

The GOSPEL GUARDIAN

VOLUME 19, NO.'S 8 & 9

JUNE 23 & 29, 1967

SPECIAL NUMBER

- INDEX -

THE CAMPAIGNS VIOLATE NEW TESTA- MENT TEACHING

Roy E. Cogdill 3

ON THE BANKS OF THE RUBICON

Fanning Yater Tant 6

HISTORICAL BACKGROUND OF "CAM- PAIGNS" IN THE CHRISTIAN CHURCHES AND CHURCHES OF CHRIST

Cecil Willis 8

THE MAN OF THE "CAMPAIGNS"

Eugene Britnell 11

PRIMING THE PUMP

Paul K. Williams 15

THE BIBLE WAY OF CAMPAIGNING FOR CHRIST

William H. Lewis 16

CONGREGATIONAL COOPERATION

Earl I. West 18

GUARD THAT WHICH IS
COMMITTED UNTO THEE

**SPECIAL NUMBER
- INDEX -**

THE CAMPAIGNS VIOLATE NEW TESTAMENT TEACHING	
Roy E. Cogdill	3
ON THE BANKS OF THE RUBICON	
Fanning Yater Tant	8
CREATING A NEW IMAGE FOR THE CHURCH	
William E. Wallace	10
HISTORICAL BACKGROUND OF “CAMPAIGNS” IN THE CHRISTIAN CHURCHES AND CHURCHES OF CHRIST	
Cecil Willis	12
THE MAN OF THE “CAMPAIGNS”	
Eugene Britnell	19
PRIMING THE PUMP	
Paul K. Williams	27
THE BIBLE WAY OF CAMPAIGNING FOR CHRIST	
William H. Lewis	29
CONGREGATIONAL COOPERATION	
Earl I. West.....	32

THE “CAMPAIGNS” VIOLATE NEW TESTAMENT TEACHING

Roy E. Cogdill

“Shortly before the turn of the present century, a movement originated in the church of Christ that resulted in what is commonly known as the Christian Church. The idea is quite generally wide-spread that the cause of this schism and resultant division was instrumental music in the worship and societies in the work of the church. Technically speaking this is incorrect. True, these were major differences between those who adhered to the original pattern of things and those who went out from us: yet instrumental music and the societies were effects rather than causes.

“Dr. A.W. Fortune, some time professor of the College of the Bible, and “Pastor” of the “Central Christian Church,” of Lexington, Kentucky, in his book, “The Disciples in Kentucky,” sets forth as grounds for the division, the following: “The controversies through which the Disciples have passed from the beginning to the present time have been the result of two different interpretations of their mission. There have been those who believed it is the spirit of the New Testament church that should be restored and in our method of working the church must adapt itself to changing conditions. There have been those who regarded the New Testament church as a fixed pattern for all time, and our business is to hold rigidly to that pattern regardless of consequences. Because of these two attitudes, conflicts were inevitable” (Page 383).

“This, we believe, is a fair and impartial statement of the divergence of views that obtained then, and are now characteristic of the two groups. Because of these differences in attitude, it was, as Dr. Fortune suggests, inevitable that division should come; and it came shortly before the turn of the present century. Those who had worked and worshipped together in the effort to plant again the Cause of Primitive Christianity in a land torn by division and cursed by denominationalism, divided among themselves, and the result was that another denomination came into existence. Ironically enough, those whose avowed mission in life was the utter destruction of all denominationalism, became but another denomination, and thus built again the things they had once destroyed! Today, the Christian Church admits its denominational status, and glories in the fact!

“Instrumental music and the societies were simply symptoms of the disease that lurked unseen; outward manifestations of an inward attitude wholly foreign to that which had characterized the restoration movement in its inception.

The real cause of division in the body of Christ was therefore, an abandonment of the principle that had hitherto motivated us. Those who no longer looked upon the New Testament as an all-sufficient guide and rule of faith and practice to demand things unauthorized therein; while those who clung tenaciously to the all-sufficiency of the

scriptures, as stoutly resisted them; and division was, therefore inevitable. This, indeed, has been the cause of all departures since the apostolic age. Those who regard the Bible as a complete Revelation for all time cannot, in conscience add to, or take from, its teaching, in the smallest particular; while those who view it only as a mass of raw principles to be worked into shape to fit changing conditions, are not restrained by the injunctions it contains against adding to or taking from the Word.”

It is scarcely believable that the above statements were written by Guy N. Woods, Gospel Advocate writer and chief exponent and defender of the liberal movements in the church today. It is even more unbelievable that he would have the unmitigated gall to vow and declare that he has not changed since he wrote these words. But it is easy to see that his diagnosis of the causes of digression that brought about the “Christian Church” is entirely correct. It is also easy to see that the same causes are at work today and have brought about the present day divisions among the churches of Christ.

The Herald of Truth, the inter-congregational evangelistic co-operations that have been formed, the benevolent societies, educational societies, hospital societies, recreational and social activities in which churches are engaging, et cetera, are not the real causes of division and disfellowship. Rather they are “symptoms of the disease that lurked unseen.” As brother Woods put it, they are, “Outward manifestations of an inward attitude wholly foreign to that which had characterized the Restoration movement in its inception. “We accept his diagnosis of the case completely. It has been confirmed by other champions of the liberal movement. A. C. Puillas thinks all of these modern innovations are permissible because “there is no pattern”. He has even written a tract on that subject. Gus Nichols, deluded and confused by the flattery of the college crowd, has abandoned his defense of truth and writes and talks profusely of the “liberty” that we have to apply these principles laid down in the New Testament because God has not told us how to apply them! Volumes could be quoted of such nature.

The idea that God has told us what to do and has not told us how to do it has been the defense of their benevolent societies and is now the ground upon which their missionary societies are being promoted. It has been pointed out to these “liberal-minded brethren” that if their contention applies to benevolent societies and justifies them it would also equally apply to and justify a missionary society. They have at least been convinced on this point and are now forming their missionary organizations without scruple even when they know that there is no authority in the Word of God authorizing them. You would think that these fellows are completely ignorant that God gave to His Church an organization through which to function and that organization is a specific one to which men have neither the right to add or diminish. These fellows, most of them at least, a few years ago joined with all of us in preaching that the local church with its (local) elders, deacons, and saints is the one and only organization that is divine in its origin or authority. We have made it ring throughout the land that “there is nothing larger — nothing smaller — nothing other than the local church. No other organization either within or without!” No voice has been stronger in shouting this than

Foy E. Wallace, Jr., but no—one has more completely succumbed to the flattery, banqueting, and patronage of the liberal crowd than has he. It does not matter what they have written or preached, nor what the Word of the Lord says, they are going to do their promoting and will destroy, they can, anything or anybody that gets in their way.

More recent and now more prominent among “missionary society” organizations and promotions among these “modern digressives” that are emerging into another denomination just like the Christian Church did more than fifty years ago is the “Campaign for Christ” movement. Several competing organizations of this movement are among us but they are all practically following the same course. Whatever organization is essential or even deemed expedient in the promotion of their “campaigns” they “scruple not” to form. The most prominent among these liberal present day promoters is the “25th and Geraldine Church of Christ” in Oklahoma City. They are now promoting “campaigns” all over the world and soliciting money from any and every source available. Their propaganda is scattered throughout the country and they are holding their promotional banquets at the “lectureships” of the liberal schools and elsewhere. Ivan Steward promoted this church into this unscriptural position and organization. He heads up their promotion and organization. They advertise themselves as the “Heart of the Brotherhood”. It would be interesting to see brother Steward with enough courage to undertake a defense of his promotion. And if he is too timid, it would be interesting to see the 25th and Geraldine Church have enough courage to secure someone who has enough courage to do so. There is no scriptural defense for it and it is pretty evident that they know it.

We suggest some very plain scriptural reasons why such an arrangement is completely out of harmony with the teaching and spirit of the New Testament. We do not hope that any of the reasons anyone might give would have any appeal to those who think they have the liberty to supply what the Bible does not teach. They have no respect for “scriptural reasons” or Bible authority anyhow. But to those who still have some respect for the Word of God and have not become the servants of human idols we trust that the following points will be carefully considered and have some weight.

I. The New Testament does not teach that one church of Christ should, could, or ever did send money to another church to support a preacher. You will search the New Testament in vain for such teaching. It is not there, generically, specifically, or liberally! It cannot be found incorporated or provided in command, example or inference! It is wholly without scriptural warrant. The preachers of New Testament times went out and were sent out by churches but when they were supported those churches sent directly to the preacher and never to another church to support a preacher. (Phil. 1:5; 2:25; 4:15-17; I Cor. 11:7-9) This cannot be disputed or denied by the Word of God. We challenge any of these present day promoters to try!

One argues what difference does it make whether a church sent to a preacher directly or to a church to support the preacher? The difference is that one is in the New Testament and the other is not in it. This doesn't make any difference to those who have no respect for the Word of God but it makes a lot of difference to those who do.

But another suggests that when a church had more destitute members than it could provide for other churches contributed to them to enable them to meet the needs of their destitute. True! But that is in the field of benevolence and not in the field of evangelism. But, someone objects, that means that there are two patterns — one for benevolence and the other for evangelism. Well, why not? If that is the way God arranged it, why not? Even the liberal promoters among us — or they were among us, but “they have gone out from us because they were not of us” (I John 2:18-19) — have two patterns so this objection: from them certainly is not valid. They incorporate into a separate society or organization their works of benevolence but they will not incorporate (at least they have not yet) their inter-congregational promotions in the field of evangelism such as “campaigns for Christ” or “Herald of Truth”. Why, if there are not two patterns?

The difference between the two can plainly be seen. Each congregation had the direct obligation of providing for its own. When it could not do so out of its own resources, other congregations could contribute to its necessity. But no congregation has the obligation to preach the Gospel beyond its own resources nor can it do so scripturally.

II. These “Campaigns for Christ” are inter-congregational arrangements and therefore necessitate an organization larger than a local church. God gave the elders of a local church the supervision of its affairs. They are to “tend the flock of God among them” (I Peter 5:2) and this is the extent of their oversight. They are to “feed the flock and take heed” to the flock over which they have been made bishops or overseers. (Acts 20:28) This is the extent of their authority or Jurisdiction. When they act beyond it they are acting “ultra Vires” — without authority. The work of more than one church cannot be combined and resources pooled without having an “inter-church” affair and no such arrangement can scripturally be put under the supervision of a “local eldership”.

III. When one church holds a meeting — campaign — for another church and promotes its activity in such an endeavor out of resources provided by still other churches the autonomy (self-government or control) of the churches involved is destroyed. Here you have one eldership overseeing and actually directing the work of another congregation in arranging for such a meeting, selecting the speaker, singer, auditorium, etc. , or in arranging the advertising, directing the “personal work” of the campaign, or in other phases of its activity. When we can get “self-government” out of this, we are really doing some crooked thinking. Whether it is usurped or voluntarily given would not make a whit of difference scripturally.

IV. Such a campaign ties churches together and therefore destroys their independence. Every church historian of any repute tells us that the apostasy of the New Testament churches was well under way when they began to ignore the independence of the local churches. Federating local churches into any kind of an effort, pooling their resources, centralizing the direction of their work in any aspect forms a connecting (organic) tie between churches that

does not exist and is not allowed by the divine plan. It destroys the identity of the participating churches and denominationalizes them. Conventions and associations are in order in such arrangements and are in principle accepted and practiced. They can well be for if God intended for there to be organic or operational combinations then He should have given us an organization larger than the local church so that it would not have to be perverted into such a functional capacity.

V. Such an arrangement as these “campaigns for Christ” destroys the equality of the churches and of their elderships. Think about the elders of the 25th and Geraldine Church in Oklahoma City directing the arrangements for a gospel meeting in Philadelphia, California, Hawaii, or anywhere elsewhere churches of Christ exist. A church of Christ and its elders holding a meeting for another church of Christ and its elders! How could equality exist in such an arrangement? The church in Jerusalem sent a preacher by name of Barnabas to Antioch when the church had just been planted there and they supported him. (Acts 11) But where do you read that they supervised and arranged all of the appointments, place of meeting, advertising, personal work campaign, etc.? There is a vast deal of difference in sending a preacher and supporting him to work for a weak church and taking over the supervision of its affairs. My brethren have always been able to see such a difference until their idolatrous promotions blinded them to the truth. Neither did Jerusalem promote other churches out of their funds in order to send Barnabas.

VI. Such an arrangement denies the sufficiency of God's organization to accomplish its mission. It impeaches the wisdom of God, Almighty and All wise, and delivers into the hands of men the right to modify, alter, seek to improve upon and otherwise set aside God's plan. If we can change God's plan for the church in seeking to improve on it, why can't we improve upon God's plan for the salvation of souls. Some think they can and these campaign promoters will come around to it.

Without equivocation or apology we charge . that such “campaigns” are unscriptural and subversive to the simplicity of the gospel. They are liberalistic, and modernistic and denominational in their nature. They cannot be defended by the scriptures.

ON THE BANKS OF THE RUBICON

Fanning Yater Tant

“Crossing the Rubicon.” For two thousand years those words have denoted the taking of an irrevocable step, committing oneself, one's business, or one's nation to a course of action from which there can be no turning back. The idiomatic expression grew out of Julius Caesar's leading his army across the small Rubicon river (between Italy and cisalpine Gaul) in open defiance of government orders. He had been victorious in Gaul and in the west, and now had committed himself to a battle to the death with the legions of Pompey and the Roman senate. “Crossing the Rubicon” could have no alternative except victory —or death. There could be no stopping place, no turning back, no middle ground.

As we enter the final third of the twentieth century there can be little question that this fateful year finds the church of Jesus Christ in a most precarious position: many thousands of the disciples have indeed already “crossed their Rubicon,” and are firmly committed to a course which can end only in full and final apostasy from the apostolic pattern. For them there is no turning back, and, although they certainly do not realize it at this time, there can be no stopping place — no middle ground. The leaders of this segment of the body of Christ are flushed with the heady feeling of triumph; they think they can sniff “victory” in the air, and are rejoicing that after more than a century and a half of isolation and exclusiveness the “Church of Christ” is at long last about ready to take its place in modern denominationalism as a sister church. Leaders of the “New Look Church of Christ,” such as Carl Ketcherside, Robert Meyers and Leroy Garrett find themselves in the delightful position of knowing that a great number of the faculties of the Christian colleges are in full sympathy with their views and objectives, and are only awaiting an “opportune time” to come out openly in favor of denominational status for the church.

But this special issue of the Gospel Guardian is going into the homes of many thousands of sincere Christians who have NOT YET crossed the Rubicon — but who are poised fearfully on the banks of that ill-omened stream. For them the die is not yet cast, the “point of no return” has not yet arrived. But it is coming. And swiftly! For let there be no mistaking the choices, and the consequences. The “Campaigns for Christ” promotions go hand in hand with Church of Christ Hospitals, Youth Camps, Homes for Unwed Mothers, Church contributions to colleges, Church of Christ Hobby Shops, Church lodges, swimming pools, youth retreats, Service Centers, “Inner City Missions” and a veritable avalanche of projects, promotions, and programs involving social gospel overtones, centralization of church resources and power, and a galloping denominational concept.

“Campaigns for Christ” is not an isolated or independent development. It grows right out of the postwar (World War I) mania to get the Church of Christ “On the March”. It is part and parcel of an almost pathological desire on the part of some brethren to change the “image” of the Church of Christ from a small, rural, isolated, lower-middle class people to

a powerful, successful, aggressive, sophisticated society which is rapidly forging to the front as the leading non-Catholic church of America!

But, even at this late hour, there are thousands of humble people (even in some of the most liberal congregations!) who are sorely troubled and perplexed by the things that are happening. They are uneasy and filled with anxiety and apprehension at the liberalism they see about to overwhelm the congregations of which they are a part. A good example is seen right in Oklahoma City, where the “Campaigns for Christ” has its headquarters (Twenty-Fifth and Geraldine Church of Christ.) Has anyone wondered why that congregation has never undertaken a “Campaign” in its own home city? Why do they find it easier to put on “Campaigns” in Philadelphia or Indianapolis or Dallas than in Oklahoma City? The answer perhaps lies in the fact that even in Oklahoma City (indeed, in the Geraldine church itself!) there is a strong under-current of opposition and resistance to these efforts to “denominationalize” the Church of Christ! Honest and humble people, desiring only to serve God according to his word, find themselves caught up into a veritable whirlwind of “go, go, go — blow, blow, blow - brag, brag, brag!”, and without their quite knowing how it happened the congregation is “promoted” into somebody's pet project — campaigns, hospitals, recreation centers, ad infinitum.

This issue of the Gospel Guardian is being sent to many thousands of Christians with the fervent prayer that they will read, ponder, study carefully the things presented, pray for God's guidance — and turn their backs once and forever on the enticing, exciting, and deadly! country that lies across the Rubicon, the country of “denominational Christianity.” To all such troubled souls we send the reminder that many thousands of their brethren have already firmly committed themselves to an undying opposition to the trends they fear; there are some thousands of conservative congregations over the nation which have taken an adamant stand for truth, and who will be neither persuaded nor pressured by the “promoters”. To them the service of God is afar greater thing than the plaudits of men or the popularity of the age.

And if one wants a fair and objective look at what is actually happening among the churches, we strongly recommend a new little booklet only published this year, entitled “Emergence of the Church of Christ Denomination,” and written by Brother David Edwin Harrell of the Department of History, University of Oklahoma. (See advertisement elsewhere in this issue.)

Let no one be deceived or lulled into a feeling of false security. Your very soul is at stake. You owe it to yourself, and to your God to ponder the issues involved in these “Campaigns for Christ,” and to take your stand with the people of God in full and faithful support of the apostolic pattern in all matters pertaining to our service of the Lord.

—F. Y. T.

CREATING A NEW IMAGE FOR THE CHURCH

William E. Wallace

One of the stated purposes of the “Campaigns For Christ” is that of building a new and better image for the church. In this article I am dealing primarily with the “Greater Indiana Campaign For Christ”, but what we write here is applicable to all the other “campaigns” inasmuch as they are all related to the same campaign movement.

Note these statements: “The campaign offers a challenge to Christians in the area to project a new and truer image of the churches of Christ.” “It is true that one of our purposes is to change the image of the church; not to change the church from God's plan but to change the concept of the church in the minds of the misinformed as to what the church is really like.”

These statements appear in the literature of the “Greater Indiana Campaign For Christ”. The first is a specific reference to the campaign, the second to the Herald of Truth. Such statements appeal to those among us who are dissatisfied with the idea of the

church being at odds with the world. The sentiment among campaign leaders seems to be toward a world conforming church. (Note Romans 12:2; John 14:30; 16:8; 17:18-19; 1 John 3:15-17)

Christians who hold a “like precious faith” with the saints of apostolic times, are naturally led to wonder about the image these campaign leaders seek to project. There is something intrinsic and inherent in present day saints, who are genuinely trying to be like New Testament Christians, which causes their minds to boggle at the idea of changing the image of the church. We like the New Testament image of the church, even with its accent on controversy and trouble. It seems that early churches were involved in pleasing God rather than in pleasing the world. They were engaged in challenging the world with the gospel rather than in attempting to project a world pleasing image.

Real churches of Christ today are what they are because they are like churches of Christ were in New Testament times. If indeed they are churches of Christ they do not need to be concerned about projecting an image. Those who are taught about what the church of the New Testament was, will see the apostolic church in these Bible congregations today. If people do not know the New Testament church, it is New Testament truth they need, not a projection of a “new and truer image.”

What kind of image do campaign leaders seek to project? The Indiana campaign posters present a picture of the modern, impressive, elaborate and plush Clowes Hall on the Butler University campus. Is this the image sought for the church? The pictures of Pat and Nick Boone are on the posters, advertising the brothers as song directors. What image is here

sought? The poster advertises the campaign as “A Unified Effort of The Churches of Christ.” Is it a unified image which is sought?

Clowes Hall is a tremendously impressive edifice, inside and out. It is certain that no congregation has such a building. If the building is supposed to reflect an image for the church, will it be a “truer image”? Other facilities which would accommodate more than the 2500 capacity of Clowes Hall could have been obtained. But it was suggested that the ornate Clowes Hall was more suited for the purposes of the campaign. Clowes Hall surely won't hold all who would like to see Pat Boone, and maybe this is why one preacher said he would bring only 'his best members'. Another highly enthusiastic preacher wrote of the campaign as “using the largest means possible to attract the largest crowd ever in the state of Indiana by any church.”

It is quite apparent that the image which is sought for the church is one appealing to affluent and sophisticated society. This is certainly a “new” image, but not a “truer” one, nor a Bible one. It is not true to the character of the New Testament church nor is it in harmony with the greater mass of Christians and churches of Christ in our time.

Considering the kind of drawing card involved, (the Boone brothers), the seating capacity is quite limited. The “best” liberal brethren can fill the great majority of the seats, so the actual services will be limited in the image making business. But professional photography and expert reporting will assure the successful image building before those who cannot attend or who do not want to get in to see the show.

The basic error in this attempt at image building is the abuse of the biblical charter for congregational function. The cooperative of congregations under headquarters of one local church attempts to build an image for churches of Christ. Such a cooperative is without biblical sanction. It has no authority to represent churches of Christ, much less build an image for them!

In Indiana a small minority is represented in the campaign. The largest congregation north of the Ohio River—W. L. Totty's Garfield Heights—refuses to have anything to do with the campaign. Most other liberal Indiana churches are standing aloof from the campaign, one or two have asked for their money back after learning that Pat Boone had been chosen to be song director. Of course all the conservative churches oppose the campaign. The campaign movement is an elaborately organized force. With pronounced opposition from both liberal and conservative sources the campaign movement with its search for acceptance in the world, may become a 20th century world conforming faction or sect.

It is quite presumptuous for the campaign leaders to take on the function of building an image for churches of Christ when they represent so few! Even if they could represent them all, they are functioning *ultra vires*—outside of that which is authorized by the divine charter.

HISTORICAL BACKGROUND OF “CAMPAIGNS” IN THE CHRISTIAN CHURCHES AND CHURCHES OF CHRIST

Cecil Willis

We have been duly apprized that the Churches of Christ in Indiana are going to conduct a “Greater Indiana Campaign for Christ” in Clowes Memorial Hall of Butler University in Indianapolis, July 3—8, 1967. The state has been divided into Regions and some of our brethren have been appointed “Regional Directors”, and one brother has been named “State Director. “ More committees have been appointed and more preliminary meetings and dinners have been held than I have time here to relate.

In the context of such a promotional buildup as has been for some time underway, it probably would do us all good to stop and to reflect on previous but similar campaigns held in Indiana and elsewhere. History is ordinarily a solid platform from which objectively to view the present. A good historical perspective is helpful in understanding the present. It was to supply such historical perspective for us that the Old Testament record was written and preserve (1 Cor. 10:11; Rom. 15:4).

Some of the brethren who have been duped into participation in this gaudy display of power in Indianapolis think this is another “first” for the Churches of Christ. Actually, our brethren who gradually digressed to become the Christian Church or Disciples of Christ have conducted many such campaigns in years gone by. This historical article might thus be called “Campaign Prototypes” or “Indiana Campaigns: A Playback.” Our brethren are merely aping the sectarians. In fact, the Christian Church prolifically used the campaigns around the turn of the century. But by 1913 it was said of some preachers that “in late years (they) have looked with suspicion” upon special evangelistic campaigns (Coombs, *CAMPAIGNING FOR CHRIST*, p. vii). Dr. Henry K. Shaw, in his excellent book *HOOSIER DISCIPLES*, said, “... interest in such campaigns began to decline in the late 1920's” (p. 282).

The sectarians had tried and discarded this ostentatious method about fifty years ago. Our denomination mimicking brethren are just now picking up the habit. But that is about par for our brethren. About the time the sectarians had decided that their social gospel experiment in maintaining human institutions through which to care for the needy was a total and absolute failure and they began to seek honorable ways to extricate themselves from their abject failures, our brethren decided to get involved in such endeavors. Thus while sectarians who had been building such institutions fifty to seventy-five years ago were closing the doors on their failing institutions, such institutions were rapidly proliferating among our brethren. So it seems about normal that our “progressive” brethren should pick up the campaign habit about half a century after their modernistic counterparts had discarded it.

But one naive little preacher over in Indianapolis has been jubilantly writing about the forthcoming campaign as though nothing like this had ever happened in Indiana before. Some of the Christian Church campaigns of fifty years ago would make this one planned in Clowes Hall look like a paper-wad shot from a pop-gun. But most of the innovations now bothering the Churches of Christ have been borrowed from the Christian Church. So it should not be too surprising to learn that the campaign idea was borrowed from the same source.

Some Campaign History

Two of the earliest and most “successful” campaigners in Indiana among the early Christian Church were J. V. Coombs (1848-1920) and Charles Reign Scoville (1869-1938). J. V. Coombs was called “one of the most successful recruiting sergeants of his generation in the American division of the grand army of Christ” by George F. Hall in 1897. Commodore Cauble, in his book *DISCIPLES OF CHRIST IN INDIANA*, said, “Brother Coombs will be remembered for the many evangelistic campaigns he led but probably longer by his famous book on *CAMPAIGNING FOR CHRIST*” (p. 207). Coombs' book was published 1913.

Coombs' purpose in writing *CAMPAIGNING FOR CHRIST* was “to furnish Christians at work with a ready-reference Guide Book in leading men and women to Christ” (p. iii). On page 19 Coombs said, “This plan of work is to be used as a guide-book for all workers in these meetings.” He gives very intricate instructions about how to set up a campaign and how to emotionalize the people. And from the reports one hears about Jimmy Allen Is campaigns, one might suppose he has memorized the book, or imbibed the principles from some other sectarian source. Before our brethren even got started in these pressure campaigns, the Christian Church had already put out a standardized hand-book on how to conduct one. In this article we want to survey some of the recommendations of this hand-book and some, of the practices of these experienced campaigners and to compare these with the methods to be employed at Indianapolis and elsewhere in other similar campaigns.

Selection of a Professional Evangelist

Coombs' *HANDBOOK* advises that those in charge of the campaign should secure “the best professional evangelist available” (pp. ix, x). Henry Shaw tells what a “professional evangelist” is, in case you do not know. Shaw says “a professional evangelist in those days was one step up the ladder above the local pastor” (p. 250). Coombs says the “professional evangelist” should be “a 'general' assigning to each his special work with keen distinction” (p. xi).

In fact, Coombs' book tells how to run a successful campaign from the key-note address of the first preparatory meeting to the last “amen”. He says that there must be an “abundant” and “judicious use of printer's ink.” There must be a host of committees, “after-meetings”,

dinners, and “good singers and singing.” Charles Reign Scoville, in his campaign sermons book *EVANGELISTIC SERMONS*, speaks of the necessity of having the help of the “faithful chorus choir.” Shaw said the successful ones of these early campaigns had to have their “entertainment features”, including special music (p. 278).

The campaigns of our brethren today also have to have their “chorus choirs”. Our brethren who run these campaigns make the ridiculous pretense to be strongly opposed to choirs in our worship services, but nearly every campaign has its “chorus choir.” Sometimes the Harding College Chorus is imported for the “entertainment feature”, as was done in the big George Benson Stark County campaign in Canton, Ohio a few years ago (They had eight or ten “responses!”).

Coombs and Scoville are depicted as nearly ideal campaigners, insofar as the “professional evangelist” is concerned. Thus let us note their preaching characteristics and recommendations, and compare them with the great campaigners among us today. Coombs was described by M. M. Davis as “an exhorter... (who) is far in advance of any we ever heard. His words have tears in them...” (*CAMPAIGNING FOR CHRIST*, p. 12). George M. Coombs said of Coombs, “Though a young man he is already in the very front of our evangelists, and has deservedly a national and enviable reputation... He is worth looking at... In the large and judicious use of all advertising expedients his work is notable ... In every legitimate way he seeks and secures attention.”

Coombs' efforts to gain attention certainly remind one of the efforts of some of our modern campaigners to get publicity and interviews in newspapers and on television and radio shows. They seek to become mere conversation pieces,,, and use every advertising gimmick the Madison Avenue advertising crowd can devise with which to sell a Volkswagen or a bar of soap. In fact, one could take the thousands of dollars spent on advertising some of these campaigns and get a big crowd out for any event. Some of these campaigns of a few days duration will have advertising and operational budgets of nearly \$50,000. But this is necessary to bring people out to “look at” these campaigners, and that is apparently a major objective with them.

W. J. Lhamon said of Coombs, “I have heard many great evangelists, the greatest perhaps in America and the world. It is not too much to say that in pathetic and tremendous appeal to the hearts and consciences of men our author surpasses them all” (*CAMPAIGNING*, p. 151). Coombs even tells the would be campaigners how to run up and down the aisles during the invitation songs in order to high pressure any prospects. All sectarian preachers already know how to do this, but some of our brethren are just catching on. Thus in some of the campaigns they have many invitation songs, tear-jerking emotional appeals, and preachers exhorting with tears in their eyes and words.

Someone reported after one of Scoville's campaigns that “Chapman, Mills and Moody are far behind” (Shaw, p. 281). These men were leading sectarian preachers of Scoville's day.

And the campaigners among us today have out-done the denominational campaigners like Billy Graham and Oral Roberts in publicity seeking, in the employment of gimmicks to get attention, and in making dramatic emotional appeals properly filled with the right number of deathbed tales. Indeed, Billy Graham and Oral Roberts might take lessons in the usage of sectarian tactics from some of our campaigners.

Coombs' HANDBOOK even instructs the would-be successful campaigner on what kind of subjects to deal with in his campaigns. He instructs the "Professional evangelist" to be sure that he manages to "Keep Sweet" (p. 19). And those who have heard our most successful campaigners report that they surely do "Keep Sweet." Billy Graham would draw but few more hearers than any other Baptist preacher if he preached Baptist doctrine in his campaigns. And our big-time campaigners would have fewer auditors if they laid the gospel on the line like the old-time brush-arbor preachers did. Some of our modern campaign do not even want the public to know that the Church of Christ has anything to do with their campaign. From the advertising done, one might surmise that some inter-denominational efforts were being made. And since any Methodist preacher could preach most of the sermons delivered during the campaign, we might add that from the preaching done on most nights, those attending would never get the impression that the Church of Christ they have known in the past had anything to do with the effort.

Coombs HANDBOOK further instructs the would-be successful campaigner to "never enter into controversy", and our campaigners surely follow that bit of advice. When have you heard of Jimmy Allen entering a debate, or Batsell Barrett Baxter, or Willard Collins? We cannot even get one of them to defend this state-wide campaign under one eldership practice.

The Campaign Objectives and Procedures

The Christian churches that were instrumental in conducting the earlier campaigns had the same objectives that our Indianapolis brethren have. Henry Shaw says that the time of the big campaigns (1897-1913) "has been designated as a time of struggle for status and numbers on the part of Hoosier Disciples", but the fact is that during this very period the membership of Hoosier churches decreased from 120, 000 to 84, 000 (p. 312). In 1899 an important meeting was held in St. Louis by some preachers who were "interested in projecting a more scholarly image for the Christian Church movement" (Shaw, p. 296.).

You will note that they were interested in "status" and in their "image", and these are among the main announced purposes of the Indianapolis fiasco. They are going to try to improve the image of the Church of Christ by a display of strength. Those responsible for the daily advertising and promotion have been instructed to be sure and get pictures of those big cars driving up to Clowes Hall, and of those well-dressed and fur draped women getting out of those big cars. We want to make an impression on the public. In fact, from the very beginning, this seems to have been a prime objective of these campaigns.

Coombs' 1913 HANDBOOK tells what procedures to use to convey this better image and status. He tells the campaigners to emphasize that the church has 1, 300, 000 members, 7, 000 churches, 6, 000 preachers, 40 universities and colleges, 30 papers, 20 publishing houses and 100 missionaries. And thus in Coombs-like fashion, our most successful campaigners give emphasis to our statistics.

The HANDBOOK says that proper display should be made of the fact that many influential people are members of the church. Coombs reminded the “professional evangelists” of his day to casually drop the fact that Timothy Coop (noted Philanthropist of England) was a member of the church, and that James A. Garfield, President of the U. S. , had been a member of the church. If that did not completely bowl them over, then they could tell of Jeremy S. Black (Secretary of State), Ira Chase (Governor of Indiana), and of various congressmen who were members of this important church. Be sure and get in the fact, Coombs advises, that the Disciples are growing faster than any other religious group, and predict that by 1963 there will be 40, 000, 000 members! That prediction ought really to give status! Of course Coombs missed his prediction by considerably more than 35, 000, 000 members, but who back then would live to 1963 to know he erred? It helped to paint the image and to attain the status just to say it.

Thus our big campaigns have a liberal sprinkling of the celebrities that are members of the church. We have our Pat Boone to lead the singing, and our Byron Nelson, or Bobby Morrow, or Judge Sam Tatum to put in a timely appearance. We use our State Senators and Representatives in a proper way to convey our status. We give special attention to our millionaire members, and feature choruses from “our schools” to let the public know that we do have schools, and that we amount to something. So the Indiana campaign has as its announced intention to improve our image, just as every other flamboyant sectarian affair has as its objective the same intent. These brethren get a little mixed up at times. On the one hand they do not want anybody to know who is conducting this affair until they get there, and then they want them to go away thinking what important and impressive people these Church of Christ folk are.

Responses and Attendance

One of the Indianapolis preachers said the other day that there never had been anything done by the sectarian churches that was going to be the success this forthcoming campaign was going to be. Henry Shaw said, “The campaigns were big business, usually so well organized, advertised, and administered, that success in terms of converts... could almost be predicted, if not guaranteed” (p. 278). Our Indiana brethren wanted to use the luxurious new Clowes Hall partly, it is reported, because they wanted to have an overflow crowd every night. If they secured one of the available large auditoriums in the city and then did not fill it, it would reflect upon the image they sought to convey.

Clowes Hall will only seat about 2500. Very likely it will be filled each night. A very

small percentage of the church members in the state could overflow the auditorium nightly. The usual procedure is to assign different churches a night to attend, until they know exactly what night what congregations will bring what number of their members to fill the auditorium. The Terre Haute churches are seeking to raise \$750 to pay for the buses to transport their members to Indianapolis on their night. Oh, they will fill the auditorium all right. They almost know right now who will be seated in what seat each night, so highly organized is this effort.

But nothing new will occur in Indianapolis. The Churches of Christ are planning to bowl the world over by the fact that we have 2500 to attend a meeting. But the Jehovah's Witnesses have nearly 100, 000 at some of their big meetings, and I have not thereby been caused to want to join them yet! In fact, the brethren who think 2500 attendance is going to be so impressive are just unfamiliar with some of the earlier campaigns. For instance, in July, 1905, during the hey-day of the campaigns, they had one here in Marion, Indiana. The attendance was 20, 000, when the entire population of the city was only about 20, 000. And this campaign only cost \$1, 000, which will not be a drop in the bucket compared to the thousands to be spent on the Indianapolis display. If the brethren succeed in getting 2500 to attend in Indianapolis, they will have about one-tenth the number that were attending such showy sectarian efforts half a century ago.

And they had responses back then. The Marion campaign saw 130 to respond; 214 responded at the campaign in little Butler, Indiana; 234 in the Evansville campaign, and 347 in the Noblesville campaign. And these were all rather small cities back then. During one of Scoville's campaigns at Allegheny City-Pittsburgh, there were 667 responses, and when he went to Des Moines, "The great auditoriums of Des Moines were not sufficiently commodious" to house the crowds, and 1114 responded. We have not yet had anything like that Des Moines campaign, and likely will not have at Indianapolis. Of course Scoville only had 573 "accessions" out of 1114 responses. And the Jimmy Allen campaigns regularly have more "confessions, re-commitments, and rededications" than baptisms. One preacher said that at some of these big meetings if a fellow gets up to close the door, they count him as a response!

Our motley crew of campaigners are strictly amateurs when they are compared in nearly any way with the campaigners of fifty years ago. Scoville got 19 calls for campaigns the very first week after he completed his first three with 70 additions. He had 10, 000 converts in 9 years. None of our boys is even close to matching that record yet. Their campaigns were so methodical we would say they were nearly computerized. One campaign report for one year showed that the 1131 "accessions" for the year only cost \$1.07 each! Now you will have to admit that's a pretty cheap member. Now let's see the Indianapolis campaign boys match that.

Conclusion

But it was not long until the brethren back then became disenchanted with the

campaigns. It seems that their most noted campaigners would not preach the distinctive doctrine they had been accustomed to hearing. It was not long until their most popular “professional evangelists” had become so professional about the matter that they were holding inter-denominational campaigns, and with equal success. They could as easily take “accessions” for one denomination as for another.

And such an occurrence may awaken some of the brethren today to the trend of the big campaigns.

Several of the most prominent campaigners believe in the direct operation of the Holy Spirit in about the same fashion as sectarian preachers. Brother Jimmy Allen is not sure that we have the truth on a good many matters, children worship in meeting houses with “Church of Christ” over the door, which is to say that some of God's children are in sectarian churches. So he is about ready to become an inter-denominational campaigner. The liberal Indianapolis preacher, W. L. Totty, recently has written several bulletin articles attacking doctrinal positions taken by campaigner Jimmy Allen to show why he and the Garfield Heights church will have nothing to do with the Greater Indiana Campaign. So the disenchantment apparently already has begun.

But meanwhile the brethren must go through with the forthcoming Indianapolis campaign. That means the churches throughout the state must send their money to the Indianapolis brethren to bail them out. Back in 1851 the Indianapolis brethren bit off more than they could chew on a project. So a letter was addressed “to all the churches in our State, requesting them to lift contributions, for the purpose of assisting the brethren in Indianapolis in liquidating the heavy expense incurred by them..” (Shaw, pp. 279, 280). And now that the Franklin Road church in Indianapolis has appointed itself to conduct a campaign for the whole state of Indiana, “all the churches in our State” are being asked to “lift contributions” to bail these brethren out.

And so on and on we go. History really has a way of repeating itself, doesn't it? But some brethren are learning, and others will never learn!

—Rt. 2, Box 149
Marion, Indiana 46952

The Man of the “Campaigns”

Eugene Britnell

If I were going to write an article on the modern “Crusades for Christ” in the world today, I would have to write about Billy Graham for he personifies the movement. Likewise, one cannot publish a paper on the modern “Campaigns for Christ” among churches of Christ without writing about brother Jimmy Allen. For some reason, he has become identified with the “campaigns” of our time.

I accepted this assignment fully cognizant of the possibility of being misunderstood and having my motives impugned. Any time one writes about a man or sin, especially if he writes objectively and critically, he runs this risk. Let it be clearly understood that I am not alone in my opposition to much of the teaching and practice of brother Allen. Brother C. D. Plum has an article in the March, 1967, issue of TRUTH MAGAZINE in which he replies to Allen's false teaching concerning a forthcoming “campaign” in Parkersburg, W. Va. Brother W. L. Totty has published a series of six articles in opposition to Allen's work and “The Greater Indiana Campaign.” Being faced with the same possibility of being misunderstood that I am, brother Totty wrote:

“I want to make it plain that I have no ill will at all toward brother Allen. I do not even know him. But I do know what he teaches, because of his writings. And when I point out the error in his teaching, I am not any more attacking him than Paul was Peter when he withstood Peter 'to his face, because he was to be blamed' (Gal. 2: 11). We are obligated to point out error, regardless of who the teacher might be. (The INFORMER, March 5, 1967).

I have known brother Allen for approximately fifteen years, and I have observed his work and teaching here in Arkansas and throughout the nation. We have studied together, heard one another preach, and engaged in a considerable amount of correspondence. We are friends and brothers in Christ. I have nothing personally against Jimmy. He is a fine man and I know that he has done a lot of good work. I would help him in any way possible and I believe that he would do the same for me.

Friendship does not and cannot mean compromise. Error doesn't grow on trees—it is taught and practiced by people. It is impossible to disassociate error from its advocates. One cannot deal honestly and candidly with error without identifying those who teach and practice it. The apostolic writer and preachers made that perfectly clear to all. So I plead for an understanding of what I shall say. This is not a matter of jealousy, envy or malice. I am not making a personal attack on brother Allen, I am opposing some of his teaching which I verily believe to be unscriptural.

Brother Allen is a member of the faculty of Harding College, and spends much of his time working in the financial interest of that institution. The “Harding College Bulletin” of

December, 1966, carried a lengthy article, along with many pictures, entitled “The Story of Jimmy Allen.” The author said of Jimmy: “When Jimmy Allen was 17 nobody thought held amount to much. But the army settled him down, Harding's atmosphere converted him, and he's been preaching ever since. 11

How Allen Started

It is difficult to understand how one man becomes so popular in a particular movement. Why does one man become the man for “campaigns” across the country? Jimmy is a good speaker, but that alone does not account for his “success.” Many other brethren are also good speakers—and far more experienced in the word and work. Incidentally, to what may we attribute Billy Graham's success? (Since Jimmy often compares himself with Graham—he did in the article mentioned above—I suppose that I can also.) Is Graham all that good? Surely many other Baptist preachers are equally as good or maybe better. But for some reason a man makes a name and then he goes on that. People often go to Graham's meeting just to see and hear Billy Graham. He is famous!

Brother Allen held a meeting several years ago in Newport, Arkansas (his home County) and had more than one hundred responses. I attended some of that meeting. The report reached many papers, and naturally brethren began to want a man for their meetings who could get such results. Are all other preachers preaching a different message? Are they lacking in ability as gospel preachers?

Exalting The Man

Maybe it is unavoidable, but when any human being becomes too popular, people have a tendency to exalt the man above the plan. And, generally speaking, the man who has reached that point does not discourage it. Whether with or without his approval, wittingly or unwittingly, Jimmy Allen has been exalted above the role of a humble servant of God who desires only to preach “Christ and him crucified. “ Within recent months or years, I have had occasion to drive through such cities as Memphis and El Paso just before one of Jimmy's “campaigns.” In each place, I saw huge street banners reading, “Hear Jimmy Allen.” The same was true of radio announcements and other advertising. From such advertising, one concludes that the main attraction is Jimmy Allen, not Christ and his gospel. It's much like the familiar ads “Hear Billy Graham.’ In contrast, consider the attitude of the apostles as expressed in such passages as I Cor. 1:31; 2:1-5; 3:4-9; Gal. 6:14 and I Thess. 2: 6. Imagine a banner across the street in Corinth reading, “Hear Paul!”

Perversion of Scripture

Of all the unscriptural teaching of brother Allen, I mention first his vain efforts to justify the type of cooperation involved in his “campaigns.” Basically, they involve the same type of cooperation as the Herald of Truth or other sponsoring church arrangements. For example,

in the "Greater Philadelphia Campaign For Christ' I which is set for August of this year, the arrangement is this: The sponsoring church is in Warrington, Pa.; the personal work is under the oversight of some elders in Oklahoma City; the master of ceremonies will be from Northwestern College; it is financed by churches over the nation; and the whole thing is under an Executive Committee! I would like to hear brother Allen try to defend that Committee while at the same time opposing a missionary society. Wouldn't that make for interesting listening?

In numerous articles and speeches which I have seen and heard, Jimmy referred to 2 Corinthians 8 and 9; Rom. 15 and Acts 11:27-30 in defense of his campaign-type of cooperation. Any man who can see a sponsoring church or an arrangement remotely related to that described above in those passages would have no difficulty at all in seeing a sprinkled baby in Acts 16:15! In the first place, those passages are all dealing with benevolence—not evangelism. Not a one of them teaches that a church or churches sent to a church to enable the receiving church to do a work somewhere else. According to these and all other scriptures on the subject, the receiving church was always in need. No church sent a contribution to another church in the work of evangelism.

Observing Others

Maybe brother Allen and many others among us spend too much time observing the "successful" work of sectarians like Billy Graham and Bishop Sheen, and not enough time in reading the scriptures. They watch those men and get the idea that Christians—people who are supposed to be governed by the Bible—can also conduct these giant campaigns and network programs. In a speech before a Conference of the Herald of Truth in Abilene, Jimmy commended Graham and said that he was moving people with the truth. He went on to say that Graham did not preach all of the truth and then added, "sticking the plan of salvation on (to Graham's sermons, E. B.) is not going to run them all away." Doesn't Jimmy know that if Graham will "stick the plan of salvation" on as Peter did on Pentecost that he will run them away?

On The Holy Spirit

It seems that brother Allen has joined with some prominent men of several other colleges in advocating the modern heresy (among us) of the direct operation of the Holy Spirit in the life of a Christian. On September 27, 1966, Jimmy delivered a "Chapel Speech" at Harding College and I have a copy of his outline. He stated that he did not believe that "the Holy Spirit operates only through the word of God in the life of a Christian." If the Holy Spirit does not operate only through the word then he operates in some way separate and apart from the word! That is what many sectarian bodies have always taught, and all gospel preachers—until recently—have denied it.

Commenting further, brother Allen said: "a. He does operate through the word. Eph.

6:17. b. He operates only through the word in the conviction and conversion of sinners. There are no Christians where the word has not gone. c. However, the Holy Spirit actually dwells in Christians (Rom. 8:9). If he does nothing as the indwelling Spirit, there is no advantage to having Him in us.”

In a review of this. W. L. Totty wrote:

“How does brother Allen arrive at the conclusion that the Holy Spirit 'operates only through the word' in the conversion of sinners but 'actually dwells in Christians' and operates separate and apart from the word in them? We all believe that the Holy Spirit dwells in Christians; but when one uses the word 'actually, I that raises another thought.

“God dwells in us, Christ dwells in us, and we dwell in Christ; but Christ does not 'actually' (personally) dwell in us. Paul said, 'So then they that are in the flesh cannot please God. But ye are not in the flesh, but in the Spirit, if so be that the Spirit of God dwell in you. Now if any man have not the Spirit of Christ, he is none of his. I (Rom. 8:8-9.) If one will read carefully Paul's speech, one will see that Paul is not saying the spirit actually and personally dwells in a person, because the apostle says, I But ye are not in the flesh, but in the Spirit, if so be that the Spirit of God dwell in you. I If we literalize that, we have the apostle saying that the Spirit is in a Christian and at the same time the Christian is in the Spirit. Now, we know that could not actually, personally, be; because if it were 'actually' the Spirit in us, we could not actually be in the Spirit. That would be a contradiction of terms.” (The INFORMER, March 19, 1967)

From a study of men in various movements through the years, it seems to me that when they find themselves without scriptural authority for some teaching or practice, they invariably begin to claim some miraculous or special influence of the Holy Spirit to which they then appeal for their authority. Are some of our brethren reaching this point?

The Social Gospel

Like so many others among us today, brother Allen has accepted the social gospel. He endorses the church sponsored social and recreational activities. On April 16, 1965, the White Station church in Memphis sponsored a “Jimmy Allen Birthday Dinner” in their “fellowship hall.” Tickets were sold for \$2.50 each. In what way is the church obligated to celebrate Jimmy Allen's birthday? We even oppose the church doing that for Jesus Christ!

Christians and Denominations

In his Harding speech, brother Allen said that he did not believe that “every child of God worshiping in a building with a church of Christ sign hanging out front.” In a note to brother Totty (a copy of which he sent to me), Jimmy later tried to explain what he meant. He quoted F.D. Srygley, Alexander Campbell, Moses E. Lard and G. C. Brewer as having believed

“there were Christians in the denominations.” Certainly we believe that a Christian may apostatize and join some denomination, but it seems to me that Jimmy implied that some children of God were worshiping acceptably under some name other than the name of Christ. I believe that the Harding students got that impression. If they didn't, Jimmy surely must have spent some time in explaining the meaning of the statement in his outline—explaining that it didn't really mean what it said! That could have sounded like the man who said, “I know you believe you understand what you think I said, but I am not sure you realize that what you heard is not what I meant.”

Campaign Responses

. According to the information in a recent letter from brother Allen, only 30.3 percent of his responses for the past three years were baptisms. That means that seven out of ten of those who responded were restorations or “re-dedications.” Certainly the erring need to be restored (Gal. 6: 1), but such a percentage is a reflection on either his preaching or the way brethren are living. Speaking of these organized, emotional meetings and their responses, Vernon Morris wrote:

“Does it disturb one to know that one congregation permitted its young people to arrange to go down by the river at night and erect a cross and after proper emotional preliminaries were complete, the feeling at its highest, set fire to the cross and have young people, while in this emotional state, make decisions to be baptized? Does it disturb you to know that many of our big meetings or 'Campaigns' have turned into a 'king size' confessional booth, where we boast of “re-dedications” by the hundreds? What has happened to some of the private prayers to God? Don't get me wrong. I believe in confession and the confession should be made just as public as the sin is public. Most of these sins are between you and your God, why not settle it on that basis? Isn't it true that every time you meet at the House of God you actually 'rededicate' yourselves? Where did that term originate?” (FIRM FOUNDATION, Nov. 22, 1966, p. 743.)

I seriously question whether or not these “campaigns” are the proper places for confessions or restorations. If the person who responds is a member of some congregation, why not make the confession there? Was the sin not committed before and against the home congregation, as well as the Lord? How can one justifiably run off to some great “campaign” and make a confession? So, seventy percent of the responses should have been somewhere else!

Church Support of Colleges

Brother Allen believes that it is scriptural for churches to contribute to colleges. I have a letter from him wherein he says so. By far the majority of brethren have always considered this an unsound position, and certainly it is contrary to the scriptures. He recently denied that Harding College is “primarily an academic institution” and affirmed that “its fundamental

reason for existence is religious.” If that be true, then Harding must be an adjunct to the church rather than the home and therefore the church ought to support it. Do you follow his thinking? I don't believe it, and this is not the basis upon which faithful brethren have defended such an institution's right to exist.

On Inspiration

In his Harding speech brother Allen said: “I do not believe that the people with whom I worship have the truth, the whole truth, and nothing but the truth. “ He continued by saying that we should strive to speak where the Bible speaks, etc. , and that there is room for growth in the life of a Christian. That is true, but if that is all that he meant by his statement he should have said that we did not UNDERSTAND all of the truth. Instead, he said that we did not HAVE all the truth. He further stated that “the Bible properly translated, is infallible and inerrant.” But does he believe that we have a Bible on earth today that is properly translated? We shall see.

In “The INFORMER” of March 12, 1967, brother W. L. Totty quotes from a tape recording in which brother Allen said: “Well, I believe they (King James and American Standard Versions) contain the whole counsel of God; but I don't believe they are verbally inspired. I don't believe there is a translation on the market today that is verbally inspired. If they are verbally inspired, then the translators were inspired. Not only that, since most of the men, as far as I know, all of the men who had a part in the translation never experienced the new birth.”

A Mormon will lay out several translations and then ask “Which one is the word of God?” How would Jimmy fare in such a discussion?

The original text of the Bible is verbally inspired of God. I believe that it can be translated and copied by uninspired men and still retain that inspiration. For hundreds of years after the death of the last inspired writer and before the birth of Christ the scribes copied and handed down the Old Testament, yet Jesus recognized it as inspired scripture. Read Matthew 23:1-3; Luke 24:44,45; John 10:35 and many other related passages. And what about the use of amanuenses by the apostle Paul (Col. 4:18; 2 Thess. 3:17; Romans 16:22)?

Someone may say that this is simply a matter of semantics, but is it? Maybe he did not intend to deny the inspiration of the scriptures which we have today, but his statements are certainly careless and misleading, especially when presented before students. Remember, he said that we do not have a verbally inspired Bible on earth today! Just why would a gospel preacher make such statements?

Salvation by Works

He said that he did not believe in salvation by works and gave Ephesians 2:8,9 and Titus

3:5 as proof. That is exactly what Billy Graham says and the very passages which he would use. Jimmy did not say salvation by works only. I believe in salvation by works and can prove it by Acts 2:40; 10:35; Gal. 5:6; Phil. 2:12 and James 2:14-26.

Sin and Salvation

In his Harding speech, he said that one does not have to “be right in every point to go to heaven, “ but that one “must be right concerning the way of salvation.” I have always thought that the “way of salvation” was the way to heaven!

He stated that he did not believe “that one unrepentant sin will send one to hell.” Now that's a strange statement from a gospel preacher. In debate with Baptist preachers they want to know how many sins will cause one to be lost. We reply that it is not a matter of how many but rather will any sin condemn us, and conclude that one unrepentant sin will condemn. Maybe we have been wrong!

One sin kept Moses out of the promised land! One sin killed Nadab and Abihu! One sin killed the prophet who was sent to Bethel! Read James 2: 10 and Acts 17:30.

Allen asked, “What about unknown sins?” and then cited Psalm 19:12. That verse doesn't help him. David realized that even “secret faults” could condemn him, and surely he repented or he would not have been praying. Remember, Jimmy taught that an unrepentant sin will not send one to hell! He said, God's way takes care of us” and gave 1 John 1:7 as proof. But are we walking “in the light” and in “God's way” when we refuse to repent? Luke 13:3 doesn't sound like it! I don't believe the blood of Christ will cleanse us of all sins if we are not penitent of all sins.

Lack of confidence and Courage

If you want to see a man with a spiritual backbone as strong as a wet noodle, watch a man who is caught without scriptural authority. Brother Allen will not defend what he teaches. Time and again I have called upon him to debate these issues and he has refused. I have offered him space in our paper and he refused to reply. The only offer he has ever made was to discuss these things with me privately (which I do not oppose) and with the understanding that our discussion could not be recorded! What does he fear? When a man refuses to defend what he believes and teaches, he stands in willful defiance of a command of God (1 Peter 3:15). As brother James D. Bales wrote: “Those who oppose the right kind of religious debating are either weak in the faith; afraid of their own position; afraid of the consequences of standing for the truth; or they are uninformed on the particular question under discussion.” (Christian, Contend For Thy Cause, p. 18.)

Conclusion

I could point out other things which brother Allen believes which I believe to be wrong or at least questionable, but these are sufficient to prove that he teaches error and is unworthy of the influential position which he holds among brethren. I don't believe that he can be trusted to teach the truth concerning the true nature and mission of the church, the autonomy and sufficiency of the congregation, and other things of major importance. If he continues as he has in the past, I verily believe that his influence will prove harmful to the church. I hope that brethren will cease to use him in such responsible positions, and I pray that he will repent and use his ability in declaring "the whole counsel of God. "

I trust that I have written the truth in the right spirit and with the proper motives. If I have failed to do so, I pray that God, brother Allen, and all who are involved or concerned will forgive me, and I stand ready to make any correction that truth demands.

—P. O. Box 3012
Little Rock, Arkansas

Priming The Pump

Paul K. Williams

“You Are Invited. . . G. I. C. C. RALLY” read the invitation. The double-header features Mrs. Helen Young speaking to a luncheon rally (over 400 tickets reserved at \$2. 50 each) and Mid McKnight speaking on how personal work can help the campaign that same evening at the Northeast Church of Christ building. It says that they are “Appearing In Behalf OF GREATER INDIANA CAMPAIGN FOR CHRIST.”

This is a sample of the preliminary ballyhoo in this extremely well-organized effort. The publicity build-up began in January. Still three months before the actual Campaign itself, the efforts were reaching a fever pitch. Banquets were being held in strategic locations over the state, with Bill Carpenter, Jr. delivering rousing perorations to the assembled groups to give money for the Campaign and to get people to Clowes Hall Auditorium July 3-8. Organizing meetings were being held regularly, with some eighteen different areas of work laid out with different people in charge of each, and usually a committee working in each. Student participation (a number of Harding College students were scheduled to come to Indianapolis to work in the Campaign), Promotion and Advertising, Worship, Responses, Financial, Counseling and Follow-Up are a few of the “Responsibilities” listed on the organization sheet. Besides the G. I. C. C. RALLY for March 31 there were scheduled a Junior-Senior Banquet on May 26 (sponsored by North Central Church of Christ), a Ladies' Lectureship on June 13 (also sponsored by North Central Church of Christ, and judging from the location it must be a banquet), and an Indiana Youth Rally on June 17-18 at the Fountain Square Church of Christ. (Both these congregations are in Indianapolis.)

Besides the State Director (Wm. J. Carpenter, Jr.) there are regional directors. The state has been divided into at least nine regions with a Director appointed for each. In each region there has been or will be a banquet with Bill Carpenter speaking. It was said at the beginning of the campaign for the Campaign that every family in the state would be contacted with publicity for the July 3-8 Clowes Hall extravaganza.

The reason for the selection of Clowes (pronounced “clues”) Hall is an interesting one. Clowes Hall is a brand-new, \$3,000,000 luxury auditorium on the campus of Butler University. It seats 2500 people in plush red seats and is the home of the Indianapolis Symphony Orchestra. It is evident from what Bill Carpenter has said at the organizing sessions that the main reason for choosing Clowes Hall is its prestige value. They anticipate that it will

actually be too small and are even now making plans for closed circuit TV to other places to accommodate the expected crowds. Another auditorium, seating many more people, is available, probably at less cost. But they are giving no consideration to it and are featuring a huge picture of Clowes Hall on their posters and other advertising material.

Besides the speaker, Jimmy Allen, they feature pictures of Pat and Nick Boone, listed as Song Directors for the Campaign. Brother Earl West, preacher for the 10th and Franklin Road Church of Christ (the sponsoring church for the Campaign) stated that it will “enhance our reputation to use Pat Boone. “The entire proceedings are to be filmed in color in order to “put the church in a new light. “ The films may be used on local television in the place of the Herald of Truth.

These moves are well-calculated and deliberately planned, for Bro. Carpenter says that this campaign is designed to change the image of the church. He states that Indiana is one of the four richest states in the union as far as the church is concerned. He wants everyone to know it, so the fanciest auditorium, the best-known song director, etc. are being chosen. One photographer has been assigned to photograph the people entering Clowes Hall, and he has been specifically directed to concentrate on the ones in mink coats getting out of their Cadillacs.

The amount of money that they are trying to raise from all the churches of Christ in the state of Indiana is \$15,000. I personally doubt that this will be enough and anticipate that they will try to raise more than this (and succeed). According to the “Jimmy Allen Campaign Financial Report” of February 28, 1967, Bill Carpenter, the State Director, is being paid \$800 per month. He is a busy man and certainly earns that money, as overseeing all those committees, planning all the details, raising the money by speaking to dozens of congregations, etc. is a big job. But I thought it interesting that for six months before the campaign there must be a paid state director in order for there to be a six day meeting in Indianapolis! This means that one-third (nearly \$5, 000) of the announced \$15,000 goal will be paid to the money raiser! (As an item of interest, the report showed that \$4050 had been contributed by 10 churches as of the first part of March and all but \$40 had been spent.)

The publicity also emphasizes the fact that this is a “unified effort” of churches of Christ. One of the express purposes of the Campaign is to bring about unity of the churches of Christ in Indiana. What it is actually doing, of course, is to further widen the breach between the digressive, liberal brethren and those who are concerned about following the New Testament. They seem to think that organization is the way to unity. And they are certainly organized. It would be difficult to see how any denomination could be more organized. But whatever unity may be effected by the Campaign will be a unity outside of the authority of Christ. The unity God enjoins upon us is unity in Christ—in his teaching. This Campaign is showing a total disregard for the teaching of God on the subject of the organization and mission of the church. Even in the guise of seeking lost souls there is an evident desire to please the world through worldly means. The whole thing is so brazen an attempt to be in every respect like the denominations that any one with a respect for the Scriptures can have nothing to do with it.

—412 Lawndale Drive,
Plainfield, Indiana 46168

The Bible Way of Campaigning For Christ

William H. Lewis

We are living in a day of big “Campaigns.” Some people launch “advertising campaigns” in an effort to sell their products. The armed forces often wage a “military campaign” to obtain some desired results. The “Campaign craze” is having its effect upon the church of our Lord today. We hear of such things as “Youth For Christ Campaigns,” some “area-wide campaign for Christ,” etc. even in the church of Christ. In the near future a multiplicity of congregations of the Lord's church in the state of Indiana are to “cooperate” in promoting “The Greater Indiana Campaign For Christ” here in the city of Indianapolis under the sponsorship of the Franklin Road church of Christ of this city, of which, Bro. Earl West is the preacher.

I have no reason to doubt the honesty and sincerity of the brethren who will have a part in this gigantic effort to preach the gospel to those who may attend the services of this “campaign.” I like to think of them as being honest and sincere, while at the same time I know that they are honestly mistaken, and sincerely wrong. I'm sure that most of them really think that they are “campaigning for Christ.” But are they?

Let it be understood right now that I have no objections to my brethren campaigning for Christ if they do it by divine authority! It is good for God's people to do all they can to preach the gospel to the lost by any, and every means at their disposal, where there is no Bible principle violated. I am not opposed to means or methods being employed in performing the work of the church. However, there is a Bible way to campaign for Christ, and there is man's way of doing it. I, here and now, charge that “The Greater Indiana Campaign For Christ, “ is not the Bible way to “campaign for Christ,” but, is the way of men!” It is without Divine authority! This I shall prove.

The Bible Way to “Campaign For Christ”

(Individually)

Immediately after the establishment of the Lord's church on the first Pentecost after the resurrection of our Lord from the tomb (Acts 2), individual members of the church realized their obligation and privilege of teaching and preaching the gospel of Christ. The Pentecostians “continued steadfastly in the apostle's doctrine.” (Acts 2:42) Philip “preached \Christ” in Samaria. (Acts 8:5) He “preached Jesus” to the eunuch. (Acts 8:35) Aquila and Priscilla taught Apollos “the way of God more perfectly. “ (Acts 18:24-26) As the results of the persecution of the church at Jerusalem, many of her members “went every where preaching the word.” (Acts 8:4)

Now, who will say that these people were not “campaigning for Christ?” We should all

be doing more of this kind of “campaigning for Christ” today! We are all united on this ground. (See Heb. 5:12-14) I know of no one who objects to this kind of “campaigning for Christ.” When we do as did the early church with regard to this matter, we do so by Divine authority.

Collectively, Or As A Congregation

The congregations of the Apostolic Age put forth a concerted effort (simultaneous action) to carry out the Great Commission in preaching the gospel to the lost. Each congregation worked concurrently in their effort of preaching the gospel. The word “church” is used in at least three different senses in the New Testament: (1) the church universal (Matt. 16:18), (2) the church local, (Gal. 1: 2; 1 Cor. 16: 1; Rev. 1: 4), and the church in the assembled form (1 Cor. 11: 18, 20). With regard to the organization of the church the word is used in the local, or congregational sense. The local church is composed of a part of the “church universal” members of which have banded themselves together in some locale for the purpose of worshiping God, and carrying on the work of the church. The local congregation is the only organization the Lord's church has. Every thing that God has ordained “the church as such” to do can, and must be done in, and through the local congregation. The church universal has no organization. It is not functional!

When a local congregation is fully organized, it has a plurality of men known as elders who have the oversight of that one particular congregation. (Acts 14:23; Titus 1:5; Heb. 13:17) These men are to have the qualifications as are outlined on the pages of inspiration by the Holy Spirit in 1 Tim. 3, and Titus 1.

Scriptures Violated By The Greater Indiana Campaign For Christ

Please read Acts 20:28-31. What do we read in those verses? (1) Elders are to take heed to themselves first, then to all of the flock where they are elders. (2) Elders are made by the Holy Spirit. (Such is done when they possess the qualifications as given by the Holy Spirit.) (3) The Holy Spirit made them “overseers.” (4) They were to “oversee” only the local congregation where they worked and worshipped. (5) They were to “feed” this flock. This was done by teaching them the word of God. (There is no such thing as a “non-teaching elder” by God's authority.) (6) There were dangers from without, (v. 29) (7) However, the most serious danger to the welfare of the church was to come “from within” the eldership. (v. 30) (One of the first departures from the Divine pattern of the New Testament church was in “church government.”)

Please read 1 Pet. 5:2, 3. What do we find in those verses? (1) the “feeding” and the “oversight” of the elders was limited to the flock of God which was “among” them. (2) Such work was to be done willingly, with a ready mind, not by constraint, nor for filthy lucre. (3) They were not to lord it over the charge allotted to them, or act in a dictatorial manner, as masters over slaves. (4) They were to be “examples to the flock,” or be living such lives that all could safely follow their example and go to heaven when they die.

In the Bible the work and authority of elders stopped at the church in which they lived, worked, and worshipped. Those elders had no authority to take charge of the money of any church except the one over which they were “overseers.” Each congregation was a self-governing unit, of, and within itself. It was to plan and execute its own work to the extent of its ability. God does not require an individual or a congregation to do that which it is unable to do. (Matt. 25:14-30; II Cor. 8:12)

The only time a congregation in the New Testament sent “relief” to another congregation was when the receiving congregation was in need! (I Cor. 8:13-5) If this is not true, then let someone produce the passage that teaches otherwise.

Any organization larger than the local congregation is too large to be the New Testament church. Any organization smaller than the local congregation is too small to be the New Testament church. Any organization the same as the local congregation (which, of course, is an impossibility) is not needed, as we already have the local congregation — the only organization of the New Testament church.

Nowhere do we read in the New Testament where congregations of an area, or a district, ever “combined” under the “sponsorship” of a local congregation to do the work of the church. If such combinations are accomplished today they are done without Divine authority. All of the local congregations were separate and apart from each other, and were bound together only by the bond of brother love.

The Greater Indiana Campaign For Christ, and the Herald of Truth radio and TV arrangement, both, violate these scriptures and principles. (No one should know this better than Brother Earl West, having written and preached these truths in days past as he has.) I can see no justification of anyone who respects Divine authority having anything to do, by way of encouragement, with such area-wide “campaigns” as will be the “GREATER INDIANA CAMPAIGN FOR CHRIST.”

—2986 S. Roena Street
Indianapolis, Indiana 46241

CONGREGATIONAL COOPERATION

(A SERMON)

EARL I. WEST

(Note: This sermon was preached by Brother West at Cuyahoga Falls, Ohio, in May, 1953. It was tape-recorded as delivered, and was later edited and corrected by Brother West himself. This sermon represents his belief and conviction before he aligned himself with the present denominational trend among the Churches of Christ. Brother West does not now adhere to the principles he so ably set forth in this discourse, but so far as we know has never published any explanation for his change nor outlined the reasons which brought it about. — Editor)

The subject of congregational cooperation is one that deals with a theme of how one congregation may cooperate with another to do the work of the Lord. That is one of the oldest problems that has come up in the history of the Church, and in a very few moments we are going to find out how that problem arose, and some of the answers that were early given to it.

The problem I think you realize, is very much alive in this day. How may one congregation work with another or cooperate with another to do the work of the Lord? Going back just a few years, most of us had the impression that the answer to the problems of the world lay in preaching the Gospel of the Lord. Most of us became convinced that such a thing as world peace would never be brought about by guns or bombs or airplanes, but rather when men and women were converted to the primitive gospel of our Lord. I believe that there was a feeling which swept most of the congregations at the end of the war, that somehow or other when the war finally would end, we would all try to do more to preach the Gospel than we had ever done before.

Now, there were many congregations as well as many individuals that decided to do the work of the Lord in foreign mission fields. Some of the finest of the men that we have in the church today, some of the most noble of Christian characters, decided that when the war was over, they were going to go to foreign countries like Italy, Japan, Germany, or France to preach the gospel and try to convert the people. Some of the young men were in the Army overseas during the war and saw the need for it back in those days. When the war was over, they began to interest all of us in a campaign to do more in the way of preaching the word of the Lord.

After the work started, however, there also followed in the wake of it, a thought on the part of many individuals that the congregations were not working together by the New Testament principle to do this missionary work. As some examined the Scriptures, they started to have serious doubts that the principle that we have been following is the principle

that really has been outlined in the Bible. Nobody, particularly, is to blame for it. Although a number of years ago the problem of how a congregation could cooperate with another was much alive in the church; yet for the last 40 or 50 years it has been more or less dead. It has been dead, really, because we have been dealing with so many other problems, mainly premillennialism. In giving so much attention to that particular line of thought, our brethren simply did not take the time to really investigate into the question of how one church or congregation ought to cooperate with another, and it has only been with the last 5 or 6 years that the old problem has been brought up again. Once again our brethren are thinking about it, studying about it, and trying to come up with the right answer on the basis of New Testament teaching.

For the past three or four years, I have studied this problem seriously. I don't come to you tonight to speak on the subject with any idea at all that I have solved all of the problems in connection with it. I am not coming tonight with any idea that I know all of the answers to every phase of the problem. Yet, I do believe on the other hand, that there are principles involved that everyone of us ought to see very clearly, and I am not speaking tonight with any intention whatsoever of discouraging any kind of mission work that our brethren are doing in the world. As a matter of fact, those that are now in the foreign fields doing this mission work are men that I respect very highly, and, I say it tonight, not with any feeling of bragging about any modesty, but I recognize in spiritual qualities, their superiority to me. I appreciate the sacrifice that they are making. I am not proposing in any sense of the term to try to say anything that will at all discourage anybody in preaching the gospel anywhere in the world. What we need is more of the Word preached. We need more and more and more congregations of the Lord established instead of assuming attitudes that are going to discourage people from doing that work of the Lord. On the other hand, it is entirely possible that you and I can in the midst of our enthusiasm allow ourselves to be carried away from New Testament principles.

There are people that apologize for an incorrect practice on the ground that there is good being done by it. Why, I know people that are supposedly good Protestants, for example, that apologize for the Roman Catholic Church and think what they are doing is right simply because, after all, they do some good. We have our brethren that seem to say: "If we are doing good, that is all right regardless of whether the principle involved is right or wrong."

The only thing that I am interested in tonight is have you study with me the principle involved in how one congregation may work with another congregation. I am not interested in trying to say anything that is going to discourage the work of our Lord anywhere. I hope not to be able to say anything tonight that will at all interfere with any good work, but rather I hope tonight to be able to say something that will help us in the good that we are doing, to see that it is channeled along the line of following the right principle... the Principles outlined in the Bible. What does the Word of the Lord teach? Let us first investigate the Bible to see what the Word of the Lord has to say.

COOPERATION IN NEW TESTAMENT TIMES

The eleventh chapter of Acts is the first example of cooperation. We have, first of all, in this chapter beginning with verse 19, an example of cooperation of the Jerusalem church with the church in the city of Antioch. I am not suggesting this example because it solves all the problems because it doesn't. I do want to have us see as we go through the New Testament what the problem is and to notice these cases. Coming then to the 11th chapter of Acts, we observe that certain brethren—mainly from the Island of Cyprus—had gone over into Antioch in Syria for the purpose of establishing a church. When they came into that city, they preached the Word for a time and the Bible tells that there were many people added to the Lord.

Now you notice the text with me. Acts 11:19-23:

“They therefore that were scattered upon the tribulation that arose about Stephen traveled as far as Phoenicia, and Cyprus, and Antioch, speaking the Word to none save only to Jews. But there were some of them, men of Cyprus and Cyrene, who when they were come to Antioch spake unto the Greeks also, preaching the Lord Jesus. And the hand of the Lord was with them: and a great number that believed turned unto the Lord. And the report concerning them came to the ears of the church which was in Jerusalem: and they sent forth Barnabas as far as Antioch: who, when he was come, and had seen the grace of God, was glad; and he exhorted them all, that with purpose of heart they would cleave unto the Lord.”

That is not all of the story but it is a part of it, so let us stop and emphasize it. We observe, then, that the city of Antioch was, as we might call it, a mission field; for there was not a congregation there at all. It so happened that among those who came to Antioch, were people of Cyprus and Cyrene. They came there, the Bible tells us, preaching the Word of the Lord; and the hand of the Lord was with them and many people were added to the Lord. When the news of what had occurred in Antioch reached the church in Jerusalem, the brethren in Jerusalem decided to send forth Barnabas to them. When Barnabas came to Antioch, he went to work preaching the Word. Barnabas had not been there very long when he remembered his friend, Saul of Tarsus, was preaching over in Silicia or in Tarsus. Barnabas said “goodby” momentarily to the church of Antioch, went over to where Saul was, found him, brought him back to Antioch. Barnabas and Saul labored together in that mission field to build up and to plant the New Testament church. Let's stop and think just a moment about it. Here is a case where the church at Jerusalem sent Barnabas to the city of Antioch for the purpose of working with, indoctrinating and planting more firmly the church that was already located there. For a whole year, Barnabas and Saul of Tarsus preached the Word in Antioch and the Bible tells us that “much people was added to the Lord.” Now that is the first case in the New Testament that we have of one congregation cooperating with another to do the work of the Lord.

There are many things about that case that are not recorded for us in the Bible. For

example, we might notice that the church in Antioch did not ask the church in Jerusalem for any aid so far as we know. Nor was there any record that Jerusalem sent any money, but they did send the preacher and I am sure that all of us could see that whether they sent the preacher or whether they sent the money to hire a preacher, is immaterial to the principle involved. They, nevertheless, sent Barnabas to Antioch, and he worked with them. So far as we know, Antioch did not ask for help. We might pause here long enough to emphasize this. So many times our brethren get the idea that they are not going to do anything for the Lord unless their arm is twisted and they just have to do it. That was not the spirit of the Jerusalem church. They saw that Antioch needed some help. They did not wait to be asked. They saw the need; they arose and met it. They sent Barnabas up there.

Who was Barnabas? We know from Acts 4:36 that he was the man from Cyprus by the name of Barjoses, a good friend of Saul's right after Saul's conversion, at a time when Saul had no other friends. The Jews hated Saul for turning a traitor to their cause. The Christians were suspicious of him because they only remembered him as one that persecuted them. Barnabas came along and gave Paul a helping hand. We do not have much more about him other than that; nevertheless, Barnabas was sent up to do this work. Barnabas asked for Saul and Saul came down and together they preached the Word of the Lord. All I know is that the Jerusalem church apparently voluntarily decided to send aid to the brethren up at Antioch to help them plant the cause. Now there are a lot of things I would like to know, that I just do not know. I would like to know what part inspiration had to play in it. The Bible does not say, I would like to know whether they were asked or who sponsored the work but I do not know. The Bible does not say and I don't want to get any more out of the recorded than Luke, the inspired historian, put into it.

Let's look at a second example. In Acts 11:27 we read these words:

“Now in those days there came down prophets from Jerusalem unto Antioch. And there stood up one of them named Agabus, and signified by the Spirit that there should be a great famine over all the world: which came to pass in the days of Claudius. And the disciples every man according to his ability, determined to send relief unto the brethren that dwelt in Judea: which they did, sending it to the elders by the hand of Barnabas and Saul.”

And then in Acts 12:25:

“And Barnabas and Saul returned from Jerusalem, when they had fulfilled their ministration, taking with them John whose surname was Mark. “

This is another case of cooperation. A famine was prophesied so the brethren in Antioch, every man according to his ability, sent aid down into Judea and delivered that relief unto the hands of the elders. Antioch knew there was an emergency in Judea... a need greater than they could furnish. There isn't any record that the brethren in Judea asked the brethren in Antioch for any help at all. The brethren in Antioch foresaw a need and arose to meet that need. The famine was something that was beyond their power to meet. The brethren in

Antioch decided: “every man according to his ability, determined to send relief unto the brethren that dwelt in Judea. “ There is an important principle involved in this. The only time that Antioch saw any need of helping Judea was when the church of Judea could not help themselves. They were desperately in need so the church in Antioch, seeing the need, sent them relief according to their ability.

Here is something important for us to consider. Some times brethren get the idea that they ought to go around with a hand out, all the time begging some congregation to help them. Brethren, begging isn't a sign of strength, it is a sign of weakness. I will beg if I get weak and have to do it, but I am not going to do that. Begging at any time is a sign of desperation. It is a sign of weakness on our part. We ought not to think that we are strong and powerful because we do it.

In the brotherhood today, any congregation of any size is getting on an average of five to ten letters a week begging for money for this or that or for something else. It has gotten to the point almost that we do not need elders anymore.. all we need is a committee to take up the money and to simply parcel it out to one place after another that happens to have its hand out.

Back to the famine in Judea. They needed some help; they could not do the work by themselves. For the brethren in Antioch to refuse them would have been wrong. Therefore, as they could, they sent the relief. Now then, when the relief came down, you will notice this, that it was delivered over unto the hands of the elders. Now what that relief was, I do not know. I used to think it was money and I read that Scripture that way. It does not say money. It says relief. As a matter of fact, I doubt if it was money. The trouble in Judea was that they just did not have any food. They did not need money. What they needed was bread. They, the brethren in Antioch, gave what relief they could and sent it by Barnabas and Saul. Barnabas and Saul were nothing more than the messengers. They were the delivery boys in this case. That is all. As far as their action here is concerned, they did not exercise any authority whatsoever. The brethren took it up, Barnabas and Saul acted as kind of a mailman would act and just delivered it down there to the elders of Judea.

Now notice another thing about the Scripture. When they made the delivery, they delivered it to the elders in Judea. . . TO THE ELDERS. It was given to the ELDERS to distribute and if some of our brethren were right, this ought to have been turned over to the deacons to distribute. Let's stay by the New Testament Pattern. The elders are the overseers of the congregation. The deacons are men known for their anxiety to work and they just work wherever the elders of the congregation may see fit to put them to work. That is the Bible way.

What I want you to notice in this case is that when it comes to the matter of the delivery of this, the Bible says it was done through the elders in Judea. Sometimes brethren imagine that it was done just to Jerusalem. That is not what the Bible says. It was given to the elders

of Judea. There were many congregations in Judea, not just one. There were many of them and the relief was turned over to the elders of the congregations in that territory. What did the elders do with it? They simply distributed it among the needy members of the congregation over which they were the elders. Did the elders here assume the oversight of a work bigger than the congregation over which they were members? Certainly not. The elders of the church were overseers of the congregation, so they took the resources which had been put at their command and used it among the needful members of the church. There is no authority granted to these elders more than that which they had in the local congregation of which they were members.

Let us notice a third example of cooperation. There are more cases in the Bible, but let us notice I Corinthians 8:6-24 where Titus and two unnamed brethren were sent to Corinth to take up the collection for the saints in Jerusalem as the apostle Paul had planned in I Cor. 1:1-4.

A fourth example: I Cor. 8:1-5 and Rom. 15:25 -26. The churches of Macedonia through their deep poverty abounded unto the riches of their liberality. They asked Paul to help them by receiving their gift for the ministering to the saints in Jerusalem. Again the same principle is involved.

Another example is found in the 4th chapter of the book of Philippians. Paul had gone out of the city of Antioch to do his preaching. When Paul was on his second missionary journey, he went to Philippi, planted the church there, and shortly afterwards, went on across Macedonia into Thessalonica. Then to Berea and other regions and finally down to Athens and Corinth. In the 4th chapter of the Philippian letter, Paul writes to the congregation:

“And ye yourselves also know, ye Philippians, that in the beginning of the gospel, when I departed from Macedonia, no church had fellowship with me in the matter of giving and receiving but ye only; for even in Thessalonica ye sent once and again unto my need. Not that I seek for the gift; but I seek for the fruit that increaseth to your account. But I have all things, and abound: I am filled.”

Here is an example of a congregation cooperating in the work of the Lord. What was Paul's relationship then to the church at Antioch? Sometimes brethren have said, “Well, Paul was related to the church at Antioch as though we were under the elders of that congregation and responsible to them.” Normally, you and I would say that is true. But it so happens in the case of Paul that there is a different problem that enters into it and that is the fact that Paul is an apostle and inspired of the Holy Spirit. Paul did not need to be under anybody's elders to do the work of the Lord. Paul was an ambassador, friends, not of any church; Paul was an ambassador of Christ. He had been sent by the Head of the church, Christ, to go out and to preach the Gospel to all places. When it came, however, to Paul's needs, these had to be taken care of and Paul said to the church at Philippi: “You sent time and again unto my needs, first in Thessalonica and then in other places as well.”

What do we find then? We observe that when Paul went out into the evangelistic field to preach, HE received contributions. I Cor. 11:8-9; Phil. 4:16. Instead of these churches sending their money to Antioch for Antioch to send their money to Paul, the church at Philippi sent the money directly to Paul. That is the way it was done in New Testament days. Instead of sending it to the church at Antioch as the head over Paul's work, they just sent the money directly to the man in the field. There was not any need of going through any other congregation to get the money to the man in the field that needed it.

We have been studying the method of cooperation as set down in several examples in the New Testament Pattern. Now let us turn to the methods used today and during the Restoration period to see whether we have been following the New Testament Pattern. I want you to understand that as far as I am personally concerned, what Alexander Campbell taught, what David Lipscomb taught, or what any other man taught does not weigh one bit with me. Our final authority is: what does the Lord teach on the matter?

COOPERATION IN THE RESTORATION TIMES

Back in a very early day when there were men like Alexander Campbell and Walter Scott who did so much preaching here in the Western Reserve; those men faced the problem of how the churches may cooperate with one another. All of you recall that the answer they gave to the problem was that we may go to work and establish another organization and through that other organization channel our activity so that the gospel of the Lord is properly preached. Here on the Western Reserve there was the earliest of all of the human organizations founded for that purpose. In those days, Alexander Campbell was yet a member of the Baptist Church. Not because he believed in the Baptist doctrine, not because he had any sympathy for it whatsoever. As a matter of fact, when the old Brush Run congregation joined the Red Stone Baptist Association, it was with the understanding that they would ascribe to no creed any further than that creed may be in perfect harmony with the teaching of the Word of God. Because Alexander Campbell did not agree with them, he was forced out of the Association. On the Western Reserve they established what was known as the Mahoning Association. The Mahoning Association proposed to have all of the churches belong to it, but allowed each congregation an absolute freedom so far as the maintaining of its own work was concerned. The congregations merely sent representatives to the Association. They had their regular annual meetings from the time it was formed in 1823 until it was dissolved in the year 1830. During those years, they met and brethren sent out the evangelists. Walter Scott was sent out by them and many of the churches here on the Western Reserve were established by the work of Walter Scott along in the years 1827, 28, and 29.

After a while Scott, particularly, began to have some doubt that the Association was the right way in which to work. This did not mean at all that Scott was weaned entirely away from them. He seemed to be confused as to whether the Association was right or wrong. Afterwards, brethren began to come together in various localities such as Ohio, Kentucky,

Tennessee, Indiana and all over the nation to form what they called their district cooperation meetings. They were called Cooperation Meetings and the first were held purely on a district basis. That simply meant that a geographical area was more or less segregated and all of the churches in that area sent their messengers to an annually designated place to discuss the work of the Lord.

These cooperation meetings were very much lacking in machinery. They had their treasurers to be sure, they also had their assistants or secretaries and officers of the meeting. Each of the congregations by means of their representative sent messengers to that organization to make plans to do the work of the Lord. As time went on, we had the beginning of State meetings. There was the formation of an institution here in Ohio in the year 1853, and this year they are celebrating their Centennial. We had one formed in Indiana in 1839, but there were state organizations and all of the churches in the state worked through these for the purpose of getting their missionary work done. There finally developed the national organizations. In the year 1849 one was established in the city of Cincinnati and called the American Christian Missionary Society.

For about 7 or 8 years Alexander Campbell had been working methodically preparing the ground for the establishing of this national organization. Everyone had given a good deal of thought to the question of organization. The answer that Campbell was giving to the problem was that the congregations can best unite their efforts by means of the formation of another organization and through that organization do the work of the Lord.

Almost from the very beginning until the day the Missionary Society was formed, there were occasional voices heard that doubted whether that was the Scriptural plan. Barton W. Stone had his doubts about it and carried on a discussion with Walter Scott in the year 1826 in Stone's paper, *THE CHRISTIAN MESSENGER*

There were others like T. M. Henley of Virginia, who was one of the earliest of our preachers in that state. Their voices, however, were much in the minority. The influence of a man like Alexander Campbell was so great that almost everybody lined up behind him. Many do not understand Campbell's real thinking on the question of how the Missionary Society came to be organized. You and I would say that a man as great as he ought to understand that a Missionary Society was not to be found in the Word of God. But, on the other hand, Campbell had a certain kind of reasoning which has been followed by men of the Christian Church from that day on down to this.

Campbell went on back to the use of the word "church" as that word is found in the Bible. Campbell said that the word was found in the Bible in two different senses. First, we have the use of the term in its LOCAL sense. There is such a thing as "the church at Corinth" and "the church at Jerusalem." The term merely designates the word "church" with reference to a local congregation of the Lord's people under the oversight of elders or bishops. Second, Campbell pointed out that the word "church" is also found in the Bible in its "universal

sense. “The word “church” is used sometimes in the Bible with reference to all of the people of God that may be found the world over.

When you and I think of the church today, we may think of it very correctly in each of those two senses. First, you may talk about the church in Cuyahoga Falls, meaning by that, this local congregation. Second, you may talk about the church in general; meaning the brotherhood in its entirety ... the congregations of all of the people of God. Just imagine for a moment that there are 10, 000 congregations in the brotherhood. When you speak of all of these 10, 000 congregations, you use the term “church” in its universal sense.

In substance, Campbell reasoned that God gave to the church the responsibility of preaching the gospel to save the lost. When God told the church to save the lost peoples of the world, in which sense of the term was God using that word? Was God meaning by that the church in its UNIVERSAL SENSE, or was God meaning the church in its LOCAL SENSE? Campbell suggested that God was thinking only of the church in its universal sense. Therefore, it was absolutely essential for Campbell to get people to ignore the church locally. He believed we should forget the local church and think only in terms of the universal church or the brotherhood in its entirety. In other words, God has given to them the responsibility of preaching the word that souls might be saved. Campbell reasoned that the church universal is to do that work of preaching the gospel. How can the church in its universal aspect do that work of proclaiming the gospel? Campbell's answer to the question was that the church has no way that is designated for it in the Bible; therefore, on the basis of that, the church universal can go to work and devise any scheme on the apology of its being an expediency. Each one of these 10, 000 congregations that go to make up the church universal may send a messenger to another organization. If they choose to set themselves up a Missionary Society and through that society do their work, that's their right and their privilege. God has not told the church universal how it is to do its work. Therefore, the church universal is allowed to go along on any plan that it may desire to do its work.

In this reasoning Campbell overlooked that the church universal has no organic existence on the face of the earth. The only Scriptural organic existence that there is for the church is the church in its local sense. The largest single unit of God's people to be found on this earth is a local congregation. The most powerful individual so far as God is concerned on this earth is the elder, the overseer of the congregation of the Lord. The church universal has no organic existence whatsoever. The church universal can operate only by the means of the local congregation, and just as each one of the local congregations does its work, as each one of them properly organized moves along to do its work, the local congregation then not only glorifies God in Heaven, but the church in the aggregate also glorifies Him.

THE CHURCH UNIVERSAL AS SPOKEN OF IN THE BIBLE

The church universal has only one head, according to the Bible, and the head of the church is none other than Christ Jesus our Lord. When Paul said in Colossians 1:18 that “he

is the head of the body, the church” he meant that the Lord was not only the Head of the church in Colesse or in Ephesus, but rather, Paul had in mind all of the brethren, the church universal. This suggests that there is only one officer that the church universal has ... that officer is the Lord Jesus Christ. When congregations begin to imagine that they can go together and operate as the church universal, whether they mean to do so or not, that which always results from their efforts is one that supersedes or takes the place of the Lord Jesus Christ. It never has failed. It never will fail.

Back in the Dark Ages, for example, the gradual Apostasy from New Testament principles finally resulted in the establishment of the Roman Catholic Church.

The Roman Catholic church is, of course, a name that designates the idea of a church universal. There isn't anything wrong with the word catholic. In spite of the fact that sometimes we are a little afraid of it, the word “catholic” just means “universal” and that is all that it means. Now, take the Roman Catholic Church, that church that claims to be universal, and ask the question: “Who is the head over the church? Who is the one that guides it in all that it does? Who is the one that dictates to every local congregation what it must do?” In the final analysis the one that does that is none other than the Pope in Rome and the result of it is, as they put it, the “viceregent” of Christ upon this earth. Now that word means the “pope” is none other than the earthly Christ. He exercises the powers of Christ on Earth. He is to the Catholic what the Lord is and to all practical intentions and purposes, to ignore the Pope is equivalent to ignoring Christ. According to Catholic doctrine, the pope is the head of the church here on this earth, and the only difference between the Christ and the Pope is the fact that Christ is up there in Heaven where you can't see Him, and the Pope is down here on earth where you can. As far as their power or authority is concerned, there is not any difference. The point I wish to emphasize is that whenever one tries to get the church universal, to do anything to guide the directions of the church universal, it always results in the formation of the same kind of a monstrosity—something that is not in the Bible but rather that challenges the dignity, the power and the authority of the Son of the Living God.

One may take this same principle and follow it right on down and apply it to the Protestant churches. Protestantism denies a belief in the Pope of Rome. But you may study any denomination that you desire, and you will find that it has something else. Using the principle of the church universal concept, they have all the churches of the denomination welded together into another organization. That organization might be called the General Assembly or some other name, but in every denomination, there is some kind of headquarters or assembly that makes the laws and passes the rules and regulations for its various congregations. Admittedly, the Protestant churches have not gone as far as Roman Catholicism has. Yet, when you take the function of this organization that guides and directs the local congregations and welds them together; what is that organization? Whatever it be, whether it be an organization or whether it be one man, or whether it be a committee of men — what do you have but again something that assumes the power, the authority, the dignity and the honor that belongs to the Lord?

There isn't a man on this earth, I care not if he is an elder, a preacher or who he is,, there is not a man on earth who has any right from God to make one law governing the people of God. The duty of the elder is to see to it that the law of God is respected; but he is not the lawgiver. Whenever any body of people exists for the purpose of making a law, it then takes the prerogative that belongs to our Lord. Not that it has been done intentionally, not that it is even obvious, but it is there, nevertheless. Whenever you delegate to this organization, the Pope of Rome, to a committee or to an organization the right to weld the congregations together to make laws for them to guide them in what they are to do, you have, therefore, done something that challenges the authority, the power and the dignity of the Son of God.

I say all of this, brethren, in order to get you to think about this fact: Anytime there would arise among us brethren that want all the churches as one, moving forward together in some sort of an organizational capacity, you and I ought to look twice before we leap. We ought to be sure that we are not on the highway to Rome rather than to Jerusalem.

The Christian churches followed Alexander Campbell's plan and all of them were welded together into the Missionary Society. A few years have gone by and now look about and see what happened! Who is it that owns the property of the church universal? The Missionary Society. For all practical intents and purposes,, the Missionary Society is the head over the Christian church and, I say to you without hesitancy, that it functions in the very way that the Pope of Rome does. Even as the Pope of Rome has usurped the power of the Lord Jesus Christ, in that very way has Protestant denominations through centralized control usurped the power of our Lord. The first defense that was made for the Society was to forget the church local, then think only of the church universal and allow the church universal to act in any way that it decided the best way. This was one answer to the problem of how congregations should cooperate.

A second answer to the problem came up just a very short time after the Missionary Society was inaugurated. That was started out in the state of Texas, and was mainly led by a man by the name of Carroll Kendrick. Bro. Kendrick left Kentucky in 1851 because of his health, moved out into Texas which was then a very wide, open, wild and rugged country. Already a few congregations of the Lord had been planted there. Kendrick decided that he wanted to try to get all of the churches to work together in some way that would be Scriptural and in harmony, of course, with the Word of the Lord. He worked with that until the beginning of the Civil War. When the war came, the brethren in Texas were pretty much divided over the war spirit. After it was over, they renewed their associations and met in what was called "state meetings." They recognized very well the danger to which the Missionary Society might go. Carroll Kendrick saw the danger as all of them did; so they decided to have some means by which all of the churches could work together but avoid this danger of having an institution to tell the churches what to do. So, Kendrick asked the churches in Texas to get together for a state meeting. That state meeting in Texas was held every fall along about the 4th Sunday in October from about the close of the Civil War on up until 1886. There wasn't

any machinery about it. They didn't have any treasurer elected, they didn't have any officer particularly. All they did was to come together.

When they got together, the messengers from all the churches gave reports: Since our last meeting we baptized 25 and we sent out two or three preachers to establish other congregations. "In general the report was given and then following the report, they selected what they called their state evangelists. They didn't want the Society to do the work of preaching the gospel, so they decided to choose one local congregation, and put all this work under the oversight of the elders of this local church. Now there always have been brethren that get the idea that if you can put something under the oversight of elders, it is acceptable. Well, Kendrick had that idea, "Let's put it under the elders of the church."

For many years in Texas, Bro. C. M. Wilmeth was selected as the state evangelist. The work was done for many years under the oversight of the elders of the church at Sherman. The elders of the church guided the work and congregations that wanted to help support Bro. Wilmeth out in the field, sent their money to the Sherman Church. The elders in turn looked after him, sponsored him, controlled him, and more or less regulated his conduct. All of it was done under the oversight of the elders of the local church in Sherman, Texas.

In 1886, there came up a big battle in Texas—one of the worst that the church has ever seen at anytime in that state. The reason for it was that some of the men from the Missionary Society came over to Texas and said that instead of this state meeting they wanted to start a Missionary Society selected by all of the churches of the state of Texas. Many of the brethren knew that this attempt was going to be made; but each side more or less marshaled its forces, ready in anticipation of the coming struggle, and hoping they might stem the tide of the Society in Texas. In 1886 they had a very dramatic meeting in Austin, Texas in which there were men like old General R.N. Gano. Dick Gano, who was a confederate general during the Civil War, was an elder of the Pearl and Bryan street church in Dallas for many years. When an effort was made to start the Society, old General Gano stood up before them and wept like a child and begged them not to try to start the Society, but it did little good. J. D. Tant was just starting out as a young preacher and he tells us in one place that he was at the meeting but didn't know too much what was going on because he had gone there to court. At any rate, he listened to old General Gano who lost the effort.

The final result was the establishment of the Texas Christian Missionary Society. When that was started, the old question came up about what to do about these schemes. Carroll Kendrick's idea was to go along with the Society. The question received a thorough thrashing out back in the years 1885 and 86 in the GOSPEL ADVOCATE. There were men like Bro. John T. Poe of Longview, Texas who for many years was one of the outstanding Texas preachers, that debated back and forth whether this sort of a set-up was the Scriptural way. It was decided for the most part that this was not the way that God planned for the churches to do their Missionary work.

The problem subsided for a while, but in 1910 it came up momentarily again through a rather innocent gesture on the part of the church at Henderson, Tenn. The brethren had a meeting at the church in January of 1910. Bro. A.G. Freed was there, Bro. Herdsman, Bro. G. Dallas Smith and a good number of others, and when the meeting was held, they decided what

they wanted to do was to sponsor a missionary in the destitute field of West Tennessee. G. Dallas Smith reported that they were going to put this work under the oversight of the elders of the church in Henderson and all the churches in West Tennessee were to send their money to the elders of the church at Henderson so that they could support the work.

Bro. David Lipscomb, then an old man, heard about it and started out to write articles. Bro. Lipscomb said that he was surprised that the brethren had started this. The brethren had had experience with it in Texas several years ago. We saw the end to which it had come. He was surprised that brethren had decided to start it again. The result of the matter was that Bro. Freed said that Bro. Lipscomb misunderstood them. They had not really intended to do it that way. Bro. Lipscomb then acknowledged the fact that he had misunderstood them and the whole matter was dropped.

From that day down to about five years ago, the old problem had never been raised again. In 1910, brethren were pretty much settled on how they ought to do their missionary work. In the year 1915 there came up a battle over premillennialism and it pretty largely occupied the thinking of our brethren down until some ten years or so ago. Brethren began to wake up and realize what has been going on so have started to re-think the whole problem.

Basically, there are three ideas coming down from the Restoration Movement as to how one church can cooperate with another. First, the answer given by Alexander Campbell was that the churches can cooperate by forming another institution and through that all of them do their work. Second, Carroll Kendrick advocated to let all of the churches—the church universal—operate by all the congregations sending their money to one congregation. Let the elders of that church, therefore, act as the overseers of the work. And the third: Bro. Lipscomb's attitude on the other hand was no congregation, no eldership has any right to oversee the work done by more than the congregation over which they are elders.

So, the real problem is: can the elders of a local church oversee the activities of the church universal? If so in the principle that is followed, these elders have become another missionary society.

In 1889 Bro. Lipscomb received a letter from J. W. McGarvey about a young man in school—The College of the Bible. He was a very promising man from Armenia, who, after completing his college work, wanted to go back home and preach. Bro. Lipscomb went before three of the larger churches in Nashville and told them that Bro. Asariah Paul wanted to go to Armenia and preach the Word. He asked if they would help him. All three of them said they wanted to help. Bro. Paul went over to Turkey to preach. Nobody sponsored him.

He just went over thereto preach the Word, but regularly the brethren in each congregation sent directly to the man in the field, and that is the way he was sustained in his work. Later on, the Japanese work came up and the work in China; so the brethren said, "The way we are going to do it is let if every congregation as it prospers to help in this work, to send directly to the man in the field. That way we do not take the eldership of one church, build them up and magnify them to the point where they have the oversight over a work being done by the church universal."

The eldership of the church according to the New Testament plan has no more power than over the congregation of which they are members. The elders of a church do not have any right Scripturally to oversee a work on behalf of the church universal, any more than a Missionary Society has any right to oversee any work on behalf of the church universal. When we begin to do it that way, we have started on the highway to Romanism rather than going back to the city of Jerusalem. The elders of the local congregation are limited in their authority, in their power and in their operation unto the congregation over which they are elders. When, therefore, the church universal designated the eldership of a local congregation to supervise, or to sponsor or to oversee its work, the elders, therefore, have been delegated, voluntarily, of course, but they have been delegated a power that does not belong to them.

The way Bro. Lipscomb often explained that it should be done was that one congregation would proceed to do its work, work that it can do, work that is within its own right to do, and another congregation may proceed to do the same work that it has a right to do. If there comes up an emergency that one congregation cannot meet, the other congregation may go over and help it during the emergency. When the emergency has subsided, the other congregations are left perfectly free. to go right on doing the work of the Lord. There has been in the meantime, no cumbersome machinery whatsoever that has been set up, nothing at all installed that has to be torn down or wrecked. The congregations can work, each one of them in its own local capacity.

A large part of this problem of church cooperation arises because brethren don't understand what cooperation is or even when they are cooperating. Brethren can cooperate, do cooperate when each one of them bears the work that he is supposed to do. It doesn't matter if each one of them is even conscious of the existence of another one or not. They don't have to pool their money. They don't have to put it under the oversight of a designated central church. If in a city like Akron, the Brown Street congregation does its work of saving souls, they are following the divine pattern laid down in the Bible. If the Thayer Street congregation does its work according to the divine pattern and the Cuyahoga Falls congregation does its work following the divine pattern; they are cooperating. That is cooperation. What do you mean by cooperation, anyway? It is simply working together by the same set of rules.

The idea that some of us have that we are not cooperating unless we all go together and do something big with each other, that is the very thing that has caused most of the fuzziness

on the whole problem of church cooperation. If Bro. Brannan does the work of the Lord like the Lord wants him to in Akron, Ohio.; and I, in Indianapolis, follow the Lord's pattern also

... we may be 300 miles from each other, but we are cooperating. We are both following the same pattern, doing the same work and trying to glorify the same Lord. That is cooperation. When brethren talk so many times about the fact that we do not cooperate with each other, they simply do not understand, because they themselves manifest that they have a hazy idea of what cooperation is.

THE PRINCIPLE INVOLVED IN COOPERATION

The principle is simply this: no eldership of any congregation, has any right to voluntarily or involuntarily take over a work for the church universal. The power of an eldership is limited to the resources of the congregation over which they are elders. When you and I begin to take a church, as they did in Texas, and set it up for all churches to contribute through that one church to do their work; you have in principle, the same system as that of the Catholic Church through the Pope, or that of Protestantism through their centralized control (Missionary Society, etc.). I know that it does not look so dangerous but so far as the principle involved, there is no difference, if it is followed through to its logical end. That is the reason we need to be so careful.

Many people forget sometimes that the Pope in Rome is not a glorified preacher. He is simply an elder that has gotten out of line. The Pope in Rome in the very early days was simply an elder, a bishop, and somebody delegated him a whole lot more authority than he had any right to have; and when he got the authority, he would not turn loose of it. You can take your elders of a congregation and the moment you give to them more power than they have a right to have, then you have in principle, a Missionary Society.

CONCLUSION

In the Bible we have noted four cases of church cooperation: Acts 11, the church at Jerusalem cooperates with the church at Antioch; Acts 11 and Acts 12:25 the church at Antioch cooperates with the churches in Judea; and then, I Corinthians 8, the churches at Macedonia and Achaia cooperates with the churches in Judea; and then, Philippians 4, the church in Philippi cooperates, I suppose we would say, with Paul. That is the way it was in New Testament times.

As I suggested to you at the beginning, I did not talk on this with any thought whatsoever of trying to discourage the work of the Lord anywhere, anytime. Some of the best, most conscientious men that I know of are men that are working in foreign fields tonight and some of them are the very best friends that I have. I admire them. I love them, and I am gladly willing to concede that in terms of spirituality, if they are the kind of men I think they are, they are far better men than I know that I am, and I appreciate them and love them and

admire them a great deal. I do not want to discourage them in their work by speaking this way tonight.

I am not interested in the least in trying to say anything that might disrupt the unity of the people of God. Many brethren cannot see the difference between thinking a problem through and in some sort of a heated manner going to work to try to draw lines of fellowship. Brethren who are doing this mission work today, are people just like myself. They always thought that that was the right way. Until some three or four years ago, I always imagined that was the right thing to do until I began to think the problem through.

These other men have not been occupied as I have. They have been occupied with other things and maybe have not given it the attention that they should have given. It is no time to feel hard against anybody. No time to have any bitterness in your heart toward or against anybody or any good work. What we all ought to do in the very kindest of spirits possible is to open our minds and think for ourselves, come to independent conclusions and resolve that we are going to stand upon "thus saith the Lord." "I know that will please the Lord if we do it that way. Sometimes brethren get to the point that their minds are closed. They do not appear to want to think about a problem for fear that they might learn they are wrong. That is unfortunate. None of us ought to get to that point. We all ought to admit that there is a possibility that we might be wrong anytime and be willing to study anew and investigate to find out. But always in the end, let us all be willing to stand upon the principles of Truth.