Perhaps you are one of those journalistically inclined marksmen who like to shoot at somebody but are jittery about being shot at. You think it poor taste for anybody to point a pen at you but cannot resist the temptation to point yours at him on occasion. Now, here is the latest technique, demonstrated and employed by the advocates of highclass journalism. If your pen serves as a safety valve for pent-up emotions that might bring some return consequences, or are contrary to your avowed principles of soft speech, make a period and put the cap on your pen before you sign your name. If on the other hand you are rather proud of, than ashamed of yourself, and want everybody to know you did it, but have a feeling that your lame logic may invite reprisals, copyright it, put up a legal "no trespass" sign. That may protect you but I doubt it. A pacifist is not supposed to chain a bull-dog to his front gate post.

Occasionally I read about some brother "resigning" his position as "minister" of a local church to enter "the evangelistic field." As I view it, the language is unfortunate or else the work as "minister" was unscriptural. A man may be supported and directed by one church to do the work of an evangelist in a specified field for any length of time circumstances may suggest it to be advisable. He may change fields often and travel much. He may stay in one field a long time and travel little and be doing the work of an evangelist all of the time. Traveling is not evangelizing. He may evangelize while he is traveling as Phillip did or he may do it after he arrives, and should do it as long as he stays. If the preacher of a local church is not evangelizing, what is he doing? If he is not in the "evangelistic field," where is he? I have been an evangelist for lo, these many years. I have traveled much and preached in many meetings, over a wide territory. I have confined my labors to one locality for months or years at a time in what is frequently referred to as "local work." I have preached the same gospel all the time, done evangelistic work all the time, and been in the evangelistic field all the time. A gospel preacher is in "the evangelistic field" anywhere he is, if he preaches the gospel. If he is not in it, he had better get in it, and stay in it. "Do the work of an evangelist, fulfill thy ministry." (2 Tim. 4:5).

Brother G. H. P. Showalter, editor of the Firm Foundation, recently made some sensible remarks about the dangers and advantages of advanced education. There is a more or less general feeling among disciples to the effect that higher education shipwrecks faith or else dilutes it to the point of impotence. The facts of the case should guide us to our conclusions. We know some men of high educational attainments who are strictly loyal to New Testament principles. Brother Showalter happens to be one of them. We know others with as many degrees as a thermometer, who have "gone modern" on us. Perhaps modern education is dangerous very much after the same fashion that money is. It was and is hard for both rich men and wise men to enter the Kingdom of God. The one relies too much on his money; the other on his education. It is a case of pride and distortion of values. "Charge them that are rich in this present world, that they be not high-minded, nor have their hopes set on the uncertainty of riches, but on God, who giveth us richly all things to enjoy; that they do good, that they be rich in good works, that they be ready to distribute, willing to communicate, laying up for themselves a good foundation against the time to come, that they may lay hold on the life which is life indeed." (1 Tim. 6:17-19)

This is a challenge which is hard for a rich man to meet, if he is anything short of being a genuine Christian. Many turn and go away sorrowful as did the rich young ruler when Jesus placed a like challenge before him.

The possession of great learning or power also has its dangers. For behold your calling, brethren, that not many mighty, not many noble are called. (1 Cor. 1:26) For it is written, I will destroy the wisdom of the wise, and the discernment of the discerning will I bring to nought. (1 Cor. 1:19) Now the natural man receiveth not the things of the Spirit of God: for they are foolishness unto him; and he cannot know them, because they are spiritually judged. (1 Cor. 2:14)

It is evident that man must rely on the divine revelation we have in the Bible for his knowledge of God and his will. He must walk by faith. If it is fatal for him to trust in the power and position that money brings, it is no less fatal for him to put his trust in human wisdom and make his own saviour. This misplaced trust is the ground of "will-worship" condemned by Paul (Col. 2:23) and endorsed by modernists. Neither education, culture nor money should lead away from God but they often do. "Let no man deceive himself. If any man thinketh that he is wise among you in this world, let him become a fool that he may become wise. For the wisdom of this world is foolishness with God. For it is written, He that taketh the wise in their craftiness: and again, The Lord knoweth the reasonings of the wise that they are vain. Wherefore, no one glory in men. (1 Cor. 3:18-21).
THE EMERGENCE OF A NEW MOVEMENT

The October number of West Coast Christian, published by James L. Love11 of Los Angeles, Calif., contains the following announcement:

"On Jan. 1, 1939 a new religious paper is to be born. It will be born out of dissatisfaction of our present publications-dissatisfaction in that our present papers do not appear, from a survey which has recently been made, to be reaching the public as they should . . . . It was the prayer and hope of the leaders of the new paper to build upon the Gospel Advocate and make it the paper that the brotherhood appeared to desire, but such an arrangement could not be made."

The survey referred to above was made by Clinton Davidson of New York City several months ago, by sending out a questionnaire to a large number of preachers, and possibly others. Later Mr. Davidson published a report of the results of this survey. Unfortunately we cannot quote from this report, for the author-although it was distributed free-copyrighted the contents of the same. No part of it can be quoted without the permission of the author, and so far this permission has not been obtained. But the report referred to the fact that the author conferred with publishers with the hope that they would make certain changes to conform to the plans of the new paper. One publisher at least, was invited to a meeting of the promoters of the new paper for a thorough discussion of these matters.

The Promoters

Since those launching this paper have taken the liberty twice to use the name of other publishers; and since the plan seems to be to make capital of the fact that others had an opportunity to join the movement, and thus prevent the formation of a new publication company, it seemed that the public should be told the reasons. There must be good reasons.

Propositions must be judged by the person or persons making them, and the spirit in which they are presented. This movement is apparently being promoted by Clinton Davidson, and appears to be part of a twofold plan: First, to promote certain Colleges-namely Lipscomb College, Harding College, and Abilene Christian College and possibly the one in California; second, to finance a religious journal and its paper and the publication of Sunday-school literature. Naturally and logically the paper comes first, so that there may be a medium through which to campaign for the schools.

Who is Clinton Davidson? He may be known to some extent in the business world, but until recently very few people knew anything of him as a member of the church of Christ.

The publisher of the Christian Leader stated in the current issue of that paper that Davidson had been "lost to us" for some twenty years in New York City, and that only recently has he come back to light. Yet this man who has been thus lost to "us" for twenty years now proposes to "lead" us! But where was he while he w-as "lost to us" during these twenty years? The Leader says he was in New York. Others considered reliable have said that he was also attending a large modernistic Christian Church of that city much of that time.

The first time we ever heard of him was when he began the campaign to change the policy of our oldest papers to conform to his movement. At the same time, he also informed certain ones that he "had the dope" on prominent preachers in the church, and that he was going to expose them.

It is utterly repugnant to the spirit of the Christian religion to begin a campaign for Bible colleges, religious journals, or anything else, by playing detective and obtaining, or claiming to obtain, information reflecting upon the character of some of the outstanding leaders of the church, who might be expected to oppose the campaign, or have already opposed some doctrine in which the promoter may be interested. All who know these men know that such threats are malicious, and that they are ready for the showdown! If these men are not fit to preach, why has Mr. Davidson not already exposed them?

Why did Clinton Davidson copyright his report? If he has diagnosed the ills of the church and has the remedy, why keep the information under padlock.

We are also told by those who are in a position to know that some months ago H. Leo Boles wrote Mr. Davidson and asked him about his religious affiliation during the past ten years. Mr. Davidson is said to have resented the inquiry and professed complete ignorance as to who H. Leo Boles is. Imagine a man undertaking to publish the kind of a religious paper the brotherhood needs and wants, who does not know who Brother Boles is! Perhaps that is the reason Brother Boles escaped being placed on the blacklist.

About the time Brother Boles wrote him, he is related to have placed his membership in Manhattan Church in New York City, a loyal congregation which has been meeting for several years. He is said to have sent his membership by letter, but after this action was criticized as placing membership by proxy, he appeared in person the following Sunday and expressed his wish to be known as a member of that congregation. It was understood when he first moved to New York, he met with this congregation, but about ten years ago he began attending services at the Christian church in New York City. This church is described as one of the rankest and most modernistic Churches of the world.

Where was Brother Davidson while the brotherhood was supporting the work in New York City? A Nashville church is maintaining a mission, with a full-time preacher in New York City. While the church sent missionaries to New York, was Davidson warming his toes at the fires of modernism and digression? But this is the man who can tell leaders of the church what is wrong, and rally them to his campaign to solve all the problems of the brotherhood! This expert specializes in big jobs only. But he "copyrights" his findings! Is it because he feels vulnerable, and does not want to be exposed? Let the brotherhood take notice that we have a new form of "ethics" in religious journalism-that of, copyrighted articles-a real innovation among gospel papers, introduced by this religious technician, Clinton (Copyright) Davidson.

The Combination

The new paper will virtually be an organ of certain colleges, whose policies of softness and compromise have been criticized. It was first suggested that the schools publish a paper. It is understood that the schools themselves were afraid of that. But the connection between the schools and the paper cannot be successfully denied, nor wisely ignored. Who were those who made pilgrimages to the mecca of this Deliverer of colleges in New York City? These college men. Who have been associated with Davidson on all his trips to the South? These College men.
Who have attended the meetings in the interest of the new paper? These same school men. Who stand to benefit from his movements? Those interested in the welfare of these colleges, of course.

It will be unfortunate when the marriage ceremony is performed between the schools and the new paper. It is unfortunate for the schools when they enter into an arrangement of this kind. It is the saddest day in the history of the so-called Restoration Movement when a paper with a promiscuous ownership (or any other kind) becomes the virtual organ of these institutions. It does not matter what paper it is, nor what institution, or institutions it may be; it is an extremely dangerous tie-up. It is a distinct and ominous threat to the autonomy of the churches and the integrity of New Testament Christianity. It is as distinctly sectarian as the machinery of any denomination upon the earth.

Such a movement is sure to bring strife and division. It will array those against the schools who have been supporting them, because they love the purity of the church more than the schools. It will cause others through their loyalty to the schools to ignore the safety of the cause of the Lord.

If the movement should be successful it is sure to divide the church of Christ, because it constitutes a more definite and developed departure from New Testament simplicity than did the introduction of instruments of music into the worship half a century ago!

Other gospel papers, are themselves religious institutions, and cannot question the right of individual Christians to found institutions for teaching the Bible, caring for orphans, and promoting other good work. But we cannot recognize the combination of religious institutions with the religious press. It contradicts the wisdom of the founders of the American government, who provided three branches of government to serve as checks upon one another. It violates divine wisdom and common sense. This is the longest step toward sectarianism that those who have enlisted under the Restoration Movement were ever called upon to make at one time. Any publisher loyal to New Testament principles would refuse such a tie-up, unless deceived as to its nature.

No Controversies

The new paper is not supposed to allow controversy. Other papers may have erred in allowing controversies of no profit. But when a paper lets it be known in its incipience that it is against controversy, that paper is fundamentally and organically wrong on the face of it.

But do not think for a moment that Davidson does not engage in controversy. He has, his own ideas of ethical controversy which he carries on through circularizing the brotherhood with mimeographed one-sided correspondence and copyrighted articles and surveys. Ethical journalism! Ethical correspondence.

Mutual Sympathies

On the whole, it is not difficult to see the trend of the new paper, if the adage that one is to be judged by the company he keeps can be relied on. The Truthseeker, known to be of Pro-Boll sympathy, announcing the merger with the new set-up definitely extends the olive branch to the Boll party. The December Word and Work, (the Boll-Jorgenson paper) looks with longing eyes to this new movement whence cometh their help. The West Coast Christian, by James Lovell likewise gives vent to feelings of antipathy toward the policies of other papers and is known to be friendly to the Boll party. Clinton Copyright Davidson, himself, feels the necessity of getting out another mimeographed edition to the preachers relative to his connections and association with the Boll element. What if he does have brother-in-law and other family connections and personal associations with this party? He says J.ペット- track Ezell has a brother-in-law who was a Boll sympathizer, but who would say Ezell was one? But Mr. Copyright Davidson has no fought Bollism nor made the effort to straighten his Bollite kinfolks out like everybody knows Ezell did. Now, if he will fight it like Ezell did, we will say with him, what of it? But if Ezell had followed the Davidson copyright ethics of helping the Boll movement and other departures in the church, and had promoted kch a movement as Davidson is doing, such in-law connections and other personal affiliations would imply just what it does in this case. Our copyright promoter was brought up in Louisville at the feet of Boll? Are not certain members of his family, as he admits, ardent devotees of Boll, Homer Ruth- erford for instance? And does he not himself oppose the very men and the very papers who have been holding the line against the advances of the Boll movement? He should not wonder that he should be judged by the company he keeps. Besides that, where and when has he come forward with an outright and forthright repudiation of R. H. Boll and his party, or declared himself without equivoca- tion on the persons and issues involved? Contrariwise, he prosecutes the preachers and papers that have waged the fight against the Boll faction, and pledges the new paper to a peace policy, which the Boll side accept as gestures in their direction as seen by their own statements in the current Word and Work.

Whether important or unimportant per se, premillennialism is the outstanding religious issue of the day, not only in the church of Christ, but throughout the religious world.

Yes, other papers were asked first. The new paper could have been prevented—but at what a price! The policy would have been turned over to a board that they would appoint, let them choose the editor, let them say what should be and what should not be published! Does any reader think any paper should accept such a proposition? Would any thoughtful person anywhere ever have any respect for such a publisher or for the paper?

A religious paper has nothing but its policy, and its past. Many of us thank God that other publishers refused and are praying that they will stand by that refusal and fight.

F. E. W., Jr.

PUBLICATION NOTICE

It will be observed that the present issue of the Bible Banner is twenty-four pages instead of the usual sixteen. There is a purpose. The first issue of the Bible Banner appeared about two weeks late, and has been off date each month since. We wish to get on publication date-namely, the first of each month. The present issue is a January-February combination to enable us to do so. We are giving the readers an extra-special to make up for it. The next issue will appear March first, and on the first of each month thereafter.
The Spirit That Stoned Stephen

For sometime threats and rumors of threats to sue the editor and publisher of the Bible Banner have been in circulation. It has been quite commonly reported that "the man from New York," chief promoter of the new paper to be published on a "high plane," was seeking some cause (just any cause) to sue this paper. He thinks he has found it, as the following letter indicates:

Dear Brother,_____________________

The Gospel Advocate and the Bible Banner published an advertisement stating that the Bible Banner Company will be incorporated by yourself and others.

I am one of the men who has been promoting the combination of certain other papers with the Christian Leader. In the November issue, on page 13, the Bible Banner published a statement regarding these men which, I have been informed by eminent legal counsel, is libelous.

I should like to discuss this matter with the owners of the paper or the owners of the Bible Banner Company and as the published statement that "the company is being incorporated" by you and others has not, to my knowledge, been publicly denied, I should appreciate hearing from you as to the connection that you have with the Bible Banner or the Bible Banner Company.

Sincerely yours,

Clinton Davidson

P. S. Was the company incorporated?

It is evident that this self-appointed Moses of a new journalism among the brethren wants to sue somebody. They cannot answer our arguments, and cannot stone us (literally) as the Jews did Stephen, so they will just sue us.

When the Bible Banner was launched, it was announced that it would be incorporated through a number of interested brethren. The announcement was made with the understanding of all and in good purposes. However, the actual incorporation was a mere detail. Resources with which to carry on, is the main thing. Companies and corporations are of no major importance.

It has been decided to operate the Bible Banner unincorporated. If the man from New York can make anything out of it, he is welcome to anything he can stir up. And if he wants to sue anybody, he will have to sue me, individually and personally - for how much? Thanks for the compliment. But I shall not subject my good friends to his threats of embarrassment.

So just bring along the "eminently legal counsel" from New York, and a "Philadelphia lawyer" with him, and I will try to arrange my appointments to attend the ceremonies. My mail is received in Oklahoma City, Oklahoma. I reside in the same city where I receive my mail, sign my name to everything I write and I do not copyright my articles.

But let the good brethren reflect a little. This man who wants to sue somebody is the one who, according to the paper he bought out, "has been lost to us for twenty years." Nobody knows where he has been nor what he has been doing during that time except that he was admittedly not devoted to things spiritual. He reappears to "lead us" into a new era of Journalism. He begins his effort to suppress freedom of expression.

I was asked if I would refuse to be in this heavenly in earth and replied that I would unless it was considerably cooler than Peter said in 2 Peter 3: 10-12.

1. I learned that the argument on "believe unto," "re- pent unto," "confess unto," and be baptized into proves nothing as the "unto" and "into" come from the same Greek word and might as well be translated "into." I learned that the reason more preachers don't accept this is because they would have to revise many of their sermon outlines or stop using them.

2. I learned that many of our preachers are making a cold, formal system of legalism out of the gospel and that their preaching is devoid of spirituality. John T. Hinds and N. B. Hardeman were called by name. I learned that Brother Hardeman is not an orator and that he preaches on nothing but first principles.

3. I learned that the fact I carried an insurance policy showed a lack of faith in God as he has promised to take care of His children.

4. I learned that God's providence is the same in both Old and New Testaments; that a Christian might expect to make more potatoes on the same piece of ground than an infidel would make; that God will drive the worms off the crops of a Christian and run the disease away from his fruit trees if he has enough faith and prays enough.

5. I learned that the enforcement of God's providence will see to it that any man who is as honest as was the ennuch in Acts 8 will get the gospel in some way or other; that the Holy Spirit dwells personally in the Christian and not just through "the mere word", that even the sinner has that much Spirit; that when I was older I would appreciate this doctrine more.

6. I learned that our preachers have preached too much on baptism and "have stressed it all out of joint" and "overemphasized" it.

7. I learned that 80% of the church leaders and preachers today are products of Christian schools.

8. I learned that we are "creed bound" and that our "unwritten creed" is as strong as any denominational creed.

9. I learned that debates nearly always do more harm than good.

10. I was informed that in 1 Cor. 15:24 where Paul says "then cometh the end," that the "then" denotes a period of time between the resurrection of the righteous and the coming of the end; that this period of time may be either ten seconds or a thousand years but that there must be such a period.

11. I learned that God is not going to be cheated out of His earth but in all probability will have heaven here on earth. I was asked if I would refuse to be in this heaven on earth and replied that I would unless it was considerably cooler than Peter said in 2 Peter 3: 10-12.

12. I learned that many of the pioneer preachers believed in premillennialism and no one kicked up a fuss about it.

13. I learned that R. H. Boll is kind, godly, pious, reverent, clean, pure, holy and spiritual. (Yes sir, these (Continued on Page 24)
Attention is called to the article by George W. DeHoff, entitled "What I Learned In Brother Armstrong's Classes," which appears in editorial space. Because of its bearing on the matters discussed herein, it should be read first.

Back in 1935 when the pressure was applied, by F. B. Srygley and others, to certain school men among us to make a clear statement of their positions on the divisive doctrines of Premillennialism and kindred questions, Brother J. N. Armstrong, of Harding College, with apparent irritation and vexation finally delivered himself, with marked resentment, under the above caption. But his statements turned out to be more of a criticism and condemnation of brethren who opposed the Boll party than a forthright stand on the issues involved. Timely and effective strictures were offered by a number of able brethren and it was plainly shown that Brother Armstrong had not taken a straightforward position on the questions at stake. He wrote six or seven articles trying to keep from saying what could have been said on a postcard. His series of articles revealed a very definite sympathy with both the personnel of the Boll party and with policies of the school and the teaching of their proponents.

A partial statement of his views was later published in the Harding College Bulletin and widely circulated as a manifesto of Harding College's position on the question. Notwithstanding the fact that these articles had been definitely challenged in the Firm Foundation, Christian Leader, Gospel Advocate and Gospel Guardian. Doctor Benson has even more recently said that Brother Armstrong's position remained unchallenged for the more than two years since his statements appeared! The articles in which his statements were both challenged and exposed are still available and can be reproduced. Brother Armstrong's zeal for R. H. Boll has eaten him up. He cannot keep quiet, as the college evidently would like for him to do. In spite of all efforts to smother his views-they will out. So President Armstrong, now Dean of Bible in Harding College, goes on record again, both in his classes and in correspondence with the students.

A Correspondence Course in Bollism

The following letter was sent to the writer with request that it be published and reviewed in The Bible Banner. As it so vitally affects grave issues in the church, it should be read first. Any person of any ability is free to make a clear statement of his beliefs and convictions, but, if he is not bold enough to come out, he cannot expect his views to be published and reviewed. Brother Armstrong was bold enough to come out, and reveals the type of teaching that is being done in the colleges today. I take it that R. H. Boll himself would not endorse what he "learned" in his classes at Harding College, as his article already referred to indicates.

With the name of the addressee deleted, copy of Brother Armstrong's letter to one of his students is here inserted as requested, and as follows:

May 28, 1938.

Dear —

I enjoyed your late letter and I am glad to answer inquiring.

I do not believe that the whole world will become subject to Christ just through the preaching of the gospel, for we are expressly told that as Jesus comes back again a sword will proceed out of his mouth and with it he will smite the nations, etc. Rev. 19:11--

This is no doubt a part of the abolishing of all rule, authority, and power, in his subjecting of all things to himself.

The scriptures for my faith that finally the kingdom of heaven, the church, that was established on the earth on the first Pentecost after the Lord will possess the earth are these. Dan. 2 and 1 Cor. 15:24-28. If we are right in saying that this second chapter of Daniel refers to the establishment of the kingdom and if the Christian’s present reign of Christ left on the earth. And this is in the life time of Christ's present reign.

Yes, I had heard of the article in the Gospel Guardian. As you see my article appeared in the Firm Foundation in 1934 and in our bulletin in the summer of 1935, whereas you say Brother H. Leo Boles wrote the article in which he is supposed to have "retracted" his saying which I quoted from "the book "Unfulfilled Prophecy" in October-1935. Shall I now burn up the remaining copies of the bulletin still in our offices? Would this be necessary? If so he and the Gospel Advocate should dump the book "Unfulfilled Prophecy," but I see they still advertise it and sell it to people who never heard of the Gospel Guardian. I am not sure, however, that he does retract what I quote from him. You will notice that he says "It is not fair to the present situation to quote me in '1927 from the book, 'Unfulfilled Prophecy,' which expressed the attitude then and applied these quotes to R. H. Boll, whereas now he says that these brethren who have departed so far from the faith have gone in exalting their 'theories.' I did not 'apply' the quotation I used 'to the extremities to which these brethren have gone' in exalting 'their theories' that he had not gone in 1927." Here he would have the difficulty of his life to show any new "extremities" to which Boll has gone. Boll teaches exactly what he did in the debate, "Unfulfilled Prophecy," and his "sense of their theories" now that he had not then. It would not be fair to R. H. Boll, nor to H. Leo himself to include Boll in "these brethren--" for Boll has made no changes and H. Leo Boles would want to say it if he had the "theories" that he had not gone in 1927. Here he would have the difficulty of his life to show any new "extremities" to which Boll has gone. Boll teaches exactly what he did in the debate, "Unfulfilled Prophecy," and his "sense of their theories" now that he had not then. It would not be fair to R. H. Boll, nor to H. Leo himself to include Boll in "these brethren," for Boll has made no changes and H. Leo Boles would want to say it if he had the "theories" that he had not gone in 1927. Here he would have the difficulty of his life to show any new "extremities" to which Boll has gone. Boll teaches exactly what he did in the debate, "Unfulfilled Prophecy," and his "sense of their theories" now that he had not then. It would not be fair to R. H. Boll, nor to H. Leo himself to include Boll in "these brethren." For on the first Pentecost after the resurrection of our Lord the church that was established on the earth will possess the earth.

Besides if Brother H. Leo Boles means that he would not now say what he did in 1937, about R. H. Boll why does he say it only in a paper that died before it began to live, and then was never read by a handful of mail-in subscribers? Why not put his retraction in his own paper, the Gospel Advocate, and in the Foundation, if he wants to protect the reader's of the book, and in putting it in those papers why doesn't he give the new "extremities" to which Boll has gone since 1927? I wonder, too, how
much of that book he wants to take back that he meant "Teach but what's right, not mean "Then do you mean then do you mean that a different attitude to a "faction" that other brethren would not hold? There is no difference here. I would hold the same attitude to a faction that Brethren Brigance and Hardeman would hold. We might disagree in judgment as to what particular group is a faction, brethren have in the past. You surely do not think I would fellowship or endorse a faction?

I'd like to see in Boll's own language that he believes the church is an "accident," rather than see some one else's misrepresentation of what he did say. But if he has gone to "such extremities" at all, he did it before 1927 when he gave him a clean sheet of endorsement as a brother in Christ.

I am very frank in saying that there is a real difference between certain other questions and the millennium and that difference is that the government question, the elder question, then, do you mean, the "College question" and the re-baptism question involve the practice of the church and of the brethren. This makes -these last named questions more serious, indeed. But the difference on the millennium question has been raging for twenty years and more and has not in its life time changed the practice of the brethren or of a single church, not even the church in which it is claimed the doctrine originated, though the preacher who is said to be the chief "offender" has been that church's preacher for thirty seven years. This is long enough to show effects.

Finally, We at Harding College learned to think much of you last year. Our appreciation of you has not changed. We think much of you, and anytime we can assist you we shall be glad to do it.

Very sincerely,

J. N. Armstrong

Some Comments On The Letter

1. It must be evident to all that Brother Armstrong is making a labored defense of R. H. Boll among his preacher students, both in and out of the college. He will not have it that 3011 is a factionist, nor that he is even one of the extremists. He seems to think that those who oppose Boll and his party are the factionists, and if Rom. 16:17-18 is applied to anybody, it must not be to Brother Boll and his party. He will give Boll himself "a clean sheet of endorsement" but would apply Rom. 16:17,18 to "these brethren." What brethren? In one of his articles he objected very much to "drawing the line" on anybody, and said that no man had any right to "enter the sacred precincts of another man's conscience" and tell him what to do. He is not to teach. Brother Armstrong could apply Rom. 16:17,18 to "these brethren," the group to which Brother Boll does not belong, without entering their sacred precincts? He would condemn some of Boll's disciples who have gone to "extremes" but will shield Boll, their teacher and promoter, and let him go scot free!

2. In the October, 1935, Gospel Guardian, H. Leo Boles had a straightforward statement on the developments of Premillennialism under the heading "The Issue Then And Now." In this article Brother Boles pointed out the extremes of the Boll theory. Brother Armstrong would have us think that Brother Boles did not mean to include Boll himself in the extremes of his own theory and of "these brethren" who have followed it toits logical ends! Let the victims of the theory, and his disciples, bear the stigma and be disfellowshiped, but let their teacher and master be shielded!

He thinks perhaps Brother Roles did not really mean what he said because he said it in the Gospel Guardian instead of the Gospel Advocate. A good way to settle that is to ask Brother Boles. The main point is -- Brother Boles said it, and said it effectively, and said it truthfully and forthrightly.

As for the Gospel Guardian, it did not die, but merged with another paper with "increased circulation" like Truthseeker (Brother Armstrong's paper) said it was doing Jan. 1. And while the Gospel Guardian was cruising under its own flag and mast, it was read by more than any "mere handful" as Brother Armstrong remarked. Its smallest press run was 5,000; its largest 10,000. The particular issue that carried Brother Boles article "The Issue Then And Now," (7,000 copies) was exhausted and the demand for extra copies could not be supplied. We venture the statement that the lowest figure above quoted is more than Truthseeker ever issued.

But if Brother Armstrong wishes to insist that the Gospel Guardian died, we reply that even so, it "being dead yet speaketh."

3. Let it be observed that Brother Armstrong's real position has begun to sift through the smoke and the fog. Brother Armstrong has really heretofore not been pressed at the sore spot. He has been disarming suspicion by admitting that the present reign of Christ fulfills Dan. 2. But he believes that the stone has not filled the whole earth, and that all the enemies of Christ are to be put under his feet, not by gospel power, but by physical force. He believes the time is coming when Christ will not have an enemy on earth, and he will accomplish by his personal presence and physical force what cannot be accomplished by the gospel. It is on these points that we have sought to draw him out, and he 'now puts himself on record, teaching them to his students. His theory differs from Boll's only in some of the details. He claims that all enemies, not one excepted, will be put down during the reign of Christ- that, the time will come right here on earth when among the reigning millenniums-all that excepted-will be friends of Jesus. He admits this will not and cannot be accomplished by the gospel. He also indicates that it will be after the coming of Christ, between his coming and "the end"-which is his millennium. He refers to Rev. 19:11 to support the theory that a literal sword proceeds out of the mouth of Jesus when he "comes back again," and that he will lead an army to smite the nations, put down all governments and enemies, and reign here on earth. It is then that the stone fills the whole earth. This is not only Brother Armstrong's "millennium theory," which he says agrees with that phase of the "pre-millennium," but like Neal and Norris, he assumes that Rev. 19:11 is literal and refers to the second coming of Christ-a thing they cannot prove.

If his position is ever fully stated to the public, there will be a sensation in some circles. It will be seen that we have stated the facts in saying that his theory differs from Boll's only in some details.

The Period of Time

As for the period of time between the second coming of Christ and "the end"-the passages are numerous which declare that Christ must sit at God's right hand until all enemies are under his feet. Death is the last enemy. (1 Cor. 15:28) So Christ must sit at God's right hand-stay in heaven until the last dead person is raised. Since millennialists say that the wicked will not be raised until after
the thousand year's reign—but Paul says that Christ must stay in heaven till the last dead person is raised—and therefore the kingdom cannot be on earth between the two resurrections at all, so he stays in heaven during the millennium! The fact is, of course, all the dead will be raised at the second coming of Christ—when he will remain in heaven until the final resurrection, when the last enemy is abolished. There cannot be a reign on earth between two resurrections, and both Brother Boll's and Brother Armstrong's theories, which differ only in mere details, are utterly untenable.

It is the sheerest folly for Brother Armstrong to attempt to read into 1 Cor. 15:24-28 his earthly program, after the second coming of Christ, as an ultimate fulfillment of Dan 2:42-44. And as he is palm ing these things off on his preacher boys, in classes and in correspondence, the brethren should know it.

A few months ago Doctor Benson took up a defense of Brother Armstrong in a correspondence with the writer. He was asked the straightforward question: Will you endorse the record and the teaching of J. N. Armstrong? That was put down as the whole issue then, so far as Harding College is concerned. The question was not answered then, and has not been answered since. We now put the question down again: Does Doctor Benson, and Harding College, endorse the views of Brother Armstrong as stated by himself in this "correspondence course" he administered to a young preacher, and his record on this question through the years? No college can escape the responsibility for the erroneous views held and taught by its faculty members. Brethren who support and patronize the school have the right to know what is held and taught. Further more, plain freedom of speech and press requires that such teaching be subject to scrutiny. The good of the Cause requires it.

How To Treat the Boll Question

There is yet another angle to this matter. In an exchange sometime ago with W. E. Brightwell, of the Gospel Advocate, Brother Armstrong very stoutly affirmed that Premillennialism, as an issue should be treated exactly as the Civil Government, Rebaptism, the Elder ship and College questions were treated. He classed them all together. Personally, I am quite willing for Brother Armstrong to treat the Boll and Millennial question as he did Sommer and the College question. In looking back over the past to see how he treated Brother Sommer and the College question, in order that we might know how to compare it with his attitude toward Brother Boll and the Millennial question, which he says should be treated alike, we found an old out-of-print copy of the Armstrong-Sommer Debate on the College question. It is a book of 300 pages; nearly as large as the Neal-Wallace Discussion, which Brother Armstrong thought should never have been held. Now, how did he treat Daniel Sommer and the College question? Let us quote some of his strong denunciations of Sommer and his College doctrine.

In Brother Armstrong's first negative speech he indulges in the following charges against his Brother Sommer.

Let my respondent face the issue, for he is guilty of disturbing the peace of God's children over nothing, absolutely NOTHING, (italics and capitals his), unless, forsooth, it be wrong for Christians to invest their hard earned money in honorable businesses over a mere living. (page 10.)

That was a very good start in showing us how to treat a man who disturbs the church over nothing—and that is what the "neutrals" call the Boll theory. But hear him again in the same speech:

It is foolish and sinful to disturb the harmony of God's people over anything else than an issue. I do not believe that all of Brother Sommer's fog 'and smoke can hide the issue from the truth-seeking heart... see how great a fire a little matter kindleth how much dust and smoke may be raised over nothing. (Pages 11, 12)

That is warming up fairly well in his treatment of his brother, but we read on. In his second reply to Sommer he really begins to castigate his brother:
He is that "debater" (?) that has criticised, accused, and unmercifully condemned, disciples of Christ, and now when brought "face to face" he ignores every courtesy to discuss the issue and, school-boy-like, sends me matter prepared years before I wrote the article in which I so earnestly plead that he face the issue without loss of time. (Page 19)

Brother Armstrong is to be one of the writers on the new paper which is pledged to "ethical journalism," wonder if he could induce them to reprint his own articles in the new paper which is pledged to "ethical journalism," in this debate? But more:

Such a course on the part of a man of such reputed powers, is inexcusable ... It is a shame to treat truth-seeking hearts so. If Brother Sommer can do no better and will confess the fact to us, we shall be glad to excuse him, but so long as he makes such great professions and pretensions we have a right to expect better things of him. (Page 20.)

Evidently Brother Armstrong was not so well up on his ethics then as he ripped into his opponents pretensions. But that is really mild as he turns on more heat in the same speech, as follows:

He should hide his face in shame. He has confused the people of God all over this country by his theory-of "The Lord's money," and the only honorable way out of it for him is a full confession that he has been wrong about it. (Page 23.)

But perhaps Brother Armstrong is more sensitive to the College issue than the Premillennial issue! Hear him in his third reply to Sommer:

He has "puffed," "blown" and "bragged," as only Daniel Sommer can. He is that braggart that always does his bragging behind his Chinese wall with barred gates. Truly, his courage (?) is great when the issue is far off. Oh! the bravery-that has been shown behind the "fence." Never has there been more boasting done by any crowd than by those that have seemed to oppose this school work; and now when the champion, aye, even the father of it all, is brought hand to hand with "striplings," he refuses to consider one single thing that is being said. (Page 30).

He continues in the same "reply" to speak of "his absurd doctrine"; "he is afraid of the issue"; "he dare not touch my questions for he sees the torpedo under them"; "Will Daniel Sommer still be regarded as a debater"—and on and on. Wonder if the new paper would allow a discussion on such a "high plane" as this one, held in 1902 by two brothers in Christ? Brother Armstrong was certainly much given to that mode of discussion.

Incidentally, thirty years ago he was about the age I am now. He thinks it is wrong for us to debate the Premillennial question with Neal and Boll; but it was right for him to debate the College question with Sommer. Still, he says that we should treat Boll and Premillennialism as he treated the College question!

At this point Brother Sommer called rules on Brother Armstrong, one of which reads:

The Bible shall be the only standard of appeal for authority in this discussion, and, therefore, all personal matters, and all human standards shall be excluded.

In regard to Brother Armstrong's alleged violation of this rule, Sommer said:

In the light of the foregoing the reader will please consider the personal reflections in each of my respondents replies to me, especially the third, fourth, fifth and sixth paragraphs of his third reply. If that is not "personal abuse" and "mud-slinging," then I have never seen an exhibition of it. I pronounce it scurrility, and therefore, unworthy of a professor of Christ, a pretended gentleman, a college president, or an ordinary man. (Page 37).

This was Brother Armstrong's way of treating his Brother Sommer and the College question in 1908, while he was President of Western Bible Literary College, Odes- sa, Mo. And he says that we should treat Brother Boll and the Millennial question as he always treated the College question! Whew! We haven't got started yet! And what will the new paper do with him if he does that?

After Brother Sommer accuses Brother Armstrong of being a "bad-tempered babe" and "numbered with the truce-breakers" and "carnal" and of making statements "positively untrue" (Page 38), Brother Armstrong then proceeds to take his scalp again.

What is said concerning my respondent reflected on him as a debater. I did not mean to reflect on him as a man and a Christian. I have the right to expose his conduct as a debater, and God being my Helper, I will do it. I entered this discussion because I believed the truth was suffering.

That verbose, illogical, assumptive, presumptive (Sommers) tract with which he is so well pleased. It is none of Brother Sommer's business, when he objects he becomes a meddler in other men's matters, a "busy-body." I do not know what he will say next for his positions are so manifestly false that he cannot move without deepening his predicament. 

The fourth reply of Brother Armstrong's was punctuated with all such "high-toned" discussion, suitable for "the kind of a paper the brotherhood wants," according to Jimmy Love11 maybe; But let us raise the curtain on the next scene.

For years he has been "a trouble" in Israel, and, like Ahab, he has charged this trouble to as consecrated disciples as live today. "History repeats itself."

Now, it occurs to me that it would be a most apt and timely thing for Brother Armstrong to apply this treatment to Brother Boll and the Millennial question, as he said should be done!

But again:

I have been scrupulously careful not to reflect on my respondents motives and honesty. I leave you to judge what success I have attained. I did say that he had "bragged" as only Daniel Sommer could, and I repeat it. (Page 60). Well, we would hate to be anywhere about when Brother Armstrong was not "scrupulously careful"-besides, is it not reflecting on a man's motives and honesty to say that the had to be scrupulously careful to avoid doing so? But on Page 92, it seems Brother Sommer might have decided two could play at the game, so Brother Armstrong complains: I challenge him to prove that I falsified. But again:

I have never read or heard the expressions "falsifier," "falsehood," "lie," "liar," "slanderous," "slanderer," "wicked," "demagogue," "depths of Satan," "unmitigated falsehood," "coward," "cowardly conduct," "braggart," "dishonest" "scurrilous," "bad-temper," "truce-breaker," and words that express allusion of "mud-slinging" that were employed in the Sommer-Armstrong debate on the College Question. One was as deep in the mire as the other-except that Brother Armstrong started
it—and then when Brother Sommer doubled the dose in return, Brother Armstrong complained as follows:

If he were an unscrupulous lawyer, a mean politician, and a sound-minded man, I could understand his abuse of my language; but as it has been for many years a student of the Bible and a follower of the meek and lowly Jesus, his course is inexplicable. I refer to these matters to show Bro. Sommer’s ugliness as a debater and also his weakness. He has no truth to present so he spends his time fighting me personally. (Page 160).

But Brother Armstrong was just as “ugly” as Brother Sommer and it was a case of the pot calling the kettle back. Of Sommer, Armstrong said:

I am sorry for a man that cannot control his carnal nature any better than Brother Sommer. He takes advantage of every statement that can be twisted or abused. His last article is a shame to the religion he professes. (Page 208)

Of Armstrong, Sommer said:

My slanderous opponent, who confesses that he is “wicked” and a “liar” asks, “Where are the depths of Satan”? ... when I began to write against religio-secular colleges I did not suppose that those who advised them would be so determined to defend them that they would disregard common veracity in order to make a show of defense for them. I did not suppose that their chief advocate would confess that he and his colleagues are “liars” and “wicked.” (Page 154).

Thus on and on through more than three hundred pages, Brother Armstrong, according to statement to Brother Brightwell, shows us how to treat the Boll-Millennial question—that is, as he treated the College question!

Finally, he reaches a verdict, as follows:

May God pity the man who is so wedded to his theories that he will twist, squirm, guess at and even abuse God’s holy word to sustain it; who loves his theory more than he loves the truth.” (Page 191)

I know that my respondent and a very few other preachers are so blinded by their party spirit that they would be willing to rend asunder the body of our blessed Redeemer over the matter. (Page 193).

On the point of fellowship, Brother Armstrong stated himself as follows:

Will Daniel Sommer still be regarded as a debater? Will he be recognized as a man of power and ability? Will he be allowed to disturb the peace of God’s children further? ... I am persuaded better things of the great brotherhood of Christ.” (Page 31)

In his letter to the young preacher Brother Armstrong said that he would not fellowship a faction. He has no trouble deciding what a faction is on the college question and he enters their “sacred precincts” and “draws the line” on R. H. Boll and shuts him out by contract.

An Old Problem For The New Paper

The Truthseeker has committed the new Leader to a policy of good fellowship for Brother Boll and those who hold his views. But in the Christian Leader of December 6, 1938, in an article entitled “Another Talk With Our Read-
CONTRIBUTORIAL

"THE KINGDOM OF GOD"


JOHN T. LEWIS

Reading Charles T. Russell's writings is like wandering through a wilderness of meaningless words and phrases befogging and confusing the issue, and coming out with a no hell theory. R. H. Boll's book is not so voluminous--reading it is like being lost in the woods, wandering in a circle, and finally coming out in Jerusalem under a legalistic Judaic temporary kingdom, with Jesus Christ demoted to an earthly king, to reign in the same city and on the same throne. This is all a medley of absurdities. In the first place Abraham never understood that the land of Canaan was to be the permanent home of his descendants. Paul says: "By faith Abraham, when he was called, obeyed to go out unto a place which he was to receive for an inheritance and he went out not knowing whither he went. By faith he became a Sojourner in the land of promise, as in a land not his own, dwelling in tents with Isaac and Jacob, the heirs with him of the same promise: for he looked to the city which hath the foundations, whose builder and maker is God." (Heb. 11:8-10) I am sure this was not the Jerusalem in Palestine, where Brother Boll and his friends are going to the second coming of Christ; but "the new Jerusalem" John said he saw "coming down out of heaven from God, made ready as a bride adorned for her husband." (Rev. 21:2) That is the city God's people should be expecting at the second coming of Christ.

In the second place the kingdom over which David reigned was born in rebellion against God. In 1 Sam. 8:4-7 we read: "Then all the elders of Israel gathered themselves together, and came to Samuel unto Ramah, and they spake unto him, Behold, thou art old, and thy sons walk not in thy ways; now make us a king to judge us like all the nations. But the thing displeased Samuel, when they said, Give us a king to judge us. And Samuel said unto Samuel, Hearken unto the voice of the people in all that they say unto thee, for they have not rejected thee, but they have rejected me, that I should not be king over them." Again in 1 Sam. 10:17-19, we read: "And Samuel called the people together unto Jehovah in Mipah; and he said unto the children of Israel, Thus saith Jehovah, the God of Israel, I brought up Israel out of Egypt, and I delivered you out of the land of the Egyptians, and out of the hand of all the kingdoms that oppressed you: but ye have this day rejected your God, who himself saveth you out of all your calamities and your distresses; and ye have said unto him, Nay, but set a king over us." The kingdom of Israel was not only born in rebellion to God; but ended in disgrace with Israel in captivity. "It is thy destruction, 0 Israel, that thou art against me, against thy help. Where now is thy king, that he may save thee in all thy cities? and thy judges, of whom thou saidst, Give me a king and princes? I have given thee a king in mine anger, and have taken him away in my wrath." (Hos. 13:9, 11) This is the kingdom R. H. Boll, J. Frank Norris, Glen V. Tingley and those of similar ideas say will be re-established at the second coming of Christ.

The Promises To Abraham

We are now reviewing chapter four of Brother Boll's book. He says: "The limits of this study forbid the quoting in full and discussion in detail of the divine promises given to Abraham. The reader will find it very helpful to read in this connection the following passages: Gen. 12:1-3, 7; Chapt. 13:14-17; Chapt. 15 entire; Chapt. 17: 1-19 and 22:15-18." In these scriptures Brother Boll asks us to read, we have the land promise, the covenant of circumcision, and the promise of a universal blessing all made with Abraham. The land promise and the "covenant of circumcision" were limited to the fleshly descendants of Abraham; but "the promise" and the "covenant of circumcision" were limited to the fleshly descendants of Abraham; but "the promise of a universal blessing" was not limited to Abraham's fleshly progeny. The very nature of the promise prohibits such a construction. "And in thy seed shall all nations of the earth be blessed; because thou hast obeyed my voice." (Gen. 22:18) Brother Boll's theory is these promises were insep...
arable and are yet to be fulfilled at the same time, and in the same place-Palestine-to Abraham's posterity, and that nothing can prevent their future fulfillment. On page 22, we read: "To Isaac himself God spake: for it was based upon the fact that Abraham had obeyed God's voice; which fact was in the past and could never be undone."

The Land Of Canaan
Let us look into the land promise and see if it has been fulfilled. Later we will take up the promise of "the universal blessing." We learn from Gen. 12:1-7; Gen. 13:14-18; Gen. 15:7-16 the land of Canaan-the land which God showed Abraham and the land into which Abraham came-called by Paul "the land of promise" (Heb. 11:9), was to be the national home of Abraham's posterity; but they were to go into bondage and be afflicted four hundred years before they took possession of their country. Egypt was the nation to which they were in bondage. In Ex. 2:24, 25 we read: "And God heard their groanings, and remembered his covenant with Abraham, with Isaac and with Jacob. And God saw the children of Israel, and God took knowledge of them." Again we read in Ex. 6:2-8, "And God spake unto Moses, and said unto him. I am Jehovah and I appeared unto Abraham, unto Isaac, and unto Jacob, as God Almighty: but by my name Jehovah I was not known unto them. And I have also established my covenant with them, to give them the land of Canaan, the land of their sojournings, wherein they sojourned. And moreover I have heard the groaning of the children of Israel, whom the Egyptians keep in bondage; and I have remembered my covenant. Wherefore say unto the children of Israel, I am Jehovah, and I will bring you out from under the burdens of the Egyptians, and I will redeem you with an outstretched arm, and with great judgments: and I will be to you a God; and ye shall know that I am Jehovah your God, who bringeth you out from under the burdens of the Egyptians. And I will bring you into the land which I sware to give to Abraham, Isaac, and unto Jacob, as God Almighty: but by my name Jehovah I was not known unto them. And I have also established my covenant with them, to give them the land of Canaan, the land of their sojournings, wherein they sojourned. And moreover I have heard the groaning of the children of Israel, whom the Egyptians keep in bondage; and I have remembered my covenant. Wherefore say unto the children of Israel, I am Jehovah, and I will bring you out from under the burdens of the Egyptians, and I will redeem you with an outstretched arm, and with great judgments: and I will be to you a God; and ye shall know that I am Jehovah your God, who bringeth you out from under the burdens of the Egyptians. And I will bring you into the land which I sware to give to Abraham, Isaac, and unto Jacob, and I will give it to you for a heritage: I will give it unto your seed; and they shall possess it, and dwelt therein. And Jehovah gave them rest round about, according to all that he sware unto their fathers: and there stood not a man of all their enemies before them: Jehovah delivered their enemies into their hand. There failed not aught of any good thing which Jehovah had spoken unto the house of Israel; all came to pass."

The Land Possessed
After the death of Moses, Joshua became their leader, and led the children of Israel across the river Jordan into the land of Canaan. We will now hear him concerning the land promise. "So Jehovah gave unto Israel all the land which he sware to give unto their fathers; and they possessed it, and dwelt therein. And Jehovah gave them rest round about, according to all that he sware unto their fathers: and there stood not a man of all their enemies before them: Jehovah delivered their enemies into their hand. There failed not aught of any good thing which Jehovah had spoken unto the house of Israel; all came to pass."

(Continued on Page 23)
**Doctrinal Weaknesses of Christian Church-ism**

**Confirmed Transgressors of New Testament Law Would Justify Every Error and Innovation by Appealing to Asserted “Spirit” Rather than be Rebuked by the Plain “Letter” of the Word of God.**

A. B. KEENAN

Like much of what one will see and hear in a Christian church, Frederick D. Kershner’s *The Restoration Handbook* (Series I), a pamphlet of sixty pages bearing the imprimatur of the Standard Publishing Company, is a mixture of good and evil. That is, it may be called a “mixture” if one can conceive of a cup of clear water and a bottle of ink being thrown together without all becoming black.

The booklet is divided into two parts, “Restoration History” and “The Bible,” each consisting of six chapters: “Origin and Purpose of Restoration Movement,” Life and Work of Alexander Campbell,” “The New Testament Analyzed,” “Interpretation of the Bible,” etc.

One courses through ten chapters with a feeling of being instructed and edified. When he has finished the eleventh, however, he cannot but conclude that weasel words have destroyed the edification of the previous chapters and have substituted demoralization.

This chapter, devoted to ‘The Interpretation of the Bible’ discusses the “rationalistic and ‘ecclesiastic-al’ methods before taking up the ‘legalistic’ and ‘scripturist.’” Under the third heading, Kershner disposes:

“This method of interpretation is the one followed by those who insist rigidly on the letter of the Word. without seeking first for the spirit of it. The old Pharisees were the special advocates of this view. Jesus combated it constantly, saying upon a certain occasion that the letter killeth, but the spirit giveth life. The legalist wants to obey every jot and tittle of the law, but in his slavish devotion to the text he almost invariably misses its real meaning. Legalism is the direct opposite of rationalism and is just as far away from the truth. The two extremes of rationalism and legalism were exemplified in the time of Christ in the teaching of the Sadducees and the Pharisees. The former were the rationalists of their day and the latter the legalists. Both positions were wrong and both are equally condemned in the New Testament.

“There are many modern legalists, and not a few of them are in the Protestant Churches. Wherever they are found there will also be found a narrow, bigoted, uncharitable and formalistic type of religion. Legalism kills the life and leaves only the empty shell of Christianity. It blinds the fairest flowering of the soul and drives out all of the finest graces of the Christian life. It is one of the greatest foes of genuine Christianity.”

Under the fourth, “The Scriptural Method” comes the following:

“The Scriptures themselves lay down the correct method by which they are to be interpreted. Jesus in his use of the method and the vast strove to get at the principle involved regardless of the letter, and to proclaim supreme loyalty to that principle. He condemned the skeptical rationalism of the Sadducees, no less than the narrow legalism of the rival party in Judaism. Paul followed the same line of procedure, although technically a Pharisee, in his thinking. The principle of interpretation which is involved is perfectly clear. The Scriptures are not to be defiled. Their value lies solely in the message which they convey. They are the bearer of certain great truths and ideals, and it is these truths and ideals which are of supreme value rather than the words which are used to convey them to the minds of others. The Bible is not intended to enslave the intellect, but rather to set it free. The whole question is one of life and freedom versus formalism on the one side and destructive rationalism on the other.

This chapter is concluded by two paragraphs headed by “The Restoration Position,” more accurately perhaps “The Christian Church” position:

“The Restoration movement has had to deal with all of the four forms of Biblical interpretation which we have mentioned. Its early advocates adopted the intellectual and the vast majority of their followers have done the same thing, but there have been a few exceptions. There is even today a rationalistic school who attempt to wear the Restoration name. A few representatives of this school accept the developmental theory, though the number is very small. A far larger group have gone astray on the rock of legalism. These well-intending people have tried to elevate matters of opinion into the realm of faith and doctrine, basing their action upon a purely legalistic view of Holy Writ. Undoubtedly the greatest obstacle in the way of progress of the movement is found in legalism.

“The modern, like the ancient, legalist is apt to be intolerant, pugnacious and extremely set in his ways. Nevertheless, the main current of the movement has successfully steered clear of extremes and has adhered to a sane and balanced Scriptural method of interpreting God’s word.”

With such thinkers and those they represent would Bro. Wittry have us join in love feasts and mutual admiration societies. The above lines are a classic bit of Christian church wobbling, and may be taken as typical of the best that can be made of its inconsistent position. While there never has been any question that the Old Testament is essentially a book of law and the New Testament a book of grace, it is folly to presume that the former is without its grace or the latter its law. To view this ‘reality with blurred vision is to set forth exactly what Kershner has in the accompanying paragraphs—teaching inoffensive to Methodist, Presbyterian, or Catholic.

For the life of me, I cannot see how we can get the “spirit” of the Word without first having a healthy respect for its letter. Surely Kershner must know better than to misapply our Lord’s rebuke of Pharisaism to an alleged conflict between the grace and law of the New Testament. The most confirmed of transgressors of the doctrine of God could justify his every error by appealing to the “spirit” of any passage rather than suffer rebuke by its plain letter. Faithful disciples want to obey every jot and tittle of every Biblical law applicable to them, nor does this make them stop confessing that they are unprofitable servants, sinners saved by grace. Call them “legalists,” if you will, their devotion to revelation “slavish,” they shall continue to have a profound regard for such injunctions as “Be immersed.” “Sing and make melody in your hearts.” “Do this in memory of me.” “Love one another.” and a whole New Testament full of others.

Furthermore, what Jesus condemned in the Pharisees was not their attempt to adhere to the letter of the law of Moses so much as it was their efforts to substitute for it the letter of their own traditions, and by this transfer of affections to nullify the law of God. The contemporary counterparts of the Pharisees are not those who hold to the letter of the New Testament, but rather some others who deny its teaching by their preferential clinging to “tradition” in the form of mechanical instruments of music in the worship, societies, sprinkling of babies, episcopal church or-
A Modern Community Church And
The So-Called Christian Church

G. K. WALLACE

Observing Holy Week

When men forsake the Bible as a guide, there is no end to the foolishness in which they will engage. Note the following in regard to the Central Christian Church, Wichita, Kansas, written during Holy Week, as they call it.

"In recognition of Holy Week the Central Christian Church will observe the ordinance of the Lord’s Supper Thursday evening at eight o’clock. * * * The communion will be presided over by the junior board of the church with the official board seated in a body to be served."

"Holy Week’ is unknown in the Bible and is purely a Roman Catholic ordinance. No church in Bible times ever observed any week as holy. In observing “Holy Week” the Central Christian Church is simply aping the Roman Catholic Church.

However, we do find that the early church did observe the Lord’s supper. (Acts 20:7; 1 Cor. 11:26). This was observed on the “first day of the week” but notice, the Central Christian Church has so strayed from the "old paths" that they observed it on "Thursday evening."

A Five-Dollar Offer

The paper says, “the communion will be presided over by the junior board of the church with the official board seated in a body to be served.”

This scribe will send any reader five dollars if he will send him the reference in the Bible about the “junior board” of any New Testament congregation. The Bible does not speak about “junior” and "official boards.” The elders and deacons of the church are to see after the work and this in God’s appointed way. You may say, "The official board is composed of the elders and deacons.” If so, pray tell me of what the “junior board” is composed? Why not call Bible things by Bible names and do only that which the Bible authorizes.

Often it is said, “The Christian church is just like the Church of Christ except in the use of instrumental music.” That may have been true at one time but not so today. The Christian Church is just like the Church of God, except it is exactly different.
Some time during the latter part of 1933 little circulars were distributed everywhere stating that no one would debate with Judge Rutherford. When I received mine I went immediately to the public meeting place and "accepted." They were almost speecheless that anyone could be so reckless as to do so. A few days later a lady, who refused to give her name, asked me to go to Houston, Texas, on the following Sunday, where Rutherford was to deliver a lecture, and see if a debate could be arranged. I did so, and made arrangements with the master of ceremonies to have a conference with "Judge" at the Rice Hotel at 5:00 P. M. I remained at the Hotel from 4:30 until 7:30 but he did not show up. A few days after I came home from this fruitless trip, another circular was distributed in Port Arthur which read as follows:

"Everyone is Invited to Hear Judge Rutherford's Lecture, 'Religious Intolerance,' This lecture was originally delivered in front of riot guns, sawed off shot-guns, and heavily armed men.

Come To The Odd Fellow's Hall Corner Procter and Atlantic, Port Arthur Saturday, 7:30 p. m., Dec. 30. Free Free!"

At their meeting to hear a Phonograph Record, in which he again boast ed he could not get an opponent, I circulated a leaflet worded as follows:

"Judge Rutherford's Challenge Accepted"

"Months ago a challenge was issued by the 'Judge' in which he claimed to be eager for a discussion, but after attending a meeting of his followers here in Port Arthur, and there accepting his challenge, and several weeks ago, attending his lecture in Houston, where I presented my acceptance to the Master of Ceremonies, only to be denied an interview, I am forced to the opinion that his challenge was insincere! He, evidently, challenges those whom he knows will not accept and refuses even an interview to those who he knows will accept! Furthermore, I now challenge him! There are no impossible qualifying clauses to my challenge, such as the 'Judge' puts to his, but it applies to the 'Judge,' first, and also to all his followers, down to the smallest, anywhere, any time any pre-

"The 'circular' advertising this meeting was worded so as to create a false impression. You probably would not have come if they had told you the truth. This is to be an ELECTRICAL TRANSCRIPTION! But I am not surprised after my experience concerning the 'challenge.'

"I am prepared to show that all their many predictions failed, and are, therefore, false. I will prove them wrong, about 'Hell,' 'Resurrection,' 'Judgment,' 'Spirit,' 'The Kingdom of Christ,' etc. I affirm that Charles T. Russell is now in a place of torment and will, after the general Resurrection and Judgment, spend eternity in the lake that burns with fire and brimstone where there will be 'no rest day nor night forever and ever!' Furthermore, I affirm that Rutherford is a rebel against the government of the United States, and as such, should be imprisoned for his treasonable utterances.

"If he does not agree to a discussion, I insist that he is the biggest coward who ever hit Texas!"

Some one sent a copy of this circular to Rutherford and in a few days I received a letter signed "The Golden Age" and a marked copy of that magazine, published in New York, containing a special article from which I glean the following:

"This challenge, which is merely an application of the original challenge to one organization, appeared in The Golden Age of May 24, 1933, page 536. Judge Rutherford has no other challenges outstanding than those to the Federation of Churches and the Pope.

"There are now thousands of these clergymen in the bread lines. They would be glad to do anything at all to get more comfortable quarters even for a night. No challenge was ever made to these men; it is present tuous for any of them to suppose that they were ever addressed.

"How could a debate between Judge Rutherford and any man who is either in the bread lines or near the bread lines be in any way an honor to the name of Jehovah God, and how could it in any way determine the great question raised.

"At the moment, men who claim that they are entitled to debate with Judge Rutherford by reason of his challenge are, blustering about and making many broad statements, and it is due the public and these upstarts that we set forth the facts. The challenge made by Judge Rutherford is his challenge to the combined clergy, and according to all the rules of debate that challenge must be either accepted or rejected.

"Terms of The Challenge Perfectly Plain"

"The terms of Judge Rutherford's challenge as set forth above are perfectly plain, and readily comprehended by anybody who understands English, yet the only ones who have made any pretense of giving consideration to this challenge are those of the 'Church of Christ,' in which organization there are no clergymen whatsoever. These letters Judge Rutherford has ignored for the reason that not one of them complies with the terms of the challenge, for at least the following reasons:

"(1) No one in that organization even claims to be a clergy-man;

"(2) Not one of these men has received the backing or endorsement of the Federation of Churches and the Roman Catholic organization;

"Not one of them has made any pretense of offering to pay half the radio expense, which would be at least $850-000.

"It will be noted that the challenge is to the Federation of Churches of America, together with all the Catholic and Protestant organizations, and that the clergymen, both Catholic and Protestant, do not represent Jehovah God and Christ, but they do represent the Devil!"

"Anyone who knows Judge Rutherford would not believe for a minute that he is a coward; but for a man who claims to be representing the Lord to resort to the language of the street to bolster up himself proves such a man hardly competent to discuss God's Word with anybody."

"Jehovah's Witnesses, going from door to door with the message of God's kingdom, should be very particular to refer all persons interested in the challenges to the challenges themselves. If they would do this they would save themselves and the would-be-debaters and ourselves much trouble. Not one of the would-be debaters has yet met even one of the conditions laid down by Judge Rutherford; and unless all the conditions are met, then the debate will not be held. The challenge has been repeated in The Golden Age several times; no one has dared to accept it as laid down; and for anyone to try to stage a comeback by saying he has accepted the challenge, when he knows he has not done so, is to commit a peculiarly clergy-like act."

The interesting correspondence which ensued and a refutation of this arrogant, persistent, and widespread heresy will appear in the future issues of the Bible Banner."
The Spurious System's of Russell and Rutherford

GEO. B. CURTIS

Russellism has deeply invaded the religious thought of this century. Denominations are honeycombed with the Russell-Rutherford teaching. It found lodgment among some in the church of Christ, and the Boll defection is the result. The agents of this sect are among the busiest of all religiousists. It is time that their doctrines are more clearly understood and their aims more fully exposed.

The most active group among them are Rutherford's followers who style themselves "Jehovah's Witnesses," about the worst misnomer of which we have any knowledge. I could name them anybody's "Witnesses" from the devil's up or down to Rutherford's and find a name more belittling them than the one chosen by them for themselves. Their whole system of theology is as erratic as their name. It would be as amusing as a "comedy of errors" if it were not a tragedy in souls.

A Politico-Religio Society

Saturate one thoroughly with a no hell, no soul, no resurrection, annihilation, second chance theory and he is forever worthless here and hereafter. The teachings of Russellism are both anti-scriptural and anti-American. They strike at the very heart of Christianity, abolishing the belief in his resurrection and his divinity. They look toward a system of anarchy in the affairs of men by their enmity to all existing governments. This movement is more political than religious in its aspects. They make capital out of every national calamity and crisis. They play upon the credulity of the simple-minded in every war and rumor of war. They thrive on dire predictions of future events. They offer little hope in this life and rob all hope of the life to come.

"Jehovah's Witnesses" are enemies of constitutional government. Under the guise of religion, their henchmen attack American government. Under the protection of the liberty, they seek to undermine that constitution. By the mediums of the press, public address, phonograph record, radio, by every means possible they spread their poisonous doctrine. Of a truth "they bite the hand that feeds them." From a national standpoint they are more insidious than Nazism or Fascism-more dangerous than a "yellow peril" for they strike at the very heart of the nation politically and religiously. They have no respect for the ideals of American governments. Their politico-religio system of theology has no foundation in truth and no place in the lives of intelligent people. It is a cancerous growth upon religious and political society.

A Jargon of Contradictions

That this system is false can be proved by the books written by Russell and Rutherford, themselves. These abound in contradictions, false prophecies, misquotations of the Scriptures, misapplications and no applications of the Scriptures. Every species of evidence that mark systems of religion spurious are to be found in the works of these false prophets.

In debate with Ralph G. Green, who is probably the ablest man among them, I pressed him on some of the contradictory things found in Russell's "Studies in the Scriptures." Vol. 7. He repudiated this entire volume. When pressed on Rutherford's predictions that failed to happen as the "Judge" said in "Millions Now Living Shall Never Die," he repudiated this booklet also in its entirety. So here was one of "Jehovah's Witnesses" testifying that another one of "Jehovah's Witnesses" had given false testimony. Such is their predicament.

The quotation that provoked the repudiation of Rutherford, in "Millions Now Living Shall Never Die," is found on page eighty-eight, and it reads:

"The chief thing to be restored is the human race to life: and since other Scriptures definitely fix the fact that there will be a resurrection of Abraham, Isaac, Jacob and other faithful ones of old, that these will have first favor, we may expect 1925 to witness the return of these faithful men of Israel from the condition of death, being resurrected and fully restored to perfect humanity and made the visible and legal representatives of the new order of things on earth."

At the bottom of page eighty-nine and the top of page ninety, Rutherford further states:

"Therefore we may confidently expect that 1925 will mark the return of Abraham, Isaac, Jacob and the faithful prophets of old."

There is not a flapper in the entire land that gets her date book as badly mixed up as does Russell and Rutherford! They cannot make two prophetic statements that are in harmony. Their dates just will not harmonize. Here's how they mix them:

4. The Jubilee began in 1925. (Millions Now Living, etc., p. 89.)
5. The church will be glorified 1914. (Studies Vol. 2. p. 77.)
6. The church will be glorified 1918. Studies. Vol. 7. p. 64.)
7. The kingdom to have universal control 1914. (Studies. Vol. 2. p. 77.)
8. The kingdom to come in 1931. (Studies. Vol. 7. p. 569.)
10. The harvest ended 1914. (Studies in S. Vol. 2. p. 234.)

From a national standpoint they are the ideals of American governments. Under the guise of religion, their henchmen destroy the visible and legal representatives of constitutional government. Under the inspiration of God, they adhere to the inspiration of God. They play upon the credulity of the simple-minded in every war and rumour of war. They thrive on dire predictions of future events. They offer little hope in this life and rob all hope of the life to come.

A Sample of Absurdities

To show other absurd claims of the Russelites. These quotations are taken from volume seven of the Studies in the Scripture series. On page 107 of "Millions Now Living" Rutherford places his unqualified endorsement upon this work, which also bears the title, "The Finished Mystery." He says, "The Finished Mystery is the first and only book that has ever made clear the prophecies of Revelation and Ezekiel." Then a quotation from it is equivalent to a statement from Rutherford himself. So hear these:

2. "William Miller was the sixth angel of Rev. 9:13." (Pp. 163.)
3. "Pastor Russell was the seventh angel of Rev. 10:7." (Pp. 169.)
4. "The angel that showed John the heavenly scenes in the book of Revelation was Pastor Russell beyond the veil." (Pp. 11 with 334.)
5. "Many horses running to battle of Rev. 9:9 means "The Old Methodist Hell Fire Revivals." (P. 160.)
6. "The scorpions with tails, Rev. 9:10, are the Methodist class leaders." (P. 160.)
7. "If one violates Rev. 22:18, 19, his punishment will be after he is raised from the dead to study the seven volumes of Russell and get things straightened out in his mind." (P. 338.)
8. Preachers will have to work for a living and spend sixty-five cents for an alarm clock in the Russellite millennium. (P. 285.)
SOME MEN HAVE CONVictions.

JAS. T. AMIS

Some one has said: “Every Christian has a right under heaven to preach his convictions.” The speaker was not inspired. I deny this yet not I, but Paul. In the first place, no Christian has a right to have “convictions” of the character above signified. Such “convictions” are “heresies, hobbies, divisive doctrines, obscure subjects, unlearned questions,” to which men hold tenaciously, against all arguments and evidence. What preacher hides himself under the plea of “my convictions” when he is contending for plain gospel doctrine which Paul preached? He rests his case, not upon “convictions,” nor upon his “liberty in Christ,” but upon the great truths of God’s word. In Paul’s letter to the evangelist, Titus, he declares against certain “vain talkers and deceivers,” and he says nothing about their “right under heaven to teach their convictions.” On the contrary, he demands that “their mouths must be stopped: who subvert whole houses, teaching things which they ought not.” (Titus 3:10) He signifies that it is the duty of the elders to do this “mouth-stopping.” That might be construed into the unsavory “gag rule,” but it is heaven’s rule for protecting the church against heresy. Paul further authorizes the preacher to “reject a heretic,” after duly admonishing home (Titus 3:10) So, let’s not be too easy with the “pious” brother who is persisting in airing his “convictions.”

When God had thus endeavored to fulfill his promise of a King on David’s throne, he would have found it impossible to fulfill that promise regarding “A High Priest after the order of Melchizedek.” He would then have been forced to resort to a different brand of “spiritual contingency” in order to fulfill his priesthood promise. Or, is the priesthood of lesser importance, and might be waived in favor of a kingdom to suit the misguided perceptions of the Jews and pre-millennialists? But we should not speculate on “what might have been”; but should reserve our speculation for “what is to be.” Without “both” kingdom and priesthood in conjunction “the peace of God” could not rule in the hearts of men, therefore, after the thousand years of kingship, another period must be provided wherein “The Branch” could become “a priest on his throne.” And so the game goes on.

If And If Not

R. H. Boll wrote, (The Kingdom of God, page 46): “The only thing that ever stood in the way of Israel and her glorious promises, kingdom and all, was her sinful condition. That removed, every other promise must necessarily be fulfilled and that speedily.” The natural conclusion is that if Israel had turned from her sinful condition while Jesus was preaching to them, he would “speedily,” immediately, have begun to reign over Israel in Jerusalem in that fantastical millennial reign that is now supposed to begin in a short time, in the very near future. What If Israel had done that? Jesus would have at once become “King of Israel in Jerusalem” as was “The Preacher.” Then would have appeared another very serious complication: About five and one half centuries before the Lord was compelled to resort to “a spiritual contingent, the church,” God had declared the prophecy that The Branch (Messiah) was to be “a priest upon his throne: and the counsel of peace shall be between them Both,” (Zech. 6:13). Both kingdom and priesthood were necessary to the “counsel of peace.” The King alone could not make for peace. But here is the difficulty: Jesus could not be a priest on earth, for he came of the tribe of Judah, “of which tribe Moses spoke nothing concerning the priesthood.” He could not be a priest (on earth), seeing that they are priests that offer gifts according to the law.

Shall the fulfillment of these promises of retribution be overlooked, while seeking an excuse for the expectation of blessings? Is it out of harmony with God’s nature to forget promises of blessings, but quite permissible for him to forget his threats of punishment? Did Israel sin? Did they go after idols and strange gods? Did they forget his law and disregard his commandments? “All the day long have I stretched forth my hand to a disobedient and gainsaying people.” “Because they have forsaken me, and have burned incense to other gods, and have filled this place with the blood of innocents: they have built the high places of Baal, to burn their song with fire for burnt offerings unto Baal, which I commanded not, nor spoke it, neither came it into my heart,” (Jer. 19:3-5). Israel did that against which Moses had warned them. Will God keep his promise of punishment? He had promised Israel, through Moses, that if they ever committed such abominations, they should be carried away captive from their land, and “thou shalt see it no more again”, (Deut. 28:68). Through Jeremiah, God declared of Israel and Jerusalem, that when they should fall by the sword before their enemies (Romans), “Thus saith the Lord of hosts, Even so will I break this people (Israel), and this city (Jerusalem), as one breaketh a potter’s vessel, that cannot be made whole again,” (Jer. 19:11). Is that not the truth of God as well as his promises of blessings?

When Israel had voided the covenant and the promises by their continued transgressions, God declared that he had broken with them, (Zech 11:10-13), and that “the things that I have given them shall pass away from them”, (Jer. 8:13). Is that not the truth of God? How, then, can Israel be restored to her former glory as a nation upon this earth, “If God’s promises can be relied upon to mean what he says”? Is it not also true that Jesus told the Jews that “The kingdom shall be taken from you and given to a nation (people) that shall bring forth the fruits thereof”?

(Continued on Page 23)
Christ And Pilate--A Kingdom Conversation

E. R. HARPER

During these days of speculation over the Lord’s Kingdom and its earthly nature, I believe a study of his statement to Pilate in John 18 will do much to help us understand this question. The Jews were trying to have the Lord put to death under the Roman laws. They brought Jesus from Caiphas to Pilate. He inquired of them concerning the accusation against Jesus. They answered “If he were not a malefactor we would not have delivered him unto you.”

Pilate commanded them to judge him by their law, to which the Jews replied, “It is not lawful for us to put any man to death.”

Pilate now returns to the judgment hall and calls Jesus and “said unto him, Art thou the King of the Jews?” To this Jesus answered, “Sayest thou him, Art thou the King of the Jews?”

Pilate represented power, other than the Jews, interested in this coming kingdom of the Lord. What had he decided about the nature of this kingdom? Had Christ convinced Pilate of that which some are trying so hard to make us believe that Christ came to establish an earthly kingdom. The Jews had decided that this Christ did not intend to do it, and they were through with him and ready to kill him as an imposter. But what has Pilate decided?

“Pilate therefore said unto him, Art thou a king then? Jesus answered Thou sayest that I am a king. To this end was I born and for this cause came I into the world, that I should bear witness unto the truth. Every one that is of the truth heareth my voice.”

With this statement the conversation ended, the decision by Pilate has been reached. What was it? Had he decided that Christ intends to build a kingdom, earthly as that of Caesar’s, to overthrow by force the kingdom of Caesar? Nay verily. Pilate’s answer condemns every “Bollite,” “Premillennialist” and “Material Kingdom” builder. Hear him in his denunciation of them. “Pilate saith unto him What is truth? And when he had said this he went out again unto the Jews and saith unto them, “I find no fault in him at all.” Question: If Pilate had been con would Pilate have said, “I find no fault in Him? The very fact of an earthly kingdom being built up right in the very dominion of Caesar would have been grounds for Pilate to have put Christ to death without any accusation from the Jews. But when Christ convinced Pilate that his kingdom was not one that would use soldiers to fight his cause as did Caesar, then Pilate no longer feared his kingdom. All Caesar ever feared was an earthly army great enough to destroy him. When he sees that this kingdom to be organized by this Christ was not of that nature, he declared “I find no fault in him.” Had Christ planned an earthly kingdom, Pilate could have found fault in him, and put him to death for “high treason” against Caesar’s kingdom?

To question Pilate’s decision is to believe that Christ deceived Pilate in this conversation. I believe that Jesus told the exact truth, and that he showed conclusively in this conversation, that he did not come to this earth to build an earthly government to rule here on this earth as a Caesar, for governments and placing his people in the positions of rulership in very much the same way as the kingdom of Caesar was doing. His is a Kingdom spiritual institution and not a worldly one.

When Christ rode into Jerusalem, as recorded in Matt. 21, in midst of the multitude spreading their garments before him and strewing branches in the way, shouting “Hosanna to the son of David; Blessed is he that cometh in the name of the Lord.” Had he at that time shouted “Down with Caesar, up with My Kingdom. On to Rome, Forward March!”, with Chief Priests leading the parade do you think they would have demanded of Pilate to crucify him?

Now let us see what we have. All who were interested in this New Kingdom were represented. The Jews, Rome, and Christ. The Jews were convinced that Jesus did not intend to build an earthly kingdom and they denied him and branded him an imposter, declaring that the true Christ had not come and they so teach to this day. They are yet looking for their leader to come and build that earthly kingdom. Pilate, the representative of Rome was convinced that Christ did not intend to build an earthly kingdom, and he pleaded for his life, declaring that there was no fault to be found in him. Christ testified to the fact that his kingdom was not be an earthly kingdom by saying that it is not of this world, declaring that if it were then would his servants fight that he be not delivered to Caesar’s court.

The testimony of the Jews, Caesar and of Christ declares that this Christ who has come does not intend to build an earthly kingdom. Yet we cannot convince the Premillennial-Earthly Kingdom builders that either of the above powers knew anything on earth about this question.

We have but one of two things to do about this matter.

1. We can take the position of the Jews, that Christ is and was an imposter, and yet look for another, since he did not build this earthly kingdom (if an earthly kingdom was to have been built when the Christ came.)

2. We can take the position of Christ himself before Pilate, that it was not an earthly kingdom, that he came to establish.
LISTENING TO “THE GIPSY”

HUGO McCORD

Sister Luther Roberts about a year ago wrote an interesting article about attending a Texas preaching service of “Gipsy” Smith. That famous evangelist, “a layman who has preached to more people than any living person, whose tours cover five continents,” has been in Washington. Proud of the fact that he is not ordained, he says he can reach people only that a “parson” cannot reach. Maybe I went to hear him with a wrong viewpoint, for I certainly heard much more good than I expected. He preached things that, I dare say, half the preachers in the United States do not and will not preach today. And if there are gospel preachers who do not condemn card playing, he preached things those men will not preach.

The sermon I heard was to women, who filled the main auditorium: men were herded to the balcony. Taking his text in Matthew 14, he preached as forcefully on adultery as did John to Herod. “If any of you women has a second husband, and not for adultery, you are living in sin. It does not make any difference if State laws have given other reasons for divorces; State laws cannot make adultery respectable. If a State should make murder legal, would it change God’s law? If a State should make stealing legal, would God’s law be changed? Legalized adultery, the modern divorce, has no more God’s approval than illegal adultery. John told Herod, ‘Send that woman home; you are living in sin.’” So send away your second and third and fourth husbands; they are not your husbands anyway; only the first is your husband; you are an adulteress with all the others.” I wondered about the preachers grouped on the platform with Mr. Smith: do they preach on divorce that strongly? And, second, I wondered about myself (I always wonder about the wrong one first; would that I were grown up enough in Christ that I should examine myself before I examine others).

The daughter of Herodias was “before instructed of her mother.” “The pulpit,” continued Mr. Smith, “does not have the power a mother has, for good or ill.” Mrs. Katherine Booth, founder of Salvation Army, mother of ten children, all of whom were preachers, was quoted: “I believe it is possible for every godly mother to be ten minutes ahead of the devil with every child.” “Mother,” cried the evangelist, “you are the same as God to your children for awhile; they believe everything you tell them. One mother said, ‘I began on my first-born twenty years before he was born by giving myself to Jesus. Then it was easy to train the child.’ If you talk about your religion and do not live it, your children will despise you. A young college graduate said, ‘I am twenty-four, and I have never heard my parents pray.’ Your church membership is a hindrance if you do not live the life. The way you talk, how you dress, the cocktail parties you attend, the game of bridge you play—your children know all about them; you cannot fool your children.” Then Mr. Smith told of a young man coming home and laying $250 on the table and of his mother being astounded. “Where did you get it?” The son replied, “I won it at cards.” “0, Son, Son! Don’t you know I am a church worker, secretary of the Ladies’ Auxiliary? Don’t you know I am one of the leading Christian women of this town? I demand of you to take the money back.” The boy answered, “Mother, when you take that big vase back that you won at bridge, I shall take the money back. Mother, you taught me to play cards on this very table, and I should rather play for $250 than for a vase.”

“At home,” continued the lay preacher, “do your children see you read the Bible and sing hymns? No, No! It is jazz, jazz, jazz all the time. Have your children seen you on your knees? Some children are cursed in their birth. Do your children see you drink cocktails? You are not sober if you take a teaspoon of liquor. If ten glasses make a man drunk, one glass and you are one-tenth gone. Some children are drunk before birth, for their mothers are drunk. Your children will behave for your sake, because they love you, if you live right. We need, above all else, godly mothers in America.”

Mr. Smith thus condemned divorce, cards, and drink in such a forceful way. Why is it that a man, so pointed and so bold on those questions, cannot go all the way and preach a full gospel? Why does he not tell people what to do to be saved as they did in Bible times? In Bible times, gospel preachers not only declaimed against social evils (Gal. 5:19-21), but also preached: “Repent and be baptized every one of you in the name of Jesus Christ for the remission of sins.” (Acts 2:38) Faith alone was not enough to save; repentance and baptism were commanded too. Mr. Smith does not command “anybody to be baptized (Acts 10:48), as did God’s preachers; he says sinners may be saved without baptism, and if they are baptized, they may choose any mode they prefer. Instead of teaching sinners they must (1) hear the word (1 Thess. 2:13); (2) believe in the Lord (John 8:34); (3) repent (Acts 17:30); (4) confess the Lord (Rom. 10:9,10); and (5) be baptized (Mk. 16:16). “Gipsy” Smith has a different plan of salvation. Cards are passed to the audience, containing the following plan of salvation:

THE GIPSY SMITH MEETINGS

Washington, D. C.

No. 1

Believing Jesus Christ to be the only Saviour for sinners, I do here and now accept Him as my Lord and Saviour, and promise by His grace to love and follow Him. Name __________________________.

Address __________________________

Church Connection ________________

(If any)

Mr. Smith is doing much moral good, but what a shame it is that a man with his suasion in the pulpit does not preach the “whole counsel of God.” Because he seems such a good man, because he preaches such high morals, people go away thinking themselves saved, not knowing they need to “wash away” their sins, according to the Lord’s own appointment,
A Set of Two’s
THAD S. HUTSON

FIRST: Two comings of Christ in the future. He comes, a part of the way, then he goes somewhere—(the Russellite Rapture); then he comes again before he gets here. If this be true, his final coming will be his third coming. But we read: "and unto them that look for him shall be appear the second time without sin (for a sin offering) unto salvation." (Heb. 9:28)

Do but the scriptures teach two future comings of Christ? I have failed to find it. The scriptures they cite do not teach it. But this is one of the cracker ends of the premillennial theory.

SECOND: Two kingdoms or thrones.
Did Christ come, or will be come to establish two kingdoms, or to sit on two thrones? No one but a modern speculator ever said so. Christ is now on the throne. (Luke 1:32-33, Act 2:29-30) "He seeing this before spake of the resurrection of Christ" (Acts 2:31), not of his second coming. Christ is to reign till all enemies shall be put under his feet, and the last enemy to be conquered to death. When death is destroyed, that will empty all graves. Where does the second resurrection come in here? Christ will not leave the throne till this is accomplished, that is till all graves shall be emptied. When Christ comes he will execute judgment against the ungodly; (Jude 14) When Christ comes he will punish the disobedient. (II Thess. 1:7-9) This is to be done "when he shall come to be glorified in his saints." The wicked are mentioned first here!

THIRD: Two future literal resurrections one thousand years apart. The Lord is coming with his holy angels. (Matt. 25:31) The Lord shall descend with his mighty angels. (II Thess. 1:7-9) The Lord shall descend with ten thousands of his holy ones. (Jude. 14) When the Lord comes, this world shall be burned up, and all the elements in it shall melt with fervent heat. (II. Peter 3:10-12)

Christ is now King. He now occupies the throne of David. It is a spiritual throne. It will take more than an anonymous slander to overthrow the plain word of God.

But we are told that we should ignore Premillennialism. Is it ignoring it to put added power into their hands? Is it ignoring any thing wrong, by placing the power to suppress truth into the hands of the enemy? Is it ignoring the wrong by promising to give the people what they want, not what they need; to suppress that which is unpleasant, even the unpleasant truth?

MY PEOPLE
JAMES E. WHITE, Indian Evangelist

What sort of person is the American Indian? What is his nature I have studied my people in my home on the Reservation, in Indian schools, and in their very sacred chambers of traditional, ceremonial activities.

The Indian has a big soul. He has forgiven the white man’s trespass upon his lands, and is not walling about it. The American Indian realizes that though he has lost a continent he has gained a civilization.

Some people think the Indian is aloof. If he seems so, it is partly because of a native spirit of independence; partly, because he has had to learn caution. But once you convince an Indian of your integrity, he will prove himself the best friend you ever had.

The Indian is very modest about any of his natural talents or achievements. He dislikes “publicity,” “grand-standing,” and “artificiality.” He likes to lead. Our ancestors were a well-governed people. Our chiefs were leaders, not rulers. Though we lived in frail homes of skin and bark, we needed no door locks or keys to protect our property.

This column presents the first of a series of articles dealing with presentday conditions of the American Indian. We feel that we will be able to present, along with our mission activities report, a factual and, we hope, interesting story about the Indians.

It is a strange fact that practically none of the grade or high schools and relatively few of our universities teach courses designed to give a true picture of the history of the American Indian. This is due, in part, to the fact that there are very few suitable text books available. Many basic misconceptions concerning the Indian have gained a firm footing in popular tradition and have been perpetuated by improperly informed writers.

Early in the 16th century when America became definitely recognized as a separate continent, Europe began to speculate on the probable origin of the natives of this new land. By this date Christianity had become firmly entrenched as the religion of Europe. In keeping with the religious spirit of the age, a solution of the problem was first sought in Hebrew traditions that the Indians were descendants of the “Lost Tribes of Israel.”

Other writers saw resemblances of Central America and Mexico. Others thought that they could see the hands of the Phoenicians or the Greeks in some of the customs of the Indians. Many conflicting stories which have been proven myths have circulated throughout the past four hundred years. On the origin of the American Indian, in this country, one theory is as good as another, but the generally accepted theory will be discussed in another article.

The Evangelistic work among the Indians is practically at a standstill, during these winter months. At the close of my summer’s work among the Oneida tribe of Wisconsin, we were again confronted with insufficient financial support to remain active in the field. Since the Indian mission started in 1931 with complete mission equipment but with no definite plan of sponsorship, the interest churches had for Indian people soon faded away. With substantial assistance on by churches with proper oversight, the career could have been definitely established among the Indians of South Dakota. Unfortunately lack of sponsorship, and not enough churches interested to keep the work going, from month to month we are uncertain just how contributions will keep up. Finally we had to give up the work in South Dakota, largely because of lack of support.

Since November 10, 1938 to December 1938, once again we resorted to contacting churches in Oklahoma, a thing I dislike to do. This is the second time that I have been compelled to face the alternative of having to travel among churches to enlist more consistent support for my work or discontinue it. My people need the Gospel. For we hear the inspired voice saying: “Whosoever shall call upon the name of the Lord shall be saved. How then shall they call on him in whom they have not heard? And how shall they hear without a preacher? And how shall they preach except they be sent?” (Rom. 10:13-15).

Preaching to Indians should be seriously considered by Oklahoma churches, who are able financially to keep the Indian mission alive, for once we gave up the Indian work. The Indians of the United States will be without the Gospel of Christ. During the month of January and February 1939, I hope to be in Texas among churches in the interest of my work. As much as I dislike to be a burden to the brethren, I am trusting that you may give my plea whatever consideration you may feel able according to the ability of the church. Send all contributions for Indian Missions to Forrest B. Stwalley, 1026 Dye Road, R. F. D. 5, Flint, Michigan or direct to me at Oneida, Wisconsin, Box 7.
Kentucky Currents
E. G. CREACY

Northside Indianapolis

Fourteen years ago I made my first visit to Indianapolis, Indiana, and conducted a tent meeting for the struggling group worshiping on the south side. The following year, I conducted a tent meeting for the small group on the east side that had begun to meet. At that time there were only thirteen members. At intervals, during these years I preached regularly for both of these congregations, and also conducted a number of protracted meetings. By united sacrifices and labors, both of these congregations have grown into large and respectable bodies. A few years ago, a congregation was started in the Brightwood division, made up largely of brethren who worshiped at East Side. I preached through two meetings for them.

When Brother Hugo McCord left East Side Church to labor in Washington D. C., I was invited to work with the church. Two very pleasant years were devoted to the work. My whole heart and soul were given to the program of the church. During the time, the new house of worship was secured on Layman Avenue. We had “additions” most every Lord’s day—it was like a long protracted meeting! My work terminated July 1, 1938. Pleasant memories of relations with East Side shall linger with me till death.

For about two years, some of the East Side members have had in mind to start a congregation on the north side. In September (1938), the opportunity for such a worthy work was made possible. The magnificent church building at 40th and Capitol Avenue was advertised for rent. The building is a brick veneer, three-story structure, with a seating capacity in the main auditorium for about four hundred. The interior has recently been redecorated, and class rooms arranged. The brethren secured this building, with heat, lights, and janitor service, for only $50.00 per month. A five-year lease was made.

I was invited to assist in a protracted meeting, and being convinced that the work was Scripturally planned and launched on a New Testament basis, I accepted the invitation. The meeting began December 8th, and closed on the 18th. Two were baptized, and a number of people influenced who are associated with the Christian Church. The meeting was well attended and fine interest and spirit manifested. Negotiations are under way to secure an able evangelist to labor with them in word and doctrine.

The church has a bright future, the field on the north side is inviting, and the members are some of the very salt of the earth. They realize that a crisis is shaking the churches. They are determined to not only stand for the truth, but also stand against all errors and innovations. The church is militant, and is destined to become the leading congregation in the North. Straight preaching, preaching that will cut to the line, is the kind of preaching that will save souls and build up a New Testament church.

Some of the warmest friends I have on earth are in Indianapolis. It is always a pleasure to labor with them and assist in any worthy work. May the Lord’s cause prosper in Indiana.

* * *

The Tishbite

By a casual glance through the pages of the Boll-Jorgenson periodical one may detect that they feel keenly the death blows they are receiving from a mighty army under the leadership of the King. E. L. Jorgenson, Boll’s first lieutenant, declares they have “had abundant provocation and temptation to launch out upon the sea of personal controversy.” Well, they did “launch out” at one time, and it seems they got satisfied. They know their foolish theories cannot stand the acid test, and now they have fallen upon the plan to pursue the line of least resistance. They have learned that debate is sinful—they do not believe in debating! The reason they do not believe in debating is the same reason that a cow without horns does not believe in hooking. Elmer Jorgenson’s squib in a current issue of their paper is a tacit admission of defeat, and stammers in speech, he is a poor witness to the cause of Christ in Indiana. Jorgenson depicted the new doctrine. The brethren secured this building, with heat, lights, and janitor service, for only $50.00 per month. A five-year lease was made.

I was invited to assist in a protracted meeting, and being convinced that the work was Scripturally planned and launched on a New Testament basis, I accepted the invitation. The meeting began December 8th, and closed on the 18th. Two were baptized, and a number of people influenced who are associated with the Christian Church. The meeting was well attended and fine interest and spirit manifested. Negotiations are under way to secure an able evangelist to labor with them in word and doctrine.

The church has a bright future, the field on the north side is inviting, and the members are some of the very salt of the earth. They realize that a crisis is shaking the churches. They are determined to not only stand for the truth, but also stand against all errors and innovations. The church is militant, and is destined to become the leading congregation in the North. Straight preaching, preaching that will cut to the line, is the kind of preaching that will save souls and build up a New Testament church.

Some of the warmest friends I have on earth are in Indianapolis. It is always a pleasure to labor with them and assist in any worthy work. May the Lord’s cause prosper in Indiana.

* * *

Around Which Corner?

M. D. Baumer, of Winchester, Kentucky, in Christian Leader, commends Brother F. H. Woodward’s timely tract, “Studies on the Kingdom Question.” But Brother Baumer in the very recent past “cast anchor” in Chas. M. Neaf’s Church, and there is a New Testament Church “just around the corner” - the Fairfax Church! It looks like the legs of the lame are not equal. However, Brother Baumer should not be penalized at the brethren in the “blue grass region” of Old Kentucky because they do not have confidence in him. He, like some others, disclaims belief in the spiderweb theories of R. H. Boll and Chas. M. Neal, but aids the premillennial faction in spite of all we can do about it. When a preacher wavers in action, and stammers in speech, he should not anathematize the brethren because they are skittish of him.

Peace At Pampa

Pampa, Texas
December 17th, 1938.

To the Brethren of the Francis Ave., Church:

After due and prayerful consideration, and with a desire in our hearts to see peace and tranquil conditions characterize the cause of Christ in Pampa, Texas; we submit the following:

We realize that as fallible men we are subject to mistakes. We want the brethren of the Francis Ave., congregation to know that while we were worshipping with, and acting as its
leaders, many mistakes were made. Things were done by us that caused some to think there was a desire on our part to ignore the wishes of the members. Wherein such impressions were made and received from our actions, we pray that brethren of the Francis Ave., congregation will look back to the day of our leadership realizing our responsibilities and forgive and forget our shortcomings, with the future of the cause of Christ in view.

We further pledge ourselves to do all that we can in the fear of God and love of the truth to promote and maintain fellowship between the two congregations, and to discourage at all times anything that will destroy it.

Signed: J. E. Williams, Guy C. Saunders, C. C. Woodard.

Note: The above letter was accepted by the Elders of the Francis Ave., congregation.

* Pampa, Texas December 17th, 1938

To The Brethren Of The Central Church:

A deplorable condition among the members of the body of Christ has existed in Pampa, Texas since June 1934. We realize that in passing through such extreme situations as prevailed many mistakes were made by all. We realize fully our responsibility in the matter and it is our desire to make all corrections necessary in order to relieve ourselves before God for the wrongs done and establish amicable relations and Christian fellowship between the two congregations.

It is herein acknowledged with sorrow and regret that principles of New Testament teaching were violated by the circulation of petitions calling for the resignation of Elders of the Church and the application of Majority Rule procedure. We believe such procedure to be unscriptural and hereby repudiate it. These wrongs are freely acknowledged by those involved in the difficulty which occurred here and forgiveness both by the Lord and those affected by the mistakes made is sincerely and earnestly sought.

We herein further pledge ourselves to condemn and discourage any further agitation of those things which occurred in the past and to encourage such fellowship between the two congregations as will promote New Testament Christianity.


Note: The above letter was accepted by the Elders of the Central congregation.

A Church Merger

THOS. J. WAGNER

The above is the caption of an article published in the Owensboro Messenger under date of June 26, 1938, regarding the union of Temple Methodist Church and First Congregationalist church in San Francisco. It is a very unique union in that neither church gives up anything. They are represented as being San Francisco's largest downtown Protestant congregation. The back ground for the union seems to be that the Methodist church bit off too large a bite in the purchase of their fine church building and hotel, got caught in the whirlpool of the depression and lost their church building. They were invited by different denominations to hold their services temporarily in their buildings. The Congregational church played the part of the good Samaritan and took in his neighbor. The writer of the article gives us to understand that the whole thing is a merger and not a sub-merger. What is the name of this new baby? Who is to be the preacher? Is he to be a Methodist or Congregationalist? Both preachers are to continue preaching as co-pastors. They select the subject and both preach on it. Each church maintains its corporate entity. Its members are to be carried as members of its denomination.

Methodists are to send delegates to the Methodist conference; the Congregationalists are to send delegates to the Congregationalist conference; Each church will continue its missionary work with one common treasury handling beneficent funds and apportioning it to both sects. Whose name is to appear first in announcements, bills, etc.? Each said the other should be first. They compromised by letting the name of one “Doctor” appear first on one bill and the name of the other “Doctor” appear first on the next. Methodists remain Methodists; Congregationalists remain Congregationalists; but what about the new members that come in after the merger? They are to members of the united church. It is a case of my children and your children worshiping (or is it playing) with our children.

Witty-Murch Movement

It might be that the Witty-Murch movement can get some pointers from this strange merger. They can just get together, neither congregation give up anything, both of them do the preaching, alternate their names on the bill board, neither of them contradict what the other preaches, and what have we? If Brother Witty is right in what he preaches and practices, he has no surrender to make. There can never be a unity, in fact, with our digressive brethren, unless they are willing to surrender their innovations and stand with us where we were standing when they went away. No brethren, there is no meeting in the middle of the plank.

Methodist-Congregationalist

Since the Bible says nothing at all about Methodist or Congregationalist, and neither is promised any blessing for being such, it will be as well to be united in outward form, even if not in fact. It would be vastly better for both denominations to surrender their corporate entities, cease being Methodists and Congregationalists and be simply Christians; cease following their creeds and accept the Bible alone as their only and all-sufficient rule of faith and practice; cease attending conventions and be content to let the Lord lead the way and all will be well. This is the only ground by which God will accept our unity.

Deceiving Plebiscite

By G. K. Wallace

The exchange brings information concerning a “plebiscite” conducted among ministers of the church to determine the kind of papers desired by the brethren.

The authors of this system will do well if they will deal carefully with the election returns. This is true because:

1. These brethren know that only a percentage voted in the plebiscite.
2. Every one knows that the opinion of the minister is not necessarily the opinion of the members of the congregation. The majority of the members of the body of Christ did not participate.
3. The results as published, lead folk to think that the opinion of the entire brotherhood is given. “Let no man deceive you with vain words: for because of these things cometh the wrath of God upon the sons of disobedience.”
4. The return of this plebiscite offers a medium of publicity which presents the church in a deceptive light.
5. Until some one discovers a way to get a hundred percent cooperation of church members in such a movement any plebiscite conducted will be dangerous as misinformation.

Brethren will do well to consider this movement carefully for one outstanding reason.

1. It is an avowed effort to find out what men desire and then give them that which they want, regardless of their needs. Paul says, “For am I
now seeking the favor of men, or of God? Or am I striving to please men?
If I were still pleasing men, I should
not be a servant of Christ."

The new journal will "appear" to represent the "brotherhood." It will be vexation without representation. Better let the plebscites remain with the fascist nations which not alone pass out the ballots but give the answers.

An Impression

Horse Cave, Kentucky,
January 7, 1939.
Christian Leader Pub. Inc.
Cincinnati, Ohio.

Dear Brethren:
The new Christian Leader came to day, and I have carefully read it from cover to cover. As I finish with its "A final Word," I agree with the Editor that "some sort of impression" was made upon me, and I now wish to comply with his urgent request to tell what it was.

The new paper seems destined to provide a "safety zone" for apologists and compromisers. Much of this issue is well flavored with an apologetic mood, and it will not raise the ire of errorists and innovators, and the pre-millennialists will fare sumptuously.

The policy of the paper will largely be determined by the response to the Davidson questionnaire, we are informed. The questionnaire I received was a compilation of questions so framed as to adduce answers that would corroborate the sentiments of the querist, and I put it in the waste basket. I saw the trick in it, and was fearful that something was about to be started that would cause more confusion and further rift in "Israel."

After reading the Editor's more than half-page narrative concerning the extrinsic appearance of the new paper, my mind automatically reverted to the Savior's statement, 'Cleanse first the inside of the cup and the platter, that the outside thereof may become clean also.' Concerning the cartoons, I beg leave to say that I see no merit in them, and wonder if they do not tend to cheapen the religion of the Christ.

Does the "copyright" of this new paper mean that its promoters seek to hide behind the "laws of the land" and muzzle gospel preachers? Does it mean that we have a "New Deal" for churches of Christ? But I feel certain there are some gospel defenders left that will not let it pass. This so-called "copyright" is a tacit admission that somebody is afraid of the "big bad wolf."

It would be interesting if the Managing Editor would inform his readers if he now has "definite convictions" concerning some very vital questions: namely, whether there will be a millennial reign of Christ on earth; and, whether a portion of mankind will be given a second chance! A few years ago he said he did not have definite convictions concerning these questions. This is not a personal reflection upon any one. It is legitimate that I, one of the readers of the new paper, ask these pertinent questions. I would not, knowingly, hinder any righteous cause.

I sincerely hope that promoters of this new paper will receive this letter with the same good spirit it is written. I am, Yours for the Old Paths,

E. G. Creacy

Was Paul A Sectarian Leader?

REX A. TURNER

The genius of the soft-movement family can not be questioned. Their child was born January 1. Feelings for this much longed-for child have run unusually high, because it was of test-tube birth. To have the child this process was the only alternative since other publishers and papers refused to father it.

The demagogues of this new-paper movement, being vainly pulled up by their fleshly minds boast a "classical" magazine, tailored to please. Brother Rowe awaits the response to this endeavor with trembling anxiety. He fears that due to the magazine's classical character it will be over "some of us common people's heads." There is one thing we know: each of the writers has a Websters dictionary from which they may extract their abstract tongue-twisters.

The fence-straddlers have joined this movement and extended the olive branch to R. H. Boll. He and his adherents are "worthy of fellowship." Therefore allayed hope for the truth and the Boll's brain-storm theory are violating Rom. 16: 17. Such is the complacent, denude of logic argument made by Brother Beam. When men will thus pervert the word of God to their own selfish purpose, it is no wonder that confusion and division exists within the pale of the church.

Schemes of heresy have evolved out of endlessly varied intermixtures of Russelism, Adventism, Softism, and have poured into the church of the living God. Paul would rank the leaders of such false teachings as priests of devils. But many of our brethren are "simply not interested" in the evils of these false doctrines. They "know when a man sins by using the Lord's name in vain," but the dangers of the "game of 'pre' and 'post' and '1000 years' is all too much for them." (James L. Love11 in West Coast Christian-November Issue) "Poor things."

What happened when the incongruous monstrous teachings of the judaizing leaders were flourishing with rank luxuriance among the churches of Galatia? Did Paul assume the disposition of a sentimental young girl, with dreamy, wistful, melting blue eyes and try to love this hideous doctrine out of them? Did he tolerate the doctrines of these heresy scouts in order to avoid wranglings, fightings, personalities and etc? The great power with which Paul resisted the demands of those judaizing teachers is expressed: "to whom we gave place in the way of subjection, no, not for an hour." Contrast this apostle's bold courageous stand for God's truth with the passive cowardice of our sleek, stilted preachers, who, with all clerical dignity, prescribe indifference as a cure for the damnable heresies in the church of our Lord. Such men have a debased conception of the New Testament Christianity.

Paul led the fight, and poured out the wrathful pronouncement of God upon those judaizing teachers thusly:

"But though we, or an angel from heaven, should preach unto you any gospel other than that we preached unto you, let him be anathema." In the Roman letter he instructs, "Mark them that are causing divisions and occasions of stumbling contrary to the doctrine which ye learned: and turn away from them." The soft-group declares they do not believe the theory of R. H. Boll, which is to admit his doctrine is contrary to the doctrine learned from God's word. But, instead of marking him and his adherents, they have marked those who have so nobly contended for the truth. John says, "If any man come unh to you, and bringeth not this teaching, and if his teaching do not agree in the doctrine of Christ, he is anathema." The church at Thyatira did not heed this apostolic teaching, and so became a partaker of the sin of false teaching. Our Lord said to her: "I have this against thee." We cannot escape the force of the inevitable conclusion: Our brethren who will not stand firmly opposed to false teaching are partakers of the same.

In this fight Paul "resisted Peter to the face." Peter did not believe the doctrine of those judaizing teachers, and had even taught against it when at Jerusalem, but on the coming of certain from James he became afraid of what they of the circumcision would
say; and so, drew back till his influence was definitely with those false teachers. Many of our brethren do not believe the doctrine of premillennialism, and have even preached sermons against it under favorable conditions; yet, in the present crisis their influence has ben with the neutrals and premillennialist. Like Peter they “stand condemmed.”

Those who take a sinking spell when they hear or read controversy among our brethren, (For instance the newspaper-supporters) should let this example teach them that there are times when controversy, public rebukes, and the marking of certain brethren, are duties of paramount importance. Such is the only security against fatal error. No private friendship can be pleaded in excuse for letting a public evil go unchecked, and in such cases brother must oppose brother, though his heart bleeds at the necessity.

According to our soft brethren Paul was a sectarian leader.

Kingdom of God-- (Cont.) continued from page 11

haim, and the Amorite, and the Canaanite, and the Girgashite, and the Jebusite.” Here God designates the boundaries of the land, and mentions the nations over which Israel should rule while in their national home land. Let us read again in 2 Chron. 9:22-26: “So King Solomon exceeded all the kings of the earth in riches and wisdom. And all the kings of the earth sought presence of Solomon, to hear his wisdom, which God had put in his heart. And they brought every man his tribute, vessels of silver, and vessels of gold, and ramien, armur, and spices, horses, and mules, a rate year by year...and he ruled over all the kings from the River even unto the borders of Egypt.” Therefore God fulfilled the land promise to the seed of Abraham, Isaac and Jacob in every particular, and its fulfillment was climaxed in the reign of David and his son Solomon.

End Of The Earthly Kingdom

The earthly kingdom of Israel, the fleshly posterity of Abraham, reached the zenith of its worldly power and glory in the reign of Solomon, David’s son, and because of sin it came to a final ignominious end in Coniah another descendant of David. We read in Jer. 22:28-30: “Is this man Coniah a despised broken vessel? Is he a vessel wherein none delighted? Wherefore are they cast out, he and his seed, and are cast into the land which they know not 0 earth, earth, hear, the word of Jehovah. Thus saith Jehovah, write ye this man childless, a man that shall not prosper in his days; for no more shall a man of his seed prosper, sitting upon the throne of David, and ruling in Judah.” Therefore never again shall descendant of David rule in Judah-Israel’s once glorious and national home.

Brother Boll said: “The limits of this study forbid the quoting in full and discussion in detail of the divine promises given to Abraham.” But we have quoted at length, and discussed in detail the passages Brother Boll suggested that we read, and I think we have unmistakably learned that the land grant God made with Abraham was fulfilled in the absolute sense, to his posterity. In our next we will study and discuss chapter five—“Israel and the Kingdom.” (To any one who may want to reprint and criticize any statement in this article, permission is hereby granted. Furthermore whenever this writer writes a statement he is not willing for anybody to reprint, and comment on, he hopes it may never reach the public.-Jno. T. Lewis).

Some Men Have Convictions continued from page 16

promises of Jesus as important and sure as any? And was it “a spiritual contingent” when Jesus fulfilled the Father’s promise, given centuries before, that the things he had given them would pass from them? Why the great zeal and solicitude for the Jews? They are now a people disgraced and condemned of God and disregarded by their fellow men, with no more promise of spiritual consideration than any other people, who must be saved by being “grafted in again,” even as must all men be saved. A thousand years is too brief and of too little importance to enlist the interest of Christians who are laboring for that eternal rest on the new earth. Why waste time over a paltry thousand years which will so soon be gone?

Make Room For Sodom

To Israel, God said, “As I live, saith the Lord, Sodom thy sister hath not done as thou hast done. Neither hath Samaria committed half of thy sins. But thy sister Sodom hath done more abominations than they. When I shall bring again their captivity, the captivity of Sodom and her daughters, and the captivity of Samaria and her daughters, then will I bring again the captivity of thy captives in the midst of them. When thy sisters, Sodom and her daughters, shall return to their former estate, and Samaria and her daughters shall return to their former estate, then thou and thy daughters

shall return to your former estate.” (Ezek. 16:48-55) Have provisions been made in that fantastical millennium to accommodate Sodom and Abraham? They will be there “in the midst of them,” when that time comes If It Comes. Will the Sodomites add prestige and glory to the character of those resurrected saints? Are they given as a sample of what citizenship will be there? “The things written aforetime, were written for our learning,” so we may learn the nature of the people in the millennium.

That Wallace Scare

CLED E. WALLACE

Brother E. L. Jorgenson, rabid future-kingdom advocate exhales this one:

“Our observation and experience indicates that the Wallace scare is nearly over.”

Then it ought not to be long now till the fraud-cats will be bold enough to sign their names and venture out without the protection of their copyrights.

Bro. Jorgenson also speaks of “Brother Wallace’s extreme ‘Ishmaelite’ attack on brethren and schools everywhere.” Well, he stated his honest convictions and signed his name, which goes his “Tishbite” attackers at least one better. That word “Ishmaelite” has a familiar sound. O, yes, John B. Cowden called N. B. Hardeman that very name and accused him of attacking his brethren. I wonder if it is a mere coincidence that Cowden and Jorgenson speak the same language! They both seem to me to be “scared” and somewhat red-headed to-boot.

If “the Wallace scare is nearly over” it ought to be “nearly” time that Brother Jorgenson or somebody of his way of thinking does something about the devastating attacks Wallace has made on his pet theories. His “attacks on brethren and schools everywhere” is not what Jorgenson is worried about. The stinging slapping he has given Word & Work for the false doctrine it teaches has caused the “scare” and at the risk of re-agitating the brother’s subsiding fears, I am informing him that it is not “nearly over.”
"HE STANDS WITH US"

CLED E. WALLACE

Some things we have said in the papers have brought about an exchange of letters between Brother James L. Lovell and me. I have taken the liberty to quote from these letters which I feel certain that Brother Lovell will not mind. I have never met him but would like to. He impresses me as one of those frank, outspoken kind of persons who does not grow bitter under criticism and is not enough in love with his own mistakes to defend them. He remarked in a letter that I probably thought him soft or compromising but he knew absolutely nothing about premillennialism and did not want to know. I retorted in a good natured way, and he took it that way, that I was possibly mistaken about him being “soft,” it was evidently “pure ignorance” on his part. Now, some people are inclined to get out of humor with me because I do not behave and talk like Lord Chesterfield when I point my pen in their direction. In the first place, I am not a Chesterfield. In the next place, if I were, I wouldn’t waste it on some folks I write at. Here is an interesting paragraph from Brother Jim’s letter.

Ignorance is exactly the word. I have tried and tried to tell my readers that I am not a Bible student, that I still had “cuckle-burrs” in my hair, and as a writer, I would do for better on the farm. That is why I am not fighting premillennialism; however, I have never once said I opposed those of you who did or the manner in which you did it. I opposed the way you went after those of us not in sympathy with the doctrine but showing it differently from you. Bless your heart, I feel that you and others have stopped the spread and you will see in my next “comic” that I say I am glad. Then, the reason I do not bother about the question is because it is not taught out here but we who oppose it stand together, that we propose to wield the ax on the first head that pops up. Do get me now? Another thing: I am not a Brewer, Hall or any other man’s man. I will string along with Jesus and take my chances. This so far as opinions go . . .

Now I feel very close to you and feel sure that you will just say Lovell is too dumb to bother about on the Pre-M question, but he stands with us due to his simple knowledge of the establishment of the Church and Kingdom and his observations of the harm the question has caused.

Now, lest some of the literalists take Brother Jim too seriously, I plead for him that he is neither “ignorant” nor “dumb.” He is a rugged individualist who has been places and done things and is now making an honest effort to “string along with Jesus,” and is, I think making a tolerable success of it. He has in his time been Sheriff of his county, a professional shooter for the DuPont Company, big game hunter and collector of fire arms. He is now a Christian and an editor.

I got the impression that a straight-shooter like him was missing the target on a disturbing issue and have given out some ungentle hints to that effect. He is getting his shots closer to the bull’s-eye. He does know when the kingdom was set up and recognizes “the harm” the future-kingdom doctrine “has caused” and he promises that if the monster raises its head in California, he’ll lay down his gun and take an ax to it. “He stands with us.” There never has been any personal difference between me and Brother Jim and it looks as though there isn’t any other kind, which suits me to a T.

Of course our brother cannot criticize us for doing in Texas as; Tennessee and Kentucky what he proposes to do in California if given the same provocation. In fact he thinks we have “stopped the spread,” which is about equivalent to chopping the thing’s head off. That may spare him a job of using an ax in California.

One word of warning, beloved. You had better get a little better acquainted with the dragon. It does not always stick its head up to be chopped at. It may even be in California, and rumor says that it is, and you not know it. It has a way of sneaking around in the dark, under assumed names, and does not always sign its name. It even claims to be “stringing along with Jesus” and if you know as little about it as you say you do, which is likely, you might even be found rubbing noses with some “head that pops up” when it ought to be chopped off.

The only way I know to show my lack of sympathy with false doctrine is to use the sword of the Spirit on it. If you have some other way, I’m a little by that like you claim to be about this future kingdom business, I don’t know anything about it and don’t want to know. The sword of the Spirit is good enough for me. I have not “gone after” those of us or anybody else, whose attitude did not in my opinion lend aid and comfort to the enemy. The lovers of truth have no right to be apologizing for the protagonists of error. It isn’t a question of personal hatred. I’m not out of humor with anybody, except the slimy purveyors of anonymous libel and I hold them in too profound contempt to be made at them. If they ever get as far out as California, I’m willing for Brother Jimmie to use his ax on them if he can hit a head in the dark.

“Do you get me now?” Yes, I hope so. You stand with us and even if you do not do any fighting this side of California, we can depend on you not to help the crowd we are fighting. Now “get me!” If you are called on to use that ax in California and need any help, call on me! I believe that your ax and my sword would get heads to rolling. What I Learned In Brother Armstrongs Classes
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adjectives were all used in describing him.) I learned that he has never caused any trouble on account of any theories, that he could count on his fingers the times he has ever preached on the millennium, that many brethren are sinning because they will not call him to preach, will not recognize him as a brother and will not ask him to pray in their congregations of the church.

14. I learned that Foy E. Wallace Jr. had caused far more trouble with his theory of the millennium than R. H. Boll had. (It did no good for me to remind the teacher that Brother Wallace had said he had no theory of the millennium.)

15. I learned that if it is right to let J. L. Hines, H. Leo Bolles, C. R. Nichol, and L. S. White present “their views” of the millennium it is “only fair to let R. H. Boll come to the college and present his views” on the subject.

Two other Harding graduates have read this and at least one or the other remembers to have heard it all. Both of them recall having heard most of it.