As I exhorted thee to tarry at Ephesus, when I was going into Macedonia, that thou mightest charge certain men not to teach a different doctrine, neither to give heed to fables and endless genealogies, which minister questionings, rather than a dispensation of God which is in faith; SO DO I NOW. But the end of the charge is love out of a pure heart and a good conscience and faith unfeigned; from which things some having swerved have turned aside unto vain talking; desiring to be teachers of the law, though they understand neither what they say, nor whereof they confidently affirm . . . . holding faith and a good conscience; which some having thrust from them made shipwreck concerning the faith: of whom is Hymenaeus and Alexander; whom I delivered unto Satan, that they may be taught not to blaspheme.  
1 Tim. 1:3, 7, 19, 20.

And even as Jannes and Jambres withstood Moses, so do these also withstand the truth; men corrupted in mind, reprobate concerning the faith. But they shall proceed no further; for their folly shall be evident unto all men, as theirs also came to be.  
2 Tim. 3:8-9.

This testimony is true. For which cause reprove them sharply, that they may be sound in the faith, not giving heed to Jewish fables, and commandments of men who turn away from the truth.  
Tit. 1:13, 14.

A factious man after a first and second admonition; refuse; knowing that such a one is perverted, and sinneth, being self-condemned.  
Tit. 3:10, 11.

O Timothy, guard that which is committed unto thee, turning away from the profane babblings and oppositions of the knowledge which is falsely so called; which some professing have erred from the faith.  
1 Tim. 6:20, 21.
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THE HISTORY OF THE BOLL MOVEMENT

The present issue of the Gospel Guardian represents a Special Number. Its purpose is to inform the brethren everywhere, especially all of the preachers, of the actual origin of the troublesome “Boll Question”. Few have had access to the inside facts which reveal the heart of the trouble from its incipience. A knowledge of these facts will serve to disillusion many people as to the spirit of the men back of the Boll movement. It has been generally believed that they were men of deep reverence and spirituality but there has never existed a movement which in personnel furnishes a better example of wolves in sheep’s clothing than the Boll party and its leaders.

A Sufficient Apology

In order that all may know that this issue of the Gospel Guardian is not a personal attack of the editor upon mere persons, nor yet a peeve that he is nursing, nor even his original suggestion, attention is directed to the letters on page 3, bearing requests from eminent brethren for the publication of the matter here presented. These letters are from brethren whose integrity is beyond question, whose opportunity to know existing conditions and to sense the needs of the hour must be admitted, and whose standing will in all evidence carry weight with unbiased persons.

N. B. Hardeman, President of Freed-Hardeman College, is not only a recognized educator but is the top evangelist in the church today. E. H. Ijams President of David Lipscomb College, and James F. Cox, President of Abilene Christian College, are scholars of first rank and hold places of leadership in the church and in the world. These men are not promoting prejudices nor harboring hatreds nor perpetuating personalities. It is their knowledge of affairs and their abiding interest in the truth that calls forth the request for this admittedly far-reaching stroke. Their letters of request furnish sufficient ground for this issue and therefore sufficient apology for it. The publication of their letters is not intended at all to side-step responsibility or to escape any consequence incurred by a defense of the truth, but rather in the belief that the readers are entitled to know that this issue of the Gospel Guardian represents more than the editor’s own opinion and judgment.

“The Simple History of the Case”

In the November Word and Work, Brother Boll gave what he called a “simple history of the case” regarding the digressive division-the instrumental music case. There was an apparent weakness running through the whole of his article manifestly because he felt the effect of his argument against division over an admitted nonessential like instrumental music as it applies to the division he has caused and is promoting. So we are now giving him the “simple history of the case” on his own division.

The history of the case dates from the clash R. H. Boll had with the Gospel Advocate twenty years ago over his teaching. He was at that time its front page writer. Because of his visionary teaching he was dismissed. Later, upon his agreement with the management of the Advocate not to teach his theories, he was restored to his place. But instead of respecting his agreement he began again to feature his theories. He was again removed from the Gospel Advocate staff. He then denied that he had ever made any such agreement, and preferred some very serious charges against the Gospel Advocate editors. Among the things he said was this statement, which appears in the Klingman-Kurfees correspondence from its original source: “I know the men who are back of the Advocate today are false and unrighteous.” He called them “The Nashville Council”; “These Scribes and Pharisees”; and “false brethren”. The “combine”, as he called these brethren, consisted then of J. C. McQuiddy, E. G. Sewell, A. B. Lipscomb, M. C. Km-fees, F. W. Smith, E. A. Elam and T. B. Larimore. The language used by this man of boasted meekness should be a great disillusionment to those brethren who have believed him incapable of being wrong even in spirit. This is only a sample of the many things of like sort that he has said about his brethren.

Yet he has only recently repeated his condemnation of the “vicious” attitude of others. Of all men he should have the least to say of such a spirit. The course of his whole movement has been one of enmity and revenge. And he would make the church the victim of it-which is the thing that makes the issue more than personal; it becomes an issue between R. H. Boll and every member of the church who would defend its sacred heritage of truth and unity.

Publicizing the Case

It has been asked by good people with good motives: Why give publicity to a local affair? The answer is because Brethren Boll and Jorgenson have forced the issue upon the whole church. Before Brother Boll began teaching his heresies in the Gospel Advocate there was no division—not even dissension on the questions involved. Before Brother Boll went to Louisville, Kentucky, there was no division there over the question. But now he has his own party in and around Louisville, disfellowshipped by the original congregations; he has his school and his paper, both devoted to the policy of promoting his teaching; and his missionary machinery, to hold a “bread and butter” grip on the missionaries. And in various and sundry ways which do not commend them to our consciences, nor unto God, they have pushed their party lines beyond Louisville and have challenged the entire church with their manifestoes. Because of this we believe the brotherhood should know “the simple history of the case”.
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A Statement of the Issue

The idea has prevailed that the case under consideration has been chiefly an issue between Brother Boll and certain other brethren and that it turns on a mere speculation in teaching. This is a mistake. It is not, in the first place, a personal matter and his teaching is not, in the second place, a mere speculation. Doctrines which default prophecies concerning the establishment of the Messiah’s kingdom—that dethrone Jesus Christ; that reduce His church in this dispensation to a mere substitute, or a vestibule, which is no better if as good; that would restore the old nation of Israel in Palestine; that would reincarnate the Lord Jesus Christ and seat him on David’s throne in Jerusalem, literal, Judaistic, Palestinian and earthly, to be a world king in a world kingdom patterned more after the pagan kingdom of Rome than the glorious kingdom of heaven—that doctrine I say is more than a speculation. It is a vitiating heresy—a human creed. To call them speculators and their system of teaching speculation is giving the whole thing too much consideration. Their teaching is false doctrine, blatant and flagrant. No lover of the precious truth should waste any tears of sympathy over these men and their movement as the light is turned on them.

The Barriers to Fellowship

While the line of battle has been formed over the doctrinal issues at stake, there is yet another issue either before or behind that one which would require a settlement in the restoration of these men and in order to absolve this case. It is a moral issue—a question of discipline.

The Klingman-Kurfees correspondence sums up the barriers to fellowship:

1. The heretical teaching of R. H. Boll.
2. The action of the Highlands Church in withdrawing from those men who opposed the teaching of these theories in that church by E. L. Jorgenson which resulted in disfellowshipping charter members of the congregation.
3. The charges made by R. H. Boll against the brethren of the Gospel Advocate (including J. C. McQuiddy, M. C. Kurfees, E. A. Elam, E. G. Sewell, F. W. Smith, A. B. Lipscomb and T. B. Larrimore,) that they were “false and unrighteous” men. If that charge was true, those men could not be fellowshiped. If that charge was untrue, then R. I-I. Boll could not be fellowshiped until his false charges should be removed and amends made.
4. The agreement made by R. H. Boll with the Gospel Advocate, which agreement he broke and afterwards denied.

This four-point statement of the case represents the issue confronting the Boll party today. Two of those items are based on doctrine, and two of them represent a moral issue. Until both issues are settled it is out of the question for churches of Christ to have fellowship with the Louisville-Boll party. These barriers to fellowship were raised by themselves, and if because of these things they are out of fellowship with the church in Louisville on what ground can these men be fellowshiped by churches of Christ anywhere? The question, therefore, stands as a question of discipline as well as one of doctrine.

The A. B. Lipscomb Letter

Among all of these matters there is one that is especially significant from the present angle. It is the exchange of letters recently—just this year—between R. H. Boll and A. B. Lipscomb. Feeling the effect of a congealing sentiment against him, Brother Boll writes to Brother Lipscomb, as the only living witness to these things, to exonerate him. Brother Lipscomb’s reply definitely fixes the blame. Read it. It is the straw that breaks the camel’s back. It means that either all of these brethren who testify against Brother Boll are altogether unrighteous and untruthful, and Brother Boll himself alone truthful and righteous—or that he is the offender and has grievously sinned not only against the brethren with whom he was associated but also against the church which he has divided. His sin reaches up to heaven. Truly, “it will be but a little while longer, and we shall answer to Him” and it is the prayer of us all that Brother Boll may yet see the error of his course and set these matters right. He is the only man who can do it. It remains to be seen whether he will rise to do it or whether like Ephraim joined to his idol he will pursue the diabolical and devious way that has characterized his course of the twenty years behind him.

The Highland Episode

Vital to the case also is the record of facts submitted by C. A. Taylor of the action of the Highland Church (the Jorgenson-Janes church in Louisville) which withdrew fellowship from brethren Taylor and Rubel because they opposed the teaching of these heresies by E. L. Jorgenson in that congregation. The result of this action was division, the disfellowshipping of the older and charter members of the congregation who built and paid for the house of worship they occupied. This action—which Brother T. Q. Martin called a “piece of high-handed wickedness” and “this Highland outrage”—has been a stench in the nostrils of E. L. Jorgenson and the Highland church for years. They have sought in every way possible (except the only right way—the acknowledgment of their wicked deed) to escape the odium of this action. They have issued statements and explanations but have never rectified their wrong. The latest effort was the camouflage of “restoring” Taylor and Rubel upon supposed confessions and concessions they were said to have made. The sole purpose of this formality was an attempt to justify themselves, an effort at self-exoneration, at the expense of brethren Taylor and Rubel. Their very action in this matter, in their reiteration of false accusations against these men, only added insult to injury. Of course, such a crafty maneuver was rejected by brethren Taylor and Rubel, and all of those good people who stand with them. Notwithstanding this fact, E. L. Jorgenson and his group have circulated the report that these brethren were “restored” to the fellowship of the Highland church, and to carry out their designs they have withheld the facts from their own congregation—they did not read the reply of Taylor and Rubel to the church! For that reason and in order that these things may be known to all, that misrepresentation may be counteracted and truth prevail, the record of these actions has been supplied by Brother Taylor for this issue of the Gospel Guardian and will be found on page 12. The false move the leaders of the Highland church have made in this affair is the tacit admission, without a confession of it, that their action was a fatal blunder. They have been shrewd enough to twist certain statements made by brethren Taylor and Rubel into “concessions” but they have not been clever enough to conceal their strategy. As the matter stands, the responsibility for making the teaching of E. L. Jorgenson a test of fellowship in the Highland church rests solely on him and them and the only way to absolution in the case is for them to unconditionally revoke the action taken against these brethren, accompanied by whatever other amends the injury to these brethren and to the church may demand.
**Down-To-Date**

Over the period of these years Brother Boll has made many propositions, Each time, however, he has retreated from his own offers and his propositions have become a sort of a wolf! wolf! cry. As a connection between some of the facts herein presented it seems almost necessary to reproduce two editorials that appeared in the Gospel Advocate in 1932-33 when the writer was editor of that paper. The gesture of Brother Boll’s hand under “Here’s My Hand” and his subsequent “Doctrinal Manifesto” and the two editorials called forth by these utterances of his, furnish the actual setting for the present angle of things. In order that the readers may have a view of the whole movement in its stubborn course the 1932 “Doctrinal Manifesto” is reprinted herein together with the replies that were made to it.

Another important link in the chain of events is the article of Brother T. Q. Martin, dealing with the Jorgenson “Circular Letter” which appeared in the Christian Leader several months ago. Brother Martin is one of the most loved men in the church. He is a man of deep reverence and is not by nature a controversialist, but having exact knowledge concerning the things of which the Jorgenson “Circular Letter” was such a gross misrepresentation he could not let it pass uncalled. This article is vital to the present status of the case and should be read.

We commend these things to the consideration of that great brotherhood of gospel preachers to whom this issue of the Gospel Guardian is being sent complimentary, believing that when these facts are known to the brethren, the audacity of the men promoting the Boll party will stand self-rebuked, and that in the future neither countenance nor quarter will be given any of them, that this party may become entirely localized to R. H. Boll’s own little diocese of churches in the vicinity of Louisville, Kentucky.

**A Question for the Neutrals**

For the “Boll sympathizers” who are all the time saying that they “do not believe the doctrine” but are neutral in the controversy and who hold the men of this movement in such fond regard that they cannot “draw the line on them” nor “cast them out” there is yet a question. Since they have criticised the Haldeman Avenue church and the “Haldeman Preachers” and in fact all the rest of us who have fought the battle on this issue-in view of the facts presented herein, let them suggest what course should have been pursued, that could have been pursued in interest of truth and righteousness. What would you have done in the matter, brethren? Can you point out anything in this entire record that is favorable to R. H. Boll and his party? If so, it is time to cease neutrality and come to his defense. If not, it is still time to cease neutrality and come to the defense of these righteous principles for which the faithful brethren in Louisville have so uncompromisingly stood through all opposition and criticism during these years. In short, if you were in Louisville with whom would you “play ball” with whom would you associate? The answer to these questions will determine what your attitude should be toward these men and their movement anywhere else. “Now I beseech you, brethren, mark them that are causing the divisions and occasions of stumbling, contrary to the doctrine which ye learned: and turn away from them. For they that are such serve not our Lord Christ, but their own belly; and by their smooth and fair speech they beguile the hearts of the innocent”. There is no alternative in the application of and obedience to this divine command.

**JOINT REQUEST FOR FACTS**

Dear Brother Wallace:

In order that our young preachers and others may be informed regarding the origin and continued agitation over the teaching of Brother R. H. Boll and others, we believe it will be in order for you to gather up such facts as have appeared in various publications and tracts and publish these in your magazine with as little comment as is necessary. You have doubtless seen a recent correspondence between Brethren Klingman and Kurfees. Such a publication would serve as a ready reference to facts that have entered into this unfortunate affair.

After you have prepared your material, we would suggest that you confer with representative brethren for final approval before publication.

Fraternally,

Nov. 5, 1935  N. B. Hardeman  E. H. Ijams

Dear Brother Cox:

For the last fifteen or twenty years, there has been more or less agitation over the question of Premillennialism and over questions pertaining to Brother Boll and his teaching. I have young preachers and others ask me the facts about what has been done and the origin of the trouble.

I have just thought that it might be well to ask Brother Wallace to get up these matters with no more comment than is necessary to explain and let this appear in his magazine so that all of us might have it for reference. One reason I am writing is because I have seen a recent correspondence between Brother George Klingman and Brother J. F. Kurfees. They have reviewed this pretty thoroughly and it seems to me that what they have written, together with additional facts, would be worthwhile to these young preachers who knew nothing of differences at the beginning.

If this meets with your approval, I am suggesting that we sign the enclosed. I hope all may be well with you.

Faithfully yours,

Nov. 5, 1935  N. B. Hardeman

Dear Brother Wallace:

I wish to commend very highly the first issue of your magazine, “The Gospel Guardian”. I am sure it will do much good. I shall be very glad to have a copy of it come regularly to our library so that our young preachers may have access to it.

The Boll question has been agitated so long and so many have written about it and discussed it that there is much confusion today in the minds of many of the younger members of the church. In order that our young preachers may be informed regarding the origin and continued agitation concerning R. H. Boll and his teachings, we believe it wise for you to gather up such facts as have appeared in various publications and tracts and publish these in your splendid magazine with as little comment as is necessary. You have doubtless seen a recent correspondence between Brethren Klingman and Kurfees. Such a publication as we are requesting would serve as a ready reference to facts that have entered into this unfortunate affair.

After you have prepared your material, we would suggest that you confer with representative brethren for final approval before publication.

This is a form letter which was sent me by Brother N. B. Hardeman with request that I write you as president (Letters are continued on bottom of page 4)
THE KLINGMAN-KURFEES CORRESPONDENCE

A Discussion that Reveals the Real Spirit of the Boll Movement from Its Incipiency; that Brings to Light Information that Has Apparently Been Suppressed; Setting Forth an Array of Facts Withheld from Certain Documents Circulated by R. H. Boll and E. L. Jorgenson. It Turns the Louisville Party Inside-out Exposing the Subtle-mindedness of Its Leaders and the Sinister Character of Methods Employed to Promote Their Personal Designs and Party Ends.

Ever since the line of false teaching was drawn by R. H. Boll in Louisville years ago, and the subsequent action of the Highlands church in disfellowshipping the men who opposed the teaching of the Boll doctrine in that church by E. L. Jorgenson, the Boll and Jorgenson contingent has been held by the Haldeman Avenue Church (old Campbell Street Church), the original congregation in Louisville, as a faction. Being on the ground and having had knowledge of and experience with this group from the beginning their decisions and actions in the case through the years are entitled to respect. But occasionally individuals who know nothing of the development of this defection take it upon themselves to reopen the case with a view toward settling the trouble-apparently in favor of Brother Boll and his party.

The latest effort of this kind was made by certain Louisville preachers of the Boll side which was afterward taken up and pursued by George A. Klingman, preacher of the Highlands church, a Boll- Jorgenson congregation. A conference was called by the Boll-Klingman side and a meeting was held in the office of J. F. Kurfees. The following correspondence between Brother Klingman and Brother Kurfees, is the result.

The fact that the 1925 Elam extracts are being circulated, and that, too, for the purpose of reflecting upon the record of men who have passed to their reward is within itself sufficient as a reason for giving the facts to the brethren. Another fact is that Brother Klingman, after opening the question himself, makes no effort to sustain his statements or to clear himself of the situation in which he has involved himself in his attempt to aid these guilty brethren in Louisville and in circulating these extracts thus actually propagating falsehood and slander.

This correspondence reveals the real spirit of the Boll movement and should be given a careful reading by all who are interested in the actual facts and in truth and righteousness.

G. A. Klingman Re-opens the Case

Dear Brother Kurfees :

I am enclosing two extracts from Brother Elam's letters to Brother Boll. In view of the fact that Brother Smith withdrew his charge of falsifying, this matter is satisfactorily settled in my mind. I do not understand why all others who made the charge of falsifying did not withdraw their charges; and I wonder why Brother Elam's letters were not published ten years ago.

I have done all in my power to help bring about a reconciliation and re-union between the Napoleon Blvd. and the Highland congregations. I am happy in the thought that the Highland congregation has withdrawn the action that was taken against Brothers Rubel and Taylor, and that said congregation extends Christian love and fellowship to the Napoleon congregation. This exonerates the present congregation at the Highlands and leaves the personal matters to be adjusted between the parties involved.

Will you kindly show this letter to Brothers Douthitt and Craft.

Sincerely,
Feb. 21, 1935.
(Signed) Geo. A. Klingman.

Dear Brother Klingman :

Your letter of the 21st inst. was duly received, and as requested I showed it to Brethren Douthitt and Craft.

After reading your letter, Brother Douthitt said he intended to write you, and has done so, and I have a copy of his letter. He has quite thoroughly covered the points raised in your letter and exactly as I would have endeavored to do, and therefore I endorse every word of his letter, but by way of emphasis, I wish to make this further reply.

of this institution. I am very glad to concur with him and others in this request to you for this valuable contribution to the church.

With very best wishes to you in your great work, I am,
Yours fraternally, James F. Cox.

Dear Brother Km-fees :

I have read very carefully every word of the entire seven page correspondence between you and Brother George Klingman. And I say to you frankly, that to me it looks like the last word on the matter. I cannot imagine what reply will be made to this, if any. And I do not see how Brother Klingman can afford not to say something in reply. It would be too much for me to try to ignore it if I were in his place.

After reading all the correspondence, including the statements from Brethren Smith, Boll, Lipscomb and Klingman, I am forced to the following conclusion:

When Brother Klingman makes some satisfactory reply to your letters, or condemns Brother R. H. Boll for being responsible for these conditions, then I may understand why he opened "this controversy". But until then, I shall continue to wonder.

I am always happy to see any one correct any error in his teaching, or conduct, therefore I shall be delighted to have any information concerning any endeavor toward correction.

Nov. 18, 1935
Thankfully, I. A. Douthitt.
I take it that the object of your letter to me, with the extracts from Brother Elam, is for the purpose of convincing me and others that differences here should have been composed and fellowship restored many years ago.

In the light of what transpired in our conference here at my office June 9, 1932, I am forced to conclude from your letter that the Elam extracts are of quite recent news to you and that on learning of their existence, matters at once were “satisfactorily settled” in your mind.

You seem surprised and express wonder that all others did not withdraw their charges, as much as to say, “Now with this newly discovered evidence, you (I) will surely do so.” To this I will just say that I am surprised that you would presume to hand me these extracts as sufficient evidence to “satisfactorily settle matters” in my mind, without the extracts being supported by proper acknowledgments, which were so completely covered in the conference here at my office and which you will see are repeated in Brother Douthitt’s letter by quotations from “Facts About R. H. Boll,” by F. W. Smith.

At our conference here every word of these charges were read and discussed, and certainly you understood that these barriers would have to be removed before matters could be “satisfactorily settled” in our minds.

Now I ask—have they been removed? and if so, please furnish the evidence and it will be carefully considered.

As to the Highland division, I have only to remind you that in discussing that matter at our conference here, you yourself said, among other things, that the move made by the congregation for which you preach to compose the difference and settle the trouble was not right; that you opposed the sending of that letter of Brother Taylor, etc. and added that you had hopes of reconciling the differences or you would not be there.

In our conference, you said you opposed the letter Brother Taylor refused to accept it, and I understand that the Highland Church refused to have Brother Taylor’s reply read to the congregation. Did that show a restoration of fellowship, or that the Highland Church was exonerated?

What, may I ask, has transpired since that makes it possible for you to say the Highland congregation is exonerated?

As requested, I return herein the extracts from Brother Elam’s letters.

Fraternally,


(Signed) J. F. Kurfees.

The letter from B. L. Douthitt, minister of the Haldeman Avenue church, mentioned above is here given because of some very vital points it contains.

Dear Brother Klingman:

Brother J. F. Kurfees, at your suggestion, gave me your letter of February 21. I have carefully read your letter and the two enclosed extracts from Brother E. A. Elam’s letters to Brother R. H. Boll. Your letter and the two enclosed extracts from Brother Elam’s letters to Brother Boll do not satisfactorily settle matters in my mind.

The Charge of Falsifying

Brother Boll made a certain agreement with the Gospel Advocate management in 1915. Brother Boll publicly denied for four years that he had made any agreement with the Advocate in any sense at all. According to Brother F. W. Smith, in 1919, Brother Boll admitted that there was an agreement with the Advocate. Has Brother Boll confessed that he denied for four years “what he knew was true while he was denying it?” Did he incorporate this confession in his “statement” to Brother Elam? This confession is not made in the two “extracts” with your letter to Brother Kurfees.

In the extract from letter of E. A. Elam to R. H. Boll, dated Oct. 12, 1925, Brother Elam says, “He (F. W. Smith) accepts your statement and withdraws the charge of falsifying as far as he is concerned.” What was the “statement” upon which Brother Smith withdrew the charge of falsifying? Did Brother Boll ever publish his “statement” upon which Brother Smith withdrew the charge of falsifying? Did Brother Boll ever make this “statement” to all with whom the agreement was made in 1915?

In the extract from letter of E. A. Elam to R. H. Boll, December 8, 1925, I note the following from Brother Elam, “more could not be expected or asked of you on this point.” Just what was “expected” or “asked” of Brother Boll on this point and what was Brother Boll’s reply to the things “expected” or “asked” of him? The extract from Brother Elam’s letter does not state what was expected or asked, neither does it give Brother Boll’s answer.

Brother Klingman, I note that you say, “I do not understand why all others who made the charge of falsifying did not withdraw their charges.” Don’t you suppose that “others” who made the charge of falsifying, did “understand” why they did not withdraw their charges? Do you believe they would have refused to withdraw the charge without just reasons? In “Statement of Facts About R. H. Roll,” page 3, F. W. Smith says:

“No matter how many senses Webster gives the word ‘agreement,’ R. H. Boll’s denial in 1915 was that he made no agreement in any sense at all, yet he admitted in 1919 that ‘there was an agreement in the former sense.’ Thus, by his own words, he is convicted of having deliberately denied for four years what he knew was true while he was denying it. He not only failed to confess this sin publicly when he made his admission in 1919, but he has never yet done so; and until he does so confess it, churches and preachers everywhere should kindly but firmly refuse him the fellowship and co-operation which should be accorded only to true men.”

Now please tell me if Brother Boll ever publicly confessed that sin as demanded by Brother Smith in the above quotation? If so in what paper and what was the date of publication? I shall be very grateful for the information, as it will help me to satisfactorily settle matters in my mind.

You say, “I wonder why Brother Elam’s letters were not published ten years ago.” Why not ask Brother Boll “why” Brother Elam’s letters were not published ten years ago? Do you not also wonder why Brother Boll did not publish his confession ten years ago? If I am not mistaken, Brother Boll was publishing a religious paper during 1925, and it is not too late to publish all of these letters yet, including, of course, Brother Boll’s confession. Perhaps the whole correspondence would make a good “manifesto” for one issue of the Word and Work during 1935.

From the two extracts you sent Brother Kurfees, I take it that you have access to the correspondence between Brother Elam and Brother Boll. Will you kindly give me a copy of the whole correspondence? I shall be glad to pay a typist to copy the letters. Your enclosed extracts from the letters by no means help to clear matters in my
mind. Perhaps if I had a copy of the letters, I could say with you, “this matter is satisfactorily settled in my mind.” Surely you will assist me in this matter. Let me hear from you soon as possible in regard to this most earnest request.

“Ugly Epithets and Charges”

Just a few words about the “ugly charges” Brother Boll made against certain brethren mentioned by Brother F. W. Smith, “Statement of Facts About R. H. Boll,” page 5. “The Nashville Council”; “These scribes and Pharisees”; “false brethren”; “I know the men who are back of the Gospel Advocate today are false and unrighteous.” Please note the following quotation from Brother Smith, “Statement of Facts About R. H. Boll,” pages 7 and 8:

“Now, finally, if the charges which I. H. Boll makes against us in that letter are true, then we are unfit to be members of the church of God, and unworthy of the respect and fellowship of any child of God. But if these charges are not true, then R. H. Boll is unfit to be a member of the church of God and unworthy of the respect and fellowship of any child of God; and the church to which he ministers, as well as the brotherhood at large, should demand, as I now demand of him, that he either prove these ugly charges or confess and apologize for the sin of making them, and for the double sin of making a false statement for four years, which, according to his own admission in 1919, he knew was false while he was making it.”

In the above quotation you see that Brother Smith says, “I now demand of him, that he either prove these ugly charges or confess and apologize for the sin of making them, and the double sin of making a false statement for four years, which, according to his own admission in 1919, he knew was false while he was making it.”

Are these, Brother Klingman, satisfactorily settled in your mind? If so, how and when were they settled? At the time Brother Boll made these charges, I understand T. B. Lariimore, J. C. McQuiddy, F. B. Srygley, M. C. Kurfees and others were back of the Gospel Advocate. I have never thought of these good men as preachers that were “false and unrighteous”.

The Highland Church Action

In the second paragraph of your letter to Brother Kurfees, you mention a very serious matter in reference to the Highland and Napoleon Blv’d congregations. Are you sure that you are correct in the following statements. “I am happy in the thought that the Highland congregation has withdrawn the action that was taken against Brothers Rubel and Taylor, and that said congregation extends Christian love and fellowship to the Napoleon congregation. This exonerates the present congregation at the Highlands and leaves the personal matters to be adjusted between the parties involved”?

May 12, 1932, the Highland Church of Christ sent Brother C. A. Taylor a letter extending fellowship on so called “concessions” that Brother Taylor said were never made by him. You will recall that Brother Taylor answered the Highland letter on May 26, 1932, in which he replied to the nine (9) items listed as “concessions” made by Brothers Rubel and Taylor. Brother Taylor closed his reply with the following paragraphs:

“It is with keen regret that I must decline your offer to resume our broken fellowship for your letter extends fellowship based upon our supposed ‘concessions’ and not because you have repented of your wicked act. The barrier erected by you in 1918 will never be removed and our differences will never be composed until and unless you take the correct action based upon proper grounds.

“I understand your letter to me was read to the Highland congregation and if this is correct, you have done Brother Rubel and me an additional injury, which can be partially corrected only by also reading to that entire congregation this reply.

“I shall appreciate being advised when this has been done.”

Brother Klingman, you no doubt will remember our conference in J. F. Kurfees’ office June 9, 1932, that this very matter was discussed and that you made the following statements:

1. The Highland letter to Brother Taylor went out over my protest.
2. I knew that the offer would not be accepted by Taylor and Rubel.
3. The Highland letter was not repentance.
4. The Highland brethren did wrong in refusing to read Brother Taylor’s reply to the congregation.
5. Haldeman Avenue Church was right in refusing to recognize the Highland Church.
6. I would not be preaching for the Highland congregation if I did not have hope of reconciling the two congregations.

To be perfectly frank (but in all kindness) I do not understand how you can say in your letter to Brother Kurfees of February 21 that the “Highland congregation has withdrawn the action that was taken against Brothers Rubel and Taylor, and that said congregation extends Christian love and fellowship to the Napoleon congregation.” How can there be “reconciliation and re-union” between the congregations when the Napoleon congregation plainly declared the proposed fellowship had done Rubel and Taylor an “additional injury”? According to the record I must say that the Highland Church is not “exonerated” and you did not think that the Highland Church was exonerated June 9, 1932, some time after the Highland Church received Brother Taylor’s letter and refused to let it be read to the entire congregation at Highland, as Brother Taylor requested.

Now that you are telling that the Highland congregation is “exonerated” of their “wicked act” of 1918, I shall advise Brother Taylor to publish the two letters that have passed between the parties involved?

Sincerely yours,

Feb. 25, 1935

(Signed) B. L. Douthitt

Brother Douthitt received no answer to the above letter. The following letter from Brother Klingman is all that was received.

Mr. J. F. Kurfees:

Your letter of Feb. 26 came duly to hand.

My reply to Brother Douthitt’s letter will suffice as a reply to yours except that I wish to call your attention to two points:
The Charges Against R. H. Boll

In your first letter to me, dated February 21, 1935, you said:

“I am enclosing two extracts from Brother Elam’s letters to Brother Boll. In view of the fact that Brother Smith withdrew his charge of falsifying, this matter is satisfactorily settled in my mind. I do not understand why all others who made the charge of falsifying did not withdraw their charges; and I wonder why Brother Elam’s letters were not published ten years ago.”

In my reply to the above, I said:

“I take it that the object of your letter to me, with the Elam extracts, is for the purpose of convincing me and others that differences here should have been composed and fellowship restored many years ago.”

That’s what I thought was your purpose. I quite naturally concluded that the Elam extracts were new evidence to you; that you thought it would be new to me (though it was not) and that in view of the fact of this newly discovered evidence to you, I would by it be convinced of two things:

(1) That those who died without having withdrawn their charges, died in sin.

(2) That those of us who are alive (myself and others), who believed, and still believe, the charges true to facts, would now realize our mistake; would see from the evidence you produced that differences should have been composed and fellowship restored many years ago.

But I certainly missed your point, if indeed there was any point, in your writing me, for in your reply, March 16, 1935, you said:

“I did not write to convince you and others that differences here should have been composed and fellowship restored many years ago.”

Well, my dear George, may I ask just what was your purpose in writing me? Just whom did you expect to influence, help, hinder or hurt by writing and opening the question with me?

There were four reliable Christian gentlemen who testified in this matter. Brother A. B. Lipscomb was one, and as he is now living, you would not, I know, expect me to speak for him; nor would you expect me to speak for the lamented Brother McQuiddy—Brother Smith was your witness; hence, there is no reason why you should or would write me about either of these three men. If you can advance a reason, please send it along.

I am, therefore, convinced that your purpose, and only purpose, in writing me was a deliberate effort on your part to cast reproach upon the record and course pursued by my departed brother, M. C. Kurfees—yes, him and him only—a rare act for a Christian gentleman to do, assuming as I do, that you had, or at least should have had, all the facts at hand before writing me as you did.

Now if I am wrong in this charge, I will gladly withdraw it, if you will advise me, stating specifically to whom, other than M. C. Kurfees, you had reference when you said: “I do not understand why all others who made the charge of falsifying did not withdraw their charges.”

Yes, M. C. Kurfees died without having withdrawn his charge against R. H. Boll; no one denies that. He could not have done otherwise and remained true to facts and the Word of God.

Boll’s Agreement with the Gospel Advocate

The facts are, as you know or should know, that R. H. Boll made an agreement with the Gospel Advocate management in 1915; that he later publicly denied making any agreement at all, thus raising the question of veracity between himself and the brethren who were present and heard him make the agreement. He continued his denial for four years, when in 1919 he admitted there was an agreement in a sense, and his admission was published in the Gospel Advocate of October 2, 1919; but his admission was not accompanied with any confession of his four year denial, nor has he ever confessed his denial so far as I know. On this matter, in his tract, “A Statement of Facts About R. H. Boll,” by F. W. Smith, he (Smith) says:
“Thus, by his own words, he is convicted of having deliberately denied for four years what he knew was true while he was denying it. He not only failed to confess this sin publicly when he made his admission in 1919, but he has never yet done so; and until he does so confess it, churches and preachers everywhere should kindly but firmly refuse him the fellowship and cooperation which should be accorded only to true men.”

If you have any evidence of his public confession, either before or since the death of M. C. Kurfees, please give me name and date of paper in which it appeared.

Attacks Character of Gospel Advocate Editors

But that is not all, for in this same tract, in commenting on a letter that R. H. Boll wrote to a brother, F. W. Smith says:

“In this letter he designates us by the following ugly epithets and charges: ‘The Nashville Council’. ‘These scribes and Pharisees’; ‘false brethren’; ‘I know the men who are back of the Gospel Advocate today are false and unrighteous. If you desire it, I will give you proof and specify instance after instance’; ‘They have inaugurated a campaign of willful misrepresentation’; ‘They sit in judgment on men, and even on congregations — they brand, stigmatize and ostracize whom they will, while they themselves are responsible to no man’; ‘What are you doing in that combination? What part and lot have you with them? What have you surrendered to them? ‘What you have had to surrender, if anything, in order to stand in the Advocate’s favor, I don’t know.’ ‘To hold with the side that represents prestige, numbers, and power may be simplest, easiest, most comfortable and profitable.’ ”

Then Smith says:

“The readers may decide for themselves how the use of such language and charges against brethren comports with the supposedly smooth and sweet spirit which some people claim that he has.”

F. W. Smith Withdraws Charge Against Boll

But, you may say, the Elam extracts sent, dated 1925, shows that Brother Smith withdrew his charge of falsifying. Well, my long personal acquaintance with Brother Smith enables me to say that I never knew a man more ready to condemn sin, or more ready and willing to forgive than F. W. Smith; and that he did at one time make overtures in the hope of a settlement of this unfortunate affair is not denied, but that it was ever completely settled with him, and remained so up to the date of his death, is denied and will be denied until you or some other man produce evidence to the contrary.

In the extract you sent from a letter of E. A. Elam to R. H. Boll, dated October 12, 1925, Brother Elam says: “He (F. W. Smith) accepts your statement and withdraws the charge of falsifying so far as he is concerned.” To this you were asked: “What was the ‘statement’ upon which Brother Smith withdrew the charge of falsifying?” “Did Brother Boll ever publish his statement?” “Did Brother Boll ever make this ‘statement’ to all with whom the agreement was made in 1915?” In this same extract Brother Elam says “Brother Smith wishes these statements of 1915 and 1919 put in your letter and wishes an explanation of harmony of the two in regard to the agreement.” How did he “explain” and “harmonize” these two “statements”??

In the extract from letter of E. A. Elam to R. H. Boll, dated December 8, 1925, Brother Elam says: “More could not be expected or asked of you on this point”. To this you were asked: “Just what was ‘expected’ or ‘asked’ of Brother Boll on this point and what was Brother Boll’s reply to the things ‘expected’ or ‘asked’ of him?” The extract does not state what was expected or asked; neither does it give Brother Boll’s answer. Your answer to all the foregoing will be appreciated and perhaps will help us both to “understand why all did not withdraw their charges”.

You, Boll and Jorgenson all seem to rely on the same 1925 Elam extracts to clear Brother Smith, and to charge M. C. Kurfees as the guilty man in the case. Jorgenson wrote a letter to a brother in which he stated that only one of the editors of the Gospel Advocate did believing these things and referred to the 1925 Elam letter. Brother Boll wrote and sent to Brother Lipscomb the same Elam extracts you sent me, same wording and same date-1925. Evidently these 1925 Elam extracts have been rather widely circulated. Brother Douthitt urged you to send copies of the whole correspondence between Elam, Smith and Boll, hoping to receive something more definite, but you failed to comply, even though Douthitt offered to pay for the typing.

You say in view of the fact that Smith withdrew his charge, you do not understand why all others did not do so. Well, will you tell me, please, upon what ground did Brother Smith withdraw his charge? What did Boll say or do that caused Smith to withdraw his charge? This information is vital to the issue you raise, and I hope you will favor me.

Smith Cancels the Withdrawal of His Charge

Based on the Elam 1925 extracts, Brother Smith made you a good witness in 1925, and of course it is natural for a man to stand by, uphold and endorse his witness, and I hope that you will be just as loyal, true and steadfast to him, and just as strongly endorse him in 1926 as you did in 1925. I am not going to cross-examine your witness (Brother Smith), but simply let him give his evidence—his 1926 evidence, in his own words. So now let us hear the witness (Brother Smith) as he gave testimony in 1926. I have before me a letter, dated November 3, 1926, written by F. W. Smith, in which he says:

“It is also true that after denying that he had made such an agreement with the Advocate, for three or four years, he came and stated over his own signature that there was an agreement between him and the Advocate regarding his peculiar views, but he expressed no sorrow, repentance, nor confession of thus having wronged the Advocate during those years.

“Within the last twelve months he has completely reversed himself regarding his acknowledgment of the agreement, stating in substance that he did not mean anything more by that statement than was expressed in his first denial of any agreement at all. This leaves the matter in this shape: he deceived us by making the impression on us that there was an agreement such as we claimed, and the matter is now where it was before, namely, the Gospel Advocate management is placed in the attitude, by Brother Boll, as falsifiers in that they claim he had made an agreement, which he now denies.”
That now is the evidence as given by your witness, Brother Smith, in 1926, and irrespective of what he did or did not do in 1925, that’s what he said in 1926; and whatever Boll may have said or done in 1925, Smith says he (Boll) “completely reversed himself, expressed no sorrow, repentance, nor confession...he deceived us.”

That’s the evidence of your witness, F. W. Smith, the man you put forward to prove the innocence of your client, R. H. Boll, in an effort to establish guilt on the part of “all others” who did not withdraw their charges. It seems to me you will have to get a better witness, if you hope to win the case.

**Boll and Klingman Withhold Facts**

In the light of these facts, I ask your earnest and sincere consideration of the following:

(1) Were you, Brother George, in possession of the facts as stated by the 1926 Smith letter when you wrote and opened the matter with me?

If you were, then the only possible conclusion is that you purposely withheld them in an effort to deceive; if you were not in possession of these facts, you should have obtained them before writing me and casting reflection on any man or men for not having withdrawn their charges.

(2) If you were not in possession of these facts, you can easily clear yourself of the above charge I make against you, and which you should do, by simply making the same charge against R. H. Boll; namely, that if he was in possession of these facts when he gave you the 1925 Elam extracts, he purposely withheld them in an effort to deceive, and you can also charge him with the same offense when he wrote and sent the same 1925 Elam extracts to Brother Lipscomb, which will be seen farther on by the Boll-Lipscomb correspondence.

(3) Should he (Boll) deny possession of these facts (though I hardly think he will), he, and all of us, would of necessity, have to conclude that F. W. Smith was badly “off” either in 1925 or in 1926, or in both years, for not many who ever knew F. W. Smith, including Brother Boll himself, would think he would not in some way advise a man when and where he might prefer charges against him.

(4) E. L. Jorgenson either had, or should have had, these facts before sending out his “circular” letter, falsely accusing Haldeman Avenue and its preachers for the division here, and before he wrote Brother Rowe, stating that only “one” of the Advocate editors died believing these things. Jorgenson can now add at least one more to his list.

If none of you knew these facts it would seem that you, Boll and Jorgenson should send out a “circular” in order to set yourselves in the proper light with all to whom you sent the 1925 extracts, for Brother Boll said to Brother Lipscomb, as you will see, that as a result of a renewed effort (in 1925), it ended in “perfect” agreement with all—Hall, H. Leo Boles, E. A. Elam, and even including F. W. Smith, but was again frustrated by Brother Kurfees. Certainly you should send out a revised circular, extract or something of the kind.

As the facts show, according to Smith’s letter, that he still held these charges against Boll in 1926, doesn’t that show conclusively that Boll had not, up to that time, confessed his wrong and made matters right? Not only had he not done so in 1926, but I now call your attention to the fact that he had not done so even down to 1932—years after the death of both F. W. Smith and M. C. Kurfees.

**Boll-Jorgenson Erect Barriers to Fellowship**

In the early part of 1932, Jonah W. D. Skiles requested a conference with Henry Craft, B. L. Douthitt and myself to discuss a program of cooperation among the churches of Louisville. This request was granted and we met in my home and continued until late in the night. Brother Skiles said that he deplored the division in Louisville and asked what steps must be taken to restore fellowship and cooperation among the congregations of Louisville. I called his attention to the following:

(1) Speculative views taught by R. H. Boll and others.

(2) The barrier erected by the Highland Church in 1918.

(3) R. H. Boll’s agreement with the Gospel Advocate in 1915.


Brother Skiles read these ugly charges Brother Boll made against certain brethren and said that he could not believe that Brother Boll had made such charges. He suggested that he would like to take the matter to Brother Boll and ask him if he made the charges cited by Brother F. W. Smith.

**Boll Admits Making the Charges**

Brother Skiles called another meeting after talking with Brother Boll about the ugly charges. This meeting was held in my office, in June 1932, and you, yourself, Brother Klingman, were present at this meeting. I asked Brother Skiles, as you will recall, if R. H. Boll admitted that he made the ugly charges referred to above, and Skiles said that Brother Boll admitted that he did make the charges, but was “peeved” when he made the charges. I asked if that was all Brother Boll said and Brother Skiles replied “Yes”. That was a most excellent opportunity for Brother Boll to withdraw and make amends for his ugly charges, but the word “peeved” fails to show that he did do so. Therefore, up to this time, 1932, R. H. Boll had not, and did not at that time, withdraw the charges he made against certain brethren and confess the sin of making them. On this, I again quote Brother F. W. Smith: “Now, finally, if the charges which R. H. Boll makes against us in that letter are true, then we are unfit to be members of the church of God, and unworthy of the respect and fellowship of any child of God. But if these charges are not true, then R. H. Boll is unfit to be a member of the church of God and unworthy of the respect and fellowship of any child of God; and the church to which he ministers, as well as the brotherhood at large, should demand, as I now demand of him, that he either prove these ugly charges or confess and apologize for the sin of making them, and for the double sin of making a false statement for four years, which, according to his own admission in 1919, he knew was false while he was making it.” (Statement of Facts About R. H. Boll, pages 7 and 8.)

**Boll’s Letter to A. B. Lipscomb**

In spite of the foregoing facts, Brother Boll, still anxious and hoping yet to clear himself of the charges, and
specifically charging M. C. Kurfees as the man who blocked all efforts for a settlement, wrote Brother A. B. Lipscomb on January 23, 1935, as follows:

"Doubtless you saw in the Christian Leader of January 8th the article by T. Q. Martin. Of all the brethren of the Advocate who knew the inside facts of the controversy that began in 1915, you are the only one living today, and I believe that with your knowledge of all the facts you could do much to clear me of the reproach and false accusations that have pursued me these years.

"You may perceive that T. Q. M.'s article is simply the echo of Brother M. C. Kurfees' strangely warped views. I believe that you knew all the time that Brother Kurfees was laboring under a misapprehension, and, like myself, you were unable to correct him; and throughout the rest of his life he assiduously and indefatigably spread abroad his version of the matter.

"Now I think that you would be able to bear a testimony that would go far toward removing the stigma and clearing my name of the reproach which Brother Kurfees placed upon him and which some are trying to perpetuate to this day.

"It is not for my own sake alone that I am appealing to you. Much evil could yet be remedied if the true facts were known. Do what you think right and good about the matter, and may the Lord direct your heart.

Yours in Christ
(Signed) R. H. Boll

"P. S. I am enclosing two extracts from letters to me by Brother Elam.

R. H. B."

Note the following statements in that letter: "The echo of Brother M. C. Kurfees' strangely warped views"; "you were unable to correct him"; and pleads that Brother Lipscomb would be able to remove the stigma and clear his name of the reproach which Brother Kurfees placed upon him and which some are trying to perpetuate to this day.

It is a fact, and has been a fact all along, that Brother Boll himself is the only man that can "remove the stigma" and clear his name. And no one knows better than Brother Boll how it must be done, if it is ever done.

Lipscomb's Reply to Boll

In answer to the letter quoted, Brother Lipscomb made a very cordial, kind, but very appropriate reply, in which he stated, to his own good judgment in the matter, made the positive agreement outlined above. My memory is so clear as to when and how he made it that I can but regard his subsequent denial and attempt to put the Gospel Advocate in a false light as a breach of confidence and trust wholly unworthy of Christian manhood. What a glorious privilege it would be to express forgiveness should our dear brother have the grace to pursue the course he has so persistently urged upon others in times past through the columns of this paper and acknowledge his error! Not one of the misguided friends with whom he has surrounded himself, and who are bent upon propagating divisive teachings would suggest this to Brother Boll. But he himself should understand that true friendship, impelled by the word of God, must insist upon it as the only righteous course'."

Of course, Brother Lipscomb's reply was not satisfactory to Brother Boll; so he wrote Brother Lipscomb again on February 4, 1935, and in this letter I note the following:

"It seems to me that the doctrinal differences have nothing to do with this. It is a plain question of righteousness, which, I fear, the Lord, the righteous judge, must take up. It will be but a little while longer, and we shall answer to Him."

A Question of Righteousness

I agree with Brother Boll in that it is, first of all, a "plain question of righteousness", and that is exactly the position taken and held by M. C. Kurfees to the day of his death, for he said all along that: "The question of veracity between Brother Boll and all of us brethren who testified against him must first be settled before I can or will have any cooperation or Christian fellowship with him".

Brother Klingman, has it been settled? Who, other than Brother Boll, can settle it?

In this same letter, February 4, 1935, to Brother Lipscomb, Brother Boll makes this unbrotherly and false charge:

"Several times the matter would have been adjusted if Brother Kurfees had not blocked it each time. The simple fact, as I see it, is that Brother Kurfees started the trouble and kept it up, when the rest of you brethren would have been glad to settle it in love and tolerance, but apparently you brethren yielded to Brother Kurfees, and so the matter must go to a higher Tribunal."

Well, to say the least, Brother Boll doesn't give the other brethren much credit for doing their own thinking, when he says they "yielded" to Brother Kurfees. Most assuredly, Brother Lipscomb is not now under the influence of Brother Kurfees, and he still holds the same opinion he had in 1916 when he testified.

Brother Boll added the following post-script to this same letter:

"The quotations from Brother Elam's letter I sent you are several years later (1925), the result of a renewed effort made by S. H. Hall, H. Leo Boles and E. A. Elam, which ended in perfect agreement among us (even including F. W. Smith), but was again frustrated by Brother Kurfees."

That shows the same date of Elam extracts as you sent me, namely, 1925, and he says they were in perfect agreement even including F. W. Smith. From the quotation I gave from Brother Smith's 1926 letter, that "perfect" agreement, if indeed it was ever "perfect", must have fallen by the wayside.

With these facts before you, do they, or do they not, enable you to understand why "all others" did not withdraw their charges against Brother Boll?

Of course, I know, and others know, that M. C. Kurfees has been, and is yet, charged with starting and "per-
petuating” this controversy, and is also charged with persecuting Boll, but facts show this to be false—every word of it, for as a matter of fact he said and did as little or less than others who made the same charge against Boll.

Now finally, not that he was perfection itself, for I make no such claim, I am not in the least disturbed about what M. C. Kurfees believed or disbelieved; neither am I disturbed over what he did or did not do, right up to his last moment on this earth. And may I, his brother in the flesh, be pardoned for saying that I am not in the least ashamed of his earthly record. That his works will live and do honor to the glory of God many long years after the memory of his bitterest opponents shall have perished from the earth, I haven’t the slightest doubt. I, therefore, stand ready to make defense whenever, wherever and by whom he may be unjustly attacked.

Fraternally,
J. F. Km-fees

Klingman "Answereth Not"

Dear Brother Km-fees:

I received your letter some time ago. We are very busy preparing to move to Texas this week to take up work with the congregation at Bryan.

Let me assure you again that what I have written you was simply my own personal judgment and attitude. It has never occurred to me to suggest what you should do in the matter; and so far from reflecting upon the integrity and sincerity of any one, it has been fartherest from my heart.

Sincerely,
Nov. 25, 1935
( Signed) Geo. A. Klingman

It is obvious that what Brother Klingman says is no answer to my letter; hence, I am compelled to leave him in the exact position in which, by his own invitation, my letter places him. It will be remembered that it was he, and not I, who opened the question. Should he decide later to make any effort to clear himself by answering and furnishing the information called for, I will be glad to consider what he has to say and feel sure this paper will grant us space.

The reader will note from my letter that there are at least three men, R. H. Boll, Geo. A. Klingman and E. L. Jorgenson, circulating these 1925 Elam extracts, all for the same purpose—namely: to show that Brother F. W. Smith withdrew his charges against Brother Boll and that M. C. Kurfees should have, but refused to do so! Of course, Kurfees refused, and I stated the facts, the grounds, for his refusal, which facts Brother Klingman failed to attack; and in spite of being twice urged to do so, he fails to state the ground, the facts, when, where and what Brother Boll said that caused Brother Smith to withdraw his charges.

Another vital matter, of which he says not one word, is the statements made by F. W. Smith in his letter of November 3, 1926. In this letter, as the reader will note, Smith says: "That (Boll) after denying that he had made such an agreement with the Advocate, for three or four years, he came and stated over his own signature that there was an agreement" . . . "but expressed no sorrow, repentance, or confession" . . . "within the last twelve months he has completely reversed himself regarding his acknowledgment of the agreement" . . . "he deceived us." Those were the statements of F. W. Smith in 1926, about one year after the date of the Elam extracts which they are so freely circulating. On this I asked Brother Klingman specifically if he were in possession of these facts when he wrote and opened the matter with me, but he makes no answer. What Brother Klingman needs is a new set of "extracts".

In his circular letter, E. L. Jorgenson said only "one" of the Advocate editors died believing these things, that is, the things charged against Brother Boll, but in the light of these facts, a revision of his circular would he in order.

The reader will also note that on January 23, 1935, Brother Boll sent these 1925 Elam extracts to Brother A. B. Lipscomb, along with his plea that Brother Lipscomb "knew the inside facts and would be able to bear a testimony that would go far toward removing the stigma and clearing his name of the reproach and false accusations that have pursued him these years." But, knowing the "inside facts," Brother Lipscomb was not favorably impressed and promptly replied by calling attention to, and even quoting, his testimony of 1916 that Brother Boll did make the agreement as charged.

Now, since Brother Boll seems to believe in "true facts" being known, I presume that when he gave to Brother Klingman the Elam extracts, he also gave him these "true facts," as stated by Brother Lipscomb, but if so, Brother Klingman withheld them, for he did not mention them when he wrote and opened the matter with me.

I have no idea who will be the next to receive these 1925 Elam extracts but fairness and common honesty demand that they be accompanied with both the statements made by Brother Smith in 1926 and the Boll-Lipscomb correspondence. This will keep the record straight and will show that M. C. Kurfees was not the only one that did not withdraw the charges made against R. H. Boll. Moreover, this will also help to carry out Brother Boll’s own wish, as he expressed to Brother Lipscomb—namely, "much evil could yet be remedied if the true facts were known."

So say I, and I think Brother Boll should urge Brother Klingman to be more liberal in stating facts when distributing his Elam extracts.

J. F. Kurfees.

RELIGIOUS TANGENTS AND SPECULATIVE UNSOUNDNESS
CLED E. WALLACE

O. E. Phillips has fulfilled some prophecy. Some discriminating brethren have been predicting for a good while that he would seek the fellowship of those who have corrupted the worship and compromised the doctrine of the New Testament. So he has gone to the Christian Church. Of course with his present views that is where he belongs. He probably should have gone sooner. It has been known for a long time that he had no pronounced convictions against the use of instrumental music in worship. Along about the time he softened on that question, he became enamoured with the current speculative opinions about the millennium. He developed into a crank over Revelation and prophecy and talked about as much about Mussolini as he did Christ. He has helped to generate strife and division over untaught questions. It is really a pity. Brother Phillips has some ability and did some good, preaching the gospel of Christ before he became unsound in the faith. He has forfeited the confidence of a large host of loyal disciples of Christ by the course he has been pursuing. He is a star actor in an anti-climax. It looks like he could see it. But if he cannot, then his experience should be a warning to others. It is not too late yet for him to hack up on to the main line of gospel principles and preach the gospel like he once did and like his father did before him. He will have a hard time. I think, finding happiness where he is. Flying off at speculative tangents will disqualify any preacher as a proclaimer of the simple gospel of Christ.
F. W. SMITH'S STATEMENT REGARDING THE R. H. BOLL AGREEMENT

The following reproduction is a photostatic copy of F. W. Smith's withdrawal of his acceptance of one of R. H. Boll's explanations about his agreement with the Gospel Advocate. Brother Boll made on agreement with the Gospel Advocate not to teach his theories, he afterwards repudiated the agreement, and denied that he had made one. Brother Smith charged him with falsifying. Brother Boll later admitted that he had made an agreement but sought refuge behind Webster's definitions of what "agreement" meant. He made some explanations and offered some apologies. Naturally of a forgiving disposition Brother Smith took a charitable view of it and withdrew his charge that Brother Boll had "falsified." But immediately upon his doing so, it appears that Brother Boll's attitude in other and later letters convinced Brother Smith that his explanations" and "apologies" were not according to the facts and he cancelled his withdrawal of the charge against Brother Boll and returned it to its original status.

Below is the cancellation statement made to E. A. Elam on the margin of the Elam manuscript in F. W. Smith's own handwriting. This document has distinct significance in the case for the reason that Boll and his followers have clung to the story that all of the Advocate editors, except M. C. Kurfees, withdrew their charges against him and are circulating the Elam letters as proof, with the final facts of the case withheld. This photostatic copy, with the A. B. Lipscomb letter on another page, is definite and final on that point of the "Boll Agreement." It is given here simply in interest of facts and in defense of the integrity of a great man, F. W. Smith, who though "being dead yet speaketh.

There was an agreement in the former sense; for without dictation from men, and as free under God and because my judgement approved, I was of the same mind with the other brethren that it was best not to press the doctrines in question. But there was no agreement in the second sense of Webster's definition.

The later statement which I made in 1919 in order to define and explain the term "agreement" I meant to be in perfect harmony with the former statements (which were made in 1915) and represents and embraces the facts as I understood them at the time the first statements were made.

On October 16th, 1925, Brother Boll further writes:

I hope you may be able to make it clear to my brethren who may seem disposed to question the motive of the statement I made in October, 1919; defining the term "agreement" that that statement was in no sense an attempt to exonerate myself of any charge, or to alter my previous statement by putting a new construction on the language.

In reply to this Brother Smith says;

Brother Boll, on December 9, 1515, referred to his first statement of November 4, 1915, as above quoted, said, "On this and no other understanding or agreement did I resume my work on the Advocate."

This statement was a "denial" of the private agreement Brother Boll had made with the Gospel Advocate to cease teaching certain doctrines, thus placing the Advocate in the attitude of misrepresenting the facts in the case, and in consequence of which he was charged with falsifying.

But since Brother Boll now disclaims that he "intended" his statement of November 9, 1915, as above quoted, to be a "denial" of the private agreement had with the Advocate, which agreement he admitted in his last statement of October 2, 1919, as above quoted; but that he "intended" his statement of November 9, 1915, to mean or embody what was expressed in his last statement of October 2, 1919, the charge made against Brother Boll of falsifying is withdrawn.

It must be distinctly understood, however, that the acceptance of Brother Boll's explanation as to what he meant by his statement of November 9, 1915, and the withdrawal of the charge made against him of wilfully falsifying, are not to be considered in any sense an endorsement of the doctrines in question.
To prevent further circulation of false statements being made by R. IT. Boll, E. L. Jorgenson and Don Carlos Janes, the following correspondence is published.

From Michigan to Texas persistently comes reports of statements made by these men that the Highland Church of Christ, Louisville, Ky., has done all it can to adjust differences in Louisville in which they are involved, and that R. 0. Rubel and C. A. Taylor are wholly responsible for failure to compose the differences. For this reason it seems proper to publish the written record.

These false statements are being used by the sympathizers of R. H. Boll in an effort to shift from their shoulders to that of others the responsibility for division which came to and continues with the church, because of the pressing of their theories.

It is proper to state here that E. L. Jorgenson and Don Carlos Janes were in 1918 and 1932 and are now, practically in control of the Highland Church. Neither Brother Rubel’s letter nor Brother Taylor’s letter, declining their terms of fellowship, has ever been read to the congregation.

A Disciplinary Fiasco

Mr. C. A. Taylor
Louisville, Ky.

Dear Brother Taylor:

In view of numerous concessions made at various times by Bros. C. A. Taylor and R. 0. Rubel, viz: That they were not always as kind, gentle, forbearing and considerate as they could and should have been; That they sometimes made mistakes in the methods they employed; That they regret all this; That the above admissions are freely made because it is right and in the hope of bringing about unity; That they were "fractious"; That a correction was made on the "Autocracy" pamphlet after discipline had been administered; That publication of that pamphlet is now considered "unwise"; That after the discipline, Bro. Rubel settled his personal difference;

That Bro. Taylor recently expressed his willingness to stand by any concessions he had ever made;

In view of these concessions relating to conduct which the Highland Church regarded as fractious (though they did not); conscious of our own imperfections, and in our desire for peace and unity-previously expressed in various conciliatory overtures—we from this date remove the disciplinary action of May 16, 1918, and extend fellowship to Bros. Taylor and Rubel.

Yours in Christian Service,

HIGHLAND CHURCH OF CHRIST
May 12, 1932
(Signed) H. V. Leatherman, Secretary.

Mr. I-I. V. Leatherman, Sec.,
Highland Church of Christ,
Louisville, Ky.

Dear Sir:

This will acknowledge receipt of your letter of May 12, 1932 and a reply will be sent you soon.

My son, Allen, is seriously ill, but I hope his condition will permit me soon to prepare my reply.

Very truly yours,

May 13, 1932
(Signed) C. A. Taylor.

The Camouflage Rejected

The Highland Church of Christ
Louisville, Ky.

Brethren:

Under date May 13, 1932, I wrote to acknowledge receipt of your letter May 12, 1932, saying that reply to your letter would be sent soon as my son’s health would permit me to give attention to a reply and I will now answer your letter in accordance with that promise.

I have not, since receipt of your letter, communicated with Bro. R. 0. Rubel, Sr. but feel confident that his judgment, regarding the matters mentioned, will fully agree with this letter.

For fourteen (14) years you have sought relief from the condemnation, under which you rest, in the eyes of both God and man, but always you have endeavored to escape any acknowledgment of wrong upon your part, and now you have apparently tried to convert statements made by me into a confession which would possibly not only justify your action in 1918 but which you seek to use as an excuse for extending to us your fellowship.

You also appear utterly indifferent to the fact that every time you publicly offer to Bro. Rubel and me an unsatisfactory basis for settlement, you are still further injuring us in the eyes of all those members of the church who are not familiar with the entire history of this matter, and you have again apparently repeated such action, notwithstanding the fact that I have time after time requested that nothing more be done until and unless the Highland Church by congregational action admits, without qualification, that by withdrawal action in 1918 you wronged Bro.

(Continued on next page)
Rubel and me and express regret for that wicked act. Any acknowledgment that you have wronged us or that you regret your action is conspicuously absent from your letter and letter is silent regarding any congregational action having been taken.

During these fourteen (14) years we have responded to many brethren who have approached us regarding settlement of our differences and in a spirit of conciliation and with the understanding that you would right this wrong, if we would contribute all possible toward a better understanding, I have made certain statements which I fear have been sadly misused. No so called “concession” was ever made by me, and I feel certain none was ever made by Bro. Rubel, which could possibly be properly used by the Highland Church as a basis for “extending fellowship” or as an explanation of why you “extend fellowship” to us.

Terms of Reinstatement Artificial and Strategical

Your letter contains nine (9) items listed as “concessions” made by us, to which I now refer, beginning with second paragraph of letter and considering them in rotation:

1. I have always said that I do not believe it humanly possible for anyone to have been actively connected with such a situation as existed in the Highland Church during the long period of three (3) years, in which so many of the members objected to Bro. Jorgenson as our preacher, without sometimes failing to be as “kind, gentle, forbearing and considerate” as they should have been, but this failure was not at all confined to one side, in this controversy and certainly Bro. Rubel and I were not the only members in the entire congregation who yielded to these ordinary impulses. All that this statement was ever intended to or properly could be understood to mean, is that we, as you say of yourselves in your letter, are “conscious of our own imperfections”. However, an admission upon our part that we are not “perfect” shall not be magnified by you into such a confession of wrong doing as to provide for you a vehicle with which to justify the withdrawal from us, upon the charge that we were “factionists” and “disobedient”. If so, it is most discouraging to right the wrong done us and it is extremely discouraging also because I was led to believe they would encourage you and not upon the charge that we were “fractious”.

2. While I have never doubted and do not now doubt the righteousness of our refusal to support, through the agency of our minister, the objectionable doctrine featured and pressed in 1914-1918, I have sometimes questioned the wisdom of some moves involved in our efforts to induce the congregation to change our preacher, but such mistakes did not warrant you in withdrawing fellowship from us, upon the charge that we were “factionists” and “disorderly”, nor as a basis upon which to explain why you now offer to us our fellowship.

3. Of course, I, as all right-thinking Christians should, regret any kind of mistakes I may make.

4. These statements or admissions were, of course, made because I believed it right to do so and were made also because I was led to believe they would encourage you to right the wrong done us and it is extremely discouraging to see how you have misused my efforts to promote peace.

5. When I said that perhaps the Highland Church members had mistaken “fractious” conduct for “factionist” conduct I had in mind only the usual meaning of the word “fractious”, (which I understand to be snappish, apt to become angry) and I fully realize that under such a long series of aggravating circumstances any one would likely become “fractious”, in the sense in which I used that word but you based your withdrawal from us upon the charge that we were “factionist”, (which charge is absolutely false) and not upon the charge that we were “fractious”.

6. I do not recall that any “correction was made on the ‘Autocracy’ pamphlet”.

7. I am inclined now to the belief that publication of that pamphlet was “unwise” but I do not now and never have believed its publication was sinful.

8. All I know about the settlement of personal differences between Bro. Rubel and Bro. Jorgenson is that Bro. Rubel said he would “try to believe” that Bro. Jorgenson did not intentionally misrepresent letter of Hro. Lipscomb. I do not know how well he has succeeded in that effort.

9. I resent this imputation, that I might not “stand by” all statements I have ever made and challenge the truth of such an insinuation.

Action Must be Unconditionally Revoked

I have been quite candid in this letter because it is very important to me that the misuse of statements I have made be corrected and not because I wish to be abrupt.

It is with keen regret that I must decline your offer to resume our broken fellowship for your letter extends fellowship based upon our supposed “concessions” and not because you have repented of your wicked act. The barrier erected by you in 1918 will never be removed and our differences will never be composed until and unless you take the correct action based upon proper grounds.

I understand your letter to me was read to the Highland congregation and if this is correct, you have done Bro. Rubel and me an additional injury, which can be partially corrected only by also reading to that entire congregation, this reply. I shall appreciate being advised when this has been done.

Very truly yours,

May 26, 1932

(Signed) C. A. Taylor.

Highland Leaders Ignore Facts and Assume Innocence

Dear Brother Taylor:

We acknowledge with thanks your letter of May 26th and sincerely regret that you did not accept our offered fellowship but we continue to extend the hand of Christian fellowship and brotherly love. Praying that you will yet come and worship together with us,

Yours in Christian Service,

June 16, 1932

H. V. Leatherman, Secretary.

Mr. H. V. Leatherman, Secretary
Highland Church of Christ
Louisville, Ky.

Brethren:—

This is to acknowledge receipt of your letter, June 16, 1932, which reached me last Tuesday.

The “hand of Christian fellowship and brotherly love”, which you profess to extend to me, will be most cheerfully and promptly accepted, when and if it is accompanied by congregational acknowledgment, that in 1918, you wronged Bro. Rubel and me.

Until such acknowledgment is made, failure to compose our differences, continues to rest squarely upon your shoulders and upon your souls.

Clearly, this is the teaching of the Word of God, regarding such matters, and I can not ignore His plain teaching.

Very truly yours,

July 9, 1932

(Signed) C. A. Taylor.
"THAT CIRCULAR LETTER FROM LOUISVILLE"


The Gospel Advocate of December 20th, 1934, published an editorial from the pen of Brother F. B. Srygley, under the above heading. I had received from different persons three copies of that same letter. I suppose these copies of the letter were sent to me because of the reflection cast upon "Haldeman preachers". I suppose I have conducted more meetings for the Haldeman Ave. congregation in Louisville, Ky., than any other man now living, that is counting the meetings before and since the building of the present house used as a place of worship by this congregation. I shall later give attention to what is said in the letter about Haldeman Ave. But first I notice briefly, item 1 in the letter, to which item, Brother Srygley, who was present at the Winchester debate replied in his own inimitable way.

The Winchester Debate

That item asserts that the doors of the meeting house of the First Christian Church at Winchester, Ky. were closed against the debate "for one single solitary cause. The vicious spirit and method of the negative".

From the printed debate and from the testimony of competent witnesses who attended the debate, it develops that Brother Neal after boldly challenging the brethren anywhere and everywhere to debate with him, when his challenge was accepted, objected to having moderators, selected a chairman to preside, and when his chairman assumed the functions of moderator, and practically, the functions of dictator, he uttered no word of protest. Foy Wallace did not tamely submit to being told what he should say or not say in the debate. I have heard him speak very emphatically when condemning error, but to say that his course was "vicious" or "unchristian" would not be true. "Vicious" is a very ugly word, especially coming from one of a group of brethren for whom special piety, long suffering and mildness in manner are claimed. Every time one of these disturbers of Zion is criticized, an apologist arises to tell us of the piety, self-sacrifice, devotion to Christ that these brethren display. I find that these sweet-spirited brethren can actually, when their pet theories are called in question, apply very ugly epithets to their brethren.

(Continued on page 16)

Dear Bro. Taylor

Crichton, Ala.

Yours of the 27th to hand. Yes, I received the letter from the Highland Church informing me that we were both restored to full fellowship.

I have not replied to it as I fully expected to hear from you in reference to your course.

I heartily indorse your reply. Inclosed you will find letter from Bro. Srygley in reply to letter I wrote with reference to the Highland letter May 12th. Think he hits the nail on the head. Trying to shift the whole trouble on our shoulders. Guilty conscience need no accuser and worm is now turning.

Glad indeed to hear Allen is improved and getting along so well. Mrs. Rubel has been sick for the past week but is weak and the least exertion exhausts her. I am still a little lame, but attribute it to youthful growing pains.

We both send love to yourself and family. Also all the Church folks.

Sincerely yours,

(Signed) R. O. Rubel, Sr.

June 1, 1932

The Wrong Rests Upon Jorgenson, Jones and Highland Church

Crichton, Ala.

Mr. H. B. Leatherman
2013 Grinstead Drive
Louisville, Ky.

Dear Sir:

Replying to your letter of May 12th ; I have delayed answering expecting to hear from Brother Taylor.

I received a copy of Bro. Taylor’s reply several days ago, and I fully endorse every article in his reply of May 26th.

Never by word or act have I made any concession that could be construed as making overtures for re-instatement to fellowship in the Highland Church. You did the wrong and the Highland Church should confess the wrong done not only to Bro. Taylor and me but to the old members that built and paid for the house of worship you now occupy.

I can not accept the fellowship offered me on the conditions you laid down. Instead of the wrong you did in the name of the Church you confess wrongs for Taylor and Rubel but do not make any efforts to confess the wrong you did.

I think Bro. Taylor has made it clear to the Church the grounds upon which we will accept fellowship in the Highland Church. Will you kindly read this letter to the Church ?

Will thank you very much for doing so.

Sincerely,

(Signed) R. O. Rubel.

June 16, 1932

But the letters of Taylor and Rubel were never read to the Highland Congregation, for reasons which perhaps Jorgenson, Janes, and the leaders involved with them could tell us.

C. A. Taylor.
Let those who attended the Winchester debate after it was moved to the court house, answer as to whether Brother Neal displayed the same sweet spirit that he seemed to possess while in the house of the First Christian Church.

The Louisville Churches

But here is item 4 in the above named letter:

“There are in Louisville and in this immediate district (on the Kentucky side) thirty simple congregations of Christ. This count goes no further out than many of our brethren go for an evening’s service. In three of these, and in three only, Boll, Janes and Jorgenson are not fellowshipped by the leaders. The three are Haldeman Ave., and the two selected groups; Atwood (which is Haldeman’s mission) and Napoleon (which is the group formerly at Highlands). At one time there was a small group led off from Longfield Ave. by one Pendergrass who is now gone; whether they meet any more or not I do not know. One could almost say the only division in Louisville is Haldeman against all the rest! For all the opposition has grown out of opposition from Haldeman preachers’.

This makes the impression that Haldeman Ave. congregation, and “Haldeman preachers” are a perverse group. No mention is made of any cause for opposition on the part of Haldeman Ave. nor of any cause why “the group formerly at Highlands” is not still there.

I formerly lived in Sellersburg, Ind., in the days before the divisive speculation was thrust upon the churches of Christ, by a “group” that would not listen to counsel or advice from any source. In those days I attended union’ prayer meetings at Portland Ave., in Louisville, Campbell St. (now Haldeman Ave.) and at Highlands. There was beautiful fellowship among all these congregations. You could not tell who was a member of any particular congregation unless you should ask the question. All the “groups” in Louisville know this is a true statement.

I happen to know that Haldeman with its “selected groups” teaches and practices just what it taught and practiced when fellowship among the Louisville congregation was intact. Who broke the fellowship and provoked the opposition?

Have you ever known division in the body of Christ, when those who stood firm for the plain, simple teaching of God’s word were not accused of causing the division? The Louisville case is not an exception. Let us note some facts of which the Jorgenson letter gave no hint.

Highland’s “High-handed Wickedness”

In May, 1918, Janes, Jorgenson and their associates in the Highlands Church, Louisville, Ky. withdrew Christian fellowship from R. 0. Rubel and C. A. Taylor, two as fine specimens of Christian manhood as I have ever known. This piece of high-handed wickedness was pretty thoroughly discussed in the Gospel Advocate of June 20th. and 27th and Oct. 10th, 1918.

The Haldeman Ave. congregation and hundreds of other brethren condemned that presumptuous course knowing that the reason for such action against these excellent brethren was their opposition to the speculative guesses about unfulfilled prophecy that these disturbers of the churches were and are still pressing. We are commanded to mark and to turn away from such, and inasmuch as that wrong has never been righted, Haldeman Ave. and others for 16 years have observed the apostle’s instructions in Rom. 16:17. When congregations can withdraw fellowship from good brethren for opposing factions and divisive teaching, and go unrebuked, it is time to do some serious thinking and praying.

The late J. C. McQuidd, writing about this Highland Ave. outrage, in Gospel Advocate Aug. 14, 1919, page 789 said:

“Christians should withdraw fellowship from him (E. L. Jorgenson) and in a spirit of gentleness should plead with him to repent and beg forgiveness for his unwarranted and unchristian conduct. No other course will satisfy the demands of justice. . . Those responsible for the withdrawal have failed to give a scriptural reason for their conduct, though most earnestly entreated to do so. Is such vicious conduct to go down as an example to the churches of the future, unrebuked and unreproved? It is not an ordinary case. For an utter disregard of the Scriptures it has few, if any, equals. Every Christian should rebuke the wrong, not in a spirit of vengeance, but in a spirit of meekness. They should do it first for the salvation of E. L. Jorgenson and those responsible with him. Second, they should do it that other churches may not fall into a similar sin.”

Does some one say I should not quote from Brother McQuidd, since he had gone to his reward? Well, I have not mentioned him. And others have gone to their reward, between whom and Brother Robt. H. Boll there was, and remains to this day, a question of veracity.

The Question of Veracity

That Brother Boll is the chief man in advocating the peculiar views that have disturbed the churches in Louisville and elsewhere, cannot be successfully denied nor evaded. When the controversy between the Gospel Advocate and Brother Boll first arose, my confidence in both the management of the Advocate and in Brother Boll was such that I hoped matters would be righted in a little while.

My confidence in Brother Boll was shaken when in 1915 such men as E. G. Sewell, M. C. Kurfees, F. W. Smith, J. C. McQuiddy and A. B. Lipscomb claimed that there was an agreement between them and Brother Boll, that he, R. H. Boll, would cease to feature his teaching on unfilled prophecy, which agreement Brother Boll denied. It did seem strange to me that the five brethren had falsified and that Bro. Boll alone had uttered the truth, and yet either the five brethren or Brother Boll did falsify.

Now four years passed and the matter stood thus, a question of veracity. In 1919 Brother Boll made a statement, in substance this: There are two senses in which the word agreement is used, and that he had made an agreement in a sense. I was forced to believe that Brother Boll was uncandid, and that he was bound to know that he had not “come clean”.

When he later made ugly, grievous charges, embodied in epithets which he applied to Advocate editors, my faith in the man simply died.

Here are the names of the Advocate editors at that time: E. G. Sewell, T. B. Larimore, M. C. Kurfees, E. A. Elam, F. W. Smith, J. C. McQuiddy, A. B. Lipscomb. All these men save A. B. Lipscomb have gone hence. Brother Lipscomb lives at Valdosta, Ga. and may be consulted by any who are interested, as to his earnest, yet unavailing effort to induce the Highlands Ave. brethren, those guilty of the high-handed outrage against C. A. Taylor and R. O. Rubel, to make some amends for their action. These men Taylor and Rubel were and are in fellowship with Haldeman Ave. The faithful soldiers of the cross, listed above, as deceased editors of the Gospel Advocate, lived and died in the fellowship of Haldeman Ave. congregation.

(Continued on next page)
A DOCTRINAL MANIFESTO

(Editors by R. H. Boll, in Word and Work, 1932)

In view of recent utterances of some religious journals, some editorial, some otherwise, the editor of Word and Work feels impelled to state again and anew his doctrinal position and church relationship. It appears that some editors and some other writers, and perhaps some other brethren, are not wholly decided as to whether they should any longer continue in fellowship with some of the rest of us who do not share their views of prophecy. In fact, they are almost decided to sever relationship with the brethren who so differ, unless, of course, those brethren would come across and fall into agreement with their views, which views they seem to have set up for a standard of soundness and basis of fellowship. Now, in order to clarify things and to make it easier for those writers and their friends to decide whether they can consistently fellowship with the brethren whose prophetic views are obnoxious to them, I thought good for my part to state my position, which is the only position and creed to which I can and willy subscribe. I feel assured that the rest of the objectionable brethren (though I have not consulted any of them) will indorse the same position. To this position I shall be true; and if any of us must be rejected from fellowship on such grounds, I can see no other chance. They will just have to put us out!

I shall not, however, try to formulate any statement. I simply quote from my tract, "The Church I Found," published about ten years ago. In that tract I outlined what I still believe to be the simple, nonsectarian Christian position.

Boll's Vindictive Spirit

Now here are some of the epithets hurled at these men whose memory loyal Churches of Christ delight to honor, by R. H. Boll who is almost worshipped by some of his admirers: "The Nashville Council"; "These Scribes and Pharisees"; "false brethren"; "I know the men who are back of the Gospel Advocate today are false and unrighteous"; "they have inaugurated a campaign of wilful misrepresentation; "they sit in judgment on men, and even on congregations-they brand, stigmatize, and ostracize whom they will, while they themselves are responsible to no man."

All these charges and epithets are found on page 5 of "A Statement Of Facts About R. H. Boll", published by the lamented F. W. Smith. Shall all this pass without re- buke?

That there is a serious division in Louisville over the teaching of Brother Boll and his associates cannot be ignored. That these brethren of the "Word and Work" have pressed their views on unfulfilled prophecy, to the disruption of congregations cannot be denied. It is not with me a question of how many or how few fellowship these brethren, but I shall still hope and pray that fellowship among the congregations in Louisville may be restored. But such fellowship can never come until those who have broken that fellowship, make amends for their course.

I have tried to write in the spirit of love. I know that I cherish no animosity toward any one. I write in the spirit of fairness, and I know it unfair to charge Haldeman Ave. and "Haldeman preachers" with the responsibility for the division in Louisville, Ky.

T. Q. Martin.

In Regard to Standards of Doctrine

How as a babe in Christ I conceived of the Christian's freedom in personal responsibility to his Lord--comes back to me in the remembrance of little casual disputes. On one occasion a man said to me: "I know what you people believe on the intermediate state-I heard one of your preachers on it not long ago." "That doesn't signify anything," I answered him. "The preacher you heard may have been right, or may have been wrong. We are not bound to our preachers, nor by anything any man among us may say. Our only appeal is to the word of God." That was a month or so after my baptism. I have had no occasion to alter my position on that matter. To this day I take it that no man or set of men, however learned, venerable, and good, can be authority to a simple Christian. If any man is so scholarly or so deeply versed in the Scriptures, it ought to enable him to point out and set forth that much more clearly what the Scriptures say on any matter in question. If he cannot do that, his reputation is vain. It is certain that, for all his reputed knowledge and ability, we will not take his word. When he can point out God's word on the matter, so that I myself can see that it is God's word, I accept it-not because that able brother pointed it out, but because it is God's word. To this day, in my judgment, the consideration that this or that great man taught thus and so, or that the editors of such and such a religious paper stand for this or that, or even that the brotherhood believes thus and so, weighs absolutely nothing, so far as the determination of the faith of the humblest Christian is concerned.

Such was my understanding when I became a Christian, and such I conceived to be the position of the one and only church to which I then subscribe or to which I ever expect to belong. To these principles I have never been unfaithful.

In accordance with this principle, I have never set up my findings in the Word of God as the standard of truth and test of fellowship for any one, nor allowed any one else's views to be set up as a standard for me.

I will quote a little further in order to help those militant brethren better to judge whether I belong to the church of Christ, and to their fellowship:

The Creed Question

I do not belong to any "church of Christ" which stands on any other platform, nor do I own any doctrine of any "brotherhood" which narrows down, or superadds to this simple basis of faith any doctrines of men, or any creed formulated by men. As I would not subscribe to a human creed that contained error, or any tenet or article of faith contrary to my judgment to the word of God-so neither would I subscribe to any man's creed if that creed contained to the dot all I now believe, and all I understand the Bible to teach. I can accept no human creed, good or bad. The moment a Christian bows to a human creed, he ceases to be a simple follower of Christ. An alien authority has intruded between him and his Lord; and his claim to be a member of the church of Christ requires the explanation that he belongs to that particular party which holds to such and such a creed as the authoritative expression of its faith. If a man thus bound to a creed should see occasion (as any living, growing, thinking man must) to correct past views, or to enlarge past conceptions, and to take in new truths from the storehouse of God, he would either have to shut his eyes to light, or break away from the old creed, and formulate a new one every time he made a step forward. Thus comes the mul-
tiplication of sects. But the true Christian is committed simply to the word of God in the sight of the Lord-all of it, and it alone, and that is his ultimate and only standard of truth and doctrine, in which lies boundless scope for his growth and progress, and correction.

Now, if those brethren, over and above the fundamental statement of the faith, that Jesus is the Christ, the Son of God, and the acceptance of the Scriptures as the word of God and only authority in faith and practice-if in addition to this they demand that in order to fellowship certain beliefs of theirs on certain points of prophecy shall be accepted, there is nothing but a question, but they must exclude us from their sect; for some of us certainly will never subscribe to their human creed. Of course they think their creed is true and correct-I give them credit for honesty of conviction. But what creed-makers ever thought otherwise than that their articles of faith were the Simon-pure truth? Indeed, they may have been for the most part and so far as they went true and correct. But I came out from an organization which set up a man-made creed, and I do not propose to belong to another of like sort. I quote again:

The Church | Didn't Join

After all the writer has gone through, would he have to fear that while endeavoring to stand simply as a Christian, and to belong only to the church spoken of in the New Testament, he might inadvertently have fallen in with a sect which, while calling itself by that good name, stands upon something else than the whole inclusive and exclusive basis of the whole word of God? I cannot admit such a thought for a moment. When I say that I stand absolutely and foursquare upon the word of God, all of it and nothing but it-not any creed or theory of any man, either of my own or any other’s, and that by that Word and with it I am content to stand or fall-I am declaring the fundamental position of the church of Christ, and of many thousands of simple Christians, my brethren in the Lord. If there be any organization that stands for less or more than this; if there be a party holding articles of faith and tenets of man’s deduction and manufacture as a creed and standard of doctrine, written or unwritten— I do not belong to such a party organization, let its name be what it may. If, for example, there is a body of religionists who, in order to fellowship and unity with them, would demand submission to tenets such as that Dan. 2:44 was (or was not) fulfilled on Pentecost; that the church is (or is not) the equivalent of the kingdom; or that Christ will not come until the world is converted; or that Christ now is, or is not, on David’s throne; or perhaps, that certain portions of Scripture (say, the prophecies) are not to be taught, or if taught not to be insisted on for what they plainly say and mean in simple, faithful acceptance of the inspired words—if I say, there were such a body demanding submission to such or such like articles of faith, on pain of ostracism and excommunication from their brotherhood and fellowship—they do well to count me out, for indeed I belong to no such sect.

Now, this ought to make the matter perfectly clear. If, then, those brethren insist that certain of us must subscribe to their views on prophecy (or else promise to keep silent on the subject), we must regretfully permit them to draw their line on us, and sorrowfully leave them to their human sect which they have formed and which they call “church of Christ.” But with the rest (who are many) who are merely simple Christians, I stand fully and whole-heartedly identified. May I quote once more from the same tract:

But from the people who call themselves simple Christians-with whom also I am wholly at one in all understanding of all that is required to make a man a Christian, and in all matters of congregational practice: who stand upon the whole word of God, willing to test all things by that word alone, in brotherly fellowship with all who stand with them upon the same broad (and narrow) basis from them I would not be severed or distinguished for any consideration, nor for all the world excluded from their Christian fellowship. To that following I belong; of that people I am one, though the very least and unworthiest. Were I cut off from them, I should be at a loss indeed, for I have no other plea than theirs, and nothing else to preach or teach, nor any sort of distinctive doctrinal principles to found a sect upon, even if I were capable of so evil a thing— which please God, I am not.

Here I must rest my case. I should be sorry to see a contingent within the professing church of Christ forget their principles and degenerate into a creed-bound human sect. But for no fear or favor, nor for the sake of any specious plea for unity, can I subscribe to anybody’s creed or join their sect. So make up your minds, brethren, as to how it shall be.

DOES IT READ THAT WAY?

H. L. Olmstead, a tooth and toe-nail premillennialist says that the song “I know that my Redeemer liveth and on the earth again shall stand” has “either been omitted or those words changed in some of the new books”. He then adds: “I notice that they still read that way in Job. 19:25, 26.” Now, does it read that way? Get your Bible, Brother Olmstead, read what Job says, apologize for what you said he said, and take it back, unless you want your perversion of Job’s statement to stay on record. What Job said reads this way: “I know that my Redeemer liveth, and that he shall stand in the latter day upon the earth”. Neither the King James Version nor the Revised Version says “again shall stand”. And Job’s statement was made several centuries before the Redeemer came and did stand upon the earth. Brother Olmstead either ignorantly or deliberately misrepresented Job, either of which is bad enough. But that’s just a sample of how Premillennialists get their theory. It is just as easy for them to read things into the text that are not in it, and ignore things in the text that are in it, as it is for an ordinary sectarian “Fundamentalist” like J. Frank Norris, with whom they have so much in common.

--Editor.
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**BROTHER BOLL’S PROPOSITION**

(Editorial in Gospel Advocate by Foy E. Wallace Jr., Replying to Boll’s “Here’s My Hand” and “A Doctrinal Manifesto,” 1932)

In a recent issue of the Word and Work, Brother R. H. Boll extends his hand to us on a proposition regarding the teaching of certain prophetic theories which have been sponsored by that magazine. His proposition sets forth exactly the principles for which the Gospel Advocate has contended all the time, and we stand ready to complete the gesture toward unity so far as the editorial responsibility of the Gospel Advocate extends.

“Here’s My Hand.”

Under this heading Brother Boll delivers his proposition to us as follows:

“If any are sincerely troubled with fears lest any false doctrines, theories, speculations, etc., may rise up to disturb the unity of the church, I would like for my part to go on record on my own behalf, and as far as my responsibility for the Word and Work extends, that nothing shall be taught on any prophetic theme except what can be read from the Bible. On the question of the kingdom, for instance, the Word and Work is willing to set forth and emphasize any and every statement found in God’s book, in its own fair light and context, without addition, subtraction, or alteration, and without regard to any theories on the subject.

On the Coming of Christ, on the Thousand Years, on the Throne of David; on all disputed and prophetic themes, in short, I am willing to let God alone speak. In all discussions and expositions of passages bearing on these matters I propose to regard carefully, even scrupulously, what the passage in question actually says; to draw no unwarranted conclusions or unnecessary inferences, to build or defend no human theories, to avoid mere philosophical and syllogistic argumentation on Bible themes. I feel sure that all the friends and writers of the Word and Work will endorse such attitude. If the brethren who have pressed the other side of the controverted matters will bind themselves in like manner, harmony ought to be complete.”

If Brother Boll will live up to this proposition, harmony will be complete. And if he had never pursued any other course than the one he now proposes, there never would have been anything except harmony on these questions. He proposes “that nothing shall be taught on any prophetic theme except what can be read from the Bible.” This proposition bars all “interpretations” and “views” of prophecy beyond what the Bible “actually says.” We accept it. It is exactly what “the brethren who have pressed the other side of the controverted matters” believe. Brother Boll has, in fact, conceded that position to us by the admission that we have “pressed the other side of the controverted matters”. Since his side has been, by his own admissions, dealing with interpretations of prophecy which destroy harmony, “the other side,” by his admission, has been against these interpretations, and stands, therefore, upon the exact proposition on which Brother Boll offers his hand.

In view of this proposal, Brother Boll’s references, in the same issue of his paper, to what the pioneers taught on these questions is untimely. He is not proposing to do or teach as they did, but to teach only what the Bible “actually says”. Nearly every man who has ever had a peculiar position to defend, has claimed “the pioneers” on his side. If we were at present devoted to the task of defending the teaching of the pioneers on the issues involved, it could be successfully done, at least, to the extent of proving that they did not hold the views advocated by Brother Boll. But that is not the proposition. Brother Boll has offered his hand on an agreement to teach only what the Bible “actually says” and only “what can be read from the Bible”—“without addition, subtraction, or alteration, and without regard to any theories on the subject”. While this will require that Brother Boll repudiate some of his own books and withdraw them from the market, we hope that lie will not recede from his proposition, which we wholeheartedly accept without modification.

“A Doctrinal Manifesto.”

While waiting for us to accept or refuse his proposition Brother Boll issued another number of the Word and Work containing “A Doctrinal Manifesto”. Concerning this number he says: “Of all the issues [of his paper], our preaching brethren must have this one: we send it to them all.” He further states that this is not the first time all the preachers have been treated to a free edition of his magazine. “Once before, for four consecutive months,” he says, “we ventured by faith to send the Word and Work to an extra list of two thousand preachers.” And between these “specials” we all know that he has been diligent in the propagation of his peculiar theories. Still, we have been supinely told that they have not pressed these theories and that we should not have opposed them. But even after extending us his hand on a proposition for unity our brother editor felt called upon for some reason to issue a “speculation special” in an effort to proselyte all the preachers. And worse still, in this issue he refers freely to those who differ from his views as “creedists,” “creed-bound,” “a self-constituted ecclesiasticism,” and “a human sect which they call ‘church of Christ.’” Aside form being extremely untimely, with his proposition pending acceptance or rejection, the language is hardly consistent with our brother’s professions of piety and reverence, if not entirely incompatible with his own standard of integrity. Really, his proposition ought to be amended to include a retraction of these charges and an apology for his hard sayings; but if he will stand by the proposition on which he extends his hand, we will not require it of him.

But while we are waiting for his proposition to be confirmed, some strictures on our brother’s “manifesto” are in order.

1. Our brother editor says: “In view of recent utterances of some religious journals, some editorial, some otherwise, the editor of Word and Work feels impelled to state again and anew his doctrinal position and church relationship.”

This declaration is hardly true to the facts in the case. Brother Boll would leave the impression that “recent utterances” of others impel him to make a declaration of his doctrine. But all informed brethren know that he has been at it all the time. His own unyielding attitude toward the propagation of his objectionable doctrines has called forth all the opposition. The suspension of the discussion of these questions in the Gospel Advocate over a period of time was, it seems, construed as a surrender of the issues involved, and the effort to advance their theories was given impetus. Thus an undue advantage was taken of a gesture for unity. It was this attitude of the editor of Word and Work, with his increasing propaganda, that called forth the “recent utterances” in the Gospel Advocate.

2. Our brother editor states further: “Some editor and some writers are not wholly decided as to whether they should any longer continue in fellowship with some of the rest of us who do not share their views on prophecy.”
This statement is a cunning but very ignoble effort to shift the responsibility of division and disfellowship. Brother Boll plays ventriloquist and makes it sound as if the voice of "views on prophecy" were coming from some other than his own direction. But his speculations are too notorious for this device to work. His name is virtually a synonym for theorizing. Any attempt to absolve his own guilt by adroit references to other prophetic views, as though it were just a matter of choosing between views held by others and his own, can only be classified as a shrewd maneuver. It is the editor of Word and Work, not "some editor and some other writers," who has been imposing "views of prophecy" upon the brethren. Who does not know that Brother Boll plays ventriloquist and makes it sound as if the voice were as the brethren were in those clays and there will be no temptation to foist it bodily upon the churches? Brother Boll admits this himself when he speaks of "the good old days" before he had, they did not feature them. They held them only as opinions. Brother Boll does not do this. He asserts that his theories are plainly taught in the Bible, and it has been observed that eighty per cent of the space in his paper is accepted? Does he now mean to say, "Fellowship me, fellowship my theories"? Then who draws the line of fellowship? Brother Boll himself when he speaks of "the good old days" when there was no "trouble" over these issues. Let him be as the brethren were in those clays and there will be no trouble now. Whatever "views of prophecy" the brethren before us had, they did not feature them. They held them only as opinions. Brother Boll does not do this. He asserts that his theories are plainly taught in the Bible, and it has been observed that eighty per cent of the space in his paper the last few years has been devoted to the agitation of these divisive questions.

"They Will Just Have To Put Us Out"

3. Our brother editor further deposes after this fashion: "If, then, those brethren insist that certain of us must subscribe to their views of prophecy (or else promise to keep silent on the subject), we must regretfully permit them to draw their line on us, and sorrowfully leave them to their human sect which they have formed and which they call "church of Christ."

If by "those brethren" Brother Boll means the Gospel Advocate, we gladly inform him that we are not now, nor have we ever been, interested in getting anybody to subscribe to anybody’s “views on prophecy”. Contrastively, we have earnestly sought to induce “those brethren” who are teaching “views on prophecy” to abandon their divisive work and “follow after the things which make for peace, and things wherewith one may edify another.” This statement of Brother Boll’s in itself amounts to a confession of heresy. It is a tacit admission that his views are so far out of line with the body “which they call 'church of Christ'” as to require much forbearance and toleration in order to fellowship him. Our much-exercised brother pays himself no compliment in holding himself in such an attitude before the churches. Hear him again: "If any of us must be rejected from fellowship on such grounds, I can see no other chance. They will just have to put us out." Who does Brother Boll think can disfellowship him? The Gospel Advocate claims no such prerogative. Our understanding of what the New Testament teaches is that only the local church with the divine arrangement of elders and deacons can withdraw fellowship. We believe and teach this autonomy of the local church, and could not be so inconsistent as to contradict it by disfellowshipping Brother Boll or anybody else. The purpose of the Gospel Advocate is to advocate the gospel, not disfellowship people.

But what does all this mean, appearing in the next issue after an extended hand on a proposition for unity? Does it mean that he withdraws his proposition before it is accepted? Does he now mean to say, “Fellowship me, fellowship my theories”? Then who draws the line of fellowship? In his proposition Brother Boll proposes to “regard carefully, even scrupulously, what the passage in question actually says; to draw no unwarranted conclusions or unnecessary inferences, to build up or defend no human theories,” etc. Now he says he will “regretfully permit” somebody to “draw their line” on him before he will “promise to keep silent on the subject”. We are unable to interpret these “recent utterances” of his in the light of the proposition he made in the preceding issue of his paper.

4. Regarding creeds, Brother Boll says that no line of fellowship should be drawn. "Over and above the fundamental statement of faith that Jesus is the Christ, the Son of God, and the acceptance of the Scriptures as the word of God and only authority in faith and practice.” He further avers: "I am standing absolutely and foursquare upon the word of God, all of it—and not any creed or theory of any man, either my own or any other, and that by that word and with it I am content to stand or fall—and that I am declaring the fundamental principle of the church of Christ.”

His statement of the Scriptural creed is correct, and we promptly accept and avow it. But that he is “standing absolutely and foursquare” upon it we positively deny. He is standing absolutely on his own opinions and theories, all of them “over and above the fundamental statement of faith” which he has laid down as his creed. Brother Boll himself does not practice what he preaches concerning “drawing the line of fellowship” on this statement and nothing more. Hear him: "The Word and Work has repeatedly and with much care and detail shown that the charges of teaching 'Russellism' and 'Adventism,' which have been brought against its editors and some other brethren, are wholly untrue; that the Word and Work and all its friends stand opposed to both these false cults and against every distinctive doctrine of both Russellism and Adventism."

Here Brother Boll finds himself drawing the line of fellowship “over and above” the fundamental statement of faith he avows. On what ground does he draw the line on the Russellites, Adventists, and Fundamentalist Baptists who hold views so similar to his own on prophetic subjects? They will all subscribe to his statement of faith. Yet he indignantly disclaims any part or lot with such “false cults” and "stands opposed to" and is “against every distinctive doctrine” of these people. We would like for him to itemize the difference between his “views of prophecy” and theirs, so we can all see it, and then explain to us where, how, and why he can draw his line on them without making a creed “over and above” the one upon which he predicates fellowship. “Happy is the man who condemneth not himself in the thing that he alloweth.”

All the talk about an unwritten creed is for effect. It is not even new. It is an old, tattered scarecrow. Every innovation has sought justification in this creed-bound cry. Thus came instrumental music and all the talk about “the creed in the deed” when loyal brethren resorted to legal protection of property rights against the innovators. It is precisely this same spirit crying in these brethren, “Creed, creed!” when they encounter opposition to their efforts to foist a new system of prophetic doctrines upon churches of Christ. We shall not be weakened in our opposition to this or any other form of error by any such feint.

Where the Case Must Rest.

5. Here is the final deposition of Brother Boll’s manifesto: “Here I must rest my case. I should be sorry to see a contingent in the professing church of Christ forget their principles and degenerate into a creed-bound sect. But for no fear or favor, nor for the sake of any specious plea for unity can I subscribe to anybody’s creed or join
BROTHER BOLL WITHDRAWS HIS HAND

(EDITORIAL IN GOSPEL ADVOCATE BY FOY E. WALLACE JR., REPLYING TO THE FINAL STATEMENT OF R. H. BOLL WITHDRAWING HIS OFFER OF HARMONY, JANUARY, 1933.)

There have been three novel issues of the Word and Work since October. In the October number Brother R. H. Boll said “Here’s My Hand” on the proposition “that nothing shall be taught on any prophetic theme except what can be read from the Bible” and “to regard carefully, even scrupulously, what the passage in question actually says.” But immediately succeeding this offer came the November Word and Work with a triple “Doctrinal Manifesto” published in special edition and sent free to all the preachers. With strictures on the manifestoes, the Gospel Advocate without reservation accepted Brother Boll’s proposition. Brother Boll said: “If the brethren who have pressed the other side of the controverted matters will bind themselves in like manner, harmony ought to be complete.” If by “the other side” another theory is meant, the Gospel Advocate is left out, for we advocate no theory. But assuming that Brother Boll meant those who oppose his theory, and therefore included us, we accepted his proposition. Believing that he was sincere in making such an offer, we expected favorable results. Instead, the December Word and Work brings us the following statement, given in full as it appeared in that paper:

“When a fair and brotherly proposition like that presented in the October Word and Work (“Here’s My Hand”) is made an occasion of further denunciation and misrepresentation, it is evident that the trouble lies deeper than mere disagreement on prophetic teaching. Harmony can never “be complete,” even with the extremist adherence to the letter of Scripture, unless there be a disposition to deal kindly and uprightly with brethren.

When a group of men set up their own prophetic views as a standard of sound doctrine, and on the penalty of ostracism demand submission to the same—that is making a creed; and that—not mere difference and controversy, or brotherly correction of what they believe to be error—is “the insidious peril that is threatening the churches.”

If our October proposal might yet be accepted in that fraternal spirit in which it was offered and as intended to apply, not to one side only, but to all parties involved, there would still be hope that something good would come of it. Meanwhile we assure our readers that the Word and Work shall not be drawn into unpleasant and unprofitable controversy. Beginning with the New Year, the Word and Work intends to make no further reference to adverse utterances in the papers. With malice toward none and charity toward all, we shall try simply, and to the best of our ability, to teach the word of God, and by the manifestation of the truth commend ourselves to ever-man’s conscience in the sight of God.”

The foregoing “utterance” is rather a tame sequel to the virulent outbursts that have appeared in the Word and Work lately. In order that the issue be kept clear and the record straight before the brethren, a few final observations seem necessary.

First: It was immediately after this “fair and brotherly proposition like that presented in the October Word and Work” that Brother Boll featured his triple “Doctrinal Manifesto” in a special edition of his magazine which he sent free to all the preachers.

Second: In this special edition, sending forth three editorial encyclicals, harsh and denunciatory terms, even to the point of redundancy, were hurled at the brethren who oppose Brother Boll’s positions on prophetic subjects. We pointed out a list of seventy-five words in one issue of the Word and Work the use of which was more severe than anything that has appeared in the Gospel Advocate. In fact, Brother Boll’s doctrinal manifesto could quite appropriately have been named “A Doctrinal Denuncio.” His talk about dealing “kindly” and “uprightly” with brethren would be received with better grace, as would also his protestations of charity, if he would remember that “charity begins at home.”

Third: It is evident that Brother Boll insists on making—3 personal matter of these differences. But it is not a personal matter. We are interested only in the issue. There are thousands of brethren, the writer included, who could not make it personal if they wished, for there are no personal differences or partisan feelings involved. Why should Brother Boll withhold unity from the brethren on such grounds and thereby try to force personalities upon them when they are interested in nothing except the issue of truth and unity upon it? It is hard to harmonize Brother Boll’s valediction of “malice toward none” with his action in withdrawing his hand on his own proposition. The inevitable impression on the minds of many brethren just as sincere will be that his action in this matter is a betrayal of his own heart—that in his soul is the smouldering fire of malice toward brethren who have opposed him, deeper, indeed, than his love for unity.

Fourth: It is further evident that Brother Boll did not expect us to accept his proposition; but we did, unreservedly. But since he followed his offer of unity with three editorials virtually daring brethren to disfellowship him, it became necessary for some strictures to be offered on his bold declarations. Brother Boll now makes this the ground of withdrawing his hand. If that be the ground, then he furnished it himself. On the same ground, could we not have refused just as consistently his offer? If not, why not? It is a poor rule that will not work both ways.
Fifth: Brother Boll says his proposition was not accepted in that fraternal spirit in which it was offered. But when did our brother become a discerner of spirits? His proposition was offered along with a three-header doctrinal manifesto, and it was accepted with our editorial respects and logical strictures. But here is the issue: Brother Boll made us the proposition “that nothing shall be taught on any prophetic theme except what can be read from the Bible; ... to regard carefully, even scrupulously, what the passage in question actually says,” etc. And now, because he thinks the proposition was not accepted in the right spirit, he will not do that—he will continue to teach and preach more than he can “read from the Bible” and will not “regard carefully and scrupulously what the passage in question actually says!” Before he will do that, some one must accept his proposition in the right spirit! This is a tacit admission that his theories are beyond what the Bible actually says, and he has inadvertently conceded the point. If Brother Boll’s proposition is a righteous one, why should he not stand by it, regardless of the spirit in others? In so doing, if there be those who do not have the right spirit, will he not have disarmed them in their opposition to him? Sixth: Our brother editor now assures his readers that the Word and Work will not be drawn into an unpleasant and unprofitable controversy. A belated decision, indeed!—after five special editions of his paper carrying his doctrinal manifestoes to all the preachers. He fires the cannon, forms the line of battle, and ignobly retreats, casting aspersions on others. The controversy has manifestly been unprofitable to his failing cause, for brethren are getting their eyes opened to see that his system of heresy is not as harmless nor its advocates as innocent as they have appeared to be.

Seventh: Finally, Brother Boll makes a New Year’s resolution—he will “make no further reference to adverse utterances in other papers.” His doctrinal manifesto was issued just in time, for now he could not publish it without breaking his resolution. Therefore, if his manifesto was right, his resolution is wrong; and if his resolution is right, his manifesto is wrong. We think both of them are rather oblique.

If Brother Boll had published a New Year’s resolution to cease the agitation of his peculiar and heretical notions, it would have been much the better part of valor, far more honorable, and would have received the universal applause of the brethren. Instead, he issues an obstinate resolve to continue his course. So the case is resting with Brother Boll’s refusal to accept our hand on his own proposition. It is well that the brethren know henceforth where to place the responsibility for alienation and disfellowship. It rests upon Brother Boll himself. But if he will yet come to his own terms in that fraternal spirit he has extolled, but failed to practice, our hand is yet extended; for upon the proposition to teach only what we can “read from the Bible” and “to regard carefully, even scrupulously, what the passage actually says,” we shall stand whether he does or not.
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R. H. Boll in his publications of his premillennial theories often goes out of the way to tell his readers that he denounces the theories of Charles T. Russell. Brother Boll speaks of Russell’s “whole false theory”. In his “A Statement” in the Word and Work, Brother Boll says: “I denounce the theories of Adventism and Russellism”. A careful reading of their literature on the kingdom question reveals the fact that Brother Boll does not oppose Russell’s “whole false theory”. I have itemized a few essential elements of the premillennial theory of Russell and Boll and present it in this article by comparison. Does R. H. Boll oppose Russellism? The reader’s attention is called to the “law and testimony” of the case.

I. The Chance After The Second Coming.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>RUSSELL</th>
<th>BOLL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>“Christ comes before the conversion of the world, and reigns for the purpose of converting the world: that the Church is now being tried, and that the reward promised the overcomers is that after being glorified they shall share with the Lord Jesus in that reign, which is God’s appointed means of blessing the world and causing the knowledge of God to come to every creature.” (Divine Plan of the Ages, Page 91)</td>
<td>“It (the millennium) will be a time of order-conversion. Government, the maintenance of law and order, is not salvation or conversion. The hearts of men are not reached by outward rule. That must come through the Word, which will then go out from restored Israel into all the world. . . . To the light of the Truth, then shining unobstrusely, men shall come by multitudes in glad surrender”. (R. H. Boll, The Revelation, Page 69)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

“And while they went away to buy, the bridegroom came; and they that were ready went in with him to the marriage feast: and the door was shut. Afterward came also the other virgins, saying, Lord, Lord, open to us. But he answered and said, Verily I say unto you, I know you not”. (Matt. 25:10-12)

Both Russell and Boll provide for a chance (world conversion) after the second coming of Christ. In the lesson of the Ten Virgins Jesus teaches that after his coming the door was shut. Russell and Boll open the door for salvation to the world after the Lord has shut it. The theories of both Russell and Boll are opposed to the plain teaching of the Word of God.

II. The Future Kingdom Theory.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>RUSSELL</th>
<th>BOLL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>“A similar mistake, a very common one is to suppose that God’s kingdom is now established and ruling over the earth, and that his will is now being done among the nations”. (Divine Plan of the Ages, p. 75)</td>
<td>“Thus again the coming of the kingdom is made contingent upon the return of the Lord Jesus Christ”. (R. H. Boll, Kingdom of God, p. 75)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

III. The Future Reign of Christ.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>RUSSELL</th>
<th>BOLL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>“From this it is evident that the kings who reign with him will not be crowned nor reign in this life”. (Divine Plan of the Ages, p. 284)</td>
<td>“So, whatever the doctors may say, we shall not reign with Christ till after his coming. But then we shall, if we are found to be faithful to the end”. (R. H. Boll, Boles-Boll Debate, p. 201)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Peter says: “But ye are an elect race, a royal priesthood, a holy nation, a people for God’s own possession, that ye may show forth the excellencies of him who called you out of darkness into his marvelous light”. (1 Pet. 2:9)

What is a royal priesthood? A royal priesthood is a priesthood of kings. Peter addressed Christians in his time as kings. Paul says, “they that receive the abundance of grace and the gift of righteousness reign in life through the one, even Jesus Christ”. (Rom. 5:17) Both Peter and Paul teach that Christians are now reigning with Christ. Both Russell and Boll clash with the plain teaching of the word of God in 1 Pet. 2:9 and Rom. 5:17. In the Boles-Boll debate, Brother H. Leo Boles quoted 1 Pet. 2:9 and Rom. 5:17 and made strong arguments from both passages and throughout the entire discussion Brother Boll disregarded the arguments. It is evident why Brother Boll failed to make any reply to these passages of Scripture in his debate with Brother Boles. These two simple passages of Scripture at face value clearly teach that the Lord’s people are now reigning with Christ. To deny that we are now reigning with Christ is to deny the “plain declaration of the word of God”. “Choose you this day whom ye will serve. . . . but as for me and my house, we will serve Jehovah”.

Since the day of Pentecost Christ has been a ruling King, Priest on his throne, and an Advocate. Premillennialism denies the Kingship, Priesthood, and Mediatorship of Christ. Let us denounce the theories of men and stand on the Bible and the Bible alone.
The Personalities Left Out

(By the Editor)

Commending “Christ on David’s Throne”, a very excellent treatise on Premillennialism by John T. Hinds, G. C. Brewer says: “Brother Hinds is fair and logical, and has left personalities out of his discussion entirely”. Well—that is more than Brother Brewer has done. Nearly every article he writes is in criticism of somebody or in reply to somebody’s criticism of him. And he could not even commend Brother Hinds’ good tract without taking a slap at others, past and present, who have braved the battle in defense of what Brother Brewer now admits is the truth on the question.

One would think by the way he talks that Brother Brewer never gets personal. But read his published articles to say nothing of some of his unpublished articles that some of us know about. Why, he cannot even answer his critics on the “budget” system without slinging sarcasm. He headed one of his articles on that subject replying to a good man’s questions, “Another Objector Heard From” and his articles are punctuated with references to those who differ from him as “objectors” and other names not calculated to make a brother feel good toward him. Brother Brewer wrote a friend of mine that my attitude on the Boll question is due to “an abnormal state of mind”! Very kind and non-personal isn’t it?

When Paul exposed certain erroneous theories concerning the resurrection, he named the men who had “made shipwreck concerning the faith” by teaching them. “Of whom is Hymenaeus and Alexander; whom I delivered unto Satan, that they be taught not to blaspheme”. So in writing on such things it seems Paul “has not left personalities out entirely”. If Brother Brewer is not careful he will find himself criticizing Paul.

But Brother Brewer says that he “agrees with Brother Hinds in every respect”. Why is it then that he has stood on the sidelines criticizing our discussions instead of doing as Brother Hinds has done in consistently opposing these errors? Brother Brewer has not done one thing to strengthen the defense of the truth on these issues but has said and done many things both publicly and privately, to weaken it. Just recently in his meeting at Plant City, Florida, he criticized the brethren in Jacksonville, Florida, for their attitude toward Homer N. Rutherford, who after having left Jacksonville, returned and started a Boll congregation almost in the shadow of the Riverside Park church where he had formerly preached. Brother Brewer told a group of younger preachers in a private home that Homer Rutherford was a very “meek and humble man” and that R. H. Boll was a great Bible scholar! One of the young preachers left, the other one stayed to hear what else Brother Brewer would say. Being so much younger than Brother Brewer they held their counsel, but Brother Brewer’s remarks made an impression on them about like his Abilene College speech made on some of the rest of us. The foregoing was told to me recently in the presence of several witnesses by a young preacher who was present when Brother Brewer was doing this talking. This is just one of many such occurrences.

If Brother Brewer “agrees with Brother Hinds in every respect” it is hard to harmonize some things he has said. Brother Hinds believes the theories of premillennialism to be vital in their consequences and destructive of the gospel of Christ, and proves it in his tract. But Brother Brewer said in his own statement of explanation in the Firm Foundation of his Abilene address, referring to his criticism of our discussions: “I did not regard the proposition of sufficient importance to merit so much attention.” But now he says the best way to circulate Brother Hinds’ tract on the same proposition in the Firm Foundation is: “I could devoutly wish that it were never again mentioned among my brethren”. But in his commendation of Brother Hinds’ tract he says: “I am going to urge the elders of the congregations where I go to buy this tract in one hundred lots and to give them to the members”. That’s fair and logical, too, isn’t it? I wonder if these and so many other conflicts in Brother Brewer’s statements and attitudes are due by any chance to “an abnormal state of mind” or is that just his normal way of doing?

There is no place in defense lines of the truth for time-servers. We need men who know where they stand and who will not lend comfort to the enemy. We need men who will do some of the fighting themselves instead of occupying an observation post to observe who is and who is not fighting in just the manner that he likes. It is an easy matter to stand by and criticise those who are in the fight but it is quite another matter to gird up the loins and do some of the fighting.

On this point my good friend P. W. Stonestreet hits the point with a pungent punch in a personal letter: “I call attention to a significant statement by G. C. Brewer in his commendation of Brother Hinds’ tract in the Gospel Advocate of December 26, page 1242, as follows:

‘Brother Hinds is fair and logical, and left personalities out of his discussion entirely.’ Even so, personalities left out or put in are only incidental to the essential proof added in any discussion and should, therefore, not be exalted, even by suggestion, to the place of essentials. But Brother Brewer knows that inasmuch as ‘Christ on David’s throne is now reigning’ is a very prominent phase of the subject that you discussed with Neal, which he opposed; and in his effort to suggest a difference between what he opposed then and what he commends now, he even resorts to an incidental! Even if Brother Hinds purposely left out that incidental, that in no way vitiates the fact that it is incidental to the discussion.

Of course, circumstances and individual methods properly govern the use of personalities in discussion. Christ and his apostles used both methods. Sometimes the personnel is sufficiently understood as to be properly omitted, but it is inconceivable that anyone, without an ax to grind, would even suggest such an incidental in commending a tract, as if the merits or demerits of a discussion were governed by inci-dentals!”

Brother Brewer might reply to this, or make more explanations, but how can he do it and leave the personalities out?
PROPOSITION: “The Bible Clearly Teaches That After the Second Coming of Christ and Before the Final Resurrection and Judgment There Will Be an Age or Dispensation of One Thousand Years During Which Christ Will Reign on the Earth.”

A full discussion of the following live questions:

1. Will Christ Reign on the Earth a Thousand Years After His Second Coming?
2. Is There a Future Millennium?
3. Does Christ Occupy David’s Throne Now?
4. Will National Israel Be Restored to Palestine?
5. Will Jerusalem Become the Capital of a World Kingdom?
6. Are the Old Testament Prophecies Concerning Fleshly Israel “Unfilled Prophecy”?
7. Was the Kingdom of Daniel 2:44 Set Up on Pentecost or Was It Postponed?
8. Is the Second Coming of Christ Imminent-Impending?
9. Are the Theories of Premillennialism Vital to Christianity?
10. Are the Consequences of These Theories Destructive of the Gospel?
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