

Macedonian Call

"Come Over into Macedonia and Help Us."—(Acts 16:9.)

Volume 15

INDIANAPOLIS, IND., SEPTEMBER, 1941

Number 9

"The Pastor" and The Bible College

In Which H. Leo Boles, Former President of David Lipscomb Bible College, and N. B. Hardeman, President of Freed-Hardeman College, refuse to affirm their Teaching and Practice in the proposition that "The Human Organization of a Bible College . . . is in Harmony with the New Testament."

Are We Sectarrians?

If you read the religious papers of this brotherhood, you are pained at the differences, confusion and division among those people who have for a century been pleading for Unity on the Bible and Bible alone. I am coming to you with many facts and truths which may help us see a true foundation on which we may unite and free ourselves from the stigma of division among us.

For many years I have done little else except read and study the Bible and teach it to others. I have read tens of thousands of pages of church history. I have been reading practically all of the religious papers for thirty-five years or more. So I ought to have some information which might help. And in an unbiased way I wish to present to you what I think is wrong. If I were to consult the flesh alone, I should rather take the opposite view from that which I present, for it is more lucrative and popular; but what shall it profit a man to gain the world and lose his soul, or forfeit his eternal life?

It is important that we ask ourselves, "Am I a sectarian?" Glibly do we condemn the "sectarians" about us; yet what is a sectarian? Listen: A sectarian is one who blindly belongs to a party and will not honestly consider any reasoning against it. There are people in the denominations who WILL earnestly consider the Bible and will come out, and these are not sectarians, but God's people in Babylon. On the other hand (and I say it sadly), there are MANY in the "Church of Christ" who have taken positions and WILL NOT consider any reasoning against them. Is that true of you regarding "the pastor" system and the Bible college question? God forbid that we denounce sectarians when we are sectarians ourselves. Could Paul say to us what he said to certain Jews, "Wherein thou judgest another, thou condemnest thyself"?

The "One Body" (The Church) Versus Other Bodies (Organizations)

We all admit what Paul says, "Unto God be glory in the Church." (Eph. 3:21). But what is the church? It consists of the individual Christian working as a mere Christian to the glory of God. It consists of the Christian family doing that, such as Priscilla and Aquila when together they were converting Apollos (see Acts 18:24-28); and a father and mother teaching and training their children in God's way (see Eph. 5, 6). It consists of the local congregation working as such. The apostolic Christians glorified God "in the Church," and that is the way they did it.

When the teaching of the Bible is part of the curriculum in a college, the man teaching it is not doing the teaching as an

individual Christian but as part of an organization. He loses his identity as a mere Christian worker and gives it over to the human organization. It is the school which is doing the teaching and it receives the credit for it. It is like a railroad company and an engineer working for it. If the engineer should strike an automobile and kill a man, the relatives would not sue the engineer but the railroad company. Why? The engineer's work is lost in the work of the company. He is not working as a mere individual. So with one who teaches the Bible in the human organization of a Bible college. Let us go more into details.

"There is one Body." (Eph. 4:4). "The Body, the Church," (Colossians 1:18). "Unto him [God] be glory in the Church," (one Body). (Ephesians 3:21). Here it is distinctly shown that we must glorify God in the one Body, the Church, not in some human organization, body. Paul shows conclusively that the only basis of Christian "unity of the spirit in the bond of peace" (Eph. 4:3), is this "one Body" along with other oneness mentioned. Much division is brought among professed Christians by their other bodies to do work of the one Body, the Church. Their "liberty" is condemned by these scriptures.

The Church has its laws, elders, deacons, treasurer, and is the "one Body" of the New Testament; the missionary society has its laws, president, vice-president, treasurer, board, and is another body (organization). But Paul says, "Unto God be glory in the Church" (Eph. 3:21).

The aid society has president, laws, treasurer, and is another body (organization). But Paul says there is "one Body." (Eph. 4:4).

The Bible College has president, laws, treasurer, other officers, and is another body (corporation), in which they are trying to glorify God; but Paul commands to glorify him "in the Church", "one Body."

The orphan home, established by Christians, has president, vice-president, board, treasurer, laws, and is another body, organization; yet inspiration commands to glorify him in the "one Body", the Church.

If Bible classes on Lord's day morning are organized with superintendent, treasurer and other officers, they fall in the same class. And if a religious paper is a corporation, organization, it, too, is another "body" and unscriptural.

A Proposed Debate Between D. A. Sommer and H. Leo Boles

Some time in June, 1941, a pastor (feeder) of a Bible college church in Indianapolis, and a pastor of a college church in Anderson, Ind., came to me and among other things asked if I

MACEDONIAN CALL

Devoted to the work of establishing and developing New Testament churches.

Published Monthly by
D. A. SOMMER
918 Congress Avenue
INDIANAPOLIS, IND.

Subscription Price, \$1.00 a Year
New names in any number, 50c each.
Old names in clubs of five or more, 75c each.

Entered as second class matter May 1, 1936, at the post office at Indianapolis, Indiana, under the Act of March 3, 1879.

would debate the college question in Indianapolis with H. Leo Boles (who was then holding a protracted meeting at East side church in Indianapolis). I replied that I would, and was exhorted to send propositions. Bro. Boles is one of the most prominent of the college advocates, being "Staff Writer, Editor Sunday School Literature" of the Gospel Advocate, as his letter-head tells us, and is ex-president of a Bible college.

Now in differences among men, every one should be willing to affirm his own teaching and practice in clear, unequivocal (unambiguous) terms. Bro. Boles would not affirm and deny the propositions we presented which bring out clear differences between college and anti-college brethren. Here they are:

Sommer's Propositions to Boles

PROPOSITION I—The Human Organization of a Bible College, such as David Lipscomb College, Abilene Christian College, Freed-Hardeman College, Established by Christians to Teach the Bible Along with Secular Branches—is in harmony with the New Testament.

..... Affirms, D. A. Sommer Denies.

PROPOSITION II—Human Organizations of Schools, Established by Professed Christians to Teach Religion, or Teach the Bible, were Largely Responsible for the Development of the Roman Catholic Church, were Largely Responsible for the Infidelity and Apathy in Protestantism, were Largely Responsible for the Degrassions of the Christian Church, and are Largely Responsible for Worldliness and Apostasy in Professed Churches of Christ.

D. A. Sommer Affirms, Denies.

PROPOSITION III—The One-Man Preacher-pastor (feeder) system, in which a Preacher, Usually Imported, Preaches Every Sunday morning and night, and Takes Charge of Other Public Meetings, in a Church with Elders—is in harmony with the New Testament.

..... Affirms, D. A. Sommer Denies.

PROPOSITION IV—God's System of Edifying the Organized Church, when the Whole Church is Gathered for the Lord's Day Worship, is Through Elders AND Other Members of the Body of Christ.

D. A. Sommer Affirms, Denies.

Boles' Letter in Reply

Nashville, Tenn., June 10, 1941.

Dear Bro. Sommer: The copy of your letter of June 6 to me was handed to me the day before I left Indianapolis. I just now find time to give attention to it. Permit me to make reply in a kind and frank manner.

Your propositions are indefinite and very evasive and unskillfully drafted. You either have written these propositions so that you knew that I would not accept them or else you did not know how to draft propositions for debate. Your second proposition is a historical question in the realm of ecclesiastical or church history. You should know that such a clumsy proposition would not be interesting or profitable to the public. You

can prove most anything by church history; there are historians who have written on nearly every side of so many propositions. Your third proposition is not definite enough to bring out a clear issue. Why waste time in discussing such a clumsy proposition? Your fourth proposition sets forth no issue in a definite way between us. I am persuaded that you knew this.

If you really want to debate you can get it. I have no time to waste with anyone who is not a Christian gentleman and one who will not maintain Christian conduct during a discussion. Many preachers do not know, it seems, how to treat an opponent in a courteous and Christian way. If you are not willing to agree to do this you need not make any reply to this letter; if you are willing then you may sign the enclosed propositions and we will arrange a suitable time and place in Indianapolis for the discussion. Your signing the [two] enclosed propositions will be proof that you sincerely desire a discussion. Yours fraternally,

H. LEO BOLES.

(Boles Propositions are given as we review them.—D. A. S.)

Sommer Reviews Boles' 1st Proposition

PROPOSITION I—Faithful Christians Have the Same Scriptural Right to Teach the Bible in Colleges as Editors Have to Teach It Through Religious Papers.

H. Leo Boles Affirms Denies

There are several expressions in this proposition which are ambiguous or irrelevant, but to save space and unnecessary discussion we pass over them. The proposition does not touch the real issue between us which is this: Do Christians Have the Scriptural Right to Establish HUMAN ORGANIZATIONS, such as David Lipscomb College, to Teach the Bible? Why did not Bro. Boles affirm that instead of presenting his evasive and equivocal proposition? Religious papers are not under discussion at all, though it is true that when they become organizations, corporations, to teach the Bible they stand in the same class with the colleges. A religious paper published by an individual is a thing altogether different from a college run by a corporation, and Bro. Boles ought to know that. I will affirm the scripturalness of the Macedonian Call, if it is called in question, but we cannot get Bro. Boles to affirm his practice. The question is not whether he is in the same boat with me, or I with him, but whether Christians have the scriptural right to form HUMAN ORGANIZATIONS to Teach the Bible. HIS PROPOSITION IGNORES THE ISSUE ALTOGETHER.

Sommer Reviews Boles' 2d Proposition

PROPOSITION II—It is Scripturally Wrong for Faithful Christians to Teach the Bible in Such Colleges as David Lipscomb, Freed-Hardeman, Harding, and Abilene.

..... Affirms, H. Leo Boles Denies.

1. There are equivocal expressions in this proposition, too, which we pass over, to save space and unnecessary discussion. 2. The proposition is negative. Why should he call upon me to affirm a negative? It is logic and common sense for every man to affirm his own teaching and practice, but Bro. Boles will not, will not, do that. I will affirm my teaching and practice, now let him do his. But he won't. 3. There are some things in Bible Colleges which in themselves are right, just as there are things in the Roman Catholic Church which in themselves are right. Bro. Boles' proposition does not cut these and other irrelevant points out of the discussion, and does not hold to the main point of difference: Have Christians the scriptural right to form HUMAN ORGANIZATIONS to teach the Bible? Is there not a reason why Bro. Boles will not affirm this main point at issue?

Sommer's 1st Proposition

PROPOSITION I—The Human Organization of a Bible College, such as David Lipscomb College, Abilene Christian College, Freed-Hardeman College, Established by Christians to Teach the Bible Along with Secular Branches—is in Harmony with the New Testament.

..... Affirms, D. A. Sommer Denies.

There is not a single expression in this proposition to which Bro. Boles can make a reasonable objection—that it does not

state the point at issue. He knows that they are "ORGANIZATIONS," for they are incorporated, and his brethren admit they are organized. He knows that they are "HUMAN" organizations, for he certainly would not say they are divine. He knows they are "ESTABLISHED BY CHRISTIANS"—he certainly believes the college brethren are "Christians." He knows that they "TEACH THE BIBLE ALONG WITH SECULAR BRANCHES." There is not a single expression in my proposition to which he can justly find objections, as not stating the point at issue; yet when all the expressions are connected, he will not, will not, affirm it. Why? Is there a reason? Yes. It cuts out all quibbling and irrelevant issues.

ALL Bible college advocates that I have ever dealt with have evaded this main point of the controversy for the same reason. They wish to say: I believe a man can run a farm and teach the Bible, and run a suspender factory and teach the Bible, and teach school and teach the Bible, etc.—which is NOT the question at all. They wish to slip from the work of an individual to the work of a human organization established by Christians for that purpose of teaching the Bible. They EVADE the very point under discussion of Organization.

The following shows the real reason Bro. Boles will not affirm the real point in this discussion. With the missionary society probably in mind, he wrote this, which applies to his Bible college the same as the society, in the Gospel Advocate, p. 149, Feb. 15, 1940:

"As Christians may co-operate with one another in living the Christian life, so churches may co-operate with each other in furthering the cause of Christ. The moment that ANOTHER ORGANIZATION is formed, that moment the co-operation ceases to be in harmony with God's will."

Now, since the co-operation in a Bible college is in "ANOTHER ORGANIZATION," let us apply his reasoning, and we have this: "The moment that another organization called a Bible college or orphan home is formed, that moment the co-operation ceases to be in harmony with God's will." How any sane mind can reach any other conclusion, I can not see. Therefore, the Bible colleges "cease to be in harmony with God's will," according to Bro. Boles himself!

Now we see WHY Bro. Boles will not affirm my first proposition. He must either give up his Bible college and orphan home, or stand forth as a type of the most inconsistent of reasoners. The thousands of college brethren stand in the same inconsistent and self-convicted position.

How any reasoning man can say, "Preaching the Bible through the human organization of a Missionary Society is WRONG, but teaching the Bible through the human organization of a Bible College is RIGHT"—I can not, can not, can not see.

Jesus said, "Go ye therefore and teach [make disciples of] all nations, baptizing them . . . teaching them to observe all things whatsoever I have commanded you." (Mat. 28: 19, 20.) By what authority does the Bible college advocate say to the dissenters: "It is all, all wrong for you to 'teach' all nations through your human organization of a Missionary Society, but all, all right for us to 'teach' the 'all things' through our human organization of a Bible College after they become disciples?" This may be "dividing" the Word, but is it "RIGHTLY" dividing the word of truth?"

N. B. Hardeman Wouldn't Debate It, Either

Several years ago, I tried to get an oral debate with Bro. Hugh McCord, pastor (feeder) of the East side church in Indianapolis. He replied that he would debate me in the Macedonian Call. I replied that our challenge was an oral debate in Indianapolis, but that since he mentioned papers, I would be glad to debate in the Macedonian Call AND Gospel Advocate. It never matured. But Bro. N. B. Hardeman, president of Freed-Hardeman College, when passing through encouraged him; so I sent the proposition to him to try his courage, and received the following curt reply: "Dear Bro. Sommer: I am not interested in a debate with you whatsoever. Give my regards to your father. Fraternally, N. B. Hardeman."

Now, Bro. Hardeman is as big a man as the college people have, probably, and he may have considered the publisher of the Macedonian Call "too small a fry" for him, but I can not help thinking that he shied from the proposition for the same

reason that Bro. Boles has done. It states exactly the point at issue, and shows the gross inconsistency of the Bible college advocates. If the missionary society is wrong because it is a human organization doing part of the work of the Church, when Paul commands us to glorify God "in the Church,"—then the Bible college, and orphan home, too, are wrong for the same reason. ANY human organization established by Christians to preach the gospel, teach the gospel (Bible), help the poor, sick or orphans, is unscriptural. "Unto God be glory in the Church." (Eph. 3:21.)

Bible Colleges and "Christian" Orphan Homes Are Rivals of the Church

We all believe that the apostolic Christians gave glory to God in the Church, and when we look at their example we find: 1. Apostolic Christians worked as individual Christians under Christ and his Word. 2. They worked as local churches. 3. They worked as Christian families. Priscilla and Aquila, husband and wife, together taught Apollos the way of the Lord more perfectly. Fathers were to teach their children, and wives were to work with their husbands. These early Christians obviously glorified God "in the Church" when they worked as families, homes, in teaching their children.—Hence, work of the Church includes work in a Christian home. Does it not follow, then, that Christian Orphan Homes, and Bible colleges, human organizations, which some would try to have us believe are mere "adjuncts and extensions of the home," are in reality "adjuncts" to the Church?

Inasmuch as Paul says of God, "Unto Him be glory in the church," (Eph. 3:21), and inasmuch as early Christians worked as individuals, local churches, and as Christian homes, does it not follow that they were working "in the Church," when husbands and wives taught their children and others, and together did good unto others?

Inasmuch as Paul shows that the basis of Christian unity is "one Body," (Eph. 4:4), and inasmuch as the early Christians obviously worked in that "one Body" when they worked as individuals, local churches and Christian families, what right have we, then, to form another "body," organization, and call it an "adjunct to the home" which is part of that "one Body," when that home is Christian?

Is not visiting widows and orphans part of the work of the Church as individuals, local churches and Christian families? Then what scriptural right have "Christians" to form a human "adjunct," another "body," called an orphan home or old folks' home, to help do that?

What is the Work of the Church, Anyway? Is not teaching and preaching the gospel, the Bible, part of the work of the Church? Is not teaching the morals and spiritual things in that gospel, and thus building character, part of the work of the Church? By what rule of common sense do we say concerning the Great Commission, the command to "teach all nations" is work of the Church, and the dissenters have no right to form a missionary society to do that; but the command in the same Commission,—teaching them [disciples] to observe all things whatsoever I have commanded you—is NOT work of the Church, and we can form a human organization of a Bible College to do it in part? Since Paul commands to glorify God in the Church, what right have you or any group of "Christians" to form a human organization called a Bible College, to teach the Bible, or build character, and call it an "adjunct to the home"?

Freed-Hardeman College Bulletin, April, 1936, page 12, says: "Not only is the school maintained IN ORDER to develop the moral and spiritual qualities of its pupils," etc. Now is it not the purpose of the Church to "develop the moral and spiritual qualities" of its members? And is not Freed-Hardeman College a RIVAL body of the Church when it proposes to do this work of the Church?

An Abilene Christian College Bulletin says on the "Purpose" of their school: "Abilene Christian College proposes to emphasize the study of the Bible as the inspired Word of the living God. IT IS THE PURPOSE to get the great truths of the Bible into the hearts and minds of the students who attend it, in order that their lives may be influenced, guided and directed by its sacred teachings." Now is not that exactly the purpose of the Church? And thus is not Abilene a RIVAL organization of the God-given Church?

The George Pepperdine Foundation says: "The Foundation was formed in 1931 as a non-profit California corporation, organized for the PURPOSE of doing educational, CHARITABLE and RELIGIOUS WORK, especially among young people." Now does not Paul command us to do our Educational (when it is the Bible), Religious and Charitable work "in the Church"? And does not this "corporation" (body) become a RIVAL body of the Church?

The David Lipscomb College is the oldest college among the churches opposed to the Christian Church, and in its catalogue of 1921-22, it says on page 10 (The same is quoted and endorsed by Harding College in their Bulletin, Oct. 1928, p. 2): "Its supreme PURPOSE as set forth in the charter 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." Now is not that THE EXACT PURPOSE OF THE CHURCH?

From their own catalogues and bulletins we have let the five colleges tell what their purpose is, and you can see that their main purpose is the same as of the Church. They are rival organizations of the Church. To call them "adjuncts of the home" does not camouflage their real identity.

Human organizations of Bible colleges or orphan homes, established BY CHRISTIANS to teach the Bible or religion or build character or take care of orphans, are contrary to Paul's basis of unity on "one Body," the Church, and contrary to his command to glorify God "in the Church," and hence are unscriptural.

For these reasons faithful Christians are duty bound to oppose them just as they do the Missionary Society.

Now don't tell us with tears in your eyes of the great good your college and orphan home is doing. The digressive does that with his Missionary Society, and you discard the plea. Moses "did good" when he brought the water from the rock, yet was not permitted to enter Canaan because he took the glory to himself. Uzzah "did good" when he tried to keep the ark of God from being dashed to pieces, but God smote him and he died before the Lord. There is a "good" which is an evil—when it is not according to God's word.

Sommer's 3d Proposition

PROPOSITION III--The One-man Preacher-pastor (feeder) System, in which a Preacher, Usually Imported, Preaches Every Sunday Morning and Night, and takes Charge of Other Public Meetings, in a Church with Elders—is in Harmony with the New Testament.

Affirms, D. A. Sommer Denies.

J. G. Peevyhouse says this in the Gospel Advocate, June 19, 1941: "It seems that about all one can see and hear today both 'on the record' and 'off the record', is something about the 'pastor system'." That is a healthy sign. I did not notice so much of it till we sent out our May, 1940, issue of the Macedonian Call on "A Forgotten Scripture." We sent a copy to every one in the Year Book of Preachers and to all the "Correspondents of Churches of Christ." More than fourteen thousand copies went out. A prominent old preacher in Nashville, Tenn., said, "It is worth its weight in gold." A brother who recently visited in the South said, "I found your May, 1940, issue in many libraries of brethren." (If you did not receive a copy, send a stamp for a FREE copy.)

The practice mentioned in this 3rd Proposition is almost universal among the college brethren. Practically NO effort is made to develop elders. Paul commanded Timothy to commit what he had learned "to faithful men who shall be able to teach others." (2 Tim. 2:2.) Practically no preachers are doing that. They are only fifty per cent New Testament preachers. Why don't they develop elders? Answer: They wish the elder's work and authority for themselves. Is it not time that these preachers quit denouncing sects for their unscripturalness, and look awhile in a mirror at themselves? There is as much authority in the New Testament for the pope of Rome as for the one-man preacher-pastor (feeder) in a church with elders. No wonder Bro. Boles would not sign his name to this 3rd Proposition, and did not give any sort of a substitute.

Ancient Israel demanded a king that they might be like the nations about them, (1 Sam. 8); and modern Israel demands a pastor that it may be like the denomi-nations about them. Thus does history blindly repeat itself.

Sommer's 4th Proposition

PROPOSITION IV—God's System of Edifying the Organized Church, When the Whole Church is Gathered for the Lord's Day Worship, is Through Elders AND Other Members of the Body of Christ.

D. A. Sommer Affirms,

Denies.

God ordained "Preaching" for non-believers, and "Teaching" for believers and non-believers. Note the following:

"And Jesus went about all Galilee, teaching in their synagogues, and preaching the gospel of the kingdom." (Matt. 4:23, 9:34.) "He departed thence to teach and to preach in their cities." (Matt. 11:1.) "Being grieved that they taught the people, and preached through Jesus the resurrection from the dead." (Acts. 4:2.) "And daily in the temple, and in every house, they ceased not to teach and preach Jesus Christ." (Acts 5:42.) "Paul and Barnabas continued at Antioch, teaching and preaching the word of the Lord, with many others also." (Acts 15:35.) "Paul dwelt two whole years in his own hired house, and received all that came unto him, preaching the kingdom of God, and teaching those things which concern the Lord Jesus Christ." (Acts 28:30, 31.)

Alexander Campbell said in 1853, when he was 65 years of age, (as found in the Millennial Harbinger for that year):

"Preaching the gospel and Teaching the converts, are as distinct and distinguishable employments as enlisting an army and training it, or as creating a school and teaching it. Unhappily for the church and the world, this distinction, if at all conceded as legitimate, is obliterated or annulled in almost all protestant Christendom."

Search the New Testament closely and see if you can find a single instance where apostles "preached" to Christians. Look up the word "preach" in an unabridged concordance. But better still study the five Greek words translated "preach." The word "preach" in Acts 20:7 is translated "discoursed with," in the Revised Version. Paul spoke about preaching to the Romans, but the letter shows he is addressing part of it to non-believing Jews. For a fuller discussion of this point, send a stamp for FREE copy of Macedonian Call for March, 1941, on "Why the Church of Christ Has Stumbled." Alexander Campbell made this distinction, based largely on George Campbell's distinction between Greek words translated "preach," in his Translation of the Gospel with Notes. George Campbell devotes twelve pages to a discussion of those Greek words. This whole system of PREACHING entertaining sermonettes to Christians, instead of TEACHING them, is a relic of apostate Christendom, and has been the cause of much stumbling and staggering and even falling, in the "Church of Christ."

Paul said to the Ephesian elders, "Feed the church of God," (Acts 20:28); he did not tell them to hire some one to feed it for them, inasmuch as they were too busy to study.

In 1 Cor. 14:26 we have this: "When ye come together, every one of you hath a psalm, hath a doctrine [teaching] hath a tongue, hath a revelation, hath an interpretation." Though these were inspired gifts, it shows that in the apostolic Church several took part when the whole church was gathered together and not simply one man—the pastor, minister, preacher. Why were elders to be "apt to teach" (1 Tim. 3:2), if they were not to teach but could turn that over to "the pastor" (who is unmentioned in the New Testament?) Why were they to be "able by sound doctrine both to exhort and to convince the gainsayers" (Titus 1:9), if the preacher was to do that? Why were the Thessalonian brethren commanded to "edify one another" (1 Thess. 4:11), if they could sit back and let the preacher do that for them. Our Sunday night meetings were primarily intended as evangelistic, to preach to the world, so we are not speaking of such meetings. Paul commanded Timothy, a young preacher, that "The things which thou hast heard of me among many witnesses, the same commit thou to faithful men who shall be able to teach others also" (2 Tim. 2:2). This shows that the preacher is commanded to develop teachers in the churches, AND THIS NEGLECT HAS UPSET ALMOST ENTIRELY THE DIVINE PLAN OF CHURCH GOVERNMENT. When this long-lost scripture is truly found again, the kingdom of the clergy must go to its own place.

Paul's stay of three years at Ephesus is no authority for the one-man preacher-pastor system where the imported hireling does the feeding the elders should do, for Paul's enemies charged that "throughout all Asia this Paul persuaded and turned away much people" (Acts 19:26); and afterward he told the elders there to "feed the Church of God" (Acts 20:28). Apostolic evangelists built churches and worked their way OUT of the public services for the church (especially when the whole church was assembled); while modern preachers, pastors, located ministers, work their way INTO such services, so that the church can not do without them or some one to take their place.

Some uninformed, mentally-lazy, spoon-fed Christians seem to think all their troubles will cease, when they can get a located minister to chew their food for them and put it into their mouths; but most of the divisions in the denominational world are probably over preachers.

Alexander Campbell vigorously denounced the "kingdom of the clergy," as he called it, yet when he established Bethany College, he turned on the heat in an incubator for a new batch of clerics. David Lipscomb, Abilene, Harding, Freed-Hardeman, and other such schools thought to avoid this; but their preachers as a whole come out with diplomas in their hands looking for flocks to fleece. The one-man preacher-pastor system prevails almost entirely in the South where these Bible colleges flourish, thrusting the God-given eldership into a corner of the stage.

The George Pepperdine College

George Pepperdine established the Western Auto Supply Company from which he has derived millions of dollars which he now wishes to devote to the cause of Christ. I am personally acquainted with Bro. Pepperdine, and have talked with him several times about things pertaining to the kingdom, yet not in late years. He may be a sincere man, but the millions of dollars he has put into the Pepperdine Foundation, I firmly believe will do much harm to apostolic simplicity of the Church.

The first sentence in his "Story of the George Pepperdine Foundation," reads thus: "The Foundation was formed in 1931 as a non-profit California corporation, organized for the purpose of doing educational, charitable and religious work, especially among young people."

Now work in the Church consists of local churches working as such, individual Christians working as mere members of the Church, and husbands and wives (Christian families), working as such, for in apostolic times they glorified God "in the Church" and they did it in these capacities. Paul commands specifically "Unto God be glory in the Church," (Eph. 3:21). And when we do "charitable" work and "religious" work and "educational" work in the Bible through the "corporation" (another body) called George Pepperdine Foundation, instead of simply through the "one Body," the Church,—are we not disobeying God?

The Foundation does not beg from churches (I think will not accept money from them), but in "The Story of the George Pepperdine Foundation" as copied in full in the Bible Banner, Sept., 1940, most of that "story" is given to begging from individuals, especially from non-members of churches of Christ, business men who have money to spend that way. Here are a few sentences:

"It is expected that interested persons will make substantial gifts and bequests to the Foundation. Friends of the Foundation can render a service by sending in the names of persons able to contribute substantial amounts, to whom you would suggest we mail this booklet," etc.

And in a personal letter to Foy Wallace, published in the Banner of Oct. 1940, Bro. Pepperdine says of the booklet on the Story of the Pepperdine Foundation: "This booklet is not intended to be circulated among members of the Churches of Christ, because we do not solicit funds from them. . . . The purpose in issuing such literature is to interest wealthy citizens of our community in the work the Foundation is trying to do."

From these statements and others found in this "Story," I deduct the following conclusions:

1. The Pepperdine Foundation is a huge corporation composed of members of the Church of Christ and non-members.

2. The religious part of it handles and disburses to churches of Christ large sums of money from the millions which Bro. Pepperdine has set apart for that purpose. But gifts from non-members do not go into this "religious" department.

3. The "educational" part no doubt includes the Pepperdine College, which teaches the Bible as part of the curriculum. The teachers in the school are largely members of the Church of Christ, the president must be a member, and many of the gifts begged from non-members go into this work of teaching the Bible along with secular branches. But teaching the Bible is work of the Church, either as individual Christians, Christian families, or local churches. Therefore, this hybrid organization of George Pepperdine College is doing work of the Church, through aid of Christians and non-Christians together.

4. The "charitable" part of the Foundation includes "services to crippled children, its care of boys and girls from broken homes . . . Boy Scout troops and boys' clubs." Now is it not the business of Christians to glorify God "in the Church" by helping all such people, as opportunity offers, either as individual Christians, local churches, or Christian homes, without any human organization ("body") except the "one Body," the Church? Yet, this Pepperdine Foundation has Christians calling on non-members to help them do such work through this human corporation which Christians should do "in the Church."

Students and young men supported by this Foundation go out among the churches, and instead of glorifying the Church in their conversation, glorify the Foundation. Their chief topic of conversation is the great work the Pepperdine College is doing.

Ted W. McElroy, when criticizing this Foundation, says in the Bible Banner, June, 1941: "We also preach that there is one body which cost the blood of Christ; I think this forbids forming another body to do the work that the Lord ordained the Church to do. Any other body robs God of the glory he should receive through the church." Now this language not only condemns the Pepperdine Foundation, but also Abilene, Harding, Freed-Hardeman and David Lipscomb Colleges, for is not teaching the Bible "work of the Church," and were not these colleges established to "teach the Bible"? Yet McElroy and Wallace both still hung to these colleges as scriptural in principle. They are as inconsistent as Pepperdine, whom they criticize.

Whenever you get a big bunch of money together, the devil always gets his hand in, and Bro. Pepperdine is innocent of history if he thinks he can keep him out. Satan has always made a specialty of "big" churches, too. Maybe that is the reason God scattered the big church in Jerusalem. David Lipscomb knew the saddening history of religious schools, but seemed to think he was wiser than other founders and established what he thought would be a different and safer one. But from many writings in the South, there is every evidence that his school and all its daughters are going the way of all of them, even H. Leo Boles being witness. If Bro. Pepperdine's Foundation does not soon leave its original principles (especially since the board of advisors is composed of non-members of the Church of Christ), it will be different from all other human institutions. About one generation is as long as we can hold even a local church in line with the Bible without a big break, and it has the inspired Word of God to govern it. How much less can we hold in line with God's Word a huge and rich corporation founded and perpetuated in the wisdom of man, and partly composed of non-members of Christ's Church. The Banner thinks that college is already becoming worldly, even the president of the College. I fear for true Christianity from this union of the Church and the world. "Be not unequally yoked with unbelievers . . . Come out from among them and be ye separate." (2 Cor. 6:14-18.)

Foy Wallace, Jr., Has a Stained Banner

He is fighting many evils in churches in his Bible Banner, including evils in the Bible colleges, yet avows loudly that he is not fighting the college as such but only evils in it. Regardless of his camouflage about these colleges being "no more than auxiliary to the home," we have this important truth from him, in Banner, Sept., 1938:

"The Bible further teaches that the church is all-sufficient to carry out this divine mission without the aid of human machinery. Any organization larger or smaller than the local church through which to do the work of the Church [is not

teaching the Bible the supreme work of the Church?—D. A. S.] is an unscriptural organization through which to do work of the Church, and takes away from it the praise and glory. Therefore, we condemn the missionary society [why not, also, the Bible college] as an auxiliary to the Church, a human machine seeking to do work that God has commanded his church to do. We pronounce it, without further argument here, unscriptural." Ditto his Bible college.

As we have said repeatedly, apostolic Christians glorified God in the Church, and they did it either as local churches, individual Christians working as mere Christians, and husband and wife teaching the Bible as Aquila and Priscilla, and fathers and mothers teaching their children. All of this is "in the Church." The Bible knows nothing of any smoke screen called "adjunct of the home," which in reality does work of the Church—teaching the Bible. Bro. Wallace's argument against the missionary society condemns his Bible college. I think his "Banner" has a pretty big blotch on it.

Sommer's 2d Proposition

PROPOSITION II—Human Organizations of Schools Established by Professed Christians to Teach Religion, or Teach the Bible, Were Largely Responsible for the Development of the Roman Catholic Church, Were Largely Responsible for the Infidelity and Apathy in Protestantism, Were Largely Responsible for the Digressions of the Christian Church, and Are Largely Responsible for the Worldliness and Apostasy in Professed Churches of Christ.

D. A. Sommer Affirms

Denies.

I left this proposition till last because there is so much data on it, that we saw we could insert only what we had space for. The Bible college advocates have praised to the skies these schools. From childhood I have read those praises in their papers, nearly all of which I have read. One college professor asserted that the "quickest way back to Jerusalem was to establish Bible colleges," and he spent his time trying to do that. J. N. Armstrong almost pronounced damnation on all those who refused to donate to his school when he said that "Our school may not depend on your gift but your soul may." A generation ago, this was the trend of sentiment, but now many of the Bible school fanatics are coming to their senses when they see its fruit. Yes, Jesus says, "By their fruits ye shall know them"; and in this proposition we wish to look at its bitter fruit.

The Roman Catholic Church is perhaps the greatest HUMAN organization the world has ever seen. It is an apostasy from the true Church of Christ of the New Testament. And the church school was largely responsible for the development of the clergy which has held that hierarchy together. Alexander Campbell in his great fight against "the kingdom of the clergy," said in his Christian Baptist, pages 61, 62:

"Mosheim, from the mass of evidence on this subject to which he had access, satisfactorily shows that the first theological seminary, established at Alexandria, Egypt, in the Second Century, WAS THE GRAVE OF PRIMITIVE CHRISTIANITY. Yet, it appears that the first school instituted for preparing Christian doctors was the fountain, the streams whereof polluted the great mass of Christian professors, and completed the establishment of a paganized Christianity IN THE ROOM OF THE RELIGION OF THE NEW TESTAMENT." (Preachers would do well to read Mosheim's quotation in FULL.—D. A. S.)

Why, oh why, with the wrecks of primitive Christianity strewn all along the path of Romanism and Protestantism, did David Lipscomb establish Nashville Bible School which became the mother of all the other schools in "Churches of Christ," all of which are now acting true to form and are leading astray those who established and support them!

The modernism, higher destructive criticism, infidelity, whatever you wish to call it, which is being taught in the colleges of Protestantism, have emasculated the denominations. The preachers do not believe the Bible and its teachings concerning the judgment, and punishment of the wicked, and hence do not preach it; and men and women will not reform their lives unless they believe strongly that they must answer for the deeds done in their bodies. Thus, these schools, in their infidelity, have lead to the great indifference in Protestantism.

And the saddening thing is that the Church of Christ has stumbled and staggered because it would not learn that they should touch not, taste not, and handle not, these religious schols. The Campbell movement started all right and continued well for a generation but then drifted off. Joseph Franklin, son of Benjamin Franklin, in his "Life of Elder Benjamin Franklin," pages 72, 73, speaks thus of the apostasy in the second generation of this Restoration:

"The preachers left off their efforts to develop the talent in the churches [like practically ALL our preachers have done today.—D. A. S.] . . . They were not so apt in the edification of saints, and especially showing the disciples how to edify themselves. . . . This remark, however, does not apply to the earliest preachers of the Reformation. We have seen that Samuel Rogers, in the Dear Creek Church, had nearly the whole congregation at work at first, and developed eight preachers out of their number. The same was true of his contemporaries. The lapse was in the second generation. [After Bethany College sprang up.—D. A. S.] **THE RECOVERY IS A THING OF THE FUTURE.**"

In the first number of the Christian Baptist, published in 1823, Mr. Campbell has a long essay on the Apostolic Church which he described in part thus:

"They dared not transfer to a MISSIONARY society, or Bible society, or EDUCATION society [which would include the Bible college.—D. A. S.] a cent or a prayer, lest in so doing they should rob the church of its glory, and exalt the inventions of men above the wisdom of God. **IN THEIR CHURCH CAPACITY ALONE THEY MOVED.**"

Our college brethren itch to quote this passage against the digressives, yet it condemns their college as well. One paper a year or so ago quoted it and left off the "education society" part!

In 1840-1841 Mr. Campbell went contrary to his own teaching and established Bethany College. Then in 1853 he made a speech at Harrodsburg, Ky., quoted in the Millennial Harbinger for that year, in which he condemned the preaching system which was growing up among them, in contrast to the eldership. Thus, in twelve years his college was bearing its fruit of a new clergy, a system which he condemned so strongly at first. From Bethany sprang all the other colleges, and from them a clergy, until the Church became preacherized instead of elderized—the preachers supplanting the elders. Thus we have this one-man preacher-pastor system everywhere the college system thrives.

In the Banner for April, 1940, Foy Wallace, the editor, says: "Remember that it was the colleges, not the societies, THAT SWEEPED THE CHURCH INTO THE DIGRESSION. The colleges were before the societies and far more powerful in their influence. Their original intent was all right, but they later became the hotbeds for innovation, compromise and all forms of digression." And yet, Bro. Wallace, you and many others STILL wish to toss here and there such a dangerous boomerang. "By their fruits ye shall know them."

G. H. P. Showalter is publisher and editor of the Firm Foundation, one of the strongest of the Bible college papers, and he writes a long article against the evils of the colleges of the Christian Church, concluding with these words: "AND THEY DID IT THROUGH THEIR COLLEGES." Yet, Bro. Showalter STILL blindly cultivates such hotbeds of apostasy.

L. L. Brigrance, one of the prominent college preachers, and I think a teacher in Freed-Hardeman College, in the Gospel Advocate of July 24, 1941, quotes this "from a biographical sketch of Benjamin Franklin, written by John F. Rowe":

"About the period of 1856 the 'pastorate' began to be discussed. This meant, by its special advocates, that 'educated pastors' must take the oversight of churches. . . . Colleges sprung up in every direction; teachers, by scores, rushed to the colleges; in a short time hundreds of pastors, without age or experience, and some without any previous religious education, were seen rushing (with diploma in hand) for the most inviting churches, the majority of which had been built by now-slighted evangelists."

Bro. Brigrance says in the same article: "There is no denying the fact that the 'pastor system' exists among the Churches of Christ today. It is a growing evil. It constitutes a major menace to the cause of Christ. [And your colleges developed it.—D. A. S.] If it continues to develop as rapidly during the next quarter of a century as it has during the last one,

the greater part of the Church is going to be corrupted by it. 'Brethren, we are drifting.'

According to Rowe, Showalter and all our authorities, this pastor system came through the college. The religious school always has destroyed apostolic simplicity in the end, though at first it seemed to be a great defense of the Truth. This danger is one of the plain lessons we learn from history. And YET you brethren—Brigance, Boles, Hardeman, Showalter, Wallace, et al.—will AGAIN point that loaded gun at the blood-bought Church of God, and pull the trigger!

Many writers have shown in their papers the wordliness of these colleges; even Bro. Boles himself, as well as Bro. Hardeman, have shown that there is great digression in their colleges. A big fight is now on against the "pastor system" which their colleges have developed. They are now tasting the bitter fruits of these schools they have praised so long, and they will have to gather much more of this noxious fruit which will make the churches writhe in pain. No wonder Bro. Boles will not debate the fruits of these human organizations established to do part of the work of the Church. It is the poisonous fruit of Rome. Can we learn nothing from history? Is it another case of "fools and slow of heart"?

"By their fruits ye shall know them." "Every tree which bringeth not forth good fruit is hewn down and cast into the fire." Have you the courage to hew down this evil and cast it into the fire? Time will tell how much you love the Word of God.

Weary With the Fight

Yes, Bro. Daniel Sommer made a great fight against the Bible Colleges; and in his teaching on 2 John 10, 11, he tried to protect the churches against those who advocated these human organizations to do work of the Church. (See his book, "Questions, Answers and Remarks".) But the paper through which he did most of his work, now called American Christian Review, has grown weary with the fight; and although it still says it is against the colleges, it speaks very weakly, and fights now to mix the college and anti-college groups, a course diametrically opposed to its principles through forty years. In the paper's history through seventy years, it has fought the one-man preacher-pastor system; but now in the very church at 29th St., in Indianapolis, which Daniel Sommer largely established, and where the publishers of that paper have always held membership, they have "the pastor" just as much as the college people or even the Christian Church. They have joined the Big Drift away from the Bible. The Review contends that the colleges would be all right in principle if "they did not touch the church treasury." Such reasoning would also admit missionary societies (with money bogged from Christians), aid societies, old folks homes, orphan homes, etc. They are fighting only evils of the colleges, as Wallace and others are doing, but not the principle that they are human organizations doing part of the work of the Church.

For eight or ten years the Missionary Society of the Christian Church has held its annual meetings in an auditorium of Butler University, Indianapolis. Bro. Daniel Sommer, much of whose life's business has been to fight the innovations of the Christian Church, attended nearly all of these meetings and was a prominent speaker. At times his opposition to innovations, through the decades, was brusque, but in his late eighties he had "softened" much, just as ninety-nine men of such age do toward their life's work. Sometimes he was permitted to speak in these meetings on the things which divide us, but mostly on such subjects as, "Shall Christians Go to War?" The Society encouraged attendance of the Church of Christ people, for at times more than half of those present were members of Churches of Christ. The publisher of the Macedonian Call attended ONCE, and saw that we had everything to lose and not one thing to gain by such mix-ups, and refused to attend another time. The publishers of the American Christian Review encouraged this entanglement with error.

This flirtation with the Christian Church, along with the Open Door Policy of the Rough Draft of the Review, either put it into Claude Witty's head to inaugurate the Witty-Murch peace conferences between the Church of Christ and Christian Church, or at least encouraged him to do it.

Now what? In Don Carlos Janes' "Missionary Messenger" for July, 1941, is the announcement that S. S. Lappin is to hold a meeting for the Highland Church of Christ, Louisville, Ky., beginning July 13. Lappin was editor of the digressive Christian Church paper, Christian Standard, for many years,

and there is no evidence that he has given up his adherence to instrumental music in worship and missionary societies. A prominent Christian Church preacher told me they would not give up their mechanical music and societies. One prominent writer in the Advocate says, "It was proposed by Claude Witty, who has been the leader on 'the conservative side,' that the question of 'instrumental music in the worship,' should be left TO EACH CONGREGATION to decide for itself 'under the oversight of its own elders.'" Notice, they are not deciding the question by the Scriptures. Suppose half the elders or half the congregation is for the innovations and half against—then what? It would be another harrowing period of confusion, strife and division—the very thing Witty and Murch profess to be trying to eliminate. Witty does all the compromising on his position; Murch, none. Witty's position is, "Let us get together," while the motto of the brotherhood from the beginning has been, "Let us get together on the Bible." "How can two walk together except they be agreed?" "The wisdom that is from above is first pure, then peaceable."

It is now announced that Witty and Murch are about to start a paper to carry on this "war of nerves," to try to break down the wills of those who still desire to be faithful to the Lord. Witty is the "Quisling" of "the people of God"—a "fifth columnist" in Churches of Christ. And the American Christian Review has encouraged Witty in this compromise even more than any college paper. The preachers and writers and subscribers who are encouraging the Review, are partakers with them in this apostasy.

Every evidence is that the Review changed its name from Apostolic Review back to American Christian Review (which was the name used by Franklin before the formal division with the Christian Church),—in order to try to obliterate differences between the Church of Christ and Christian Church. When they changed the name, they said: "Through the years after Franklin's decease . . . all had their turns at re-naming the Review (Octographic, and later Apostolic) and re-shaping its policy. The shocks have been terrific and often a severe strain on the brotherhood patience. But by God's grace and the priceless confidence of some friends of His cause, this old paper greets the year of the Lord Nineteen Hundred and Forty, with high hopes to which a new year is entitled . . . confident that we have AGAIN found the 'old paths' . . . determined henceforth to 'walk therein' and find rest for our souls. And as our first step we re-claim the name The American Christian Review."

This shows that they partly repudiated Daniel Sommer's long fight against the Christian Church and against permitting false teachers among faithful churches. The difference between the Macedonian Call and A. C. Review is that the M. C. stands on that position from which the Review "by transgression fell." (Acts 1.) But many are now seeing that the Review is headed for the Christian Church. Those people, who rashly said that the conflict between the writers in the Review and in the M. C. was a "mere paper fight," "mere family fight," "mere preacher fight," ought to be ashamed of their shortsightedness and should come out humbly and acknowledge they were wrong and that it is a fight regarding great principles. The M. C. publisher is writing this in the home of one of those who now sees and has changed, though he opposed our stand at first. We are looking for other honest ones. Are you one?

Why Don't We Develop More Scriptural Elders?

Daniel Sommer and A. M. Morris, through forty years or more held Protracted Bible Readings with churches, at regular school hours generally, going through the Bible in about ten weeks. This helped some elders and prospective elders who could attend, and nearly all the preachers for they made it their business to attend. It did not reach the large majority of elders and prospective elders in the brotherhood. It is the small churches we should be specially interested in, so that we can make them strong. After forty years we still have a weak eldership as a whole compared with that described in the New Testament.

The Protracted Bible Readings are fine for large churches which can support them, but the Macedonian Call (as our name shows) indicates that we are interested in scattering our efforts so that the weak will have a chance. The Bible Readings reach practically ALL our preachers but do not reach one-tenth of the elders and prospective elders. The reason is that the small places can not afford them. That makes a brotherhood of churches influenced by preachers more than by elders.

most elders not being sufficiently effective in their public work to command the respect of the members as they should.

This problem is still before anti-college brethren as well as college brethren: How can we develop a scriptural eldership in ALL the small churches as well as large ones? For twenty years it has been advocated (ad nauseam to many) that at least EVERY church have a week or two of Bible study and development by a competent man each year, or at that time which is most convenient. We are making progress. If you have something better, I am sure we all shall be glad to hear it.

The Church of Christ has staggered and stumbled and floundered and fallen, through the past century, because it did not have a scriptural eldership; and it did not have a scriptural eldership largely because there was no serious effort to develop one, and because we spent our time developing the preacher. Out of the Bible colleges strutted the young preachers with their diplomas, looking for flocks to fleece; and they with the fastidious sisters have generally told the inefficient elders "where to head in." The weakness is because we have spent ten times more effort in developing preachers than in developing elders. The only hope is to come back to the "Forgotten Scripture," mentioned in our May, 1940, issue, in which Paul commanded the young preacher (which applies to all today): "The things which thou hast heard of me among many witnesses, the same commit thou to FAITHFUL men who shall be able to teach others also." (2 Tim. 2:2.) If the preacher you have won't do that, get rid of him and get one who will. If they would be scriptural, preachers must quit PREACHING to CHRISTIANS, and earnestly TEACH and DEVELOP them. If half of us would do that, there would be a world revolution for good in the Church of Jesus Christ. It is God's way.

To My Fellow-Preachers:

So far in this paper, I have addressed arguments to you, but now I wish to appeal to your sense of duty. I have tried to show that these Bible Colleges and Orphan Homes are Unnecessary, Unscriptural and Dangerous. Now I wish to have a heart-to-heart talk with you regarding it all.

Let me ask you sincerely. Do you think down deep in your heart that when you are doing the work of the elders in a church, you are more scriptural than the sectarians you condemn? How can you conscientiously denounce them when you are not standing with the Scriptures on just as important things?

Perhaps you say that the reason you are preaching every Lord's day in a congregation where there are elders, and are thus "the pastor," feeder, of the church instead of the elders, is because the elders are not qualified to do that work. Well, what are you doing to qualify them? Can you sincerely say that you are committing what you know "to faithful men who shall be able to teach others," as Paul commands? Please talk to the Lord about that.

Don't try to soothe your conscience with the thought that you go out once a year and hold a couple of protracted meetings. That is a fine vacation for you, for you can preach the old sermons, and have a real change. But even at that, have you taught the churches you visited that they should develop their talent, and have you tried to get them into that?

You "feed" the whole church Sunday morning, and all who come Sunday night, and you lead the mid-week meeting, and possibly teach a Bible class Sunday morning. Thus you probably do ten times more teaching, feeding, of the church than all the elders put together. When you do all that, are you not in truth guiding, and in short ruling, the Church? Do you not have far more influence in the church than all the elders have? Now if you are a spiritual evangelist, will you not try to develop those elders so that they can guide that church instead of yourself, and try to transfer that work and influence to

them? If you are not willing to obey the Lord in this, are you not inconsistent in exhorting others to deny themselves, when you are not willing to give up influence which belongs to elders, which you have assumed to yourself? If the congregation is not ready for this (which you may use for a cloak), would you not do well to "teach" the disciples instead of "preach" to them, as the apostolic evangelists did? Read closely again what we have said about Teaching and Preaching.

The historians we have quoted show us clearly that the first generation of this Reformation of which we are a part, started all right, and developed scriptural elders, but that when they established Bethany College the pastor system was soon developed and the Church drifted off. Joseph Franklin, son of Benjamin Franklin, in his biography of his father said on that apostate "second generation," "They were not so apt in the edification of saints, and especially showing the disciples how to edify themselves. . . . The lapse was in the second generation."

The RECOVERY IS A THING OF THE FUTURE."

You young men, while reading of the battles of the pioneer preachers, have often said to yourselves that you wish you had lived in those glorious days of sacrifice and conquest. Well, now there is a chance for your dreams to come true. There is need of pioneer work against this one-man preacher-pastor system and the college which nourished it. **Are you ready for the task?—the task is ready for you.** In fact, I believe everything is ripe for a great work to be done toward leading thousands back to that glorious "first generation" of this Movement, and to the First Century of Christianity. I do not think that one half or even one fourth of the college people, especially the preachers, will come back to that purified age of the Church, but I do believe that many thousands will come back, and that we shall have to start all over again. But it will take sacrifice, like that of the pioneers, especially when you strike the College, which is the root of the evil. But listen to this solemn warning from God to Ezekiel, and thus to you who claim to be a leader of God's people—

"O son of man, I have set thee a watchman unto the house of Israel. . . . When I say unto the wicked, O wicked man, thou shalt surely die; if thou dost not speak to warn the wicked from his way, that wicked man shall die in his iniquity, **but his blood will I require at THINE hand.**" (Ezekiel 33.)

O God, help us to free ourselves from this awful responsibility by doing our full duty to Thee, regardless of what it may bring to us in this life.

"O, Lord, Send Me." Let us quit singing this song. "Here Am I, O Lord, Send Me," or else transform its words into deeds. This paper has come to you through the generosity of anti-college and anti-pastor brethren, who are interested in you. You may not agree with every point presented in it, but there is so much truth here that you will surely do much good by loaning the paper again and again to your brother or sister who might be interested. Though we are sending this to most of the preachers of churches of Christ, and to many others, yet many sincere preachers may not receive it; loan them your copy. There are hundreds of thousands of members of "churches of Christ," who will not be permitted to see it unless you are willing to let the Lord "send you" Send stamps for as many FREE copies as you can use.