

The GOSPEL GUARDIAN



Dedicated to the Propagation and Defense of New Testament Christianity

VOLUME 2

SEPTEMBER 28, 1950

NUMBER 21

WARNING AGAINST DEPARTURES

Cled E. Wallace

THINGS TEMPORAL AND ETERNAL

In two articles, reprinted from the files of the Gospel Advocate, brother H. Leo Boles, pointed out the steps of departure from the New Testament order, that finally resulted in the organization of the American Christian Missionary Society. Nobody anticipated the ripened fruit of these departures when they began to step in the wrong direction without taking the precaution of consulting the scriptures for every step.

Eighteen years ago, when this series of articles was written, brother Boles was alarmed over tendencies among churches of Christ, which had wrought such havoc some generations earlier, when digressive tendencies culminated in the maze of "organized effort." They had plenty of warning, but it was treated then very much as it is treated now. These issues continue to live, each generation needs its education in loyalty to the scriptures, and warnings must be repeated over and over again. It is tragically true that every generation produces many who in the name of "progress" impatiently surge out of the limitations of New Testament teaching and invariably sail under the banner of zeal for the lost, and compassion for the unfortunate. And most of them manifest honesty in their intentions. They are usually uncanny in their ability to whip up a mass interest, even to the point of religious hysteria. Every departure from the truth which reaches large proportions rides on a wave of popular enthusiasm. Woe be to him who stands in the way.

I was a sitter-in and a looker-on at the last lecture-ship of Abilene Christian College. Frankly, I was alarmed. Every major speech impressed me as a part of a well-oiled propaganda machine, which rolled along without opposition. It was a one-sided affair without opposition. There was no serious discussion of any real problems that confront the church in any speech that I heard. One of the best speakers that I heard made an indirect attempt to reply to something I had written, or at least I so construed it. I had made some quotations in a series of articles on "Voices From the Past" which had attracted wide attention and comment. This speaker, a friend of mine, observed that every generation must face its own problems and solve them in the light of its knowledge of

the Bible, and not depend on voices of the past. Of course there is enough truth in this to decoy the unwary in jumping at some wrong conclusions.

It remains however, that they had the same Bible we have, and it taught then just what it teaches now. The problems that led to digression then are the same that are leading to digression now. What David Lipscomb, M. C. Kurfees, H. Leo Boles and the Strygley's, and other able men had to say about those problems ought to be of great value to this generation. What is history for anyway? Can any generation make its own history without reference to the past? An effort now to hush the voices from the past carries with it a distinct suspicion that lessons from the past are unwelcome, and the door to digression is opened wider.

The article I am now handing you from brother H. Leo Boles shows that ripened fruit of tendencies and departures, which were no more alarming when they first arose than some to be seen among us today.

THE MISSIONARY SOCIETY -- ITS CONSTITUTION

(by H. Leo Boles, Gospel Advocate, Oct. 13, 1932)

The history of the "missionary society" is given for two reasons—namely: (1) that brethren may see the way departures are made and be warned against them; (2) that all may see to what extremes any departure will soon lead. There ought to be important lessons impressed upon the readers as we trace the history of this bold and aggressive departure from the New Testament teachings, or the "ancient order of things." Mr. Fortune says: "While it was intended that all the missionary work of the church should be conducted by the American Missionary Society, it was soon found that the most of its energies were devoted to the work of evangelization in America." (Origin and Development of the Disciples, page 150). Mr. Fortune is a member of the "Christian Church", and at the time he wrote his book he was Professor of Church History and Doctrine in the College of the Bible, Lexington, Ky. It will be noted that he states that "it was intended that all the missionary work of the church should be conducted by the American Missionary Society" It was the intention, then, when the missionary society was organized, to take the work of the church out of the hands

(See WARNING Page 14)

WARNING - - - - - (Continued from Page 1)

of the church and place it in the hands of "the American Christian Missionary Society." What a bold step! The church is robbed of its work and mission by those who profess to be loyal to it!

When the American Missionary Society was organized in 1845, a committee of seven was appointed to draft the constitution for the society. Surely the brethren who were intelligent enough to draft these resolutions and constitution knew that the New Testament gave no authority for such an organization, and that a "constitution" for such a society would not be found in the New Testament; hence, they were forced to resort to the expediency of human judgement and wisdom to prepare such a constitution. Again, they surely knew that they had abandoned their motto: "Where the Bible speaks, we speak; and where the Bible is silent, we are silent." They do not now look for a "Thus saith the Lord" for guidance, but they proceed according to the dictates of human wisdom. The committee which was appointed drafted the constitution and submitted it to the assembly of delegates for ratification. It is well for us to study this constitution; hence, it is given here.

Constitution

Article 1. This society shall be called the "American Christian Missionary Society."

Article 2. The object of this society shall be to promote the spread of the gospel in destitute places of our own and foreign lands.

Article 3. The society shall be composed of annual delegates, life members, and life directors. Any church may appoint a delegate for an annual contribution of ten dollars. Twenty dollars paid at one time shall be requisite to constitute a member for life, and one hundred dollars paid at one time, or a sum which in addition to any previous contribution shall amount to one hundred dollars, shall be required to constitute a director for life.

Article 4. The officers of the society shall consist of a president, twenty vice-presidents, a treasurer, a corresponding secretary, and a recording secretary, who shall be elected by the members of the society at its annual meeting.

Article 5. The society shall also annually elect twenty-five managers, who, together with the officers and directors of this society, shall constitute an Executive Board, to conduct the business of the society, and shall continue in office until their successors are elected, seven of whom shall constitute a quorum for the transaction of business.

Article 6. Two of the vice presidents, the treasurer, the secretaries, and at least fifteen of the managers shall reside in Cincinnati or its vicinity.

Article 7. The Executive Board shall have the power to appoint its own meetings, elect its own chairman, enact its own by-laws and rules of order, provided always that they be not inconsistent with the constitution; fill any vacancies which may occur in their own body or in the offices of the society during the year; and if deemed necessary by two-thirds of the members present at a regular meeting, convene special meetings of the society. They shall establish such agencies as the interest of the society may require, appoint agents and missionaries, fix their compensation, direct and instruct them concerning their particular fields and labors, make all appropriations to be paid out of the treasury, and present to the society at each annual meeting a full report of their proceedings during the past year.

Article 8. All moneys and other property contributed and designated for any particular missionary field shall be so appropriated or returned to the donors, or their lawful agents.

Article 9. The treasurer shall give bond to such an amount as the Executive Board shall think proper.

Article 10. All the officers, managers, missionaries, and agents of the society shall be members in good standing in the churches of God.

Article 11. The society shall meet annually in Cincinnati, on the first Wednesday after the third Lord's day in October, or at such time and place as shall have been designated at the previous annual meeting.

Article 12. No person shall receive an appointment from the Executive Board unless he shall give satisfactory evidence of his Christian character and qualifications.

Article 13. No alteration of this constitution shall be made without a vote of two-thirds of the members present at an annual meeting, or recommended by the Executive Board.

It is strange that those who had so stoutly opposed creeds, disciplines, and confessions of faith, and had pledged themselves to follow the New Testament without any addition to or subtraction from it, would enter into such an organization as the American Christian Missionary Society. Again, it is strange that a religious people who had repudiated all sects, denominations, and organizations formed by human wisdom would now enter into such an organization to do the work of the local church, it is, indeed, strange that a people who just a few decades back would have denounced such an organization would now form such an organization with its constitution which made the payment of a certain sum of money a prerequisite to membership in it. Again, it is strange that a religious people who claimed to speak where the Bible speaks and to be silent where the Bible is silent, or pledged themselves and their word that they would find a "Thus saith the Lord" in the New Testament before they would do anything in the name of religion, would organize the "American Missionary Society." In the organization of this society they surrendered one of the fundamental truths of the Restoration Movement and departed from the simplicity of the New Testament pattern. Not only did those who organized this society surrender the fundamental principles of the Restoration Movement, but all who are working in and supporting such a society today are going contrary to the principles of the Restoration Movement. The pioneer preachers who entered into this surrendered these principles.

(Note. We are not quite ready to draw up a constitution to direct missionary activities for "the church universal." We are just learning to walk in the direction of "regional meetings" to stir up zeal and try out our legs. When the right stage of "missionary consciousness" has been aroused, some interesting and advanced things ought to begin to happen. It will take some "mass-meetings" with imported speakers from abroad, aided and abetted by choruses from our colleges, to really get the movement to rolling. In the meantime, some of the brethren might find some useful hints in the constitution of the American Christian Missionary Society to oil the machinery for "Church of Christ Recreation Centers" where "Church of Christ young people" can court and sport and learn how to get married. I reckon I was just plain lucky to find and win the woman I did without the aid of such means of grace. Back in those days, the home was home, and the church was the church, and the school was a mighty small one. Some how we made it.)

The GOSPEL GUARDIAN



Dedicated to the Propagation and Defense of New Testament Christianity

VOLUME 2

OCTOBER 12, 1950

NUMBER 23

STEPS ALONG THE ROAD

Cled E. Wallace

THINGS TEMPORAL AND ETERNAL

We are handing you the fourth of the series of articles by brother H. Leo Boles in the Gospel Advocate pointing out the steps along the road to the full development of the missionary society and an "organized effort which centralized the efforts of the churches and took over control of their affairs. In the light of this, advocates of the New Testament order are justified in being allergic to any tendency among the churches which squints in the direction of this sort of an apostasy. "The steps" as brother Boles outlined them are significant in the light of both the past and the present. "Where do we go from here?" is a very reasonable question and cannot be ignored.

The good old Gospel Advocate, on whose staff I operated regularly for nigh on to ten years, writing quarterlies and weekly articles, has been quite impatient with me of late, and not near as full of the "kindness and love of God" which the editor of the Firm Foundation says should "apply in all our fraternal relations to the brethren." My reactions have been such as to lead some good brethren to conclude that I am not white enough to call the kettle black, a point which I am possibly not in a position to argue. Anyhow, in the good old days on the Advocate my meanness "and efforts at being funny" were very well received. I received some very nice compliments from F. B. Srygley, H. Leo Boles, F. W. Smith, S. H. Hall and even G. C. Brewer. It could be that the present editor's horror over my barbarities of style and unfortunate timing and manner of writing, is due to the fact that he has enjoyed greater growth in the "kindness and love of God" than I have. Be patient with me. It is harder for some men to be good than it is for others. It may be that time will mellow me down where I will run the editor of the Gospel Advocate and the editor of the Firm Foundation a close race in these laudable virtues.

As a step in the right direction, I want to compliment and commend the editor of the Gospel Advocate for accepting my suggestion that he run some of the articles of brother Boles and brother Srygley on the editorial page of his paper. This is a kind of cooperation I endorse and appreciate. It is even possible that the Advocate may some time say something nice about the Gospel Guardian.

Miracles have happened. If a few compliments will fetch him, I'll try to think up some.

Read this article over carefully.

THE "UNITED CHRISTIAN MISSIONARY SOCIETY"

(By H. Leo Boles, Gospel Advocate, Oct. 20, 1932)

After the first step was taken toward "organized efforts" and a departure from the New Testament teaching was made, it was easy to take other steps and form other organizations. The human reason that would justify one organization would also justify many organizations. The departure from the New Testament in forming one organization opened the way for the organization of all sorts of societies. The people of God cannot be too cautious about proceeding along New Testament lines. Mr. A. W. Fortune, in his book, "Origin and Development of the Disciples," page 157, says: "When the first steps were taken in the direction of cooperation, the leaders could not see the great organization into which it would ultimately develop. If they had had a glimpse of what the outcome would be, they would have refused to go forward." Mr. Fortune is in sympathy with all these organizations and departures, and he speaks the truth when he says that if the pioneers had seen the final development of organized efforts they would never have taken another step. Our brethren who have not gone over the road ought to take warning from this statement and find a "Thus saith the Lord" for every step taken.

There were a number of organizations formed. In 1874 the "Christian Woman's Board of Missions" was organized; in 1875 the "Foreign Christian Missionary Society" came into existence; in 1887 the "National Benevolent Association" was organized; in 1888 the "Board of Church Extension" was brought into existence; in 1895 the "Board of Ministerial Relief" was organized; and in 1900 the "Christian Educational Society" was organized. These separate boards and societies promoted different phases of the activities of the church. Each "board" has its special day in the church calendar, and a campaign to raise funds for each of these organizations

(See STEPS page 10)

STEPS ----- (Continued from Page 1)

extended throughout the year. To those who are familiar only with the simple organization of the New Testament church it is astonishing what a burden these organizations placed upon the church. Sometimes rivalry and jealousy existed between the promoters of the different societies. In the same church each of these boards and societies had their special leaders and promoters. This fostered strife between the different leaders and prevented brotherly love in the congregation. There was much overlapping of these societies and much energy was wasted in the promotion of these organizations. One wonders where the church may be found in the midst of so many organizations.

Many of the wise leaders among our digressive brethren or in the Christian Church, saw that these societies were defeating the mission of the church. At the Centennial Convention in Pittsburgh in 1909 a committee was appointed to promote the union of all the boards and societies. It required ten years of education before the "Christian Church" was ready to take the step toward uniting these different organizations. In 1919, at the convention in Cincinnati, Ohio, the "United Christian Missionary" was formed. This "United Society" was organized and set up on Oct. 20, 1919. The articles of incorporation were worked out and signed in June, 1920. The "United Christian Missionary Society," "Board of Church Extension," "Christian Woman's Board of Missions," "Foreign Christian Missionary Society," "National Benevolent association of the Christian Church," and the "Board of Ministerial Relief of the Churches of Christ." All of these signed the articles of agreement and consented to the forming of a new organization which should perform the duties and functions of the various societies mentioned above.

A constitution was drafted for the "United Christian Missionary Society." In the constitution the aims and objects of the society were clearly set forth. The constitution says that the object of the "United Christian Missionary Society" "shall be to preach the gospel at home and abroad; to maintain missionaries, preachers, and teachers in America and other lands; to promote religious education in the churches; to establish and conduct schools, orphanages, hospitals, and homes; to pension and support disabled ministers and missionaries and their dependent families; to assist in the erection of churches and other buildings for religious purposes; to disseminate religious information and encourage a missionary and benevolent spirit in the churches; to solicit, receive, hold in trust, and administer funds for these objects; and to engage in any other form of Christian service that will help to bring in the kingdom of God, in which his will shall be done, as in heaven, so on earth." It is strange that religious people would organize institutions and frame the by-laws of those institutions with the wisdom of men and set aside the New Testament church and still claim to do the will of God on earth as it is done in heaven! St. Louis, Mo., was selected as the headquarters for this new society. The "United Christian Missionary Society" did not take in all the societies and boards which had been organized in the "Christian Church." The "Board of Education of the Disciples of Christ," the "Board of Temperance and Social Welfare," and the "Association for the Promotion of Christian Unity" were not included in the "United Christian Missionary Society." These boards still conduct their own educational and financial campaigns; hence,

there is still some competition and overlapping of efforts. Many strong men among them opposed the uniting of all their organizations into one big organization; quite a few of them are still opposed to the "United Christian Missionary Society."

There is no end to organization when once a departure is made from the New Testament pattern. It will be well to note the steps that were taken which resulted in this tremendous organization now known as the "United Christian Missionary Society." The steps are as follows: (1) "Cooperative meetings"; (2) "Organized cooperation"; (3) "Bible Society"; (4) "The American Christian Missionary Society"; (5) many organizations too numerous to list; (6) finally, the "United Christian Missionary Society." The steps were taken gradually and carried them over the same road that resulted in the organization of the Roman Catholic Church and all other gigantic denominational organizations. Those who have studied these things and have observed the dangers in them are grieved at the least departure from the New Testament pattern. Occasionally brethren who claim to follow the New Testament and who claim to be loyal to the congregation in its autonomy call for "preachers' meetings," "elders' meetings," "cooperative meetings," "tabernacle meetings," "union meetings of all the churches," and "get-together meetings of the leaders" of the churches in a certain city or vicinity. These are steps along the road of departure from the New Testament order of things and are impregnated with great danger.

(Further Comment.)

It will be all right with me if this article from brother Boles appears in both the Gospel Advocate and the Firm Foundation. The editor of the Firm Foundation brushes off our warnings as of little consequence and appears to think that a little more love will resolve all our difficulties. I'm afraid that it isn't as simple as that. He says that "if mistakes have been made, they should not be overlooked; but to undertake to parallel the work the independent churches of Christ are now doing with the deliberate organization of Church Societies for foreign and home missionary work of a century ago is not correct." Neither could the first steps "along the road of departure from the New Testament order of things" "of a century ago" be paralleled "with the deliberate organization of Church Societies for foreign home missionary work." We are not that far along yet. We are just looking with longing eyes and drooling a bit at the sight of the green grass of "organized effort" just across the fence. We are not ready to break through yet. "The brethren at Lubbock disclaim anything of this sort" and assure the editor that there is no ground for alarm—and it gives him a comfortable feeling. Some years ago rumors were floating about to the effect that things were not exactly as they ought to be in the way of soundness out at George Pepperdine College. The editor flew out to look the situation over. The administration convinced him that everything was all right and he became serene and comfortable over that situation and apparently has been comfortable ever since. Many very discriminating and loyal brethren do not share that comfort. They think the editor had the wool pulled over his eyes. He apparently sees no danger in the present situation. And the money, thousands of dollars of it, continue to pour into Lubbock, Brownfield and Memphis,

(Continued on next page)

STEPS - - - - - (Continued from page 10)

and beives of secretaries are busy. Who controls and oversees what? Maybe we need a new definition of "church autonomy." Hundreds of "contributing churches" sending their money to three "sponsoring churches." Adopting the language of the editor of the Firm Foundation, "Of course, the New Testament gives nothing of the kind."

—o—
SEND IN YOUR RENEWAL TODAY !!!
—o—

MUSIC - - - - - (Continued from page 3)

to God, and the people would see that God was with them by seeing this king in their power. But Samuel said that it was rebellion. Saul didn't think about this incident as rebellion, but it was, Saul had rebelled against God's commandments. What Saul did seems like a little thing, and he had good intentions, but it was sufficient to cost Saul his throne. He was rejected from being king, and he never prospered ruling over the people. God chose another man to go in his place.

Then we have the case of Uzza: David was bringing home the ark from Kirjath-jearim, the ark was on a cart being pulled by oxen, being driven by Uzza and Ahio. As they came to the threshing floor of Chidon the oxen stumbled. God's law concerning the ark was that even those who carried it were not to touch it. (Num. 3:31; 4:15) But here was danger, the oxen had stumbled, the cart had shaken, and the ark was in danger. Uzza put forth his hand to stay the ark. He was just going to stay the ark, keep it from falling off the cart. He had no evil intentions. But the record says, "The anger of the Lord was kindled against Uzza, and he smote him, because he put his hand to the ark; and there he died before God." (I Chronicles 13:10) Now that seems like a little thing, a very slight infringement upon God's command, but that slight infringement was sufficient to cost Uzza his life.

There is another example which we want to mention on this point as we pass on. That is the case of Nadab and Abihu, the sons of Aaron who "took either of them his censer, and put fire therein, and put incense thereon, and offered strange fire before the Lord, and it devoured them, and they died before the Lord." (Lev. 10:1-2) The way many people reason today they would reason thus: They offered fire and the incense was burned. That thing which God commanded was done. Therefore, God had no grounds to object to the procedure. But God did object, he sent the fire and it consumed them and they perished. Oh, that is a little thing, men say, that is just a small infringement on God's will. Yes! but those men paid for it with their lives. Thus we see that in everything, when God deals with man, God demands obedience, complete and implicit obedience to that which he commands.

—o—
(Printer's Note: Our apologies to brother Robertson and our readers. We mixed up the sequence that these fine articles were to run in and now we are striving to unravel them. Two weeks ago Number Two came out and then we found Number One, which we are now running belatedly. Next week's issue will carry the concluding article in this series, Number Three.)

SUPPER - - - - - (Continued from page 5)

like some people do today about the first day of the week, he would have cried; "But the law just says 'remember the sabbath day', it does not say every, and I kept it last week." Just as surely as the word meant that day in every week, as used there; it means the first day of every week in the New Testament.

Do you think that dictionaries and grammars do not substantiate such a usage? Webster's Unabridged Dictionary says that "the" used with reference to names of days of the week, means regularly on those days. The example is, "On the Sunday he goes to church." It says that that means regularly on Sundays. In our calendar that day is the first day of the week. What then do the words mean which say that the disciples came together on the first day of the week? Is their meaning contrary to the definition given by Webster, contrary to usage in the scriptures in other places, and contrary to common usage; as has been given above? That is what some would make it, who would obey the commands of the Lord in a haphazard fashion, who would do his will when it is pleasing to them rather than be pleasing to the Lord.

The scriptures teach us to assemble; to partake of the Lord's supper when assembled; that assembling and partaking to be done on the first day of the week; all usage divine and secular attesting to regularity on every first day of every week. Let not the Christian be deceived by teachers' statements that such a frequent observance will destroy the effectiveness of the memorial. Nothing will destroy the effectiveness of a memorial more than a slack, infrequent, and indifferent observance of it. Besides, we are to keep the teaching of the Lord no matter what its effectiveness may be. It is better to walk in the Lord's ways than to hear all the appeals of teachers who take from the Lord's will about worship to God. Let us show the Lord's death by a regular assembling to eat of the Lord's supper as he has taught us.

SALVATION - - - - - (Continued from Page 9)

Jews had been boasting or glorying about their law. All such boasting was abolished by the new law. In the foregoing passage the Old Testament law is called a law of works and the New Testament law is called the law of faith. The New Testament Christians did not boast about faith, repentance, confession and baptism. We don't boast about these commands. The false prophets of the present day misrepresent us when they misapply Eph. 2:8-9 by saying that we teach that people are saved by works. Here is exactly what Eph. 2:8-9 means: The Christians at Ephesus had been saved by the law of Christ and not by the law of Moses. We teach that sinners are not saved by doing the works of the Old Testament law. We teach that sinners are saved when they do the commands of the New Testament. Inspired scripture says: "The grace of God that bringeth salvation hath appeared to all men, teaching us that denying ungodliness and worldly lusts, we should live soberly, righteously, and ungodly, in this present world." (Titus 2:11-12) How did God's grace that brings salvation save the people? He taught them to do certain things. The idea that God's grace comes to the sinner's body direct from God in the person of the Holy Spirit and saves without the sinner obeying certain New Testament commands is from Satan.

The GOSPEL GUARDIAN

Dedicated to the Propagation and Defense of New Testament Christianity

VOLUME 2

AUGUST 17, 1950

NUMBER 15

VOICES FROM THE PAST

Cled E. Wallace

THINGS TEMPORAL AND ETERNAL

It has been suggested in more than one controversy, that the blessed dead should be allowed to rest in peace, and that the present generation should fight its own battles with its present knowledge of the word of God. There is some merit to this suggestion in some instances. However, a situation has arisen that justifies a reprint of some articles written in the past by able and reliable men, involving issues that are now again to the front.

The editor of the Gospel Advocate is sensitive to any suggestion that the Gospel Advocate "1950 style" is any different from "1932 style." He specifically promised the readers, when he assumed his present position, that the policy of that paper would remain unchanged. He is allergic to change. He has even chided and ridiculed men who have changed positions on various issues. This fact will make these articles we are reprinting of special interest. He cannot complain at this, for about all he has ever done was to reprint articles with an "editorial note" attached. Since he has given his hearty endorsement to brother H. Leo Boles and leaves the impression that he and brother Boles saw eye to eye on about everything, we shall allow our readers to see some of brother Boles' articles, unabridged as written by him, and appearing in the Gospel Advocate.

Another reason for this is that there appear to be many good men who think we are radical and have advanced a new and unheard of position in regard to the cooperation of churches. Some of these articles ought to open their minds on this point. It ought to help them see wherein the departure lies.

HOW TO DO MISSIONARY WORK

By H. Leo Boles (Gospel Advocate, Nov. 3, 1932)

The church of the New Testament is a missionary church. All the work that it does; that it should do, is missionary work. Any work that it does in filling its mission is missionary work. The church is doing missionary work when it feeds the hungry as much as when it is preaching the gospel. What is the New Testament way of doing missionary work or carrying the gospel

to foreign lands? What examples have we in the New Testament of this kind of work? Are the examples of missionary work in the New Testament for us to follow today? I think that all will answer this question in the affirmative. How are missionaries sent out? Who sends them? Who supports them?

The New Testament gives an example of a church doing missionary work in the case of the church at Thessalonica. Paul and his company had left Antioch and had gone to the province of Macedonia. The church had been established at Philippi. Paul went from Philippi to Thessalonica and established a church there. The churches in Macedonia were not wealthy. Later, when Paul wrote to the church at Corinth, he said to them that they knew "how that in much proof of affliction the abundance of their joy and their deep poverty abounded unto the riches of their liberality." (2 Cor. 8:2) Paul states further that they contributed "beyond their power." Now, this church at Thessalonica, like all other New Testament churches, was very active in having the gospel preached. In writing to the church at Thessalonica, Paul said: "And ye became imitators of us, and of the Lord, having received the word in much affliction, with joy of the Holy Spirit; so that ye became an example to all that believe in Macedonia and in Achaia. For from you hath sounded forth the word of the Lord, not only in Macedonia and Achaia, but in every place your faith to God-ward is gone forth; so that we need not to speak anything." (I Thess. 1:6-8)

We learn from this that although the church at Thessalonica was poor, yet it abounded in zeal and missionary activity; that from this church "sounded forth the word of the Lord, not only in Macedonia," but in other places. Thessalonica was in the province of Macedonia. This church had the gospel preached to others in Macedonia and extended its activities beyond the boundaries of its own province. This should teach us that no church is so poor and so weak but that it can do missionary work. We learn, furthermore, that no church is so poor or weak that it needs to cooperate with other churches in doing missionary work. The church at Thessalonica had the gospel preached throughout the province

(See VOICES page 2)

VOICES (Continued from page 1)

of Macedonia and Achaia without the cooperation of any other church or the help of any missionary society. If this church in its deep poverty could carry on an extensive program of preaching the gospel in an independent way, why cannot other churches do the same?

This leads to the declaration that the missionary work of preaching the gospel as recorded in the New Testament was done by individual churches acting independent of each other. There is no example in the New Testament of two or more churches joining together their funds for the support of the gospel. J. W. McGarvey, who was an able exponent of society work, or churches working through missionary societies, was called upon to give an example of churches cooperating in having the gospel preached. He replied: "I do not find in the New Testament a single example of two or more churches that cooperated in mission work." Professor McGarvey had written two commentaries on the book of Acts of the Apostles; he had been a close student of the New Testament for many years; and he was in favor of churches working through the missionary society. In fact, he stoutly defended the missionary society and urged churches to support the missionary society. He was frequently called upon to give his reasons for supporting the missionary society. He would have rejoiced if he had been able to give a New Testament example for such church cooperation in missionary work. The fact that he did not give it is proof positive that he could not give it. But when he makes the confession that there is no such example in the New Testament where "two or more churches" cooperated in missionary work, we may know that there is none to be found in the New Testament. Brethren who are specializing in "missionary work" and traveling over the country trying to get churches to "co-operate" in supporting missionaries should ponder seriously this statement of Professor McGarvey. A challenge is here issued to anyone to find a New Testament example of two or more churches uniting their funds and supporting the preaching of the gospel.

Churches cooperated in relieving the distress during the famine, but churches did not "cooperate" in supporting the preaching of the gospel. The fact that we have no New Testament example of such, and have no statement of Scripture which authorized it, ought to be sufficient to convince all that God did not want his churches to work that way. There are found in the New Testament three distinct sources from which the preacher of the gospel received support. It is well for us to study these. The first source is from the church that sends out the preacher. Paul says on this point: "What soldier ever serveth at his own charges? who planteth a vineyard, and eateth not the fruit thereof? or who feedeth a flock, and eateth not of the milk of the flock?" (I Cor. 9:7) The Lord ordained "that they that proclaim the gospel should live of the gospel." (Verse 14) A church could not be faithful to the Lord by sending a man out to preach the gospel and let him go at his own charges. The second source from which the preacher received support was from the people among whom he labored. "But let him that is taught in the word communicate unto him that teacheth in all good things." (Gal. 6:6) Again: "If we sowed unto you spiritual things, is it a great matter if we shall reap your carnal things?" (I Cor. 9:11) The mission field is where the missionary plants and sows,

and God wills that he shall reap of the carnal things of the people among whom he labors. Paul was thrown by a shipwreck on the island of Melita among barbarous people. It is not reported whether anybody turned to the Lord, but Luke says: "And when we sailed, they put on board such things as we needed." (Acts 28:10) Paul and others remained there some time, and we cannot think of Paul's remaining there and not preaching the gospel. When they were ready to leave, they gave to them such things as were needed. The third source from which the missionary received support was from "other churches"—that is, from churches other than the one in the field where he worked. Other churches with their independent and individual activities sent support to the one who needed help. These three sources are clearly revealed in the New Testament. The church sending the preacher out should support him; the people among whom he labors should help; and other churches may contribute to his needs.

(Associate editor's note: It will take more than the memory of conversations on the part of "the canny editor" and the "Ace writer" of the Gospel Advocate, that they had with brother Boles, to off-set his writings. If he changed, then the editor certainly would not try to defend him, since he is pretty rough on men who change. We have more interesting articles in store for the readers, all from the files of the Gospel Advocate. Watch for them, and be amazed, inasmuch as we are assured that the "1950 style" of the Gospel Advocate is no different from the "style" of other years. We have been accused of misrepresenting these men. We will let them speak for themselves. The current efforts of the Gospel Advocate to discredit us in our quotations is a subterfuge that anybody but a mighty corny editor ought to be ashamed of.

"ASK YOUR PREACHER"

By W. CURTIS PORTER

Contains six sermons that are just what the title implies—questions to the preachers who teach for doctrines the commandments of men. Excellent to hand to your religious friends. Paper bound.

Single Copy 50c

Write for Quantity Prices

Order From

ROY E. COGDILL PUBLISHING COMPANY
Box 980 Lufkin, Texas

THE ORIGIN AND CLAIMS OF ROMAN CATHOLICISM

by Roy E. Cogdill

This tract covers all the ground in a digested manner. In this day of Catholic domination, we need to know more about their doctrines that we may better withstand them.

25c per copy — 5 for \$1.00

Order from

ROY E. COGDILL PUBLISHING COMPANY
Box 980 Lufkin, Texas

The GOSPEL GUARDIAN



Dedicated to the Propagation and Defense of New Testament Christianity

VOLUME 1

MARCH 23, 1950

NUMBER 45

VOICES FROM THE PAST -- NO. 2

Cled E. Wallace

THINGS TEMPORAL AND ETERNAL

Much was said a generation ago, by able contenders for the faith, about "tendencies" that led to the departure from the New Testament order of things. Departures were gradual and always began with "tendencies" which the thoughtless and uninformed thought innocent enough, and they often became very impatient with, and just as often used bitter speech in denouncing loyal and able men who were able to see what these "tendencies" would ultimately lead to. About twenty years ago, F. B. Srygley said in the Gospel Advocate:

"Human organization gets its recruits from the thoughtless brethren who begin to add little things that appear innocent. But all departures from the word of God began this way. The older brethren remember that these innovations started among the plain churches of Christ; and they started this way."

As a case in point, he cited Brother Lipscomb's discussion of the Dallas situation.

"The elders of the church at Dallas were made the supervisors of the work, received the money, employed the preacher, directed and controlled him. For a number of years they employed C. M. Wilmeth. He then dropped out of the work and the missionary society took the place. Other experiments along the same course have been made. All of them went into the society work."

Brother Srygley remarked, "It will be noted how they went from the eldership to the society" and "the matter progressed from the eldership to the full-fledged society." Some elders today appear to be enthusiastic in trying out the same "experiments." It was "the full-fledged society" back there in an experimental stage. What is it now? Who is able to guarantee that our "experiments" will not turn out the same way in "a number of years?"

One young preacher, who is no older than some of my children, wants to know what I am "doing for others, other than kick and criticize those who are trying to preach the gospel in Italy." He accuses me of "condemning the efforts of these evangelists who have gone at great expense, and have braved many dangers to preach the gospel to the lost souls of Italy, and to expose the error of the Roman Catholic Church." He even suggests that I am "jealous of the publicity that these young

men are receiving." I might even tell you what "Christian College" he came from, but the "publicity" would not do them any good. It is this type of immaturity that makes "tendencies" grow into what they ought not to, and were not intended to. I was preaching the gospel in destitute places before the young preacher was born. To him and his kind, a life-time of preaching the gospel in this country means nothing. I have been at it for forty years under just about all imaginable conditions. Yet he asks, "What are you doing now in order to spread the gospel in this land and in other lands where souls are dying without an opportunity to hear the gospel?" Incidentally, this is just history repeating itself. Innovators of a past generation sought to smother the voices of protest against every unscriptural organization, by the same kind of accusations. If a man was opposed to their society or their "plan" or even criticized it, he was opposed to "missionary work." The young man will know more, when he learns more, I hope.

Some of my critics keep asking why I don't go to Italy, if I think I can "do a better job than they." There are several reasons I can think of. One is I do not think I could "do a better job than they" and another is, I am so old and set in my ways, I think I can "do a better job" right around here where I can talk to people in their own language. There are a lot of people, not too far from me, who need the gospel as badly as they do in Italy. The way I have to poke around, I believe I'll spend what little time I have left practicing on them. Besides, if I left the country, some of these young hot-heads might start something over here they oughtn't to and I would not be on hand to protest. They are so excited now, they are accusing me of being in league with the Pope. Folks like that are liable to start anything. I think I ought to hang around and watch them and when they stampede, "ride herd on 'em." The Lord knows they need it.

But get along Dobbin. Brother David Lipscomb said in the Gospel Advocate:

"A society collects the money from churches and Christians that its own board may employ preachers, direct their labors, their pay, and control them. It concentrates the authority and power and means of all the Christians and all the churches in a few persons, who constitute a board to employ, direct, and pay the preachers. This places all the money, and all the preachers of all the churches and Christians in the hands

(See VOICES Page 4).

THE FRUITS OF PREMILLENNIALISM

George True Baker, Kermit, Texas

Jesus gave an unfailing rule for judging false teachers: "Beware of false prophets, which come to you in sheep's clothing, but inwardly they are ravening wolves. Ye shall know them by their fruits. . . . Wherefore by their fruits ye shall know them." (Matt. 7:15, 16, 20.) We may apply this rule to those teachers among the churches of Christ who advocate the theory of premillennialism. The fruits of the theory may be seen in the lives and teaching of its advocates. "By their fruits ye shall know them." A teacher is condemned or vindicated by the fruits of his teaching. No sincere advocate of any cause should object to being thus judged.

The line of cleavage between those who advocate the premillennial theory and those who do not has been tightly drawn. There is very little fellowship between the two groups, and the gulf or separation is ever widening. In view of this cleavage it is interesting to note certain tendencies in doctrine within the premillennial group. These trends are tending to widen differences between "us" and "them". I predict that in time the fruits of these tendencies will be an even greater barrier to fellowship than has premillennialism itself. From a study of the writing of prominent premillennial preachers the fruits of premillennialism can be gleaned. What one sees is not good. There is a definite departure from "the faith which was once delivered unto the saints."

In "The Evangelist," June 1949, a mimeographed monthly published by Frank M. Mullins of Dallas, Texas, we find the following statement on page 5: "It is evident from the Bible definition and use of the terms 'grace' and 'works' it is impossible for salvation to be based on both. In the light of Bible truth, salvation is either by grace or it is by works. It cannot be a mixture of the two principles. (Rom. 11:16.)" A Lutheran who believes that salvation is "by grace only through faith" could not have made a better statement of his doctrine than this. I affirm that Mullins' statement is an open and undeniable avowal of the protestant position of salvation by grace alone. It is the major premise in their system of doctrinal logic by which baptism and any other act of obedience is ruled out of the plan of salvation. Since when did James 2:24 cease to be a part of "the Bible definition and use of the terms 'grace' and 'works'?" James says, "Ye see then that by works a man is justified, and not by faith only." Can a man be saved without faith? Certainly not! Well, faith is a "work of God" (John 6:29.) Deny it!

Ashdodish Language

Words are the symbols of ideas. A public teacher should be careful to select the correct words to express his thoughts. There is always a danger in using questionable forms of expression, especially those used by the denominational world which represent ideas alien to the New Testament. Paul warned, "Sound speech that cannot be condemned;" (Titus 2:6.) From the same issue of The Evangelist as quoted above we read on page 14, "Fifteen were baptized, several came to be just Christians. . . . and at Turkey Creek this means what it should. The Holy Spirit was manifestly working throughout the meeting. . . . The last night eleven responded. . . . wonderful were the answers to prayer and glorious victory which the Lord wrought." It is evident that those who "came to be just Christians" were not among the fifteen who were baptized. Now we are ignorant of what it means "to be just Christians" at "Turkey Creek," but we always thought that "to be just Christians" in the New Testament requires baptism. Maybe its different at "Turkey Creek." The next statement that "The Holy

Spirit was manifestly working throughout the meeting" is more the jargon of "holyrollerism" than the "sound speech" of the New Testament. Truly "they went out from us."

We now present the quotations without comment. Their evident tenor betrays the extent of departure of our erstwhile brethren. "Regardless of your present affiliation, if you are born again, you will enjoy the fellowship, and will find at Mount Auburn that old time Christian love and fellowship, and be recognized as a child of God on the basis of your faith in and love for our Lord Jesus Christ." (The Evangelist, September 1948, page 5.) "If you are born again, you will find a warm Christian welcome awaits you in this church . . . we do not recognize or refuse to recognize a child of God on the basis of his local church affiliation, but upon the ground of relationship to Jesus Christ as Lord and Savior. . . . If you are saved, washed in the blood, in fellowship with the Lord, then you may be assured full fellowship in this congregation of God's people. If you are a Christian you will immediately feel at home with this church. . . . We do not claim to be the only Christians but Christians only." (Ibid., page 8.) Is there any need for comment?

VOICES - - -

(Continued from Page 1)

and under the control of half a dozen men. Really, one or two men control all such boards, and it virtually puts the whole means and men of the churches in the hands of one or two men. Such men are not, as a rule, chosen for their piety, holiness, and devotion, but for their capacity to raise money."

Remember that this sort of thing was not born full-grown. It started in "the eldership" of a local church, planning something bigger than it could pay for, and gathering in money from other churches. O, but nothing like that could ever happen to us! O, yeah!

This is why Brother Syrgley concluded and so expressed himself in the Gospel Advocate:

"Churches should never be tied together, even in as good a work as preaching the gospel to the heathens. Elders of one church should not try to get hold of the money that has been contributed by others to direct for them in foreign fields or other places. No missionary society should be started by elders of a church or by any individual. We should have no one-man missionary society. Churches should not be tied together to support schools or homes for the aged or for any other purpose."

Some brethren must have wandered quite a distance from original principles, when they consider us a bunch of extremists, for contending that churches ought to raise their own money, select their own fields of activity, choose their own workers, and attend to their own business generally, including maintaining their independence and autonomy. That high and scriptural standard is not being maintained when a church says "Me too" to the "plan" of some other church. If the planning church gets off the track, the "Me too" churches will also have a wreck. That is one of many reasons why the Lord did not want them all tied together. Sure, there'll be more to follow.

Check your expiration date. Renew now and avoid missing a single issue.

The GOSPEL GUARDIAN

Dedicated to the Propagation and Defense of New Testament Christianity

VOLUME 2

SEPTEMBER 14, 1950

NUMBER 19

THEY SAW THE DANGER

Cled E. Wallace

THINGS TEMPORAL AND ETERNAL

It has always been difficult to keep Christians and churches satisfied with the simplicity of the New Testament order of things. The churches are no stronger in faith and practice than the members of them. In every age the uninformed and the worldly have been numerous enough to influence departures from the faith. Eternal vigilance has been necessary. It is a bad sign when influential preachers and established publications apparently see no danger in anything preachers and churches want to launch in the way of something new.

Some months ago, I quoted some excerpts taken from articles which appeared in the Gospel Advocate some years ago. Some of these were written by brother H. Leo Boles. The present editor of that journal took exception to my use of what brother Boles had written and accused me of "misrepresenting the dead" and has since gone out of his way to verbally chastise us. He thinks brother Boles is "inimitable," an opinion some may not share fully, but which I do not criticize. He did see and warn against certain dangers which he thought were posed in the attitude and practice of some of the churches. These dangers are more apparent now than they were then. The things that he was afraid of are closer to us now. He thought he saw a parallel between what some of the churches were doing, and practices that earlier culminated in the missionary society. So he wrote some articles on it. I am herewith handing you one of them. "We reproduce the entire article as the inimitable H. Leo Boles wrote it."

THE MISSIONARY SOCIETY - ITS ORIGIN

(By H. Leo Boles, Gospel Advocate, Sept. 29, 1932)

The church of our Lord was established in Jerusalem on the first Pentecost after the crucifixion of Christ. Pentecost has been called "the birthday of the church." The church continued its work and mission for a few centuries without any great departures from the apostolic teaching being made. Slowly and gradually departures were made, and these departures gradually developed into the Roman Catholic Church. This great hierarchy in religion did not spring into existence full-grown; it

was many years in reaching its full development. Departures were made step by step away from the New Testament order, and the final result was the great Roman Catholic Church. This institution was formed and guided in its progress by human wisdom and superstition. The Restoration Movement sought to return to the firm basis of the New Testament. This was done, and for a number of years the church continued faithful to the New Testament pattern. It took B. W. Stone, the Campbells, Walter Scott, John Smith, and others some time to get out of the fog and confusion of religious errors. These godly men, with the New Testament in hand, led the way back to "the ancient order of work and worship." Perhaps these pioneers in this movement never entirely got away from all the superstition and confusion to which they had fallen heir from the different denominations.

After continuing true and faithful to "the ancient order" of worship for a number of years, departures were slowly and gradually made. History again repeated itself. From the Brush Run Church, which was organized in 1812, the movement originated, and had a hard struggle up to 1832. Many difficulties were encountered and the leaders had to combat with fierce opposition. Some of the leaders were often discouraged during this period and thought that the movement would never be successful. However, many of the leaders among them saw the light and were courageous enough to make the fight and win the victory. From 1832 to 1850 great multitudes of believers returned to "the ancient order" of things. During this period the movement outgrew in number any of the denominations at that time. Frequently entire churches in the Baptist denomination threw away their creeds, left off their denominational names, and returned to the New Testament pattern of work and worship. The movement continued to increase rapidly. At first the increase came largely from the agricultural sections of Kentucky, Ohio, Indiana, Illinois, Missouri, Virginia and Tennessee.

W. T. Moore, in his "Comprehensive History of the Disciples of Christ," says that for the decade ending in 1850 "twenty thousand additions to the church were

(See DANGER Page 14)

DANGER - - - - (Continued from Page 1)

made yearly." This increase brought the total numerical strength of the disciples to about one-fifth of a million members in 1860. It was estimated that during the period between 1850 and 1860 the population of the United States increased about thirty-five per cent, but the number of disciples increased one hundred per cent. The membership of the disciples increased about three times as rapidly as the population of the United States. Joseph King estimated that the number of disciples who had returned from the denominations to "the ancient order of worship" in 1820 was only about two hundred. His estimation of the number in 1860 was about one-half of a million. No religious body increased so rapidly during this period of time as did the disciples.

The increase in number greatly augmented the Restoration Movement and strengthened it, so far as numerical strength may be measured. The number increased more rapidly than a knowledge of the New Testament teaching was disseminated. Many were not well-grounded in the faith and did not understand the importance of the movement, and especially the importance of following the New Testament order of work and worship. Many who were enlisted in this great cause were tired of creeds and human traditions and wanted to get away from them. They did this; but they did not learn the New Testament teachings thoroughly, and they followed the crowd. Sometimes a party spirit was engendered instead of the spirit of Christ. An untaught membership weakened the cause. An unfaithful leadership helped to bring the movement into disrepute and gave the enemy occasion to criticize the movement. Departures from the New Testament pattern were made because many were ignorant of the New Testament. Oftentimes a lack of loyalty to the truth gave rise to some departures. The pioneers accepted the famous slogan: "Where the Scriptures speak, we speak; and where the Scriptures are silent, we are silent." Many of the leaders began to violate this rule, and not a few finally ignored it altogether.

The first wide departure which was made was the organization of the American Christian Missionary Society. Step by step, little by little, the departure led to the organization of this society. For several years the trend of the movement had been toward organization. The first step was taken when they began to have "co-operative meetings." These meetings were held in counties or districts. They were local. They seemed to be innocent within themselves, and the brethren had plausible motives to actuate them in holding these meetings. Very few of the brethren, if any, saw the danger in them. Because their motives were pure, they thought they were doing the right thing in holding these meetings.

Complaints were made that they were not doing what they should. Many claimed that they could not do much without these "co-operative meetings." They claimed that they were doing too little with the meetings, and without them nothing would be done. The denominations around them were having their great gatherings in associations, presbyteries, and conferences. So the brethren in their innocence thought that they should have larger meetings than that of the local congregation. They claimed that the churches could not make progress and fill their mission without the enthusiasm engendered by these "co-operative meetings." At first there was no

organization in these meetings, and no one thought of organizing anything when they began to have these meetings. They overlooked the fact that the period of their greatest prosperity was the period in which they had no "co-operative meetings." The greatest increase had come during the period in which there was no "organized effort" except that of the local congregation. The greatest growth came when the congregations were independent and free in their congregational activity. The great number of churches existing then in their independent operations were established without these "co-operative meetings." The brethren overlooked the fact that the only cooperation the churches needed to fulfill their mission was that each congregation do its best and work independent of any and all other congregations. They continued to stress the commission of our Lord to go into all the world to preach the gospel to every creature, but they began to inquire how this could be done without the different churches cooperating with each other. The "co-operative meetings" was the answer to their inquiry.

(Further Comment). In the light of these historical facts, where is the voracious appetite of some of our present day ambitious leaders and churches for "centralized control and oversight," under the guise of "sponsoring churches," likely to lead us? Some have suggested that there is no such thing among the churches, that we are just crying "wolf, wolf" with no provocation whatever. Their eyes must be closed tight. Even a report published in the paper to the effect that one "sponsoring church" had a meeting of representatives from "contributing churches" to discuss ways and means and things like that in connection with its foreign work, causes not a ripple of excitement or warning from the most eminent seats of influence among us, big church pulpits, and editorial chairs. The editor of the Gospel Advocate, in which brother Boles' articles appeared, is now alarmed. About what? He thinks that "seldom in modern times has the progress of the church been more jeopardized" than by the protest and warning we are raising. Brother Boles is not living now, and the present editor was not editor when the above article was written. Former editors of the Advocate did not scream bloody murder, and call preachers "reactionaries, and radicals and self-righteous snobs," because they preached that churches should attend to their own business, and not go into secular education business, and launch and "oversee" work in foreign fields for other churches to pay for. The Advocate appears to have come quite a way along the road which leads—where? We devoutly hope that history will not repeat itself in this case. But churches and preachers had better wake up!

GOSPEL - - - -

(Continued from Page 6)

of the name of Christ; they still adhere to disciplines, church manuals, creeds, and confessions of faith. They still uphold and seek to defend the addition of mechanical instruments of music to the worship of God. These things are no part of the gospel as preached by Paul; they are no part of the gospel as it was revealed to Paul by the Lord Jesus Christ. If the Bible be true, then all who preach and practice such things shall be accursed. God's word is plain, clear, and definite. There can be no excuse for a failure to obey it.

Motives
Pure

The GOSPEL GUARDIAN

Dedicated to the Propagation and Defense of New Testament Christianity

VOLUME 2

SEPTEMBER 21, 1950

NUMBER 20

A GRADUAL DEVELOPMENT

Cled E. Wallace

THINGS TEMPORAL AND ETERNAL

All departure from the truth is gradual. The seed of apostasy must be sown before the plant grows, matures and bears its fruit of full-grown disloyalty to God. "The Spirit of lawlessness" begins its work in small and pious ways. The wolf of "organized effort" has always worn the "sheep's clothing" of deep concern for the lost. Anybody with any influence who dares oppose "progressive" plans for expediting the Lord's work, is invariably dealt with impatiently as "reactionary", "anti-missionary" or any ugly term that promises to stir up prejudice against him. A man with the spirit of Elijah, who rises up to question or condemn departures from the New Testament order is certain to be accused of troubling Israel and jeopardizing the progress of the church. It has always been so. Fortunately there have always been men of that spirit who could not be brow-beaten into submission by such tactics, and consequently the truth of the gospel has continued with us, in spite of the plans of ambitious and worldly men.

Apostasy has to be gradual. Nobody would have tolerated the full-grown missionary society or the Roman hierarchy at the beginning. The first drink does not make a drunkard. It takes many and the descent to debauchery is gradual. The minds of men who are dedicated to New Testament teaching have to be gradually softened and gradually led away from it. The first departure must be subtle and have every appearance of innocence. It must also be dedicated to a good cause that touches the heart, such as the conversion of the world. I hand you a second article from Brother H. Leo Boles, setting forth the origin of the missionary society among churches of Christ. "We reproduce the entire article as the inimitable H. Leo Boles wrote it."

THE MISSIONARY SOCIETY - ITS ORIGIN

(H. Leo Boles in Gospel Advocate Oct. 6, 1932)

The missionary society, like all other human organizations, had a gradual development. We are tracing the steps in the development of the American Christian Missionary Society as it grew up in the brotherhood of the churches of Christ. The first step toward this human organization was taken when "cooperative meetings" were

held. These meetings at first were held only to promote the general interest in preaching the gospel. They did not attend to any business; no business was brought to these meetings; they had no business. They were loosely held for the encouragement of different churches; they did not touch the independence of the church. Later they began to take on the form of an organization. The first attempt to organize the forces was made in Indiana. At first, county, district, and finally State meetings were held. The State of Indiana was divided into four districts, the boundaries being definitely outlined. This was done in 1842, and has been considered as the first step toward organization of the "cooperative meetings." A. W. Fortune, in his "Origin and Development of the Disciples," page 147, says: "Those at the meeting voted to select and send out four evangelists, who were to be supported by the contributions of the disciples throughout the State." The work was to be turned over to the districts as soon as they could be properly organized." He states further: "The first State to organize definitely by adopting a constitution was Kentucky. This was at a meeting at Lexington, May 9, 1850." Gradually different States followed the example of Kentucky. They were repeating the same steps which resulted in the organization of the Roman Catholic Church.

Preachers began to call for churches to support these organizations. In fact, they were promoted and formed by the preachers. It is very likely that there never would have been any "cooperative meetings" had not preachers called for them; there never would have been the fully developed missionary society had not preachers formed it. The preachers called for churches to support them before they would launch out to preach the gospel; they called for the "cooperation" of a number of churches to guarantee their support. The "cooperative meetings" now had to have a "chairman", "moderator", or "president", or "presiding officer." Some who were still loyal to the New Testament pattern objected to these. Their objections were not considered by those who were in authority. Some churches were indifferent toward the "cooperative meetings"; some refused to cooperate on the ground that the meetings were without Scriptural warrant; others refused to have fellowship because they did not believe

(See DEVELOPMENT Page 13)

No More: "Sponsoring"

Dear Brother Tant:

We will not be 'sponsoring' the work in Holland after September. We sort of got pushed into that job before we realized what we were doing.

E. M. Lambert, Elder
Northside Church of Christ
Abilene, Texas

*(sec editorial)

Yater:

I've run across still another church (in Houston, this time) that has been sending money to a "sponsoring" church with no restrictions of any sort. The "sponsoring" church has been spending their money for them, doing work with it, and the contributing church hasn't even known what the money was being spent for!

Yours,
Luther Blackmon
Rusk, Texas

Article Needed

Dear Brother Cogdill

Here is a clipping from the Gospel Advocate in regard to the huge institution they are building at Cullman, Alabama. We are having a hard fight over this organization here, and if we could have an article from brother Wallace showing the danger of this kind of affair it would do much good in north Alabama. But we need this article now, as there is much controversy over the thing. Some, including a few elders in the churches, have not yet seen the awful danger of this kind of super organization. Get brother Wallace to help us out with a good article in the Gospel Guardian.

Your brother in Christ,
Earlie T. Williams
Florence, Alabama

DEVELOPMENT - - - (Continued from Page 1)

the preachers of some of the churches were sound in the faith, says A. W. Fortune in his "Origin and Development of the Disciples." Those who favored the organization coined the slogan: "Cooperation implies organization." They meant by this that the kind of cooperation that they had in mind required an organization. This was a departure from the New Testament. It is strange that they could not see that they were violating the very principles to which they had returned in accepting the New Testament order of work and worship. This kind of cooperation developed very rapidly among the disciples, says Mr. Fortune.

Another step was taken when the "Bible Society" was organized in 1845. This society was not patterned after the New Testament order, but confessedly after the "Baptist Bible Society" of that day. They were now trying to be like the denominations in this respect. The purpose of the organization of the "Bible Society" was a very plausible one. Its purpose was to distribute Bibles and encourage people to read them. This was a good work. It was a splendid work to distribute Bibles among the people, and still a better work to encourage the people to read the Bibles. It did not occur to them that the congregation or local church, when it followed the New

Testament and filled its mission, would do all that the "Bible Society" could possibly do. There was no need of organizing a "Bible Society" if the church filled its mission. They failed to inquire for a "Thus saith the Lord" for this step. How prone man is to exalt himself and human wisdom and ignore the word of God! It may be said to the credit of Alexander Campbell that he opposed any organization at all, and especially the organization of the "Bible Society." However, it claimed that he afterward gave encouragement to it. The constitution of the "Bible Society" stated its object as follows: "To aid in the distribution of the sacred Scriptures, without note or comment, among all nations." D. S. Burnet was the first president of the society, and Cincinnati, Ohio, was made the headquarters. Mr. Fortune says that the "Bible Society was a step toward a general organization for evangelistic and missionary work."

The final step in the departure and development was taken when the "American Christian Missionary Society" was organized. It was easy to take this step, as the former steps of the organization of "cooperative meetings" and "Bible Society" had already been taken. In the early period of the Restoration Movement all ecclesiastical organizations were considered departures from the simplicity that is in Christ and a rebellion against New Testament teachings. Many of the leaders are now ready to repudiate the New Testament. Four years after the organization of the "Bible Society" the "American Christian Missionary Society" was organized. This was in 1849. A meeting was called to assemble in Cincinnati, October 24, 1849, for the purpose of organizing a "General Missionary Society." Representatives of different churches were asked to assemble for that purpose. Already many of the "cooperative meetings" had developed into missionary societies; but now a call is issued for the organization of a "General Missionary Society." History does not record the name or the names of the ones who called for this meeting of representatives, neither does it give the source of authority for such a meeting.

There were present at this meeting one hundred and fifty-six delegates from eleven different States. This was a small number when we remember that the number of disciples at this time was more than a half million. Alexander Campbell was not present at this meeting. John T. Johnson, of Kentucky, introduced the following resolution: "Resolved, that the 'Missionary Society', as a means to concentrate and dispense the wealth and benevolence of the brethren of this Reformation in an effort to convert the world, is both Scriptural and expedient." Mr. Fortune says: "Under the protection of that resolution the American Christian Missionary Society was organized." ("Origin and Development of the Disciples of Christ," page 149). No scripture was given to show that it was Scriptural; no arguments were given to show that it was even "expedient." The organization of this society shows the weakness and frailty of human judgment when compared with the wisdom of God.

SIXTY-ONE OBJECTIONS TO THE BAPTIST CHURCH

By Will M. Thompson

Price 25 cents per copy. 5 for \$1.00

Send all orders to:

Will M. Thompson, Box 195, Anadarko, Oklahoma