apologies to make for the wrong spirit which may have been shown by some Review writers in times past, but the principles are undoubtedly those of the Word of God. If so, then these other journals undoubtedly have principles which are not in harmony with the Gospel. The friction among these papers is not a question of mere

papers, It is a question of principles, as we have seen. Alexander Campbell said, "He makes no schism who does no more than the Lord *commands*. . . . It is he who makes a new institution . . . and contends for it, that makes the schism. It is not he that obeyed the first commandment, but he that made the golden calf, that made confusion in Israel," So it is not the Review, which contends for Apostolic simplicity and purity, that is causing the confusion among the people of God; but those preachers and papers which have "golden calves", or something else of their own devising, which they are trying to force upon the brethren. Paul says of certain men (and the same applies to religious journals): "Mark them which are causing the divisions and occasions of stumbling, contrary to the doctrine which ye learned; and TURN AWAY FROM THEM"! (Rom.. 16: 17.) In all this work, the Review has stood on the unpopular side, and has lost many subscribers. It could send out a paper much better in appearance if it were willing to take the vicious advertisements of patent medicines and other questionable commodities which these other journals receive, —advertisements which even respectable secular magazines do not take. For the sake of "truth and righteousness as taught by the apostles of Jesus Christ," it rules out all these. Its existence depends on the number of its friends, and on their faithfulness and zeal in behalf of truth. ALL THOSE WHO BELIEVE THAT THE PRINCIPLES FOR WHICH IT CONTENDS ARE THOSE OF THE NEW TESTAMENT, SHOULD APPRECIATE ITS POSITION, AND SHOULD STRIVE EARNESTLY TO PUT A COPY OF THE APOSTOLIC REVIEW INTO EVERY CHRISTIAN HOME.

It is with much sadness that we make the foregoing statements; but we feel that it is due the brethren, for the clearing of their minds, that we lay this history before them, —that they may decide for themselves who are the real disturbers in Israel, and whether it is jealousy which has prompted the Review to its course of action. We

wish with all our hearts that it were not necessary to make these statements, but is defense of the truth, and in defense of the simplicity and purity and glory of the Church for which our Savior died, we have been constrained to write these things. We have been exceedingly careful in all our statements in these pages that nothing but the truth should be given; and we look upon those our friends who will show us that we have made any wrong statements of facts. Many sensitive readers have lamented much over what they have spoken of as "contentions among our leading brethren," As far as the Review and its friends are concerned, we disclaim all responsibility for every vestige of such "contentions." We did not introduce any cause nor occasion for contention, except as found in the Gospel as Divinely recorded.

Brother, there are many confused brethren who need to know the facts in this booklet, and we are depending on you to see that they get a chance to read this tract.

REVIEW MANAGERS.