STANDING IN THE NEED OF PRAYER

CLED E. WALLACE

Brother Claud F. Witty of "unity movement" fame has written a rather bitter letter to the editor of the Bible Banner against bitterness. He thinks the editor is standing in the need of prayer and reveals that he is considerably out of humor with both him and me, his elder brother. Now we are praying men and appreciate the prayers of all the faithful, but personally I'm not sure that Brother Witty is qualified to call mourners in this particular situation. He begins by assuring the editor that "I am sure any word of caution I may give you will be received with scorn, but I feel I should give it anyway," so he fires away gratuitously.

Our mild-mannered brother seems to be beside himself and surely cannot be credited with speaking forth words of truth and soberness.

You are certainly doing a lot of young men a great wrong when you gain their confidence, as you have the ability to do, and then by precept and example teach them to hate other brethren just because they do not see things as you do.

Brother Witty should be ashamed of that sentence. For a brother who does not believe in bitter personalities and impugning motives to charge that the editor of the Bible Banner hates brethren just because they do not see things as he does and teaches young men over whom he has influence to do the same, reveals an agitated state of mind that is simply astounding. He must be out on some sort of "a lunatic-fringe" as Brother Murch would say. I know that Foy Wallace loves the truth more than I think Brother Witty does. His uncompromising stand for the truth against digression and premillennialism in these troublous times is worthy of praise and not blame. "A lot of young men," thank the Lord, are being taught to hate false doctrine and compromising ways, not men.

Brother Witty goes out of his way to find somebody wicked enough to reflect the iniquities that belong to the editor. He draws a lurid picture of Daniel Sommer "twenty-five years ago." He tells "how he delighted to throw mud on everybody that did not agree with his views on the college question" etc., etc., "For years he kept this thing up, and the entire brotherhood suffered untold torture, and many churches were divided." He charges that the editor is "playing the same role in the brotherhood that" Daniel Sommer was then playing. For fear the editor might miss the point he sharpened it a little. "Brother Wallace, I wish you would think of yourself as a second edition of Daniel Sommer at his worst." At his worst. Then he reminds the editor that he is praying for him. From what I can see at this distance, I think the editor is at least on as good speaking terms with the Lord as Brother Witty is. Under the circumstances it would look better for Brother Witty to step aside and let somebody else call mourners. Come to think of it, it is rather shocking to climax an outburst of resentment and turbulent feeling with a "Let us pray."

Oldtimers will recall that David Lipscomb and other faithful men were accused of fomenting hate and creating division while the bitter controversy was on over the music and society questions. Some of the digressives prayed for some "first-class funerals" and took on as though they had a monopoly on piety, good-will and all that sort of thing. Possibly "Daniel Sommer at his worst" was as acceptable to the Lord as some of our sweet-spirited compromisers are at their best.

Brother Witty pays his respects to me as an afterthought in a post script.

On the first page of the last issue of the Banner, near the top of column one, I read "This was in significant contrast to the sickening blather of Don Carlos Janes and others who blabbed about how much they had come to love the disgressives, etc." Brother Wallace, you, as publisher, and Cled, as the writer of the statement, should apologize to the brotherhood for putting that on the front page of your paper. God's word don't teach us to speak of each other in any such way.

I wonder if Brother Witty thinks God's word teaches him to speak to the editor of the Bible Banner as he has. And don't take liberties with my language. I didn't say "blabbed," I said "babbled." Don't try to make it worse than it was. When my language needs revising toward the side of severity, I prefer to do it myself. It occurs to me that I went after Don Carlos Janes rather mildly compared to the way Claud Witty went after Foy Esco Wallace. If I thought I owed Brother Janes an apology, I would make it. As for "the brotherhood," it hasn't asked for any and a sizable part of it thinks my description of Brother Janes' reported antics at Indianapolis was quite apt. Brother Janes' was reported to have tried to suppress discussion of the issues by urging the brethren to "love it out." In contrast with Brother Boles' great speech I suggested that Janes and others "babbled" some "sickening blather." I wasn't the one and based my remarks on reports I read in the Gospel Advocate and the Christian Standard. I'm of the same opinion still and have no apologies to make. If Brother Janes and Brother Witty will not accord me the liberty to express my honest views about a matter of that kind, I'll just launch out on my own and do it anyhow. Brother Witty may be under the impression that "blather" is a cuss-word of some sort. Look it up and (Con't. on page 7)
ABRAHAM AND LOT-AN ILL-TIMED EDITORIAL ON A MISAPPLIED EXAMPLE

The editor of the Bible Banner has received a request from Brother P. W. Stonestreet, of Chattanooga, Tennessee. Brother Stonestreet is "a successful business man." In that respect could qualify for a place with the New (Digressive) Christian Leader! He is also a nephew of the late M. C. Kurfees, of whom the promoter of this New Leader, the notorious Copyright Davidson, says that he "speaks with admiration" (and there is method in his admiration) of Kurfees in connection with the effort to get the public off-scent of his known sympathy and friendship for R. H. Boll and Party). Brother Stonestreet is also an efficient elder in the church in Chattanooga and is widely and favorably known for his loyalty to the truth. Many others have expressed, and are expressing, similar sentiments to those of Brother Stonestreet's. Evidently a very vital point has been touched, and as many of us feel, a broadside frontal attack has been hurled from an unexpected source, against the defense that is being made on important issues, which cannot be conscientiously ignored. Whether the editorial referred to was intended to be misunderstood or not, the sure way to lose friends is to make your applications of the problems of the church too broad. No editorial can assume the prerogative of an oracle commanding all to desist in the fight against perverse men who are speaking perverse things in the church today, on the ground that "we are brethren." Such did not deter Paul in his fight on ancient Judaism nor will it deter us in our fight on modern Judaism in the form of Premillennialism, and New Digression in the form of Liberalism. Neither will it suspend opposition to those men who are promoting the one from the other. If this is an example of how to settle the strife over the questions at issue-then we must settle them by separation. Is this what the Advocate means in offering this example as "a better solution to the difficulty" before us in the present controversy?

Second: Abraham demanded the separation. "Separate thyself, I pray thee, from me." Is that the Advocate's application of Abraham's magnanimity to our problem? If so, who will the Advocate tell to "separate from" us? Who will be us and who will separate?

Third: It was after the separation that Abraham had peace and blessing. And the Lord said unto Abraham, after that Lot was separated from him, Lift up now thine eyes, and look from the place where thou art northward, and southward, and eastward, and westward. "...rise and walk through the land in the length of it and in the breadth of it; for I will give it unto thee. Then Abraham removed his tent, and came and dwelt in the plain of Mamre, which is in Hebron, and built there an altar unto the Lord."

It is definitely stated that Abraham and Lot could not dwell together. "So they could not dwell together." (Gen. 13:8) Abraham commanded Lot to separate from him. They did separate. Abraham had peace and was blessed, after the separation. We would all like to see another editorial in the Advocate instructing us how to make these applications in the present strife.

The Advocate editorial admits that the nature of the trouble between Abraham and Lot was personal-a quarrel between their herdsmen. In order to find application the issues before us now are held up as a mere quarrel between brethren. From the beginning there are those who have studiously endeavored to make this impression on the public mind. All sorts of propaganda has been circulat-
Paul was as personal in preaching and in writing as any man ever was; and where he denounced heresy and heretics, our strongest language is mild beside his. The sermon that played a big part in his conversion sounds "savage." As Stephen "bitterly" arraigned his brethren, the Jews, with this: "Ye stiffecked and uncircumcised in heart and ears, ye do always resist the Holy Spirit: as your fathers did, so do ye." Of course, as Brother E. W. McMillan was reported by his students to have said, Stephen might not have had the right method of approach, even if it was the Holy Spirit in him! Anyway, Paul never did forget it—and later he tore into Elymas in about the same fashion: "O full of all guile and villany, thou son of the devil, thou enemy of all righteousness, wilt thou not cease to pervert the right ways of the Lord." The advocate says of terms much milder, "What savage ferocity they suggest!" The Advocate is really shocked! That is too bad.

But, as usual, when a man 'plays up what he calls "the spirit of Christ," he violates his own dictum, and this the Advocate does in using the same strong language against others that it has condemned in others. For instance the Advocate charges those engaged in the present controversy with "conduct that can be fitly described only in language suitable to the wild beasts of the jungle." Personally, I do not know what language that is, since I have never been a wild beast in or out of a jungle! But that is rather strong language for an editor to use in an appeal for others to "cool down." It seems he got somewhat "het up" trying to cool somebody else off! Therefore thou are inexceusable, 0 man, whosoever thou art that judgest: for wherein thou judgest another, thou condemnest thyself, for thou that judgest doest the same things." Paul also said that.

In all the writings that we have read over the years from the present editor of the Advocate, we have never read anything he has said against the errors and teachers of error that trouble us now. as hard as the things he has said against those who are now engaged in this fight-to-the-finish battle against these errors. To stand by in the middle of the fight and begin criticising, as the Advocate's editor has done repeatedly since taking over his portfolio, is indeed a poor way to hold the line against the opposing forces. The Gospel Advocate owes an apology to men who have suffered and sacrificed in this fight for thus lending comfort and encouragement to the wrong side.

The editorial under review closes as follows: "What would have been the fate of Lot and Abraham with their flocks and herdsmen if they had been dominated by the spirit that prevailed in the Galatian controversy? On the other hand, how long would the Galatian dissension have lasted if all concerned had been as desirous of peace as Abraham was?"

We reply that it would have been a bad fate had Lot and Abraham dwelt together in the strife that was raging—but they separated. On the other hand, the Galatian dissension would have lasted longer than it did if Paul had not laid down the divine dictum: "To whom we gave place by subjection, no, not for an hour: that the truth of the gospel might continue with you. (Gal. 2:5) Why did he rebuke and reject them? That the truth of the gospel might continue with you. Any compromise with these modern Judaizers today, on the ground of the "magnanimity" of Abraham, or any other ground, means that the truth of the gospel will perish with us. Because: "a little leaven, leaveneth the whole lump." (Gal. 5:9) was Paul's reason for his unyielding attitude, and it is reason enough for us in maintaining the same attitude. His course in rejecting these false teachers was also prescribed for Timothy. "The factious man after the first and second admonition, reject." (Tit. 3:10) That may not be "magnanimous" but it is scriptural, and we would rather be scriptural than magnanimous.

Second: This was not only Paul's "conduct" with the Galatian fanatics, but with all other dissenters as well. To Timothy he said: "This charge I commit unto thee, son Timothy, according to the prophecies that went before thee, that thou mightest war the good warfare; holding faith, and a good conscience; which some having put away according to the truth of the gospel." (1 Tim. 1:18-20.)

Is this an example of "the savage bitterness that had been injected into the controversy," of which the Advocate speaks, and which it says Paul condemned? It sounds rather "savage" for one man to talk about turning other men over to Satan—but Paul said it and did it, and assumed the responsibility for it—"whom I have delivered unto Satan," he said. Paul surely "did reprove them sharply." As for it not being done "in a spirit of personal bitterness that would weaken his reproof"—the ones reproved thought it both personal and bitter, and were Paul's inveterate enemies.
fight to defeat and dispossess him." Now, that is what we want to see the Advocate do—some fighting. The freebooters and their confederates are on us. The Advocate admits that Abraham did not stand around and talk about his "magnanimity," but went into action. "He would fight, in fact, did fight." Since the Advocate's new editor is Abraham in this case—when is he going to begin?

We simply say what must be evident to all—that the Advocate's attitude in this thing is neither Abrahamic nor Pauline. But it is not altogether the editor's fault, though it is his responsibility. I do not doubt his personal soundness, but Clinton Davidson was "scared the wits out of" the publisher of the Advocate by threatening to "sue the sox off of" him—and he won't fight, nor let an editor fight. That is where the publisher and I would have to part.

CONCERNING PERSONAL MATTERS

Perhaps, some are already saying that this article is "sour grapes." I was mindful of that handicap before I took up the Waterman lying on my desk which seemed to say, Why not; what are you waiting on? If any be disposed to say or think so, let it be remembered that they are the ones who have declared themselves so vehemently against impugning motives. Let them apply their ethics: for I here and now solemnly affirm the highest and holiest motives in what I have written.

The editor of the Gospel Advocate is a personal friend of mine and I reaffirm that friendship. He has nothing that I want, except his goodwill, and as much as I desire that, I would not give the price of the perfect freedom of my tongue and pen for it, nor for the friendship, favor or fear of any other man.

It is evident that our fight is taking on some new aspects. The actual teaching of Boll in particular, and Premillennialism in general, has been definitely repulsed. Why are the schools that have harbored this sympathy now sowing the land down with Bulletins declaring that they are not "Premillennialists" nor "Bollites?" This they did not do and would not have done two or three years ago—and they have on the faculties the same men. Is it because they see the handwriting on the wall? If so, time will tell; for "by their fruits ye shall know them." And if their change is one of conviction rather than one of policy—"therein we shall rejoice, and do rejoice." Our attitude will be that of watchful waiting to see. And we shall be watching and seeing.

But the battle continues. It now turns on the issues espoused by the New (Digressive) Leader, of which these same schools which have disavowed Bollism and Premillennialism are a part. Our fight is with this New Deal of Liberalism—commonly known as soft-pedalism, compromise and neutrality. It is born of the Clinton Davidson movement—"conceived in sin and brought forth in iniquity." Wherever this man has gone as an apostle of sweet spirited Liberalism in public, he has left behind him in private, "a sluice of slime." To surrender to him, or to submit to his schemes, "no, not for an hour." As for the Gospel Advocate, it has apparently succumbed to the New Deal mania and is doing Davidson's bidding. Their revamped policy is exactly what Clinton Davidson commanded. So far as the Gospel Advocate is concerned, Davidson has accomplished his purpose. If announcements mean anything the Advocate is definitely out of the fight. As for the Bible Banner—we have just begun to fight. Others may follow the course of least resistance: declare peace when there is no peace; but the battle has been too hard fought. The issues too tightly drawn, and the complete victory for the truth on the grave and stupendous issues too important and imperative, to brook retrenchment or relentment. We shall stand on the issues where we have fought for them. They shall not pass!—F. E. W. Jr.

'FALSE -- ABSOLUTELY'!

In a recent editorial attention was called to a statement of the publisher of Liberty Magazine, Bernarr McFadden: "Because of my frank and sympathetic criticisms of labor, publications devoted to union interests have declared I am an enemy of unions. This statement is false, absolutely! But I believe in Americanism to the nth degree. That means, if a worker wants to join a union he should have that right; but if he desires to depend on his own efforts and does not want to join a union, he should have that privilege."

We again apply this language to some religious misrepresentation which is current.

Because I do not preach that conversion is a conversion and that repentance takes place in a nightmare, or that sanctification is cranky-fication, or Christian experience some sort of a weird dream of glorified hallucinations, people of those visionary vagaries are wont to say that I do not believe in the Holy Spirit. Is it true? It is not—"false, absolutely."

Because we oppose and repudiate materialistic, carnalistic, temporalistic, Judaistic, Davidistic, theistic ideas concerning the reign of Jesus Christ on earth in a kingdom set up in Jerusalem by physical power, wherein our Prince of Peace, the Lord Jesus Christ would rule the world with a rod of iron like Rome's and an arm of flesh like Caesar's, with the mighty monarchy of Israel in all their national pride and glory holding universal sway—when we relegate all such to the dung-heap of Judaism where Paul said it ought to be incinerated, those who hold the theory are wont to say: "He does not believe in nor hope for the second coming of the Lord." But that is "false, absolutely." Because we criticize some bad tendencies in certain colleges; calling attention to definite departures; evident dangers of college domination of the church; compromise in doctrine; weak attitude toward error; encouragement of premillennial sympathy; and because we have condemned their endorsement of the Davidsonian Movement, which is the latest Digression in the make-up of a New Liberalism—they say: He is against the schools; he is an enemy of Christian education! And that is "false, absolutely."

These dangers of institutional control of churches and domination of preachers are not imaginary; they are experimentally real. On the personal evidence and testimony of a student to whom this was done, I have the following: The president of A. C. C. called the young man into his office and flayed this editor alive (quite ethically) saying that he (I) was against the colleges, had gone off with the anti-college "Sommerites," and was moreover a crook! He then informed the young man that it would be only a matter of time until said editor (me)—would be able to preach only for some churches in the country (leaving the impression that the college was doing all it could to make the prediction come true.) But while he was getting over to the young men what he thought of me—he incidentally let us all know what he thinks of country churches!

That, brethren, is one of your college presidents giving the young man a private lesson in Christian Education! We are not against the schools; we are for them, as adjuncts of the home, but not as auxiliaries of the church. We are not against Christian Education, but we are against all the menaces of institutionalism. Moreover, we are not against going to college. I went to college—one day, when I took brother Cled's lunch to him; and T have several degrees—ninety-eight, when I'm normal! There is a place for the Holy Bible called the Ten Commandments. As an aid to practicing what they preach on ethics, we suggest that these school men read the ninth commandment and apply it to their conversations.—F. E. W. Jr.
AD NAUSEAM DELIRIUM TREMENS AT
WOODBANE ENCAMPMENT

In the special Literature Number of the Firm Foundation, G. C. Brewer takes his usual fling at those whom he dislikes-most—the men who have stood against the pet errors current in the church today, in their writing and preaching. He referred to some paper, some editor, or some writer, who writes the type of articles and publishes the type or paper fast becoming nauseating to most people. Because he dislikes them he says that they are heathen—men who classify him on the wrong side of the question? He has been against it all of these years. In spite of that, he has been preaching and writing that Harding college teaches premillennialism, thirty years, until he released his resentment of the preaching others were doing against it—kicking it around he says, and he spoke of it as if he felt like "you had better quit kicking your dog around." His attitudes do not quite harmonize. Brother Brewer has never been able to say anything against Premillennialism without at the same time revealing his inward sympathy for it or something connected with it. That is the reason he is misunderstood on Premillennialism, but is perfectly understood on Communism. He hates the latter with the venom of a rattlesnake; can gesticulate with his head and arms on that subject, and say "give me a gun," but on Premillennialism he has no fight in him, and can only show his teeth and growl at the ones who "kick premillennialism around like a football." Therein lies his trouble. But our reporter continues:

Along toward the close of that speech he stated, "Our trouble is not soundness but rottenness. The ones who are crying loudest for soundness are the rottenest." He then said: "Am I afraid to say it? If you didn't hear it, say so, and I'll say it again.

That was edifying preaching for the ethical sweet-spirited brethren to be sponsoring over at Woodlake Encampment! Brother Brewer has said quite a good deal about preachers who rant against the sects, etc., but I will venture he cannot find a preacher whose ranting against anything exceeded the ranting that he staged at Woodlake.

But our reporter continues:

In his Wednesday night speech he again referred to Harding College and said it had really been damaged by these false reports. He also mentioned A. C. C. and said all these three schools are just as sound as ever. That brings up the question: What does Brewer call soundness? He stated in his day speeches that when a man is regenerated, he doesn't come forth fighting, sputting and frothing at the mouth. But, true to form he was sputting against sputting. He stated that some brethren are in presenting cold, logical facts and that a person's faith grounded in such "would not last," and that the preachers who preached that way didn't have the spirit of Christ and didn't know God, and didn't have any hope of eternal life in heaven.

There are several conclusions which the reader may draw from the foregoing. Why appoint himself the defender of the colleges? Why not let them defend themselves? Of course Harding College gave him an honorary (?) LL. D. (?) for a Thanksgiving speech, and perhaps he must pay them for that. I do not know what A. C. C. has done for him, but he told me one time he would like to be president of it. But he will have to have more than an LL. D. from Harding College to qualify for that place—even at Abilene.

As for soundness, let the reader measure his words about "when a man is regenerated he does not come forth spuitin' and frothin' at the mouth." That sounds about like something any ordinary sectarian, would say. The remarks about "cold, logical facts" not saving anybody; and a person's faith grounded in such "would not last," and (Con't. on page 7)
THE CAUSE, CURSE AND CURE OF WHISPERING CAMPAIGNS

JOHN T. LEWIS

There is nothing more blighting and withering to a cause, to an institution, or an individual than a whispering campaign. Therefore, those who hold destructive persons, of character and influence, are whisperers, scandal mongers, and good people may unwittingly become parties to such campaigns. Since there can be no doubt about the curse of such a menace to society, to state either facts, fancies, or fiction in obscure phrases, or illusions, is to lay the foundation for a whispering campaign, to loose the wings of the scandal monger's imagination, and set to flight his wildest guesses to fly to the four corners of the earth, and like the carrion with which the buzzards contaminate the pure air, they are as apt to fall one place as another. I clip the following from the August Bulletin of David Lipscomb College.

DON'T LET THEM FOOL YOU

All Christian institutions have enemies and opposition. "Woe unto you when all men speak well of you," (Luke 6:26.) David Lipscomb College, as you may expect, has a few enemies. A small number of persons have reasons of their own for being hostile to the college. These reasons are plain to those who know the facts. Those not knowing the whisperers, or the college, may be deceived by rumors deliberately started. Then others, with good intention but wrong information, thoughtlessly spread these unconfirmed reports. In certain sections the whisper is "David Lipscomb is a Bollite school." This is false to the core. No one at Lipscomb holds or teaches the premillennial doctrines advocated by Bro. R. H. Boll, or other forms of premillennialism.

I consider the above very unfortunate statements coming from David Lipscomb College, or any other Christian College. A frank open criticism is good for individuals or institutions; but the above is not an open criticism of any individual, it is only the foundation for what it purports to condemn—a whispering campaign. Who are the "them," trying to "fool you?" Who are the "few enemies" of David Lipscomb College? And what are their reasons for being "hostile to the college?" Since "these reasons are plain to those who know the facts," give us the facts. Name the enemies, give their reasons for fighting the college, and show the absurdity of their hostility. This would be an open criticism of "the enemies of the college," and an exposure of their motives, and not a foundation for a whispering campaign. This would be good for the college, and healthful for "its enemies."

Presidents usually have their press agents, and speech writers; but if the August Bulletin of David Lipscomb College is a sample of what his agents are going to put out Brother Jiams had better "call his dogs off," they will hurt the college, not "its enemies." If the Bulletin had said some members of the faculty, and board of directors, of David Lipspocm College once thought that "Bollism" or premillennialism was not an issue, that they were admirers, and avowed defenders of Brother R. H. Boll, and did not think there should be any agitation against the theories, for which they were publicly criticised by N. B. Hardeman and Foy E. Wallace, Jr., that would have been fine because it would have been stating the facts. Then if the Bulletin had said: but these brethren have changed their minds, they have come to realize that premillennialism is an issue, and are now sound "to the core" on that question, that would have been still better. It is not cowardly but both manly and Christian to say you have changed your position on certain issues, if you have changed.

Another flash from the Bulletin:

"By their fruits ye shall know them." Lipscomb's opposition to all speculative views is evidently quite effective, since Middle Tennessee, where there are more Linscomb graduates than anywhere in the world, has less of this sort of thing than anywhere. Of the one hundred active preachers graduated at Lipscomb in recent years, not one is in any sense a Premillennialist.

This is indeed a fine record, and a wonderful accomplishment, since it was only a few years ago that it was no trouble to find brethren in Middle Tennessee, and especially in Nashville, who were open defenders to R. H. Boll, and exceedingly bitter against the opposition to him. Just last fall several congregations in Nashville sponsored a meeting in the Ryman Auditorium conducted by N. B. Hardeman, president of Freed-Hardeman College of Henderson, Tennessee. The purpose of that meeting was to stay the influence of "Bollism; sissiyism, premillennialism, and other isms that they thought were blighting the churches in Nashville. The Chapel Avenue congregation had Foy E. Wallace, Jr., go back in Nashville last spring for a three Sundays meeting for the same purpose. I am sure the brethren who sponsored those two meetings will feel that they were "taken for a ride" when they learn that the teaching and influence of David Lipscomb College in recent years had already dried up the streams of those isms, and especially had annihilated "Premillennialism."

This clears up another thing that was a little cloudy in my mind, it explains why the faculty of David Lipscomb College would have nothing to do with either of those meetings. There was absolutely no reason for giving Hardeman and Wallace credit for what the college had already done-killer "Bollism!"

Still another flash from the Bulletin:

Do not therefore let the whisperer, with a secret motive, fool you. Ask him to prove his charges. Suggest that he "nut up" or "shut up" on hearsay information. All who want to know the facts about Lipscomb are invited to ask anybody who knows them.

I indorse the above a hundred percent. "Put up" or "shut up" on hearsay information sounds good to me. That you may see how easy it is for a good brother to become a scandal monger by peddling "hearsay information" I will quote from a letter written to a faculty member of David Lipscomb College.

"Dear ______: I am writing you concerning David Lipscomb College. Hardeman is closing his meeting at ______ five miles from here. I did not go to hear him, but I have been informed that, and believe the information reliable, that he is fighting D. L. very hard, and I cannot help believe in an undermining way. He has announced that he is going to Nashville in October to hold a meeting sponsored by fifty of the congregations in and around Nashville and there were eight dissenting congregations, who did not sign the invitation, represented by fifty of the congregations in and around. David Lipscomb was not an accredited school and that F. H. was the only accredited secondary school of any religious body in this section, furthermore, that D. L. had four teachers openly teaching 'Bollism,' and that when he went up there to hold his meeting that he was going to prove it, and that he was going to 'blow the lid off and let the people know just what was being taught there'. I cannot believe the report of D. L.'s teaching, for if it is true I would not send one of my girl's there, and if it
is as Hardeman says, I hope that he will be able to put it out of existence. If, as I believe, these accusations are false, I think the college, and trustees and churches should do something to put a stop to his tongue wagging."

This letter, according to the writer, was based on "hearsay information." Look at the cross section emotions that the "hearsay information" stirred in the writer of the letter. He believed the "information reliable," therefore he believed Hardeman was fighting D. L. very hard, and in an underhanded way, by making false accusations against the college and some of its teachers. He also believes that the college, faculty, trustees and churches of Nashville should do something to stop his wagging tongue. On the other hand, if he believed David Lipscomb College had teachers teaching "Bollism" he would not send one of his girls there, and he could wish that Hardeman would be able to put it out of existence.

The writer of the letter certainly has no patience with "Bollism." But the Bulletin assures us that the teaching and influence of D. L. C., in recent years has so nearly killed "Bollism" in Nashville and Middle Tennessee that there is "less of this sort of thing than any section of the country."

But now back to the letter writer. That you may see what "hearsay information" will cause a fellow to do, if he believes the "information reliable," I will quote a statement signed by three brethren who heard Hardeman. One of them attended every service, and the other two were present only three or four morning services. After telling what Hardeman said about D. L. and F. H., they close by saying: "We are glad to state these facts in view of reports that have gone out to the contrary by . . . . . . who never attended a single service of your meetings. We have read the letter written by . . . . . to . . . . Aug. 7, 1938. We regret to have to say there is scarcely a true sentence in his entire letter except where he said 'I did not go to hear him.'"

Brethren, if you want to tell what a man says in a meeting you had better go to hear him yourself, "hearsay information" might make a scandal monger out of you. Do not tell a thing unless you are prepared to "put up" or "shut up."

Last November I was in a meeting in one of our Southern Cities. While I was in the meeting, the wife of the preacher who labors with the congregation visited her people in Tennessee, during Thanksgiving holidays. When she came back I was at their home for dinner (supper) and she told me that Brother Hardeman was telling that the faculty and all the students of David Lipscomb College were "Bollites." Believing that no sane person would make such a blanket charge, and not believing that Hardeman had gone insane, I challenged the statement, and she said one of the teachers told her that the matron told her that he said it. Of course, some whisperer had told the matron; but I venture to say that there is not a magnet on earth strong enough to pull the whisperer out of his hole, who heard (?) Hardeman make the statement.

This is enough to show the wrong of whisperers, and whispering campaigns. Now I want to say something about open and frank criticism. Open and frank criticism, is to name the individual or institution you are criticizing, and give the reason for your criticism. Whenever religious papers, schools, congregations, preachers, or even elders of churches, get too big, in their own estimation, to have their doings or sayings criticized, they are like tomatoes, in wet weather, their usefulness is about ready to crack and decay. Of course, tomatoes don't "crack" and "decay," they just burst and rot.

STANDING IN THE NEED OF PRAYER

(Cont'd from p. 4)

You'll find it an expressive term at good usage. By the way, Brother Witty, your beloved Brother Murch describes brother boles' plea as "really laughable." What do you think of that? Of whom does Brother Murch remark you "at his worst?"

Brother Witty in his letter says he is a warm personal friend of Daniel Sommer's, as though we had any objection to that. He, I take it, is also on mighty warm terms with Brother Murch and Brother Janes. He counts Foy Wallace as an enemy. He has both sugar and acid in his system. He passes out the sugar to digressives and premillenialists and throws the acid in our eyes. "There's a reason." I'm rather partial to the editor of the Bible Banner. To my certain knowledge he has never been a digressive, premillenialist, Holy Roller, or compromiser. He signs his name to what he writes, and it always makes interesting reading even at times quite breath-taking. I admit that some of it must be trying on fat folks with weak hearts. If he is as bad as "Daniel Sommer at his worst" then somebody owes old Daniel an apology. He has been slandered. There is one thing that puzzles me. I know the editor better than any of his enemies do, and have known him longer "nussed" him when he was a baby. I have always considered him a better man than I am. Brother Witty thinks he is "Daniel Sommer at his worst" and the general tone of the letter suggested to me that he would like to mark out "Daniel Sommer" and substitute the devil. Foy and I are "Siamese twins" in this fight. And after all they've said about him, the worst I've heard of any of them saying about me is that I ought to apologize to the brotherhood for calling Don Carlos Janes a silly babbler. I must indeed be one of the very elect! Personally, I don't believe the Lord would hold it against any man for calling Don Carlos Janes nothing worse than that.

PREACHERS AT WOODLAKE, ENCAMPMENT

(Con't. from page 5)

AD NAUSEAM DELIRIUM TREMENS AT WOODLAKE, ENCAMPMENT

(preachers who preach that way "do not have the spirit of Christ" and "do not know God," does not sound like a gospel preacher.

But one more paroxysm from Woodlake.

"Brother Brewer made the following charges in his last two day speeches. 'Some man is out fighting and wants everybody to conform to his opinion, and if they don't, he disfellowships them. Faith is made as narrow as can be, and comes from an ignoramus. They make a creed. I said several years ago if I go under a creed, I want to be under one written by smart men and not by an ignoramus. You must know God-not on here's the premise and here's the conclusion.'"

We have all heard the "creed" cry before. It is R. H. Boll's chief stock in trade. The fear of being "creed-bound" possesses him. But Brother Brewer does not want an ignoramus to write his creed. If he ever goes under one a "smart man" must write it. Now, just who will qualify in Brother Brewer's estimation? I have the creeping idea that what he means is that he would have to write it himself! He is not an ignoramus, you know, for Harding college gave him an LL. D.-Doctor G. C. Brewer, LL. D., Harding College-not Premillenialist! If any think all this is not very good to read it is as good to read as it was to listen to at Woodlake. It reveals the real trouble today. It is Sectarianism. It was back of digression years ago; it is back of the New Digression now. Our future fight is against Liberalism in the church. And we cannot look to men like G. C. Brewer to make it.-F. E. W. Jr.
RETRENCHMENT -- LESSONS FROM HISTORY

Cecil B. Douthitt

The conflict had been fierce and strong throughout the day in one of the great battles of the Civil War. The Union forces had been driven back to the very brink of the Tennessee River and were fighting with their "backs to the wall." Victory for the Comedate forces seemed certain in that battle. But in the afternoon of that fatal day a noted Comedate general fell mortally wounded. His successor decided on a complete change of policy of retribution for the remainder of the day. This curtailment of activities of the Comedate charge gave the Confederate forces an opportunity to rearrange and reinforce their broken ranks during the night and prepare for a counter charge the next day. The Confederate policy of retribution quickly converted their apparent victory into miserable defeat, and left open a gate-way into the South which they were never, able to close throughout the war.

Many times in the course of human events a victory almost won has been changed suddenly into shameful defeat.

When Moses and the Israelites came near the border of Canaan, spies were sent to spy out the land. Upon their return ten of the spies persuaded the people to adopt the defeatist policy of fear and retribution. These spies, who themselves felt like grasshoppers in the presence of the enemy, made cowards and weaklings out of potential victors and conquerors. Their newly adopted policy did not protect them nor take them to victory: it drove them deeper into the wilderness where they died like flies. That forty year period of suffering and death in the wilderness was caused by a policy of fear and weakness recommended by the spies who were unfit for any place of trust among the people of God, the most powerful people on earth.

The counterpart of these examples of history has appeared many times in the church of our Lord. About twenty five years ago a few brethren undertook to force the revamped theories of Pastor Russell upon the churches. They named their system of doctrines "Premillennialism." Wherever they went with their theories, discord and division followed in their wake. The issue was clearly drawn, debates both oral and written were conducted, and the fight became fierce and strong in many sections of the country.

A few months ago it became quite clear to those who were in the midst of the fight, and who were observing conditions carefully, that the cause of premillennialism was being "bottled up," and its forces were fighting with their backs to the wall. Small congregations in and around Louisville, that had been under the domination of premillennial leaders, were becoming outspoken in their dissatisfaction with these divisive theories. Members of some of the strongest premillennial churches in Louisville were convinced that trouble would prevail as long as these theories were taught, and they were beginning to realize that abandonment of speculation was the only road to peace and fellowship, which they desire very much. Something was about to happen in the camp of premillennialism in Louisville. Victory for truth was in sight.

While right at the verge of victory the forces opposing speculation have received in recent months some pretty tough blows from unexpected quarters, and the retreat of the premillennial forces, which started when Foy Wallace was editor of the Advocate, has been checked. One of the best known and most loved evangelists among us, and who is as well acquainted with conditions as any man in the church, said to me not long ago that, if Foy E. Wallace had continued as editor of the Advocate till now, the premillennial disturbances would have been abolished by this time.

Blows From Unexpected Quarters

One thing that caused a great deal of rejoicing among the leaders in speculation and gave them renewed hope was the sale of the Christian Leader, accompanied by its policy of neutrality on everything. Clinton Davidson, an expert promoter and high powered salesman, who had been lost for twenty years to "Editors, Evangelists, Preachers," and everybody else, except the digressives of New York and the premillennialists of the Blue Grass Region of Kentucky, sent for Brother F. L. Rowe to come to his estate in New Jersey. While there Brother Rowe evidently was frightened as badly as the ten spies in Canaan. There he saw "a great accumulation of material, all having to do with religious papers." He saw "unlimited resources" in New Jersey. He reported that they could put him "out of business inside of a year." "seriously cripple the Advocate," but "not do much harm to the Firm Foundation, as they are too far away." How terrible! Think of it: Three great papers—the Leader, the Advocate, the Firm Foundation—had stood as bulwarks against error and innovation. And Brother Rowe saw something in New Jersey that could absolutely fold up the first bulwark, cripple the second, but not do much arm to the third, as it was too far away. Was that "accumulation of material" on the side of truth, or on the side of error? If on the truth's side, how could it crush the Leader and cripple the Advocate, if the Leader and Advocate were on the truth's side at that time? If Brother Rowe was correct in his report, then what he saw in New Jersey was not a colleague in the fight that was then being waged by the Leader, the Advocate and the Firm Foundation, but an opponent—an opponent of truth as opposed to speculation and all forms of digression. Brother Rowe surrendered the Leader to Brother Davidson, and there was joy among the premillennial leaders in Louisville. James De Forest Murch was also made happy and he too, praised the New Leader. But why shouldn't they rejoice and praise the Leader? Hadn't Brother Davidson been a friend and an active supporter of digression and premillennialism for twenty years? Didn't he launch the Leader on a new policy that suited them exactly?

If Brother Davidson had stopped with the purchase of the Leader, he could not have stopped completely the rapid retreat of premillennialism. But he did not stop there. He moved on Nashville, invaded the Advocate office, and though he did not gain possession of the Advocate, he evidently "scared the daylight"s out of Brother Leon McDaidy, and immediately the Advocate began the pursuit of a policy in perfect harmony with Brother Davidson's ideas, but contrary to the course it had consistently followed for more than eighty years.

This sudden change in the Advocate has checked the retreat of premillennialism in Louisville. The leaders among speculators welcome its new policy, and the rank and file of their followers are cherishing a new hope that peace and fellowship may become a reality without the removal of their leaders. This is a tough blow from an unexpected source. We had looked for better things from the Advocate.
The Advocate Claims One Policy
And Follows Another

No one could object to the policy as stated by the “committee” about the time Brother Goodpasture became editor. But it is quite clear that he is not following that policy. In reply to a very emphatic protest against his editorial course, Brother Goodpasture wrote to the elders of the church in Lakeland, Fla., “that there is no basic change in the policy of the Advocate.” I am not denying the sincerity of his statement, but it is an error. Those four elders of the Lakeland church have been familiar with the contents of the Advocate over a period of many years. Was it just a brain storm that caused them to believe that the Advocate has recently made a “basic change” in its policy? What about W. Clarence Cooke, Price Billingsley, Thomas H. Burton, and all the rest of us who have sent in protests? Are these protests due to our inability to read the English language, or does Brother Goodpasture think we are just trying to be mean?

In the July 13 issue of the Advocate, the editor says his course is not one of “retrenchment, weakness, and compromise,” but that it is a “golden mean”--middle of the road--policy. Of course Brother Jorgenson thinks he has Word And Work perfectly balanced on a “golden mean” ; Brother McMillan thinks the same thing about the Christian Leader; Brother Errett thinks the Christian Standard is right square in the middle of the road: the ten spies could have argued that a sojourn in the wilderness was a “happy medium” between the invasion of Canaan and the return to Egypt. The terms “golden mean,” “middle of the road,” and “happy medium” do not appropriately describe any of them. Their policies are expressed more correctly by such words as “retrenchment,” “weakness,” and “compromise.”

The very fact that the Advocate’s “golden mean” is precisely what the disturbers of the churches want, should cause its management to give more prayerful consideration to the judgment of good men expressed in many letters. False teachers in the church know that as long as Brother Goodpasture follows and defends his “golden mean” they will never be exposed by name through the Advocate.

The proof that the friends and leaders of the premillennial movement are doing all they can to convince the brethren that peace and fellowship can be restored without anybody’s renouncing the theories, is so abundant that the the management of the Advocate ought to be able to see it. That tract published over the signature of S. R. Logue and under the loquacious caption, “When the ‘Gospel Advocate’ honors friends of R. H. Boll and a financial backer of ‘Word and Work’ peace is in sight," is sufficient proof within itself that their main objective is to persuade the rank and file of premillennial adherents that “peace is in sight” and may become a reality without forsaking the theories or removing their leaders? What other conceivable purpose could that tract have? As long as they hold to that opinion their divisive work will continue, and I know what I am talking about.

Instead of helping us prove to the followers of the leaders in speculation that there is not going to be any peace as long as premillennialism is taught in the churches, Brother Goodpasture actually joins them in their efforts by misrepresenting M. C. Km-fees through the misapplication of an article which he quoted in an editorial in the Advocate of July 13. It is indeed surprising that Brother Goodpasture would go so far as to try sincerely to class M. C. Kurfees with himself in refusing to expose the premillennial leaders by name. Brother Kurfees taught that the churches should “mark them” and “turn away from them.” J. C. McQuiddy taught the same thing in the Advocate of August 14, 1919. If Brother Goodpasture wants us to believe that he stands with Kurfees and McQuiddy on these matters, let him state through the Advocate that the churches should withdraw from the premillen- nialists who persist in teaching their theories. That is what Kurfees and McQuiddy taught, and the premillennial leaders know it.

I am familiar with conditions among the premillennial followers in Louisville; I know their sentiments and views. They have been taught that their leaders have not been “marked” except by a few congregations in Louisville. If all the potent factors among us, including the Gospel Advocate, will make it clear that we can have no fellowship with them as long as the theories are taught and as long as Rom. 16:17 remains a part of the Bible, then something would soon break lose in the premillennial camp. That is the scriptural course.

We will be successful in this fight anyway finally, but the victory can be won much earlier with the help of the Advocate. If Brother Goodpasture refuses to help us and continues to defend his neutrality under the name of “golden mean,” and persists in his campaign of the “blue pencil,” it will not be long until the influence of the Advocate will be as powerless as the substance of its articles now is.

In a very dignified letter Paul said that Hymenaeus and Alexander had made shipwreck concerning the faith; that Demas forsook him through his love of this present world; that Alexander the coppersmith did him much evil. He withstood Peter to the face, and told Euodia and Syntyche to be of the same mind, and put it all in a dignified, permanent record. No man is qualified for any place of trust among the people of God, who consigns to oblivion every article that points out the evil workers and false teachers by name.

The New Leader and the Gospel Advocate have become tools in the hands of the enemy, and both are being used to convince the supporters of speculative theories that “peace is in sight” without forsaking the theories. These papers could easily put a stop to that, if they would take the scriptural attitude toward all who “goeth onward and abideth not in the teaching of Christ.” (II John 9-11).
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“THE TRIUMPHAL ENTRY”

JNO. T. LEWIS

Remember, according to Brother Boll, the preaching: “Rejoice ye! for the kingdom of heaven is at hand,” done by John the Baptist, Jesus Christ, the seventy, and the twelve under the limited commission, up to the 13th chapter of Matthew, was the announcement of “the appearing of the Messianic Kingdom, with all it involved the appearance of the Great King of David’s line; the destruction of the Gentile world power, the deliverance and national restoration of Israel, and her exaltation to earthly sovereignty; the promises God made to the fathers, and the prophets’ vision of the future glory of the People, the Land, the City, and the Kingdom.” Thus Brother Boll teaches that “The Great Crisis” was reached in the 13th chapter of the gospel according to Matthew. After all the teaching that had been done on the subject, Jesus Christ learned that the Jews were not ready for their kingdom and “earthly Sovereign,” so he postponed the kingdom and from then on taught in parables.

I believe God is omniscient, and just why he did not tell Jesus Christ, before he left heaven, that the Jews were not ready for him and his earthly kingdom, will always be a mystery. I know it was a great disappointment to Jesus Christ to come as the “Great King of David’s line for the deliverance and national restoration of Israel, and her exaltation to earthly sovereignty” to find that after much teaching on the subject, his restorative efforts were premature. A great mistake has been made somewhere, possibly it is in Brother Boll’s teaching on this subject. In speaking of the allegorical teaching of Christ, Brother Boll says: “These parables are really an announcement of the new and unexpected aspect of the Kingdom would assume during an anticipated age of the king’s rejection and absence from the world.” This makes it look a little like God made the mistake, that he “anticipated the king’s rejection:” but said nothing to “the king” about it, just let him come on and find out for himself by teaching and trying to persuade the Jews to accept their kingdom, and him as their earthly king, the “Great King of David’s line.” But maybe Brother Roll is wrong about the purpose for which Christ came into the world. “We read in John 3:16 “For God so loved the world, that he gave his only begotten Son, that whosoever believeth on him should not perish, but have eternal life.” Nothing here about the “national restoration of Israel, and her exaltation to earthly sovereignty.” I am sure Brother Boll would say: “John was talking about one thing and I was talking about another.” I know that too: but what I am getting at, is which one was talking about the right thing. But we pass on to what Brother Boll calls “Four Features of The Triumphant Entry.”

“First of these is the fact that they placed their garments upon the colt that He might sit thereon, and spread their garments in the way before Him. It was an act of royal homage, a final acclamation of Him as the long promised and expected Messiah of David’s line, King of Israel. And since the King had come, so the kingdom also had come nigh to them: even ‘the kingdom of our father David’ (Mark 11:10).”

According to the above, not withstanding the fact that Christ had been preaching “the new and unexpected aspect of the kingdom” from the 13th chapter of Matthew till his “triumphal entry” into Jerusalem during his last week on earth, the Jews still had an opportunity to accept their “national restoration, and exaltation to earthly sovereignty.” The people were clamoring for their king, his kingdom, and Jesus was ready to accept their acclamation; but their rulers rejected both, and thus spurned the last offer of their king. This, of course, was very disappointing (?) to Jesus Christ, their King, because it made it necessary for him to go the way of the cross, and thus carry through his parabolical teaching of “the new and unexpected aspect of his kingdom.” I am sure that the rulers’ rejection of Christ, as their earthly king, was very disappointing to the devil too, because his hope of keeping the grave closed over man was forever gone, his ultimate defeat was in sight. Of course it would be idle to guess what the Lord would have done with the Gentiles, if the Jews had accepted their “national restoration and earthly sovereignty.” As it is we can sit in the vestibule till the kingdom comes. But we go on, “The third feature was the Lord’s lament over Jerusalem. Among the hallelujahs and hosannas, and the cries of wild rejoicing, a wail was heard of infinite sadness. It came from the lips of the king himself who was weeping aloud over Jerusalem.” I have always believed, and still believe, that Jesus wept over Jerusalem because her inhabitants had rejected him as their Saviour, and not as an earthly ruler or king, just as people reject him and his teaching today. I believe it is absolutely absurd to say that Jesus wept over Jerusalem because they had rejected him as an “earthly sovereign.”

1. Let us itemize and analyze what Brother Boll says: “Jerusalem had missed her chance. What would have happened had she understood and seized upon her opportunity? Who would doubt what?”

Why, of course he would have established the premillennial “Messianic Kingdom, with all it involved—the appearance of the Great king of David’s line; the destruction of the Gentile world power; the deliverance and national restoration of Israel, and her exaltation to earthly sovereignty.”

2. “To be sure a host of questions would arise in view of such possibility.”

There was positively no “such possibility.”

3. “If Jerusalem had received her king and humbly bowed to His righteous will—how could he have died?”

He would not have died, there would have been no death, no resurrection, and therefore no hope of the general resurrection, the devil would still have power over the grave.

4. “How then could the church have come into existence?”

It could not have come into existence. We would just have the earthly kingdom of Israel without the vestibule, or “the new and unexpected aspect of the kingdom.”

5. How could the scriptures have been fulfilled that thus it must be?

They could not have been fulfilled, Brother Boll, therefore your theories must be “gone with the wind.”

6. “A thousand such hypothetical questions could be asked along any line; and it would be idle to guess what would have been the result if this or that had been different.”

Yes, Brother Boll, but when we are studying the virgin
birth of Christ, his life, his miracles, his death, his resurrection from the dead, his last commission to the apostles, his church—his blood bought institution, its worship, its mission in the world, and its ultimate destiny, such foolish and ignorant questions should never enter our minds. Therefore any theories that would suggest "such hypothetical questions," in our study of the above subjects, should be relegated to the realm of religious fanaticism.

7. "God would have known in any case what to do."

I doubt that, Brother Boll. The church was in God's eternal purpose (Eph. 3:10, 11); and Jesus Christ, as a lamb, was slain before the foundation of the world, in the Purpose of God (1 Peter 1:18-21); and Paul said: "Apart from shedding of blood there is no remission" (Heb. 9:22). Therefore if the Jews had accepted what you say John the Baptist, Jesus Christ, the seventy, and the twelve preached up to the 13th chapter of Matthew, the church would not have been established, nothing but "the Messianic Kingdom, with all it involved—the appearance of the Great King of David's line; the destruction of the Gentile world power; the deliverance and national restoration of Israel, and her exaltation to earthly sovereignty." This certainly would have frustrated God's eternal purpose, and what could he have done? Nothing but establish the earthly kingdom of Israel without the vestibule. The thought makes me shudder.

8. "But it is sufficient for us to know that Jerusalem did reject her king and failed of her opportunity; and though the offer was made to her in good faith, her rejection of the invitation was foreseen, and made a factor in God's larger plan."

"God's larger plan" was to postpone the establishment of the kingdom, and just build the vestibule. I suppose the kingdom with the vestibule would be a larger plan than the kingdom without the vestibule; but as it is we just have the vestibule.

9. "Undoubtedly she might have realized her ancient promises then."

According to Brother Boll the church was not in "her ancient promises."

10. "But God knowing that she would in no wise hear, had laid his plans accordingly from of old; yet not presuming upon his foreknowledge, but all along and earnestly, lovingly, giving them the full opportunity to make their own choice and to decide their own destiny."

We Gentiles should rejoice that the Jews did not accept their "ancient promises," because if they had we would not even be in the vestibule of the kingdom.

11. "A fourth feature of the 'triumphal entry' was that it was specifically foretold in the scripture."

We will accept this statement from Brother Boll without controversy, it is about the only fact he has stated in all of his dissertation on the "triumphal entry."

We have followed Brother Boll in his meanderings through "the four features of the triumphal entry," and have come out in the church—the vestibule of the kingdom for which we thank God and take courage, if it is a little odd to have the vestibule without the kingdom. We now come to the closing paragraph of the 6th chapter. Brother Boll says:

12. "We have now briefly traced the kingdom-teaching of Matthew, the kingdom-gospel, from beginning to the end. We have seen how the Old Testament promise of the Messianic Kingdom of Israel and its world-wide sway was at first entirely in the foreground. how a crisis came when the opposition of Israel culminated in Plans of mur-
der; how then the Lord Jesus Christ began to announce an entirely new and different aspect which his kingdom was to assume; and how thenceforth, not leaving out of view the Old Testament promise of the Kingdom."

According to this the "Old Testament promise of the kingdom" was an earthly kingdom, not a spiritual kingdom, "the present, spiritual, veiled, suffering form of the kingdom of Heaven, until He should come again, occupied the foreground of His teaching." Thus closes the 6th chapter of Brother Boll's book.

Brother Boll uses the terms "Messianic Kingdom, and Messiah" frequently in his book; but he uses these terms loosely. He invariably uses the term "Messianic Kingdom" when he speaks of the kingdom, which he says Christ came to establish—the earthly kingdom of Israel, and the "Messiah" as King over the postponed; yet the future earthly kingdom of Israel. The primary meaning of Messiah is—"The anointed one; the Christ: the promised deliverer of mankind." Second, "Loosely, a looked for liberator of a country or people." It is in the latter sense only that Brother Boll uses the term in his book—"The Kingdom of God." All of God's kings over the earthly kingdom of Israel were anointed with oil, and by man, Christ alone was anointed with the Holy Spirit, and by God himself. He alone assumed the title of "The Anointed One," and he assumed this title only as the "promised deliverer of mankind, and not as an earthly Sovereign. In Christ all the types, prophecies, and promises of the Old Testament center. "For in him dwelleth all the fullness of the Godhead bodily, and in him ye are made full, who is the head of all principality and power" (Col.2:9,10). He is the effulgence of God's glory, and the very image of his substance, the inexhaustible fountain of all spiritual, and temporal blessings, the matchless, incomparable Redeemer of all that believe on him. It was He, "who abolished death, and brought life and immortality to light through the gospel," he indeed is the "King of kings, and Lord of lords." Therefore to speak of Christ, in any sense, as an "earthly sovereign" is a degrading, and blatant species of infidelity—"lacking the true faith." I hope this was not give our neutral brethren nervous prostration, and cause them to turn lose another flow of scurrilous anonymous letters against the editor of the Bible Banner. I have written this in defense of God's "anointed One," my Lord and your Lord, and I alone am responsible to God and man for what I write.
THE ACTUAL FACTS CONCERNING HARDING COLLEGE VERSUS THE BENSON-SEARS BULLETIN

E. R. Harper

I am submitting for publication over my name some things that I believe the brotherhood should know about Harding College and some who are in Harding College. In the first place I want it understood that I am not against the school, but am for the school's being sound in all lines, and I know it is not.

If any one doubts that I have tried to be a friend to the school I will just say this for them to consider. I am the only man who has ever been able to get the church at Fourth and State in Little Rock to let Brother Armstrong preach there. I was the one who induced them to invite Brother Benson to preach for us, and to appear over the radio. I have helped to send three preachers through the school, one of them this year, Brother Waymond Miller; one last year, Brother Carroll Cannon; and I baptized and sent to school one year, with the aid of the church here, Brother Alstone Tabor, minister for the church at Twelfth and Thayer, in Little Rock, and I went on his personal note another year that he might go back. I preach all of their young preachers and have tried to help them. I got for the college the radio hour used to broadcast the speeches of their leading business men who have come to Harding, and the time was given them. I announce all their programs over my radio program and have done many other things for them, but I am not allowed to appear in the auditorium of their school, before their students. I challenge them to find a preacher in Arkansas who has done more for them than I have done. I have suggested these things that those who read this may know that I have honestly tried to work with and help the school.

Some may say, why did you do all this, if you do not think all things are sound? That is a good question, and for this stand I have been criticised by my brethren. They have gone so far as to call me a man who will do one thing and say another because I helped the school, took up for Brother Benson, and yet said there were certain things in it that I could not recommend. Well, I did it because Brother Benson had promised me and others that, if given a chance, he would get all matters fixed up. That he has not done; but they are growing worse, as these letters will show, and for that reason I cannot any longer recommend him, or the school as a sound institution, to my brethren.

We, the undersigned, do come to our brethren, begging that you listen to our plea, read these letters and help us to have in Arkansas an institution that is free from false theories and tendencies herein discussed. The future of our state will be molded by the influence of the school. We deserve to have a school above suspicion, and these letters from them and their own students speak a language that none of us can question, it seems to me.

Is Harding College Sound?-Let Brother Benson Answer
In Public Discussion

“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 scripture for my faith that finally the Kingdom of Heaven, the Church, that was established on the earth on the first Pentecost after the resurrection of our Lord, will possess the earth are these: Dan. 2, and 1 Cor. 15:24-29. If we are right in saying that this second chapter of Daniel refers to the establishing of the kingdom, and if the stone “cut without hands” was the kingdom in prophecy and promise, then its obliterating of the image which represents four great earthly powers, and becoming a great mountain filling the whole earth, could mean nothing else but that this kingdom is destined to fill the whole earth.

“Then, the other passage says Christ must reign until he has abolished all rule, etc., till he hath put all his enemies under his feet. If Christ does this, and Paul says Christ must reign till this is done, then when it is accomplished there can be no authority on the earth but Christ's. Thus he will have conquered the whole earth, and re-established the Divine authority over the whole earth. Then he will deliver the kingdom up to the Father according to Paul’s teaching. If my position should agree with premillennium, I rejoice that they do preach truth at that point.

“All we need to do is to settle in our own minds whether the prophecy about the stone cut out of the mountain represents the kingdom established on Pentecost. This done we have to believe, that this kingdom will one day fill the whole earth.

“Again, if Christ must reign till he hath put all his enemies under his feet and his reign is on earth then there will come a time when there will not be one enemy of God and Christ left on the earth, and this is in the life time of Christ's present reign.”

Signed,
J. N. Armstrong,

Now what do we have?
1. The gospel will not make them subject to Christ.
2. Christ, at His second coming, will do this with the sword proceeding from his mouth.
3. He is going to conquer the earth.
4. The Kingdom is going to possess the earth.
5. He is going to re-establish the Divine Authority over the whole earth.
6. There will be no authority on earth but Christ's.
7. So complete is this conquering that not one enemy of God and of Christ will be left on the earth.
8. This is all to happen during the life time of Christ's present reign.
9. This is with His present kingdom and during his present reign.

10. Then he will deliver up the kingdom to the Father.

Christ Will Conquer By Physically Billing People On Earth

The following questions were asked by Judson Woodbridge, of Ft. Smith, and answered by Brother Armstrong. This letter is dated Dec. 6, 1938, sent by Brother Woodbridge.

"In the letter you wrote to me, you stated that Christ must reign until all his enemies are destroyed. You also stated that there would be rebellious people upon the earth, that he would slay by the sword from his mouth. There are two or three things I would like to ask for correct understanding."

Questions

1. "Is that sword of the mouth to be used before he comes to judge, or at that time?"
2. "How long will it take Christ when he comes the second time to slay his enemies?"
3. "Is the conquering of the last enemy to be at the last day when he comes in the clouds or before that time?"

Brother Armstrong's Answer

No. 1. "Your letter has just been received. I hasten to reply. Your first question asks, When will the sword be used? I would not even know that there would be a sword proceeding from his mouth, except that the Holy Spirit had said so in this one passage. So far as I know there is not another reference to it anywhere in the Bible. So all I know about it is in this passage. From the passage it appears to me that it proceeds from his mouth as he returns, followed by the armies which are in heaven. So I will judge he will use it as he comes and as it proceeds from his mouth. In verse 21 of the 19th chapter of Rev., it is said, 'The rest were killed with the sword of him that sat upon the horse, even the sword which came forth out of his mouth; and all the birds were filled with their flesh.' So I have always supposed that he used it as it proceeded from his mouth. However I am not concerned about when he uses it, since he does not make it clearer than this; but I am concerned about the plain declaration of the Holy Spirit to the church that he will smite the nations and will kill with the sword which came forth out of his mouth."

No. 2. "How long will it take Christ when he comes to slay his enemies?"

Answer: To this question I would say: I have no idea as to how long. If there be an intimation in the Revelation of God as to how long, I do not know it."

No. 3. "I also have to say to your third question that I do not know, However, I do know that The last enemy that shall be abolished is death." Hence, as he slays with this sword, death still exists on the earth and men are still dying and their fleshly bodies are being devoured by the birds. So evidently the completion of the abolishing of the last enemy will come after the smiting of the nations and the slaying of the sword-men still live on the earth at that time and are still subject to death, physical death. Now, Judson, these questions are new to me and I never thought upon them before. Of course, I do not know what you have in mind, but I should like to know. I really fail to see why we should be concerned about them."

Comments by E. R. Harper

Now what do we have? In addition to the letter that Christ and his present kingdom under his present reign will conquer the earth, possess it, and re-establish the divine authority over the whole earth, after his second coming and before he delivers it up to God the Father, we now have the following to add to it from the above letter.

1. Here we have the Dean of Bible in Harding College saying, "I am not concerned about whether the Lord uses this killing method before the judgment, or if he comes to the earth a long time beforehand and gets it done. Here is an issue that is dividing churches, and breaking hearts over its effects, and he is not even concerned about it. I do believe that the Dean of Bible should at least become concerned about it. Think this over brethren.

2. He has no idea as to how long it will take the Lord after he comes again to slay his enemies. At this point, I asked Brother Benson to take Brother Armstrong's argument, or statement, and refute R. H. Boll's argument that it will take a thousand years. He said he couldn't. But at this point just what is Brother Armstrong's position on this? Hear him in a letter to B. G. Hope April 29, 1939.

"Dear Brother Hope;
I have your letter written at Lexington, Oklahoma. Twenty years ago or more-yea, it was before the world war, I preached some at Lexington, Oklahoma, and while I never preached on the subject about which you ask in your letter, either at Lexington or anywhere else, I suggest that our memories are too treacherous for us to rely on recollections twenty years old for accuracy. (Brother Hope asked about the thousand years reign.) But when one never preached on a certain subject, he surely knows that. Brother Bland no doubt heard me explain sometime, either in conversation or in answer to a question, 1 Cor. 15:22-29.

"In commenting on the fact the 'Thens' in the passage mean 'Afterwards,' or 'Later,' I often say that the space of time between the Resurrection of the saints and the end could be 'A few hours, or a thousand years, even two thousand years.' This is no doubt what our Brother Bland remembers.

"As we all know the first "Then" has already covered two thousand years, and still the 'Then' goes on. How much the second then may cover none of us know.

Yours sincerely,
J. N. Armstrong."

Now we have it. It may go on for thousands of years. The Lord is coming again. The righteous saints are to be raised and between the resurrection of the righteous saints, and the end, the Lord is here, conquering the earth, possessing the earth, re-establishing the divine authority over the whole earth. He is killing men here on earth, while they live in their flesh, and the birds are eating, devouring their fleshly bodies. It will continue until there will not be one enemy of God and of Christ on earth. It is during his present reign, notice, the letter says, Christ's present reign, and with his kingdom, present kingdom, and it may take even two thousand years, no one knows, for the Lord, here on earth, after the resurrection of the saints and before the end to subdue His enemies. If this is not the materialistic reign of premillennialism, then I admit that I am too dumb to catch on. Let Brother Benson now write another Bulletin and show, with this in it, how sound they are, and how we have misunderstood them and misrepresented them.

3. Here he says that the Lord is going to do his slaying while men are living and dying in the flesh. That the birds are going to destroy their fleshly bodies after they have been killed. Can you imagine that the Lord will come to this earth and while we are living and dying in the flesh, and that before the end of time, he will be going over the country killing men and letting the birds eat their fleshly bodies?
He says this will happen after the resurrection of the saints. Well, upon force may be the position of the two resurrections. Those whom he will kill he comes to the earth, and after the resurrection of the saints, must also be raised. They are wicked men. So he has the Premillennial theory to a dot.

(1) Christ’s coming-then there may be a 1,000 or 2,000 years-then the end.

11. If his position should agree with “premillennium,” he rejoices that they preach the truth at that point.

If this is not an earthly, materialistic reign of the Lord, how would you go about making one? After the Lord comes, and before he delivers the kingdom up to the Father, He conquers the earth with the sword; the kingdom possesses the earth; he re-establishes the divine authority over the whole earth; there is no authority on earth but Christ’s, not an enemy of his is left on the earth, and it is during his present reign and Kingdom. So he will be reigning in his present kingdom, and with it, after his second coming, and will conquer the earth and overthrow and subdue the nations of this earth before he delivers it to the Father. Let R. H. Boll beat this for the Lord’s being on earth with his kingdom! If the Lord is not reigning on earth during this time, let them tell me who is? Brother Armstrong is a premillennialist, if I know what that term means.

(2) Resurrection of the saints-after which there may be 2,000 years-then the end.

(3) The wicked are killed while they are here-1,000 or 2,000 years may take place before it is accomplished—these wicked he has slain must be raised-so the final resurrection of the wicked at the close of this space of time, may be 2,000 years.

(4) During this period between his second coming and the end he is reigning with his present kingdom, conquering, possessing the earth, establishing his authority on the earth by killing his enemies.

(5) Between the resurrection of the saints and that of the wicked he has slain, there is a space of time, maybe 1,000 years, maybe 2,000.

(6) Let Brother Armstrong and Brother Benson tell us how they can train young preachers to meet Rutherford, Norris, or Boll. If he teaches against these things he violates his conscience. If he does not teach them, but teaches what he believes on them, he is a Premillennialist, and if he will do nothing about it we do not need him nor them.

BROTHER ARMSTRONG DEFENDS BOLLISM — CHALLENGES AND OFFERS TO DEBATE

In a letter to Judson Woodbridge, minister of Church of Christ at Ft. Smith, Arkansas, dated May 18, 1939, Brother Armstrong says:

“Will you point out to me the specific thing or things in ‘Bollism’ that are destructive of the word of God and that hinder one from obedience to Christ and that you believe would condemn a soul at the judgment of God? As to my ‘attitude’ and my ‘position,’ I stand ready to defend them any day or in any meeting, if given a chance. I am as conscientious in them as any of you dare to be in your own. I firmly believe that you men are unscriptural and unchristian in your method of dealing with ‘Bollism,’ whatever it may be. I believe your method is division, destructive of the New Testament unity and of the peace and harmony of God’s children.”

In a letter dated June 7, 1939, to Judson Woodbridge, Brother Armstrong says:

“Will you please answer question number ‘5’ in my letter of May 17th? You need not make the claim that Boll has ‘pushed’ his errors to the dividing of churches.

I heard this kind of tune twenty-five years by Daniel Sommer concerning Bible Colleges. He made all the disturbances over that question for twenty-five years that has ever been made, but tried to lay it on us. I believe with you that one that causes division contrary to the teaching of Christ should be dealt with. So I want to know what Boll teaches that keeps men from obeying God and that is destructive to the gospel? In other words, wherein have the churches in which those men move freely, and have for twenty years, been lead astray? Wherein have their practices and worship been corrupted? Name some destruction wrought, some disobedience caused, from the teachings of Boll on the millennium and those kindred subjects. This is my question.”

Comments By E. R. Harper

Now brethren, Brother Armstrong is demanding that we show him wherein Bollism is destructive to the gospel and is ready to meet us and defend his position on it. What is his position? Here it is: Boll is not to blame for our trouble. Those who have opposed him are the cause of the division and should be dealt with. There is nothing destructive to the gospel in the teachings of Premillennialism. We are unscriptural and unchristian in our opposition to Boll. We are divisive and destructive of New Testament unity, not them. He says the Lord is coming with a sword; after his second coming he will kill the people in their flesh and the birds will eat, or devour their fleshly bodies; he will possess the earth; he will conquer the earth; no authority but his own will exist on this earth; all this will be done during his present reign with his present kingdom, when, Christ comes to earth and establishes his reign on earth with physical force and death to conquer his enemies. It changes the nature of Christ’s spiritual kingdom to a material kingdom, using force to conquer his enemies. All of this is to be after his second coming, after the resurrection of the saints, before the end, and before the delivering of the kingdom up to the Father.

No wonder he does not think there is anything destructive to the gospel in what Boll teaches. He believes, in principle, all that Boll teaches. They differ as to when it began but so do Boll, Bogard, Norris, and Rutherford, but they all believe that Christ is coming back to possess the earth and establish His divine rule over it, for one thousand years, and Brother Armstrong says, “Boys, you are wrong there-it may be two thousand, and then it may be just started!” His position is the most dangerous of them all.

Brother Benson and Brother Sears need to bring out another Bulletin and put in it Brother Armstrong’s real position on the points of issue, and then try to show that there is no danger in them, instead of trying to cover up where they know the points are most obscure and not outstanding. They have not been fair because they have known his position all the time; we have pointed these things out in meetings in which they have been present. Let them come clean with the brotherhood and correct this situation, and then we will be behind them.

LETTERS THAT SPEAR VOLUMES

Here are letters from men who have attended Harding College under Brother Armstrong, and Brother Rhodes, and others.

“In a discussion of Matt. 5:5 at Harding College in ’33 Brother Armstrong was discussing the meek inheriting the earth. I had never heard of or known of Premillennialism, but my folks had been reared in the church of Christ, and when he began the discussion of this verse, it attracted my attention; when he suggested that the saints would inherit the earth. I asked him if he meant that we would come back here and inherit this earth. I told him
that I thought we would be caught up with the Lord in the air. At this point he went to Dan. 2:44, where this kingdom of the Lord was to be broken in pieces the kingdoms of the world and fill the earth. I never just exactly then understood his position, but I got from his teaching there, and his connecting it with Dan. 2:44, that the church or kingdom was to rule this earth at this coming. He also brought in this connection that passage in Rev. 11:15 where it says, "The kingdoms of this world are become the kingdoms of our Lord and his Christ; and they shall reign for ever and ever." Showing that at his coming the Lord was to rule this earth with his saints possessing it. It looked to me like then that it was teaching something other than the truth, thus I asked the questions on it and entered into the discussion of it. This is Premillennialism. I did not then know about that doctrine, hence, never thought of its being Premillennialism. Now I see that it was."  

"R. B. Young, Lexington, Oklahoma."

Here is a letter from Brother C. C. Burns of Florence Alabama written June 13, 1939.  

"I attended Harding College in the summer of 1930. Of course, that was in Morilton before the school moved to its present location. While in school there that summer I attended a Bible class taught by Brother B. F. Rhodes. We studied the book of Luke. When we came to the 21st chapter, and the 24th verse, Brother Rhodes expressed very freely and emphatically his views as to the meaning of the verse. At that time I had not heard much about the theory that R. H. Boll and his followers are now teaching the brotherhood with. It was practically new to me. But when I heard Brother Rhodes' explanation of Luke 21:24, I knew that such was certainly foreign to the teaching of the New Testament. In explaining or attempting to explain the expression 'And Jerusalem shall be trodden down of the Gentiles until the time of the Gentiles be fulfilled,' the following is in substance, what Brother Rhodes had to say: That Jerusalem is now being trodden down by the Gentiles and such will continue until Christ comes to the earth again. Then the times of the Gentiles will be fulfilled. Christ will take the Jew to the Holy City, and then reign in that city, and all Gentiles will be subject to the reign of Christ, as He reigns over all the Gentiles of the earth.

"As I have said, I had not then heard much about this theory and I questioned Brother Rhodes' statement. I asked him to give me an example of just what he meant or was trying to say. He said that the Bible teaches what he had just said, and that plainly; that when Christ comes to the earth again a Jewish family will be living next door to the Gentile family, on the same street. Neither Jew nor Gentile has obeyed the gospel of Christ. The Lord will take the Jew to Jerusalem with him and from that city will hold sway over the earth. Then I quoted Paul's statement concerning the abolition of the Jewish and Gentile bonds, as a nation, the statement found in Gal. 3:28, 'There is neither Jew nor Greek, there is neither bond nor free, there is neither male nor female, for ye are all one in Christ Jesus.' When I quoted that, I knew that something was vitally wrong with Brother Rhodes. His behavior seemed to betray him some way. He threw his hands into the air and with loud voice and much enthusiasm began to shout that what I had quoted was not relative in any way to the subject matter under consideration. I thought it was very closely related, and told him so. But the more I contended it was, the more he declared it was not.

"Our discussion continued along this line for the full class period and when we left the class to go to lunch he continued to try to show me that his theory was true. "I remember, too, hearing Brother Rhodes praise R. H. Boll very highly. Mr. Boll had just held a meeting somewhere near Morilton, or possibly it was in Dallas, and Brother Rhodes praised him in the highest and said something about Boll being the greatest man of the brotherhood since the days of McCarvey.

"Such is the extent of my personal knowledge as to this theory being taught in Harding College. But after hearing what I did there in the class room it isn't difficult for me to believe some other reports concerning the school's stand on the theory.

"Brother Harper, I have not attempted to quote Brother Rhodes but just to give the substance of what he taught in class."

"Fraternally,

C. C. Burns, minister of Church of Christ, Sherrod Avenue, Florence, Alabama."

In Brother Hope's letter you will notice that he quotes Brother Benson as saying that Brother Rhodes said "Boll might prove to be right in the end." Just before school was out, one of the young preachers from Harding came to see me about that "Monday night meeting," in which Brother Rhodes tried to answer the boys after they had spoken against "Bollism." He said, "Brother Harper, Brother Rhodes made a laughing stock out of us. He defended Boll's teaching all the way through. He said that one time he (Rhodes) preached like we were then, but that he learned better and that as we get older we would learn better. After the meeting was over and I went on the outside and there he argued with me that Boll tried to harmonize his theory with the Bible, but we did not." This young man said, "Brother Benson told him not to answer us but he (Rhodes) took up each Scriptural reference we used and did his best to refute them all."

I know that Brother Benson told Brother Rhodes not to answer the boys, for I asked him, at that Ft. Smith Meeting, if he didn't tell Brother Rhodes not answer the boys, and he said he did. I asked him why? He said that under the circumstances he thought it not best. I asked him if he couldn't keep these fellows from doing such things when he asked them. He said, "I didn't." To which I replied, "If I were President of a school and my teachers would not listen to me under such circumstances I would get me another teacher."

This young man said Brother Benson called them into his room and promised them if they would say nothing about this meeting (for it would hurt the school), he would promise they should have another meeting to discuss this issue, and that he would give them his word that neither Brother Armstrong nor Brother Rhodes would try to answer them. Brother Benson admitted this promise at the Ft. Smith meeting. If they both are sound as his circulars say why this promise to keep them quiet?"

These letters from the Bookkeeper at Harding in the Early Thirties

"Mr. E. R. Harper,
Little Rock, Ark.

"Dear Brother Harper:"

"Please pardon delay in replying to your card which I received four days ago.

"In order to make this matter clear and avoid possible misunderstandings and misrepresentations, I beg your indulgence in a rather lengthy and somewhat tedious explanation of that which I remember to have been the situation at Harding during my stay there with regard to Bollism.

"When I entered the school, June 1930, I had never heard of the school's sympathy with the Boll Doctrine. During the summer of 1930, a brother from Alabama, who was attending Summer School, came to me and seemed
very much disturbed because of what he considered tendencies toward Bollism in Brother Roll’s, or Brother Rhodes’ classes. I am not quite certain which class.

“The occasion to which you refer was about as follows: We were considering an invitation to Mother Boil to deliver the Baccalaureate Sermon. There was objection raised by some member of the Committee. A discussion followed in which Brother Armstrong and others thought it unwise to have Brother Boll. Brother Rhodes said he was willing to be the only one to know how he stood and that so far as he was concerned he favored having Brother Boll to deliver the address. He never did declare himself to be in full accord with Brother Boll but I got the impression that he was. I cannot recall the exact words of any one but I remember very distinctly that none of the older teachers ever expressed themselves as being opposed to the teaching of Boll…. I wish to state that I hold Brother Armstrong in very high esteem and I believe his attitude toward Bollism to be one of neutrality…."

“Fraternally yours,
F. H. Dunn.”

In November of 1936, in my study at Fourth and State, took place a conversation in which, if I remember correctly, were present Brother Brewer, one of our elders, and Brother Yater Tant, now of Denver. In this meeting I told Brother Benson of a letter I had from Brother Hope, stating that Benson held to some Premillennial views, all of which he denied very bitterly. I did not find the letter just then but wrote him about it the next day. Here is a part of that letter:

“I must say that you will find the longer you are back home in this “mess,” (I do not mean in school, I mean this part of that letter: the more you will see and know that certain phrases and expressions have been used by that crowd of Kingdom advocates and sympathizers, until one in your position will have to be very careful lest he be badly misunderstood. It may be that it should not be that way but it is nevertheless.

“Now as to the letter I have from Brother Hope, since he gave to you my card, I am giving you his letter word for word, feeling that he will not object. The letter:

“I have been opposing Harding College because I felt that at least phases of “Bollism” were taught. On October 12 I had a conference with Brother Benson here at Paragould. From this conversation I find that he opposes the literal reign of Christ on earth, however, he had no hesitancy in stating that the devil was not bound now and would not be until the millennium sometime in the future. I have a letter mailed after he returned to Searcy arguing the above. I have believed and taught that the devil is bound and that to teach that he was not would be a phase of “Bollism.” Am I right? Is the above position of Brother Benson’s safe?”

B. G. Hope

Here is another letter from Brother Hope regarding the letter and correspondence and conversations with Brother Benson.

“Dear Brother Harper:

I was glad to hear from you and I appreciate the things you said. I have been fighting for the truth and expect to continue. Brother Benson is just now realizing what “Bollism” means. I think his eyes are being opened. I am sure that I understood him correctly the first time (the time of the other letters) I talked with him but I am glad to see him change. I have witnesses as to what was said in that first conversation. I am willing now to stand by Benson if he will clean things up. Neither do I appreciate those who have always apologized for Boll.”

B. G. Hope

Now to show that Brother Benson did believe that the devil was not bound and would not be until “the millennium,” I give a letter signed by him and Brother Hope. The Letter:

“Dear Brother Harper:

B. G. Hope
George S. Benson.

Now, after this statement, and some things that Brother Benson has said and done, we were getting behind him personally and I have been recommending him as trying to do something about this matter. But in a recent radio lecture (for which lecture I helped Brother Benson to get his crowd by announcing it several times over my program, by his request that I help him) he says: “I do not believe a single one of these Premillennial views and there is no teacher at Harding College who teaches or ever has taught a single one of these views.”

Now, as a matter of fact, we heard him in that meeting at Ft. Smith, after this lecture was written, admit that he one time believed them and so stated in Harding College in his history class, before he went to China. In 1936, he comes back as President of Harding, at Searcy, and admits that he did believe that the “devil was not bound and would not be until the millennium some time in the future.” (still holding to one of the main phases of Bollism the binding and loosing of the devil in the millennium.)

Now if Brother Benson is sound and has changed his mind about these things let him admit the truth of all this, and clear it all up with the brotherhood, and we will be for him.

What is their object? Here it is. They are scattering circulars all over the brotherhood saying that they have been misrepresented; that they have always been all right; and they are doing this for the purpose of making it appear to the brotherhood that those of us who will not give them a clean sheet of commendation are refusing it without a just cause. We now have definite proof from them that they have been, and some are today in error about many things. Brother Armstrong’s own letters show that he right now holds to the theory in his own making.

Here are letters stating that Brother Rhodes taught it and argued in his classes; did not care who knew that he was for Boll’s coming to Harding; and now here are these letters from Brethren Hope and Benson showing that Benson was all mixed up on the thing after he came back from China as President of the college.

If no one had fought against such tendencies, what might have happened in Harding, when they have fought all who defend the truth and oppose Boll; when they have defended Boll; and believe the Lord with His kingdom is
going to conquer, possess, and subdue the earth by killing men while in the flesh; and that it may be 1,999 or 2,900 Years between the second coming of the Lord and the end?

Brethren, think it over and say what you think.

STATEMENTS FROM PRESIDENT OF BOARD, PREACHERS AND EX-STUDENTS

The letter below is from Clem Z. Poole who is President of the Board of Trustees of the school. It is an answer to certain questions I asked him. They are good.

Also, I am giving the names of those who have written me and said they were behind this issue, as it is. Nearly all the men at the meeting have either told me or written me that this needs to be done and they are back of it, except Brethren Benson, Sears, H. H. Dawson, and T. H. Sherrell, all of Searcy and of the school.

A Joint Statement

"Since the blame is placed upon some two or three in Arkansas for all the trouble with Harding; and since there is being put forth a strong effort to make it appear that nothing is wrong at Haram and never has been; and since the purpose of all this seems to be to ruin the influence of some men in Arkansas and the brotherhood who have been pleading for a sound school at Harding; and since the report is going around that some are just jealous and envious and want to become president of the school, especially are they saying that about E. R. Harper, of Little Rock; we, the undersigned, are sending all this material to the paper that the public may know the truth as to why we the preachers of Arkansas are not behind Harding College. We wish to be behind it and have offered everything that is fair, and have worked for it until we can no longer carry on with them, until they lift the doubt from the school and place it to where we will not have to always be apologizing for our position. We are true to the Book, and do not uphold Boll in his errors that have divided the church. We feel that he is the aggressor, and that he has caused the trouble contrary to the truth of the Bible, and has continued to teach his heresies to the sorrow of the church, and we hereby declare ourselves as one in the defense of the truth and in opposition to Bollism."

George B. Curtis, Morrilton, Arkansas.

Harbert D. Hooker, Springdale, Arkansas.

Douglas Perkins, North Little Rock, Arkansas.

Cleon Lyles, Muskogee, Oklahoma.

B. G. Hope, Paragould, Arkansas. Student of Harding.

R. B. Young, Lexington, Arkansas. Student of Harding.

(not present in the meeting)

C. C. Burns, Florence, Alabama. Student of Harding.

(Ted McElroy, Bentonville, Arkansas. Student of Harding.)

Clem Z. Poole, Austin, Arkansas, President of Harding Board.

Judson Woodbridge, Ft. Smith, Arkansas. (To whom many of the letters which appear in this issue are written, also a student of Harding at Harper, Kansas).

James H. Brewer, Little Rock, Arkansas.

Malcolm Bowen, Lexington, Oklahoma.

There can be no mistake as to the unity of those who were there, V. E. Howard, Greenville, Texas, (then of Conway, Arkansas); Frank Puckett, of Jonesboro, Arkansas; Brother Case, an elder in the church at Muskogee, Oklahoma; J. H. Martin, of Morrilton, Arkansas; only one of whom I have consulted about this article. I leave it to them to discuss it, and am not afraid.

At The Fort Smith Meeting

"Dear Brother Harper:

"I knew nothing about the Fort Smith meeting until the Saturday before it happened on Monday. Harbert Hooker called me stating such a meeting was being held and I was invited to be there. I believed it was for the good of the cause, so went.

I learned more in that meeting about Harding College teachers than I knew before. From that meeting both Brother Case, an elder who was with me, and I were forced to conclude that the staff, as a whole, believe Bollism, and that Brother Armstrong and other teachers have misrepresented their stand. Also, Brethren Benson and Sears stated they would not want Brother Armstrong to know about the meeting, etc. It was decided that they would see what they could do about getting some one to take Brother Armstrong's place as Dean of Bible. Preachers present in the meeting promised to raise the money to pay this new teacher. The qualification the new teacher must possess is that of being able and willing to speak out against Bollism."

Cleon Lyles, Muskogee, Okla., July 24, 1939

I have asked all whose names appear in this issue if they knew of any trick behind that Ft. Smith meeting and not one of them knew of anything, and each of them deny bitterly that he with any one 'Sat Behind Closed Doors' to decide on any plans in that meeting. We asked for it to be on Thursday that we might get all the preachers there who were interested in coming; but Brother Benson made it Monday or not at all. So we had from Saturday night until Monday to contact what we could, otherwise all the preachers in the state would have been invited. Many of them were called, but we could not contact them. Others could not come who were called, and others could hardly get there by one o'clock Monday. We explain this one point that it may be known that it was not a "Hand Picked Bunch" who were known to be against the school. Out of the twenty-odd there, eleven of them were Harding students; six of them had never attended a Christian school; one I do not know about; the other three that I recall being there represented three other religious schools. So it cannot be said that it was "stacked against them." I want this to stand out.

President Of Harding College Board Speaks

Dear Brother Harper:

In reply to your letter of July 7, I will answer the questions in order as briefly as I can to be clear.

First Question: "Did you together with me or with any one else 'sit behind closed doors, in somebody's committee room' and lay plans to get rid of Brother Armstrong or any one else from Harding College? Brother Armstrong has so accused in a letter?"

Answer: "I did not sit in any one's room or any place to plan the removal of any one from Harding College."

Second Question: "Did you with me or with any one else lay out a program that should be executed at said meeting in Ft. Smith?"

Answer: "I did not know of any program to be carried out at Ft. Smith meeting."

Third Question: "Was it not your understanding that we were all going to this meeting at Ft. Smith (April 17, 1939 to see if it were possible for the preachers of the state and the teachers of the College to get together for the good of the school, the plan to be worked out after we got there?"

Answer: "Knowing nothing of the meeting until a few
hours before it was held, I supposed that it was “a get-together meeting,” for the interest of Harding College?

Fourth Question: “Having known me as well or maybe better than nearly any one else in the state, have you ever heard me say at any time that I desired any connection with the school, from the President’s position, up or down? Have I ever told you that I was going to be president of Harding College, or that I was going to put Brother Benson out that I might take his place?”

Answer: “I have been closely connected with you since you came from Tennessee, but have never heard you even hint that you desired any kind of connection with Harding College or desired the removal of Brother Benson.”

Fifth Question: “Have you ever heard me say that I was going to get rid of Brother Armstrong to get his place? Have you ever heard me hint at such a thing in all your life? (You have known me since I was a boy, and have been closely associated with me in our work at Little Rock, coming to North Little Rock by my suggestion.)”

Answer: “No suggestion has ever been made to me that you wanted to get rid of Brother Armstrong that you might get his place.”

Sixth Question: “Was this understood by you to be a trick upon the part of any one? Did it not seem to you like an open affair with every man discussing fully what he thought? Is this what you would call a trick?”

Answer: “I did not understand there was a trick, but all together were to discuss fully whatever issues that should arise. Certainly I knew of no trick.”

Seventh Question: “Do you understand that no one questioned Brother Armstrong’s position before my coming to Little Rock? Do you and did you understand at that meeting, or before that meeting, that I am the man who has been responsible for the report that Brother Armstrong is ‘not sound and has lost the confidence of a great part of the brotherhood?’ Has that report come to you from me, or did it come from every source that spake at Ft. Smith at that meeting? Do you consider, as President of the Board of Harding College, that I am responsible for the report that Brother Armstrong has lost the confidence of the brotherhood, or is it his own teachings and his own writings? Be plain with me. He has charged that I am the one guilty.”

Answer: “Around 1928 or 1929, I heard it rumored that Brother Armstrong was not sound. Early in 1929 while I was preaching at 12th and Thayer Church of Christ, in Little Rock, and a student at Harding College, I invited J. S. Warlick, who was holding a meeting for the church there, to visit the school. He told me that ‘Armstrong is a Bollite,’ so he refused to visit the college. Those who spoke at Ft. Smith said that the brotherhood over the state had lost confidence in Brother Armstrong. Brother Harper, you are not responsible for this report.”

Eighth Question: “As President of the Board, and being present at the meeting at Ft. Smith, do you remember any facts that were refused in that meeting? It is charged by Brother Armstrong that we would not allow certain facts to be presented and utterly disregarded facts they had, which if presented, would have defeated our arguments. This is the force of his letter. I thought we were there from 2:00 until 9:30 that night, and that they had the floor for hours, and presented all the facts they had. Is that your understanding of the meeting? Did the school have arguments that they did not present? I want to know.”

Answer: “I do not know of any one who was not allowed to present any evidence he might have. The meeting was from early afternoon until near 10:00 P.M. All had all the time he desired to present evidence. I know of no one being hindered from saying whatever he wanted to say or to present any facts.”

Ninth Question: “In a letter Brother Armstrong says, ‘Surety-you do not think that nobody but Poole knew he was going to make his demand. That thing was all gone over in somebody’s committee room behind closed doors.’ Now Brother Poole, is this true? So far as my part of it win you, I know it is not true, and I do not believe that you planned it with any one else; but since the charge is made against you, I want you to have the opportunity of answering for yourself.”

Answer: “I know nothing of any Committee behind closed doors, or anywhere else going over this matter. I do not think it was done. I did not know that I would make the demand until I saw the brotherhood over the state had lost confidence in Brother Armstrong. The ex-students present were all condemning his position (except T. H. Sherrell, the preacher for the church in Searcy, and a student then in Harding College, Brother Benson, President of the School, and Dean Sears, who is Dean of the College). I made the ‘Demand’ only in the interest of the school and Christian harmony. I made the plea that I did not want Brother Armstrong to be thrown out, but provided for properly for his long service in Christian schools. The church of our Lord is too valuable, and Harding College is worth too much for one man to hinder the progress of either. I further stated that it is better to sacrifice one man that the church may prosper and maintain its unity, and the school go along as a great factor for good, than to hold the man, and as a result both institutions lose their influence. I love Brother Armstrong, but I also love the college and the truth.”

Tenth Question: “Brother Armstrong says, E. R. Harper is stirring up trouble in a state in which if there be one man, woman, or child in the whole state that espouses Bollism, whatever that may mean, or believes it no one among us knows it.’ Do you think I am the cause of this strife in Arkansas? Was there any trouble in his classes, or criticism, branding of Bollism, and lack of confidence, in the state before I came here? He says, ‘He is to be held responsible for any discord, strife, and division that he causes over it by trying to force his judgment on a brotherhood and in doing it violates a most sacred principle of the Christian Religion.’ Now, do you think I am the man who caused Brother Armstrong’s trouble and the criticism in the state? Was it here before I came? Did I not inherit a work in a state torn with strife and discord over the school? Was this trouble not already in the state and school before I came to Arkansas? I want the truth just as you see it. Do you think I have done wrong in fighting for the truth as I have in our home state? If so, speak frankly.”

Answer: “The first part of this question is answered in No. 7. (Turn and re-read No. 7 and it will show there was trouble long before E. R. Harper came to Little Rock). “No one does wrong in pointing out error or raising his voice against it.”

Eleventh Question: “Do you believe that R. H. Boll is responsible for the trouble in the church, or are we who oppose his errors of Russelism to blame? Brother Armstrong says in a letter of June 7, 1939, ‘Will you please answer number 5 in my letter of May 18?’ You need not make the claim that Boll has ‘pushed’ his errors to the dividing of the churches. I heard this kind of tune for twenty five years by Daniel Sommer concerning Bible Colleges. He made all the disturbance over that question for twenty five years that was ever made, but tried to lay it...
on us. I believe with you that one that causes division contrary to the teachings of Christ should be dealt with. So I want to know what Boll teaches that keeps one from obeying God and that is destructive to the gospel? In other words, wherein have the churches in which these men move freely, and have for twenty years, been lead astray? Now, Brother Poole, what I want to know is, Do you think this is sound, and that a man with such teaching as that should be retained as head of Bible in our college? Do you consider the above sound and true to the church you and I love? If not, will you answer these from your heart for me?

Answer: "I believe that R. H. Boll is the cause of the trouble we now have. Certainly, those who oppose this error are not responsible for the trouble. I say remove the cause and no trouble will exist. Brother Blansett, of Dallas, 'pushed' this error to the dividing of the church, and certainly he is to blame for it. Those who hold such liberal ideas should not be placed in positions to teach our youth."

Twelfth Question: "Did I understand you correctly to say, at Ft. Smith, that Brother Armstrong said in one of your classes that (1 Cor. 15:24) "Then cometh the end" meant that after Christ's coming to earth it might be 1,000 or 2,000 years before delivering the kingdom to God the Father, for the word "then" in that verse meant a period of time? Is not this the heart of all Premillennial teaching?"

Answer: "Just as class closed, I asked Brother Armstrong, would not Christ rule until the last enemy, death, should be destroyed, then deliver the kingdom back to God? to which he replied, "then" was a period of time which might be a few minutes, or a thousand years or it might be two thousand years. Brother Gilbert Copeland also heard this statement."

Thirteenth Question: "Did I understand you correctly when you said in the meeting at Ft. Smith, 'Brother Benson I have withheld things that I should have told just because you promised me that you would get this all fixed up, if we would give you time; but instead of its getting better it is getting worse. There are places in my own home county where I can't preach because of my connections with the school.' Then, following that, you gave your reasons for believing that Brother Armstrong was not sound because of your argument with him over 1 Cor. 15:20-29."

Answer: "This is as nearly correct as could be stated."

Fourteenth Question: "Is it not a fact that in your own congregation where you are an elder, and for which you have preached for years, you all refuse to have the boys from Harding College because you have trouble with them. Did I understand you correctly in this?"

Answer: "The reason for not having the boys from Harding was their utter disregard for the Elders, which caused division." (This is not to be meant for all of them, but for those who came to Austin. E. R. H.)

Fifteenth Question: "What did you think of Benson's admitting that he one time believed the theory and of his having believed and defended demons being cast out by an Adventist preacher (He says it was a Holiness preacher) in China and that we could perform miracles, and when I asked him if he could do it like the Holiness he said, 'I do not claim that I can do it, but I do not limit the power of God.' That is the argument of all Holiness I ever did know. I want to know just what you think of a man like that being head of our school? Write me at once please."

Answer: "I did not understand the question, and only remember Brother Benson saying something about 'we do not limit the power of God.' Now to give a brief review: About 9:30 or 10:00 o'clock Saturday before the meeting on Monday, Brother Harper phoned to me that there was to be a meeting at Ft. Smith with Brother Benson and others of the school and some preachers over the state, concerning the school. Until this time I knew nothing of the meeting: no plans were discussed and no proposed program was planned, suggested or discussed, before the meeting was called to order by Brother Woodbridge. After about six or seven brethren had spoken, condemning Brother Armstrong I made the "Demands" and "Plea" as stated above. Submitted in love, Your Brother in Christ, Clem Z. Poole, President of Board of Harding College.

IS E. R. HARPER SEEKING TO BE DICTATOR OF ARKANSAS?

E. R. Harper is a native of Arkansas and I have heard him say many times that he is proud of it. He received the most of his education out of the state, and up until about six years ago, he did most of his preaching out of the state. Since then he has been minister of the church at Fourth and State Streets in Little Rock. Shortly after he came there, he was instrumental in beginning a daily broadcast over radio station KARK. This broadcast has continued until the present time. He has used every means possible to promote New Testament Christianity, but as a result he has been accused recently of desiring to be the "dictator" of the churches in Arkansas. I think I know Brother Harper about as well as any one in the state, and I am positive that he is free from a dictatorial attitude. This accusation originated in the mind of an enemy and is being fostered by his critics. This accusation with other things has come as a result of his condemning all kinds of error. Inasmuch as he has not been in full sympathy with the policy of Harding college, some have accused him of wanting to be president of the school.

A dictator dictates. Most people resent being dictated to. At least the preachers of the state would rebel against such an attitude. With the exception of those in the state whose soundness has been questioned or whose policy toward those who are unsound has been questioned, the preachers are one hundred percent with Brother Harper. Most all the preachers in the state have been invited to have a part in the broadcast there, and I do not believe that Brother Harper has ever outlined to any of them what he wants said. That can't be said about some of the preachers who are of the "sweet spirit" type. I have preached for him a number of times and he has refused to even make suggestions to me. Does that sound like he is seeking to be dictator of Arkansas? Again, why would he desire the presidency of Harding College? If he desires prestige, his present position will give him more: if he desires money Harding offers nothing comparable to his present place; if he is honestly seeking a place where he can do the most good, could he have a greater opportunity at Harding than where he touches thousands of lives by radio and then preaches to thousands on his evangelistic tours? The answer is, no. All Brother Harper has tried to do is to keep the church in Arkansas free from all error and to preach the gospel, just as it is written. The church needs more men like Harper, and all these false accusations cannot lessen his influence where he is really known. Every person who has either originated or fostered and has for any reason failed to apologize for it, Harper, we are for you. Go on with the fight. Some of us will fight by your side. B. G. Hope.
GEO. B. CURTIS ON THE FORT SMITH MEETING

Quite a lot has been said about a meeting that was held in Ft. Smith, Arkansas, during the Spring of this year in which some problems growing out of Harding College policies were discussed. I happened to be a spectator, and mildly a participant, in the meeting. My conviction then and now was that the meeting was for the good of Harding College. I have spent the major portion of my life in the school rooms of Arkansas and Texas, twenty-five years, and am a friend of education with particular stress on Christian education. Yet, the stigma attached to Harding College is such that I have preferred to send my children to state schools, with all their dangers and imperfections, than to expose them to the softness, sectarian attitude and Boll sympathy that is so manifestly a part of the structure of the college at Searcy, Arkansas.

I took rather lengthy notes on the meeting but am writing this article away from my notes while in a meeting at Carthage, Mo., but the things noted here are as they occurred as nearly as it is possible for human memory to report them.

Brother Woodbridge called the meeting to order and acted as chairman throughout the day. The meeting was entirely orderly and those taking part discussed all matters ireely without, seemingly, heat or partisanship. I was pleased with the general tenor of things and hoped that much good to the school would come of the things discussed. The college was represented by its president, Geo. S. Benson; its dean, Brother Sears; two members of the board, Herbert Dawson and Clem Z. Poole and Brother Sherrill. Among the various others present I recall Brethren J. H. Martin, Morrilton, Ark., H. D. Hooker, Springdale, Ark., Ted McElroy, Bentonville, Ark., B. G. Hope, Paragould, Ark., D. H. Perkins, Little Rock, Ark., V. E. Howard, Conway, Ark., E. R. Harper, Little Rock, Ark., Fayne E. Curtis, Morrilton, Ark., Judson Woodbridge, Ft. Smith, Ark., and Frank Puckett, Jonesboro, Ark., and I. It was the report of all the preachers present not connected in any way with the school that the idea of Bollism, and Boll sympathy was strongly intrenched among the churches of Christ over the state, as being fostered in Harding College.

Correspondence from the pen of Brother Armstrong was read in which the idea that at the coming of Christ the sword of his mouth would put down the enemies of the Lord and that an indefinite period of righteous rule would prevail after his coming, and this to take place here on the earth. Brother Pooles and others said that in Brother Armstrong's classes, he taught that the word "then" in 1 Corinthians 15:24, in its original meaning, demanded a period of time between the second coming of Christ and the end here spoken of. (Note: This was taught freely in his classes in college at Morrilton, and in the public teaching done there in the church. I have had numbers ask me about this word "then" and tell me what Brother Armstrong had to say about it since I have been in Morrilton. Brother Sherrill attempted to show that Brother David Lipscomb and Brother John T. Hinds taught theories closely allied to that of R. H. Boll and J. N. Armstrong relative to the second coming of Christ.

One of the surprises to me of the whole day was Brother Benson's attitude toward miracles. Brother Hope confronted him with the testimony, which Brother Benson did not deny, that he, Benson, believed in the possibility of performing miracles today, and that he cited an example of the casting out of a devil by a Seventh Day Adventist from a Chinese, as proof. He was also confronted with the statement that he, Benson, under the influence of Earl Smith for a time accepted the teaching of Boll. Brother Benson did not deny this. This contradicts all of his bulletins.

The thing of the whole meeting that has caused the greatest amount of adverse criticism from Harding College quarters was the plan suggested for the removal of the taint of Bollism from the college. It was suggested (I believe that Brother Howard mentioned the idea first) that the only thing that would effectively put the college right before the churches, would be to have a man at the head of the Bible department whose position upon the premillennial question was known to be sound. It remained for Brother Clem Z. Poole to make the suggestion that this course be pursued. After much discussion, in which Brother Harper and others urged the wisdom and necessity of caring for Brother Armstrong and consenting to his remaining in the Bible department in the college, under the new Dean of Bible, it was agreed upon by all, including President Benson and Dean Sears, that this was the wise thing to do. The Harding College representatives agreed to do all they could to carry out this plan. I thought that within a short time all of us could point proudly to Harding and recommend it to the young men and women who were ready to enter college. Imagine my surprise when a few days later I learned that the Harding delegation had come by Morrilton and reported to their representative among the elders of the Morrilton congregation that their preacher had been a bad boy by being at Ft. Smith and fighting Harding. I later learned from correspondence that Brother Armstrong had with Brother Woodbridge and from other sources that Benson, Sears, and others of the college delegation denied agreeing to a plan to put a sound man at the head of the Bible department of Harding College. I have learned some things since then about what to expect when you raise your voice for reform in Harding College. I am sorry to say it, but when one gets his training in the only school in which it is said that "fools learn" the school of experience—he knows whereof he speaks. It is my experience that the man who fights for the purification of doctrine at the Searcy college will find himself the victim of every species of cheap politics, down or up. This is evidenced by various bulletins and pronouncements given publicly from officials in the college, contrary to the disclosures of their true convictions in private correspondence on the question of Bollism. You cannot rely upon their bulletins.

For the benefit of those who do not know about the matter, let me say that some of the men who are taking the most active part in the state of Arkansas for the purging of Bollism from the school are Harding College men. We have no finer men than B. G. Hope, V. E. Howard, Clem Z. Poole, President of the Board of Harding College, Judson Woodbridge, E. G. Couch, Geo. W. DeHoff, Ted McElroy and Frank Puckett, all former students of Harding College, and who have the good of the school at heart. I believe they love the school with all the love one usually feels for his alma mater, but they love the truth and the body of the Lord—his church—better. They are fighting against the error and softness that they know to exist in Harding college and are suffering persecutions for it. By voice and by letter more than one "preacher student" of Harding, the past term, condemned Harding's attitude toward Bollism. They were on the carpet for it. I have never found a student from Harding that will assert that Brother Armstrong has ever taught his pupils how to meet the opposition held by R. H. Boll, but all have heard him defend Boll against those who are fighting to keep the church pure in doctrine. Verily, there is an "Ethiopian in the coal bin somewhere." Geo. B. Curtis.
B. G. Hope Tells What Armstrong And Benson Have Believed And Taught

Recently much has been said about Bible Schools. Some have been condemned by various ones who are skeptical of their soundness. At the meeting at Ft. Smith, Arkansas, in April, in the interest of Harding College, it was stated that all the suspicion concerning any teacher teaching or sympathizing with premillennialism had originated in the minds of enemies of the school and without a reason for it. This statement was made after a number of faithful gospel preachers had said that they could not conscientiously support the school.

At the time of the meeting referred to, I was doing the preaching in a series of meetings at Lexington, Oklahoma. Brethren Boll, Wood, Phillips, Smith et. al., have held meetings there. J. D. Bland, one of the elders, is an avowed premillennialist. He seems to be proud of the fact. In discussing matters with him, he told me that Brother Armstrong taught him the first he ever knew about the two resurrections and the reign between them. A number of brethren have heard like expressions from Brother Bland. Brother E. W. Scott, a former elder at Lexington, says the following in a letter dated June 18, 1939: "I have mentioned, I wrote Brother Armstrong regarding his teaching on this subject, for he has always been sound regarding Premillennialism. Most of the things that were said had already been said and, as usual, many words were used to explain the position of Harding College. Personally, I have never questioned the soundness of Brother Sears except as he comes to the defense of those who sympathize with R. H. Boll. "Ye shall know the truth and the truth shall make free." In this letter, Brother Armstrong stated that he remembered that he never preached on the subject that I mentioned - Premillennialism. Well, a man doesn't have to preach on a definite subject to teach some things that are closely related to another. Brother Bland did not say that he took "Premillennialism" for a subject. He says, "Our memories are too treacherous for us to rely on recollections twenty years old for accuracy." If I were to even intimate that Brother Armstrong had taught twenty years ago that man is promised salvation in this age without baptism, he would resent it, I am sure. I am sure that he remembers what he preached before the war on instrumental music. I am wondering why he can't be as accurate today about this question. Do you think Harper, Hardeman, Wallace, will forget in twenty years what they are preaching today concerning premillennialism?

Again he says that he has commented on I Cor. 14:22-20 (this reference should be I Cor. 15:22-23) saying that there is a period of time between the resurrection of the righteous and "the end."

The idea of two resurrections is a phase of the "theory." I do not know whether Brother Bland told the truth or not but he and Brother Armstrong know. But even if Brother Armstrong taught no more than what he has stated in this letter, his teaching along this line is dangerous. It has led Bland to accept the entire theory. A belief in any part of the theory is dangerous.

Brother Benson believed the theory in 1925; in 1936 he stated that the devil was as loose today as he had ever been; that people might be possessed with devils as in the days of Christ, that devils might be cast out in this age; in 1936 he said that Brother B. F. Rhodes said that Boll might prove to be right in the end; in 1937 he told me that he had changed his mind about some of the above things.

In the Ft. Smith meeting some old students said that Brother Armstrong failed to teach them how to meet the theory even when asked about it; another student said that Brother Armstrong stated that his position was about the same as that of Doctor Brents. Now, you can decide from the above information as to the cause of suspicion. These statements have all been made by them, yet when their soundness is questioned, many rise up and cry "Persecution."

Honest men change their minds. Brother Benson has told me that he had changed his mind, but publicly he always leaves the impression that he thinks now as he has always thought. I am ready to support the school when all matters are cleared up and the disposition is manifested by those in authority to make things safe. I am wondering what has become of the plan that was suggested at Ft. Smith. Many of us are anxious to know what is going to be done.

In the May 1939 Bulletin Harding College, there were two articles on subjects named in the heading of this article written by Brethren Benson and Sears. No doubt the purpose was to leave the impression that Harding College had always been sound regarding Premillennialism. Most of the things that were said had already been said and, as usual, many words were used to explain the position of Harding College. Personally, I have never questioned the soundness of Brother Sears except as he comes to the defense of those who sympathize with R. H. Boll. "Ye shall know the truth and the truth shall make free."
was quoted by one of the writers in the bulletin. What is truth? If some facts are withheld, is a truthful impression left? It is beyond question that some things have been left out of the bulletin. Why? You may answer. Brother Benson did not tell that he believed the theory in 1925 but claims to have changed his mind; that he once said that people might be possessed with demons today as in the days of Christ; that he gave as an illustration a case in China where he said a denominational preacher castout a devil. (I understand that Brother Benson has forgotten that he said this. Well, he did, but when a witness rebuked him for it, he weakened. The witnesses are still living and are liable to live for some time yet.) He said that Christ might perform miracles to day, it is His business; and that the devil is as loose as he ever was.

The above facts were withheld from the Bulletin and hence, a wrong impression is left. Again, half of his article was given to show that there would be one resurrection. He sent this out intending that people believe that they are sending their children to a school where they teach just one future resurrection. He did not tell that the Dean of Bible believes that there will be two future resurrections in connection with the present one. I know that he knows it for Brother Armstrong has repeatedly said so.

Is all the truth given in this article?

Look at some more things. Brother Benson has said in the past that Brother Rhodes said that he did not believe the "theory," but R. H. Boll might prove to be right in the end. Why did Brother Sears not include this in his article, "Facts You Want To Know?" As to the visiting brethren, who have been invited to lecture, there is no point there. Brother Armstrong would have invited Boll if it had been left wholly to him. He would put all on the same plane and wishes that the rest of us would say nothing about those brethren who are dividing churches by preaching this theory. As to Brother Brewer, no one classes him with the number who have fought against Premillennialism. According to reports, he has refused to debate the issue. It would have been better for the college if his name had been left out in this connection. Why did one of these brethren not tell about some of the student preachers saying that Brother Armstrong failed to teach them how to meet the theory even when asked? They did tell about Brethren DeHoff and Tyler making such good speeches against Premillennialism. I wonder if Brother Armstrong helped them prepare these speeches? Did they sound like Brother Rhodes had anything to do with it? He can show them how weak some of Brother Wallace's arguments are but he is not on record showing the boys what strong arguments he can make that cannot be torn down. Why not tell it all?

Why did Brother Benson not tell that he asked Brother Rhodes even before the meeting not to say anything about the speeches in his final speech?

The bulletin is misleading in that it fails to present the whole truth. This would have never happened if those from Harding College had lived up to the agreement when we were all in Ft. Smith.-B. G. Hope.

WILL THERE BE AN UNDERSTANDING?

April 17, 1939, a group of preachers and friends of Harding College met at Ft. Smith, at the invitation of Brother Woodbridge, to discuss a plan by which all could conscientiously support the school. All seemed to be interested in a correct understanding of affairs as they existed. It will be impossible to give the report in detail, so I will try to give what seemed to be the result more than anything else. If I understood the matter correctly, the meeting grew out of some correspondence between Brethren Armstrong and Woodbridge. Brother Woodbridge had received a letter from Brother Armstrong that he could not understand. The letter was read and discussed pro and con. Brethren Benson and Sears attempted to explain away what was really said in the letter. You will find the contents of this letter in an article by Brother Harper.

Even though some are saying that there was not much criticism brought up at the meeting and only three or four had any criticism to offer, there was much said as criticism and, at least, ten or twelve voiced their sentiments that they could not support the school as things then stood. There was only one preacher there who seemed to sympathize with the present position and policy of Harding College. After much discussion, the question arose: What can be done about it?

Brother Poole, the President of the board, suggested that Brother Armstrong be relieved from his present position in the school. All from Harding college opposed this suggestion very much. It seemed that this would be necessary if the support of the entire group was gained. But it became evident that no progress could be made along that line. So late in the meeting Brother V. E. Howard, a former student of Harding College, and the minister of the church at Conway, suggested that an extra Bible teacher be secured about which there is no doubt and leave Brother Armstrong there. It was made plain by Brother Howard that this teacher was to be one who would really expose the theory and condemn those who are promoting such an idea. Brother Howard had said that until something was done he could not support the school. He had stated that Brother Armstrong had failed to teach him how to meet the theory even when asked about it. When this suggestion was made, a number of us agreed that this would help matters wonderfully. Brother Harper then said that it would suit him, provided that the new man would be placed as Dean of Bible, with Brother Armstrong under him, and if such were done, he would help raise money to support the new teacher. This suggestion was made after the teachers at Harding made mention of the fact that they did not know how the school could support another teacher. I agreed to do the same thing, and a number of others offered to aid along this line. The sentiment of all who were there seemed to be against the present policy of the school, except Brother T. H. Sherrell who lives in Searcy and preaches for the Searcy congregation. He tried to make it appear that Brethren David Lipscomb and John T. Hinds held the same position that Brother Armstrong had taken in the letters which had been read, and held to some premillennial views.

After the Searcy folks went home, according to some of their students, they reported a great victory for the school and that they gave us a "whipping." I wrote Brother Benson and inquired about the progress that had been made in meeting the conditions that were agreed upon there at Ft. Smith. In his reply, he did not refer to that part of my letter. We have all anxiously waited for conditions to be met but all reports that came for a long time were unfavorable to anything being done. However, in a recent conversation, Brother Benson said that he was trying to find some one to teach but was not interested in getting a new Dean of the Bible.

Since 1936 Brother Benson has been promising that something will be done. Conditions are no better so far. In a conversation with me in 1936 he stated that things were not as he would like for them to be and that he hoped to get them in better shape; he has in the past called some of the preacher boys into his office and promised them he was going to do something, stating that he knew some of the teachers were not teaching things right: but now in 1939 when I called attention to the fact that Brother Armstrong's position did not harmonize with his, he stated that that was for Brother Armstrong and me to settle. We
were talking about the two resurrections. Why should I be the one to settle it? Who is President of the school, any way? That doesn’t sound like he aims to do much, He now defends Brother Armstrong’s position publicly, but in 1936 he stated that Brother Armstrong was not as strong as he wished he were. Brethren Armstrong and Rhodes have both expressed sympathy for Boll, as letters in the issue of the Banner show, and Brother Benson realizes it. Some of the friends of the school have made suggestions as to what can be done.

Brother Benson has said that he wanted to do something as he knew some of the teaching was not right, and now we wonder just what is going to be done. Will all the Bible teaching in Harding College be under a man who believes as is expressed in Harper’s article, taken from letters signed by Brother Armstrong. Brother Benson has been mixed up on matters. He has stated that Christ might perform miracles today, but recently he stated that he didn’t imagine that miracles would be performed. Does he imagine that the Holiness are wrong, or does he know? Do he and Brother Armstrong imagine that the Holy Spirit operates directly upon the heart of a sinner, or do they know that it does or doesn’t? It seems to me that there should be a more definite conviction about the matter than that. Can there be an understanding until all these things are cleared up? I am praying for the day to hasten when all doubt can be removed from the college in order that the brotherhood as a whole can get behind the school—B. G. Hope.

GEORGE DEHOFF REPORTS WHAT HE LEARNED IN BROTHER ARMSTRONG’S CLASSES

I am a graduate of Harding College and a friend of that institution. I praise its good and condemn its bad. My loyalty to the college is on exactly the same basis as my loyalty to a daily newspaper, a publishing house, or any other human institution. Assuming the role of a reporter and without arguing the points at all, I here give some of the things I learned in the classes of Brother J. N. Armstrong.

1. I learned that the argument on “believe unto,” “re- repent 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 reason more preachers don’t accent 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 God’s providence will get to it that any man who is as honest as was the eunuch 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 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 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 millenium, 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 millenium 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 millenium.)

15. I learned that if it is right to let J. L. Hines, H. Leo Boles, C. R. Nichol, and L. S. White present “their views” of the millenium 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—George W. DeHoff.

SLATER SONG BOOKS

“PRAISE AND REVIVAL SONGS,” is now ready. 96 pages, 114 songs. About 20 new songs; 25 later popular church songs; 70 old songs and hymns. Designed for revival meetings and Lord’s Day worship. 20c per copy; $2.00 per dozen; $7.25 per fifty; $14.00 per hundred, prepaid. Introductory price for ten days, $6.50 per fifty; $12.00 per hundred.

“THE CHURCH HYMNAL,” second edition. 224 pages, 247 songs. Not a better church book on earth, regardless of the price. A returnable copy for examination. 35c per copy; $3.60 per dozen; $7.00 per twenty-five; $13.00 per hundred.

“THE CHURCH HYMNAL,” second edition. 224 pages, 247 songs. Not a better church book on earth, regardless of the price. A returnable copy for examination. 35c per copy; $3.60 per dozen; $7.00 per twenty-five; $13.00 per hundred.

Prepaid. Special price for ten days: $2.75 per dozen; $11.06 per fifty; $21.80 per hundred, prepaid.—Will W. Slater.

Send all orders to Will W. Slater, Publisher, Box 667, Henryetta, Oklahoma.
BENSON'S LECTURE AND BROTHER ARM-STRONG'S POSITION

In the lecture of Brother Benson's on "Premillennialism," which lecture within itself is not bad, are some things worthy of notice.

He says, "Following are specific views which I understand to be so recognized." (That is, recognized as Premillennial in their meaning. E. R. H.)

1. "When the Lord returns, only the righteous dead shall be raised while the unrighteous dead shall remain in their tombs for a thousand years."

2. "An earthly kingdom will be established upon Christ's return, over which he will reign upon the earth for a thousand years. In this kingdom there will be births and deaths and a general temporal physical reign, with the Lord and his saints ruling the whole world with its temporal physical beings."

3. (Skipping this one for the last of this article).

4. "The gospel will be preached during the thousand years, and Satan, having been bound and cast into the pit at the beginning of the thousand years, all men, no longer tempted by Satan, will obey the gospel and thus usher in a period of perfect holiness."

5. "At the close of the 1,000 year reign the unrighteous dead will be raised, Satan will be released and will lead the unrighteous in a final attack upon the righteous. In this attack the Lord and his saints will be victorious and the devil and his followers will be cast into the lake of fire that burns forever."

6. "It is these and other similar views which I understand to represent the general pre-millennialism of today."

7. "I do not believe a single one of these pre-millennial views and there is no teacher at Harding College who teaches or ever has taught a single one of these views."

Now Brother Benson surely knows that this statement will not hold up when those of us who know, take him to task. In the first place, he himself one time believed every one of them, and in his history class, in Harding College, at Morrilton, so stated his belief in Boll's explanation of Revelation to be the "only plausible explanation of the book of Revelation." A number of us witnessed his confession to this in the Ft. Smith meeting after this lecture was given.

The record will show, and I have the letters of confession from him, that when he came here as president of Harding College that he believed the devil was as loose as he had ever been and would not be bound until the millennium some time in the future. So Brother Benson himself has believed the theories above mentioned, and believed a part of them when he became President of Harding College. Let him play fair with those of us who are begging for a sound school.

Is Brother Armstrong Premillennial?

Brother Benson says that one of the theories is that "When the Lord returns, only the righteous dead will be raised, while the unrighteous dead shall remain in their tombs for a thousand years."

Brother Armstrong says, "In commenting on the fact the Thens' in the passage (1 Cor. 15:22-29) mean "afterward," or "later," I often say that the space of time between the resurrection of the saints and the end could be a few hours, a thousand years, or even two thousand years. This is no doubt what our Brother Bland remembers.

As we all know the first "then" has already covered two thousand years and yet the "then" still goes on. How much the second then may cover none of us can know.

In his period of "may be 1,000 years," Brother Armstrong has the Lord slaying the wicked who live here in the flesh. They must be raised from the dead sometime, hence we have definitely two resurrections, that of the righteous, then the slaying and killing of the wicked and their resurrection, with a space of time between, of 1,000 or possibly 2,000 years.

So Brother Benson, according to his theories of premillennialism, has made Brother Armstrong definitely a premillennialist. Brother Benson, you need to come out with another bulletin showing that not one of them believes in the doctrine.

Another theory, says he, is that "an earthly kingdom will be established upon Christ's return, over which he will reign upon the earth for a thousand years. In this kingdom there will be births and deaths and a general temporal reign, with the Lord and his saints ruling the whole world with its temporal physical beings."

Brother Armstrong, in his letters that appear in the paper, says, "The Lord will conquer the earth with the sword at his second coming; the kingdom will possess the earth; Christ will re-establish the divine authority over the whole earth; there will be no authority on earth but Christ's; this will be in the life time of Christ's present reign; men will be living and dying in the flesh; the birds will devour their fleshly bodies this will be after the resurrection of the Saints; and before the end; Christ may be 1,000 years or 2,000 years petting it done; then will come the end when the Lord will deliver up the kingdom to the Father, as Paul says: if this agrees with Pre-millennial he rejoices that they preach the truth at this point: he also says there will not be one enemy of God and of Christ left on the earth during the period mentioned above.

If this is not Brother Benson's kingdom ruling on earth where men are living and dying in the flesh, and where the Lord is here on earth with his saints ruling and reigning over a world with its temporal, physical beings, let, him give us an example. So again he proves Brother Armstrong a Premillennialist. We need another Bulletin, Brother Benson!

4. Here Brother Armstrong has his own plan just like all other Premillennialists have. It is hard to get the exact view of any of them right at this point, but we are going to point out some absurdities in his. The position that Brother Benson admits is Premillennialism is that "the gospel will be preached during the thousand years, Satan having been bound, and cast into the pit at the beginning of the 1,000 years, all men, no longer tempted by Satan will obey the gospel and thus usher in a period of perfect holiness."

Well be it remembered that one time Brother Benson believed this, per his own admission. Since he became president of Harding College he has believed that the devil was as loose as he had ever been and would not be bound until this thousand years began. Now, he should, at least, take back the statement that not one of them ever has taught the theory which leads people to believe that they never have believed it. All we want is the truth, brother Benson. You taught it in this correspondence and conversations with us. Remember that.

Brother Armstrong does not believe that the Gospel
will do the bringing of the world unto Christ, or subject it to him, hear him: “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 the Lord comes back again a sword will proceed out of his mouth and with it he will smite the nations, etc.”

No, Brother Armstrong believes in the rod of iron policy, which is far worse than the average Premillennial theory. His position on this subject is the most dangerous right here of the two. Brother Armstrong believes, however, that every man that lives through that period will become subject to Christ and that there will not be one enemy of God and of Christ left on the earth. He says it will be by the sword, as the Lord kills them, other pre-millennialists say that it will be as Brother Benson pictures in his statement. But they all believe that it will be complete and on earth. Instead of saying that it will just take a 1,000 years to accomplish it, Brother Armstrong says it could take 2,000 years. So again Brother Benson makes Brother Armstrong out a Premillennialist.

Just here let me ask them: Since the gospel was to be preached to an nations, and that until the end (Matt. 28:19-20), and since men are to glory God in the church by Christ Jesus throughout all ages without end (Eph. 3:21), and since no man can become a member of the church except by obeying the gospel, how then is the Lord going to come to this earth before the end, and with the sword kill and slay men as they live and die in the flesh?

If the church is to last until the end, and the gospel is to bring men into it, and since the gospel is a spiritual power that reaches the hearts of men, what is going to happen when the Lord comes to this earth with the sword of his mouth, which Brother Armstrong says is not the gospel, and begins to kill and slay with it, and have the beasts eat the fleshly bodies of those that we are to reach with the gospel? Looks to me like the Lord has a terrible conflict. Too, Christ is the High Priest over the House of God. (Heb. 10:21). The High Priest has to be in the Most Holy Place to offer for our sins and that is to be done throughout “the church age,” and that is “world without end.” Paul says “If he were on earth he would not be a priest.” (Heb. 8:1-5). So when he comes to earth, surrounds his priestly office and they have men living and dying in the flesh with no hope of salvation, as there will be no high priest.

The Lord in doing this also abdicates his heavenly throne and thus we are for that period of time without a redeemer, savior, high priest, mediator, and king. The Lord has suddenly come to the earth and started to slay men in their flesh. This is contrary to his conversation with Pilate in John 18 when he said, “My kingdom is not of this world, etc.” Another Bulletin, boys! Why not just do what all of us know should be done. Get rid of such a thing in our schools.

But remember, Brother Armstrong says this peace, or subjection, will come by the sword of his mouth-not by the gospel.

5. Here they differ some. “At the close of the 1,000 years’ reign the unrighteous dead will be raised.” Brother Armstrong says it may be two thousand years, but these wicked dead, who have been killed during that time, must be raised together with the rest of the wicked. The righteous have already been raised at the Lord’s second coming. So here again we have the heart of Premillennialism in Brother Armstrong’s position, Brother Benson being the judge.

Satan will be released and will lead the unrighteous in a final attack upon the righteous. In this attack the Lord and his saints will be victorious and the devil and his followers will be cast into the lake of fire that burneth ever.” Well, Brother Armstrong says that “during this space of time between the resurrection of the saints and the end the Lord will conquer all, the wicked and “then” the kingdom will be delivered up to the Father as Paul stated. So he differs with some of them as to the time when the Lord is going to kill the unrighteous. Instead of its being at the close of the thousand years it is going to be “during this space of time between the resurrection of the saints and the end.” I had just as soon have the one as the other. Both are destructive to the word of God.

Just here I wish to ask Brother Armstrong a question. I do not believe he will do anything with it. He says that after the Lord conquers the earth, the kingdom possesses the earth, there is no authority on the earth but Christ’s. “Then” the kingdom will be delivered up to the Father, as Paul says. He also states that the “then” of 1 Cor. 15:22-24 demand a space of time. Here is what I want to know: How will he ever bring this thing to an end? If “then” means there is to be a space of time, may be two thousand years, how does he know that his “then” will not just keep on having this space of time? If so “when” would Paul ever get time to deliver it up to the Father? Every time he “then” starts to do it there may be a space of two thousand years. Give us an example, Brother Armstrong, of how to use the word “then” to mean, without a space of time of “maybe two thousand years” and “maybe” we can get Paul to use it, and get the kingdom delivered up. If not, Paul is out of luck. We need more Bulletins. Brother Benson!

Now, I come to statement No. 3 in Brother Benson’s theories, which reads as follows: “The Jews will be restored to Palestine and will fill a special place of honor under the Lord during the one thousand years.” In the letter from Brother C. C. Burns, he says, “I attended Harding College in the summer of 1930. I attended Bible classes taught by Bro. B. F. Rhodes when we came to the 21st chapter of Luke and the 24th verse. . . Brother Rhodes had to say Jerusalem is now being trodden down by the Gentiles, and such will continue until Christ comes to the earth again. Then the times of the Gentiles will be fulfilled. Christ will take the Jews to the Holy City and then reign in that city and all Gentiles will be subject to the rule of Christ as he reigns over all the Gentiles of the earth. . . our discussion continued along this line for the full class period and when we left the class to go to lunch he continued to try to show me that this theory was true.” Another Bulletin, Boys!

Here is a man who says Brother Rhodes taught him in Harding exactly what Brother Benson says is “Premillennialism”, yet not one of them teaches it or ever has taught it! Just this year a young preacher told me that Brother Rhodes argued with him a long time that Boll tried to harmonize his theory with the Bible, and that we did not. Yet they do not teach it or believe it and never have! All I have to say is this, if they do not and never have, there must have been a dumb group of students going there for these men say they got it there. I know they did not get it from me.
“DEALING FAIRLY AND HONESTLY”

JOHN HAYES

In the Gospel Advocate of March 23, Brother Brewer has an article under the heading, “Questions on Brother Brewer’s Plan,” in which he attempted to answer some questions that “come from far corners.” (Just a kind of bad habit with Brother Brewer to brag on himself; wants us to know that what he writes attracts attention “from far corners.”)

He had written an article before on “Premillennialism” and some of the “writers and preachers” criticized that article in a way that did not suit him, so he says: “The brethren have a right to say what they are pleased to say about it. This was to be expected, and is not at all re- sented. It was expected, however, that at least the preachers and writers would understand the background and oc- casion for this appeal at this time. It was also expected that they would deal fairly and honestly with the sugges- tion.”

As I thought over that blanket charge against the preachers and writers, that they were unfair and dishonest, I remember that the new editor of the Gospel Advocate, Brother Goodpasture, had promised to carry on after the spirit of David Lipscomb, its founder. I remembered that Brother Lipscomb allowed me, just a country, backwoods, and uneducated preacher, to criticize the editorial on some of the members of my home congregation for leaving the Lord’s-day worship to attend a sectarian “Sunday School Rally.”

So in my innocence and simplicity I sent Brother Good- pasture an article criticizing “Brother Brewer’s Plan.” I knew that I knew very little about the “Ethics of Modern Journalism,” and absolutely nothing about the method of Approach,” so I asked him to correct any mistake and to blue pencil anything offensive.

I waited two weeks and just thought, well its in the waste basket and not worth noticing, so I wrote a brother in Kentucky, calling his attention to one fact that I thought had been overlooked and asked him to reply.

In a few days he wrote me that it was useless for him to reply that Brother Cecil Douthitt had sent a reply and it was returned with a polite refusal.

After my article had been there over a month I wrote Brother Goodpasture, in which I said: “If you are not going to publish my article will you please be frank with me and tell me why? I just can’t see why Brother Brewer should be allowed to accuse others of dealing unfairly and dishonestly and leave the impression we are fighting Broth- er Boll.” Then I asked him, “Don’t you think, brother, the churches should not recognize Brother Boll until he con- fesses his sin of charging the editors of the Advocate with lying and calling them hypocrites and unrighteous men? Do you think that those who do not know the facts should know them?”

Brother Goodpasture then came out with his “famous” editorial on those who pose as critics; that generally they have a beam in their eye while the one they criticize have the mote. When I read that editorial, I wrote and told him that I would not trouble him again with anything, but since he was free from a beam in his eye, to please obey the other Scriptures, Gal. 6:1, 2, and point out the beam in my eye and Brother Douthitt’s.

Since he had said one should not be a critic with a beam in his eye, and he was criticizing the “would-be critic,” he could tell us. He wrote me a nice letter and assured me that his editorials was not directed at me, but has never answered my questions.

I admit that I was hurt that my article was not pub- lished. But upon reflection I don’t think Brother Good- pasture is to blame nor the committee. I think conditions in the Advocate office now are what they were a few years ago, when I asked one of its present writers why a certain Brother had been dropped from the paper and he said, “Brother .......... owns a controlling interest in the paper and he told this writer that he was too plain and quoted from David Lipscomb too much.” I am not telling this because I am sore because my article was not published, but with the Christian Leader gone “Copyright- ed,” and the Advocate allowing a Boll sympathizer to charge preachers and writers with “Dealing Unfairly and Dishonestly” and cutting off any reply; its time the brother- hood wakes up to see where our papers and editors are drifting.

If the above statement is called in question I am ready to give the names. I only left out names to save the one who told me any embarrassment or cause him to lose his job.

With this explanation I want to call attention to one fact that seems to me has not been stressed enough. That is, there has come into the church thousands of young people who know little or nothing of the Boll trouble or rather the trouble Brother Boll and his disciples and sympathizers who say they don’t believe his (Boll) theories, have caused in the church and that while Brother Brewer charges others of not dealing “fairly and honestly,” he presents a plan that dishonors God and is a reflection on good and godly men that have passed away and have no chance to defend themselves from the hidden slurs that Brother Brewer’s plan contains.

Here is his “plan” (the right word is Propaganda) in his own words, “I proposed that the premillennial brethren, if they are ready to give up these troublesome points of teaching, give up teaching them, at least meet with a band of worthy and influential men and make known their purpose to do this and this committee or company of brethren could assure the rest of us of the genuineness of the intention to cease their teaching and recommend that we now cease fighting them and extend to them full fellowship.” Now, young people that is Brother Brewer’s Plan to settle the Boll trouble.

If I had suggested such a plan it would not amount to much. (Why, Brother Goodpasture did not know anything about my standing and asked Brother W. Clarence Cooke about me, and Brother Cooke told him I was 0. K., and to publish my article.) But when a man of Brother Brewer’s standing and a regular writer whose articles bring ques- tions from far corners, it has an influence.

Remember, it is the young people especially that I am trying to help.

I want Brother Brewer to answer a question, to help us to show the young people that he has not dealt “Fairly and Honestly” with them.

Brother Brewer, if I am guilty of calling you and the Elders of the Church, where you live, liars, hypocrites, and unrighteous men and should move to Lubbock, where you preach and ask for membership, would you and the elders welcome and receive me, if I refused to confess my sin? No, young people, that is not a silly question. Neither do I believe that Brother Brewer sanctions receiving into fel- lowship men who lie and slander their brethren, but this will help us to show you the hypocrisy behind his plan and the veiled slurs at the dead.
Now, if Brother Brewer thinks preachers should deal "Fairly and honestly," I want him to be fair and honest with some questions, then the young people will see the whole thing is nothing but "Propaganda" to "save face," and does not remove the trouble nor save Brother Boll's soul.

Brother Brewer:

1. Do you believe that M. C. Kurfees, J. W. Smith, J. C. McQuiddy and their fellow editors of the Gospel Advocate were "worthy and influential" men in their day?

2. Do you believe that Brother Boll made an "agreement" with the Advocate not to teach and write on his theories that they thought unwise to do?

3. Did Brother Boll deny for over three years that he had made an agreement with them, knowing all this time that he had made an agreement, and then try to dodge that he had lied by a definition on the word "agreement"?

4. Are you willing to go on record that you believe what the editors said Brother Boll agreed to do?

5. Do you believe that Brothers Kurfees, Smith, McQuiddy and their fellow editors were "Scribes and Pharisees," "False and Unrighteous men?"

6. Did Brother Boll make the charge against them that they were such men?

7. Did they call upon Brother Boll to prove such ugly charges or retract them and make a confession for having made them?

8. Has Brother Boll ever proven those charges or made an apology for having made them?

9. If you would not receive me into the fellowship, if I had called you and your Elders liars, Scribes, Pharisees, False and Unrighteous, without repentence and confession, tell the young members of the church why Brother Boll should be fellowshipped until he confesses his sins and apologizes? But that I should not be.

Young people, hear me, I am not trying to embarrass Brother Brewer but to show you that he is the last man to charge others of not "Dealing Fairly and Honestly."

When you read his plan you would just never know that Brother Boll had ever promised "prominent and influential" men not to teach these things that were causing division and hard feelings. When you read his plan you would never know that he had denied for over three years that he had, made any agreement with those "prominent and influential" men. When you read "Brother Brewer's Plan" you would never know that Brother Boll had said these "prominent and influential men" were "Liars," "Scribes and Pharisees," and "Unrighteous Men!" When you read Brother Brewer's "Plan" you would think that there was only one thing to do to settle the Boll trouble, that is for them to quit teaching these troublesome things that are not necessary to the salvation of your soul.

Now, young people, I want you to read the seventh chapter of Joshua and see if Brother Brewer has not been guilty of hiding from you the sins of Brother Boll, and that he has not dealt "Fairly and Honestly" with you in his "Plan."

I want you to notice he says in his plan, "And recommend that we now cease fighting them." I want you to see the hypocrisy behind that statement. Brother Brewer knows that he above all men has never fought Brother Boll, but has always spoken words of praise about him. He just wants to get over to you young people that some "preachers and writers" have been fighting Brother Boll.

Now, young people, read the 11th and 12th chapters of 1 Samuel, and when I ask Brother Brewer, when Nathan the prophet said to David the king, "Thou art the man," was he fighting David the king, or the sin he had committed? "Ordinarily people are too same" to believe he was fighting David. See his article and answer to question 3.

Now, young people, I want you to see some more of the "fairness and honesty" of Brother Brewer. After giving his plan he says, "When Brother Calhoun came back from his sojourn with the digressives, there was a conference or a consultation of leading Brethren in Nashville, arranged by Brother Hardeman, I think. Brother Calhoun met with these brethren and they all together discussed the terms on which he could again receive the endorsement and fellowship of the loyal brethren. After this meeting, or those meetings, many statements appeared in the papers commending Brother Calhoun to the brethren everywhere. Would not some similar action with reference to Brother Boll be wonderful? To me it would be."

My faith in Brother Brewer has been wavering for sometime, (and it hurts so bad when a man of prominence says or does anything to cause anyone to lose faith in him) but when I read the above statement my faith in the man died. Young people, Brother Brewer wants you to think that Brother Calhoun's case and Brother Boll's case are parallel.

Brother Brewer, after Brother Calhoun met with these brethren and discussed the terms on which he could receive the endorsement and fellowship of the loyal brethren and this fact was published, did Brother Calhoun deny there were any terms discussed and agreed upon?

Did Brother Calhoun denounce those same brethren as "Scribes and Pharisees" and "False and Unrighteous men?" Brother Brewer, did Brother Boll deny that he made any agreement with the editors of the Gospel Advocate and call them "Scribes and Pharisees," "False and Unrighteous men?"

Now, young people, if Brother Brewer will come out like a man and say he does not believe Brother Boll made any agreement with the editors of the Gospel Advocate and that he never called them "Scribes and Pharisees," "False and Unrighteous men," then I will confess that I have sinned and apologize for saying he has sinned, and practiced deception in the above example of Brother Calhoun, and the Advocate in protecting Brother Brewer.

If Brother Brewer thinks people should "deal fairly and honestly," he should demand of the Advocate that they should not protect him after he has made the charge.

Now a word to Brother Boll. I was one of the first students of the Nashville Bible School, now David Lipscomb College. There is a kind of sacred love in my heart to all its students, and I wish Brother Boll could see his real friends.

Brother Armstrong and Brother Brewer have given you a martyr complex, and you have listened to false friends. No one hates you, no one has been fighting you. Down deep in your heart you know you have taught these things that have troubled the church.

You have sinned in calling these brethren the ugly names you have, and refusing to prove these charges or apologize for making them. It takes a brave man to confess his wrongs. No one wants to humiliate you. Every member of the great brotherhood would rejoice, there would be rejoicing among the angels, and what a burden would be removed from your troubled soul. You and I, Brother Boll, have reached the Valley on the Western side. The shadows lengthen before the setting sun. Soon the tomb, a little short sleep, then the judgment.

Don't, Brother Boll, let false friends lull you into a false security. You may scoff, or turn this away with a smile, but remember after death it will be too late. I hope Brother Brewer will confess his sin that my faith in him may be restored.
AN INTROSPECTION
E. G. CREAM

A persistent conflict between truth and error is not new—trials ever been since the days of Adam. No one can excuse that falsehood is without force or power. Falsehood has sway over men and even nations, it has slain cities and valleys 01 the earth with the blood of its practice. Judging from past history, we should not feel at “ease in Zion.” The church is threatened by every conceivable menace these days. But truth is more powerful than falsehood. Every inch of ground gained for the cause in apostolic and “pioneer” days was gained by a relentless war on error. The church grew in those days; the church was distinctive, and held aloft the banner of non-denominational Christianity. The foe went down in defeat. But there is a decided “let up” these days. Many are raising the white flag, and some have actually signed an armistice with the forces of evil. There should be more militancy shown on the part of preachers, elders, and leaders. The church is fast losing that militant spirit that was so characteristic in former days. The dreaded enemy of the church is not without; it is within. It seems that there is a softening actually pervading some of the older periodicals among us. Every false system is a development. The Roman Catholic Church did not come into existence over night-it was a development. The so-called Christian Church developed after several years-the result of courting favor and yielding to sentiment. These symptoms are seen today within the church. At rapid speed, another apostasy is developing, if it has not already developed! For example, the Davidson Movement has some of “our” colleges, some of “our” foreign missionaries, and many of “our” popular pastors effectively woven into its machinery. But all have not bowed the knee to Balaam. There are some veterans left, and a host of young men. We have not given up the fight, and a relentless war to save the church from disaster must not wane. “Thou has given a banner to them that fear thee, that it may be displayed because of truth.” Brother Wallace, we are with you to “keep the Bible Banner waving.”

IN-CULLINGS-COMMENTS AND CORRESPONDENCE

DO NOT INDORSE HARDING COLLEGE

Taylor is another church of the Boll-Jorgenson order. Highlands is the Jorgenson church in Louisville, a rank Premillennial group, and Camp Taylor church. Highlands is a rank Premillennial group, and Camp Taylor is another church of the Boll-Jorgenson order.

DO NOT INDORSE HARDING COLLEGE

F. E. Pennington

We are with you to “keep the Bible Banner waving.”

SOME COMMENDATIONS

I may not be slow to wrath, but I am sometimes slow to speak. But I want you to know that I am being benefited by reading the Bible Banner. Of course, I cannot speak with the knowledge and experience of older brethren, but either I am keeping in closer touch with religious trends of the day or the church is facing the greatest battle it has faced during my time. We sometimes say, “If there ever was a time it is now” but, of course, the time has always been and it is exceedingly so today that every soldier of the cross should buckle on the whole armour of the Lord and do battle for God and for right.-A. S. Landiss, Chattanooga, Tenn.

I know you do not need a word of encouragement from me, but I hope you will believe me sincere, when I say that I love you, and thank God for the work you have done to save the church. My prayer is that your enemies may be confounded, and that you may live long to tell the story so true.-Boyd D. Fanning, Moundsville, West Va.
SIGHTING-IN SHOTS

CLED. E. WALLACE

Preachers And Money

If preachers did not marry, raise children, eat and wear clothes they might get along very well without money. As it is most of them manage to get along on some how without much. Some brethren are rather fond of saying that and. The brethren do the deciding, usually without consulting the preacher. They often debate the case in a closed session and I often wonder why they never think to ask the preacher in and consult him. Were he bold enough to suggest an amount, it would probably be far from extortianate. Many of the churches should practice quitting the miserly way they have of putting capable and hard-working preachers on a mere sustenance dole. They make an ox of him to tread out their corn and secure him with a muzzle that a mosquito couldn't wiggle through. It would make sordid reading if some preachers were to frankly tell of their financial treatment at the hands of some churches. There is nothing personal in this as I'm getting along very well even if I'm not uneasy over being picked 'up for evasion of income taxes.

Preachers as a rule are a liberal lot. They give according to their ability with a ready mind. For this they receive a blessing. They also do some involuntary giving they will, I fear, get no credit for. For instance some brethren may decide without consulting the preacher what he should be paid for his services. Then without consulting him they decide to pay him somewhat less because they have had to repair the meeting house, install some fans, build a sidewalk or buy some songbooks. They did not ask him if he wanted to make a contribution, they just took it out of his check. The amount they took without asking is usually more than anybody else gave. What can the preacher do about it? He might do several things but my advice to him is to do exactly nothing. He had better just thank the Lord they didn't take it all, and go on his way rejoicing. You may get a healthy lift from an unexpected source at some other place.

It often happens that somebody who controls the purse of a church justifies himself for short-checking the preacher by obso keeping the utility of the. He is in the bond of peace. Brother Lipscomb told of a church that was torn up over an argument between two locally prominent brethren. The question at issue was the age of a hog when he shed his teeth. It sounds incredible but it happened. In my rounds I picked up this one. A brother owned a good dog and a sister in the same congregation owned a sorry calf. The brother, sister, dog and calf were neighbors. The good dog one day developed an unneighborly mood and chewed the calf's tail off. The sister who owned the calf didn't like it a little bit. Women are that way and she proceeded to tell the onwer of the dog what she thought of him and his dog. The man made the mistake of talking back to an angry woman. Men are that way, you know. The dispute developed into a row involving the friends of both and the result was a disrupted church. Silly wasn't it? Sure, but most church fusses are! Finally, a local philanthropist bought the calf for two dollars and a half, knocked it in the head with a hammer and the trouble was settled. It helped when the dog mysteriously disappeared at about the same time. The dog was mainly to blame. Canine responsibility is greater than some of them seem to appreciate. The mistake of this particular dog was in his choice of beef. He would have done less harm had he chewed on well chosen and retreating areas of some of the brethren. It wouldn't have made the good sister who owned the calf half as mad.

There's A Difference I Trow

I have been asked several times lately by some who ought to know the answer, if any real difference exists between "us" and "the Christian Church" in matters of doctrine. It begins to look like there may not be much difference between some of "us" and "the Christian Church" on much of anything, the way some on both sides are carrying on. If we can say "them" for their soft preaching, they can pick out some pretty mush declaimers among "us." Anyhow, some of us out on the "lunatic fringe" still contend that disciples who corrupt the worship and compromise the doctrine are digressives "in fact and act" and we will have no fellowship with their wayward manners. When they go out from us because they are not of us, there's a difference, I trow.

MORE DAVIDSON SCHEMES

We have it on what we consider unimpeachable evidence that Clinton (He Won't Fight) Davidson recently approached a certain Texas Christian with a pretty little scheme to cause embarrassment to both the editor of the Firm Foundation and the editor of the Bible Banner. He had heard somewhere that this Christian had "something" against Showalter-something that could be used as a club in forcing Showalter to publish articles against the editor of the Bible Banner (articles written by Davidson, which the Christian Leader because of its "high ethical standards" could not publish). Thus the leading light in the new Firm Foundation to do the publication of sweet little inanities in the Christian Leader and the black-mailing of other religious papers to publish the vicious things which he wants to say, but cannot say in his own paper.

But for once the astute New Yorker's judgment of people failed him; he underestimated the fairness and the integrity of character of the one whom he approached. He was told in no uncertain terms what that one thought of his Michavellian plot. It was pointed out to him that he was attempting to force the Firm Foundation to do the very thing which his own paper had been organized to correct in the brotherhood: the publication of vicious and bitter personal attacks. If Clinton is determined as to how we furnish him with the source of information regarding the Texas Christian who was insulted by his proposal, upon his request.
Clinton Davidson recently went before the Manhattan congregation and made confession of sin, saying that he had done wrong in going with the Christian Church. In February he contended he did right in going with the digressives, trying to teach them, and when he found he could not change them, he quit. When asked how he could worship with the instrument, he contended they brought the instrument in, they played it, and that he worshipped in his heart.

In February he wrote disparagingly of the instrumental music issue, saying the Lord is more interested in saving sinners than He is in instrumental music or the method of distributing: the Lord’s Supper. Thus reducing the same music to the same principle as a way to distribute the Lord’s Supper! But he is changing! In a recent Leader he wrote of the woes of departing from God’s order, saying church history teaches us not to stray even in small things. And he made instrumental music a serious departure from God’s system.

In view of his past, and his present effort to remake our journalism, there is plenty of ground to be suspicious yet of our brother. In some way the gravity of compromising with the digressives has been brought home to him. In some way I pray that the gravity of compromising with premillennial schismatics may be brought home to him. He says he knows nothing of the theory, saying that he does not even know whether or not it should be taught. A man that barren of knowledge is not ready to correct journalism.

Brother Davidson completely hoodwinked me; he pulled the wool over my eyes. I am ashamed that I was so dull. He told me that for the time he was “lost” he contributed to three missionaries, one of the Fox brothers, and two others. He refused to name the two others, using the excuse that others would cut their support to them if they knew of his donations. I accepted that excuse, I am too gullible. Not until I had gone did I think: Why name Brother Fox then? Why was he afraid the others’ support might be cut, but not Fox’s? Was there another reason for not naming the two? Twice I have asked him since in letters to assure me that “the two” were not Don Carlos Janes and Homer Rutherford-Premillennial factionists. He will not give me any such assurance.

Brethren Benson and Sears have just visited Washington. I am all ways going off half-cocked, but I thought it’d be unfair to the truth were I not to tell Brother Benson that I did not think his college strong enough against the Boll faction of Premillenials. I am here attempting to “view some news” and here are some of his statements—nearly all “involuntary,” but answers to direct questions:

1. He would not have made Brother Armstrong’s statement that Bible students “far superior to me” believe in the restoration of the Jews. Yet Brother Benson is out peddling Brother Armstrong’s statement; he left it at Jasper, Ala., at Brother Nichols’ home.

2. He does not approve of the Leader giving reports of Boll men-Janes, Flavil Hall, Hoover. Voluntarily, he said Ernest Hoover had ruined himself by preaching for a Chattanooga faction.

3. He said he would not call on a Bollite to pray in one of his meetings—where he regards such a factionist. Yet he said:

1. “There has been too much harsh criticism of Bollites.” I urged him to show us how; urged him to lead the fight in an aggressive way; befitting a college president.

2. The Neal Nashville meeting was a failure”—showing that there is not much premillennialism in Nashville.

3. He defended G. C. Brewer as sound in the fight, saying I was warped in my judgment of him.

4. To questions about Jorgenson and Janes, he said: “I haven’t read such from them.” I asked “But you know where they stand?” He replied “Yes, I guess they stand with Boll.”

Thus nothing aggressive! I may be wrong but my conception of a college president is one who goes ahead and does his full duty without goadings and pushings being applied.

**AT THE CROSSROADS**

I want to commend you for your fine work in the Bible Banner. I think I have never read anything just like, and just as pointed as, your review of Brother Boll’s book and arguments. I think the many alarms sounded regarding the softening attitude of the brethren have not been sounded in vain. And I think they needed to be sounded. I believe that the church may even now be at the cross-roads, and it seems to me it is taking the right track, I have, at least, noticed more firmness in the stand of many within the last year. Perhaps we are learning that a sword is made to cut with, not to smear butter.—Reuel W. Lemmons, Tipton, Okla.

A Puzzle In Premillennialism

When God’s own time was full, He sent his Son to earth, To execute the plan decreed Long ages ere his birth.

His message was the same as John’s— Sent forth from God on high, To say, “Repent, and be baptized, The kingdom draweth nigh.”

But God his mind did change—they say— In deference to man. Because the Jews rejected Christ, There was a change of plan.

An earthly kingdom Jesus meant To give to men, ’tis said, But when the Jews rejected him He gave the church instead!

But why should Jews reject their Lord, Who came to give them just The thing they sought above all else, For which their souls did lust?

The Jews rejected him, they say, Because he did not give The thing they sought above all else— They would not let him live!

But why did Jesus come to give The very thing they sought, And they refused and murdered him Because of what he brought?

The Solution:

In truth, he did the very thing He came to earth to do. He did not change the plan one whit, Or turn to something new.

His kingdom was not of this world, ’Twas never meant to be. It never will be of this world Throughout eternity.

On David’s throne he’s sitteth now, As said the prophets true, From God’s right hand in majesty To rule o’er Greek and Jew.

The kingdom we enjoy today Four thousand years was planned, And John and Jesus told the truth, The kingdom was at hand!

-W. E. Brightwell.
Not Interested In "Wants"—But "Needs"

I did not receive one of the questionnaires, but if I had I would not have paid any attention to it. I am not interested in what the brotherhood wants, but what it needs—Christ's Gospel plainly and simply preached.—R. L. Andrews, Ferndale, Mich.

No Answer-Wrong Number!

Have read every issue and appreciate your defense of the ancient order of things. I received Brother Davidson's questionnaire but did not answer it.—John G. Childress, Childress, Texas.

Who Are Representative?

Davidson's questionnaire was not answered. Possibly he does not account those who did not make favorable reply as "representative." Someone must wage the battle. I know of no better suited to the work than you. May our heavenly Father continue to bless you.—D. W. Nichol, Kilgore, Texas.

Who And Where Are The Softies?

I appreciate the Banner. Your article on "What the Church Must do to Be Saved" really hit the spot. More power to you. I answered the Davidson Questionnaire and found I was out of line with the brotherhood according to the survey he made. Thanks to the Banner for correcting the impression that all our preaching brethren had gone softie.—J. C. Murphy, Beaumont, Texas.

Wrecks The Gospel

I did not answer the questionnaire sent me concerning what kind of religious journalism I liked. There is only one book of religious literature that I am sure is right in all phases, and that is the Bible. I have no fear of my copy of that being changed, so why should I try to force my likes on others. I pray that all may take the Word of God and that alone for their rule of faith and practice. Do what it commands, believe its every word and trust in its promises. There are too many souls to be saved, and the Gospel is the only power to save them. "Premillennialism" is not the gospel or any part of the gospel, but a wrecker of the only power God has given to save, which is the gospel, "I am set for the defence of the Gospel."—R. T. Towery, Sinton, Texas.

His Chief Reason

I did not sign the questionnaire. Here is my chief reason. "For do I now persuade men or God? Or do I seek to please men? For if I yet pleased men, I should not be a servant of Christ." What little I know about preaching the gospel and writing the gospel has been learned from the New Testament, and not by sounding out spineless brethren to see what they want.—Fred E. Dennis, Marietta, Ohio.

Remove The Blight

I didn't answer the questionnaire sent out from New York regarding the sort of paper desired. I received one but I didn't think it would serve any good purpose, so passed it up. I deeply deplore the unsigned circulars that are being sent out all over the brotherhood. I bow my head in shame at such practice. To think that brethren would condescend to such a practice is enough to make us all feel the need of getting down in sackcloth and ashes and begging God to remove the blight for the Body of Christ.—L. R. Wilson, San Antonio, Texas.

Sad Commentary

What sort of religionist is he who seeks to determine the mind of the brethren in order to know what to preach? In order to know what to write? Sad commentary on the state of the church when men feel disposed so act. Very unsavory! No. I did not kill Cock Robin!—Homer P. Reeves, Huntsville, Ala.

"Stand Therefore"

I have just finished reading the last issue of the Bible Banner. I enjoyed it so much that I cannot refrain from telling you so. I appreciate what you are doing. It seems likeness of another man who "stood like a stone wall." I did not kill Cock Robin.—J. W. Roberts, Iraan, Texas.

A Hunter-But Not Guilty!

I am quite a hunter. I am a "crack shot" when it comes to killing birds. I have killed ducks on Reelfoot lake, quail all over Texas and Tennessee, but I never killed Cock Robin. The fact is I did not know he was dead until I saw his obituary in the paper. I did not receive a questionnaire. Guess they never heard of me either. Some folks are so ignorant!—C. H. Woodroof, Winchester, Tenn.

Infamous Questionnaire

The Banner is superb. ... I have yet to meet the preacher, elder, or deacon who even answered the infamous questionnaire. It was an effort to buy out a few and intimidate the remainder. But a good salesman would not attempt the impossible. Everything about the whole set-up is manifestly false; I would not only doubt that he has money, but I even doubt that he has it copyrighted! I challenge them to produce five hundred names of the six hundred thousand members of the church in the United States!—O. C. Lambert, Port Arthur, Texas.

"Campbell-Lights"

CHAS. M. CAMPBELL

W. E. Brightwell truly says: We are a part of the all things that work together for good. and we add, no wonder that so little good is being done. There is the work, and the together. * * *

The organ-grinders of the digressive faction of the church have stigmatized their opponents "anti-organ," "anti-missionary," and such other nice names as their "scripture" vocabulary could produce, and now comes the modest, pious, prayerful, sweet-spirit, outcast, downtrodden and persecuted R. H. Boll of unfilled prophecy interpretation fame, brandishing his dear brethren as "anti-millennialist!"

The Book uses "anti" to the tune of designating dissemblers who pose as sheep when they are ravening wolves—Antichrist! The name would well apply to those who are so far from Christ's spiritual kingdom as to announce an earthly one, where Christ is dethroned and demoted from his throne in the heavens to the earth, his footstool.

* * *

Brother Ernest Beam reports through the Gospel Advocate that one T. A. Phillips has recently taken his stand for truth against the errors of digression, and credits Brother Claude Witt, of wirewalking fame, with having converted him, by correspondence. We have no right to deny the claim, but we do feel justified in asking a few questions. First, what will Murch think of Witt for taking one of his brethren since they have supposedly entered a peace pact, without authority or qualification? Second, why does Witt not convert Murch by correspondence, instead of joining him in writing a booklet promoting their unity program? Third, who has this correspondence, and why not print it? It should prove very interesting reading—especially for Murch.

* * *

Recently a gifted young brother asked the writer if he thought the church was by some being sold down the river. After due deliberation, circumstances compel the conclusion that the church is not being sold down the river—no! They are giving it away, and almost paying to digressives to take it!
THE SUMMER is rapidly passing away. Fall of the year is close at hand. A few more weeks and literally thousands of boys and girls all over the United States will be going away to college, for every young person that hopes to amount to anything in this age MUST go to college. But the all-important question is, “Where shall I go?” The importance of selecting the right school cannot be overemphasized. May we ask you to consider carefully the following advantages offered by Freed-Hardeman College before you decide to go elsewhere.

1. THE SCHOOL PLANT consists of eight or nine acres of land, upon which are situated five beautiful, modern brick buildings-administration building, two dormitories, cafeteria and gymnasium, and science building-all equipped with strictly modern furniture and apparatus.

2. MORAL AND SPIRITUAL ATMOSPHERE is pure and wholesome. Your associations with both faculty and pupils will be pleasant and elevating. There is certainly nothing more important in the success and happiness of young people than clean thinking and clean living. The very atmosphere here is conducive to both.

3. OUR EDUCATIONAL STANDING is exceptionally fine. For years Freed-Hardeman College has been a member of The Tennessee Association of Colleges and The American Association of Junior Colleges. Its application for membership is on file with the Southern Association of Colleges and Secondary Schools with every reason to believe it will be accepted. Its work is accepted by the leading colleges and state departments of education.

4. THE COSMOPOLITAN CHARACTER of our student body is remarkable. You will be thrown among boys and girls coming from all kinds of places from “away up at the head of the hollow” to the great metropolitan cities. Twenty-one states and the Dominion of Canada were represented last year. Students from such cities as New York, Philadelphia, Detroit, Cleveland, Cincinnati, St. Louis, Chicago, and many others. Why do they come to Henderson? There must be a reason.

5. INDIVIDUALITY is an outstanding quality of Freed-Hardeman College. It is not just another school. It is unique in many respects. The principles that govern it, the spirit that animates it, the aims and objects for which it is striving, are the outward manifestation of the inward character and thinking of a faculty that sees religious, social, and educational matters in the same light. The result is that our students have individuality. They have definite ideas and ideals. They stand for something. They become vital forces in life.

6. LIVING CONDITIONS at Freed-Hardeman could hardly be better. Beautiful, modern dormitories furnished with new single beds; running water, both cold and hot, in every room; tub baths on every floor and showers in the basement. The new cafeteria furnishes the finest quality and a great variety of foods at moderate prices where everyone can have just what he wants and pay for only what he gets.

7. SOCIAL AFFAIRS AND RECREATION are both pleasant and profitable. The largest liberty consistent with good conduct and work is allowed. Games, sports, parties, banquets, trips to Shiloh battlefield, to the great TVA dams up down the beautiful Tennessee River and to the old home of “Fighting Joe” Wheeler, also to the cities of Memphis on the Mississippi and Nashville on the Cumberland are a part of the year’s program.

8. THE MAIN THING, however is something else. In spite of this pleasure-loving age we still believe with Longfellow that “Life is real, life is earnest, and the grave is not its goal.” We want our pupils to grow in all intellectual, moral, and spiritual things. We want them really to get something here of permanent value-something they can take away from here with them that will be of incalculable value to them throughout this life and the next. Over and above all other considerations this is the MAIN THING.

We believe expenses at Freed-Hardeman College are lower than at any other school of equal merit.

Write for catalog if you do not have one. Send in your room reservation at once before they are all taken. For further information write to

N. B. HARDEMAN, President
HENDERSON, TENNESSEE