

## UNITY NOTES

If people known as "disciples of Christ" intend to make advancement toward the unity the gospel requires, they must cease their talk against what certain ones call "legalism". That was the kind of talk adopted by those that urged their humanisms on their brethren. In Matthew fifth chapter the Savior gave due credit to the strictness of the "old time" law, and then declared he proposed to hold account than that law held anyone. Whoever overlooks this may scarcely be accredited with having learned the alphabet of the gospel law. While the law given through Moses held those to whom it applied responsible for their words and works, the Savior declared he would hold them responsible also for their thoughts and emotions! See Matt. 5:21-30.

Then in Matt. 5:31-37 we are informed that in regard to divorce and swearing He would hold mankind by stricter law than was given through Moses. Though Moses suffered a man to put away, his wife for various causes, the Savior proposed but one cause. And though Moses suffered, and even authorized, swearing by the name of God (Deut. 6:13), yet the Savior proposed to rule out all swearing of every kind! This is emphasized by the words recorded in James 5:12.

All. this is against all talk about our "liberty under the gospel", which many have imagined suffers them to do as they please in offending their brethren by their devices. The apostle Paul teaches that our liberty in certain respects is limited, or restricted, by the ignorance, and weakness of certain brethren. (See Rom. 14th Chapter, also 1 Cor. 8:9-13.) But advocates of divisions among disciples have ignored and even reversed such teaching.

Next we should turn to Matt. 5:38-48 and learn that in regard to retaliation for injuries suffered, and in treatment of enemies, the Savior proposed teaching, much stricter than that given by Moses. Not Only so, but the Savior's teaching on these questions seems the reverse of what was authorized by the Jewish law. But advocates of humanisms in worship and work of churches of Christ, who lived in a former generation, adopted the saying, "We are not under the law, but under grace"—Rom. 6:14, And they pressed that saying to an extreme use—so extreme that they seemed to think it gave them "liberty" to legislate for the kingdom of Christ, and introduce any device they saw fit to advocate. By so doing they showed they were not logicians, to say nothing of being Scripturists and Christians.

And not one of those who denounced what they called "legalism", and disturbed churches by advocacy of humanisms, seemed to have studied the letter to the Galatians with advantage. Certainly they did not seem to apply any of it to themselves as against Judaism. Yet in every chapter of that letter is recorded sufficient to alarm every true disciple against the thought of adopting any part of Judaism not authorized by the gospel! And yet that letter seems to have been ignored by all who were determined to make of the disciple brotherhood a "successful and popular people. Or, if that letter was considered by them, they saw only its bearings against churches not mentioned in the Bible, but ignored its bearings against

themselves.

The extreme desire to "baptize sinners and capsize sectarians" rather than to teach the baptized ones to "walk in newness of life" was one extreme of pioneer preachers which did churches of Christ much injury. But that was not the worst nor most damaging extreme that ever afflicted us as a people. A considerable number of a second generation of preachers and writers of the brotherhood of "disciples" showed they, were chiefly moved by desire for popularity, prominence success. As a result they adopted that Judaistic something called "instrumental music" and pleaded the example of the Judaistic David as their "patron saint" whom they wished to imitate. But at the same time they denounced his plurality of wives, and have been slow to imitate his dance in religious service!

But worst of all is that when they adopted the Judaistic David's musical instruments they placed themselves under the Judaistic law—and "Christ became of no effect" unto them! They then became hound by all of Judaism as certainly as that Paul's declarations in the first of Galatians fifth chapter are applicable in regard to anything except circumcision. And if Abraham's circumcision, reinforced by the Jewish law, made "Christ of no effect" to Gentile Christians, the question arises, What will adoption of David's musical instruments be to Gentile Christians who adopt them?....And if those who adopted that circumcision became "fallen from grace" and "debtors to do the whole law," then did not, advocacy of David's musical instruments have the same effect on those who adopted them?

Does some one try to break the force of this by saying the Judaizing teachers of that generation urged "circumcision" as something necessary to salvation? This may be admitted, for it is indicated in Acts 15:1. And did not those who contended for musical instruments among disciples say they were necessary to draw sinners to hear, the gospel, and thus be saved? But in Gal. 6:12 Paul declared, "As many as desire to make a fair show in the flesh, they constrain you to be circumcised; only lest they should suffer persecution for the cross of Christ." "And surely those who contended for musical instruments among "disciples" in the nineteenth century desired to make "a fair show In the flesh" and to avoid being reproached by "the sects. All this is worth considering by advocates of Unity among disciples... .By our devices we divided the church in order to convert the world; though the Savior indicated the church must be united in order that the world might believe in Him. (This also is worth considering!)

"Eternal vigilance is the price of liberty" is an old and true political saying., To this some one added "and eternal vigilance is the price of a good character." And what is true concerning political liberty and human character is certainly true of religious safety. That Safety First doctrine is good in all departments of life, but specially in regard to religion. In all directions we should consider the question of safety. And as the religion offered in the New Testament pertains to both time and eternity we should certainly consider the doctrine of the unity the Savior prayed for, the night of his betrayal, as of utmost importance.

All circumstances connected with the Savior's prayer for oneness of his people should solemnly impress all those who desire to meet his final approval.. Read it again: Neither pray

I for these alone, but for them also who shall believe on me through their word: that they all may be one as thou, Father, art in me and I in thee ; that they may be one in us: that the world may believe that thou hast sent me" , (John 17.:20, 21). This means the conversion of the world was intended to depend on oneness of disciples. And the actual demonstration has been made. that a divided church cannot convert the world locally or generally.

When this unity meeting at Butler university, July 1931, was nearing its conclusion some one said the result of divisions among disciples "was "a million unconverted souls." Probably true. And if he said the result of all divisions of professed Christians from the day of Pentecost in Acts 2nd chapter till the time now passing — if he had said " a billion of souls have remained unconverted", that one's speech would not have seemed extravagant. For with exception of history of martyrs for Christ and a few others, the history of divisions of professed Christians has been a record of disgrace for the name and gospel of Christ.

Whoever will read with care the history of divisions of professed Christians will learn on the basis of the merest technicalities many divisions have been a record of disgrace for the name and the gospel of Christ.

Whoever will read with care the history of divisions of professed Christians will learn on the basis of the merest technicalities many divisions have been made. What is worse is that a considerable number of them were maintained for generations, if not for centuries. This is evident in any volume offering a brief record of all religious denominations. And such record will reveal unholy contentions and disgrace ! Because persecutions on account of religion are not authorized by the Savior, multitudes have seemingly thought they could adopt any land of foolish doctrine or practice and urge it with all possible zeal, and yet be saved.

Liberty has been abused to the limit in regard to doctrine and practice by professed Christians. Man: have pleaded much for "common sense", and what has been left, to their common sense they seemed to think was left to their common nonsense or folly. This has been specially evident in regard to building. meeting houses that burdened congregations with debt. And same has been true in regard to rejection of mature preachers and the plea for young men to serve as preachers for churches that are well established. Such churches need elderly men as preachers, mature men; experienced men to serve as elders who "labor in word and doctrine,"

When "the disciple brotherhood" becomes united as it once was and as it should always have been, then all elderly preachers who are good enough and have health enough to serve as elders may be engaged to "labor in word and doctrine" as mentioned in 1 Tim. 5:17,18. And they will be supported by the church as there indicated. This will avoid all talk about "pensions for old preachers." Rejection of a man because he is over fifty, sixty, even seventy or eighty years of age — because he is "that old" — and choosing, a young man for "pastorate" of a church, is a doctrine contrary to reason and revelation. That is the doctrine of militarism for private soldiers, and the doctrine of nuance for unofficial employees ; but not for managers.

Where is the army that rejects an officer, specially a general, before he is sixty years, of age? And where is the business concern that retires its managers when even sixty years of age? Only men supposed to do the "most strenuous work of a physical kind are retired at forty-five "because of age" in any army. The First "World "War was called "the War of Old Men", when referring to its chief commanders. And the war the Church is supposed to wage against the World requires, the oldest, maturest, best men connected with the Church. This must be considered — if disciples are again to be united according to the Savior's prayer for unity.

Mention should again be made that our religious neighbors are wrong by conviction—wherein they are wrong. They have been imposed on by wrong testimony, and by that testimony have been wrongly convinced. That is true of even leaders among our religious neighbors. They have been trained to think a happy religious feeling or emotion is proper evidence of pardon, and that people may get to Heaven in many different "ways, and thus may be honest. But that is not true of people known as disciples. ~We have been taught better; have learned much about right divisions of the Bible, and have pretended to speak where the Bible speaks and be silent where it is silent. As a result, wherein disciples are wrong they are inexcusable.

All humanisms adopted by disciples are result of desire and determination on their part to be "successful". And many among us have desired to be "popular", forgetting that the friendship of the world is enmity with God (James 4:4). And to this should be added that what is.. "highly esteemed among men is abomination in the sight of God" (Luke 16:15). But, overlooking such and such like declarations. of the Sacred Text, many disciples wished to be "like other people"—to be successful; and popular in order to be successful:—and successful in order to become popular! As a result they adopted one humanism after another, and assassinated the plea for the oneness of God's people on the Bible as the only reliable religious creed.

Yes, a certain class of liberal disciples in a former generation actually assassinated our plea for oneness of God's people on the Bible as the only safe religious creed! I say "assassinated" because that plea was made ridiculous because those who commenced to make it became divided over humanisms in regard to work and worship of the church. Having become ridiculous it was annulled; and liberal disciples became a party among parties, a communion among communions a denomination among denominations! Many of them have resented the charge that they are a "denomination; yet the efforts to be successful rather than faithful show they are of the order of the denominations around them rather than like conservative disciples who strive to be faithful rather than successful.

Here is something that should be repeated: — A fashionable lady inquired of an old preacher "if a lady could not be fond of dress without being proud." He answered that if he would go along a road and see a fox's tail sticking out of a hole in a tree, he would be quite sure a fox was inside that tree!... And thus with "liberal" disciples—the desire to be successful and popular—and to become popular in order to be successful, and to be

successful in order to become popular—that desire is common in the Romish church and all those that have sprung from her directly or indirectly. That desire when adopted by "liberal" disciples separated them from their apostolic brethren, and made them a denomination in mind, heart and life. And rejection of divisive humanisms is the only plan of relief from this charge.

Then there is another evidence on this subject. The religious denominations quite generally indulged in reproachful names against disciples who advocated 'need of water baptism in order to assurance of salvation from sins committed while alien sinners. "Campbellite", "water Salvationists" and various other reproachful names were adopted by our religious neighbors in order to damage us and our plea for simplicity of the gospel. And, on the same principle "liberal" disciples adopted the names "antis," "anti-everything," "fogies," "old fogies," "moss-backs," "kickers," and various other un-handsome names. Thus liberal disciples showed the same dis' position that denominations generally showed toward disciples generally, and they all overlooked the Savior's saying: "Inasmuch as ye have done it unto one of the least of these, ye have done it unto me!"

If an artist would picture a man to represent Unity among believers in Christ, and then represent different leaders of "the disciple brotherhood (who have been chief in urging humanisms) with daggers in their right hands and thrust to the hilt into the body of Unity—such picture would indicate the tragedy of our history as a people! But who dares draw such a picture? Who would indicate the individual hand that thrust each dagger? Yet such a picture with the individual hands named, by which the daggers were thrust, would not be too severe—if we consider the crime committed and its evil results. Perhaps a million souls have been lost as a result of that crime—the crime of assassinating our plea for unity!

But some one may say, "Those were good men, and they did not mean to do any harm." This may be admitted. But if they had studied the Bible as they should have studied it, they might have learned what the Savior meant when he said in a parable: "'Well, done, thou good and faithful servant"; but said never a word about "success". And they might have learned what the Savior meant when he said, "Be thou faithful unto death, and I will give thee a crown of life"; but did not add a word about "success". The unavoidable conclusion therefore is that the desire to be successful, rather than faithful, assassinated our plea for unity, and made "the disciple brotherhood" a compromised, betrayed, disgraced people!! We divided the brotherhood in our zeal to convert the world—though the Savior prayed that we should be united in order that the world might believe in Him!

TAKE OUR PRAYERS, for example. It is so hard to find lips saying the same words they said when we prayed that day. They may be saying the same words they said one week or last month. Christ, in speaking of this aspect prayer, said "use not vain repetitions". We, like Gentiles Christ's day, think we will be heard for our much speaking when, in reality, a halting, broken but heart-felt sentence more pleasing in sight of God than a glib, polished, wordy notion of a prayer. John Burton put it in these words: "I often say my prayers, but do I ever pray. And do the wishes of my heart go with the words I say I may as well kneel down

and worship gods of stone, As offer to the living God a prayer of words alone; For words without the heart, the Lord will never hear; Nor will He to those lips attend, whose prayers are not sincere."

What about the songs we sing in worship to our Father in heaven. How easy it is for the words, so familiar through long usage, to flow melodiously from our lips with never thought as to what they mean. How difficult to remember five minutes later exactly which song it was we offered to God as our heart-felt devotion. The Apostle Paul set the standard for singing, and set it high, when he said, "I will sing with the spirit and I will sing with the understanding also" (1 Cor. 14:15). This is the only kind of singing that could ever be meaningful as worship.

That the plea for oneness of God's people on the Bible alone—that this was and is the grandest and best plea offered since the church of the New Testament went astray—needs only to be stated in order to be understood and admitted. And "that those disciples who divided the church of the New Testament in the 19th century were guilty of the greatest theological crime of modern times is evident as soon as stated. And that those disciples who are still contending for humanisms by which the church was divided are partakers of that crime is likewise evident. as soon as stated. Matt. 23:29-32 furnishes evidence of this.

Those who magnify the men that were chief in assassinating our plea for unity in the first half of the 19th century, and exalt their names without a word of criticism concerning their evil work, will find difficulty in exonerating themselves for endorsing that work'. And those liberals now in possession of houses largely, if not wholly, built by conservative disciples, who were robbed entirely of their holdings in those houses, may never think they are enjoying stolen property. The thief of temporal belongings is a criminal before the law of the land in which he lives, and so is the one who knowingly enjoys or cares for stolen goods of any other kind.

Does some one ask, "why mention those unpleasant events of the past while writing notes on unity " The answer is that not one in a thousand of the liberals seems to have considered seriously the crimes that were committed when the disciple brotherhood was divided. Those who committed those crimes plunged forward like madmen and madwomen, and as one of the elders on that side said to me—"I want peace—yes, I want peace." Then he whirled and with a violent gesture toward the meeting house said in frenzied tones—"But they can't take that organ out of that house unless they take it over my dead body.!" That man was a religious criminal.

If those who desired humanisms in the 19th century had only said to the conservatives in regard to meeting houses, ""We offer to give or take and divide the property", they would have shown some honor. But I never learned of an instance of that kind. On the contrary those desiring humanisms brought them into the house and virtually, or in substance, said, "You submit or leave! And if you leave, we will be mean to you by reproachful names!" By so doing the advocates of humanisms, among disciples became thieves, robbers, assassins, when

considered or measured by the gospel. And their successors in use of humanisms do not seem to regard their condition seriously!

One prominent participant in the recent unity meeting held in Indianapolis has since expressed himself thus: "But—as the ultimate Protestants we are never going to get together ourselves on the matters which have divided us: we've simply got to go on practicing our liberty, with strengthening tolerance." This implies that nothing is, in that writer's estimation, to be given up, left, discarded, denounced, of the humanisms that divided us. It means also that "good natured compromise" is all that may be justly expected—according to that writer's ideas. But I don't agree with him, for we sang during that meeting in July (1931) without use of a man-made instrument. One advance toward unity which all present seemed to enjoy!

As certainly as that liberal disciples of this generation are Christians at heart—in mind and heart devoted to the Savior—so certain is it they will wish to please Him in every particular. And when they consider the seriousness of the offense committed against the best plea ever entered since the primitive church went wrong, then those who are really devoted to the Savior will wish to discard the divisive humanisms. Those really devoted to the Savior will wish to please him regardless of cost to themselves. Alien sinners who have learned to love God and Christ because of what the divine Father' and his Anointed One have done in man's behalf—such sinners are ready to deny themselves everything necessary to please God and Christ, and save themselves. And surely all devoted disciples are ready to do the same!

On the basis of devotion to the Savior, disciples may hope for union and unity—even "the unity of the Spirit in the bond of peace." Those who talk and write of "liberty" to hold to humanisms that have divided disciples, seem not to have considered what the apostle Paul wrote about his liberty being restricted—even by ignorance of those disciples who thought they should not eat of meat offered to idols.. See 1 Cor. 10:28, 29. And if ignorance of disciples while Paul was on earth was sufficient to judge a Christian's liberty, is not the same yet true! But suppose those who now object to humanisms in work and worship of the church are not the ignorant ones —then what? Suppose they are only contending for what is divinely authorized? Then what?

Christ will incline us to do, we need to consider again how Christ himself acted while here on earth. According to John 5:19, Christ said of himself, "The Son can do nothing of himself; but what he seeth the Father do." This should mean to all who have "the spirit of Christ<sup>?)</sup> that they should do nothing of themselves, not even bring into the worship or work of the church any kind of a humanism. Then in John 5; 30 the Savior further said, "I can of mine own self do nothing" This should further assure us that we should not add to the worship or work of the church, especially when we read in John 8:28,"" Then shall ye know that "I am he, and that I do nothing of myself."

But in modern times the more certain persons think they have of "the spirit of Christ" the more they think they are at liberty to adopt of their own ideas in regard to religion both in doctrine and practice. Near or about all the two hundred religious parties in the domain of so-called Christendom profess to have "the spirit of Christ". This is true even of

conflicting and contending parties. Yes, they all profess to have somewhat of that spirit, and the more they profess to have of it the more they are disposed to introduce humanisms in both doctrine and practice. This is certainly true of all grades of those "who profess sanctification as a special second blessing", yet the gospel as revealed in the book of Acts seems of little use to them.

Are not "liberal" disciples liable to deceive themselves on this question? Somebody has introduced humanisms into the worship and work of the church sufficient to ASSASSINATE OUR PLEA for the oneness of God's people—the best plea ever made since the primitive church went astray. Yes, that plea has been assassinated, and somebody is guilty of that crime! Not many now living had much to do in perpetrating that crime, but many now living have been endorsing it. That their endorsement of it has been innocently made may be admitted; yet they are now entreated to consider if they should not turn from that which is a crime when measured by the Savior's prayer and, example—and—the apostle Paul's exhortation—for unity.

As "disciples" we have been accustomed to say to our religious neighbors that they can come to us, for we have the Bible only for our religious creed; but we cannot go ' to them because they have a humanly arranged religious creed besides the Bible. On the same principle the "conservatives" of the ' disciple brotherhood can say to the "liberals" that they can come to us; for we have the Bible only as our guide, while they have much more than the Bible in their practice, if not in their theory. . . . As disciples we have said to our religious neighbors that they can all accept immersion, but we cannot accept their sprinkling or pouring for baptism. That is good reasoning.

Besides all else, the "conservatives" can say to the "liberals"—"You admit you can sing in good conscience any worshipful song without use of a humanly arranged instrument of music, and on that basis we can unite in the song service of the church. Then why not discard the instrument entirely—at least in the hour of worship—and thereby avoid the difference between us on that subject?"

If that is not good reasoning on that subject, then it is not good to be used against our religious neighbors with reference to immersion instead of sprinkling and pouring, nor with reference to the name Christian for all true followers of the Savior.

But as some one has said, "An ounce of custom outweighs a ton of reason." To this may be added: "An ounce of custom outweighs any amount of revelation!" And as the poet Schiller declared—"Out of the common is man's nature formed; And custom is the nurse to whom he cleaves."

Yet when we consider that many heathen at Ephesus not only turned from their idols and immorality, but those that used "curious arts brought their books together and burned them" regardless of the price—when we consider that Miracle of Humility and Self-Abregation in many heathen, we may wonder if such a miracle is not now possible among "disciples of Christ".



In proportion as we are united to Christ we wish to be united with all Christians. In proportion as we love the Savior, we love his people, and specially those who are most careful to do his will. Much is said about having "the spirit of Christ". And that is a, good subject. The apostle Paul declared in Rom. 8:9, "Now if any man have not the Spirit of Christ he is none of His." In other words, those do not belong to Christ who do not possess his spirit. But according to Rom, 8:15 the apostle Paul wrote of "the spirit of adoption whereby we cry: Abba, Father"; and this means that impartation of the Holy Spirit which is bestowed, on us when we are baptized according to Acts 2:38.

But in order for us to know what "the spirit of Christ" will incline us to do, we need to consider again how Christ himself acted while here on earth. According to John 5:19, Christ said of himself, "The Son can do nothing of himself; but what he seeth the Father do." This should mean to all who have "the spirit of Christ" that they should do nothing of themselves, not even bring into the worship or work of the church any kind of a humanism. Then in John 5:30 the Savior further said, "I can of mine own self do nothing." This should further assure us that we should not add to the worship or work of the church, especially when we read in John 8:28, "Then shall ye know that I am he and that I do nothing of myself."

But in modern times the more certain persons think they have of "the spirit of Christ" the more they think they are at liberty to adopt of their own ideas in regard to religion both in doctrine and practice. Near or about all the two hundred religious parties in the domain of so-called Christendom profess to have "the spirit of Christ". This is true even of conflicting and contending parties. Yes, they all profess to have somewhat of that spirit, and the more they profess to have of it the more they are disposed to introduce humanisms in both doctrine and practice! This is certainly true of all grades of those who profess sanctification as a special work, or a "second blessing". Yet the gospel as revealed in the book of Acts seems of little use to them.

And are not "liberal disciples" liable to deceive themselves on this question? Somebody has introduced humanisms into the worship and work of the church sufficient to ASSASSINATE OUR PLEA for the oneness of God's people—the best plea ever made since the primitive church went astray. Yes, that plea has been assassinated, and somebody is guilty of that crime! Not many now living, had much to do in perpetrating that crime, but many now living have been endorsing it. That their endorsement of it has been innocently made may be admitted; yet they are now entreated to consider if they should not turn from that which is a crime when measured by the Savior's prayer and example—and—the apostle Paul's exhortation—for unity.

As "disciples" we have been accustomed to say to our religious neighbors what they can come to us, for we have the Bible only for our religious creed; but we cannot go to them because they have a humanly arranged religious creed besides the Bible. On the same principle the "conservatives" of the disciple brotherhood can say to the "liberals" that they can come to us; for we have the Bible only as our guide, while they have much more than

the Bible in their practice, if not in their theory. . . . As disciples we have said to our religious neighbors that they can all accept immersion, but we cannot accept their sprinkling or pouring for baptism. That is good reasoning.

Besides all else, the "conservatives" can say to the "liberals"—"You admit you can sing in good conscience any worshipful song without use of a humanly arranged instrument of music, and on that basis we can unite in the song service of the church. Then why not discard the instrument entirely—at least in the hour of worship and thereby avoid the difference between us on that subject?"

If that is not good reasoning on that subject, then it is not good to be used against our religious neighbors with reference to immersion instead of sprinkling and pouring, nor with reference to the name Christian for all true followers of the Savior.

The church at Ephesus was in danger because of one lone complaint the Savior made against it. That church was right in eight or nine particulars, definitely mentioned to its credit, as we are informed in Revelation' second chapter. But in fourth and fifth verses we read: "Nevertheless I have somewhat against thee, (because thou hast left thy first love. Remember therefore from whence thou art fallen, and repent, and do the first works; or else I will come unto thee quickly, and will remove thy candlestick out of his place, except thou repent,." This does not have appearance of compromise even in one particular.

If the Savior had intended to compromise with a church at any time, place or condition, or in any particular, the revelation to that effect could have been. appropriately made in regard to the church at Ephesus. It had done and was doing right in so many particulars. He said "I know thy works and thy labor and thy patience, and how thou canst not "bear them that are evil; and thou hast tried them who say they are apostles and are not, and hast found them liars: and hast borne and hast patience, and for my name's sake hast labored and hast not fainted. But this thou hast that thou hatest the deeds of the Nicolaitans, which I also hate." Yet that church was in danger because it had left its first love!

In view of such decision of our Savior concerning the "church at Ephesus, what may "those churches of the disciple, brotherhood expect that have adopted from one to a half-dozen humanisms in worship and work? Besides, what may they expect in view of the fact that their devotion to humanisms has lessened their devotion to the ordinances. Baptism has a forward as well as backward bearing. In baptism we are not only buried to the past but raised to walk in newness of life. And in proportion as disciples have given time and attention to their humanisms they have neglected the care and smugglings necessary to walk in newness of life.

How many disciples can say they have not left their "first love"? How many churches can say they have not left their "first; love ?" How many can truthfully say they are not "lukewarm" in their religious life?—Our religious neighbors generally need conversion in regard to relation of water baptism to remission of sins of aliens from the commonwealth of Israel. And disciples generally need conversion in regard to relation of water baptism to the

life of the Christian. As a result our religious neighbors are widely separated from scriptural unity, and same is true of many disciples. "With few exceptions disciples have left their first love and are in danger."

The first love of many of our religious neighbors is summed up in humanisms that pertain to doctrine and practice—especially in doctrine. Their theory of conversion is—"Repent and pray till you feel" your sins are forgiven, and then be baptized (immersed or sprinkled) when you wish to join some church not mentioned in the Bible." Then their theory of church government is—"Adopt any method of government, or any class of officers you think best, regardless of the New Testament." Finally, their theory of the life of the church member is—"Live a decent, moral life, attend church services with reasonable regularity, and be liberal toward the preacher and all other church enterprises, and you can get to Heaven."

Our religious neighbors have substituted prayer for baptism. Instead of advocating the scripture "be baptized calling on the name of the Lord," they say, "Call on the name of the Lord without baptism till you feel your sins are forgiven, and regard water baptism as a non-essential, except for membership in the church not mentioned in the Bible." Briefly stated this is their real position or theory in regard to "conversion to Christ—this is their "first love" on that question. They magnify faith, repentance and prayer, as to accomplish or attain a certain condition of being or emotion which they regard as evidence of pardon. As a result they underestimate the value of water baptism and misplace it in the salvation of sinners.

In view of doctrines and practices of our religious neighbors, they need to be turned from their "first love" and learn the book of Acts and much found in the Epistolary writings, in order to be rightly positioned in doctrine and practice. Then a large majority of those in "the disciple brotherhood" need to turn from their humanistic doctrines and practices, and go back to their "first love" in regard to doctrine and practice. In other words, those religionists who have been wrong need to repent and get right; while those who were once right but have gone wrong, need to repent and return to the right.—But "a miracle of humility" will be necessary in order to accomplish what is here suggested. Such a miracle may be bought, and must be wrought, in order that scriptural unity may prevail.

A miracle of humility is necessary in order for our religious neighbors to learn and accept the doctrine of the New Testament in regard to conversion of sinners and sanctification of believers, also the divine teaching in regard to worship and work that is divinely ordained. And such a miracle seems altogether possible when we consider what change was made in the heathen at Ephesus. They turned from their idols, also their immoralities. Then the workers of "curious arts" not only decided to turn from such arts, but they brought books on their arts together and burned them regardless of the price.

And what are books on "scientific theology" except books on "curious arts"—when measured by the simplicity of the gospel of Christ? Surely the "clerical orders" of the Catholic and Anglican clergy can only be regarded as the result of curious reasoning, when considered in light of the New Testament. Same may be said of church polity or government

of the Presbyterian and Methodistic denominations. Certainly the New Testament does not authorize any orders of uninspired preachers except evangelists, and elders who labor in word and doctrine; nor any local officials except overseers and deacons.—But a miracle of humility will need to be wrought in order for clergies of those communities to acknowledge all this.

And such a miracle will need to be wrought in each of the religious communities referred to before the unity for which the Savior prayed (and to which the apostle Paul exhorted) can be accomplished. But how many young clergymen that have taken humanly arranged orders will humble themselves to become evangelists of the order mentioned in the New Testament, and will "endure hardness as good soldiers of Jesus Christ" as the apostle Paul mentioned to Timothy? And how many older clergymen will consent to become local elders of the order mentioned in the New Testament and will "labor in word and doctrine"—such as Paul referred to in 1 Tim. 5:17?

And how many bishops of the Methodist Episcopal church, either North or South, will consent to resign their high official positions in order to become evangelists or local bishops or overseers, to help the other overseers or elders in care of a local congregation, and be supported by that congregation as an elder who labors in word and doctrine? See 1 Tim. 5:17. Yet that is necessary in order to attain the simplicity that is in Christ." Paul wrote of that simplicity in 2 Cor. 11:3, and such simplicity embraces what is offered in the entire New Testament. In names, doctrine, practice, worship, work, church polity or government, the New Testament offers the simplicity of the gospel of God's grace.

The entire domain of the external universe exhibits unity of design and harmony of performance. The first and most constant exhibition is seen in the heavens: the calm and mysterious constancy of the blueness of the sky; the brightness of the sun, moon, stars; and the order in which they are all maintained from generation to generation. Same is true in the animal and vegetable kingdoms of earth, and, as far as we know, in the domain of the mineral kingdom. And these three kingdoms are harmonious—they are in harmony with each other, and all contribute to man's welfare. These considerations should convince mankind that the Bible is altogether right, and should be obeyed in its call to unity.

"The heavens declare the glory of God and the firmament showeth his handiwork." Thus wrote the Psalmist David in beginning his 19th division of his volume of praise, prayer) thanksgiving and adoration. Then in that same division of his writings he declared, "The law of the Lord is perfect, converting the soul: the testimony of the Lord is sure, making wise the simple. The statutes of the Lord are right, rejoicing the heart: the commandment of the Lord is sure, enlightening the eyes. The fear of the Lord is clean, enduring forever: the judgments of the Lord are true and righteous altogether."—do not such declarations show the inspired David regarded everything perfect that came from God?

The fact that God stamped perfection on the entire domain of nature ought to be sufficient to convince mankind that God has offered perfection in the Bible. Surely God would not make that perfect, which is to perish, and make that imperfect which is to abide

forever! Therefore he would not arrange perfection for man's body, but arrange imperfection for his soul or spirit;—But as perfection is found in the unity and harmony of the material world, so is perfection found in the unity and harmony of the spiritual world. For that reason the Savior's prayer for unity of his followers, and the apostolic exhortations for our unity ; should be of chief consideration in these days of divisions, strifes, contentions."

Augustine, most celebrated of African bishops, we may safely say, went farther than the gospel required he placed on record an unnecessary confession immoralities. And he was the man, previously reported, who is accredited with this saying: "The essential to salvation from sin is humility; the second essential to salvation is humility; the third essential to salvation is humility." And that saying SHOULD not be forgotten for it may be safely adopted aid to salvation from divisions now existing in domain known as "Christendom." Certainly not unity is possible while preachers and people generally remain so stiff-necked and stiff-kneed they refuse to humble themselves beneath the mighty of God.

And the psalmist David seems to have been very humble when he wrote: "Have mercy upon me, O God, according to thy loving kindness: according unto the multitude of thy tender mercies blot out ray transgressions. "Wash me thoroughly from mine iniquity and cleanse me from my sin. For I acknowledge my transgressions: and my sin is ever before me. . . . . Wash me with hyssop, and I shall be clean: wash me, shall be whiter than snow. Make me to hear joy and gladness; that the bones which thou hast broken may rejoice. Hide thy face from my sins, and blot out mine iniquities. Create in me a clean heart O God; and renew a right spirit within me. me not away from thy presence; and take not thy Holy Spirit from me."

David showed humility also when he became aware of his sin in causing Israel to be numbered, for in 2 Sam. 24:10, 17 we read: "And David's heart smote him after that he had numbered the people. And David said unto the Lord when he saw the angel that smote the people, and said, Lo, I have sinned and I have done wickedly: but these sheep, what have they done! Let thine hand, I pray thee, be against me and against my father's house." This further indicates David's humility, and he was a man after God's own heart— we are informed.

In 1 Sam. 13:14 and Acts 13:22 we are informed David was a man after God's own heart, which means he was such a man as God desired him to be.. But as David committed certain grievous offenses, the question arises, "How could he have been so highly commended ?" The answer is in the fact that David was humble enough to confess his wrongs promptly when he was told of them, and to repent of them. And this implies that we are men and women "after God's own heart" in proportion as we follow David's example in those excellencies. "We must be humble enough to be willing to be told of our faults and to turn from them,—even our faults in dividing God's church.

And Saul of Tarsus was a "chosen vessel" unto the Lord, though he was a blasphemer and persecutor. We read of this in Acts 9:15. And what was true of Saul of Tarsus? After he became an apostle of Christ he declared that when it pleased God to reveal his Son unto

him, then he held no conference, with flesh and blood. (Of this we may read in Galatians first chapter.) And now the statement should be made that a man "after God's own heart and a man who is a "chosen vessel" unto the Lord are closely related, especially as we are informed of their readiness to turn from wrong in a humble manner when convinced of it. "We must imitate the humility of such men—in order to be united in Christ.

If disciples of Jesus Christ are ever going to be united they need to become humble enough to accept the doctrine that "our best friends are seldom our most pleasant companions." Those who are our best friends are wise enough to know our faults and good enough to tell us of them. And we need to be wise and good enough to be willing to learn where we are wrong, and then humble enough to turn from our wrongs. David said, "I have sinned"; also "I have""sinned and I have done wickedly", "I have done very foolishly: " (See 2 Samuel 24th chapter.) And Saul of Tarsus said of himself that he "was before a blasphemer, and a persecutor, and injurious." And David was a man "after God's own heart," and Saul was a "chosen vessel" unto the Lord.—They were humble.

And, as far as the record informs us, neither David nor Paul tried to justify himself by false reasoning. This sets an example for us. David did not regard the prophet Nathan as his enemy because that prophet told, him of his fault. Neither did Saul of Tarsus try to make any explanations to the man Ananias, who came to him while he was praying and told him what he "must do." Thus the psalmist David and Saul of Tarsus set a good example in regard to candor, humility and promptness. David said, "I thought on my ways and turned my feet unto Thy testimonies: I made haste and delayed not to keep Thy commandments" (Psalms 119:59-60). And Paul said, "I conferred not with flesh and blood" (Gal.1:15-16) Here is an example for us.

The most radical and offensive statement "made in the course of the Unity meeting at Butler university (Indianapolis) during the first three days of July 1931, was probably this:

"Our religious neighbors are wrong by conviction for they have been imposed on by false testimony; but 'disciples' who are wrong are wrong by determination,—for they have determined to be popular, and have adopted popular means and measures in order to accomplish that end."

As a result. Prov. 15:10 was declared to be applicable to nearly all "disciples" who are wrong: for with the rarest exception they show temper when reprov'd, and will not change from their wrongs.

Yes, "Correction is grievous unto him that forsaketh the way; and he that hateth reproof shall die!" And that declaration of Solomon seems applicable to a large majority of "liberal" disciples. After exposing to the limit the false reasoning of their religious neighbors concerning one class of humanisms, that we have adopted the same method of reasoning in behalf of another class of such isms. In other words, after exposing the folly of saying "A drop of water is as good as an ocean for baptizing," they adopted the folly of saying, "A

tuning fork to give note of a song to one person is the same in principle" as an organ to accompany the entire song for the entire audience."—Yes, and after exposing the "mourning bench" method of converting sinners and sanctifying believers, to the limit of their powers, many disciples have adopted sensational preaching and music for the purpose of overpowering men, women and children (especially children) in order to gain numbers and make big reports of additions. As congregational discipline has been discarded except when some one arises and speaks against their humanisms!

Then, after exposing Nadab and Abihu for offering "strange fire before the Lord which he commanded them not,"—after exposing them to the limit, the "liberal disciples have offered service in various societies, regardless of God's commands!

When Israelites in the days of the prophet Samuel called for a king, in order that they might be like nations around them, they were wrong by determination. This became evident when God protested by mouth of Samuel. They showed they did not care for what God said, for they answered: "Nay, but we will have a king !" And the same disposition has been shown by "liberal" disciples generally in regard to their humanisms. Neither divine revelation nor human reasoning was of any importance to them. Regardless of God, man or the devil, they determined to become like the denominations around and be popular, successful, influential, great.

After commenting to the limit on David's mistake in trying to move the ark of God on a cart, many disciples carted, or otherwise moved, a musical instrument to a meeting house (perhaps under darkness) and placed it near the pulpit; and were present Lord's day morning ready to defend it with their fists—regardless of God, man or the devil! Then, when "conservatives" of the brotherhood left, they were derided as "fogies," "old fogies," "anti-every thing," "moss-backs," "kickers," and later as "Sand Creekers." I say in view of such and such-like conduct, those guilty of it were ! BY DETERMINATION!

In Jer.5:30, 31 we find this; "A wonderful and horrible thing is committed in the land: The prophets prophesy falsely, and the priests bear rule by their and my people love to have it so:—and what will you do in the end thereof?" Another evidence of God's ancient people being WRONG BY DETERMINATION. They loved to have it so—regardless of truth and righteousness, and we might say—regardless of God, man or the devil! They said, in Isaiah's period of prophecy, that they wished to hear "smooth. And God said, "This is a rebellious people, children, children that will not hear the law of God: who say to the seers, See not; and to the Prophets, Prophecy not unto us the right things, speak unto us smooth things, prophesy deceits." (See Isa. 30:9, 10) They were WRONG BY DETERMINATION!

Same was true of Pharisees and Sadducees, chief priests and scribes, while the Savior was among men in person. They were not open to conviction; for neither the Savior's words nor works seemed to affect them except to cause them to hate him. On the same principle we find "liberal" disciples quite generally proceeding in this generation. Neither human reason nor divine revelation seems to affect them.. They wish to remain as they are, though their humanisms have assassinated the best plea ever made among mankind from the time

that the primitive church went astray— THE PLEA FOR THE UNITY OF ALL BELIEVERS IN CHRIST ON THE BIBLE AS THEIR CREED.

If disciples of Christ are going to unite, then those who have adopted humanisms must learn not to forget their major premise," and must learn that" if that premise is not correct, then their reasoning is false. In other words, they must learn better than to say, "If men may justly make improvements in things "temporal they may justly make them in regard to things spiritual." This implies that things temporal and things spiritual are of the same order, and that God has not given any more instructions in regard to things spiritual than he has in regard to things temporal!

If we say because men have made improvements in regard to farming implements they have equal right to make improvements in regard to religion— this implies the soil of the earth is of the same order with the human mind and heart. But this is evidently false. It implies also that God gave man as detailed instructions in regard to farming as he has in regard to religion. This also is false. Then to say that because man has made improvements in method of transportation from place to place, therefore he may add humanisms to worship and work of the church—this also is evidently false. For it implies that traveling from place to place and religion are of the same order.

Yet after all improvements man has made in implements for farming and gardening (called agriculture and horticulture by learned ones)—yet his improvements are all artificial. And after all of man's artifice, yet if the God of nature does not grant favorable seasons, then all man's devices and labors are in vain. And after all of man's boasted improvements in method of travel, yet the most important is God's arrangement for every human being to walk on two feet. Besides all this we may safely say more health and vigor may be secured by talking than by any other method of travel. Finally, those who cannot walk are unfortunate travelers.

The statement should next be made that the Bible is God's book for man's guidance in religion; and not for farming, gardening, hunting, fishing, build, big houses, nor in regard to any kind of mechanism. That man can do for himself God has intended: for him to do. But as he could not find out the right way to worship God—therefore God gave him a look of religion guidance at the proper time and lines. And for man to conclude that because he has been able to make improvements in mechanism, therefore he can make improvements in methods of religious worship and work—this is unreasonable for any other religious people. But it is far worse for disciples of Christ, who preach that the gospel of Christ is perfect.

People known as "disciples of Christ" are under deeper condemnation for their errors than are their religious neighbors. Catholics and Protestants genially are creed-bound. This is true of the preachers, also of people taught by them. But "disciples" are free to obey the gospel of Christ as revealed in the New Testament. Besides, they are taught the gospel of Christ is God's power to save alien sinners without addition of humanisms of any , kind. Yet any "disciples" seem to have imagined the gospel is defective in regard to worship and work of the church, and that their human ingenuity is needed to supply imaginary defects in that



gospel. In all this they are inexcusable!

The extent to which certain disciples have gone in order to “popularize” the gospel is shocking to all those devoted to the gospel as revealed in the New Testament. And this means the degree of humility those disciples will need to manifest in order to return to the gospel as revealed in the New Testament, suggests a miracle of humility! Yet such degree of humility is necessary in order that disciples may again be united. “The unity of the Spirit in the bond of peace” can only be secured by disciples discarding all humanisms in worship and work of the church, even as they have discarded them in preaching the gospel to alien sinners.

The decision that the gospel is perfect for conversion of sinners but imperfect for worship and work of the church—that decision is an evident absurdity. Yet such absurdity has been adopted by all disciples who made use of humanly arranged devices, in regard to religious worship and work. Here is an astonishment:—Perfect for converting sinners, but imperfect for perfecting believers! The apostle Paul declared “all Scripture is given by inspiration of God, and is profitable for doctrine, for reproof, for correction, for instruction in righteousness; that the man of God may be perfect, thoroughly furnished unto all good works” (2 Tim. 3:16,17). This must be accepted without doubt by all disciples who wish to be united as the gospel requires.

What is the Bible to us? “What use should we make of it?”

Is the Bible the standard by which to measure ourselves? or, Are we the standard by which to measure the Bible?

Must we conform to the Bible as it applies to us? or, Are we the standard to which the Bible must be construed so as to conform to us? —These questions need to be considered by all who would help in the all important changes necessary to unite the disciple brotherhood, and then show the different religious communions in Christendom how to be united. And this should be the chief consideration for all communions in Christendom.

Should baptism be reduced in meaning so as to mean sprinkling; or, Should those who have submitted to sprinkling for baptism make the change and conform to baptism in its most, evident meaning? In other words, should the immersion in water that is evidently set forth in the New Testament be so reduced in meaning as not to require any changes in those who have been sprinkled on for baptism in their, infancy, or later? This, involves the question whether mankind should so change as to conform to the Bible in regard to baptism, or that the teaching offered, in the Bible should be conformed to the baptismal conditions found among mankind. Must we change to meet God in his word, or must God's word be changed to meet us?

We all admit immersion in water by authority of Christ is scriptural baptism. “Why then should not all accept immersion and be united in regard to it? Besides, we all admit we may sing without musical accompaniments and be acceptable to God. Then why not dismiss musical instruments from our worship entirely, and use them only in practice as we would

use the note system when learning a tune? Then we could be united on that subject." And our union would be on the same, principle of the union we propose with all those that practice sprinkling. We think the proposal is reasonable and scriptural in the one direction, and We may be sure it is in the other.

We would not need to give up near as much in order to unite in singing without the instrument, as we propose for our neighbors. "We will only need to turn from something, omit something, leave off something we confess is a non-essential. But our religious neighbors who have accepted sprinkling or pouring for baptism will, not only need to turn from such an institution, but they will need to be immersed by authority of Christ, and into the name of the Godhead. How much easier, then, should we find our change than they would find what we propose to them! (This is worth considering, for sake of unity.)

In regard to names, the same is true. We are already united in that all obedient believers have right to be called Christians. And we are generally united in belief that "Church of Christ" is right for a company of Christians when banded together for worship and work. But our religious neighbors would all need to give up their party names, or party use of names. And they would need to accept the divinely given names, as recorded in the New Testament. Here again we find disciples ask more of their religious neighbors than they are required to do, in order to unity. What is good for others is good for us, and we, should set the example for unity!

But every question pertaining to our oneness in Christ will soon be settled when we all decide we should measure ourselves by the New Covenant scriptures, without trying to measure any of those scriptures by ourselves, whether the subject under consideration be names, doctrine, practice, worship or work that we may find in the word of God. If we decide to measure ourselves by the Divine word, and will be faithful in actuality of measuring, then we may all be united as we learn what that "Word requires: But if we try to construe that Word to suit our notions and practices, then we shall remain divided, and suffer results!

And what will be results of going on in division contrary to plain teaching of the New Covenant scriptures. Will the Savior finally say to us, "Well done, thou good and faithful servant"? Or will he say to any disciples, "Depart!—for you mistreated many of My humble disciples, and reproached them with degrading names, and in so doing you reproached Me by those names. . . . And that is the teaching found in latter part of Matthew 25th chapter. But what liberal disciples ever thought they were reproaching the Savior with reproachful names when they repeated the words—fogy; old foggy, moss-backs, kickers? Not one, we may suppose. And who thought, of reproaching Christ by hurling the name Campbellite at Christ's humble disciples? But, see Matthew 25th chapter!

A certain kind of unity is based on honesty. Such unity may be designated by the word affinity. Honest men and women are drawn toward each other and have mutual admiration. This is true in tics, business, education, religion. Same is ti dishonesty. Thieves have affinity for each and same is true of all vile characters. On the principle, disciples are

drawn together. And apostle Paul's exhortation to "speak the same," with the apostle Peter's exhortation to "speak as the oracles of God"— such exhortations, o will tend to bring people together. This means Divine doctrine, obeyed, will bring true disciples the unity of the Spirit in the bond of peace.

In a recent copy of a certain journal of liberal sentiments I find: "Unless our radicals and conservatives alike can develop an attitude of real liberalism in correct usage of the word, there is not much hope for unity." This suggests "good-natured compromise", of which Thomas Campbell wrote in his "Declaration and Address" in 1809. He mentioned that as a possible "basis of union if religious parties of so-called Christendom could not unite on the Bible. And that suggests what has been called a "gentleman's agreement" in certain other domains when satisfactory legal enactments cannot be secured.

In behalf of the conservatives I may safely say if they did not have stern and scriptural convictions in regard to divisions in "the disciple brotherhood", then they could easily become more liberal. But their convictions are that they have everything in their teaching and practice necessary to conversion of alien sinners and the sanctification of believers be prepared to maintain his denial by mention of some teaching of the word of God the conservatives have omitted. And if they have all that is divinely required for conversion of sinners and perfection of believers they surely do not need more. "The old guard dies, but does not surrender!"

Does some one say humanisms are necessary in order to adapt the gospel to mankind? If so, I again ask, Who adapted light to the eye and the eye to light? Who adapted sound to the ear and the ear to sound? Who adapted food to hunger "and hunger to food? Who adapted rest to weary limbs and weary limbs to rest?. Who adapted. sleep to the eyelids when heavy for sleep, and the eyelids in that condition to sleep? Who adapted Water to thirst and thirst to water? Who adapted atmosphere we breathe to our organs of respiration, and those organs to the atmosphere? Who adapted common air to wings of the bird, and wings of the bird to the air? Who adapted water to fins of the fish and fins of the fish to water?

And would God make all adaptations in nature. such that we must regard them as perfect, yet make imperfect the adaptation of his word to the human mind, heart and life? Would He stamp perfection on the entire domain of nature which is to perish, but stamp imperfection on the religion. He intended for man's spiritual welfare for time and eternity?— Asking these questions is to answer them. Who presumes to tamper with sun, moon or stars? Who presumes to rearrange rotations of the earth? Whoever heard of a man that said he needed to "oil the axle-tree of the universe"?

And yet man, who knows nothing when he enters this world and knows nothing in its entirety when he leaves it — man in his vanity presumes to tamper with, modify, rearrange, imagine something defective in religion as offered is the gospel, and supply what he imagines is defective, and thus complement and supplement what God arranged for man's welfare in time and eternity and pronounced per feet. — What shocking, horrifying ,Satanic irreverence he said to Jesus, "All these things will I give thee if thou wilt fall down and

worship me." All irreverence for God is devilish !

Must we bend to suit God's word, or must we try to bend God's word to suit our notions? Must we conform to God's word in every particular, or must God's word, by various interpretations, construing, omissions, emendations of our own, be made to conform to us? God's ancient people were; guilty of trifling with his law and striving with" its precepts; and God said to them, "Woe unto him that striveth with his Maker! Let the potsherd strive with the potsherds of the earth. Shall the clay say to him that asketh it, What makest thou? or thy work, He hath no hands?" (See Isa. 45:9.) These questions imply that in God's estimation those who, did strive with Him disregarded and even impeached His wisdom.

And do not all those impeach or disregard Divine wisdom who add humanisms to the gospel? They will deny they add to the gospel; and their denial is correct if we confine, attention to facts of the gospel summed up in the death, burial and resurrection of Christ, ,Nor do disciples of Christ add to commands for the alien sinner in order to become Christians. But when certain disciples come to worship and work of the church they think they can make certain humanisms that will make the church more acceptable to certain classes of man kind. Then they hope to do much good by their humanisms that the Lord will accept what they offer Him. As a result, "disciples" are divided!

Mention should again be made that our religious neighbors are wrong by conviction—wherein they are wrong. They have been imposed on in wrong testimony, and by that testimony have been wrongly convinced. That is true of even leaders among our religious neighbor. They have been trained to think a happy religious feeling or emotion is proper evidence of pardon, and that people may get to Heaven in many different ways, and thus may be honest. But that is not true of people known as disciples. We have been taught better; have learned much about right divisions of the Bible, and have pretended to speak where the Bible speaks and be silent where it is silent. As a result, wherein disciples are wrong they inexcusable.

All humanisms adopted by disciples are result of desire and determination on their part to be "successful". And many among us have desired to be "popular", forgetting that the friendship of the world is enmity with God (James 4:4). And to this should be added that what is highly esteemed among men is abomination in the sight of God" (Luke 16:15). But, overlooking such and such like declarations of the Sacred Test, many disciples wished to be "like other people"—to be successful; and popular in order to be successful:—and successful in order to become popular! As a result they adopted one humanism after another, and assassinated the plea for the oneness of God's people on the Bible as the only reliable religious creed.

Yes, a certain class of liberal disciples in a former generation actually assassinated our plea for oneness of God's people on the Bible as the only safe religious creed! I say "assassinated" because that plea was made ridiculous because those who commenced to make it became divided over humanisms in regard to work and worship of the church. Having become ridiculous it was. annulled; and liberal disciples became a party among

parties, a communion among communions, a denomination among denominations! Many of them have resented the charge that they are a denomination; yet the efforts to be successful rather than faithful show they are of the order of the denominations around them rather than like conservative disciples who strive to be faithful rather than successful.

Here is something that should be repeated: — A fashionable lady inquired of an old preacher "if a lady could not be fond of dress without "being proud." He answered that if he would go along a road and see a fox's tail sticking out of a hole in a tree, he would be quite sure a fox was inside that tree!...And thus with "liberal" disciples—the desire to be successful and popular—and to become popular in order to be successful, and to be successful in order to become popular—that desire is common in the Romish church and all those "that have sprung from her directly or indirectly. That desire when adopted by "liberal" disciples separated them from their apostolic brethren, and made them a denomination in mind, heart and life. And rejection of divisive humanisms is the only plan of relief from this charge.

Then there is another evidence on this subject. The religious denominations '*quite*, generally indulged in, reproachful names against disciples who advocated 'need of water baptism in order to assurance of salvation from sins committed while alien sinners. "Campbellite", "water Salvationists" and various other reproachful names were adopted by our religious neighbors in order to damage us and our plea for simplicity of the gospel. And, on the same principle "liberal" disciples adopted the names "antis." "anti-everything," "fogies," "old fogies," "moss-backs," "kickers," and various other un-handsome names. Thus liberal disciples showed the same disposition that denominations generally showed toward disciples generally. And they all overlooked the Savior's saying "Inasmuch as ye have done it unto one of the least of these, ye have done it unto me!"

If an artist would picture a man to represent Unity among believers in Christ, and then represent different leaders of "the disciple brotherhood" (who have been chief in urging humanisms) with daggers in their right hands and thrust to the hilt into the body of Unity—such picture would indicate the tragedy of our history as a people! But who dares draw such a picture? "Who would indicate the individual hand that thrust each dagger? Yet such a picture with the individual hands named, by which the daggers were thrust, would not be too severe—if we consider the crime committed and its evil results. Perhaps a million souls have been lost as a result of that crime—the crime of assassinating our plea for unity!

But some one may say, "Those were good men, and they did not mean to do any harm." This may be admitted. But if they had studied the Bible as they should have studied it, they might have learned what the Savior meant when he said in a parable: "'Well done, thou good and faithful servant"; but said never a word about "success". And they might have learned what the Savior meant when he said, "Be thou faithful unto death, and will give thee a crown of life"; but. did not add a word about "success". The unavoidable conclusion therefore is that the desire to be successful, rather than faithful, assassinated our plea for unity, and made "the disciple brotherhood" a compromised, betrayed, disgraced people!! "We

divided the brotherhood in our zeal to convert the world—though the Savior prayed that we should be united in order that the world might believe in Him!

Many, disciples, have deceived themselves by use of "glittering generalities". A notable instance of this was the adoption of the motto—"In faith unity; in opinion liberty; in all things charity." That motto appears well to the eye and sounds well to the ear, but when viewed by the light of either logic or the Bible it appears indefinite and deceptive, and seems closely related to the speech of the serpent that spoke to our mother Eve. "Then our eyes shall be opened, and ye shall be as gods, knowing good and evil"—the serpent said. That sounded well, but was too much of a generality to reveal its real meaning.

The word "faith" used in the New Testament has both a subjective and an objective meaning or application. It means individual belief, also the doctrine believed. "Without faith it is impossible to please Him, for he that comes to God must believe that he is, and that he is a rewarder of them that diligently seek him. See Heb. 11:6. That declaration well illustrates what is meant by individual belief. Then in Jude 3rd verse we find: "Earnestly contend for the faith which was once delivered to the saints." This illustrates faith as a doctrine or system of teaching, especially that revealed as the gospel of Christ.

If the expression "in faith unity" was intended to mean the gospel in its fulness, then it referred to Christ with all the revelation made by him and 'concerning him—even in the Old Testament. Yes, and as Christ is evidently the central character of the entire Bible when considered in all his' attributes, then the expression "in faith unity" means unity in regard to the entire Bible. And this is what "disciples" began to contend for over a hundred years ago. They adopted the saying that "the Bible is the religion of Protestants," and they enlarged it to this: "The Bible, the whole Bible, and nothing but the Bible, is our religious creed."

But if the expression "in faith unity" was intended to mean individual belief, then it referred to that which is dependent on the sameness of testimony, and the sameness of opportunities for accepting it. And in view of the diversities of opportunities for learning what we should believe, and our capabilities of grasping or understanding what is offered to us and appreciating it aright, the apostle Paul exhorted: "Now I beseech you, Brethren, by the name of our Lord Jesus Christ, that you all speak the same thing, and that there be no divisions among you; but that ye be perfectly joined together in the same mind and in the same judgment," See 1 Cor. 1:10.

"In Opinion Liberty." What does this mean? As ' used in "the disciple brotherhood" in the latter half of the 19th century it meant, the liberty to thrust a musical instrument into the meeting house of a congregation of disciples after much electioneering; and then the liberty of those who regarded that instrument a relic of Judaism forbidden by the letter to the Galatians—it meant the liberty of all such to leave regardless of their financial interests in the meeting house. It meant also the liberty to find another place of worship, and the liberty to be stigmatized as "fogies," "old fogies," "antis," "mossbacks," and other reproachful names!

This reminds me of the common doctrine of "personal liberty". Advocates of such liberty claim right to get drunk, make criminals of themselves then plead before the court that they "did not when the crime was committed!" Such advocate "personal liberty" think they have the right to foul with tobacco smoke the air that others breathe, and thus they proceed to smoke in all public where smoking is not forbidden. The apostle doctrine of liberty was that he was restricted in regard to certain things that were right before God, in order not to offend a man who was ignorant.

In All Things Charity." What did this mean? Surely the expression "all things" is universal form, and unless modified by other words it should be accepted without modification in all respects. For "in all things charity" meant charity free of manner of evil! And such has been the result, the one exception in the practice of those who had that motto was in regard to those who still contend for the order of worship, and work of the church authorized in the New Testament without modification. Their contention was not charitably considered but was treated with contempt. "What a motto was for a "religious" paper!!

Many in "the disciple brotherhood are accustomed to say if our religious neighbors would take the truth, the whole truth and nothing but the truth concerning what is necessary for conversion of sinners and perfection of believers, they could all be tried on those questions. And that is true; but not the whole truth. What is true concerning our religious neighbors is true concerning all disciples! If we would take the truth, the whole truth and nothing but the truth in regard to every question about worship and work of the church, then we would all be united in regard to those questions. Suppose we go to beginning of "extras" among disciples and inquire which of the apostles recommended organization of a Sunday school with superintendent and assistant, also with secretary and treasurer? Which one ever spoke of a Sunday school "the best part of the church" or even as "part of church"? Not one mentioned it! Yet in Titus 2nd chapter, a special class of teachers was recommended for a special class of pupils. This implies every special class of pupils should have a special teacher suitable for such pupils. Concerning this much we can be united, but not concerning an extra organization with officials. not mentioned in New Covenant scriptures.

Mention should next be made that we can all be united on the record of Dorcas in latter part of Acts 9<sup>th</sup> chapter. On that record we can be united and every woman connected with the church—who time, health, skill and means to follow the example Dorcas set—should be permitted to do so without a criticism, and with commendation. But we cannot be united that an extra organization called Dorcas Society, or Ladies Aid society may be scripturally formed with president, vice-president, secretary and treasurer. We can all unite in regard to that kind of work for all individual women able to do it in their homes, or places where they live; but not unite on the extra organization,

To the record of Dorcas may be added the record of Aquila and Priscilla in regard to Apollos, "an eloquent man and mighty in the Scriptures." But Aquila and wife heard him and beheld that he knew only the baptism of John the Baptist, "they brought him unto them and expounded unto him the things of God more perfectly." This is recorded in part of Acts 18<sup>th</sup>

chapter, and we can all be one in regard to lawfulness of following their example as time and occasion permit. But we cannot united on proposal to build educational institutions, with separate officials, unmentioned in the Word of God.

Referring to Acts 19th chapter we may say we all be united that those immersed persons (not baptism into the name of the Father, Son and Holy Ghost should be baptized again. But we cannot, insist of Acts 19:5, insist on rebaptism of. all who been immersed by our religious neighbors. For reason we cannot be united in adopting the expression "sect baptism" with reference to all aliens performed by our religious neighbors. Valid immersion is determined by sincerity of the immersed, rather than by the administrator. If not, then if a hypocrite would a sincere believer among "disciples", then such immersion would invalid!

We may all unite in regard to example of the church in Philippi sending to the apostle Paul's needs (Phil. 4:15,16). But we cannot be united that a society or extra organization, with officers "unmentioned in the New Testament, should be formed in order to send money to support a. man in preaching the gospel. We may take the truth and the whole truth in regard to that question and be united. Then if we take all the truth, and nothing but the truth, we can not be divided in regard to that subject nor any other. If we resolve to be true to obligation of a witness to tell the truth, the whole truth, and nothing but the truth in our religious teaching, we cannot be divided.

One more illustration should be offered, or one more instance mentioned. We find foundation for it in 1 Cor. 16:17,18, where we learn of three men who came to Paul and supplied what was lacking on part of Corinth church. We can all 'be united that every disciple able to do so should supply what a preacher engaged in work of the gospel needs, especially if he has been neglected by the church that should support him. But we cannot be united on three men, nor any other number, in forming an organization with officials not mentioned in the Bible, to do such work Nor can we have such organization and officials and be united in our teaching and practice!

Daniel Sommer