Don’t turn in impatience from another consideration of this question, dear reader, because you consider it unutterably trite. We wish it were “trite” and answered negatively forever. But certain trends among immersed believers in Christ have brought the subject to the fore again, and if you can “hear us of your clemency a few words,” you will find, we are confident, that you have not been bored by a twice-told tale.

Whether or not the church of Christ is a denomination among denominations depends altogether upon circumstances. It is a denomination if it is characterized by one or all of the following attributes:

1. A date for its founding previous to or later than Pentecost, A.D. 30.
3. Terms of admission which do not coincide with faith, repentance, confession, and immersion.
4. Innovations in worship (they may range from pageantry and incense burning to the use of ‘mechanical musical instruments).
5. Unscriptural methods of spreading the gospel.
6. Preachers who affiliate themselves with undeniable and undenying denominationalists in “ministerial alliances” and “union meetings.”
7. Preachers who by word or deed, or both, imply, if they do not overtly assert, that the church has been too extreme and needs to get closer to the “middle of the board.” Surely they have been thinking of the church largely in terms of its being a sect which needs to get along with other sects amicably. If this has not been their thought, then they have been unfair in encouraging out-and-out denominationalists to believe that we are ready to concede that our position is not all that the scriptures would have it.

Preachers who leave that which is clearly revealed for that which can be understood only with the aid of their own ex cathedra utterances, the denial of the legality of which leads them to brand the rest of us as “rejectors of the whole counsel of God.”

The church of Christ is not a denomination if

1. Its history can be traced back through secular and sacred history to, but not beyond, Pentecost in the year of our Lord 30.
2. Its members are called “Christians” without any kind of sectarian prefix or suffix.
3. Its name honors Christ and helps that giving of preeminence to him which Paul enjoins.
4. Its members are immersed believers in him.
5. They follow a “thus saith the Lord” for everything they do in worship or work.
6. They respect the silence of the Word both with respect to this worship and work and to God’s handling of the future.
7. They cherish and hand down to their children the things which have been revealed, and leave to God’s interpretation in his own good time the things which are obscure.

They demand that the only “getting together” with professors of religion of any kind or degree be strictly on the basis of the New Testament Scriptures.

They do not stultify themselves by hobnobbing, fraternizing, h a n d s h a k i n g, backslapping, stomach stuffing, tiptoeing, tap dancing, teeter-tottering, 0 r w i r e walking,
WHAT IS IT ALL ABOUT—AND WHAT DIFFERENCE DOES IT MAKE?

As surprisingly strange as it may sound, the above caption represents the interrogations of R. H. Boll in Word and Work. Brother Boll is bewildered—he does not know what it is all about. Thus the editor of the champion publication of millennialism pauses in pushing his premillennial pen, and with a feigned ignorance of any occasion for “the condition of things,” for which condition he himself the cause, he stages an act! There is method in his ignorance. But he fails to make his feint effective. due to the fact that his very air of injured innocence becomes his confession of conscious guilt.

It is noteworthy that Word and Work’s periodical outbursts are timed. We can always look for them just before or after significant events, such as important debates with a Neal, Norris, Webber, or Tingley. But especially significant now is the N. B. Hardeman Ryman Auditorium Meeting in Nashville, backed by the majority of the fifty congregations in Nashville, but having the organized opposition of every compromiser and Boll sympathizer in Tennessee and Kentucky with enlisted help all the way from New York to Texas and Californial So Word and Work’s “Brother Boll” must deliver another manifesto, timed and toned to break the force of the pressure he feels bearing down upon himself who is the center of the divisive elements which form the present and impending crises in the church.

In dramatic deliverances this theorizing disturber of the peace of Zion forgets to be sweet-spirited. His temperature rises to high fever as he hurls broadsides at those who have blocked the path of his theoretical teaching. The kind (?) and gentle (?) epithets he uses in his references to them are such as, “insist fiercely,” and “bitterly denounce,” and “declare vociferously,” and “denounce and condemn,” and “oppose vehemently”—all of which they (his opposers) are doing just “to save their faces,” which is, says he, the sole cause “for all the rumpus they have raised.” What pious profanity! Who said that “the man from Louisville” is “like Jesus” who “never fought back”?

Let us examine minutely this Bollistic document with a view toward lifting the bewilderment of its author by telling him what it is all about and showing him what the difference is. We quote his statement section by section below.

KING-KINGDOM-CHURCH

1. “They insist fiercely that the kingdom exists now; that it was established on Pentecost, and Christ is king, and all members of the church are in his kingdom (Col. 1:13)—as though somebody were denying it. But nobody denies that. We are agreed on this.”

The foregoing represents the adroitness with which Brother Boll would set aside the scent and make those who do not know what he teaches believe that his kingdom teaching has been misrepresented. He says nobody denies that the kingdom was established on Pentecost and with a gesture, asserts “we are agreed on this.” Now, let us get this straight by putting the witness on the stand for a cross-examination, and apply his own teaching to the above statement.

(1) Concerning the kingdom on Pentecost.

“We have put much stress upon this matter because of its own weight and importance. We trust, however, that the reader would even without this discussion have perceived that the kingdom announced by John (and afterward by the Lord Jesus himself, Matt. 19:28; Mark 1:14, 15) could have been none other than that of Old Testament prophecy and of Jewish expectation in so far as that expectation accorded with the prophecies. And this is borne out by what we find in the following chapters of Matthew. If it be felt a difficulty that that kingdom though announced as “at hand,” has never yet appeared, we shall find an explanation unpuzzled and natural, and one that will cast no reflection on the truth and goodness of God.” (Kingdom of God, by R. H. Boll, page 34.)

Here is the plain declaration of Brother Boll himself that the kingdom preached by John and Jesus before Pentecost, though announced as at hand, has never yet appeared. Now, will Brother Boll kindly tell us, in view of this his own statement, what kingdom was established on Pentecost? Mark you, the kingdom which Jesus said “at hand”—“has never yet appeared.” Did Jesus announce more than one kingdom? It looks like someone else is trying to “save his face” by manufacturing another kingdom than the one “of Old Testament prophecy” which Jesus promised and has set up a minor kingdom on Pentecost in order to be able to say that “nobody denies” that the kingdom was established on Pentecost. R. H. Boll does deny that the kingdom announced by John and Jesus was established on Pentecost, for he says in his own book that “this kingdom ... has never yet appeared.” Since he says that the kingdom announced by John and Jesus was “none other than” the kingdom of Old Testament prophecy, let him show where any other kingdom was ever promised in prophecy or announced by John, Jesus or any other inspired writer. It is Brother Boll’s solemn duty to do this.

(2) Concerning the church and the kingdom, our witness (Brother Boll), says that “all members of the church are in his kingdom” (Col. 1:13), and adds “as though anybody were denying this.” Well, it is a certain fact that R. H. Boll denies that all members of the church are in that kingdom announced by John and Jesus, for he says that kingdom has never yet appeared. Brother Boll is on record that the kingdom mentioned in Col. 1:13 is not the kingdom Christ announced and intended to establish. Let him tell what kingdom it is, where was it ever mentioned, and how it differs from the kingdom Christ announced and expected to establish. It is plain that Brother Boll will have two kingdoms where Jesus had only one. Nobody denies that Jesus is a dodge, a mere quibble, and quibbling is not honesty.

The fact is, Brother Boll believes and teaches that the church is only a phase of the kingdom; or what he once called the vestibule of the kingdom; and what he later called a manifestation of the kingdom; but which he has more recently named “the new spiritual contingent, called the church,” which came as a result of the postponement of the real kingdom—but none of these descriptive terms were employed by Christ or any apostle or writer in the New Testament, nor any term like them.

Lest any should think we are misrepresenting “the man from Louisville” let us call the witness back to the stand. Hear him:

“We have now traced the kingdom-teaching of Matthew, and the kingdom gospel, from beginning to end. We have seen how the Old Testament hope of the Messianic kingdom of Israel and its world-wide sway was at first entirely in the foreground; how a crisis came when the opposition of Israel culminated in plans of murder; how then the Lord Jesus began to announce an entirely new and different aspect which his kingdom was to assume; and how thenceforth, not leaving out of view the Old Testament promise of the kingdom, the present, spiritual, veiled, suffering form of the kingdom of heaven, until he should come again, occupied the foreground of his teaching.” (Kingdom of God by R. H. Boll, page 46.)

If the reader can pierce the vagueness of the above ramblings of the witness, he will sift out the gist of his theology—namely, that when the Jews decided to murder Jesus, the Lord in turn decided to postpone his kingdom.
so he introduced *a new and unexpected phase* of the kingdom—the church and deferred his kingdom “until he should come again” yet he would have his readers believe, when he gets into a tight, that “nobody denies that” the kingdom was established on Pentecost! But R. H. Boll denotes that, for he declares the kingdom “has never yet appeared” and asserts that Jesus changed his plans, and also his preaching, from that kingdom which had been announced to “a new and unexpected phase” which he styles “a new spiritual contingent, called the church.”

Hear him again:

> “Whether there had been any formal offer of the kingdom made to them, and, upon their rejection the same was withdrawn and postponed is no essential matter. But if salvation was offered to the nation by Jesus, all else was implied therein as a matter of course: and if that was nationally rejected, the fulfillment of their prophetic hopes was thereby made impossible, and automatically deferred until the time when the nation would turn to acknowledge Jesus Christ and be forgiven.” (Kingdom of God, by R. H. Boll, page 46.)

**Do you get it?**

The fulfillment of these prophecies was made impossible and the kingdom was automatically deferred. Yet Brother Boll upbraids those who “insist fiercely that the kingdom exists now—as though somebody were denying it!” It looks very much like R. H. Boll is denying it, if words have any meaning at all. It was foretold by the prophets and announced by John and Jesus, but automatically deferred when the Jews rejected Christ. Yet when his opposers “insist fiercely that the kingdom was not deferred, but was established on Pentecost, “to save his face” he will say “nobody denies that!”

To extricate himself from a similar situation on Holy Spirit baptism as a condition of pardon to all alien sinners, the Birmingham debate, Mr. Tingley took the absurd position that there are two Holy Spirit baptisms. And now to escape the inevitable consequences of his argument on the automatic postponement of the kingdom and in order to get around Col. 1: 13 Brother Boll takes a position equally absurd—namely, that there are two kingdoms, the one which was postponed and another of his own manufacture (like Tingley’s Holy Spirit) which was never once foretold or mentioned in the divine plan. For ordinary sectarianists to thus dodge and quibble when they get caught between a rock and a hard place is to be expected, but for any man who makes the claim of being a gospel preacher to do so must be a shock to his most ardent devotees.

Up to the present point the witness, Brother Boll, has the kingdom postponed, but, he says, *nobody denies that it was established on Pentecost!* The kingdom was “automatically deferred” … “until he should come again,” but all the members of the church are in it now! Christ is king, but his kingdom has “never yet appeared”! He is king in his kingdom, but not occupying his throne! A common sectarian debater never became more involved in such a mesh of glaring inconsistencies. A man who can’t beat that even when he is on the wrong side of the question ought to put up his pen. But we are not through.

DAVID’S THRONE—ALL AUTHORITY

II. “They bitterly denounce brethren who do not believe that Christ is now on David’s throne. Yet all of us believe alike that Christ is on the throne that he now occupies (call it what you may), and that he has all authority in heaven and on earth.”

(1) The witness says that we all believe that Christ is on the throne that he now occupies. Certainly. The Russells believe that also. So does the man we debated with in Birmingham. Christ is on the throne that he occupies in other words, he says that Christ is on the throne that he is on! What throne is that? Brother Boll replies: It is the throne he is on. Such is the quibbling of a man who is afraid of his ground, and quails before the argument.

Brother Boll knows, as every man who knows the issue knows, that *the throne of David* is the heart of the whole question and that it is a pitiful begging of the question to say that it matters not what throne he is on now. If Christ is not on David’s throne now, he has no throne and no kingdom, because David’s throne was the only throne that was ever promised to him, and he was never promised, nor did he ever announce more than one kingdom.

On the other hand, in Brother Boll’s theory, the future earthly throne of David in Jerusalem is essential to his millennium. If there be no future earthly throne of David, there is no future earthly millennium. Why, then, is all the dodging of the issue? Why say “it matters not” and “there is no difference” and “what is it all about”?

(2) David’s throne in the Old Testament was God’s throne. It was also his throne; and it was Solomon’s throne. “And also Solomon sitteth on the throne of the kingdom. And moreover the king’s servants came to bless our lord king David, saying, Thy God make the name of David his father, and prospered; and all Israel obeyed him.” (1 Chron. 29: 23.) It is clear enough that Solomon sat on God’s throne, but Solomon sat on David’s throne, yet Solomon sat on his own throne. It must follow therefore that God’s throne, David’s throne, and Solomon’s throne were all one and the same throne. It should be just as clear that Christ is therefore now on God’s throne, but also on His throne, yet it is David’s throne for the Father’s throne, and His throne, and David’s throne, are one throne in the ante-type, as they were one throne in the type. The distinction Brother Boll makes on the present and future throne, in order to put Christ on a throne on earth in the millennium, is a distinction without a difference. Jesus Christ has acceded to the only throne that he will ever occupy, according to the scriptures.

(3) It is not amiss to carry this point further here. When God promised David that he would set his son on his throne, he said it would be done while David slept with his fathers. (2 Sam. 7: 12-14; 1 Chron. 17: 11, 12.) That he did not refer to Solomon is established by the fact that Heb. 1: 5 quotes the “Son” part of the passage from 2 Sam. 7: 14 and applies it to Christ. So inspiration settles that. Since the Son whom God would set on David’s throne is Christ, it follows that Christ must occupy the throne of David while David sleeps with his fathers. But David will not be sleeping with his fathers after the second coming of Christ. All premillennialists tell us that all the righteous dead will then be raised—David will not be in the grave. But the Son must sit on David’s throne during the time that David sleeps—therefore Jesus Christ cannot occupy David’s throne after the second coming of Christ. With this in mind, hear Peter on Pentecost: “Brethren I may say unto you freely of the patriarch David, that he both died and was buried, and his tomb is with us unto this day. Being therefore a prophet, and knowing that God had sworn with an oath to him, that of the fruit of his loins he would set one upon his throne he foreseeing this spake of the resurrection of the Christ.” (Acts 2: 29-31.) Peter told the Jews that David’s tomb was yet with them—David was yet sleeping with his fathers—and when he said that God would raise up one to sit on
his (David's) throne he spoke of the resurrection (not the second coming) of Christ. His conclusion was: “Therefore being by the right hand of God exalted, ... he hath shed forth this, which ye now see and hear.” (Verse 33.) Any man who can see through a ladder ought to be able to see that point.

But Brother Boll writes at random of someone who “bitterly denounces” him because he does not believe that Christ now sits on David’s throne. In denying that fact, he denies the sworn testimony of the God of heaven to his servant David, and denies the inspired interpretation and application of the prophecies made by Simon Peter of Pentecost. Still, he charges that someone “brands the plain import of those scriptures as false teaching.” My brother, thou art the man!

(4) The witness further deposes that Christ has all authority in heaven and on earth. He says we all alike believe this. But we do not believe it all alike for Brother Boll is on record. On page sixty-one of “Kingdom of God,” by R. H. Boll, the witness, is found the statement that Christ is not king “in fact and act,” but his throne is now “de jure et potentia”—by right and authority only; but when Christ returns, his throne will be “de facto et actu”—that is, in fact and act! If he told the truth on page sixty-one of his kingdom book, how can he mean what he says now? To say that Christ has all authority in heaven and on earth but does not have it in fact is just as one who promised to put his foot back. He has all authority—but not in fact! Brethren, that is Bollism, and they call it harmless! But that is not all. Hear him further.

COMING BACK-FOOT ON EARTH

III. "They declare vociferously (and denounce and condemn whoever holds the view) that Christ will never set his foot on the earth again. Yet they believe and teach that he is coming back. If he really comes back what difference could it make whether or not he would actually touch the earth with his foot?"

(1) Here is a sample of the misrepresentation characteristic of all errrors in an argument. Who has ever declared “vociferously,” or otherwise, that Christ will never set his foot on the earth again? That is exactly the same misrepresentation that Norris and others of his stripe and strata have indulged in, and now Brother Boll stoops to do the same. Nobody that we know of ever made such a positive declaration. Here is the challenge that has stood through five debates: "Let the man who teaches that Jesus Christ will reign on the earth a thousand years produce the passage that says he will ever set his foot on this earth again. All we have said is that there is no verse that says so. The challenge to produce the verse, or one by which such could be necessarily inferred, stood in two debates with Neal, one with Norris, one with Webber and one with Tingley. It is now referred to R. H. Boll. It was not met in the other instances, though each time the speakers had several days in which to produce the passage. It is now put up to Brother Boll. Give us the passage. No need to “go around by the Joneses,” and look up verses in the Old Testament, centuries before the first coming of Christ—the challenge says "again"—that he will put his foot on this earth again—just one New Testament passage that says it, Brother Boll.

But what difference does it make, asks Brother Boll, whether he actually touches the earth with his foot or not? Well, in the light of his theory it seems to me that it would make quite a good deal of difference. R. H. Boll and party teach that Christ will literally occupy the literal throne of David in literal Jerusalem, and literally reign on the literal earth a literal thousand years. Now, just how could he do that if he did not “actually touch the earth with his foot”? Still, Brother Boll asks, “What difference does it make?” Evidently, he does not know what it is all about. The brother is bewildered.

IMMINENCE-LOOKING-THE PRACTICAL POINT

IV. "They oppose vehemently the doctrine of the imminent return of the Lord, yet acknowledge that we should be looking for him—which is the whole practical point of the matter."

(1) If “looking for him” is the "whole practical point," then the question of imminence is not any part of the "whole practical point" and Brother Boll concedes what we have been urging all the time, namely, that his theories are not practical. Now, let him come on the rest of the way and concede that they are not scriptural and "all the rumpus" will be over. Brother Boll might not be able "to save his face" by doing such a thing, but, as Brother Srygley remarked, he would “save his soul.”

(2) If Brother Boll does not really know the difference between “looking for him” and teaching such theories, his confusion is confirmed. We look for Christ when we hope for him. Hope is based on his promise. We can hope for anything he has promised, but we cannot hope for what he has not promised. Christ has promised to come; hence, our hope, otherwise referred to as waiting and looking. But he has not promised to come during my lifetime, therefore I could not hope for such.

(3) On the subject of imminence, F. B. Srygley has touched “the whole practical point,” and the scriptural point as well, in the Gospel Advocate, as follows:

“My idea of this matter is that if we are prepared to live, we are also prepared to die, and if we are prepared to die, we are prepared to meet the Lord. If it is not preparedness, then we do not need preparedness. If it is the Lord, it taught it when it was written; if it taught it when it was written, its coming was not imminent then (for imminent means overhanging, nothing between us and the coming of Christ). If this is true, the brother does not know that it is true. For the Lord said that he did not know when he would come, neither did the angels. It was a secret held by the Father alone, and still Brother Boll says that his coming is imminent. But they say that Christ is liable to come at any time. No, he is not liable to come until the Father decides it; but if we will obey the Lord, we will be ready for him at any time.”

If Brother Boll still wants to know the difference, we may suggest further that the apostles and early disciples looked (believed in and hoped) for the coming of Christ before such theories as his were known. The fact is, where the truth stops Brother Boll’s theories begin. He has admitted it by conceding that “the whole practical point” is in the thing upon which we agree—namely that the Lord will really come again. With such admissions who can say that he is not responsible for perpetuating division if he does not cease now and forever to teach his theories?

SPECULATION-INTERPRETATION-IMPORT

V. "They decry ‘speculation’ yet themselves speculate, even wildly, on such subjects as the millennium, and insist on their own ‘spiritual interpretation of Rev. 20, and other prophecies—hardly any two alike as standard ‘sound doctrine,’ and brand the plain import of those scriptures as false teaching."

(1) Since Brother Boll chooses the literal instead of the spiritual, we are willing for him to have it. Rev. 20 says, “I saw the souls of them that were beheaded, ... and they lived and reigned with Christ a thousand years.” Being literal that must be a literal beheading; so no one gets into the millennium except those literally beheaded, which cuts him out. But if the beheading is spiritualized, so must the millennium be, hence no literal millennium, and that cuts his millennium out. Either end of the dilemma leaves him out of the millennium so what difference does it make and what is it all about—after all?
(2) He thinks some of us brand the “plain import” of Rev. 20 as false, but we have become accustomed to his desires on Rev. 20. In 1932 he made a stage play under the caption “Here’s My Hand” and offered to take “what ever passage actually says” with especial reference to Rev. 20. The Gospel Advocate promptly, editorially and officially, accepted the proposition, but it turned out to be only a gesture for Brother Boll then immediately withdrew his hand.

In 1934 Word and Work published the lamentations of R. H. Boll that he and his had been cast out “because they believed Rev. 20 as it stands.” Again, we all agreed to take Rev. 20 as it stands and not cast him out. But he again backed out.

Even a casual checkup reveals definitely that “as it stands” Rev. 20 is an inadequate text and fails very far short of containing Brother Boll’s theory of the earthly millennium. It does not mention the second coming of Christ; it does not mention a reign on the earth; it does not mention a bodily resurrection; it does not mention us; it does not mention an earthly throne; it does not mention Christ on earth; it does not mention any single distinctive point of the theory constructed on it. The material is not there.

(3) To take Rev. 20 as it stands will cut these brethren out of their own millennium, for only “the souls of the martyrs”—those actually beheaded—were said to have lived and reigned a thousand years. If literal, it excludes from the millennium all who are not literally beheaded. If figurative, then it is spiritual, and there is no earthly millennium. So Brother Boll refuses to take what the “passage actually says” and will not have Rev. 20 “as it stands,” even though these are his own word for word propositions, which he has made to the public at timed intervals, but not once time has he stood by a single proposition he has made. All his talking and writing, therefore, is just so much canting and carping; it is mere propaganda, for he has no idea whatever of taking what it “actually says” nor accepting it “as it stands” without his theories.

(4) Now he comes with his latest proposition—his 1938 down to date, streamlined proposition, to take the import of those scriptures. So that is it! The word “import” means, according to Webster, “to bring in from without; to imply” and that is exactly what Brother Boll wants to do, bring in from without what Rev. 20 does not “actually say”; and it is he who refuses to “believe Rev. 20 as it stands.” All of his talking about it therefore is pure propaganda, chiefly for the home consumption of his clientele.

(5) Of the “standardized spiritual theories” he complains because there are “hardly two alike.” Perhaps so; but in that case how could they be standardized? Furthermore, the fact that there are “hardly two alike” is only another good argument against all theories, including the Boll theories—for no two of his are alike, being contradictory at almost every turn. It remains that whether his theory is literal or spiritual (and he has both) it is just another theory. But it is well to keep in mind that the harm of a theory lies in its effect or consequences.

Any theory that postpones the kingdom, and belittles the church by making it a mere accident or “a new spiritual contingent” and that makes Christ king de jure et potentia—by right only; but not de facto et actu—not in actual fact and act, is worse than merely wrong, it is destructive of the whole gospel system, and a theory which all “true hearted brethren should rise up and discountenance.”

PARTIES-CONDITION-SITUATIONS

VI. “It is surely time that this condition of things were changed. If there be some parties in the church who, in order to save their faces, should wish to perpetuate this situation, there are also enough fair-minded, truehearted brethren to rise up and discountenance it.”

(1) If Brother Boll is sincere in the expressed desire to change the “condition of things” and not “perpetuate this situation,” the real test of that sincerity is whether or not he is willing to abandon his divisive teaching and promote unity instead of “fomenting strife and division over prophetic teaching.” His gun always kicks harder than it shoots. If he does not intend to discontinue his teaching (which he plainly does not offer to do) but only means that the opposition shall cease their objections to his teaching, leaving him free to impose his doctrines on whomsoever he will, then in one of his own pet phrases, his “specious plea for unity” can be regarded only as another challenge which will be met as all the others have been—they simply shall not pass.

(2) His statement that there are enough “fair-minded, truehearted brethren to rise up and discountenance” the opposition to his teaching shows clearly to whom Brother Boll is now looking with new hope to fight his battles—the so-called professed neutrals among us who say they do not believe his teaching but do not think they should be opposed. He thinks they are the “fair-minded, truehearted brethren” who will come to the rescue of his failing cause. He sees “a situation” in the church which is in his favor.

It is a situation we all see. It is in the colleges. It is now taking definite form in the plans to start a “brotherhood” paper, a paper-college combination designed to get control of things. Already the Truthseeker, published at Searcy, Arkansas, by the Harding College group, has announced that it will merge with the new paper, and in its last issue the olive branch was extended to R. H. Boll. West Coast Christian, published by James Lovell, makes the same announcement, and the purpose and policy of this new paper have been definitely set forth in circular letters and questionnaires and surveys, the results of which surveys or “straw votes” were published in a twenty-six page report, copyrighted by the author who served notice on all other papers on his copyright page that the report was not even to be quoted in whole or in part in other papers by anyone. That alone proves that their scheme is vulnerable, and they fear exposure in advance.

These are the “fair-minded, truehearted brethren” to whom Brother Boll is looking to “discountenance” the opposition to him and his theories—and he is looking in the right direction for his help, for that is exactly what this group will do, backed by some of the colleges and all of that element in the church which has been opposed to plain teaching and preaching. Some of them are out-and-out Bollites; others are Boll sympathizers; others think they are neutral, but in reality are not, for they are on the wrong side already; but altogether they are enemies, whether consciously or unconsciously, of the New Testament church. Faithful gospel preachers all over the land who love the defense of the truth should “rise up and discountenance” this new movement—and we believe they will. It is a call to arms.

MUTUAL REGARD—TOLERANCE—BROTHERLY UNITY

VII. “When a better spirit comes in, there will be a mutual regard, tolerance, kindness, helpfulness, love, brotherly unity, and without these things religion is hardly worth while.”

All of this sounds good; but James D. Murch and the digestives said all of that in the Detroit Unity Meetings, almost in the same words. To Murch and the Christian Church tolerance means to tolerate their unscriptural
innovations. And to R. H. Boll and Company tolerance means to tolerate their false teaching. It is, in fact, the frantic appeal of a false teacher in the church in his “death throes” to rally support for his cause. His only hope obviously lies in the neutrals, and in the proposed new paper. It proves that if the “neutrals” among us had stood with us in the fight against this parasitic growth on the body of the church, Bollism could never have rallied from the mortal wounds received to the defeats it has suffered. The neutrals are responsible for the present situation. They have cried for tolerance, and too much tolerance was allowed. In an effort to be fair, fraternal and tolerant, the Gospel Advocate has furnished a medium for some of these neutrals, and has unintentionally enabled these men to promote a personal following out of which the most formidable opposition to the principles for which the Gospel Advocate stands is in the making. It won’t be long now. The brethren will know where the preachers stand who have said they were neutral. “How long halt ye between two opinions? If the Lord be God, follow him; but if Baal, then follow him.” “He that is not with me is against me; and he that gathereth not with me scattereth abroad.”

WHAT IT IS ALL ABOUT

What, then, is it all about? Brother Boll wants to know “what excuse there can be for fomenting strife and division in the church over prophetic teaching”? Since he is the one who is doing the teaching, and therefore the fomenting, he should know; but as he feigns innocence, we again tell him, as repeatedly before, what it is all about.

Here it is—the Boll prophetic creed:

1. That the kingdom of Dan. 2: 44—the kingdom of God—has not yet come into existence.
2. That this kingdom, though announced by John and Jesus, “has never yet appeared.” It was postponed because national Israel rejected Jesus.
3. That in consequence of his rejection by the Jews, Jesus pigeonholed the divine plan, introduced the church age-meaning the present dispensation—and went back to heaven to stay until the Jews get into a notion of letting him set up his kingdom in Palestine.
4. That in the meantime (the kingdom prophecy having defaulted) Jesus is king de jure et potentia—by right only; not by any de facto et actus—not in actual fact and act.
5. That also in the meantime old pagan Rome must come back into existence in order to fulfill Dan. 2: 44 “in the days of these kings” which were in existence when the kingdom was announced but failed to arrive!
6. That the Jews must be restored as a nation, return to Palestine, and be converted, in order that Christ can be king “in fact and act” instead of being a mere crown prince on his Father’s throne.
7. That the temple of Solomon will be rebuilt; the nation of Israel restored, and the Jewish system re instituted.
8. That the Lord will then leave the throne of his majesty in heaven and reoccupy the old Davidic throne in Jerusalem to be a king on earth.
9. That the resurrected and living saints will meet the Lord in the air, accompany him somewhere in the heavens for a time to attend to certain affairs, which Russell and Rutherford call “the rapture,” but which in the Boll theory is “the first stage” of the second coming.
10. That there will be an interval between “the first stage” and the real second coming which the millennialists call the Tribulation, which the righteous (those who believe in the millennium) will escape, having ascended to meet the Lord, who will later return to vanquish the wicked nations and start the millennium.
11. That all this is imminent—liable to happen momentarily; which event would necessitate a series of miraculous interventions that completely upset the gospel order of things, such as the spontaneous regeneration of the Jewish nation and a phenomenal transportation of the Jews to Palestine. In this eventuality the conversion of the Jews would be direct and immediate and not by gospel influence; the return of the Jews would be instant and not gradual—a more stupendous event than crossing the Red Sea or the Jordan; and the rebuilding of the old Temple in less time than it took to grow Jonah’s gourd!
12. After the thousand years, Satan musters his forces once more for the great battle in the Valley of Esdraelon, his last stand, where he will be finally defeated in physical, carnal warfare by the victorious Christ, who will then take the saints to heaven to stay.

Now, that is “what it is all about”—and R. H. Boll knows it, though guileless he may appear. Do we hear someone say “Brother Boll does not teach these things”? Very well; read the evidence as we page the proof from his own statements of his “prophetic views.”

THE PROOF BY CITATION

The Word and Work, October, 1935, itemized his prophetic creed in the following points:

1. The “reign of Christ with his saints on earth for a thousand years, following this dispensation and the return of Christ.”
2. A literal resurrection of the righteous, “separated from the rest of the dead by a thousand years.”
3. The conversion and restoration of Israel to their “own land.”
4. Another kingdom of Christ “more than the church,” yet future, which Christ will establish on earth at his coming.
5. Prophecies concerning the kingdom, taken at “face value,” are yet unfilled.
6. The apocalyptic vision of Rev. 20 is literal, not figurative, and its “plain import” teaches a literal, earthly millennium. Thus far what it is all about” was set out by Brother Boll himself in 1935. Does he mean that this is not his teaching now? If so, let him say so; if not, why does he ask what it is all about?

But let us cite the proof for the remaining items of the “prophetic creed” listed above.

1. On page thirty-four, last paragraph, of the booklet Kingdom of God, by R. H. Boll himself, is found the statement more than once referred to, i.e., the kingdom announced by John and Jesus “has never yet appeared.” If he wants to take this back, let him do so; if not, it is hypocrisy for him to act as though somebody has caused a “rumpus” over nothing.

2. On page thirty-five, first paragraph, he says, “The kingdom promise was national” and since the Jews did not nationally repent, the kingdom promise was not fulfilled. Yet he now says nobody denies that the kingdom was established on Pentecost. Indeed! Then which time did he state what be believes—now or in another place?

3. On pages thirty-seven and thirty-eight he says that after the kingdom was postponed, Jesus introduced the new phase of his teaching—the parables; and the
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and unexpected aspect of the kingdom—"the church age." Does he believe this now? If so, all this talk about somebody "insisting fiercely that the kingdom exists now ... as though somebody were denying it" can be considered only as being for effect in an effort to blame others for the "condition of things" which he himself has caused.

4. On page sixty-one is his statement that Christ is not king "in fact and act" (de facto et actu) but by right only (de jure et potentia)—but when he returns he will be actual king in exercise of all authority.

Does he believe—this now? If not, when and where has he recalled it? If so, why talk about somebody "bitterly denouncing" him as though he does not "believe alike" with us that Christ has all authority in heaven and on earth? We have been taking his own word for it.

5. On page eighty-one of this same booklet (Kingdom of God, by R. H. Boll in person) is found the famous "vestibule illustration"—that the church is only the vestibule of the kingdom yet to come!

Has he taken this back? If so, where? If not, why does he use such impious language about those who have in fact represented his teaching exactly as he himself has stated it in the past, and then with his usual dramatics say "we are agreed on this" and "nobody denies that"? Duplicity is a mild term for such double-dealing and maneuvering to escape the responsibility for the "condition of things."

6. On page seventy-one, he says that "so long as Satan's throne is on the earth, Christ is not exercising the government." But now he says: "Yet all of us believe alike that Christ is on the throne he now occupies (call it what you may), and that he has all authority in heaven and on earth."

Which one of these statements does Brother Boll want us to believe, or when shall we believe what?

7. In his treatise on the Second Coming, published in 1924, page twenty-one, he says: "So the first stage of the Second Coming is when the Lord Jesus comes down to receive His own up. Then, after certain affairs have been attended to, He comes with them and the whole world sees His coming." Russell calls that "the rapture"; Boll calls it "the first stage." The difference between them is the same as the difference between tweedledee and tweedledum, except that Russell gave it an enrapturing name, and beat Brother Boll to it.

In view of all this R. H. Boll has the temerity to say that since those who "declared vociferously" against him "believe arid teach that He is coming back" why should they "denounce and condemn" such teaching as the above, as though there is little or no difference! The clumsy effort to conceal his actual teaching to save his own face, until the storm subsides, falls of its own weight and "fair-minded brethren" will not fail to see the sinister designs.

THE DIFFERENCE IT MAKES

Finally—just what difference does it make? That question involves all the consequences of the ponderous millennial program. We submit a few of the many, a sufficient number to convince anybody who wants to know that it makes a real difference.

1. The theory of the postponement of the kingdom makes the promise of God fail and the preaching of Christ false. John and Jesus said: "The time is fulfilled, and the kingdom of God is at hand: repent ye, and believe the gospel." If it was postponed, the prophecy failed. Later in his ministry, Jesus "went about all the cities and villages, ... preaching the gospel of the kingdom"—but if the kingdom did not come then what Jesus preached was not the gospel of anything; he was mistaken and his message was false. Does that make any difference?

2. Other consequences of the theory are that (1) it denies that Christ is reigning now, and puts "the reign of the Son of God" at the end of this dispensation in the millennium; (2) it nullifies the Great Commission in that it denies that Christ exercises all authority now; (3) it denies those scriptures which speak of this dispensation as "the last days," in that it teaches another dispensation after this, differing in all respects from the present dispensation; (4) it denies that Christ is on the throne of David in heaven now, and therefore bars the Gentiles from the blessings of the gospel, for James said that the tabernacle (or throne) of David must be established in order that the Gentiles might seek after God, according to the prophecies. If there is no throne or tabernacle of David now, the Gentiles are without hope (does that make any difference?); (5) it alternates Judaism and Christianity-type and ante-type—and revives the ceremonies of the law which Jesus Christ nailed to the cross and buried in his tomb. What difference could that make?

In short it is the same mistake the Jews made when they expected a king like Caesar, and in their disappointment rejected Christ, our king, and the present effort to de-throne him is but little short of the Jews' rejection of him.

It is a system of rank materialism. It teaches that saints now living will occupy "positions" of authority and exercise temporal rule in the millennium. One of the brethren in this party has elected himself in advance to be Mayor of Chicago! Another bids for the mayoralty of New York. One ardent advocate of the theory discovers that the United States will send ambassadors to Christ (who will be in Palestine) during the millennium! We believe that when "fair-minded and truehearted brethren" really know what this theory is—and that R. H. Boll teaches it—they will truly "rise up to discourage itself" not the opposition to it, but the theory and its promoters.

F. E. W., Jr.
In the September issue of Truthseeker, published in Searcy, Ark., Brother Ernest Beam had an article under the heading “Some One Should Say It,” and then he proceeded to say it. Brother Beam was one of the editors of Truthseeker, and I had planned to send this article to that paper when I noticed there would not be another Truthseeker, “that plans are being made to have a better paper with increased circulation.” I do not know whether Brother Beam intended for what he said to die with Truthseeker, or whether he was stating the policy of the new paper. That is to be seen, and will appear when the new paper appears. Let us study Brother Beam’s article in the light of facts—not fancies. Brother Beam says:

"EFFECTS TO DISFELLOWSHIP"

"After many months of witnessing the efforts of a number who are prominent among us to disfellowship Brother R. H. Boll of Louisville, Ky., and brethren of sentiments similar to his, I feel that in the humility Christ would have use it is the Christian thing to do to speak out against this effort to disfellowship. There are many things said and done in the brotherhood at large that we can pass by, no doubt, without being called to account for it by him who suffered for us, notwithstanding we disagree with it. But when such a protracted effort is made as is true in the instant case, and such demands are made to line everyone up with views taken, the way of the Cross demands we speak. There will be two churches both claiming to be of Christ if emphasis is allowed to continue as it now is. One or the other, or both, of these groups will be a denomination. And sectarianism is of Satan."

Now let us notice what Brother Beam has not noticed. He has not noticed the efforts of anybody to show the fallacy in Brother Boll’s prophetic teaching. He has not noticed the fact that Brother Boll’s vagaries of a future kingdom are tearing the spiritual body of Christ into smithereens, and causing more bitterness and alienation among brethren than the introduction of missionary societies and instruments of music into the work and worship of the church ever caused. He has only been “witnessing the efforts of a number who are prominent among us to disfellowship Brother R. H. Boll, of Louisville, Ky., and brethren of sentiments similar to his.”

Brother Beam seems to have had some kind of a spiritual lunch or urge to demolish this straw man. He says: "I feel that in the humility Christ would have us use it is the Christian thing to do to speak out against this effort to disfellowship.” I believe Brother Beam’s counsel would be safer if he would rely on facts more and his feelings less. I have read about Brother E. J. Jorgenson and the Highland Church in Louisville, Ky., withdrawing from Brother Taylor and Brother Ruble because they objected to this future kingdom nonsense being taught in the church. Brother Beam, were Brother Jorgenson and the Highland Church in Louisville, Ky., obeying Rom. 16: 17 when they did this withdrawing? I believe Brother Beam, "as a judge sits on the bench and listens to both sides of the case before him,” you can render an impartial decision here—what is your verdict in this case?

I also read that during the Norris-Wallace debate in Fort Worth, Texas, Dr. Wood, Frank Mullins, and maybe other gospel (?) preachers sat on the stage with Frank Norris. Now Brother Beam, did “a number who are prominent among us” lay violent hands on these brethren and throw them into J. Frank Norris’ pen, or did they of their own free will walk into the Norris camp, thus withdrawing themselves from the churches of Christ backing Brother Wallace in the debate, and lining themselves up with the Premillennial Baptists represented by Norris? Give us an impartial decision here, Brother Beam. There are already “two churches, both claiming to be churches of Christ,” one using missionary societies and instrumental music in the work and worship of the church, the other objecting and not using these things. Which group obeyed Rom. 16: 17 in bringing the division, Brother Beam? And which group is a denomination?

**The Tribe of Tishbite**

By the way, I have just stopped to read a six-page typewritten scurrilous, anonymous letter-postmarked Saint Louis, Mo., October 13, 1938, 11 P.M., signed “A. Tishbite,” as though there might be a tribe of them. The unmistakable intent of this letter is to assassinate the character and ruin the influence of a faithful gospel preacher, whom the writer is pleased to call “a man named Janssen.” My personal opinion of these modern “Tishbites” is that they have not yet raised their bellies from the dust of the earth. However, I may be prejudiced in my judgment. So will you please give us your impartial judgment of them, Brother Beam? I recently received a seven-page typewritten letter, with no name signed to it, and evidently written for the same purpose — postmarked Chicago, Ill. However, the writer of this letter did not slander the ancient prophet by signing “A. Tishbite.”

The Saint Louis Tishbite says: "For years he had built up a reputation as a great fighter by fighting a man in Louisville who never fought back. It was just as safe and easy to fight this man as it was for the Roman soldiers to beat Jesus, because he never fought back.” To say that Jesus Christ “never fought back” when his teaching was opposed is an inexcusable misrepresentation of the character and teaching of Jesus. Of course, Jesus Christ “never fought back” when they beat him, spit in his face and crucified him; but I have heard nothing about anyone laying violent hands on “a man in Louisville.” A man that will not fight for his convictions, and defend his teaching, should not be held up as a martyr—he is certainly not in Stephen’s class.

I would like to ask this Saint Louis Tishbite a question, and he may answer it in his next anonymous letter. For a number of years F. B. Srygley, C. R. Nichol, R. L. Whiteside, and recently W. E. Brightwell, and others have been fighting this future kingdom nonsense fathered and sent out by “a man from Louisville.” Why not try to assassinate their character, and ruin their influence as gospel preachers by sending out scurrilous anonymous letters? Why pick out “Bro. Janssen”? Srygley, Nichol, Whiteside, and others were at it long before “Bro. Janssen” got into the fight. In fact “Bro. Janssen” never got his sling and stones together until Brother Charles M. Neal, the Goliath of premillennialism in the church of Christ, “defied the armies of the living God” and challenged any one to sign on the dotted line. Whether providential or otherwise, the challenge was sent to “Bro. Janssen,” and he signed on the dotted line. The first debate between Brother Neal and “Bro. Jans-
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...was held in Winchester, Ky., January 2 to 6, 1933. After the Winchester debate, Brother Neal challenged "Bro. Janssen" to repeat the debate, which was done in Chattanooga, Tenn., June 6 to 9, 1933. The results of these debates may be the reason for "a man from Louisville" not mentioning "Bro Janssen's name." I am wondering if these anonymous letters are the best answers these Tishbites can give to "Bro. Janssen's arguments against premillennialism? I hope the readers will not confuse premillennialism with "Bollism." The latter, "Bollism," is the method of attack that Brother Boll's friends, who say they "are not committed to his views," are making upon "Bro. Janssen."

Finally, I hold no brief for Foy E. Wallace, Jr.; he is responsible for what he writes, and whatever he said about Brother George A. Klingman, and worldliness in "our" Bible colleges, he said over his own signature, and therefore amenable to the brotherhood for whatever good or harm may have been done. But not so with "A. Tishbite's" method, it like a termite works from the ground, and in the dark. Brother R. H. Boll will do himself justice when he speaks out against this diabolical procedure of his would-be friends.

"The Issue in the Case"

Back to Brother Beam's article, he says:

"I am personally not committed to Brother Boll's views in these matters and never have been. Neither have I ever been of the persuasion that it was right to drive this matter to division. I am persuaded that there have been violations of the Scriptures by brethren identified with both sides. Some have been guilty of moral turpitude and on the other side some have g-one off after spiritual gifts. Some who hold the views of Brother Boll have likely abused their freedom in Christ and those on the other side have committed similar offenses. But it seems to me none of these is the issue in this case. There are ways to take care of such matters without dividing the brotherhood.

Now, Brother Beam, since you are "not committed to Brother Boll's views in these matters and never have been," and neither are you against them and never have been, maybe you can help us some.

Moral—"Of or pertaining to the practices, conduct, and spirit of man toward God, themselves, and their fellow man."

Turpitude—"Inherent baseness and vileness of principle, nature or conduct; depravity; also any action showing gross depravity."

Since you say that we who are fighting "Brother Boll's views in these matters" have preachers who are "guilty of moral turpitude," what course of action would you advise us to take in the matter? Would you be kind enough to reveal their identity so we may deal with them? You may think us stupid not to be able to discern such base characters among us; but surely you do not believe we would knowingly fellowship such characters. What do you think Brother Boll and those on his side should do with those who "have gone off after spiritual gifts? Should they continue to fellowship them? Are you personally willing to fellowship those on one side who are guilty of "moral turpitude" and those on the other side who "have gone off after spiritual gifts? I know you say: "But it seems to me none of these is the issue in the case," but I believe such things should be made the issues, whether in this case, or others.

"Both Sides of This Controversy"

Again Brother Beam says:

"God is my witness when I say that I believe I have been in position to view both sides of this controversy as impartially as a judge sits on the bench and listens to both sides of the case before him. I believe the issue in the case is whether brethren of the views held by Brother Boll are unworthy of fellowship among us or whether those fighting him are not committing the very sin Paul condemns in Rom. 16: 17, 18: 'Now I beseech you, brethren, mark them which cause divisions and offences contrary to the doctrine which ye have learned; and avoid them. For they that are such serve not our Lord Jesus Christ, but their own belly; and by good words and fair speeches deceive the hearts of the simple.' If Brother Boll is worthy of fellowship in the sight of God it is as plain as plain could be those trying to have everyone disfellowship him or his are themselves guilty of causing 'divisions and offences contrary to the doctrine which ye have learned.' That this latter is the case and that those who have thought it necessary to press this matter to division are the ones guilty of sectarianism T am persuaded."

Thus Brother Beam, as an impartial judge sitting on the bench, calls God to witness, states the issue, and renders his verdict. The issue is "whether brethren of the views held by Brother Boll are unworthy of fellowship among us or whether those fighting him are not committing the very sin Paul condemns in Rom. 16: 17, 18." The verdict is: "That those who have thought it necessary to press this matter to division are the ones guilty of sectarianism."

To have been guilty of "moral turpitude," what are you willing to fellowship them. For they that are such serve not our Lord Jesus Christ, but their own belly; and by good words and fair speeches deceive the hearts of the simple.' If Brother Boll is worthy of fellowship in the sight of God it is as plain as plain could be those trying to have everyone disfellowship him or his are themselves guilty of causing 'divisions and offences contrary to the doctrine which ye have learned.' That this latter is the case and that those who have thought it necessary to press this matter to division are the ones guilty of sectarianism."

It is as plain as plain could be those trying to have everyone disfellowship him or his are themselves guilty of causing 'divisions and offences contrary to the doctrine which ye have learned.' That this latter is the case and that those who have thought it necessary to press this matter to division are the ones guilty of sectarianism."

To have been guilty of "moral turpitude," what are you willing to fellowship them. For they that are such serve not our Lord Jesus Christ, but their own belly; and by good words and fair speeches deceive the hearts of the simple.' If Brother Boll is worthy of fellowship in the sight of God it is as plain as plain could be those trying to have everyone disfellowship him or his are themselves guilty of causing 'divisions and offences contrary to the doctrine which ye have learned.' That this latter is the case and that those who have thought it necessary to press this matter to division are the ones guilty of sectarianism."

"The empire will have to be revamped, the Jews as a nation converted and returned to Palestine; then as the fulfillment of this prophecy the earthly kingdom of Israel will be reestablished; Christ will return from heaven to sit on David's literal throne in Jerusalem, and reign over an earthly kingdom for one thousand years. Brother Boll also teaches that Christ came into the world to establish his kingdom; but after he and John the Baptist had preached "the kingdom of heaven is at hand," and Christ had said, "there are some here of them that stand by, who shall in no wise taste of death, till they see the kingdom of God come with power," he found out that the Jews were not ready for the kingdom; so Christ quit preaching "the kingdom of heaven is at hand" and went to speaking in parables.

Brother Boll also teaches that "Christ died for our sins according to the scriptures, that he was buried, and raised on the third day according to the scriptures," and then established "a new spiritual contingent, called the church," returned to heaven without doing what he came to do, and "received universal authority de jure, de facto et actu, that is, by right but not yet in actual fact and act! According to "Judge Beam," teaching this speculative nonsense is not the issue, neither is it causing the trouble. But preaching against this tomfoolery is the issue, and is causing all the trouble, therefore those fighting this visionary bunk are sectarianists, and are committing the sin Paul condemns in Rom. 16: 17, 18. According to this philosophy let everybody join the Catholic Church, and quit fighting Catholicism. Then we will be one church and Rom. 16 will not be violated!"
In connection with our radio preaching questions have come to us concerning instrumental music in church worship. The churches of Christ do not have instrumental music in worship. We have given Bible reasons for our practice, but some continue to argue that we are inconsistent, because we use the radio to preach the gospel, and use songbooks, have meetinghouses, with lights and pews. There is no logic in these objections, but as long as such propaganda misleads some people, duty demands that we meet it. When such propaganda is used by the ignorant and uninformed, we are not especially concerned, but when men of learning, even preachers who should know better, engage in such quibbling, simply to dodge the issue and protect an unscriptural cause, it is time to obey the scripture to stop the mouths of men who teach things which they ought not, for filthy lucre's sake. (Tit. 1:11.)

A Challenge

Within recent months, more than one hundred very fine people in Indianapolis have denounced the unscriptural practices of the "Christian Church." To bolster up a lost and unscriptural enterprise (the Christian Church), certain preachers, including Dr. Trinkle of the Englewood Christian Church, Indianapolis, have declared that it is as scriptural to have instrumental music in the worship as it is to use the radio, to use songbooks and have lights and pews in the meetinghouse. I am going to answer these quibbles. But I challenge these perpetrators of truth to meet us in an open debate on the question. If we are inconsistent, as they claim, they can win a great victory for their cause, and possibly prevent another hundred leaving the Christian Church!

The time was when Christian Church preachers hailed with delight the opportunity to debate these issues, but when they saw that it weakened their cause, and people were enlightened, they raised the white flag and put up the cry that debates are wrong! But no one can accept the Bible and consistently contend that honorable debate is wrong. The truth thrives in discussion. Every prophet in the Old Testament was a debater. John the Baptist was a debater. Witness the many debates the apostles had. Paul had one debate after another throughout his life. Christ was the greatest controversialist the world ever knew. Beginning with his sharp challenge and debate with the Sanhedrin at twelve years of age there was never a time that he did not combat false doctrines throughout his ministry. Of course, "wrangling" is wrong—we are not interested in a "wrangle." But the reason Christian Church preachers do not believe in debating is the same reason that a cow without horns does not believe in hooking.

Aids Versus Additions

But let us answer these quibbles. "Is the radio parallel with mechanical instruments of music in worship?" The operation of the church and the conduct of its worship are set out by the Lord Jesus Christ in the New Testament. Where the Lord has said what to do, then that is the thing to do. If the Lord tells us to do a thing, but does not specify the way to do it, then we are to be guided by our judgment, and use the best method possible in doing the thing the Lord said do, being sure, of course, that the method we use is in keeping with the spirit of the New Testament principles. The Lord said, "preach"—"teach." The Lord tells us what to preach or teach, but, the Lord has not given a specific method to be used in preaching or teaching his written word. The radio is simply a method of teaching the truth. Hence, the method is included in the command to teach or preach. The use of the radio in teaching and preaching the gospel of Christ is not an addition to God's command. It is an aid, in doing what and only what God said do. But we are told that the mechanical instrument of music is only an aid, or a method, in doing what God said do. This is not true. Music is a generic term. There are two kinds—instrumental and vocal. They are coordinate terms. Out of these two coordinates God selected one and said, "sing." Therefore, instrumental music, which is coordinate with singing, cannot by any process of logic be made an aid to another equal. coordinate term; and, hence cannot be a method of doing what God said do. The instrument is not an aid but an addition.

Inclusive and Exclusive

Christ in giving the great commission, said, "Go preach the gospel." "Go" is a generic term—there are many ways of going. But if the Lord had specified one way to go, that would be the only way we could go in obedience to the Lord. For example, if he had said, "walk and preach the gospel," then we could not ride as an aid. So it is with the mechanical music. If God had used the term "music," then we could have the two kinds—instrumental and vocal—but God did not use the generic term. He named the kind. He said, "sing," and that excludes the other kind. This principle is seen in the institution of the Lord's Supper. The Lord named the kind of fruit to be used—"the fruit of the vine"—and, that excludes any other kind of fruit. Another would be an addition.

We are commanded to teach the word. But the Lord has not given the specific method to be used in teaching the word. We should use the best method, or methods, possible in teaching his written word. Teaching God's word in classes is one method of teaching. When we use this method, we are doing what and only what God said do. But the church is God's organization to do this work. Here, God has legislated as to the "organization" that is to do this work. If we "organize" something in addition to the church, we transgress God's holy law. The church not only teaches the gospel in sermons preached by faithful ministers, but also has a teaching service on Sunday. It is not a separate "organization," but it is the church at work. The church, God's perfect organization, is the institution to disseminate the truth and aid the poor. The method of teaching God's word in classes is not an addition to God's law. But instrumental music in the worship is an addition to God's law. The "class method," like the radio, is included in God's command to teach. It is as sinful to make a law where God has made none, as it is to violate a law that God has made. The digressives violate the law God has made, and the "anti class" extremists make a law where God has made none.
The Organ the Mere Introduction of Digression

But the organ is not the only difference between churches of Christ and the Christian Church. It is just a straw that shows which way the wind is blowing! It is true, instrumental music in Christian worship is a borrowed vessel from that cesspool of spiritual corruption, “the mother of the abomination of the earth.” Beginning in about 1869 with the organ, the Christian Church has added the select choir, the paid soloist (who oftentimes is not a member of the church), societies and auxiliaries, disgraceful and claptrap ways of raising money. The preachers are wearing great swathing and flattering titles of “Doctor” (and even a few of “our” preachers are aping them lately), “Rev.,” “Pastor,” and such like. And that is not all! They have the church federation movement, union meetings, women preachers, infant dedication, and open membership. Truly it can be said they are progressive. There is no end to additions when once they are introduced. Here, I wish to ask a question: If instrumental music aids the singing as claimed, what does it aid when some Christian Churches have it during the communion service? Does it aid the Lord’s Supper?

I have answered these questions in the hope that others may be provoked to think more seriously, and led to renounce the unscriptural practices of an apostate church, return to the Bible and stand with us upon its precepts.

Pastor A. G. Ward, in telling what the Baptism of the Holy Spirit did for him, says, “Another blessed result of the coming of the Comforter to my heart has been that I have learned to cultivate the faculty of sacred imagination and to realize the unseen.”

We are of the opinion that the gentleman is right in one respect, and that is about his imagination. However, it is not the Spirit that creates this imagination but his imagination creates in his mind and heart what he believes to be the Baptism of the Spirit. Since the Bible plainly teaches that the Baptism of the Spirit was for a specific purpose and that purpose having been fulfilled, it of necessity ceased, we know then that the gentleman is overworking his imagination.

To further show you that this is a matter of perverted brain, you will please notice the following:

Joseph Smith, the father of Mormonism, got the Holy Spirit and “imagined” the angel Moroni gave him some plates on which was written the book of Mormon.

The Spiritualists claim they talk to the dead by the power of the Spirit. The dead are called up and with them they converse face to face. It looks as if some one’s imagination is working overtime here.

Mr. Nazarene gets the Holy Spirit and jumps and shouts but can’t talk in tongues. He has the same Holy Spirit that Mr. Pentecostal has but no tongues. He also says that Mr. Pentecostal cannot talk in tongues.

Mr. Quaker gets the Holy Spirit and neither jumps nor shouts but only sits quietly. He says all the noise and talking in tongues is not of the Holy Spirit.

Mrs. Mary Baker Eddy, through what she claimed was the Spirit of God, gave to the world Christian Science. This so-called science denies that there is anything that is material. Sickness and death, it says, do not exist. This is all an illusion. It seems that when folk get their imagination started there is no end to what they may say and do.

Charles T. Russell imagined he was called of God to give us his materialistic doctrine.

R. H. Boll, Chas. M. Neal, et. al., imagined this was all true and have taken up with the same. Jorgenson, Boll, and others say that their theory is not that of Russell but we are prepared to show that their theories are as much alike as two boys born of the same mother. The theories are that close akin. Only their fathers can tell them apart.

Mrs. White says she was called of God by the Spirit, to give us Adventism.

But, alas, our missionaries begin to work their imagination. Virgil Smith, after using his imagination as to what the Bible teaches on the question of the Holy Spirit, got one of his converts—namely Joano Nunes—to the point where he imagined he had the Spirit. This unusual occurrence came after they had spent some time in repeating, “The Lord is good—the Lord is good.” Then some of them talked in tongues. We wish some of these fellows who have such good imagination would show us the scriptures where God ever authorized anyone to agonize in prayer for the Holy Spirit. Where is an example of anyone getting down and crying, “The Lord is good—the Lord is good” or as the Pentecostals do, “Thank you, Jesus—Thank you, Jesus.”

All the above testimonies of the Holy Ghost folk contradict and yet each can prove his point, because he has the witness within himself. He feels it, therefore he knows it.

Well, somehow we believe the pastor mentioned above, is right. It is a work of imagination.

God destroyed the antediluvians for a too free use of their imaginations. “And God saw that the wickedness of man was great in the earth, and that every imagination of the thoughts of his heart was only evil continually.”

Moral: Stick to the work of God and quit following your imagination.

Sacred Imagination

G. K. Wallace

GREAT GOSPEL SONGS

By Austin Taylor, Dean of Gospel Singers, Mill Soon Be Published by The Bible Banner

Watch for Further Announcement
Why The Bible Banner Moved

We have had a number of inquiries about the delay in the delivery of the October Bible Banner. This was due to the fact that the Birmingham debate had completely absorbed the editor's time the last two weeks in September, and copy for the Banner was not ready for the printers. A two-weeks' debate is an all-absorbing task.

But we wish to assure the readers that the Bible Banner is safe and certain—it was only a matter of an unavoidable delay. All assurances that were made to the public in announcing the Banner are being carried out. And it is growing. We are gratified with the response, and grateful for the assurances of friendship and support that pour in through the mails.

There have been inquiries also regarding the change of location from Fort Worth to Oklahoma City. The sole reason for this change was stated in a recent issue of the Banner. We selected Oklahoma City as the proper location, and as a matter of choice and convenience on the part of the editor and his family. There are no other reasons, hear say to the contrary notwithstanding.

Oklahoma City is home to the editor and family. It is the field of early labors, as well as late. Without reflection on the great State of Texas, and the city "where the West begins," we will say that if you will visit the capital city of Oklahoma, situated on the wide undulating prairies that connect Kansas with Texas, and then best of all, observe the prosperity and peace of several thriving churches of Christ in this city, you will wonder no longer why the editor felt the irresistible urge to return to locate and live and pursue evangelistic labors and promote the interests of the Banner from such an ideal center of society and industry. If we move again, we will let you know in advance.

The Campaign of Calumny

The appearance of anonymous circulars of malicious character apparently represents a well-laid underworld plot. There is more than one party to it. There is the writer; there is the source of his underground information; there is the one who furnishes the money. It is also remarkable that it proceeds from brethren who have boasted of superior spirituality and sweetness of disposition, and who have repeatedly charged others with dealing in personalities in the fight waged against millennial teaching. Yet it is a noteworthy fact, yea, a notorious fact, that dating from the Winchester, Kentucky, debate this group of brethren have dealt in nothing but personalities and of the basest sort.

In all the debates held on these questions, and in the editorials and articles written, we have never even by remote inference reflected on any man's character and for this contemptible contumely and work of infamy going on among these brethren whose false doctrine has been exposed, we have nothing but scorn.

So grossly perverted are the matters referred to in these scurrilous documents that even any element of truth or fact upon which some of their references are based is lost in their perversion.

We have abundant documentary evidence, signed and sworn to, in proof that all transactions referred to were honest and upright. But personally, we have never felt disposed to debate my own character. That to me is not debatable.

My own person is nothing and my individual fortune insignificant, compared with the eternal interests of the cause we have set out to defend. Therefore, should my foes succeed in proving that I am as bad as they say I am, it does not change the truth for which we have fought. The ignoble means to which they resort in a final effort to dispose of men who are in their way can be construed only as an admission of defeat in the issues which we have debated.

It is a campaign of calumny which all their pious protestations cannot conceal, though they may smile and smile and smile. They may, and doubtless will, continue to talk and talk and talk—but as they talk we shall continue to strive to do our whole duty as humbly as we can while "the nations rage and the heathen imagine vain things." We shall not stoop to their plane, neither be deterred by their calumny. They shall not pass!

The Combination Paper

With their October issues, two papers have announced discontinuance, withdrawing in favor of a proposed new combination paper—a merger, we understand of Truthseeker, Searcy, Arkansas, by J. N. Armstrong and R. N. Gardner; and of West Coast Christian, published by James L. Lovell, the two announcing discontinuance, with the October issue. Among others slated for the merger is World Vision published by B. D. Morehead, the idea being, as it seems, to combine for greater circulation.

The proposed new paper is the result of some questionnaires and circulars which have been sent to various preachers and writers over the country, upon which a twenty-six page report of the survey was published and furnished to a selected group of men. This survey was copyrighted and on the copyright page the author affirmed the statement that no part of the material in it could be used or quoted by anyone without the written permission of the owner of the copyright. It is evident that the setup, and the survey itself, could not stand the crucial test of editorial scrutiny and public examination. When men publish such documents, which are themselves attacks on individuals and the policies of other papers, and then put their statements under the lock and key so that their fallacies cannot be exposed by the use and quotation of their statements—that alone should condemn the thing to all fair-minded people, and likely will, when they know it.

Efforts were made to purchase other papers with greater mediums and merge them into this new organization. There were demands made previously upon such papers as The Gospel Advocate, that a committee of selected brethren be permitted to name an editor, and such a committee also pass on what should go into the paper and what should not, and otherwise dictate its policy. Either this, or else the new paper combination would be formed, and the paper started. Such is not far removed from the Mussolini-Hitler ideas of the suppression of the press, publishing only what they want their people to see. An editor thus hamstrung and cen-
sored would be some editor, and that would be some paper!

If the statements made in the last issue of Truthseeker represents the policy of the new paper, already the olive branch has been extended to the Boll movement, and the neutral elements in the church such as the Witty and Murch unity promoters. It also appears that the paper will be little short of an official organ, or mouthpiece for certain colleges, and will be their virtual sword and shield.

In short, it represents that type of journalism set forth in the questionnaires and the surveys referred to. It is foreign to all gospel preaching and gospel journalism, in its very attitude toward error and the defense of the truth. Its promoters are fighting against fighting, and waging a relentless campaign of calumny against personalities. The lowest, most underhanded, ignoble personalities that have ever been imposed on a brotherhood are those to which these advocates of dignified methods have resorted to.

It is understood that they are gathering now in certain of their official meetings, drafting their plans and policies. Brethren should know these things, and be not deceived by the propaganda that has been spread and the malicious attacks that are being made upon certain men who are in their way and whose destruction they apparently seek. It seems the crisis is here. To faithful gospel preachers, “Watch ye, stand fast in the faith,” (1) of its speculative teaching, (2) its anti-scriptural spots, such as the third line of the second stanza of “Safely Through Another Week” (which compare with Paul’s teaching in 2 Cor. 5:18-21), (3) its association in our minds with a serious schism in the church and with confirmed schismatics, (4) its purchase amounts to aiding and abetting all this.

Fraternally yours,
A. B. Keenan.

Does Not See the Danger of the Teaching

Somewhat has been said of loose statements that have been made by preachers among us who should be able to express themselves in language that the masses can understand. Among these are some things that E. W. McMillan has said, or is supposed to have said, in recent years. We all know that rumors, reports and hearsays are not always reliable; but often men’s general attitude and softness on important questions prepares the soil in the public mind for certain reports. After hearing Brother McMillan recently make a statement through the papers to the effect that he may have said some things in connection with the case of Stephen that left the impression on someone who heard him that this Holy Spirit filled preacher used “the wrong method of approach,” but if so, he did not aim to do so. Very well; we hope Brother McMillan will be more careful in the future but what about this from his own pen in the “Colbourn Christian,” a local paper published by himself in Clever, two years ago? The following is taken from the issue of October, 1925—Vol. IV, Number 12—and is an article which has Brother McMillan’s name to it. Read it:

“A Second Chance”
E. W. McMillan

“The phrase, ‘a second chance,’ is commonly used to suggest that form of belief which affirms that a portion of mankind, who have never had the opportunity of believing on Christ, will be given in another period of time known as the ‘millennium.’
during which time holiness is to be triumphant throughout the world. This belief grows ‘out of an argument which rests in a form of human reasoning concerning the justice of God and certain Bible quotations which, to the believer in the millennial reign of Christ, seem conclusive’ as evident proof of the doctrine. Whether the doctrine be true or untrue, the term ‘second chance’ is unfortunate. People cannot have a second opportunity without having had a first one.

‘Is it true that God will bring to the heathen nations an opportunity beyond the life of accepting the Lord? Answering I must say, it requires plain statements for me to assert with absolute certainty that there will not be an opportunity beyond this life to accept the Lord.’

Since Brother McMillan said in the above statement that he intended then to “study the question more closely,” perhaps he would now give us the “results” of the study? Did it bring definite conviction?

In 1925 Brother McMillan had been through college, attending even a Bible College; had been a teacher of the Bible; and at that time was preaching for one of the largest and oldest churches in Texas. Yet he had no definite convictions on such subjects as a second chance beyond this life for people to accept the gospel of the Lord. Any schoolboy, especially one who was making a preacher, should have been able to get definite convictions on such a subject as that in one forty-five minutes Bible lesson, with the right teacher in charge of the class.

It is no wonder to us, and should not be to him, that someone misunderstood him on Stephen’s case—or did they understand him instead?

An Editor’s Footnote

Cled E. Wallace

Some time ago Geo. L. Kerns, a preacher of the Christian Church, wrote an article for the Reader’s Forum of the Christian Standard entitled, “Who Can Answer This?” The article contained the usual quibbles and evasions employed by the digressives in defense of instrumental music in worship. It differed from others of the same kind in the fact that it was somewhat more scornful of the opposition and more reckless in dealing with the principles involved. The Christian Standard published it without comment, which was logical from the Standard’s point of view.

D. H. Hadwin, who has recently changed sides, coming from the wrong to the right side, accepted the challenge contained in the heading of Brother Kern’s article and demonstrated the fact that he is at least one who can answer this.” The Christian Standard also published Brother Hadwin’s reply in the Reader’s Forum, which appears to be fair enough but evidently the Standard felt that Brother Hadwin had answered Brother Kerns a little too well and was unwilling to risk the outcome without giving Brother Kerns a little editorial ‘scotch-ing.’ I admit that he needed help, but if what the Standard says is of much value in that respect, the fact is no great compliment to the discrimination of its readers. Here is the editorial footnote appended to Hadwin’s reply to Kerns:

“Brother Hadwin used other things in the worship that are no more mentioned in the Scriptures than is the instrument. This compels us to go a great deal deeper to determine the proper rules of procedure on all such matters.”

As I understand them, the editors of the Standard consider instrumental music in worship an unimportant matter, its use or non-use to be determined in accordance with the preferences of the worshippers. At best it is a notionate affair. One would naturally think the Standard editors occupied an exalted seat right on top of the fence. Theoretically this seems to be the case but practically — let some brother jump on to one of the Standard’s pet orchestra members, and off the fence the editors hop, and always on the same side, the wrong side. The Standard is pretty touchy on this question. It would be well for Brother Witty not to overlook this fact. If the fellowship is restored which was lost when the instruments were introduced into the worship, then the instruments must go. I am subject to correction but my present impression is that the Standard prefers the instruments to the fellowship, even though the instrument is considered a non-essential. Does the Standard think that fellowship is less so?

If “Brother Hadwin uses other things in the worship that are no more mentioned in the Scriptures than is the instrument,” it only goes to prove that Brother Hadwin is not much, if any, better than the editors of the Standard are. I admit that Brother Hadwin is justified in feeling that the editors are not braging on him. They in turn seem to be perfectly happy that they are no worse than Brother Hadwin is. Incidentally, the Standard did not specify the “other things in the worship” that “Brother Hadwin uses” that are no more mentioned in the Scriptures than is the instrument.” It would be interesting to have it do so, and when it does, we promise that the matter will be further looked into. Another thing the editors did not do, and I have an idea will not attempt, they did not answer the pointed, scriptural reasons Brother Hadwin gave for rejecting instrumental music in worship. I see some humor in the situation. I usually see it if it is there.
ANENT ANONYMOUS LETTERS

The bullet of an assassin, shot from the dark. - R. L. Whiteside, Denton, Texas.

My opinion is that the gun they use will kick harder than it shoots. - Cled E. Wallace, Austin, Texas.

I do not believe that anonymous letters will hurt you or the paper. - Loyd L. Smith, San Diego, Cal.

I have no idea who did write that circular letter, but I suppose it is being sent everywhere for the purpose of injuring you and to destroy the power of the Banner. But the people rage and the enemies imagine vain things. - Thad S. Hutson, Parkersburg, West Va.

A man that will dig at another in an unsigned letter is a moral and physical coward. It seems that he must have had some qualms about the "big, bad wolf." - Geo. B. Curtis, Morrilton, Ark.

I have seen the recent attack upon you from Chicago, and I cannot refrain from writing you and telling you how much contempt I feel for the slimy creature who was too cowardly to sign his name. Surely you have nothing to fear from such vermin who, like the night riders of old, are content to do their work under the guise of anonymity. But this is the price you must pay for your courageous fight against premillennialism in the church. Loyal disciples are behind you to a man - Guy N. Woods, Wellington, Texas.

I see it is postmarked Saint Louis. I just wonder if it was written at the same place where the stamps were cancelled. - Ben F. Taylor, Bowling Green, Ky.

This is the second letter of this type I have received. I do not have any time for a man who will write a letter of this type, especially a man who does not have the nerve to sign his name. - Marion Davis, Fayette, Ala.

I am sure that "A Tishbite" is "A Bollite" coward. Brother Wallace, you have done much to put this crowd of materialists on the run. They cannot meet the truth, so they are attacking you in this underhanded way; but I know you do not fear them. May the Lord bless you in the fight against this apostasy. - H. R. Atchison, Topeka, Kan.

I am not telling you what to do with the document; but I have my opinion of what should be done with any document a man is ashamed to send out over his own name - if he is its author. - C. R. Nichol, Seminole, Okla.

We are talking about that unsigned, inhuman letter that preaching brethren have received. We all feel like the writer was "copperheading" as Brother Cled Wallace would say, and we regret such tactics, and assure you that it does not cast any reflection on your character with us. - W. C. Ramsey, Murl, Ky.

The sheets mailed to preachers of churches of Christ, with Chicago and Saint Louis postmarks, are simply outbursts of an undercurrent that threatens the church. They evidence the success of your work in defense of the church in the time of crisis. Enemies cannot meet you with an open Bible and must seek to do their malicious work in the dark. The cowardly attacks upon the man they cannot meet is proof that your work is not in vain. Power unto you. Do not allow this work of the devil to deter you. Faithful brethren are with you heart and soul. - E. G. Creacy, Horse Cave, Ky.

I have been wondering why a certain college crowd when they received $10,000 from a certain wealthy man did not get into "a taxicab" and run over to a certain town to pay up debts that they were relieved of through the process of bankruptcy. I asked one of the "doctors" this and not only closed him up about another matter of the same kind, but provoked a young cyclone.

My best wishes and prayers accompany you and your efforts and I appreciate your efforts in behalf of the Old Paths. Not only so, but I take every opportunity to say so both publicly and privately. - Geo. W. DeHoff, Lepanto, Ark.

At a Reduced Price...

Neal-Wallace Discussion

One of the best source books on all phases of premillennialism.

Price Now $1.50

Order from

The Bible Banner
Box 1804, Oklahoma City, Okla.
WORDS OF ENCOURAGEMENT

Your first issue of the Bible Banner is received and I congratulate you. It is fine indeed. Brethren everywhere should, and all loyal and faithful will, welcome the Banner. I am going to do all I can so that it may have a wide circulation and I shall do all in my power to spread its circulation. More power to you in this worthy work.—John H. Bannister, Oklahoma City, Okla.

Congratulations on appearance as well as contents of the Banner. It reads good. Command me when I can serve you or the cause.—C. R. Nichols, Seminole, Okla.

In my estimation the Banner is very good, in fact so good that I wish you would send me ten samples and I will try and get up a club of subscriptions for you.—M. Lloyd Smith, Clyde, Texas.

We need this paper and we need you as its editor, therefore I am going to do all I can so that it may have a wide circulation. The Bardstown Road church is considering the possibilities of distributing several copies each month. We feel that the time is ripe for some militant gospel preaching.—J. M. Powell, Louisville, Ky.

I think that it is the very paper the brotherhood has been in need of so long. It is really great and refreshing to read all the good articles in this issue. I hope and pray your opportunities for such work may multiply.—C. C. Burns, Florence, Ala.

It sounds like Jude 3 to me! May the dear Lord help us to be “devoted to the defense of the church against all errors and innovations.” —Fred E. Dennis, Marietta, Ohio.

It measures up to my expectations every way. Your present setup will be a mighty tower of accomplishment, and I wish for you all the success that is possible for you.—Oscar Smith, Paris, Texas.

Count me as a steadfast and loyal supporter of the Banner.—John H. Gerrard, Lynn, Ind.

It is just what we need, and I pray that it will accomplish great good in keeping us away from departures so liable to be made if we are not constantly being reminded. You are to be commended for your courage and faithfulness to the ancient gospel and the church.—C. E. McCall, Oklahoma City, Okla.

I congratulate you on being able to get such a splendid group of men to back you in your new undertaking, and I wish for you all the success that is possible for you.—Clarence C. Morgan, Odessa, Texas.

September Bible Banner one of the best issues of any religious journal I ever read. More power to you, and Cled, and John T. Lewis, and Hugo Mc Cord, and all that are like-minded and courageous to speak.—A. C. Buchanan, Albuquerque, N. Mex.

I enjoyed the Bible Banner. Take courage and keep fighting. My prayers are with you.—W. G. Bass, Orange, Texas.

It speaks in no uncertain terms. I do not feel that you are unduly concerned over the “signs of the times.” —R. L. Smith, Los Angeles, Calif.

(Note: Brother Smith is long-time deacon and treasurer of the Central Church of Christ, Los Angeles, and is one of the editors of the Banner. He had close and intimate association. His words taken from a good, personal letter are much appreciated.—Editor.)

The Bible Banner is as good as the best. It is bound to accomplish great good in staying off departures from the Old Paths. God bless you, and keep you bold and courageous, active and clean, to do a work for the defense of the truth for many years which none other can do so well.—Gus Nichols, Jasper, Alabama.