

1949

God's Church Is Just: A Specific Discussion Of Some Cases of Church Discipline

J. D. Powers

Fred D. Weed


D. A. Sommer

C. D. McCay

A. T. Keer

See next page for additional authors

Follow this and additional works at: https://digitalcommons.acu.edu/crs_books

 Part of the [Biblical Studies Commons](#), [Christian Denominations and Sects Commons](#), [Christianity Commons](#), and the [Religious Thought, Theology and Philosophy of Religion Commons](#)

Recommended Citation

Powers, J. D.; Weed, Fred D.; Sommer, D. A.; McCay, C. D.; Keer, A. T.; Blankenship, G. R.; and Carlton, H. L., "God's Church Is Just: A Specific Discussion Of Some Cases of Church Discipline" (1949). *Stone-Campbell Books*. 365.
https://digitalcommons.acu.edu/crs_books/365

This Book is brought to you for free and open access by the Stone-Campbell Resources at Digital Commons @ ACU. It has been accepted for inclusion in Stone-Campbell Books by an authorized administrator of Digital Commons @ ACU.

Authors

J. D. Powers, Fred D. Weed, D. A. Sommer, C. D. McCay, A. T. Keer, G. R. Blankenship, and H. L. Carlton

God's Church Is Just

A SPECIFIC DISCUSSION OF SOME CASES
OF CHURCH DISCIPLINE

Containing Facts and Truths Which Concern
Every Honest Deacon, Elder, Preacher and
Other Member of "The Church of Christ"



BY

J. D. Powers, an Old-time Preacher, Stockton,
Calif.

Fred D. Weed, Deacon, Bridgeport, Conn.
(Bethel, R. R. 2, Conn.)

D. A. Sommer, Editor Spiritual Call, Indianapolis,
Ind.

C. D. McCay, Mail-clerk Preacher for Years,
Des Moines, Iowa

A. T. Kerr, Elder, Brookport, Ill.

G. R. Blankinship, Leader, Brookfield, Ill.

H. L. Carlton, Evangelist, Vienna, Ill.



1949

SPIRITUAL CALL

918 Congress Ave.

Indianapolis 23, Ind.

God's Church Is Just

IMPORTANCE OF THIS "EXAMINATION"

"Prove all things, hold fast that which is good."
—1 Thess. 5:21.

"EXAMINE yourselves, whether ye be in the faith."—2 Cor. 13:5.

"EVERY ONE of us SHALL GIVE ACCOUNT of HIMSELF to GOD."—Rom. 14:12.

There has been much confusion regarding some work done in the brotherhood, which concerns every elder, preacher, deacon and other member. W. Carl Ketcherside has just written a book on "A Clean Church," which contains many good things, and yet much of which is devoted indirectly to a defense of the unscriptural work done by certain ones. We shall permit him to be the chief witness, in his own words in the book; and shall examine his position in the light of God's Word. And all honest, anxious Christians in the brotherhood constitute the "Justice Jury," (as we shall call it); and we simply ask you to read these pages carefully and prayerfully, and then judge as one who must give account to God.

LAWS GOVERNING THIS "EXAMINATION"

"Judges and officers shalt thou make thee in all thy gates, which the Lord thy God giveth thee, throughout thy tribes; and they shall judge the people with just judgment. Thou shalt not wrest judgment; thou shalt not respect persons, neither take a gift, for a gift doth blind the eyes of the wise, and pervert the words (margin, cause) of the righteous."—Deut. 16: 18, 19.

Take a complete concordance and you will find that the word judgment (often meaning, **justice**), and its co-relatives, is used several hundred times in the Bible; and you will find that the word **Justice** itself is used more than a hundred times—showing how important it is.

“Wash you, make you clean, put away the evil of your doings from before mine eyes; cease to do evil, learn to do well, seek judgment (**justice**), relieve the oppressed, **judge** the fatherless, plead for the widow.”—Isa. 1.

“What doth the Lord require of thee, but to do **justly**, and to love **mercy**, and to walk **humbly** with thy God.”—Micah 6: 8.

“Of the increase of his [Christ’s] government and peace there shall be no end, upon the throne of David, and upon his kingdom, to order it, and to establish it with judgment and with **justice** from henceforth even for ever.”—Isa. 9: 6, 7.

“He [John the Baptist] shall go before him [Christ] in the spirit and power of Elias, to turn the hearts of the fathers to the children, and the disobedient to the wisdom of the **just** to make ready a people for the Lord.”—Luke 1: 17.

“Thou shalt be recompensed at the resurrection of the **just**.”—Luke 14: 14. (Putting **justice** practically at the head of the virtues.)

“Masters, give unto your servants that which is **just** and equal.—Col. 4: 1.

“Ye denied the Holy One and the **Just One**.”—Acts 3:14. “Showed before the coming of the **Just One**.”—7: 52. “Shouldst know his will, and see that **Just One**.”—22: 14.

“The wisdom that is from above is first pure, then peaceable . . . without partiality [with fairness, **justice**] without hypocrisy.”—James 3: 17.

“A bishop must be . . . **JUST**.”—Titus 1: 7, 8.

“Woe unto you, *scribes, Pharisees, hypocrites!* For ye pay tithe of mint and anise and cummin, and have omitted the **WEIGHTIER MATTERS** of the law—judgment [**justice**] **mercy** and **faith**; these ought ye to have done, and not to leave the other undone.—Matt. 23: 23.

"He that is UNJUST, LET HIM BE UNJUST STILL."—Rev. 22: 11. (No changing at "the resurrection of the just.")

CIVIL COURTS OF JUSTICE

"We, the people of the United States, in order to form a more perfect union, **establish justice,**" etc.—Constitution of the United States.

In civil courts—

(1) Time is given the accused to prepare his case.

(2) Judges often eliminate themselves because it might be considered that they might be biased in some way.

(3) The accused has a right to interrogate every member of the proposed judge or jury to see that he is not biased.

(4) If the accused thinks there is much prejudice in the community which might influence the judge or jury, he can have a change of venue.

(5) If he considers that he did not receive justice, he can appeal to a higher court, if he can show an iota of injustice; **AND OBTAIN ANOTHER HEARING,** or a review.

THE TESTIFYING AND EXAMINING BEGINS

Carl Ketcherside says in his book, "A Clean Church," p. 7: "I acknowledge freely my inability to make this volume what I would like for it to be, and although it sets forth my deep convictions upon this important matter, I ask that those who review it do so without sparing me. **Let the truth be known!** If error is contained in the reasoning set forth in these pages, let it be refuted, and that in such a manner as will keep men and women from being led astray by it! I will appreciate it greatly, if the spirit of those who review it, be charitable and friendly, but let us forget the attitude of those who criticize and learn from their criticism. So I plead that all feeling for the writer be banished, and the subject-matter be exposed to the searchlight of God's truth."—P. 7.

"There is no detailed information as to how the investigation must be carried on."—P. 135.

"God has laid down for us certain great and abiding principles. He has not always given us the minute details for the application of these to each specific case. [Has he in ANY case?—DAS] In such matters, we must utilize the judgment and intelligence, with which we have been furnished. **We cannot legislate, we cannot make laws.** But we must apply the laws of God in a way consistent to the Christian walk, always bearing in mind such scriptures as 1 Cor. 14: 40; Rom. 14: 22, and kindred passages."—P. 22.

"Although the N. T. law, being one of the spirit rather than the letter **does not outline a specific formula for procedure in every case of discipline** [Does it do it in ANY case?—DAS], and although the method of carrying out the teachings upon the subject is a matter for the local church to determine, it must be asserted that there are certain definite principles which govern, and which should be understood in order to offset the possibility of injustice being done."—P. 137.

"**Heaven endorses the action [of discipline] we take AS LONG AS THE PROCEDURE IS IN HARMONY WITH THE GOSPEL LAW REVEALED UNTO US.**"—P. 28.

Well said, and if Carl himself and the New Castle and St. Louis elders had followed this, there would have been no trouble.

E. M. Zerr, says of Carl's book, in Mission Messenger, February, 1949, p. 6: "Having read carefully your book, I wish to make this unsolicited statement. **I endorse EVERY argument of yours in the book, and also the application of the scriptures cited.**"

CARL'S HANDLING OF ALEXANDER CAMPBELL AND THE MILLENNIAL HARBINGER

Carl quotes from Alexander Campbell's book, Christian System. Also from his paper, Millennial Harbinger, and so states it that the reader might infer that he is quoting from Campbell when he is

not at all. I myself inferred that Campbell wrote the statements Carl quotes from the Harbinger, and because of that made this misstatement in S. C. for January: "He unjustly applies writings of Campbell, largely on living, to matters pertaining solely to church government." When I went to the library of Butler University, I found that W. K. Pendleton not Campbell made the statements quoted by Carl. At that time, Campbell was in mental decline, having "hallucinations," and was "released from pressing and life-long labors." Richardson shows that Campbell imagined he had visited the island of Cyprus; and also would sometimes at night arise in bed and pray and offer exhortation, as if in religious meetings. (See Richardson's Memoirs of A. Campbell, Vol. II, pages 647-8.) So the quotations Carl makes from the Harbinger to which he ascribes no name, mean no more than the words of any other good man of that time.

But Campbell wrote his Christian System when he was in his prime and it is to that that we wish especially to refer. On p. 35 of his own book, Carl quotes two paragraphs from Campbell's Christian System, "Chapter 16" (he says, but which is really Chapter 26). Now between his first and second paragraph he leaves out a very important paragraph from Campbell, and yet makes no indication by periods that there is an omission. Let me supply part of the omitted paragraph, Christian System, p. 94—

"The elders hear the matter; and if the case be one that requires a special committee, which Paul calls 'secular seats of judicature' [judges collectively; a court of justice—Webster.] 1 Cor. 6: 4, they appoint it; then, **NOT TILL THEN, if THEIR [judicature's] decision of the matter is refused, they bring it before the whole congregation, and he is excluded from among them.**"

Now the case would certainly require a "special committee" if the accused charged that the elders were biased, and he demanded fair judges. Hence, other men outside the elders must be selected, giving in all justice the accused a chance to help

select this "judicature" (judges collectively). Now DAS charged that the elders were biased, and he saw that he could not get justice because the elders considered themselves as final authority, and would not tolerate any fair hearing; and so he withdrew. Campbell says that it is "not till" the elders have seen that there is judicature outside themselves, appointed, who hear and decide against the accused, should it be brought before the whole congregation and the accused excluded. But did the N. C. elders offer such a judicature either to DAS or the Achors when they charged that the elders were biased, and hence a "special committee" was needed? Not at all.

When Weed proposed such a "special committee," a "judicature" as Campbell mentions, Zerr said that the time for arbitration was ended, that Sommer was in Satan's territory, and therefore could not be dealt with. In other words, Zerr gave Campbell a kick regarding his advise.

No wonder Carl came up to this paragraph from Campbell, and made a big hurdle over it, and then closed his eyes as if he had done nothing amiss! Campbell strikes a deadly blow at the heart of whole New Castle miscarriage of justice. How could Carl have kept from seeing this? Remember this, Carl himself wrote to Weed, "I deny that the elders acted wrongly, I approve of all that they did." Was he helping justify them?

Now, brothers and sisters in the great unbiased "Justice Jury," we leave it with you as to whether W. Carl Ketcherside was honest when he omitted that passage from Campbell. I am simply asking you the question.

On page 56 of his own book Carl again quotes Campbell p. 93, but immediately preceding this quotation is part of Campbell which he hurdled over as he did the other passage we mentioned. Here is what he omitted: "When they [elders] have fully examined and decided the case, they lay it before the congregation. If THEY acquiesce the matter ends, and the accused is retained or excluded as the case may be. If they do not acquiesce, OR if the accused appeals to the CON-

GREGATION, the case MUST BE RECONSIDERED; and if on further examination, both the elders, the congregation, and the accused retain the same views and the same position, helps MUST be called either from the congregation or FROM SOME OTHER"—evidently congregation.

Notice that Campbell says that if the accused appeals to the congregation, the case "MUST be RECONSIDERED." The Achors mistrusted the elders of the congregation, and would not meet them without witnesses, and said repeatedly that they wished the congregation as witnesses or some other unprejudiced ones; but all this was denied them by the New Castle elders. And when the case came up, and they were asked by the elders if they were guilty, they denied, and asked that they might speak, and Zerr said, "No sir, you may not." (See their File II.)

They were cast out of the congregation because they insisted that they meet the elders with witnesses, or that they have the congregation as witnesses—that they have a hearing before unprejudiced men. What was the matter with the elders? Were they afraid of witnesses except themselves? Is there a civil court in our land that would tolerate such injustice as the New Castle elders perpetrated against the Achors. Though they pled for it again and again, not once did the elders permit the Achors to testify before the congregation or impartial judges or witnesses. Was it not contrary to all laws of God and Man, and does it not belong to Russia rather than the U. S. A.?

Campbell said, "If the accused appeals to the congregation, the case must be reconsidered;" the Achors appealed time and again to be heard by the congregation; and were turned down by the N. C. elders; therefore their case "must be reconsidered," according to Campbell, and the N. C. elders were wrong.

Again: God's Church is just; the New Castle Church was not just; therefore, the New Castle church is not God's Church? Does not that logically follow?

When a man will quote both before and after a quotation which he makes from a man, when that part omitted condemns him, is he just and honest? Is he not garbling the language? For Webster says on "garble": "To pick out such parts of as may serve a purpose, usually unfair; to mutilate misleadingly."

Now I do not mean to say that one must always give all in a quotation, but I do ask, is one honest if he gives just what favors him and then jumps over what condemns him? When I quoted J. W. Watts' statement regarding the "swoop" meeting, I always put it like this: "He wrote me, disapproving some things I did, yet had the honesty to add, 'I think they did you wrong by taking the gang; and I told them that night of the meeting (at St. Louis) I probably wouldn't have been there either.'" I always showed that Watts disapproved of some things I had done, so as not to misrepresent in any way his language. Has Ketcherside done the same with Campbell? Not so that one can notice it! He has left the impression that Campbell was standing with him and New Castle, WHEN IN FACT CAMPBELL, BY THE STATEMENTS CARL OMITTED, OVERTHROWS THEIR WHOLE PROCEDURE OF INJUSTICE AT NEW CASTLE. How can you build a "Clean Church" that way? GOD'S Church is JUST, and HONEST, and simply does not stand for any such dishonesty. Therefore Carl does not belong to GOD'S Church unless he repents before all his readers.

In civil courts one swears to "tell the truth; the whole truth, and nothing but the truth;" has that been done in his quotations from Campbell?

In Western States News for January, Kenneth Morgan shows the value he placed, and Carl evidently did the same, on the quotations from Campbell, as he eulogized Carl's book, "A Clean Church" — "At several points the devout and studied comments of Alexander Campbell add strength to the work." But when one knows how Campbell was garbled, does it not become a saddening, deadly

boomerang? And Zerr says to Carl: "I endorse every argument of yours in the book."

Now brothers and sisters of the great "Justice Jury" of the brotherhood in general, it is up to you to decide regarding the reliability of the witness and his testimony in general, when he garbles language in that way, especially since he does it twice as we have shown, and tacitly a third time.

WAS THAT "SWOOP" MEETING JUST?

In reply to the SUPPOSE article, Carl really wrote a confession; but in less than two weeks he went contrary to it and joined the elders of the St. Louis area (if he did not engineer it) in the "swoop" meeting. The St. Louis elders insisted that D.A.S. meet with them in Indianapolis. They said that ten of them including Carl (elders in the St. Louis area), would leave their work and come; which, with the six elders from New Castle, would make sixteen. DAS protested that they intended to try to resurrect the SUPPOSE article which Carl said was settled, and there would have been 16 witnesses to two, an attack most unfair. J. W. Watts, an elder at Flat River, Mo., wrote this in a letter to me, "I think they **DID YOU WRONG** by taking the **GANG**; and I told them that night of the meeting (at St. Louis) I **PROBABLY WOULDN'T HAVE BEEN THERE EITHER.**" Now Bro. Watts is father-in-law to Carl, and he would have every reason to swing his judgment the other way; but, as I have said, though disagreeing with me in some things, he had the honesty to admit the truth on that point—that it was an unfair meeting. He must know some law, to be mayor of a city of 5,000 people, and is an unbiased witness regarding that swoop meeting; and he says it was a "wrong" to me. Other elders and intelligent brethren and sisters have said the same thing as Watts.

Has Leonard Blyeau, elder at Lillian Ave., St. Louis, ever repented of that "wrong" to me, and confessed and spread his confession over the brotherhood? **NO.** Have the other elders in the

St. Louis area who participated, or endorsed it, ever made confession for their "wrong" to DAS? **NO.** Has Carl Ketcherside made confession for that "wrong" his father-in-law said they committed against me? **NO.** Has E. M. Zerr made confession for that "wrong?" **NO.** Has Nathan Ridgway confessed the "wrong he did, and the other elders at N. C.? **NO.** Have any of these men confessed to the brotherhood for the wrong they did it by creating the big disturbance they did by reason of this swoop meeting? **NO.** Now how does it come that none of the friends of these men have been able to persuade them to make right their "wrong?"—for this is the heart of the trouble—a concerted effort to get rid of DAS for rebuking their "sin in the camp," as he did in the "SUPPOSE" article?

Bro. Weed shows they have never denied the facts presented in that article. Now Carl has written a book on "A Clean Church." How can the church be "clean" with unclean men in it as leaders trying to whip every one else into their ambitious, unscriptural ways—when they need to repent and confess their "wrongs" and scatter that over the brotherhood as they did their falsehood regarding exclusion? And Carl has praised again and again the wisdom of Bro. Watts, but what has he done to straighten up what Bro. Watts says is "wrong?" In **GOD'S Church** they straighten up such wrongs like that; but these men have not straightened up their wrongs; therefore, you readers decide whether they are in **GOD'S church.**

On page 80 of his book, Carl says, "It must be remembered that God's discipline is to be applied **TO MEN OF PROMINENCE** as well as the most insignificant individual, and if it will not stand the test when applied to prominent men in the church, it will soon not be applied at all. To uphold any man in his "wrong," is the quickest and surest way to strike at the heart of the church!" If that is true, then all those who participated in that "swoop" meeting, or endorse it, are striking "at the heart of the church," according to Carl, for from unprejudiced sources they did "**WRONG,**"

and these "prominent" elders and preachers have never made right their wrong!! They are destroying ALL discipline and justice in the church. But GOD'S Church is just!

DAS PROVES HIS CHARGES AGAINST NEW CASTLE ELDERS

(1) If you were "not" going to make a "personal offense" of the SUPPOSE article, (which Carl said was settled), why were you going to bring up in the "swoop" meeting, that SUPPOSE article, for CARL said to me over the phone that was one of the things they were going to bring up? You and Carl can settle that. (2) If Ridgway and Zerr did not say they were "dropping the matter," then why did they not make that known when I wrote a letter to them and consented to rescind my withdrawal of membership, with the understanding that they were dropping the matter? This sounds like duplicity. (3) If no wrong was done me by the "swoop" meeting when 16 men said they were coming down onto me, why did Bro. J. W. Watts, an impartial witness, say, "They did you wrong by taking the gang?" These elders can settle this with this HONEST, IMPARTIAL witness. (4) Carl himself told me that you intended to resurrect the SUPPOSE article, so the NC elders and Carl contradict each other and can fight that out—I am out of it. (5) Was Zerr indebted to Carl? Weed has shown from positive knowledge that Carl signed a note for \$1,000 to get out Zerr's QUESTIONS. Of course that does not amount to anything with Zerr! Carl told me himself that he got Bible readings for Zerr; and Carl took in hand the business matter of putting over the commentary. Didn't he make trips to Indiana, to talk with parties about it, and read the proofs, etc., and has certainly advertised and boosted it in his paper and elsewhere. I never said he financed it. The other work was enormous. The Old Testament forbid its judges to take gifts, for a gift blindeth the eyes of the wise, and all this work seemed pretty

much of a gift, for Zerr. (6) If Zerr is not the dominating force in that eldership why has he done about all the excluding in the church at NC for years, and appointing of elders (even when scriptural objections were against them)? (7) If the NC elders had not been planning to sit as judges in matters between Carl and me, why did Carl say the SUPPOSE article concerning him was one of the things to be discussed in the "swoop" meeting? You elders contradict Carl.

Thus have we proven EVERY ONE of the charges made against the NC elders. All they did was merely to deny my charges, but did not try to prove my charges false. Thus THEY are the ones who falsified. They were the accuser against my charges against them, the prosecutor, the judge, and executioner. This IS SOMETHING IN LAW AND JUSTICE! Wouldn't Tojo have been delighted to have had the same prerogative that the elders had, (which they usurped from God)—merely to deny what was said against him, without any proof? The same with Goering, Hitler, and Benedict Arnold? How refreshing to those men to have been able to say, in substance with the NC elders, "You can't try us unless we say you can?"

Can you not see, brothers and sisters of the great "Justice Jury" that men can not be their own judges when charges are against them, as the New Castle elders were?

God does not forgive sinners unless they repent and ask to be forgiven; and God does not expect us to forgive those who have sinned against us unless they repent and seek to make right their wrongs.

Speaking regarding discipline, Carl said on page 98: "Heaven endorses the action we take as long as the procedure is in harmony with the gospel law revealed unto us." But where in either the Old or New Testament were accused men given the privilege of hearing and deciding their own case, as the New Castle elders did? Therefore, according to Carl, heaven does NOT endorse their action in the case of DAS. And yet, Carl wrote

Weed, "I deny the elders acted unjustly, I approve of ALL they did." Why even listen to such a witness?

Carl also says, p. 15: "God's wrath is kindled against his people when they knowingly tolerate sin among them. The only way to set aside that wrath is by getting rid of the sin." Now, you brothers and sisters of the "Justice Jury," don't you NOW KNOW about that sin in the camp? And according to Carl himself where does that put you folks who continue to tolerate sin?

DID THE CHURCH HAVE ANYTHING WHATSOEVER TO DO WITH THE FAKE-EXCLUSION OF DAS?

Read the so-called exclusion of DAS from the File I of New Castle elders. Not one word was said about the congregation having anything to do with it. The church was not asked AT ANY TIME if there were any scriptural reasons why he should not be excluded. IT WAS ENTIRELY A MATTER OF THE ELDERS. In fact, it was whispered around, and the effort was made to keep it from the people; and when they went through with their farce, most of the congregation was shocked. No one had a chance to offer scriptural objections, FOR NO CHANCE WAS GIVEN. This is directly contrary to what Campbell said regarding such matters. Campbell, as quoted by Carl, p. 35 of Carl's book, said, "The whole community (congregation) can act, and ought to act, in receiving and excluding persons." Carl says on p. 138 of his book, "IN EVERY CASE, that it may be the will of the church, it should be asked if there are any SCRIPTURAL objections to the action being taken." But no such question was asked when they went through their fake of excluding DAS.

The New Castle elders said in substance: "Yes, DAS made some charges against us as being partial, but we decided among ourselves there was nothing to his charges, and in turn charged him with falsifying in HIS charges, and we were the judges, prosecutor, and executioner, and we cast

him out of the church, and gave no one a chance to object. Now he is in Satan's territory and can not be dealt with, and we forbid any one to talk with any one regarding the matter but to come only to us elders."

And Carl says, "I deny that the elders acted unjustly, I approve of ALL that they did."

Did the reader ever see such a bundle of contradictions and inconsistencies and tyranny?

And Robert Brumback, of Kansas City, Mo., says he has reviewed the New Castle affair, and endorses its elders one hundred per cent in that work.

"WALKING DISORDERLY"

Carl has written 18 pages on this subject; but though many good things are said, the main point is misapplied. This is the scripture: "Now we command you, brethren, in the name of our Lord Jesus Christ, that ye withdraw yourselves from every brother that walketh disorderly." (2 Thess. 3: 6-15.)

Carl says the words "withdraw from" mean the same as "put away" in 1 Corinthians 5. He and his colleagues are making much of this chapter in their effort to form an ecclesiasticism out of the Church of Christ. So far, their chief effort has been, in making their "clean church," to cast out of the church good men and women both in life and doctrine, yet whose "sin" is that they oppose their new, false doctrines. Zerr says to Carl, "I endorse every argument of yours in the book."

I deny that 2 Thessalonians 3: 6-15 refers to public exclusion, or ex-communication, from the church. It is different from the "putting away" in 1 Corinthians. I affirm that it refers to a private separation from the company of certain people in the church who were bringing reproach on the Cause; yet there was still to be a reproving of them that they might be ashamed and repent, at the same time being members. God seems more merciful than some who seem to think that public

Discipline **RIGHT NOW** is the one thing in our day. Because churches which claim to speak where the Bible speaks have not generally used this before, is no evidence that it is not the Bible meaning—unless indeed we have learned all the truths in the Bible! Let us examine it:

“Brethren,” Verse 6. He is now addressing them in their endearing relation in the Divine Family, and not in their relation to the world under the word, “church”—called out of the world.

“Withdraw yourselves,” Verse 6. Notice he does not use the terms “when ye are gathered together” which he used in 1 Cor. 5: 4, when he was talking of public church exclusion. There is not one idea in the words “withdraw yourselves” which indicate that it was public.

I used to believe that these passages referred to public church exclusion, having received it from the “fathers”; but when I began to think for myself, I changed my mind. I did this many years ago, and tell you why.

The words “withdraw from” and “put away” denote different actions diametrically opposed to each other. When I withdraw from a house, I leave the house standing right where it is, and I do the moving. When I am talking to a man on the street and withdraw from him, I leave him standing where he is, and I do the moving. And when we withdraw from a disorderly man, we leave him where he is, and **WE** do the moving. That is exactly the opposite of the “put away” in 1 Corinthians, for “when we **PUT AWAY** from among ourselves that wicked person,” we continue to stand where we have stood, and in fellowship put **HIM** in motion. That’s what we do in public church exclusion. “In putting away” we act on some one else, but in “withdrawing from” we act on ourselves. In vs. 14 of 2 Thess. 3, we have the same idea as in verse 6—“**have no company with him, that he may be ashamed.**” The meaning of the words, “withdraw from” and “put away” shows that Paul was speaking of two different acts.

“Disorderly,” Verse 6. Some good things are said here, but the question is what to do with the

people. Paul does not say to exclude them publicly from the church but to "have no company with them." The connection shows there were some lazy members among them who would not work but go around as busybodies; and Paul tells them to go to work, and with quietness eat their own bread, and keep out of other people's business. But they are still in the church.

"Have no company with him," Verse 14. That is the same thought as in 1 Cor. 5: 9, 11, referring to the private life. He is still a brother.

"Yet count him not as an enemy, but admonish him as a brother," Verse 15. This shows the strong concern and connection STILL with this brother, in spite of the applied aloofness. This all shows the deep concern which ALL should have for those not living right, so different from the snap-them-out-right-now spirit of some so-called shepherds.

That you may know that this is not the mere opinion of DAS, I refer you to the best scholars in the world, both translators and commentators, and I do not believe that there is a single translator or commentator of note in the world who will say that 2 Thessalonians 3, refers to public church exclusion, or ex-communication. Notice that one commentator says that it is **sort-of** ex-communication, but not the real thing.

On 2 Thess. 3: 6—Moffatt says, "Shun any brother"; and Weymouth says, "stand aloof"; while the Revised Standard Version, which was probably made by 100 of the best scholars in the world, says: "Now we command you, brethren, . . . that you **keep away from** any brother who is living in idleness, and not in accord with the tradition you have received from us." You can't possibly get public church exclusion out of that language.

On the words "have no company with" in 2 Thess. 3: 14,—Moffatt says, "Do not associate with him"; and Weymouth says, "Hold no communication with him." And the Revised Standard Version says: "Have nothing to do with him that he may be ashamed." This verse is an ex-

planation of verse 6, and you can see that there is no intimation of public church exclusion.

BLOOMFIELD in his Greek Testament with Notes, 2 Volumes, says on 2 Thess. 3: 6-15—"He repeats them (injunctions) with greater authority and earnestness, strictly commanding the other Christians to break off all familiar intercourse with such, in order thereby to bring them to shame and repentance . . . Thus it was a sort-of excommunication, such as was in use among the Jews."

ALFORD in his Greek Testament with Notes, 4 large volumes—"To keep yourselves from—obviously WITHOUT allusion AS YET to any formal excommunication, but implying MERELY avoidance in intercourse and fellowship."

JAMIESON, FAUSSET AND BROWN—"Withdraw—some had given up labor as though the Lord's Day was immediately coming. He had enjoined mild measures in 1 Thess. 5: 14, 'warn the unruly,' but now the mischief had been confirmed, he enjoined stricter discipline, namely, withdrawal from their company (compare 1 Cor. 5: 11; 2 John 10, 11): NOT A FORMAL SENTENCE OF EX-COMMUNICATION, such as was subsequently passed on more serious offenders, as in 1 Cor. 5: 5; 1 Tim. 1: 20."

Most of Carl's "Clean Church" (which Zerr endorses), consists of public, formal exclusion, and is founded very much on his misinterpretation of 2 Thess. 3; and we can see how the great BIBLE scholars of the world knock that misinterpretation clear out from under them, showing that God is more merciful toward the weaknesses of his offending children, than the leaders in this Diotrephesian Movement who are using this to help build their ecclesiasticism. It is strange that even if men are honest, they swing from one extreme to another—from little activity to all activity; from the preacher-pastor, to the elder right or wrong; from no discipline, to all discipline; from little regard for church discipline, to regard for it right or wrong; from loose relation of congregations, to bondage of churches to an underground ecclesiasticism.

Though God commands public church exclusion against vicious offenders, yet GOD'S church is merciful as well as just, and he exhibits his mercy in 2 Thess. 3.

CAN ONE WITHDRAW FROM A CONGREGATION?

Carl teaches in Bible classes that "One can not withdraw from a congregation, but the congregation can withdraw from him." In other words, a professed Church of Christ of the New Testament can get you under its control, and you can not withdraw from it no matter how corrupt it becomes! Is not that bondage as bad as the old Jewish law?

But you say one must bring the elders or church to trial before you leave. Well, I brought charges against the NC elders and they brought charges against me in retaliation, evidently. But I had left anyway. Now Carl himself says there are no details regarding church discipline, and he is right about that—but where does it say or intimate that you can not withdraw from a congregation unless you bring charges against it or the leaders? That all comes from the Book of Suppositions. Carl says that we have no right to make new law, and yet he and his colleagues have done that very thing.

There are principles of truth and justice which are to govern us in our carrying out of commands when details are not given. "Cast not your pearls before swine," said Jesus. When elders of churches teach, Obey the elders right or wrong; and, Elders are final authority;—the thing to do is to get out from under such ambitious men, for of course no one could bring charges against them. They destroy all true justice just as Russia does.

We knew we could do nothing with the NC elders and hence made charges against them and withdrew. And following events have proven that we were right. Weed tried to get Zerr to have a fair trial there, and he turned Weed down.

But what can one expect from men who can squelch all charges against themselves, and believe and practice the Romish doctrine, "Opposition to the authority of the elders, is opposition to the Lord," putting it all in the office and not in the scripturalness of things they do in the office? The thing to do is to get out from under them. Paul says an elder must be "just," (Titus 1). Now GOD'S Church is just; but the N.C. Church was **not** just; therefore, it is not God's church!

And those who endorse such men, are they not guilty, too? Something for "just" men to think about. GOD'S Church is just.

Paul says: "Mark them which cause divisions and offenses contrary to the doctrine which you have learned, and avoid them. For they that are such serve not our Lord Jesus Christ, but their own belly [appetites, ambitions], and by good words and fair speeches deceive the hearts of the simple." (Rom. 16: 17, 18.) These evil characters are good talkers, for by good words and fair speeches they deceive simple ones. They create divisions by their maneuvers just as some are dividing churches today because faithful brethren will not submit to obey man rather than God. These deceivers are preachers and elders and others. Anyway they are public men. Paul commands to **avoid them**. If they are leaders of congregations, like Diotrephes, the only way one can avoid them is to withdraw from them and from their congregations. No details are given but the command is to "**avoid them**."

Again, Paul says, "Be ye not unequally yoked together with unbelievers. . . . Wherefore come out from among them, and be ye separate, saith the Lord." (2 Cor. 6: 14 to 7: 1.) Now Paul does not specify, but evidently refers to all evils in or out of the church. It is a general principle. When you can not do anything with evils, you are unequally yoked with them, **so get out**. The language refers to all evils.

In 1 Tim. 6: 3-5, after portraying evil characters in the church Paul said: "**From such withdraw**

thyself." He mentions no details as to how and when, but he shows that it should be done. Elsewhere He commands Timothy to rebuke sin of all shades and grades in the church, and this scripture reveals that when he can do no good, "withdraw thyself." When we find a church like that, or a church with elders who are unscriptural and we find we can do no good, we are not to cast our pearls before swine—we are simply to do what Paul told Timothy to do. It is true as Carl says, there are no details on church government, but in all such work we MUST follow principles of righteousness God has given.

Describing a similar class of people in the church, in 2 Tim. 4, Paul commands in verse 5, "From such turn away."

These men who so confidently affirm that "one can not withdraw from a congregation, but the congregation can withdraw from you," would better give some scriptures which prove that, either specific or generic. Carl says on p. 22, "We cannot legislate, we cannot make laws," but if he has not legislated and made new laws, when he teaches that "One can not withdraw from a congregation, but a congregation can withdraw from him," then I do not understand language at all. Besides, these men don't practice what they preach on that.

CARL'S "RIGHT OF APPEAL"

Carl says on pages 132, 133: "Does he have the right to appeal? In all fairness, he must be granted that. But unto whom can he make his appeal? Shall it be to all and sundry, with charges against the eldership scattered far and wide, to those who have no jurisdiction in the case, and can never have, except as they become busybodies in the affairs of other churches? This is ridiculous to contemplate by men who are sober-minded. Such a thing would create anarchy [Wouldn't submission to unjust decisions create anarchy?—DAS], for how would it be possible for those two thousand miles away to judge in a case

in which they have no judicial right to sit? Let the excluded make his appeal to those who are members of the congregation where he was excluded, and there alone! And let that appeal be merely that they call for an unbiased review of the decision of the elders by competent persons who can judge without partiality!"

Carl starts out as if he were going to give very just privileges to the accused in HIS "right of appeal," but when you sum it up what have you? The accused can appeal to the elders only, to call "for an unbiased review of the decisions of the elders." But suppose the elders refuse, then what?

Carl's opinion, for it is only his opinion without any word of God, sounds nice, but will not work with unjust elders. When elders believe and say they are final authority, they can and have said, "NOOOOO." Weed and others tried such an appeal as Carl suggests, and Zerr says, "NO." So Carl's wonderful "right of appeal" is a misnomer and amounts to exactly ZEROOOOOOOOOO, so far as Justice is concerned. In courts of law, when a man has a right of appeal, it means that if he can show that injustice or unfairness has been perpetrated, he has the right for a new hearing, AND OBTAINS IT. But there is no such appeal in the New Castle program of injustice. They decide it all for themselves, for "opposition to the authority of the elders is opposition to the Lord," But GOD'S Church is Just.

In the quotation above, Carl says, "It is sinful and wicked to deliberately attempt to get churches throughout the land to override the scriptural discipline of elders unto whom one has been subject." Now, Carl misstates the very thing in dispute—that the discipline was "scriptural,"—and thereby he tries to influence people "throughout the land" FOR unscriptural and unsavory work of certain elders. Does he not help scatter injustice and corruption among the churches? But GOD'S Church is Just.

Carl says MUCH against what he considers the wrong way of dealing with "disorderly" or Dio-

trephesian elders, but where does he show the reader HOW to do it? And thus does he not leave the church entirely in the hands of elders of the Diotrephesian type? Especially is not this evident when one considers that Zerr and Carl together (by admitting the article in his paper), tried to destroy Peter's command against elders "who lord it over God's heritage?"

In our book, Church of Christ, written 35 years ago, we pled seven times on pages 159 to 172, for an "impartial," "fair," "unprejudiced," trial, or hearing, for elders; and we plead now just as strong for an "unprejudiced," "fair," and "impartial" trial, or hearing, for those who are not elders. **BUT IT HAS NOT BEEN GIVEN.**

And the most astounding thing to me, and one which has come nearer knocking me off my feet than anything which has come up in the Church of Christ in my life, has been the advocacy, endorsement, and tolerance, of the injustice, deception and tyranny of certain elders and preachers, by those who have professed to be intelligent faithful members of "the only true Church of Christ."

The man or woman who teaches and endorses the doctrine, "Opposition to the authority of the elders is opposition to the Lord," which with its setting means nothing less than, "Obey the elders right or wrong,"—I say, such a man or woman, does not have, in my estimation, the first conception of the religion of Jesus Christ, that **JUST ONE—the ONLY ONE** we are to serve. All the teaching against false doctrines which have been made through decades means nothing at all. This, I repeat, is the astounding thing to me.

The only way I can explain this utter indifference in members is by reading this scripture: "Among the chief rulers also many believed on him; but because of the Pharisees they did not confess him **LEST THEY SHOULD BE PUT OUT OF THE SYNAGOGUE: FOR THEY LOVED THE PRAISE OF MEN MORE THAN THE PRAISE OF GOD.**" (John 12:42, 43.)

WHAT DO "OBEY" AND "SUBMIT TO" MEAN?

Carl is writing strongly for strict obedience to elders in all things. But what does the word "obey" mean? (Send a stamp for papers discussing these words in the Greek.) Context and circumstances and other scriptures must decide largely the meaning of these words **and all other words.**

Paul in Titus 3: 1 says, "Obey magistrates," but did that mean that Christians were to obey magistrates right or wrong? Suppose they commanded Christians to burn incense to the image of the emperor, should they obey him? No, for "we ought to obey God rather than men." So with elders.

In Ephesians 5: 21-24 Paul says, "Wives, submit yourselves unto your own husbands . . . in everything." Now were they to submit if their husbands commanded them to adopt the same religion as themselves though wrong? You say, NO, of course. So with elders.

The words above must be studied in the light of the whole Testament.

Peter tells us plainly as to the kind of rule elders are to exercise over members, "**Neither as being lords over God's heritage, but being examples [examples] to the flock.**" (1 Peter 5: 3-7.) In an article in the Missouri Mission Messenger a year or two ago, which was printed without condemnation or criticism, Zerr tried to get the meaning of this scripture out of the Bible, but I see it is still there! The scholarship of the world leaves it practically as it is. (For a full print of his article and our review of it, send a stamp to the writer, and decide for yourself.)

Peter also says in 1 Pet. 5: 5: "**ALL of you be subject one to another,**" which would mean that elders, evangelists, deacons, be subject to other members, and the other members to them, except of course when there was teaching contrary to God's Word. Language is not exact like mathematics—we must study all the connections of

words. Some one has said that words are like people—they are known by the company they keep. But in all teaching by leaders, we must remember—GOD'S Church is just. And any teaching which is not just is not from God's Church.

Carl says MUCH against members disobeying elders, but how much does he say against elders' disobeying God in such commands as not to "lord over God's heritage?"

OH "OFFICIALLY"—WHAT SINS ARE COMMITTED IN THY NAME!

On page 136 Carl says: "The discipline of a church which has always been regarded as faithful to Christ must be recognized by every other congregation and individual, until that church has been positively and **OFFICIALLY** proven to be apostate and unworthy. This cannot be done by the circulation of prejudiced and biased accounts by the subject of discipline."

Now if Carl had used the word "scripturally" instead of "officially," he would have had more of a Bible position; but he has not done so. However, he should have added this: "This cannot be done by the circulation of prejudiced and false accounts by the perpetrators of unscriptural discipline."

Now let us notice the word "officially": Standard dictionary—"By the proper officer; formally or properly; as an official."

Now Carl has admitted there are little or no details regarding many things in discipline. In fact, there are very few details in any case, but every Bible student knows that the details of the general teaching must be carried out in harmony with justice, mercy, faith and humility. Now what does Carl mean by the word "officially" since the Lord has not given any details as to "officers" who are to sit in judgment and decide what churches are "apostate and unworthy?" If he means churches generally are to "officially" decide they are "unworthy or apostate," then you have a super-organization with "officers" un-

known to the New Testament "officially" deciding the matter. If he means that the congregation accused alone has the power to decide "officially" whether it will consent to a trial, then you have the monstrous doctrine that elders are unimpeachable, for they would not decide against themselves. The only way that a congregation can "positively and officially be proven to be apostate and unworthy," is for each local congregation to decide **FOR ITSELF ALONE** whether that discipline was scriptural or not; and even then it is only the opinion of the leaders of that congregation, unless it is taken up with the whole group. **Every church must decide for itself, and not one church for another.**

The religious world is filled with deeds done "officially" but not "scripturally." The ancient prophets were "officially" condemned and persecuted and even killed. The Jews acted "officially" when they threw Paul into prison, and sent him off to Rome. Jesus was "officially" condemned to die. The Roman Church through the ages has been "officially" burning people at the stake as heretics. Anathemas have been hurled at reformers "officially" through all the Christian ages. But who are "officers?" The ones Carl refers to are not mentioned nor hinted at in the New Testament. But even of elders, to carry on the work of God, it was elders of Israel who ought to have known better, who stoned prophets, persecuted Paul, killed Jesus; and unscriptural elders, bishops, are still at their work.

Carl puts it all in the **OFFICE**, and "**OFFICIALLY**," and **NOT** in the **SCRIPTURALNESS** of the work done in that office. This places him exactly with the Episcopal and Roman systems of domination instead of the apostolic. Is it not astonishing that any man in the Church of Christ which has always stood so strongly against such dictatorships should be so blind? Is it not true that there is an effort among them to build some such system that they can, and are, manipulating with underground strings?

There are a few great principles which God has given to guide his people in all ages. "Do justly, love mercy, and walk humbly with thy God." "We ought to obey God rather than men." "Weightier matters of the law, judgment [justice] mercy and faith; these ought ye to have done, and not to leave the others undone." **GOD'S Church is JUST.**

How much has Carl said about elders' acting justly, mercifully and humbly. Has he spoken once in his book about elders' acting "humbly?" The trend of nearly the whole book is "officially" and its co-relatives in thought. He has said little or nothing about the tender care a shepherd should have for the sheep, and about the life of the shepherd. How much has he said about such in his paper? Has it not been nearly altogether Activity, "Mission Work," Organization, etc.? He should have a chapter in his book on "Lording over God's heritage," but there has been no such chapter, nor very little said about the very thing which has caused more trouble than anything else in the church through the ages, and which has been the cause of the present trouble. And if he can indoctrinate the humble leaders of the churches with the spirit of domination which he is fostering, we shall indeed have an ecclesiasticism; in fact, almost have it now. And if the preachers who are running over the country and preaching and preaching on Church Discipline would preach rather on the Humility Peter commands when he says, "ALL of you be subject one to another," and the rest of the connection, there would be an apostolic church; but no, it's organization with them, and submission to elders, right or wrong. By tolerating or fostering such vicious error, such preachers themselves are binding themselves hand and foot, as we said in the SUPPOSE article, and if they do not bow down and worship in everything the men controlling the ecclesiasticism, they themselves will be cast into the furnace of fire. The great principle which should guide us in all this should be, "We ought to obey God rather than men."

Note that Peter was spokesman for **ALL** of the inspired Apostles when he said, "We ought to obey God rather than men" (Acts 5:29).

These leaders talk glibly about making "clean churches" by excluding the worldly members, and they cast them out for dancing, going to picture shows, and playing cards. But here in the leadership is injustice, deception, tyranny, garblings of men's writings, and wresting of scriptures which are against them, such as "lording over God's heritage"—and they endorse these corruptions which are doing and have done through the ages a hundred times more harm to God's "Clean Church" than these worldly things. What inconsistency! You can't have a clean brook with springs where cattle stomp around, and you can't have a "clean church" where unconverted leaders move about.

Carl has repeatedly said that everyone in the church is subject to discipline. But has he told us how to get rid of a lording elder? His "Studies in Discipline" are they not nearly altogether against the members not the leaders?

TO BE SCRIPTURAL, MUST A LITTLE GROUP BE UNDER AN EVANGELIST?

When the apostles and others went out and preached, they gathered the disciples together and looked after them, and when men became qualified in the course of time they were appointed as elders and deacons. It is probably well for a good sized group of disciples to have an evangelist over them till they are developed, at least to have some one to whom they can appeal in case of differences among themselves. Inasmuch as deacons (so-called) were appointed before un-inspired elders (see Acts 5), it might be well to appoint such at first, inasmuch as it is much easier to find men qualified for the deaconship than for the eldership. And these can appeal to an evangelist in case of differences among the brethren, if an evangelist has been agreed on.

But the doctrine that a group is not scriptural unless it has an evangelist over it, is another one

of the details which God has not legislated on, yet which man has, and has tried to enforce his new law. To put a young, inexperienced man, barely out of his teens, over a congregation, doing almost the work of elders (old men), simply because he calls himself an evangelist, is ridiculous. Christ said, "Where two or three are gathered together in my name there am I in the midst of them." These new legislators in Christ's kingdom would add to that, There am I in the midst, if they have an evangelist over them. Let's leave it as Christ left it. When the early disciples were scattered and went everywhere preaching the word to make converts, were evangelists appointed over each one of the groups which they may have gathered together? If large numbers came together, that might be all right, but hundreds of small groups of faithful brethren through the ages have met and kept the ordinances of the Lord's house and had no organization nor evangelist over them, because they were humble enough to live in peace among themselves and none were trying to rule their brethren. Is not this new doctrine an effort of some preachers to gain control over churches by having their friends appointed over the groups so that through flattery, manipulation and intimidation they can rule them all? Something to think about.

WHEN IS A CHURCH FAITHFUL?

Carl speaks of "a church which has always been regarded as faithful." That after all is a pretty vague statement. By whom shall it be regarded as "faithful?" Maybe those who so regard it are not so faithful themselves. That is much like the word "Christian." Only God knows who are faithful—the Lord knoweth them that are his.

Carl has brought up the Woman Question in his paper, and is now giving more liberty to women in public work than ever before. Now were his churches faithful before or after they received this liberty? And are the other churches of the brotherhood unfaithful who have not yet attained unto the same standard?

Carl has discussed Open and Close Communion in his paper. I really don't know of churches among us who practice "Open Communion." I have always taught that it is for believers only who have been born again, and so mention it publicly; yet if some may partake who have not been born again in the full N. T. way, I do not feel that we should create a scene by taking it from them. I have been told by one who knew, that there is now one church in Indiana which has an usher stand at the door and seat the people, putting the immersed on one side of the house and the unimmersed on the other side! I don't know whether they would separate a man and his wife, if he was not a member, or not? It seems to me they are starting a little early to separate the sheep from the goats, and besides, is not that the Lord's business?

Now this is the question, When were the churches faithful, before or after they took up with their idea of "Close Communion" in this extreme form?

Now the NC church a few months ago excluded an old woman from the church because in her second marriage she married a member of the Christian Church—not in the Lord, they said! And yet that same church has done nothing to a number of people in it who in their second marriages, have married those not members of "the Church of Christ." One man, a relative of Zerr, in his second marriage took a Methodist woman who is still a Methodist, and they even gave him papers to go out and preach. Now when was that church faithful—before or after this new practice? And if it is "faithful" now, then are not the other churches who are not "in step" with it "out of order," and hence unfaithful? Will not Shasteen have to revise his list of "faithful churches," and have on it only one name—New Castle!!! Something to think about—the terrible mess some of these leaders are getting the churches into!

Now will some one please cite a faithful church in its entirety? I can't do it. Churches are like individuals—none of them are perfect. It is an

ideal. This local church grouping, anyway, is only temporal, and will not go beyond the grave. The Church of God consists of all the faithful wherever they may be. We are not saved as churches but as individuals, and that is what we should be specially interested in. There will be no bishops and deacons as such, in heaven. We shall simply be faithful Christians, if indeed we are. Of course, bishops will have to answer for the way they have done their work, just as an evangelist will have to do for his. "Every one must give account of himself to God." Running through all this we must remember—GOD'S Church is Just.

CAN UNJUST ELDERS SCRIPTURALLY FORBID MEMBERS FROM THINKING FOR THEMSELVES?

To ask such a question is really to answer it, to right thinking people. Of course, dictators in all ages have tried to control all the information which went to the people. Hitler, Mussolini, and Stalin have done just that thing. But you would not suppose that liberty loving people, and especially leaders in churches which are supposed to teach Justice, would wish to draw "an Iron Curtain" around their flocks, to keep out information. But one is astonished. An elder in St. Louis told his members to bring to the elders the literature which had been sent them against these new doctrines. We don't know whether they burned it or not, as they did the works of "heretics" in the Dark Ages! Anyway, it shows that they did not want their members to investigate for themselves.

In their fake exclusion of DAS, the New Castle elders kept it from the people, till they went through their farce of throwing him out of the church, as they supposed; they gave no member a chance to protest such high-handed and dictatorial method of doing things, and then immediately added: "Since this pertains to the congregation as a whole, it is now stated that each member be

ADMONISHED [warned] NOT TO DISCUSS THE MATTER WITH ANY ONE BUT THE ELDERS. If any member wishes information pertaining to the case [the congregation had received not one whit up to this time] the elders will furnish same on request."

Now reader, get their File I, which those elders put out themselves, and read that for yourself, and you will imagine you are living in Europe in the Dark Ages when the word of the Pope was the word of God. The elders, bishops, are to be the **SOLE** source of information to the members. They are not even to talk with other members about the matter! The elders are to do the entire thinking for them, and members will come under censure if they do talk about this among themselves.

And when they sent out their File I, they left out the most important letter—the one containing their threat to DAS. In view of their effort to keep people from being informed, what do you decide concerning that?

Now, brothers and sisters, of the great "Justice Jury" of God ("every one must give account") does not that make such a church trial a source of ignorance rather than of information and truth? Is there a particle of fairness and justice in such procedure? YOU must decide.

And Carl says, "I deny that the elders acted unjustly, I approve of ALL that they did." How contradictory to some things in his book! What will the church come to, guided by such men? What a terrible mess they have already gotten us into! But GOD'S Church is Just, and guided by full information and TRUTH.

And Robert Brumback, too, says he endorses all this.

CAN ELDERS ANSWER FOR MEMBERS?

When Zerr cast the Achors out of the church, much as did Diotrephes of old, he demanded that if you could not produce a "specific scripture" against what he was doing, you were wrong; and

he thereby lined himself up with the sectarians and digressives. They say, where is the specific scripture which says not to baptize a baby? Where does it specifically condemn instrumental music in the worship? Where does it specifically say not to have societies? And so on and on. And Zerr says, where is the "specific scripture" which says not to do what we are doing in casting these people out of the church on the charge of insisting on bringing witnesses.

And at the same time he tried to show that members are to be obedient to the elders, and if the elders are not right the members will not have to answer to God for what is done. Here are his words in their File II, page 5, of Zerr's speech:

"Unless you can point out a SPECIFIC SCRIPTURE to prove that it is NOT a matter of advice, unless you can do that, if you YIELD TO THE AUTHORITY of those who are supposed to be in control, ALL THE RESULTS WILL BE BETWEEN THE ELDERS AND GOD, AND YOU WILL NOT BE RESPONSIBLE FOR ANY RESULTS."

And Brumback and Ketcherside say, "Amen."

Now if members can turn one matter entirely over to the elders and they will not be responsible even though it is wrong, then they can turn ALL matters over to the elders, and follow them right or wrong, and they will be saved anyway! In other words, let the Church of Christ jump onto the wagon of the Roman hierarchy. We might do that if it were not for the Word of God, especially such scriptures as these: "If the blind lead the blind, BOTH shall fall into the ditch,"—NOT simply the blind leaders. Again, "We ought to obey God rather than men."

"THIS TROUBLE SHOULD HAVE BEEN KEPT AT NEW CASTLE"

Carl declaims against scattering things abroad. Yet who started it over the brotherhood. The N. C. elders sent out notices of their fake exclusion over the brotherhood, and sent out their two

files of letters. What for? Were they not trying to force every church in line with THEIR discipline whether right or wrong? Did they not try to intimidate many churches by telling them that they could not get any preachers, and intimidate many preachers by saying that they could not get any place to preach—unless they lined up with THEM? They are the ones then that spread this through the brotherhood, and tried to back their Diotrephesian work by authority they usurped from the Lord.

So when brethren try to defend themselves before the brotherhood they are simply doing that which every man has a right to expect from honest people—to be heard. Carl says, "Let the truth be known," but the New Castle elders tried hard to keep their members and the whole brotherhood from learning the whole truth. We are anxious to have all read both sides. If the NC elders had done their work, and let it go at that, probably the matter would not have spread as it has; but they tried to whip every other church in line with their unscriptural farce, and their new doctrines, Obey the elders right or wrong; and, Heed discipline of a sister church, right or wrong. Since "every one" must answer for HIMSELF, he should not take the word nor dictums of some one else in matters pertaining to eternity.

In building up their ecclesiasticism, they are creating divisions. We know what they did at New Castle. In California one of their satellites threw an old brother and sister out of the church on trumped up charges, people who have largely been the means of starting three churches; the real reason was that they refused to endorse the heresy, Obey the elders right or wrong. They denied all the charges against them, but the elder threw them out anyway according to rules from St. Louis and New Castle. At Brookfield, Mo., Carl and C. R. Turner tried to break into the business meeting of the church, till the chairman finally told Carl to sit down. He was trying to whip that church in line with their heresies. In Unionville, Mo., R. H. Brumback helped the elder

cast seven people out of the church, the real cause being that they opposed the heresies of NC, and the elder and preacher divided it; and twenty others went out, and now 27 are meeting three times a week in a hall in that city. There are other places where they have done their Diotrephesian work. And they will divide other places unless faithful brethren rise up and keep them and their satellites out of their churches. "Mark them which cause divisions and offenses contrary to the doctrine you have learned, and AVOID THEM."

BISHOP DIOTREPHES—3 JOHN

1. Diotrephes must have been bishop there.
2. He loved to have the pre-eminence, and disrupted the church to hold it.
3. John wrote Diotrephes, or some one there, about visiting the church, but Diot "receiveth us not."
4. "Neither doth he (Diot) receive the brethren," evidently evangelists like John; and "forbiddeth them that would" to receive them.
5. He "casteth them out of the church," merely because they endorsed faithful evangelists.
6. John did not tell Gaius, to whom he wrote the letter, to instruct the "cast out" ones to "appeal their case" back to Diot, for re-consideration, or for a trial by unprejudiced parties, for he knew that Jesus said, "Cast not your pearls before swine."
7. John did not instruct Gaius that since he was in good standing, he should bring charges against Diotrephes, for he knew that one can do nothing with an ambitious specimen like Diot.
8. John did not write the "cast out" ones to make it right with their home congregation before they went anywhere else; for he put justice before formality, and took their part.
9. Nor did John write to adjoining congregations that since they are "sister congregations" they must recognize the discipline of Diot and his subjugated congregation, right or wrong, till he is "officially" rejected by churches in general.

10. Diotrephes was unjust, and John himself had recorded the words of Jesus in John 5: 30—**“My judgment is just;”** and he knew Paul had written that an elder must be **“just”** (Titus 1); and that he himself had said, **We ought to obey God rather than men,”** (Acts 5: 29).

11. Therefore, John, a faithful preacher on the outside of that congregation threw his influence with the **“cast out”** ones, just as we should do today under similar circumstances. John put pure Christianity above mere churchanity. It is tolerance of INjustice in civil or religious courts which brings contempt for all law, and NOT the intolerance of it.

"SIN IN THE CAMP"

(By A. T. KERR, Elder, Brookport, Ill.)

There have always been problems, there will always be. The attitude that problems and troubles, and things that are alarming, ought to be ignored, is not only absurd, it is unscriptural. I find that Paul told Timothy to preach the word; he said **“Be urgent in season, out of season; reprove, rebuke, exhort with all long suffering and doctrine.”** There are some people who don't seem to know or care what the Lord says; they seem to make a law to suit them and follow that course regardless of it being pleasing to the Lord or not. We care very deeply about keeping the Church what it was when the Lord designed and built it. When some development arises that modifies or changes the faith, or alters the church, it is alarming to some of us and we don't like it; and we are not going to stay quiet and allow subversive influences to gain headway unopposed, some compromisers to the contrary notwithstanding. Paul told elders of a local church, **“Take heed to yourselves and to all the flock,”** because **“from among your own selves shall men arise speaking perverse things,”** **“to draw away disciples after them.”** Paul called them wolves, and in another connection he called them dogs. To

use language like that now would give some men in religion creeping paralysis. They consider it very unchristian, but we find these warnings in the New Testament. One of the saddest things in my life is to see preachers trying to devour and bite the hands of one who has fought all his life for the purity of the Church. Brethren is there "Sin in the preachers' camp?"—A. T. Kerr.

FROM AN OLD, ANXIOUS PREACHER

My Dear Brethren in Christ:

It is with a sad heart I write these lines. My heart, mind and soul have been so worried over the confusion in the brotherhood that my rest and sleep is greatly disturbed. With respect to all and malice toward none, to be fair and just in our decisions, we must revert back to the beginning of this matter and weigh every move and action by the word of God. And this I have honestly tried to do.

From the study of the documents from both sides of the questions involved, I have learned that D.A.S. reproved and rebuked things that were wrong, and many, even elders, took exceptions to it. (I thought it a good article—J.D.P.) Bro. Carl K. manifested a fine Christian spirit in his letter to D.A.S. and that should have settled the matter. But it seems he catered to someone, and reversed his attitude overnight in regard to the matter. I think, Bro. Carl, you made a sad mistake. And when the N. C. elders, tried to get D.A.S. to stop his reprovng and rebuking, they then showed their colors. And further actions and writings of these men, some at least, prove their unjustness. I have their own documents that show, or speak, for themselves. I want the brotherhood to know, I do not endorse such unjustness. No sir, I would not endorse my Bro. D. A. Sommer in such actions.—J. D. POWERS, Stockton, Calif.

H. L. CARLTON, EVANGELIST, SPEAKS HIS SENTIMENT

"Now I beseech you, brethren, mark them which cause divisions and offences contrary to the doctrine which ye have learned; and avoid them." Rom. 16:17. "Now we command you, brethren, in the name of our Lord Jesus Christ, that ye withdraw yourselves from every brother that walketh disorderly, and not after the traditions which he received of us." II Thes. 3:6.

If the scriptures condemn any one, that one is condemned even though no action has been taken by the church. If the scriptures do not condemn a person, he is not condemned even though the church has taken action in a Diotrephesian manner. Otherwise there is no authority in the Church of Christ as set forth in the New Testament for concerted action against any member of the body, except when it is found that such an one has disobeyed Christ or is in rebellion to the law of Christ,—walked disorderly. Neither is there any authority for disturbing the peace and harmony of any individual through unfairness, deceit and injustice by lording elders.

The theme should always be to show where the one to be excluded from fellowship has walked disorderly, disobeyed Christ, transgressed the law of Christ, and not where he has been insubordinate to elders. Have we forgotten how to compare spiritual things with spiritual? It is sad indeed to note how easy some are led astray at this point at the present time, simply by good words and fair speeches.

Some are led to believe that opposition to elders is opposition to the Lord. There is not the slightest doubt in my mind, but what many will lose their souls eternally because they will not exercise their senses by reason of use to discern both good and evil in this present brotherhood division. It seems almost incredible to think that any fair minded brother or sister who has been grounded in the faith, by a few years at least, could be influenced to give place to such damnable heresies

as is being advocated and practiced at this present time, concerning the elders and their cowardly action against some who oppose their unscriptural action and procedure. It is the spirit of the Catholic church, and not the spirit of Christ.—
H. L. CARLTON, Vienna, Ill.

G. R. BLANKINSHIP, LEADER BROOKFIELD, MO., SPEAKS

To God's People Everywhere—

In 2 Peter 1-3, this apostle writes: "But there were false prophets also among the people, even as there shall be false teachers among you, who privily shall bring in damnable heresies; and many shall follow their pernicious (destructive) ways, and through covetousness shall they with feigned (deceptive) words make merchandise of you."

Realizing this to be true today as any time in the past, the question is asked, What shall we do about it? The apostle John writes, "Beloved, believe not every spirit, but try the spirits whether they are of God; because many false prophets are gone out into the world." 1 John 4: 1. The Savior says, "Beware of false prophets which come to you in sheep's clothing, but inwardly they are ravening wolves." Matt. 7:15, 16.

When evangelists think more of "their influence" being hurt than they do of their own written statements and the truth, as Carl K. did—what can we expect? And he and C. R. Turner tried to "sow discord" in the business meeting here, trying to protect and defend the unscriptural work of the New Castle elders. And to think many will fellowship such divisive work!

In Acts 20: 30, Paul in addressing the Ephesian elders said, "Also of your own selves shall men arise, speaking perverse things to draw away disciples after them. Therefore WATCH."

I'm quite sure we have a few elders today who are in that class. Should they be obeyed? The command of men is, Even though they are causing divisions and offenses contrary to the doc-

trine of Christ, we should obey them. Paul says, Avoid them; Carl K. says he endorses them. And no wonder—did they not protect HIM? Can we not see how this uncurbed influence has spread over the brotherhood working confusion and division?

John says, "If there come any unto you and bring not this doctrine, receive him not into your house, neither bid him Godspeed, for he that biddeth him Godspeed is partaker of his evil deeds." 2 John 10, 11.

The Lord through this same writer commands his people to come out of her, "that ye be not partakers of her sins, and that ye receive not of her plagues." Rev. 18: 4.

I am certain the need is as great today for the faithful to declare themselves against this digressive movement, as it was at Sand Creek, Ill., against the old digressives, and at Kansas City against the Rough Draft. "Wherefore, come out from among them, and be ye separate, saith the Lord, and I will receive you." 2 Cor. 6: 17. Submitted in defense of the truth. (Signed) G. R. Blankinship.

J. A. COLLINS, EVANGELIST, WRITES AT REQUEST OF UNIONVILLE, MO., CHURCH

Worthington, Mo., February, 1949

Dear Bro. Sommer:

After the elders at New Castle, Ind., had attempted to "cast you out," they sent some of the brethren at Unionville a copy of their proceedings. Some of the brethren sent the mentioned elders the following letter in reply:

"Unionville, Mo., April, 1947, Elders of the Church of Christ, New Castle, Ind.: Dear sirs and Brethren.—The statement of the proceedings and the correspondence pertaining to the article printed in the October issue of the 'Macedonian Call,' titled 'Suppose,' which you mailed to me, and the contents noted.

"We will say in reply, we believe that when an honest-hearted, sincere member of the church of

Christ sees anything coming up that would be harmful to the cause of our Saviour, he should use every effort to overcome its influence. We believe Bro. Sommer to be such an one. We also believe he was wholly within his rights as a Christian, and that it was his duty as an evangelist and editor of the M. C. (a paper accepted by the brotherhood) to warn of any impending evil which he saw coming upon the church. Anything less than that, in our opinion, would be a gross neglect of Christian duty.

"As to Bro. Carl Ketcherside, the letter which he wrote to Bro. Sommer, showed him to be a sincere, whole hearted Christian, a man worthy to be accepted as a brother, as a Christian and as a true servant of his Lord and Master. If Bro. Sommer was referring to Bro. Carl in his article 'Suppose,' then Carl, by the letter which he wrote to Bro. Sommer, acknowledged it and accepted the criticism. That by every right of justice and fairness, should have settled the matter.

"As to the elders of the churches in the St. Louis area, we believe them to be nothing more nor less than meddlers in things not concerning them.

"As to you, the Elders at New Castle, we believe that you have done Brother and Sister Sommer a very grievous wrong, and that you owe them an apology. This apology should be not only to them, but should be made publicly that the whole brotherhood might know. Brother D. A. Sommer stood by the Gospel in fighting the 'Rought Draft,' and almost alone; and by that fight, saved the church from being almost destroyed. We believe that he was right then, and we believe that he is right now, in fighting this evil mentioned in the article 'Suppose.' We expect to back him with our prayers, and help him in every way we can that is scriptural. Yours for the faith."

This letter was signed by seven brethren and mailed to the elders at New Castle.

I might say in passing that W. R. Clark said of the St. Louis elders that they were worse than meddlers, they were trouble makers.

The above letter along with the New Castle affair led to some discussion of these things among the brethren, and there was some difference of opinion between some of the brethren and Bro. Clark, until Bro. Clark asked Bro. Asa Hall to try to form some basis upon which they could all agree and settle the discussions. So on July 7, 1947, Bro. Hall submitted the following:

"Unionville, Mo., July 7, 1947.—We the members of the Church of Jesus Christ, worshipping at Unionville, Mo., have agreed among ourselves, to drop the trouble that originated at New Castle, Indiana.

"We are going to drop it to the extent that we will not debate the question as to who is right and who is wrong. It originated in New Castle, Indiana, and we believe that is where it will have to be settled, not in Unionville, Mo.

"If we have done anything during these discussions that is not becoming to a Christian and offended any person or persons, we ask them and God to forgive us.

"We believe this resolution and this acknowledgement will correct any errors made prior to this date concerning the New Castle trouble.

"We are further resolved to go on from here and do more for the cause in the future than we ever have in the past."

Bro. Clark and the entire congregation agreed to this. You will note they were to drop this matter and not discuss it any more. Bro. Clark was the first to break that agreement. He did not confine his discussion of it to Unionville, but talked it to members of different congregations: East Concord, Martinstown, Lemons, Milan, etc. Thus if there was any discord being sown, he was the man sowing it. You will further note that the source of disagreement was the trouble at New Castle and not the letter which was sent to the elders at New Castle.

The autumn of 1948 saw the end of the "three year plan." Robert Brumback was the last preacher there under that plan. He began a meeting October 24, 1948. The meeting closed on

November 2. On that day the following charges were given to seven of the leading brethren:

"Unionville, Mo., Nov. 1st, 1948.—Dear Bro. (name): You are hereby charged with a disorderly walk. 2 Thess. 3:16; I Tim. 6:3-5. The specific charge is sowing discord—Rom. 16:16; Prov. 6:19, thereby creating strife and schism in the congregation of the Church of Christ at Unionville, Mo. W. R. Clark, Elder of the Church of Christ, Unionville, Mo."

These charges were based on the letter written to the elders at New Castle, Ind., date of April, 1947, and were presented to seven brethren, three of whom never had been visited or admonished, namely, W. R. Tade, S. J. Richardson and Isaac Fowler. Notice that letter was dated April, 1947. Then on July 7 there was a written agreement to drop everything prior to this date. Yet Clark went back of that date to April to find something to base his charges on, **AND THUS BECAME A COVENANT BREAKER.**

But to show you that this was not the real reason for withdrawal, I call your attention to this. Bro. Ora Robinson asked Bro. Brumback what chance the accused would have, or what assurance they would have of fair treatment if they attended the trial, Nov. 3rd. Brumback replied, "You brethren are condemned already. When you went to Brookfield (Bro. Sommer was at Brookfield) against the wishes of your elder you were guilty of sowing discord." But they based the charges on the letter mailed to the elders at New Castle, evidently because Bro. Brumback had been forced to admit the brethren had a right to hear Bro. Sommer's side of the trouble at New Castle, thus forcing him into the contradictory position of saying that doing what one has right to do is sowing discord, or it is wrong to do right.

I further call your attention to the fact that W. R. Clark brought the charges, sat in judgment on them and pronounced sentence against the brethren without a single witness except himself, thus violating Christ's instructions in Matt. 18:16. No wonder Brumback said, "You are already con-

demned." The whole thing was a farce from beginning to end.

Also let me call your attention to the fact that Bro. Fred Fowler signed the letter sent to the New Castle elders before he placed his membership at Unionville, but afterward when he offered himself for membership Bro. Clark accepted him into the congregation. Evidently using that letter as an excuse to get rid of these brethren—had not, at that time, occurred to Clark. * * *

The brethren are now meeting in Unionville with the seven that were cast out and twenty others that went with them. They meet in Bixler Hall, on the west side of the square, under the leadership of L. E. Hodges and Ora Robinson. They meet three times a week.

If Bro. Clark ever exercised discipline on a disorderly member I never knew of it. He just wouldn't do it. These men were not walking disorderly. They were not accused of teaching or practicing heresy, nor were they accused of any immorality. All they were charged with was writing a letter to the elders at New Castle, Ind. Not all that was cast out signed that. They have my unqualified endorsement.

Yours for truth and righteousness,—J. A. Collins, Worthington, Mo.

This letter was shown to brethren at Unionville and approved by them.—J. A. C.

Remarks by D. A. S.

I have known Bro. Clark almost forty years, and he has always been opposed to public church discipline—thought it would do harm to the church. About four years ago I had a long talk with him and he was of the same opinion. He was afraid to do anything he thought put the church in an unfavorable light before the world.

I know that some of these men had charges against the elder, but when asked why they did not bring them said, "We are afraid that if we did, it would kill the old brother." They had some mercy which God commands, which this Diotresphesian Movement does not manifest.

A reporter says that when Robert H. Brumback was there holding a meeting, Clark, Brumback and others made trips to Ottumwa, Ia., where Carl Ketcherside was. Then they came back and immediately excluded seven brethren from the church, and surely did the very thing the elder was opposed to all his life, and brought division and disgrace to the Church which will not be overcome in decades. There must have been terrific pressure brought to bear on him to cause him thus to go contrary to his nature and principles, and disgrace the Cause as he has done. Is it possible that the St. Louis-New Castle politico-religious machine, with apparently a branch office in Kansas City, had anything to do with it? Let the reader decide for himself.

C. D. McCAY (LONG-TIME LOCAL PREACHER)

(Des Moines, 1210—46th, Iowa)

The present dissension among the Churches of Christ seems to have been brought about by the desire of certain ones to have the pre-eminence among the followers of Christ.

This is evident when we consider all the happenings in the brotherhood since the publisher of the M. C. wrote a certain article (known as the SUPPOSE article) which condemned some things that were happening at that time. There was no way of knowing to whom the article referred unless someone knew of the person or persons who were guilty of such supposed statements or acts. But the friends of W. C. Ketcherside, being cognizant of many of the statements and doings of W. C. K., proved by their own sayings and actions that he was the one in mind.

Then began action to try and justify W. C. K. in his actions and teachings, and to discredit D. A. S. for daring to rebuke the one to whom they were looking for leadership. To accomplish their evil design, the N. C. elders were brought into the picture, and E. M. Zerr, as the apostle of their

defection from the truth, began to try to bring D. A. S. under the control of the little papacy.

Maybe you think it is not like the Papacy, but we believe we can prove that it is like the Papacy of Rome. E. M. Zerr said that, "Opposition to the authority of the elders is opposition to the Lord." If this be so, it follows that the authority of the elders is equal to the authority of the Lord.

Again he says: Obey the elders and if they are wrong you will not be responsible for any results. But regardless of what E. M. Z. says: The word of God says, that we shall be judged according to our works; also that the soul that sinneth it shall die; and that does not exclude any sin that man may commit on account of obedience to the elder who might be wrong.

The Pope of Rome claims infallibility, and when he sets forth rules and regulations for the church and its members those rules are binding as are the commands of God. And E. M. Z. sets forth, that when the elders command the members of the church, opposition to those commands is opposition to the Lord. Is not this exactly the claim of the Pope? It is a little papacy they are trying to build.

By their false teaching they are dividing congregations. They do not accuse those cast out of being false teachers or as being immoral, but "sowing discord" is the general terms, and that is supported by such facts as: You asked some one to subscribe for the S. C.; or, You are upholding the teachings of its publisher. I am glad there is one, at least, that has courage to call attention to these fallacies and to declare all the counsel of God, and glad that others will support him in that work.

There is no one in their opinion who has a right, after studying the word of God, to draw their own conclusion therefrom, unless their conclusions agree with their opinions. "If you do not agree with me, you are wrong," seems to be their slogan. What conceit! To think that they are the only ones who are able to understand the word of God.

But the way of the Lord for salvation is so plain that a wayfaring man though a fool shall not err therein. I would much rather be a fool determined to do the will of the Lord than to be so "wise in my own conceits."—C. D. McCay.

"SOWING DISCORD"

(By Fred D. Weed, Bethel, R., Conn.)
(Deacon, Church at Bridgeport, Conn.)

The subject of this article is found in Prov. 6:19. The book of Proverbs together with the books of Ecclesiastes and the Song of Solomon were written by that wisest of all kings, Solomon, the son of David.

When Solomon was anointed king of Israel to succeed his father David, God appeared to him in a dream and said, "Ask what shall I give thee." Solomon replied that he was but a child and did not know how to govern God's people Israel, that he needed wisdom and an understanding heart that he might be able to discern between good and bad. This answer pleased the Lord that Solomon had asked for this thing, and God said to him, "Because thou hast asked this thing, and hast not asked for thyself long life; neither hast asked riches for thyself, nor hast asked the life of thine enemies; but hast asked for thyself understanding to discern judgment; Behold, I have done according to thy words: too, I have given thee a wise and understanding heart; so that there was none like thee before, neither shall any arise after thee like unto thee. And I have also given thee that which thou hast not asked, both riches and honour: so that there shall not be any among the kings like unto thee all thy days. And if thou wilt walk in all my ways, to keep my statutes and my commandments as thy father David did walk, then I will lengthen thy days." 1 Kings 3: 5-14.

The three books of Solomon mentioned above are a collection of observation, conclusions and wise sayings of this king of Israel upon whom God bestowed this great gift of wisdom. While these observations and sayings of Solomon are a

valuable guide for personal conduct, they are never referred to as the law or commandments of the Lord, neither are they authorized as a basis of discipline.

Referring to the sowing of discord which we are studying, Solomon in the four verses of Prov. 6: 16-19 makes a statement of six things, and adds another making seven, which he says that the Lord hates, and that are an abomination unto him; namely, a proud look, a lying tongue, and hands that shed innocent blood, an heart that deviseth wicked imaginations, feet that be swift in running to mischief, a false witness that speaketh lies, and he that soweth discord among brethren. If those who are making so much ado over "sowing discord" would heed the other six things that the Lord hates, there would be less discord among brethren in the Church of Christ today.

Let us study this subject of sowing discord and reason it through in order to understand just what it means. The dictionary says that discord is the want of concord or harmony between persons or things, as applied to persons, difference of opinions, oppositions, contentions, strifes, disputes, etc. Hence "sowing discord" is the spreading of a difference of opinion, having contentions, or having disputes. In the light of this definition, let us select a few illustrations. In the Old Testament we find many examples of the sowing of discord. Moses was "sowing discord" when he was contending with Pharaoh.

Samuel sowed discord or strife when he anointed David king while Saul was still king of Israel.

The prophets sowed discord when they reproved the various kings for their evil practices.

Elijah rebuked Ahab and Jezebel for leading the people in the worship of Baal and Elijah caused so much discord that they sought to take him and kill him.

There are any number of examples of sowing discord in the Old Testament which space does not permit to be mentioned, so let us turn to the New Testament.

John the Baptist sowed discord when he rebuked Herod and brought down the wrath of Herod and his wife upon him, so that they beheaded him.

Jesus sowed discord in that he contended with the Jews and finally drove some of them out of the temple with a whip.

The apostles sowed discord in preaching Jesus and the gospel.

Jesus said that I came not to bring peace on earth but a sword (or discord), son against father, daughter against mother, etc., Matt. 10: 34.

Paul was continually stirring up discord nearly everywhere he went. He disputed daily in the school of one Tyrannus for two years. And in Ephesus because of Paul's teaching, there was created an uproar that lasted for two hours.

These are a few of the many examples of sowing or creating discord as recorded in the Bible, and yet in no instance was anyone rebuked, or reproved for doing it.

But you may say that the persons in these examples were striving to turn the people to the keeping of God's law and commandments in the Old Testament, and in the New were preaching Christ and the Gospel, and by so doing met with God's approval and had his support. That is very true.

According to Cruden's concordance the word discord occurs but twice in the whole Bible. Once in this verse Prov. 6: 19, and again in the 14th verse of the same chapter. In these verses 12 to 15 Solomon describes the conduct of a wicked man, and sums it up by saying "he soweth discord." This is evidently the kind of discord referred to in verse 19, and is the kind that the Lord hates; while the kind of discord indicated in these examples meets with God's approval.

Now let us come down to modern times. Anyone who goes into a community where the denominations are in control, and preaches the pure gospel is sowing discord in that community. Also anyone who goes into a community where the Christian Church, so called is, and opposes and

exposes the unscripturalness of their innovations is sowing discord there. Likewise, one who goes into the territory where the Bible College is, and preaches against it, is sowing discord among those brethren.

How many preachers in the Church of Christ can say that they are innocent of sowing discord?

There is a certain preacher who was affiliated with those who supported the Bible College, but he became convinced that those who taught that doctrine were wrong and began to preach his conviction to his brethren in that congregation with the result that they excluded him from that congregation. Yet those who are excluding brethren from the Church of Christ on the charge that they are "sowing discord," gave this man a royal welcome into their ranks. It is a true saying that it makes a big difference which foot the shoe is on.

Again you may say that in all of these instances these men were exposing and opposing erroneous doctrine, which is true.

Now the question is, What is it then that is creating the discord wherein the spreading of information regarding it, is causing certain brethren to be charged with the sowing of discord, and are being excluded from the fellowship of the Church of Christ?

There is a doctrine being taught by certain elders that Heb. 13:17 requires implicit obedience to the elders in every whim that they may demand; that you must obey the elders, and if the elders are wrong, you will not be held responsible, which is the direct opposite of what Paul taught in that he said, "that everyone of us shall give account of himself to God," Rom. 14:12.

These same elders are exercising arbitrary authority under their teaching of Heb. 13: 17 and excluding members without a fair and just trial, denying them even the right to speak in their own defense.

Also, they are teaching the centralizing of the control of the Churches in the hands of one man, something that is not heard of in the New Testament.

Too, it is being taught that a group of disciples without elders must be organized with an evangelist in charge in order to be scriptural, another doctrine unknown in the New Testament. They use Titus 1: 5 for authority, "Set in order the things that are wanting and ordain elders in every city as I appointed thee." In that Paul gave Titus this appointment, it is evident that it was elders that were wanting, it is also evident that there were men there who were qualified. There is nothing in this verse implying that a congregation without elders must have an evangelist over them. To say that there is, is straining the scripture and is a false doctrine.

Paul is very explicit in giving the qualifications of men for elders, yet these men, who are thus usurping so much authority, are taking young men, mere boys, who have none of these qualifications, giving them the title of "evangelist" and placing them over a congregation as "evangelist in charge, or oversight," with all of the responsibility, power, and authority given to elders,—one man, whereas Paul speaks of elders in the plural. Is this scriptural?

It is such unscriptural doctrine and practice that is creating discord in the Church of Christ today.

Who is it that is sowing this discord?

An old question here comes to mind, "who splits the log, the one who drives the wedge, or those who oppose it?" In this case, the false doctrine and practices mentioned above,—is the wedge that is dividing the church, and therefore those who are teaching and advocating this false doctrine are the ones who are "sowing discord," and not those who are resisting it and who are exposing and opposing these false teachers. These teachers are the ones who should be excluded as false teachers, not the ones who are upholding the purity of the church as revealed by Christ and the Apostles.

I have recently been reading the account of the dealings between Ahab, Jezebel, and Elijah as found in 1 Kings chapters 17 and 18, and the situation existing at that time is so similar to that ex-

isting in the church today that it seems worthy of notice. It is not to be assumed that the modern Ahab and Jezebel are exact duplicates of those of old or either that the modern Elijah is inspired by God, but we are here pointing out characteristics which are similar in both these ancient and modern characters.

King Ahab sinned and was rebuked by Elijah; Ahab gathers together his officers and captains and sought for Elijah to kill him, but God took care of him and he was not found.

Modern Ahab did wrong and was rebuked by modern Elijah. Modern Ahab had a conscience stricken moment, and wrote Elijah a penitent letter, promising to support him in his work more than ever; but after conferring with his officers, Ahab was convinced that modern Elijah was "undermining his influence," and he repented of that letter, and gathered together his officers, with Jezebel and her officers, and sought Elijah to slay him (spiritually), but Elijah was not to be found.

Not finding Elijah, the officers of modern Ahab and Jezebel sent word to Elijah that they would drop the matter; but they did not, as they continued to look for an opportunity to make a charge against him in order to dispose of him. By creating an incident Jezebel caused Elijah to withdraw from their company and then he expelled him from the congregation. And Ahab says, "I approve and endorse all that Jezebel has done."

When King Ahab finally met Elijah, he said, "Art thou he that troubleth Israel?" Elijah answered, "I have not troubled Israel; but thou and thy father's house in that ye have forsaken the commandments of the Lord." 1 Kings 18: 17, 18.

Like Ahab of old, modern Ahab accuses modern Elijah with troubling the church, when it is Ahab who is troubling the church, in that he has forsaken the teaching of Christ.

The prophets of the Lord (those who stand firm for the purity of the church) rallied to the support of this modern Elijah in his fight for truth

and righteousness, and it seems that there are still seven thousand who have not bowed the knee to Baal.

Modern Ahab and Jezebel now gather together all of the prophets of Baal (those who accept the false doctrine of these leaders and endorse their unjust works) and raise a persecution against the prophets of the Lord, and with the help of these prophets of Baal exclude every one whom they can get hold of, by charging them with sowing discord in that they are spreading information to their brethren regarding this modern Ahab, Jezebel, and the prophets of Baal.

"Nevertheless the foundation of God standeth sure, having this seal, The Lord knoweth them that are his. And, Let every one that nameth the name of Christ depart from iniquity," 2 Tim. 2: 19. "Yea, and all that will live godly in Christ Jesus shall suffer persecution." 2 Tim. 3: 12.

Jesus said, "Blessed are ye, when men shall revile you, and persecute you, and shall say all manner of evil against you falsely, for my sake. Rejoice and be exceeding glad: for great is your reward in heaven: for so persecuted they the prophets which were before you." Matt. 5: 11, 12.

"To him that overcometh will I grant to sit with me in my throne, even as I also overcame, and am set down with my Father in this throne." Rev. 3:21.—FRED D. WEED.

TO MAKE "A CLEAN CHURCH" CARL STARTED AT THE WRONG END

Then he only went halfway. He started with the members and barely touched the leadership, when he should have started with the leadership and worked down to the members. **To purify a stream you must make the source pure.**

Moses was the inspired leader of Israel, and when Aaron and Miriam raised a rebellion against him, they were condemned of God. Korah, Dathan and Abiram and 250 other princes raised a rebellion against inspired Moses, but God told

Moses and the rest of the children of Israel to get away from them; and then God opened the earth and swallowed these three men and their immediate families, and sent a fire and destroyed the 250 princes (Num. 16).

All of these people were leaders in Israel, "famous in the congregation, men of renown," and would correspond to elders and preachers in spiritual Israel. When preachers and elders become ambitious for power and talk continually about authority and grasp for it, they occupy the place of Korah and his company. The word "in-subordination" is not in the Bible, nor is the idea in the N. T. in the sense such men use it today. Nor is the word "rebellion" connected with members and elders. And the word "obey" in the Greek shows that it is not to be obtained in the authoritative way, but by persuasion and by being "examples to the flock." And when such men practice injustice, deception, tyranny, to gain power, and even try to change the word of God which forbids "lording over God's heritage"—or put it "domineering over those in your charge" (Revised Standard Version), if you please—then the same condemnation applies to them that applied to Korah and his company.

Inspired Moses told the Israelites to "Depart, I pray you, from the tents of these wicked men, and touch nothing of theirs, lest ye be consumed in all their sins." So God today, when like ambitious men rebel against **GOD'S** word, commands us to "Depart from the tents (congregations which endorse such) of these wicked men, lest ye be consumed in all their sins." From such turn away," "From such withdraw thyself," "Come out from among them," "Come out of her, my people."

If Korah and his company had followed the word of God through inspired Moses, then the people were duty-bound to obey them; but when they left the inspired teaching through Moses, the people were to "depart from their tents." So today. If bishops obey the inspired Word, we are to follow them. I brought this out clearly in the

Guide Through Bible History, written 35 years ago, but I always said we are to obey **SCRIPTURAL** elders, and I never left that word out; when they are **NOT** scriptural and we see we can do nothing, we are to get away from their tents.

One strange thing is—that Korah and his company were punished by God because they **REJECTED** the word of God, while certain ones were cast out of the church at New Castle by its elders because **THEY OBEYED THE WORD OF GOD**, rather than elders who had rejected it.

Carl and his co-workers love to tell the story of Korah, but when one gets into it, the lesson destroys their practice. If Carl would start at the top in trying to portray "a clean church," he would come nearer doing it the Bible way. You must begin at the fountain to make the stream clean. Korah and the other leaders rejected the inspiration from God, and were punished; and when leaders today reject the justice, mercy, humility, which inspiration teaches, are they not in the same boat with Korah?

Though in ancient times the people of Israel were pretty bad, if they had had the right leaders conditions would have been different; and the same is true today. "Woe unto the pastors (elders are pastors, shepherds), that destroy and scatter the sheep of my pasture, saith the Lord." (Jer. 23:1—read the whole connection.) God got rid of those pastors in the Babylonian captivity, and gave the people new pastors who would indeed feed the flock. God's plan was to start at the leaders, and work down to the people, but Carl tries to make a clean church, by starting with the people and saying very little in proportion about purifying the leaders.

Again God showed that the leaders were the ones to blame: "A wonderful and horrible thing is committed in the land. The prophets prophesy falsely, and the priests bear rule by **THEIR** means; and my people love to have it so; and what will ye do in the end thereof." (Jer. 5:30, 31.) The priests were bearing rule by **THEIR**

means, not God's. In other words, they were usurping authority which did not belong to them, and the people were so indifferent that they did not lift a finger against it, and the "end thereof" was that they all were killed or taken into captivity. So some are unblushingly reproducing the same today. Some elders (only a few, but they are scattering their rebellion against God's justice), are "bearing rule by THEIR means"—usurping authority and are lording over God's heritage. Why does not Carl start with such leaders instead of upholding them, and endorsing their sins? To have a clean church, begin at the fountain.

God tells us plainly why the church today is having the trouble it is. Listen closely—"Thus saith the Lord; Cursed be the man that trusteth in man; and maketh flesh his arm [crowds, oratory, big stuff], and whose heart departeth from the Lord." (Jer. 17:5.)

Micah writes, 3:5: "Thus saith the Lord concerning the prophets that make my people err." Here again, God shows that it is the leaders that lead the people away from a clean Israel, and the same is true under the gospel. To have a clean church you must start with the leaders, and not omit them as has been done.

Carl devotes eighteen pages to "Walking Disorderly," and nearly altogether it applies to the members and not to the leaders. That's like a doctor treating the symptoms and not the cause of the uncleanness.

This is not my mere opinion, for in the booklet entitled, "The Bible and the Church. A Report of Addresses, given at a Bible School, Hindley, from Saturday, June 1st, to Thursday, June 13th, 1946," in Britain,—Bro. F. C. Day, in his speech, headed, "The Church of Christ—Its Government," says: "Nearly all the evils in the Church have risen from bishops **DESIRING POWER** more than **LIGHT**. They want authority, not outlook. Whereas their real office is not to rule; though it may be vigorously to exhort and rebuke; it is the king's business to rule; the bishop's office is to

oversee the flock; to number it, sheep by sheep; to be ready always to give full account." (We wish we could give the whole essay, but if you will send a few cents in stamps, we will send the whole book as long as they last.) Now if "nearly all the evils in the Church have arisen from Bishops desiring power more than light," it surely is evident Carl has gone backwards in trying to show how to have a "clean church." Instead of rebuking evil in certain bishops he has endorsed it. **What a pity!**

Paul said to the Ephesian elders, "Take heed unto YOURSELVES, and to all the flock." (Acts 20:28.) Carl quotes this on pages 56, 57 of his book and dwells on the Elders taking heed to the flock, but he does not describe the Elders taking heed to **their own** conduct, attitude, justice, humility. How can shepherds scripturally and successfully look after the flock when they need to be looked after themselves? **Carl should have written pages on that.**

Inspiration says that an elder shall be "not self-willed." In our "Guide Through Bible History," p. 45, we said thirty-five years ago: "The elders should gather up the sentiment of the brethren as to what is best for the church to do in matters where the Lord has not given the details, and in this way the church rules through them." Thus elders would not be self-willed. But a modern elder says in his speech, when like Diotrephes, he cast a man and wife out of the church, "Why does the Lord have elders if they must first find out what the people would have them do and ask their advice and follow that; then it is the elders that are being ruled by the church and not the church ruled by the elders, and that would be reversing the Lord's plan." (New Castle, File II.)

He utterly ignores Peter's command, "Neither as lords over God's heritage" (I Peter 5:3), and even tries to kick it out of the Bible. If you don't believe that, send a stamp to me for his full words. Can you wonder that an elder with such self-will has divided the church? **He has the spirit of a dictator not of a shepherd—he is a**

"lord" contrary to Peter. Inasmuch as all church history shows that such spirit has been the cause of denominationalism and papalism and most of the other troubles in the church, why did not that writer start to clean the church by cleaning the fountain springs? Does he not have the cart before the horse?

Paul says that an elder should be "sober," which means, "of sound mind; prudent; 'having the mind, desires, passions moderated and well regulated'." He also says an elder should be "grave," which means "dignified." Likewise that he should be "of good behavior." When an elder goes among brethren and privately pulls off one-man comedies, with a lot of foolishness, and almost indecency, so that giddy young members say he is "the life of the party"—is he scriptural? And when a preacher delivers baccalaureate sermons and engages in so much funny stuff, that a youth who is not a member says, when asked how he liked it—"Oh, all right; he didn't do anything but tell funny stories,"—where is the dignity, the gravity, the Lord commands? If the church has a frivolous leadership, what can one expect from the members? Paul said to Timothy to be "an example of the believers in word," but is such a preacher an example when he constantly engages in foolish talking and jesting, which Paul condemns?

Paul commands that bishops shall be "just," but when they are not fair and just, but decide their own cases and try to cast people out of the church who bring charges against them—can you have a "clean church" by endorsing such men? Has anything in detail been said against injustice in the book we are reviewing, though that is the connecting trait which holds society together?

When Peter says, "Neither as being lords . . . BUT being ensamples to the flock," he shows that the way for the elders to lead and rule is by example and not by **AUTHORITY**. He verifies this by writing immediately, "Yea, **ALL** of you be subject one to another, and be clothed with humility." "All" includes the elders, as well as

the members—the elders are to be subject to the members in everything that is in harmony with the Word of God, as well as the members be subject to the elders. How do you harmonize Peter with the elder who ridicules the idea of the elders asking members what is best to be done—in other words, he refuses to take advice from members? And then here are under them young elders eighteen months old as elders, talking glibly about their authority and insubordination and rebellion to them; and some other elders four months old, trying to crush an evangelist of fifty years service for the Lord because he rebukes certain ones they adore.

No wonder, that when Carl practically ignores all condemnation of unscriptural elders, Zerr writes his commendation of his book thus in MM for February: "Having read carefully your book, I wish to make this unsolicited statement. I endorse every argument of yours in the book, also the application of the scriptures cited. It is written in plain, understandable language, kindly yet pointed. In view of the wave of INSUBORDINATION now sweeping over the country, it is the most timely volume produced by the faithful brotherhood in several decades." This writer has expressed himself in his New Castle Files I and II, and there he uses the word "insubordination" entirely of members to the elders. So he interpreted the book to be a great remedy for such insubordination to elders, and not of elders to God. Carl's book is lopsided toward Romanism—obey bishops right or wrong.

About three years ago, Bro. Walter Crosthwaite, an old preacher of England, and editor of "Scripture Standard," wrote me this:

"My 56 years' experience of 'Churches of Christ' has convinced me that the eldership is the weak spot in our movement. Very few churches have a really efficient eldership. I have known churches that have got on well under what they called an 'Oversight Committee,' and yet when they appointed the same men as elders, trouble began. IS THERE SOMETHING ABOUT THE NAME

AND OFFICE OF ELDER THAT CAUSES MEN TO IMITATE DIOTREPHES?"

Bro. Crosthwaite does not say that the members are the weak spot in the church, but "the eldership is the weak spot in our movement." Crosthwaite is right, and Carl's book if taken seriously will surely build a new Romanish clergy. Carl has done practically nothing to strengthen the **CHARACTER** of elders, but the trend of the book is to strengthen the **AUTHORITY** of elders even when unscriptural, and practically to make that authority absolute.

If Carl has said one word against Diotrepheses in the church, I do not remember it, though I have read the book carefully, and many parts several times. Carl's "Clean Church" with elders who lack humility, justice, mercy, gravity, faith (about which Carl has said practically nothing in his book as respects elders), is like a watch with a broken mainspring. Justice, fairness (which really includes love), are the only powers which will successfully hold members of groups together, and without them society will not tick.

He may build a "church" with big crowds, oratory, funny stuff, new houses, exciting mass meetings, etc., but if it lacks gravity, fairness, humility, mercy, justice, it is simply a beautiful house built upon the sand and spiritually will soon be swept away.

GOD'S Church is JUST. "He that is UNjust, let him be UNjust still"—forever.

"Nearly all the evils of the church have arisen from bishops desiring **POWER**, more than **LIGHT**."—F. C. Day.

A SUMMARY OF THE FALSE DOCTRINES OF THE DIOTREPHESIANS

All of the teachings presented in this article are taught or practiced, or both; or endorsed or connived at,—by the leaders of this new, unscriptural, Diotrephesian, Papal Movement. We remind you of them:

1. It is scriptural for elders to try to squelch scriptural reproving and rebuking in evangelists outside their congregation, even though the rebuking is done in an impersonal way.

2. It is scriptural for an evangelist to work with and commend publicly, a singer who is immoral.

The Diotrephesian Movement has exalted talent above character, in several cases; while Paul says, "Follow . . . holiness, without which no man shall see the Lord" (Heb. 12:14).

3. It is scriptural to have a three-year Plan with churches, in which the churches look to **one man** to furnish preachers, singers, developers, Bible teachers, etc., thus developing an ecclesiasticism.

4. It is unscriptural to withdraw from a congregation without first bringing charges against the elders, even though one sees he can do nothing.

5. It is scriptural for elders to try to exclude a man who has withdrawn his membership, no charges being against him.

6. It is scriptural for elders to receive charges against themselves, decide themselves that they are not guilty, and then in turn bring charges against the accuser.

7. It is true gospel doctrine, Obey the elders right or wrong.

8. A church must recognize the discipline of a sister church, right or wrong.

9. It is scriptural for one to garble another man's writings, giving only what favors himself and jumping over what is against himself, yet indicating in no way that he has omitted such language, as was done with Campbell's writings.

10. It is scriptural to cast people out of the church merely for bringing witnesses with them to a meeting with elders, denying them the right to say a word to the congregation when cast out, or denying any hearing before unbiased judges.

11. It is scriptural to go through the fake of casting a man out of the church without asking the congregation whether there were any scrip-

tural objections, as was done by the N. C. elders in the case of a preacher.

12. It is scriptural to do such work as 11, and then forbid the members to talk it among themselves, and command them to come only to the elders for information.

13. It is a scriptural doctrine, that if the members will obey the elders right or wrong, the members need not worry for they will not have to answer to God for following elders when they are wrong.

14. It is scriptural to try to wrest out of the Scriptures, Peter's condemnation of lording elders—"Neither as being lords over God's heritage, but being ensamples to the flock." (1 Pet. 5: 3-7.)

15. These Diotrephesians have excluded many persons; and not one has been excluded because he had bad life or bad doctrine, but because he insisted on good life and good doctrine in elders as well as other members.

And now, **JUSTICE JURY**, these are some of the dangerous, false doctrines now being advocated and practised by this Diotrephesian Movement. Is it not **CHURCHANITY** instead of **CHRISTIANITY**? If you are opposed to these doctrines, we beseech you before you are bound entirely hand and foot that you show your faith by your works, and stand up and oppose these false doctrines and the preachers who are putting that yoke upon your necks. They may cast you out of the synagogues, but they can not cast you out of heaven.

"If there come any unto you, and bring not this doctrine [true doctrine] **RECEIVE HIM NOT.**" (2 John 10, 11.)

"Mark them which cause divisions and offenses contrary to the doctrine ye have learned [from the apostles], **AND AVOID THEM.**" (Romans 16: 17, 18.)

"EVERY ONE of us shall give account of HIMSELF to GOD." (Rom. 14:12.)

GOD'S Church is Just, and he that is UNjust does not belong to it, nor can he be with it in

eternity, for "He that is UNjust, let him be UNjust STILL"—forever.

NOTE

We have tried hard in this booklet to present everything exactly according to the truth. If any one whose name is mentioned here thinks we have misrepresented him and he will write out his complaint, and sign his name to it, we shall certainly consider it with care; and if we have been in error, we shall be glad to correct it. We do not claim perfection, but we have always earnestly tried to do the right. When we stumbled down the aisle with tears and confessed our faith in Christ, we meant it with our whole heart; and have tried to serve Him faithfully through these 55 years, seeking to overcome our imperfections. And we have tried also to protect His truth from ambitious and designing men with their good words and fair speeches. Oftentimes the way has been dark, very dark, and we did not understand, but light came through after a while. Some may be dismayed at confusion among Christians, but Paul warned long ago that heresies must arise that they who are approved may be made manifest among us, and I believe he is doing that very thing now. Even Jesus said that false Christs would arise and if possible would deceive the very elect. To help you to see, we have put out this booklet.

Really, friends, to have "a clean church," we must go back to the original source of all uncleanness—the corrupt heart of man. That is why we changed the name of the paper to "SPIRITUAL CALL," to cleanse the heart of man so far as we are able. So, in order that every one of you can help in making "a clean church" in God's way, of getting at the heart, we are giving you the opportunity of sending the paper a year to TEN of your friends who do not now take the paper, in or out of the church, for only \$5.00. This makes clear, clean reading matter equal to a book of nearly 200 pages, to each person, for only fifty cents

each. We try to cover every phase of the Christian life, but especially the "weightier matters of the law—justice, mercy, and faith." Can we all be "workers together with God" in this great effort?

There are things in this booklet which many brethren should read, and we hope you will loan your copy, or send to us for other copies, as many as you need.—D. A. Sommer, 918 Congress Ave., Indianapolis 23, Ind.