Logans

"But these are written, that ye mig believe that Jesus is the Christ the Son or God, and that terieving ye tn;ght have lie 4hrough his name (John 20:3))

IT IS WRITTEN



THIS PAPER IS DEDICATED TOTHE PROMOTION OF UNDENOMINATIONAL NEW TESTAMENT CHRISTIANITY

Volume I **FEBRUARY, 1956** Number 4

"TWO KINDS OF RIGHTEOUSNESS"

By W. H. Francis

"Brethren, my heart's desire and prayer for Israel is, that they might be saved. For I bear them, record that they have a zeal of God, but not according to knowledge. For they being ignorant of **God's righteousness,** and going about to establish **their own righteousness,** have not submitted themselves unto the **righteousness of God**" (Rom. 10;1-3). "In the way of righteousness is life; and in the pathway thereof there is no death" (Prov. 12:28).

From the above scriptures we learn that there are two distinct and separate kinds of righteousness, namely "**God's righteousness**" and "**man's righteousness.**" In the latter scripture (Prov. 12;28) Solomon clearly states that there is "**life**" (spiritual) in the pathway of God's righteousness. Then it is certain that no spiritual life is in the "**righteousness of man**" and that such righteousness is contrary to what Paul calls "**God's righteousness,**" in Rom. 10:3. **We** may safely conclude, therefore, that these two are opposite, the one to the other. Since God's righteousness only will lead us to life, it is sure that the other kind (man's) will lead to the other state or condition, **spiritual death. We** learn that it is not by man's righteousness that lost people have life (are saved), but rather by the execution and renewing of the Holy Spirit" in Titus 3:5.

Great Bible scholars are agreed that this passage can mean nothing else than the obeying of God's commands in being born again by the alien sinner, completed by being immersed in water for the forgiveness of sins, into the one body or church. It is true then that alien sinners can only receive life by doing the righteousness (God's) that Job ascribes to his maker (Job 36:3). Since the question is asked by inspiration, "Can two walk together, except they be agreed?" (Amos 3:3). this agreement surely could not be reached by following two entirely different ways, each having different authors. David says, "He that hath clean hands, and a pure heart shall receive righteousness from the God of his salvation" (Ps. 24:4,5). Then we must conclude that the kind of **righteousness** which lost souls are saved by comes not from any man-made way or ways of righteousness or system of commands.

Now let us learn clearly just what God's righteousness is so none may be misled in **an effort to** walk this way and reach life. For **a** true Bible definition let us go to an inspired writer: "My tongue shall speak of thy

(Continued on page 45)

2dttortat

WHO SHOULD TEACH?

By L. R. Pamplin

There have been many articles written on "teaching" in the past, articles that have dealt with methods of teaching, the places where teaching should be done, who should be taught, etc. It is my purpose in this article to call attention to the men who should teach in the public worship assemblies and the men who should not. In our efforts to shun the unscriptural one-man ministry, I wonder if we have not gone to the other extreme in elders, leaders, and congregations indiscriminately permitting any man (so long as he is "loyal") to preach (?) and teach (?) whether he has the ability or biblical knowledge to do so or not. I place a question mark after preach and teach, because there is some question in my mind as to whether that is what really is taking place when some enter the pulpit. Is it not a well known fact that in order to impart knowledge to people one must first have the knowledge himself? And is it not also well known that in order to teach people it is necessary to know something which they do not? It is an impossibility to teach people that two plus two equal four if they are already in possession of such knowledge.

We must remember that one most outstanding reason for the "assembling of ourselves together" is to teach and edify. In churches of Christ preaching and teaching have always taken the most prominent part of the service in our worship to God even though we teach and emphasize that the disciples met "together on the first day of the week to break bread." The Bible places a great deal of importance on teaching. People must be taught the will of God in order to know what to do to obey His precepts. Jesus said, "It is written in the prophets, and they shall be all taught of God. Every man therefore that hath heard, and hath learned of the Father, cometh unto me" (John 6:45). He commissioned His disciples to teach (Matt. 28:18,19). and they obeyed Him (Rom. 10:18).

Realizing the importance of teaching, should not the gospel publicly be taught in a clear, understandable and forthright manner by a man who has studied the word of life and is able to present it to his listeners in such a way as to be helpful, profitable and above all, edifying to them? It is the duty of all Christians to teach whenever the chance arises, on the highway, at work or play, in the grove, etc. Any place that is fit for a Christian to be is the place to teach the word of God. But is it the duty of every Christion man to publicly teach the word? I answer emphatically, no! On the contrary, it is the duty of those who are not well enough versed in "word and doctrine" and who are just not public speakers to use the talents that God has given them in some other work in His kingdom besides the public teaching of the word. Those who are not big enough Christians to take a

IT IS WRITTEN
Published monthly at Santa Ana, California
L. R. PAMPLIN ---------- Editor
E. L. PAMPLIN ---------- Business Manager
Subscription, free. This paper is supported by freewill donations.
Each writer is responsible for his article only.
Send all communications and material to 1711 Bush Street, Santa Ana, Calif.
All matters intended for publication should reach the office of the editor not later than the 15th of the month for publidation in the succeeding issue.

seat and let their brothers do the public teaching, who may be abler in this respect, are doing the cause of Christ more harm than good whether they realize it or not.

There are many of our brethren who have a good knowledge of the Scriptures but realize that God has not given them the necessary talents to preach effectively in public, and therefore they make no attempt to do so. They realize that they can better serve the Lord in capacities where they are able. My hat goes off to such thinking brethren. I admire them.

But how shall brethren be trained in public preaching if they have no chance to develop their talents in the public assemblies? i answer—assemblies should be provided and promoted by the church to train all brethren who would like to learn to teach the word from the pulpit. The La Habra, California, congregation a year or so ago inaugurated a Friday evening meetmg which was specifically designed to develop the talents of the younger brethren. Assemblies such as this are those which should be used for training purposes. I hardly think that the Lord's day morning service, where many times there are visitors and outsiders present, should be used to train brethren to preach. The teachings of the Bible should unhesitatingly be put before people in a straightforward, understandable manner especially at this service.

The apostle James taught concerning public teachers and realized that men should think carefully before they attempt to teach, for he wrote to Christians, "Be not many teachers, my brethren, knowing that we shall receive heavier judgment" (Jas. 3:1 A.S.V.).

A great responsibility rests upon the public teacher of the oracles of God. He is speaking for the Infiinite, and should fully realize this to the extent that if he hasn't the ability to **teach,** he should have enough respect for God and His church to not attempt to do so for fear of casting shame upon the Lord and His word. A man who stands up before a congregation of fifty people is taking up a total of twenty-five hours of their time if he talks for thirty minutes. Unless one can **give** these people something from the word of God for their time, he should humbly sit down and permit someone who can.

The apostle Paul wrote to the Corinthian brethren to "Let all things be done unto **edifying" (1** Cor. 14:26). Why? Hear Paul as he answers: "For God is not the author of confusion . . (1 Cor. 14:33). I believe that Paul was including the public teaching program and all that it includes in these statements.-1711 Bush St., Santa Ana, Calif.

PROOF AND FACTS CONCERNING THE CHURCH OF CHRIST AND WHO BUILT IT

By R. C. Clements

There have been many writers on this subject, and many that have never made the proof—but that is no reason that it can't be made—that Christ built this church. Hundreds of years have passed and gone, millions of people have died and passed on not knowing if the church of Christ was ever built. False teachers who have taught falsehoods day after day and year after year have come and gone. Many good, honest people have been deceived by them, and many more will follow their pernicious ways and be led far from the truth as it is laid down in God's word.

The question comes to us, why will good and honest folks be so easily deceived when they have God's word right in front of them to read and study for themselves? We have prophesies from the days of the early prophets telling us of the church, the place of its establishment, and the exact place of its beginning. We also have prophecies almost telling us the exact date

of its beginning, telling us exactly where the first gospel sermon would be preached and even telling us that repentance and remission of our sins which was to be preached would be preached in Jerusalem (Lk. 24:47).

The house of God was to be built in Jerusalem (Isa. 2:1-4), the word or the gospel was to go forth from Jerusalem (Isa. 2:3), and God added people to the church for the first time at Jerusalem (Acts 2:47) ; then why will people doubt the word of God and not accept what it has said? Why not all of us submit to God's will and just be Christians, not Baptists, Methodists, Mormons, Catholics, Holy Rollers, Nazarenes. Assemblies of God, etc.? There are many more so-called churches (with which God has never had one thing to do) that are claiming that they have salvation in them, and not one of them can substantiate the fact that they can come in or closer than 100 years of the date that Christ built His church. Many of them don't date back more than twenty or thirty years, and they make the claim from the pulpit that God is with them. That they feel it within themselves. Yes, all of them are making the claim that the church which they are members of is just as good as the one that Christ built, but friends, if that be true, the one that Christ built is pretty rotten. The foundation of hundreds is tumbling down, and the big churches that man has built are consuming their fruits.

We hear a great deal of talk of the works of these big churches today, accomplishing much for their members, to be sure, but what are they good for? God's word tells us that every plant that our heavenly Father hath not planted shall be rooted up and cast into the fire and burned (Matt. 15:13; Jno. 15:6). Friends, are you one of those plants, or are you the one that Christ planted? You had better make sure as you can. Take God's word which is the measuring rod and the standard by which to go, and compare your life to it. Nothing else will do. It matters but little what Bro.. Jones, Smith, some priest, Jehovah's Witness, or anyone else may tell you. Unless he can read it from God's word, just brand him as a fake until he makes the proof. The way is so plain that a wayfaring man, though a fool, need not err therein (Isa. 35:8). And a fool says within his heart, there is no God (Ps. 14:1). Are you a focl? No one wants to be a fool, but I fear that there are many that are becoming fools today because of many, many false doctrines that are being taught all over the world today. Dear reader, don't listen to me nor any other man's doctrines, but listen to what the word of God tells you.—Box 731, Broken Bow, Okla.

CATHOLICISM UNMASKED!

By Maurice C. Link

Introduction

Behind a mask of saintliness lurks the greatest abomination of the ages. In Rev. 17:5, John wrote of the future abomination that was to be loosed upon the world through the greed and godless conceit of men. "And upon her forehead a name written, MYSTERY, BABYLON THE GREAT, THE MOTHER OF THE HARLOTS AND THE ABOMINATIONS OF THE EARTH." In the first verse of the same chapter the Romish church is described as the "great harlot that sitteth upon many waters." In 2 Thess., the second chapter, Paul writes of the future Popish tyranny and warns that all those who succumb to the blandishments of this chief servant of Satan shall "perish, because they received not the love of the truth, that they might be saved."

People seem to have forgotten that once, at the height of her power, Rome bathed the world in a bath of blood, wantonly murdering all those who refused to submit to her whoresome rule. It is estimated that over two

million people fell victim to the hellish inquisition, and this is a minimum figure. When one would warn of the seeking of Catholic Rome to bring all freedom-loving nations to their knees, especially our American citadel of liberty, Americans either ignore or scoff at the warned-of danger. The most frequently given reply is that all of this Catholic persecution is in the past. That the Catholic church is now tolerant of all religious beliefs and practices, and holds no designs upon our freedom of religious thought and worship. But, is this true, or are we being lulled into a false sense of security by the side of a Iamb masking a Catholic wolf?

Let us look at a few recent events and determine from this whether dome is a lamb or a wolf. Last year, missionaries of the church of Christ 'ore persecuted by the Italian government which is dominated by the Papal See. Signs were torn off church buildings, evangelists were jailed, and Italian Christians were hounded and beaten by the dupes of Rome. In Argentina last year, Peron fought a pitched battle against Catholic domination of his country, a battle that lasted over six months. He closed Catholic buildings and schools, deported and jailed Catholic priests up to Cardinal rank proven to be conducting espionage and plotting revolt against the Argentinian government. But two months ago, Peron was overthrown and exiled, and a Rome-dominated regime set up in the place of his administration. Who can forget the picture of black-robed Catholic Jesuit priests urging on the fanatical mobs in the streets of Buenos Aires, seen by millions of Americans in newsreels flashed on the screens of theaters and television sets. All this by order of Papal Rome, yet there are those who claim that the Vatican no longer interferes in the course of affairs in soverign countries.

Do I hear you saying that this all has taken place in foreign countries ‘‘-1 can not happen here in the home of the brave, and the land of the free? In a later issue of this paper I shall give you detailed reports on various American communities where the Board of Education has fallen under the control of Roman Catholic elements which almost promptly in all cases closed the public schools of each city, and issued ultimatums that ALL children were to attend Catholic schools, regardless of their faith or parents' wishes. The stories of these incidents are sordid and chilling. Let the following words of Father D. S. Phelan, formerly the dean of Papal editors in this country, suffice for now:

> And why is it the Church is strong? Why is it everybody is afraid of the Catholic Church? The American people are more afraid of her than any people in the world. Why are they afraid of the Catholic Church? They know what the Catholic Church means.
>
> Tell us that we think more of the Church than we do of the United States; of course we do. Tell us we are Catholic first and Americans afterwards; of course we are. Tell us, in the CONFLICT BETWEEN THE CHURCH AND THE CIVIL GOVERNMENT WE TAKE THE. SIDE OF THE CATHOLIC CHURCH; of course we do. Why, if the government of the United States were at war with the Church we would say tomorrow, to—with the government of the United States . . . They say we are Catholics first and Americans decidedly afterwards. There is no doubt about it. We are Catholics first, and we love the Church more . . . than we love our children.
>
> Let the governments of the world steer clear of the Catholic Church, let the Emperors, let the Kings, and the Presidents not come into conflict with the head of the Catholic Church. Because the Catholic Church is everything to all the Catholics of the world; they renounce

> all nationalities when there is a question of loyalty to her. And why is it the Pope is so strong? Why is it the Pope is such a tremendous power? Why, the Pope is THE RULER OF THE WORLD. All the Emperors, all the Kings, all the Princes, all the Presidents of the world today are as those altar boys of mine. The Pope is the ruler of the world? Why? Because he is the RULER OF THE CATHOLICS OF THE WORLD, AND THE CATHOLICS OF ALL THE WORLD WOULD DIE FOR THE RIGHTS OF THE POPE. He is the head of the Church and they would die for the Church . . . the Catholics of the world are Catholics first, and always, they are Americans, they are Germans, etc., afterwards! [From the Catholic weekly, Western Watchman, of St. Louis, June 27, 1912, reprinted by the Voice of Freedom of Nashville, September issue, 1955] .

What arrogance, what contempt for any reaction that might possibly arise on the part of American public opinion to this open defiance of our cherished freedoms. What a fanatical proclamation of Catholic loyalty to Catholic rule and dogma, to the point of taking up arms against our President, his administration, and all of our constitutional processes of government.

In future articles in succeeding issues of It is Written, I shall conclusively prove and reveal Catholic plans to control and eventually overthrow our government. I shall show how these plans are well along the way to completion. I shall strip all camouflage from the fabric of the Romish monster and prove that it is a totalitarian government first, and a church lastly, with lands, borders, taxes, an army, law enforcement officers, ministries, embassies, consulates, and every other trapping of a temporal power; that as such its agents in the guise of arch-bishops and lesser priests, and nuns are teaching and advocating treason when they teach American Catholics to give their first loyalties in all things to this foreign power, rather than to our country. I shall prove, therefore, that the Catholic Church in America is a subversive organization and should be outlawed under the amendment to the Constitution passed last year by Congress, and that the Knights of Columbus are an undercover army with caches of arms and munitions, thus constituting a fifth column affording a threat of far greater proportions to our liberty than the comparably weak Communist underground. I shall demonstrate that Catholic doctrine is blasphemy and a passport to Hell for all who subscribe to it, and that the Pope—past, present, and future—is the anti-Christ of New Testament prophecy.

I call the reader to witness that no reflection is intended upon the character of any Catholic, and that their doctrine and intents have neither been, nor will be, represented nor misrepresented except in the exact words of their authorities. I shall make no statement nor accusation against the Catholic system that I cannot back up and support with documented evidence. I call upon all Catholics who may chance to read these articles who cannot accept this unmasked doctrine, nor carry out these unmasked plans and intents against our common land, to throw off the bonds of human authority and accept only the word of God, which alone is able to build you up and give you an inheritance among those who are sanctified through faith in God and obedience to Christ, our King and law-giver (Acts 20:32; 26.18; Col. 1:13; Rev. 17:14; James 4:12).

A Mount Carmel test is before you. "If Jehovah be God, follow him" (1 Kings 18:21).

March: Part I, "The Catholic Church in the New Testament."—1146 W. 78th St., Los Angeles 44, Calif.

Open Forum

Under the above heading are printed articles on subjects in which there has been disagreement between brethren. IT IS WRITTEN maintains an open-forum policy and holds that both sides of all litigated matters should be given fair represeotation so that the truth may be ascertained. Following is a reply made by Bro. E. H. Millar in the OLD PATHS ADVOCATE to Bro. E. H. Cavin's article on "The Breaking of the Bread," which appeared in the Sept. issue off IT IS WRITTEN and was reprinted in last month's paper.—Ed.

A REPLY TO BRO. E. H. CAVIN ON THE BREAKING OF THE BREAD

By **E. H.** Miller

There is a small group of brethren trying it seems to cause trouble over "THE BREAKING OF THE BREAD", so in "IT IS WRITTEN" their paper (Sept., 1954), they have an article under this heading to which I want reply.

Bro. Cavin (the writer) says, "It seems that some do not know when the bread becomes his body". Then he says, "The Scriptures are just as plain on the time, and place, as they are on any other subject.—Let us read Matt. 26:26; Mark 14:22; Luke 22:19.—All said Christ took the bread and blessed it, and break it and gave it to the disciples, and said take eat, this is my body. We see that when he had blessed it, he said this is my body".

"In the foregoing scriptures any one should clearly see that the breaking is for the purpose of preparing the bread to be his body".

Now, I ask everybody to reread that, and see if such teaching as is claimed by Bro. Cavin is there? No! Not one hint as to when the bread became his body, but Bro. Cavin says, "the breaking is for the purpose of preparing the bread to be his body", so, per his argument, THE BREAD CANNOT BE HIS BODY TILL BROKEN, but now watch him meet himself coming back. "Paul said in I Cor. 1 1 :24, that the bread was broken, and after it was broken, Christ said it was his body which was broken for his disciples, or YOU". Now, if Christ broke the bread for his disciples, and said, "it was his body which was broken for his disciples", per Bro. Cavin, then the bread must have been His body before it was broken, or else it could not have been His body that was broken, for if His body was broken when the bread was broken then the bread was His body before it was broken, else it could not have been His body that was broken when the bread was broken. But Bro. Cavin will say, "it was not called His body till broken, therefore it was not His body till broken⁻.

Now that looks like good reasoning to Bro. Cavin, no doubt, for he said, "The Scriptures are just as plain on the time when the bread becomes His body as they are on any other subject." He thinks he has found, THE EXACT SECOND IT "BECOMES HIS BODY", FOR SAYS BRO. CAVIN, "WHEN HE HAD BLESSED IT AND BREAK IT, HE SAID THIS IS MY BODY". But Bro. Cavin is crossing himself up again, for he first said, "let us read Matt. 26:26; Mark 14:22; Luke 22:19—All said Christ took bread and blessed it, break it and gave it to the disciples and said take eat, this is my body". Now if this proves the bread was not Christ's body till broken because it was not called "my body" till broken; it also proves what Christ gave his disciples was not his body, for it was not called "my body" till Christ "blessed it. break it AND GAVE IT TO THE DISCIPLES AND SAID TAKE EAT this is my body. You see, Bro. Cavin's argument proves

it was not Christ's body (1) WHEN TOOK, (2) WHEN BLESSED, (3) WHEN BROKEN, (4) WHEN GAVE TO THE DISCIPLES, (5) 'WHEN CHRIST SAID, TAKE EAT, for these five things took place before Christ said, (6) 'THIS IS MY BODY". Bro. Cavin wants us to see (1), (2), (3), (6), but he forgets (4) and (5) comes between (3) and (6).

The Bible does not teach when the bread becomes the body, but when man tries to prove the exact time it does by the Bible he winds up with too much, as you can see.

Let us hear Bro. Cavin again. "The scriptures clearly teach that the breaking is one of the acts that prepares it. Therefore, when it is prepared, it cannot be prepared again. Just as one who is baptized, he cannot ever be baptized again.

Brethren, if your demonstrating does not harmonize with the Scriptures, something is wrong, and it is not the Scriptures". Did you see him meeting himself again? Notice his illustration ("demonstrating?") does :.,ot harmonize with the Bible, or even with his own argument, for notice, **"the breaking is one of the acts that prepares it. Therefore when it is prepared, it cannot be prepared again",** Here is what he has, a person can only be baptized once; 'the **bread can only be prepared once, "breaking is one of the acts that prepare it", therefore the bread can be broken but once.** Bro. Cavin's claim would prove the one who serves must break the bread to "prepare it" as Christ's body, but it can't be prepared again, therefore he nor anyone else can break it again.

In I Cor. 10:16-17 Paul said, "the **bread which WE BREAK, is it not** the **communion of the body of Christ ?—For we are all partakers of that one bread".** Please notice, **"WE BREAK—FOR WE ARE ALL PARTAKERS",** the same **"WE" that breaks is** the **"WE"** that partakes! I defy any one to even try to prove, that anybody in the Bible ever broke that didn't partake, or ever partook that didn't break, or that ever broke more times than they partook.

Some may say, Jesus broke bread but didn't eat, for we read in Luke 22:19 **"He took break,** and gave thanks, **and break** it, and gave unto them saying—this do in remembrance to me. "Now," they say, "that doesn't say he ate". No but it is implied just as in Acts 20:7. So when Jesus said **"This do"** he meant for them to do what He had done. What had he done? rie broke and ate, so **Paul** said "WE break—for WE **are all partakers"** but :iys one, "you've proved **'we break—for we are partakers' (I Cor. 10:16-1 7),** and you've proved Jesus broke His bread which he called His body, but now prove He ate of that bread". Let us read Psalms 41:9 and Jn. 13:18 "(He) which did EAT OF MY BREAD—WITH Me **hath lifted up his heel against me".** So Judas ate Jesus's bread with Jesus, which shows Jesus ate of this bread with Judas, and notice, "MY BREAD" was called by Jesus "MY BODY which is GIVEN FOR YOU" Luke 22:19. But says one,.

Cor. 11:24 says 'BROKEN **for you'** instead of 'GIVEN FOR YOU' ". Yes, in the King James Version 1 Cor. 11:24 says broken, but not so in the Revised Version. The 20th Century translation of the N.T. says given in I Cor. **1 1:24,** just as in Luke 22:19. But where "broken" is used in the K.J.V., "BROKEN" does not refer to the bread, but to Christ's body on the cross. Thayer's Greek-English Lexicon that the world accepts as standard on the meaning of New Testament words, says this word means, "Shattered as it were, by a violent death, I Cor. 11:24". Robinson's Greek-English Lexicon says, "I Cor. 1 1 :24 where the allusion **is to** the death on the cross".

Brethren, don't be guilty of breaking Christ's body half in two for which there is no Bible. His literal body was not broken half in two, the FJL cad called his body was not broken half in two by Christ or anybody in the Bible. if it was, where does the Bible say so? Christ broke bread (Lk. 22:19). The disciples broke bread (Acts 20:7), and they partook of the bread they broke, (I Cor. 10:16-17, "we break—for we are all partakers").

If the brother serving at the Lord's table, takes bread, gives thanks, breaks it, and eats, then gives it to us "ALL PARTAKERS" and "WE BREAK" and "EAT" we all break once and eat once, no more, no less, then we are sure we have done all Jesus did or commanded in regards to the bread he called His body.

None but people like Bro. Cavin argue that the one who serves has to break first, but he and those like him have made that a test of fellowship, so to work in love and unity the brethren I stand identified with agree for the one who serves to break first for all agree it is safe to do so. Therefore when one of us serves he takes bread as Jesus did, give thanks as Jesus did, break it as Jesus did (break off a piece from the loaf and eat it), then gives it to the others as Jesus did, and the others "break—for we are all partakers" (I Cor. 10:16-1 7). Yes, the others break off a piece from the loaf and eat it, thus no one is offended by doing something the Bible condemns in any way; or by failing to do anything the Bible teaches they should do. Yet, brethren like Cavin have pulled out from us because the one that serves wants to break twice (once to prepare it and again to eat it). They break the loaf half in two, without Bible for such and I can't commune with half of Christ's body (?) on one plate and half on another, neither can I commune with a loaf in separate halves (divided) on the same plate, for I cannot picture two loaves as Christ's body, neither can I picture one loaf in separate halves or more pieces as Christ's body for I never saw where the Bible pictured It in such a way. Let us follow the way all agree is safe.-1003 Truitt, LaGrange, Georgia.

TWO KINDS OF RIGHTEOUSNESS

(Continued from page 37)

word: for all thy (God's) commandments are righteousness." David also says, "and the heavens shall declare his righteousness" (Ps. 50:6). All who believe the Bible may clearly see that in order for lost souls to have spiritual life(be saved from past sins) and stay free from sin, God's commandments must be obeyed. This positively proves that salvation cannot be obtained by doing any man-made set or system of commands, none of which can be read or ascribed to God's book for us, the New Testament.

Let us now learn who has authority to dispense or give us God's righteousness. Jesus says, "All power is given unto me in heaven and in earth" (Matt. 28:18). He made this statement soon after his resurrection, and it s positive now that no man or set of men has such authority. To follow a way or plan just because it may seem right will lead to a bad end (Prov. l 4:12), when such a way cannot be found in the scriptures. Surely "the way of man is not in himself, for it is not in man that walketh to direct his own steps" (Jer. 10:23). Jesus calls man-made doctrines (righteousness) vain (Matt. 15:9), and in verse 13, same chapter, he warns that any system or order that is not of God shall be rooted up.

Dear friends, why not let Christ be the leader of us all and that by what we learn in his book, which is the New Testament (Heb. 107). This and this alone will cause us to be led in the paths of righteousness for his name's sake (Ps. :3). Indeed it is very true that people are "Blessed when they

hunger and thirst after (God's) righteousness: for they shall be filled" (Matt. 5:6). This agrees perfectly with Christ's statement: "Not every ore that saith unto me, Lord, Lord, shall enter into the kingdom of heaven; but he that doeth the will of my Father which is in heaven" (Matt. 7:21). To claim life or salvation by asking of God and refusing or neglecting to do his commands is gross contradiction of the word of God and cannot produce what those who advocate and practice such claim for it. "Why call ye me, i,ord, Lord, and do not the things which I say?" (Luke 6;46).

We have learned that none can have salvation without doing God's will or His righteousness. Now let us consider the one and only place wherein righteousness can be found. "For I am not ashamed of **the gospel** of Christ: for it is the **power** of God unto salvation to every one that believeth; **to the** Jew first, and also to the Greek. For **therein is the righteousness of God revealed** from faith to faith: as it is written, The just shall live by fa;th" (Rom. 1:16,17). The scriptures furnish us completely unto every **good** work (2 Tim. 3:16,17). Only two kinds of works are listed in the scriptures (2 Cor. 5:10), and one is **"good,** the other **bad." Then it** surely behooves us all to be sure that what we do and have done is in the scriptures. Remember Christ is the author of eternal salvation only to those who obey him (Heb. 5:8,9). To please God one must **"walk by faith"** and not by sight (or **man's feelings or** righteousness) (2 Cor. 5:7). Paul tells us that faith 'ines by hearing God's word (Rom. **10:17),** and we find that "without faith God cannot be pleased" (Heb. 11:6). Also anything that is **not "of faith" is** said to be sin (Rom. 14:23).

Then **comes the question, "Is** our life secure in the kind of faith God is pleased with?" All should carefully examine their life and know whether we be "in the faith" (2 Cor. 13:5). Responsible people are taught **in the scriptures to** faithfully repent of all wrongs, confess the Name of Jesus Christ and be baptized for the remission of sins **into the** true body of **Christ (Jno. 8:21-24; Luke 13:3; Matt.** 10:32**; Acts 2:38; 22:16; and I Cor. 12:13) .**

Since there is only one body or church (Eph. 4:4; 1 :21) we could not do God's will and get into any other or be added to the wrong one (Acts 2:47). As the items, faith, repentance confession and baptism are in the gospel of Christ, one can truly obey them and in this way be obeying the gospel.

Have you, dear friend, obeyed this gospel or have you been misled by some doctrine of man's righteousness (Rom. 10:16; Prov. 16:25) ? Since God has a law for those of us to live by who have obeyed the gospel, we need carefully to mold our lives and worship by this law (Jas. 2:10). Observation teaches us that there are many different forms of worship carried on by those who claim to be God's people. Jesus prayed that his followers be **one (Jno. 17:21) and worship God "in spirit and in truth" (Jno. 4:24).** The world is filled with many different churches and many different names for the members. Are all of these a part of God's righteousness to be found in His book divine?

Let us think on these things, too, is my prayer. Further comparison of **the "Two kinds of righteousness" will come later, our Lord willing.-** 423 W. Tyler St., Mangum, **Okla.**

After the End

"There is the end of all," said a licentious infidel as he observed a funeral passing. "No!" replied a fellow-treveler, "for After death is the judgment¯ (Heb. 9 :27).

A STATEMENT TO THE ROTHERHOOD

By the Former Editor

Brethren, please don't write me any more concerning the paper, **It Is** Written. I appreciate your letters. Let's hope to have a better paper in the future. I have done my best, and so have those that have been working with me, but I know that it could have been better if others had taken more interest in it. We want to hope that Brother Leonard Pamplin makes a success with it. If he makes a mistake once in awhile, just give him credit and remember that he is doing his best, and if we were in his place, I doubt that any of us would be perfect. No, I don't **doubt it,** I am sure that none would be perfect. The thing that we want to do is to keep down disturbances among the brethren. If two of us cross, let that be among ourselves, and not let it go before the world. That is the very thing that has divided the church heretofore. Instead of reasoning on it together with the Bible, brethren have made their differences known through papers and otherwise, seeming to try to down some other brother and gain praises of the worldly-minded ones and others.

Brethren, such is to the downfall of the church and to Christianity. I pray and hope that the church really gets behind Brother Pamplin with all its might and with love, and not to make a show. If we will do that, we shall soon see digression going out of the church. I can see that digression has weakened very much in the last few years. We have about three so-called churches of Christ in Broken Bow, but none of them are making any progress. The old church that was established about forty years ago is still fighting the battle as it has for that length of time, and it is still on the up-build. "We read what we do, and do what we read," as a brother told me in his letter just the other day. Just as long as we do that, we need not to be afraid. God will put His stamp of approval on what we are doing.

Now, brethren, let every one of us commence working, and quit this shirking. Those that are backbiting and kicking (if there are such in the church), try biting your own back and kicking your own self. If this is done, I predict that you will soon see your mistakes and be satisfied. From a brother in Christ.—R. C. Clements, Box 731, Broken Bow, OkIa.

NEWS AND ACTIVITIES

. . . Had a member added a week ago Sunday (Dec. 18)—a man. His wife has been a member for years. They are a young couple."—W. A. Nelson, Rt. 1, Box 14 B.M., Somerton, Ariz.

"We have been meeting in the Community Building, in the Trailer Village, 288 Broadway, Chula Vista, Calif., and still are every Lord's day morning at 11:00 a.m.

We would like to thank each and every one of the brothers and sisters for coming to Chula Vista and meeting with us and helping us out with our work for the Lord. If it is the Lord's will, maybe soon I can come up that way and thank them in person. If some of the brethren come to Chula Vista, we will be glad to have them meet with us."—J. D. Johnson, 560 D St., Chula Vista, Calif.

THANKS—We wish to express our appreciation for the nice art work done on our masthead by Bro. Burleigh Hunt of the La Habra, California, congregation.

It has been requested by many brethren that the editor of **It Is Written** compile a list of churches that, in worship and practice, are in agreement with that which is advocated by this paper. This information is desired by many who, when traveling, would like to know of places to worship that practice as a "Thus saith the Lord." The editor presently is in possession of some of the churches addresses, but to avoid omitting any church he requests that the **complete address** where the meeting-house is located, and the address and telephone number of an elder or preacher be furnished him of **all** congregations wishing to be included in this directory. It is urged that this information be promptly sent in as we wish to go to press with it in April.

Remember, your friends need **It Is Written**
Send in some free subscriptions now!
Help increase the circulation!

OUR CONTRIBUTIONS
(from Dec. 28-Jan. 23)

Somerton, Ariz., church of Christ	$1 **0.00**
Bellflower, Calif., church of Christ	$1 **0.00**
Carlsbad, N. M., church of Christ	$1 **0. 00**
Chula Vista, Calif ., church of Christ	$ 5.00
Horace Orendorff	$ 5.00
H. I. Pamplin	$1 **9.00**
Anonymous	$ **1.00**

Who Said It?

We need today an S.S.S.S.—a "Society for the Suppression of Superfluous Societies." The church, and the church only, **will** win the world for Christ. "It is the whole business of the whole church to win the whole world for Jesus." Answer: F. T. Saunders.

Don't worry too much about what lies ahead. Go as far as you can see, and when you get there you'll be able to see farther.

There are better ways of getting up in the world than by hitting the ceiling.

The question was asked, how it happened that a certain church seemed to accomplish so easily whatever it attempted to accomplish. The reply was, "the membership of the church were like the trained horses of the fire department; as quick as the bell rang everyone jumped to his place." The success of church work depends upon the promptness with which every one is willing to do his bit.—The Chickasha Reminder, Chickasha, Okla., via the Christian **Chronicle.**

We would guess that the reason a person gets offended is some of his habits are condemned. The same reason a dog growls if he is disturbed while he gnaws a bone He fears it might be taken away from him! You know, he will even bite a friend.—from Lake Jackson, Tex., bulletin, via the **Christian Chronicle.**

The Son of God became the Son of man that the sons of men might become the sons of God.