Poor old tottering Mussolini has made a speech designed to bolster the morale of his crumbling empire. His coughing words betray the panic that grips his heart. Churchill has offered the Italian people the choice of getting out of the war and repudiating their jackal of a leader, or submit to having their beautiful country scientifically shattered. Forces are poised to carry out the threat. While Mussolini looks to the international bandit Hitler for help, my mind goes back a few years when Mussolini was swelling and ranting and some of our premillennial prophets were prophesying. The boasting dictator was about to reestablish the Roman Empire. He was actually fulfilling prophecy. Every premillennialist bulletin and pulpit exhorted us all to watch Mussolini and if we declined to do so, we were shutting our eyes in the face of inspired prophecy, rejecting the plain literal teaching of the sacred Book. I recall that one of our number, a preacher with years of experience, departed from the faith under the spell of the ugly vision of premillennialism. He wove his dreams around Mussolini and ranted and raved to the effect that they were the very word of God. He went to the progressives, then on to the Lord knows where, and was heard within the recent past to say: “I once belonged to the Campbellites.” Poor old Mussolini! And some of the prophets must feel about as sad and dejected as he and doubtless feel that he has let them down. It is not apt to cure them for they are facile in finding somebody or something else to fulfill the prophecies in favor of their dreams. But there is a host of sane and normal disciples who can profit by doing some sober thinking on these things. Some weak brethren who have been shaken by these prophetic blatherskites must feel somewhat humiliated and ashamed. It is a compliment to the sanity and good judgment of brethren generally, that they have not done more harm than they have. They are like Mussolini in at least one respect. When they are whipped, they cry persecution! The old broken-down dictator whimpers that he and the Italian people have never been understood, that England and the United States are wickedly picking on him. Of all things, he has become a pessimist with a persecution complex! Whoever saw a dyed-in-the-wool premillennialist who was not a pessimist with a persecution complex?

Some of our modern prophetic interpreters might read with some profit what a real prophet says about some prophets. Jeremiah said a long, long time ago: “The prophet that hath a dream, let him tell a dream; and he that hath my word, let him speak my word faithfully.” “Behold, I am against the prophets, saith the Lord, that use their tongues, and say, He saith.” The prophets, who a few years ago were turning the prophetic spotlight on Mussolini were evidently just “using their tongues.” Whatever use they made of what real prophets said, was obviously misapplied. Roosevelt and Churchill have apparently exploded the dream of Mussolini and some American premillennialists. The prophets must have been talking about somebody else. Surely nobody expects Roosevelt and Churchill to reestablish the old Roman Empire. Somebody better hurry, for the time is short, you know, and the day of the Lord is just at hand. Maybe the failure of Mussolini has postponed: its. Premillennialists are great on postponement. They even claim that the kingdom of God was postponed because the Jews crucified Christ instead of crowning him king on David’s throne in Jerusalem. If the Jews thwarted God’s plan once, it is entirely within the realm of possibility that America and England might do it again. You may have the idea by now, that I think the whole premillennial dream is as fantastic, unreasonable and unscriptural as my friend, Brother C. R. Nichols, has declared and shown it to be in recent issues of the Gospel Advocate.

An aging brother who recalled Indian Territory days grew reminiscent in my presence. A presidential proclamation opened up the Apache, Kiowa, Caddo, and Comanche reservations for settlement. Thousands of people, common people, some of whom had little or no education, managed to learn enough from that proclamation to file on land. It is amazing in view of the magnitude of the movement how few mistakes were made as the people took possession of their claims. Yet the language of that government document was not as simple in style, nor was it as easily understood, as the language of the Bible which affords information on the way to heaven. Any man with intelligence enough to file a claim on an Indian reservation with a government proclamation as his guide ought to be able to file a claim on a home in heaven with the New Testament as his guide. “But we cannot understand the Bible alike.” Why not? They understood the President’s proclamation “alike,” didn’t they? A lot of current conversation in religion today is just inane apology for indifference and rebellion. The story is told of an old cowman who could not read a letter unless he saw it branded on a Cow. He got into a heated argument with a neighbor over some point of government regulation pertaining to the matter of filing on claims. He had a filing receipt which the neighbor read to him, and the old man quickly and gladly accepted the correction because it involved a clear title to his claim. If a man’s title to a home in heaven is clouded by false information and erroneous ideas, it ought to be easy to take a New Testament and correct him.
R. H. BOLL AND PREMILLENIALISM

Not because of its merit or honesty of statement is the insertion below given to the readers of the Bible Banner. It is inserted because faithful brethren in Chattanooga where it was printed and circulated by E. H. Hoover (a Boll Satellite) over R. H. Boll's own initials, think it should be reviewed for the information of members of the church who are deceived by "smooth words and fair speech." Oftentimes it requires considerable space to disprove a few assertions and a long article to expose the fallacies contained in a short one. The Bible Banner will not insert or support below in as many such statements as an article of its length could easily contain. Obviously, as the exponents of most modern isms do, an effort is made to avoid the odium of certain consequences of the theory by concealing its real character. The article below is a masterpiece in that type of propaganda. We shall take it apart on the installment plan.

It is significant that Brother Boll admits being a premillennialist on the principle that one who believes in immersion is an immersionist. That is about the most candid admission I have ever seen from his pen, though unintended and he is as much premillennialized as an immersed person is immersed. He is, in fact, immersed in it.

In proof that the document below withholds the actual elements of the Boll variety of Premillennialism and is therefore sheer propaganda, I submit in this issue a review of a more extensive and belligerent effort of the same character in Word and Work, under title of "What Difference Does It Make-and What Is It All About?" The Bible Banner now has thousands of readers where it then had hundreds, and this review will be enlightening to them, as well as serve the present need in Chattanooga, Tenn.

The editorial in the next issue of the Bible Banner will be "The Essential Point in Premillennial Teaching" in answer to that section of this deceptive document, and will be followed by "Some of the Utterances of A. Campbell" from Millennial Harbinger, a set of which I have right on my shelves. They have asked for it and they will get it.

PREMILLENIALISM

The following is an outline of a sermon on the Radio by R. H. Boll in Chattanooga, Tenn., November 3rd, 1942.

"Pre-Millennialism" is not an "ism" in the sense of being a defined and particular creed or system. It is a general term of wide application. Like the term "Protestantism" it includes a great variety of religious beliefs. As for example, one who believes that baptism is immersion may be called an "immersionist," and that belief in general may be referred to as "immersionism," so everyone who believes that Christ will return before that period which is called the "Millennium" is a "premillennialist," and this doctrine in general is called "premillennialism." And just as a simple Christian, though he might be reckoned as a Protestant, could not be held responsible for all the creeds and shades of doctrine comprised under the head of Protestantism: and just as one who practices immersion would not sponsor all the views and doctrines of all the different kinds of immersionists: so one who believes that Christ will return before the Millennium could not, of course, be held chargeable with all the views and teachings held by premillennialists in general.

As for "Pre-Millennialism" as a system or theory I would like to have it understood that no simple Christian would connect himself to any sectarian creed or theory as such. A simple Christian connects himself to nothing but the word of God. He may be convinced from the teaching of that word that Christ returns before the Millennium: but he is not therefore to be classed as an adherent of Pre-Millennialism, or any kind of "ism." The Lord Jesus held the doctrine of the resurrection which was the distinctive tenet of the Pharisees but He was not a Pharisee—nor could a Christian sponsor all that may be summed up under the head of Pre-Millennialism, for some premillennialists are far afield from the truth of God's word. Most especially, he would not sponsor the vagaries and speculations sometimes charged upon Pre-Millennialism—as, for example—"A carnal reign of Christ in dirty Jerusalem, a demotion and debasement of Christ, in His coming to the earth to reign: That the Church is an accident—That Christ came for the purpose of establishing an earthly kingdom in Jerusalem, but the Jews would not let Him, so He established the Church instead and went back to heaven: That the kingdom has not been established; That the Great Commission is voided; That there will be a "Second chance"—

All such caricatures and arbitrary inferences, and any such and such-like doctrines must be repugnant to an enlightened Christian mind, and I for one, the republican the whole Church would gladly join with those who oppose them. And none of these views have any necessary connection with premillennial teaching.

The essential point in premillennial teaching is:

1. That the Lord and His Christ will return from heaven.

2. That if there is ever to be a time—of the restoration of all things (Acts 3: 19-21)—

   - when the old curse shall be lifted and thorns and thistles shall cease (Isa. 55: 12-13)
   - when the Nations shall learn war no more (Isa. 2: 4)
   - when the knowledge of Jehovah shall cover the earth as waters cover the sea (Isa. 11: 9)
   - when the groaning of creation shall cease (Rom. 8; 18-23)
   - when Satan shall be dethroned, bound and imprisoned (Rev. 20: 1)
   - when the kingdom of the world shall become the kingdom of the Lord and of His Christ (Rev. 11: 15)

if there is ever to be such a time as that (and the word of God bears that out) then Christ must and will come before that time.

So (as all standard church-history, and the encyclopaedias, and Gibbon, the infidel historian of the fall of the Roman Empire) testify—so the primitive church in general from the days of the apostles for 300 years believed. Pioneer preachers of the Restoration Movement also freely voiced such belief. See some of the utterances of A. Campbell, Walter Scott, Dr. Brents, J. A. Harding. David Lipscomb also in his book (Queries and Answers; page 360) wrote as follows:

"Jesus had been to earth and returned to heaven. Heaven must receive him until the times of restoration of all things. Then the times of restoration of all things must be when Jesus returns again to earth—the restoration of all things to their original relation to God. The relation which the world originally sustained to God was broken when man, the ruler, rebelled against God. That destruction of the world's relation to God was more far-reaching and destructive than we realize. The whole material creation shared in the evil. Briars, thistles, thorns grew in the material world, as in the spiritual. Sickness, death, mortality afflicted the material world. When man rebelled against his Maker, the material creation rebelled against man. The laws of the natural world were disordered. The germs of vegetation put forth; biting frosts or burning heat destroys them. Disorder in the laws of nature is a result of man's sin against his Maker. When Jesus
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comes again the will of God will be done on earth as it is in heaven, and all things in the world will be restored to harmonious relations with God, the Supreme Ruler of the universe. And it is edifying to note how brethren of the old days, as seen in the Millennial Harbinger, freely voiced their understanding, on both sides of this, without even a thought of mutual excommunication.

The position of the simple Christian is simply to take God’s word for his guidance and doctrine. The church of the New Testament is non sectarian, denominational. She is not officially Protestant nor Catholic, Calvanistic nor Armenian, Post-Millennial nor Pre-Millennial. She simply stands upon the word of God. As the beloved T. B. Larrimore used to say—“We are not right: The Bible is right.”

**“WHAT IS IT ALL ABOUT?” “AND WHAT DIFFERENCE DOES IT MAKE?”**

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

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

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

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

**KING-KINGDOM-CHURCH**

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

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

(1) Concerning the kingdom on Pentecost.

“we have put much stress upon this matter because of its own weight and importance. We trust, however, that the reader would even without this discussion have perceived that the kingdom announced by John (and afterward by the Lord Jesus himself, Matt. 4: 17; Mark 1: 14, 15) could have been none other than that of Old Testament prophecy and of Jewish expectation in so far as that expectation accorded with the prophecies. And this is borne out by what we find in the following chapters of Matthew. If it be felt a difficulty that that kingdom though announced as “at hand,” has never yet appeared, we shall find an exclamation unforced and natural, “and that will call no reflection on the truthfulness of God.” (Kingdom of God, by R. H. Boll, page 34.)

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

(2) Concerning the church and the kingdom, our witness (Brother Boll), says that “all members of the church are in his kingdom” (Col. 1: 13), and adds “as though anybody were denying this.” Well, it is a certain fact that R. H. Boll denies that all members of the church are in that kingdom announced by John and Jesus, for he says that kingdom has never yet appeared. Brother Boll is on record that the kingdom mentioned in Col. 1: 13 is not the kingdom Christ announced and intended to establish. Let him tell what ‘kingdom it is, where was it ever mentioned, and how it differs from the kingdom, Christ announced and expected to establish. It is plain that Brother Boll will have two kingdoms where Jesus had only one. Anybody can see that it is a dodge, a mere quibble, and quibbling is not honesty.

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

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

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

If the reader can pierce the vagueness of the above ramblings of the witness, he will silt out the gist of his theory—namely, that when the Jews decided to murder Jesus, the Lord in turn decided to postpone his kingdom, so he introduced a new and unexpected phase of the kingdom—the church—and deferred his kingdom "until he should come again"—yet he would have his readers believe, when he gets into a tight, that "nobody denies that" the kingdom was established on Pentecost! But R. H. Boll denies that, for he declares that Jesus changed his plans, and also his preaching, from that kingdom which had been announced to "a new and unexpected phase" which he styles "a new spiritual contingent, called the church." Hear him again:

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

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

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

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

DAVID'S THRONE—ALL AUTHORITY

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

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

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

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

(2) David's throne in the Old Testament was God's throne. It was also his throne; and it was Solomon's throne. "And also Solomon sitteth on the throne of the kingdom. And moreover the king's servants came to bless our lord king David, saying, Thy God make the name of Solomon better than thy name, and make his throne greater than any throne: and the king bowed himself upon the bed. And also thus said the king, Blessed be Jehovah, the God of Israel, who hath given one to sit on my throne this day, mine eyes even seeing it." (1 Kings 1: 46-48.)

Again, "And Solomon sat upon the throne of David his father; and his kingdom was established greatly." (1 Kings 2: 12.)

Again, "Then Solomon sat on the throne of the Lord as king instead of David his father, and prospered; and all Israel obeyed him." (1 Chron. 29: 23.) It is clear enough that Solomon sat on God's throne, but Solomon sat on David's throne, yet Solomon sat on his own throne. It must follow therefore that God's throne, David's throne, and Solomon's throne were all one and the same throne. It should be just as clear that Christ is therefore now on God's throne, but also on His throne, yet it is David's throne for the Father's throne, and His throne, and David's throne, are one throne in the ante-type, as they were one throne in the type.

The distinction Brother Boll makes on the present and future throne, in order to put Christ on a throne on earth in the millennium, is a distinction without a difference. Jesus Christ has ascended to the only throne that he will ever occupy, according to the scriptures.

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

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

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

COMING BACK-FOOT ON EARTH

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

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

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

IMMINENCE-LOOKING-THE PRACTICAL POINT

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

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

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

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

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

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

SPECULATION-INTERPRETATION-IMPORT

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

(1) Since Brother Boll chooses the literal instead of the spiritual, we are willing for him to have it. Rev. 20 says, “I saw the souls of them that were beheaded ... and they lived and reigned with Christ a thousand years.” Being literal that must be a literal beheading; so no one gets into the millennium except those literally beheaded, which cuts him out. But if the beheading is spiritualized, so must the millennium be, hence no literal millennium, and that cuts his millennium out. Either end of the dilemma leaves him out of the millennium—so what difference does it make and what is it all about after all?

(2) He thinks some of us brand the “plain import” of Rev. 20 as false. But we have become accustomed to his dares on Rev. 20. In 1932 he made a stage play under the caption “Here’s My Hand” and offered to take “what every passage actually says”—with especial reference to Rev. 20. The Gospel Advocate promptly, editorially and officially, accepted the proposition, but it turned out to be only a gesture, for Brother Boll then immediately withdrew his hand.

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

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

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

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

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

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

PARTIES-CONDITIONS-SITUATIONS

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

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

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

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

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

MUTUAL REGARD-TOLERANCE-BROTHERLY UNITY

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

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

*They did. This refers to the Davidson Movement of 1939 which was exposed and destroyed."
WHAT IT IS ALL ABOUT

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

1. That the kingdom of Dan. 2:44—the kingdom of God—has
not yet come into existence.
2. That this kingdom, though announced by John and Jesus,
"has never yet appeared." It was postponed because na-
tional Isreal rejected Jesus.
3. That in consequence of his rejection by the Jews, Jesus
pigeonholed the divine plan, introduced the churc age—
meaning the present dispensation—and went back to heaven
to stay until the Jews get into a notion of letting him set
up his kingdom in Palestine.
4. That in the meantime (the kingdom prophecy having de-
faulted) Jesus is king de jure et potentia-by right only;
but not king de facto et actu-not in actual fact and act.
5. That also in the meantime old pagan Rome must come
back into existence in order to fulfill Dan. 2 :44 "in the
days of these kings" which were in existence when the
kingdom was announced but failed to arrive!
6. That the Jews must be restored as a nation, return to
Palestine, and be converted, in order that Christ can be
king "in fact and act" instead of being a mere crown
prince on his Father's throne.
7. That the temple of Solomon will be rebuilt; the nation of
Israel restored, and the Jewish system reinstituted.
8. That the Lord will then leave the throne of his majesty
in heaven and reoccupy the old Davidic throne in Jeru-
usalem—to be a king on earth.
9. That the resurrected and living saints will meet the Lord
in the air, accompany him somewhere in the heavens for a
time to attend to certain affairs, which Russell and Ruther-
ford call "the rapture," but which in the Boll theory is
"the first stage" of the second coming.
10. That there will be an interval between "the first stage"
and the real second coming which the millenialists call the
Tribulation, which the righteous (those who believe in the
millennium) will escape, having ascended to meet the Lord,
who will later return to vanquish the wicked nations and
start the millennium.
11. That all this is imminent—liable to happen momentarily;
which event would necessitate a series of miraculous in-
terventions that completely upset the gospel order of things,
such as the spontaneous regeneration of the Jewish nation
and a phenomenal transportation of the Jews to Palestine.
In this eventuality the conversion of the Jews would be
direct and immediate and not by gospel influence; the
return of the Jews would be instant and not gradual—a
more stupendous event than crossing the Red Sea or the
Jordan; and the rebuilding of the old Temple in less time
than it took to grow Jonah's gourd!
12. After the thousand years, Satan msters his forces once
more for the great battle in the Valley of Esdralon, his
last stand, where he will be finally defeated in physical,
carnal warfare by the victorious Christ, who will then take
the saints to heaven to stay.
Now, that is "what it is all about"—and R. H. Boll knows it,
though guileless he may appear. Do we hear someone say
"Brother Boll does not teach these things"? Very well; read
the evidence as we page the proof from his own statements of
his "prophetic views."

THE PROOF BY CITATION

The Word and Work, October, 1935, itemized his prophetic
creed in the following points:
1. The "reign of Christ 'with his saints on earth for a thousand
years, following this dispensation and the return of Christ."
2. A literal resurrection of the righteous, "separated from
the rest of the dead by a thousand years."
3. The conversion and restoration of Israel to their "own
land."
4. Another kingdom of Christ "more than the church," yet
future, which Christ will establish on earth at his coming.
5. Prophecies concerning the kingdom, taken at "face valde,
are yet unfulfilled.
6. The apocalyptic vision of Rev. 20 is literal, not figurative,
and its "plain import" teaches a literal, earthly millennium.
Thus far "what it is all about" was set out by Brother Boll
himself in 1935. Does he mean that this is not his teaching
now? If so, let him say so; if not, why does he ask what is it
all about?
But let us cite the proof for the remaining items of the
"prophetic creed" listed above.
1. On page thirty-four, last paragraph, of the booklet King-
dom of God, R. H. Boll himself, is found the statement more
than once referred to, i.e., the kingdom announced by John
and Jesus "has never yet appeared." If he wants to take
this back, let him do so; if not, it is hypocrisy for him to act
though somebody has caused a "rumpus" over nothing.
2. On page thirty-five, first paragraph, he says, "The kingdom
promise was national" and since the Jews did not nationally
repress, the kingdom promise was not fulfilled. Yet he now
says nobody denies that the kingdom was established on
Pentecost. Indeed! Then which time did he state what he
believes-now or in his book; Which will he repudiate?
Both cannot be true. Does he now wish to renounce his
former teaching? Let him do so forthrightly without un-
measured "rants" about those who "oppose vehemently"
just "to save their faces" what he has actually taught!
3. On pages thirty-seven and thirty-eight he says that after
the kingdom was postponed, Jesus introduced the new phase
of his teaching—the parables; and the new and unex-
pected aspect of the kingdom—"the church age." Does he believe
this now? If so, all this talk about somebody "insisting
fiercely that the kingdom exists now . . . as though somebody
were denying it" can be considered only as being for effect
in an effort to blame others for the "condition of things"
which he himself has caused.
4. On page sixty-one is his statement that Christ is not king
"in fact and act" (de facto et actu) but by right only (de
jure et. potentia)—but when he returns he will be actual
king in exercise of all authority.
Does he believe this now? If not, when and where has
he recalled it? If so, why talk about somebody "bitterly
denouncing" him as though he does not "believe alike," with
us that Christ has all authority in heaven and on earth?
We have been taking his own word for it.
Has he taken this back? If so, where? If not, why does he
use such impious language about those who have in fact
represented his teaching exactly as he himself has stated it
in the past, and then with his usual dramatics say "we
are agreed on this" and "nobody denies that?" Duplicity
is a mild term for such double-dealing and maneuvering
To escape the responsibility for the "condition of things."
5. On page seventy-one, he says that "so long as- Satan's throne
is on the earth, Christ is not exercising the government."
But now he says: "Yet all of us believe alike that Christ
is on the throne he now occupies (call it what you may),
and that he has all authority in heaven and on earth."
Which one of these statements does Brother Boll want us
to believe, or when shall we believe what?
7. In his treatise on the Second Coming, published in 1924,
It is a system of rank materialism. It teaches that saints now living will occupy "positions" of authority and exercise temporal rule in the millennium. One of the brethren in this party has elected himself in advance to be Mayor of Chicago! Another bids for the mayoralty of New York. One ardent advocate of the theory discovers that the United States will send ambassadors to Christ (who will be in Palestine) during the millennium!

We believe that when "fair-minded and true-hearted brethren" really know what this theory is—and that R. H. Boll teaches it—they will truly "rise up to discountenance" not the opposition to it, but the theory and its promoters.

**THAT NEW SPIRITUAL CONTINGENT CALLED THE CHURCH**

In Word and Work R. H. Boll always has somewhat to say in reference to the reliability of God's "solemn promises" to "his people Israel." He seems much perturbed over the New Testament teaching that the church is God's Israel now. He thinks the Jews, old fleshly Israel must nationally be restored, and given a literal earthly kingdom, with Christ literally seated on David's literal throne in Jerusalem. If this is not in the picture for the Jews when Christ returns—then "we cannot know that any promise of God can be relied on, nor can we know what he means when he says anything!" He cannot see any figurative interpretation or spiritual fulfillment of the prophecies. If the kingdom is the church, and Christ is on David's throne in heaven now, he thinks that instead of fulfilling his word "to his people Israel," God has changed it and has turned "all into a spiritual and figurative fulfillment to a new spiritual contingent called 'the church'" and to him it is "as though the word of God hath come to naught."

To read these strong expressions from Brother Boll one would get the impression that he believes God always means just what he says, and that no prophecy or promise of God could ever be changed a jot or fall short of fulfillment a little. 1. "**IF IT BE FELT A DIFFICULTY**

Let us apply his own reasoning (?) to his own teaching on the postponement of that kingdom which was announced by John and Jesus as "at hand," when the **time was fulfilled**, as stated in Mark 1: 14, 15. The kingdom prophecies of the Old Testament were to be fulfilled "in the days of these kings" (Dan. 2: 44). In his book, Kingdom of God, page 34, Brother Boll admits that this referred to the kingdom John and Jesus announced; and he admits that. "these kings" referred to Rome; and he admits that "Rome is gone." But while Rome was here, and these very kings were in existence, John the Baptist announced that the kingdom foretold by the prophets and promised by God was "at hand." He said "the time is fulfilled, and the kingdom of God is at hand" (Mark 1: 14, 15). Brother Boll admits this is the kingdom prophesied by Daniel, and admits that it was the time for it to arrive. Hear his words again: "We have put much stress upon this matter because of its weight and importance. We trust, however, that the reader would even without this discussion have perceived that the kingdom announced by John (and afterward by the Lord Jesus Himself, Matt. 4: 17; Mark 1: 14, 15) could have been none other than that of Old Testament prophecy and of Jewish expectation in so far as that expectation accorded with the prophecies. And this is borne out by what we find in the following chapter of Matthew. If it be felt a difficulty that that kingdom, though announced as 'at hand', has never yet appeared, we shall find an explanation unforced and natural, and one which will cast no reflection on the truth and goodness of God." (Kingdom of God, page 34.)

Now, after admitting here that the kingdom announced by John and "the Lord Jesus Himself" was the kingdom that God had promised, and admitting also that it was the time for God to fulfill his prophetic word, Brother Boll has the boldness to...
say that this kingdom “has never yet appeared.” If God did not fulfill his word in this instance and keep his promise this time, let Brother Boll tell us how we may “know that any promise of God can be relied on” or “know what he means when he says anything.” In the face of such a theory, it comes with poor grace for R. H. Boll to talk about anybody teaching anything that reflects on the prophecies and promises of God. Thou art the man, Brother Boll!

2. “AN EXPLANATION UNFORCED AND NATURAL”

It must be evident to all that R. H. Boll has but little regard for the church. He has called it “a new spiritual contingent” (accident, emergency, liability), a thing not in the original divine plan at all. In his theory the church is only an emergency measure, a substitute for the kingdom, a mere accident resulting from a promissory default and a prophetic fiasco. If any believe we do him an injustice in these statements hear his own words further:

“We have now briefly traced the kingdom-teaching of Matthew, and the kingdom gospel, from beginning to end. We have seen how the Old Testament hope of the Messianic kingdom of Israel and its world-wide sway was at first entirely in the foreground; how a crisis came when the opposition of Israel culminated in plans of murder; how then the Lord Jesus 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, the present, spiritual, veiled, suffering form of the kingdom of Heaven, until he should come again, occupied the foreground of his teaching.” (Kingdom of God, page 46.)

So the kingdom itself was in the foreground until it was relegated by the Jews to a back seat, and when all prophecies and promises of God concerning the kingdom were thus thwarted, God “postponed” and “deferred” the whole program and Jesus then announced the “new” and “unexpected” and “different” thing which he calls a “form” and an “aspect” of the actual thing, just “a spiritual contingent called ‘the church,’” which he says is “an entirely new and different aspect” which the kingdom “assumed.” What “an explanation!” So “unforced and natural,” to avoid casting “reflection on the truth and goodness of God!” His very language condemns him; it is not the parlance of gospel teachers nor the nomenclature of the New Testament. Even the parables of Jesus, in the Boll theory, were wholly of an emergency character, for he says “these parables are really an announcement of the new and unexpected aspect the kingdom would assume during an anticipated age of the king’s rejection and absence from the world.” (K. of G., page 38.) Thus he not only borrows his thoughts from Scofield, Blackstone and Russell, but he employs all the force of their language and expressions to belittle the church, and exalt these God-dishonoring and Christ-demoting theories.

3. AUTOMATICALLY DEFERRED

But to help God out of the dilemma, which he calls “a difficulty,” of unfulfilled prophecies and defaulted promises, Brother Boll says that he will find an “explanation unforced and natural,” and he “finds” it in the Scofield postponement theory. Let those who have indignantly declared that “Brother Boll does not believe and teach such things” read his very words and inform themselves before they speak. Here they are:

“The dispute whether or not the kingdom of Old Testament prophecy (the restoration and sovereignty of The Nation of Israel) was ‘offered’ to Israel by John the Baptist and by Christ in his earthly ministry, is but a war of words, irrelevant and unnecessary. The only thing that ever stood between Israel and her glorious promises, kingdom and all, was her sinful condition. That removed, every other promise must necessarily be fulfilled to them, and that speedily. Whether there had been any formal offer of the kingdom made to them, and upon their rejection the same was withdrawn and postponed, is no essential matter. But if salvation was offered to the nation by Jesus, all else was implied therein as a matter of course; and if that was nationally rejected, the fulfillment of all their prophetic hopes was thereby made impossible, and automatically deferred until the time when the nation would turn to acknowledge Jesus Christ and be forgiven.” (Kingdom of God, page 46.)

Neither Scofield nor Blackstone, Russell nor Rutherford, ever wrote any ranker statements than these from the pen of R. H. Boll. It commits him definitely to the postponement of the kingdom after the time was fulfilled and after both John and Jesus had announced it. Brother Boll here says that when salvation was “nationally rejected” by the Jews, therein “the fulfillment of all their prophetic hopes was thereby made impossible” and the prophecies were “automatically deferred.” Do you get it—the fulfillment of these prophecies was made impossible. Daniel prophesied it; God promised it; John and “the Lord Jesus Himself” announced it—but the fulfillment of it was made impossible and it was automatically deferred! Now, who is R. H. Boll that he should talk of those whose teaching causes him to wonder if “any promise of God can be relied on” or if we can know what God “means when he says something”! He it is who says that whether the kingdom “offer” was withdrawn and postponed is “no essential matter.” With him, teaching against the future earthly, literal, fleshly restoration of the Jews is very serious because it means (to him) that God’s promise cannot be relied on; but for him to teach that God’s prophetic word and promise did fail at the very time the divine record said the time was fulfilled casts no “reflection on the truth and goodness of God.” And whether the kingdom was “postponed” or “deferred” or the “offer” was “withdrawn,” he says, is “irrelevant” and “is no essential matter.” A man who can talk and write in such vein can believe anything his fervid imagination tells him to believe. As a matter of plain fact, if the prophecy meant the ‘first coming of Christ when it was spoken by the Old Testament prophets, it could not mean the second coming at any time later. If the prophets meant the second coming of Christ when the prophecy was spoken, then it never did mean the first coming, and so nothing was “deferred,” and either way it is taken Brother Boll is wrong. But he winsces when his theories are “stigmatized” as “Bollism” and refers to what “some ignorant folk today would foolishly have called Bollism.” Note his language—ignorant folk; he forgets that he is supposed to be more pious than we are, and talks like the rest of us! This, however, is mild compared with many epithets he hurls. But we agree with him on that point—that he should never have been so ‘distinguished by the label of “Bollism” on his theories, for they do not belong to him. He borrowed them from Scofield, Russell and Blackstone, and others of that die and cast. He should return his borrowed theories to their rightful owners, and himself to the plain gospel, or else join these stray groups outright and cease to trouble churches of Christ.

3. “THE ONLY THING THAT STOOD IN THE WAY”

As further evidence that even Brother Boll knows that the kingdom prophecies referred to the first coming of Christ, and not his second coming, hear him once more:

“The only thing that ever stood in the way of Israel and her glorious promises, kingdom and all, was her sinful condition. That removed, every other promise must necessarily be fulfilled to them and that speedily.” (Kingdom of God, page 46.)

That part of the issue is settled—when God through his prophets promised the Messianic Kingdom to Israel, these prophecies referred to the first coming of Christ. Then, according to Brother Boll himself, Jesus came to establish the earthly kingdom and the Jews expected the earthly kingdom. The puzzle is that Jesus wanted to establish the earthly kingdom, and the Jews wanted him to establish the earthly kingdom.
yet the Jews crucified Christ for wanting to establish the kind of a kingdom they wanted him to establish! Can you beat it?

Again, noting his language, it is observed that the only thing that stood in the way of the kingdom prophecy being fulfilled to Israel when Jesus came was Israel's sinful condition. Then, so far as the prophecy itself is concerned, the kingdom was due, and its character was to have been exactly what they tell us the future kingdom will be. The conclusion is irresistible that if Israel's sinful condition had been "removed" the kingdom would have come and Christ would have been king on earth, in which event, he would not have been crucified. So one prophecy failed that another might be fulfilled, and because it was fulfilled, the other one failed! Furthermore, if Israel had received the kingdom, the millennium would have begun then, since it is this same millennial kingdom "postponed" and "deferred" that Brother Boll is writing about. That being true, we would not have had the parables, the gospels, the death of Christ, the book of Acts, the church, epistles to the church, nor the New Testament—but the earthly, temporal kingdom and since it calls for only a literal thousand years, it would have all been over 900 years ago, and all of us left out, including Brother Boll himself! All this consummate folly because Brother Boll is determined that the kingdom is not spiritual and that God's Israel is not the church. Surely to all who are not blinded by theory it must be evident that John and "the Lord Jesus Himself" announced a fact when they said "the time is fulfilled, the kingdom of God is at hand." That Kingdom is the church, the theories of pre-millennialism to the contrary notwithstanding.

MISSIONS AND MISSIONARIES 0. C. LAMBERT

The word mission does not occur in our English Bible. Since translators choose their own words in expressing the meaning they find in the original Hebrew and Greek, they might have correctly employed this word also. Not long since I heard a young preacher severely calling to task those who use the word loaf instead of bread, as being unscriptural. But some translators use it and it happens to be the first word Thayer uses to express the meaning of the original.

But the word mission and the word missionary have been so long employed to make distinctions unknown in the New Testament, that I feel that it would be less misleading than I if we would use other words. For instance: A mission is not a church and a missionary is not a gospel preacher or evangelist. To have a church that controls a group somewhere which they call a mission is dangerous near the Catholic idea of diocese, which was made in the early history of Christianity. If our brethren who are in distant places are not establishing churches as Paul and others did in New Testament times, then I am not interested in their work. Why is a man a gospel preacher or an evangelist who preaches the gospel in nearby places but the instant he goes to some distant place, especially, if he should cross the ocean, does he become a missionary? The denominational churches have had missions and missionaries in foreign lands for more than a hundred years, but have no self-supporting churches, and according to surveys made by their own people have failed to accomplish much. Our people in adopting their terminology have also appropriated their ideas, and we have had missions and missionaries in foreign lands for more than fifty years and have few if any self-supporting churches. Each Christian is obligated to take the gospel to others.

I may admire the purposes of these representatives of denominationalism who make such heroic sacrifices, yet I do not approve what they do, and I do not want any of my brethren to conclude that I am antagonistic toward those who are trying to spread the gospel. I am trying to help, not to hinder. I wish we had hundreds out everywhere where we have so few.

I am merely urging caution, that we want to do everything on the New Testament pattern.

I have been interested for many years in taking the gospel where it has never been known, and I can say without boasting that there are few preachers among us who have held any more meetings without any church or individual supporting than I have. It has been my great pleasure to be associated with one of the finest churches anywhere, for more than fourteen years, which believes in supporting the preacher who goes into new places. Since I am severing my connection with this wonderful church I feel that it will be pardonable to say something by way of commendation of this fine church. I deserve little credit for being so fortunate as to be connected with such a fine group of Christians. The work that has been accomplished has been by the whole church and not simply by "the preacher." This church I speak of is the Sixth Street church in Port Arthur, Texas. I think all the brethren who have held meetings there in recent years can also testify to the things I have to say.

I think the success of this church is due to the common sense plan which has been followed, which is, I am sure the New Testament plan. While they have made small contributions regularly, through the years, to work in many places, they have concentrated their forces to nearby places, and have persistently stood by the work they started until it could carry on of itself. This very essential matter of becoming self-reliant was part of the plan. There has been more than a congregation a year established through this period, and most of these places are now able to carry on by themselves and have houses of their own. I am praying for this church, that the success they have achieved may but spur them on to greater accomplishments, and that hundreds of other churches may get a vision of greater things, and get more pleasure out of taking the light to those in darkness.

Frequently I hear people speak of "hard places." I have come to the conclusion that there is not nearly as much difference in the possibilities of different localities as we sometimes imagine. It is true that people with different languages, customs, and backgrounds, generally require a different method of going about the work, and a different preparation for the worker. Many diseases which formerly baffled the medical profession are yielding to a better prepared doctor. While it may appear childish to mature people to say that one of the first things we must learn if we expect to get into the hearts of people is to be able to make friends. We avoid people we do not like. We do not buy groceries or insurance from people we dislike, and we do not go out of our way to listen to a fellow preach if we do not like him personally. Some seem to go on the idea that the best way to convert a man is to first insult him! Preaching the gospel is the greatest errand of mercy. If we are not genuinely in love with people we will fail. We ought to "become all things to all men." Paul, the most successful preacher who ever lived, preached "publicly and from house to house" (Acts 20: 20). I think it a waste of time for the preacher to simply visit the brethren to enjoy a little social chat with them, but for a person to go into new homes and make friends for the church is a great adventure. It is one of the greatest pleasures in the world. There is no clergy or laity in the church of Christ. This should not be the work of one member, which is sometimes called "the preacher," but should be the daily work of all the members. In the Jerusalem church, made up of thousands of members, they all "went everywhere preaching the word" (Acts 8: 4).

It is with many heartaches that I sever my relations with this wonderful group of the Lord's own. In fourteen years many ties will grow. Many of them are my children in the gospel. I have been at the bedside of the dying, I have seen their children grow up, have performed the marriage ceremonies

(Continued on page 15)
The old sectarian objection to Scriptural baptism has often been repeated and heard. In order to set aside plain Bible statements that tell us that baptism is essential to salvation, as Mark 16:16; Acts 2:38; 1 Peter 3:21, sectarian preachers have often asked: “What about the man who is on the way to the creek to be baptized but is killed by a falling limb or a kicking mule before he gets there?” They seem to think that God would have to save a fellow like this and thus deny his own word that says otherwise. Often in public debate I have had my opponents ask me that question. Invariably I have answered: “The man who is killed on his way to be baptized is in the same condition as the man who smothers to death at the mourner’s bench before he gets through.” Sectarian debaters do not relish this answer, but it shows the fallacy of their claim and objection. Why would God have to save the man who is killed on a mule before baptism any more than he would the man who smothers to death before he gets through?

Recently Ben M. Bogard shot this gun again in the Orthodox Baptist Searchlight, of which he is editor. He aimed it in the following manner:

“But what about a man on his way to the creek to be baptized and a bolt of lightning strikes him or an auto wrecks or a mule kicks him to death and he for that reason is not baptized. Exactly. That makes salvation depend on the freakish lightning, or the carelessness of the auto driver or the meanness of a mule. These Campbellite preachers ought to say to their prospective members, ‘If you will come and give me your hand and go to the creek and be baptized, you will be saved provided a mule does not kick you before you get there.’”

Now, it seems to me that a man who has had as many debates as Bogard and who has engaged in as much controversy as he should be able to see the consequence of his arguments. But no one seems as blind as denominational preachers. It is a well known fact that membership in the Baptist Church depends on being baptized according to Baptist usage. No man can become a member of the Baptist Church without submitting to baptism at the hands of a Baptist preacher. Baptist Church membership, therefore, depends on being baptized according to Baptist doctrine. Let us, then, load Bogard’s gun with “Baptist Church membership” instead of “salvation” and “Baptist preachers” instead of “Campbellite preachers” and point it back at him. When the explosion occurs the report sounds like this: “But what about a man on his way to the creek to be baptized and a bolt of lightning strikes him or an auto wrecks or a mule kicks him to death, and he for that reason is not baptized? That makes Baptist Church membership depend on the freakish lightning, or the carelessness of the auto driver or the meanness of a mule. These Baptist preachers ought to say to their prospective members, ‘If you will come and give me your hand and go to the creek and be baptized, you will be provided a mule does not kick you before you get there.’”

Thus it becomes evident that a man may be thrown out of Baptist membership by a reckless driver, struck out by a bolt of lightning, or kicked out by a stubborn mule. So Bogard’s argument against baptism as being essential to salvation returns with all of its power (if it has any) upon his own position that baptism is essential to church membership.

According to Baptist doctrine, would a man suffer any serious loss if he were prevented from becoming a member of the Baptist Church? They claim baptism is a Christian duty, and, while it is not necessary to salvation, every Christian ought to be baptized as a matter of obedience to God. I see. Then a reckless driver, a bolt of lightning or a kicking mule might keep a Christian from doing his duty and obeying God; and the performance of Christian duty, therefore, is made to depend on the meanness of-a mule. But Baptists also say that the Lord’s Supper can be had only in the Baptist Church. You must be baptized into the Baptist Church to be eligible for this privilege. But a man on his way to the creek to be baptized is killed by one of the afore-mentioned powers and is prevented from sharing in this privilege. And so the privilege of eating the Lord’s Supper is made to “depend on the freakish lightning, the carelessness of an auto driver or the meanness of a mule.”

Furthermore, the importance of church membership, as viewed by Bogard, is shown in a number of statements made by him in another issue of the Orthodox Baptist Searchlight. In the issue of April 10, 1941, he printed one of his radio sermons on “The Great Wedding Day.” From this sermon the following statements are taken:

“What greater honor could come to a child of God than to become a part of the ‘bride of the Lamb’s wife’?”

Those who are not a part of the bride will be permitted to work for the Lord and to invite sinners to Jesus for salvation and to be guests at the royal wedding, but the honor of being the bride of Christ will be for the church only.”

“The church question therefore becomes very important. You cannot be a part of the bride of Christ if you are not a member of the church.”

“The most important thing is to be sure we are saved and next to it in importance is to be sure we are in the church our Lord himself established so as to be a part of the bride of Christ.”

From these statements we see that Bogard believes the church to be the bride of Christ. Of course he thinks the ceremony has not taken place yet, and will not until Jesus comes, but he thinks only members of the church will constitute the bride of that day. And it is evident that he thinks the Baptist Church is the one “our Lord himself established,” even though no mention of the Baptist Church was ever made by him in all his Holy Book. But this does not keep Bogard from thinking that the Baptist Church will constitute the bride of Christ “in the great wedding day.” In view of these statements by Bogard, what can his kicking mule cheat a man out of? Bogard reasons that the greatest honor that “could come to a child of God” is “to become a part of the bride” of Christ. Yet he says this honor “will be for the church only.” So the greatest honor that could come to a child of God will depend on being a member of the Baptist Church, according to Bogard. But a man cannot become a member of the Baptist Church without baptism. Hence, the greatest honor possible for a child of God depends on baptism. A man may be on his way to the creek to be baptized, thus preparing himself for the greatest honor “that could come to a child of God,” but he contacts a kicking mule that kills him before he gets to the creek. We would have to conclude, therefore, according to Bogard’s way of reasoning, that “the greatest honor” that “can come to a child of God” depends on the meanness of a mule. “The most important thing” is salvation, but he thinks that “next to it in importance” is church membership. He does not believe that a kicking mule can cheat a man out of “the most important thing” but he does believe that a mule’s meanness may interfere with the next thing to it in importance. The sum of this whole matter is this: If the fact that a man, who is on his way to the creek to be baptized for the remission of his sins, may be killed by a bolt of lightning, a reckless driver or a kicking mule proves that baptism is not necessary to salvation, then the fact that the same man, if following Baptist doctrine, may be killed by the same bolt of lightning, the same reckless driver or the same kicking mule while he is on his way to the creek to be baptized into the Baptist Church would prove that baptism is not necessary to church membership. If not, why not? Perhaps Bogard could tell us why. I should like to see him try it sometime.
By the above title is simply meant courses of thought and action in harmony with the teaching of the Prince of Peace recorded in the inspired writers of the New Testament. In studying these principles there are human dogmas encountered not only on so-called “first principles,” but also on second principles. While such dogmas are often found to be rooted and grounded in people, they have nothing to do with Christian Principles, for only inspired teaching is the source of Christian principles.

One of the most distinct clashes between human dogmas and Christian principles is concerning the command, “Thou shalt not kill.” On that command the dogma assumes that inasmuch as it is absolute in form, it is not conditional in meaning. But those who hold to that dogma would not need to read very far in the Bible till they could see that God actually demonstrated the conditionality of that command by subsequently commanding his people to kill under certain conditions; and the conditions under which and the ordinance by which capital punishment is to be exercised are important parts of New Testament principles which are right on the subject under discussion.

“Put up again thy sword into its place: for all they that take the sword shall perish with the sword,” says Christ (Matt. 26:52.) A human theory assumes that “all” in that statement is absolute in meaning. It is absolute in form, but it is just as positively conditional in meaning, and it is right on the surface, for since time immemorial, many of those who had used the sword, died some other way. And it is significant that the Savior did not request that the sword be thrown away, but instead he said: “Put up again the sword into its place,” which shows there is a place for the sword in the divine economy.

That there is a use for the sword that is not in vain, is plain from Romans 13: 4, “For he (it’s-margin, referring to government) beareth not the sword in vain: for he is a minister of God, an avenger for wrath to him that doeth evil.” So then to use the sword is not in vain when God through His ordinance, the government, commands it to be used in performing its divine mission. And this is another reason why “all” in Matt. 26: 52 is not used in the absolute sense; and there is no valid reason why this principle should not be as plain as “first principles.”

“For this cause ye pay tribute also; for they are ministers of God’s service, attending continually upon this very thing.” (Verse 6.) The word “also” in that verse implies that helping to finance the government is “in addition” to something else. What is that something else? Evidently it comprehends anything in harmony with the government’s divine mission. The command is made more specific as circumstances develop, for as has been well said: “Strategy is deciding what to do; tactics is figuring out a way to do it; combat is getting it done.”

Hence, God’s general command to Christians is reduced to the specific by God’s ordinance according to the exigency of the moment and development of conditions; and this New Testament principle involves Christians in the practice of capital punishment through God’s ordinance.

And since no divine stipulation of either combatant or noncombatant service is made, then either is enjoined under the general commands. But a human theory suggests noncombatant service; and as a result, some sincere people seem to think it is scriptural, while combatant service is unscriptural. What a wide difference between the principles that register on the mind because of a dogma and the principles that are recorded in the New Testament! No criticism is here intended for preferring noncombatant service; only the illogical ground assigned for it is here questioned.

The background of causes that may prompt an individual, a band, a nation, or a group of nations to a murderous course, interesting as it may be, has no practical bearing on murder already committed and in course of progress. Why, the very purpose of capital punishment, whether it is of local, national or international scope, is to restrain others from starting on a similar course and also to rid civilization of those already started. Hence, the suggestion that is noticed in the religious press for scientific consideration of the background of causes of war is splendid only as a preventative, not as a cure. We need the cure now and New Testament principles provide it through the instrumentality of the temporal governments: and the matter of obeying God through His ordinance is not so complicated and slow as a scientific consideration of the background of causes; and God’s word calls for no such consideration under the existing emergency as a cure for it.

“And as ye would that men should do to you, do ye also to them likewise,” says Christ (Luke 6: 31.) This is appropriately called “the golden rule”; and another divine rule may just as appropriately be called the iron rule. There is no conflict between them as they are divinely enjoined, for God is the author of both, and we are not authorized to confuse them. While both rules may apply to the same personnel, they manifestly do not apply under the same conditions nor at the same time. That would confuse them and make them contradictory, and God is not the author of confusion. The divine exception to the observance of the golden rule is under circumstances when it is not only not mutually observed by those on both sides of an issue (that alone would not furnish the ground), but also when the issue involves consequences of far-reaching importance to and concern of civilization.

Hence, when disregard of “the golden rule” on the part of an individual, a band, a nation, or a group of nations, involves an “evil” of the enormity of that referred to in Romans 13: 4, in which organized temporal government is divinely concerned for the preservation of civilization on earth, then the iron rule for that particular occasion and purpose divinely supplants the golden rule, “for he (it’s-margin-the government) beareth not the sword in vain: for he is a minister of God, an avenger for wrath to him that doeth evil.” And to the extent that Christians obey God in the matter of obeying God’s ordinances, they are observing or inflicting the iron rule; and just as surely as New Testament principles involve “the golden rule,” so do they involve the iron rule. And fortunately for the United States and civilization, there is a gallant and noble army of young men, and a larger number of all ages backing them up at home, observing and inflicting this divine iron rule today. And why mince words about so-matter-of-fact business? Upon this claim that the iron rule is to be enforced by the government but Christians are to stand aloof from it, it should be observed that proof of just the opposite of that claim and course is what is adduced in these New Testament principles. Many religious teachers in the press and pulpit fail to observe
the divine and important distinction between the two natures or classes of evil dealt with in the New Testament, as follows:

1. It is evil for one to refuse to obey the "first principles" of the gospel and all other principles that relate exclusively to God. But civil and military government are not divinely concerned with that class of evil. And except the scriptural interest that Christians have in the eternal salvation of the souls of all, no one else is interested in this class of evil. The evil in violating "the golden rule" is not of this class, because that rule also relates to men. Neither the material sword nor its equivalent is to be used in combating this class of evil; only the figurative sword or sword of the Spirit is to be used in combating this evil. This was the evil involved when Christ gave the command: "Put up again thy sword into its place," etc. Only the persuasive terms of the gospel are to be used in our effort to correct the evil involved in this class. So the evil of rejecting this class of principles is not the "evil" referred to in Romans 13: 4, as we shall further see.

2. The "evil" referred to in Romans 13: 4 relates not only to God but it involves a principle that relates to all human-kind—saint and sinner—throughout the world, whether it is local, national or international. Hence, the consequences of this character of "evil" is not limited simply to those who commit this "evil," for it transgresses the moral rights of anyone who engages in it. The very principle upon which civilization rests is at stake in this class of "evil." So no wonder God calls for a different remedy for this class of "evil"; and the reason God calls for the material sword or its equivalent for combating this character of "evil" is another reason why it is a different character of "evil" to that under No. 1, where only the persuasive terms of the gospel are divinely prescribed. For this class of "evil" the divine remedy is force, with all that it implies, which is in sharp contrast with the evil of No. 1, which only relates to God.

That enormous "evil" discussed under No. 2 is the very "evil" referred to by Mr. Churchill in his vigorous statement in the press today, December 8, 1942, referring to Japan, which is here quoted in part: "The growing power of the United Nations will press steadfastly on till she is stripped of her conquest, punished for her treachery and deprived of her powers of evil." This paragraph is quoted from Mr. Churchill's statement to emphasize the exclusive, distinct, logical and scriptural sense in which its author uses the word "evil." On this point, religious teachers may glean an important lesson from Mr. Churchill's statement, for it deals with a New Testament principle no less than religious teachers do in dealing with "first principles."

THE INDIAN WORK
HOMER HAILEY

Brethren who have had a part in the work of Brother James E. White, evangelist among the Oneida Indians of Wisconsin, will be interested in a report of the progress of that work.

Brother White, a full blood Sioux Indian, whose wife is of the Oneida tribe, with his family moved to the Oneida reservation several years ago, soon after he completed ten years of work at Freed-Hardeman College. Under the supervision of the Murray Hill congregation, Flint, Michigan, the work began. A basement, built by the Lutheran denomination was purchased for a meeting place, which was paid for by the congregation at Flint. Soon this became too small to adequately carry on the work, necessitating the erection of a larger house.

The work made excellent progress under the church at Flint, but about two years ago, after some correspondence between the Murray Hill church and the congregation at Highland Avenue and Fifth in Abilene, the Abilene congregation assumed the responsibility of supervising the work.

At that time Brother White visited the church in Abilene, acquainting himself with the church there, and the church getting a first-hand acquaintance with Brother White. At that time Brother White told the church that his first need was for a cemetery. This was quite a surprise to the Abilene church, although it is generally conceded that some of the older churches have need for a cemetery (not particularly for their physically dead); but for a new congregation to need one was unusual. However, when Brother White explained the Indian customs and traditions relative to their cemeteries and religious beliefs, the necessary funds with which to purchase the land, were given him. A five acre plot of ground was purchased, in a prominent location, for the purpose.

Later, Brother White advised the elders in Abilene that a new building was urgently needed, the congregation having outgrown the old one. Again Brother White was asked to visit the congregation in Abilene (about a year and a half after the first visit). Plans were drawn, and a few months later the building was under way.

Brother L. E. Weathers, an elder in the Highland congregation, who is a building contractor, was sent by the church to supervise the erection of the building. This year the government limited such buildings to five thousand dollars. After some alterations of the plans, the building was erected, keeping the cost within the amount allowed.

Here, briefly, is a description of the building: The auditorium is 26 by 54 feet (inside measurement), which will seat between 150 and 200. There are four class rooms, two at each end of the auditorium. The floor is of concrete throughout; the walls of plastered sheet rock inside, with three-quarter in insulite and the board siding outside the studding. The roof is 210-pound composition shingles.

Although an electric power line passed by the building site, because the government would not allow a priority to purchase a transformer, it was necessary to install a lighting plant. A baptistry is being installed, but because of inability to secure certain materials, it was not completed at the time of Brother White's last letter.

The total cost of the building and light plant was about fifty-two hundred dollars; five thousand for the building, and two hundred twenty-five for the plant. Of this amount, the Highland congregation paid (at the time) eight hundred dollars; and had one thousand on hand contributed by individuals and congregations toward the building. This left thirty-four hundred dollars owed. Since then, individuals and congregations, with some additional from the Highland congregation, have contributed such amounts that the indebtedness has been reduced to about fifteen hundred dollars.

Should any individual or congregation desire to have fellowship in building the first meeting house to be erected by churches of Christ among the American Indians, such contributions may be sent to P. E. Cotham, 2209 South Sixth St., Abilene, Texas. Brother Cotham is acting as treasurer for the Indian fund, under the direction of the elders of the church at Highland Avenue and Fifth.

It is the firm belief of the members of the Highland Avenue church that the work among the Indians is being built on a permanent foundation. Everyone has confidence in the integrity of Brother White, and his faithfulness to the Lord and His Word. All are looking for great things among the American Indians, as the result of this work. This church should be the radiating center from which the American Indian shall be evangelized. Your assistance or help in paying off the indebtedness of the building will be appreciated by the Indian brethren, and by the church in Abilene.
MUSINGS FROM MOTOR CITY

A. B. KEENAN

My latest number of "School and Society" brings me news of three of the brethren: T. H. Etheridge, who gets the deanship of Sul Ross State Teachers College at Alpine, Texas; E. V. Pullias, dean of George Pepperdine College and who contributes an article on "Liberal Education's Greatest Need: Teachers," and Jonah W. D. Skiles of Westminster College, Fulton, Missouri, who holds forth on "Latin and Greek in Preparation for Medicine."

My long memory cannot parallel a fellow to this particular issue, so replete with the doings, and the sayings, of the initiated. These three worthies I have not known after the flesh. However, I did see a notice about Brother Etheridge in the Banner recently, so replete with the doings, and the sayings, of the initiated, that he'd gone up in the world; the name of Pullias has been one to conjure with in the brotherhood for some decades past; and Bro. Skiles is known only to me as the signer of a column in a certain Louisville, Ky., newsmag, whose editor has so much to say about the day which comes after the last day.

Perusing the editorials in the Banner recently-I always read them and never my own offerings first-I came into the office of the dean of Pepperdine by the back door, so to speak. What was said by way of introduction to the dean did not impress me with his ability to throw himself into the breach, nor with his powers of ringing out in clarion tones, "They shall not pass!"

No college among us will ever succeed in the predictable future that tries to remain half free in Christ and half in slavery to the world. "Stressing the spiritual" is, or was, the slogan of one of them. As an example of sounding forth something without commission to anything, it wins the wickerwork bathtub. The church is the fold and family of God. If a college represents it before the world, such an institution should be possessed of its spirit of brotherhood and of its love for the unsullied truth. Cliques and secret orders would better become the organizational genius and worldly-wise philosophy of Roman Catholicism than of the groups which saints preside over.

Bro. Skiles may be a good man, but I know he is aiding and abetting the propagation of disunity. I call upon him to repent of his unfortunate endorsements. Bible Banner readers then might welcome his "studies in the original text" in their own columns.

Now methinks all our truths need revision. P is for PROPHET. The present-day type
Know more than the Master when the time'll be ripe.
Q is for "QUEER ONE"! all who oppose
Suppositions and guess-work take that on the nose.
R is for RECENT: truth is as old
As the Scriptures. On that I completely am sold.
S is for SAINTHOOD. It's all yet to be—
When Satan gets bound up real tight, don't you see!
T is for TERRY: his pirates I guess
Steal 'siderably less than some pirates. Me bless!
U is for UNION both now and forever:
On Baptists, Adventists we'll turn our back never!
V is for VICTORY, to come swift and sure—
As soon as the Rapture for rich and for poor.
W is for "WORD", and it's also for "WORK."
We wonder WHOSE word; and that's one work we'll shirk!
X marks the spot where the body was found:
Where the cannons of Scripture with thongs were all bound.
Y is for YOUTHFUL, it's too bad in one's age
To cling to a notion that just won't pass the Gauge.
Z is for ZEBRA: a many striped brute;
Yet whiter than some who give Foy the boot.

"Again, the kingdom of heaven is like unto a net, that was cast into the sea, and gathered of every kind: Which, when it was full, they drew to shore, and sat down, and gathered the good into vessels, but cast the bad away."

Yes, the gospel net gathers all kinds of fish in its meshes. We stand at the place today where we can see the gathering and experience what kind of individuals many who are caught in the gospel net actually are.

There is for instance, Bro. Mackerel. He's as cold as ice. He makes his enthusiasm for gospel work conspicuous by its absence. He stands at the edge of the crowd. He lays burdens upon other men's backs, yet he will not touch one of them so much as with his little finger. He criticizes, blocks and tackles. He has not one spark of constructive or creative leadership in his body. He is the "compleat" dog-in-the-manger. He will not call the numbers, and successfully keeps anyone else from doing so.

Then there is Bro. Eel. He's as slippery as they come. Yes, he may be on the committee which has formulated the suggestions to be placed before the church. If talk were new-churches-planted the country would be covered with them from Maine to Alabama, for Bro. Eel is possessed of the persuasive verbiage of a life-insurance office manager. Yet when the work is actually to be performed, where is this enthusiast? He finds suddenly he's very busy with some other matters, etc., etc.

Then there's Sister Jelly Fish. She lives in mortal terror of a preacher's raising any issue in the neighborhood. Sister Jelly is most sweet, and most uncomprehending. "There's good in all the churches," she opines. "We must live a good life and do the best we can." Vague and indefinite sermons on love and to throw down." Or an equal mathematical proportion to the saints to reign over.

And softies delight on page after page. Why, we still make mistakes and with faults are ingrained! His priesthood's now hidden, but'll soon come to light.

In "scriptural" studies they proudly display it. On those who see big things in Mrs. White's flight.

It'll come with His coming, his crown for to get.
With a couple of guesses on God's ending this ball.
Charles M. Campbell Commended

The Northside church moves along with interest and with good prospects for the future. Much of the credit for the present improved condition is due Bro. Charles M. Campbell, now of Bowling Green, Kentucky. Brother Campbell labored faithfully and diligently in our midst for almost two years. We do not hesitate to recommend him as sound in doctrine and able indeed in building up the cause. He left the work here under the urgent invitation of the leadership to remain.

While Bro. Campbell worked with us many improvements were made on the church property, a radio program was inaugurated, a lively newspaper controversy with the Baptists was engaged in, in which the Baptists quit. Also Bro. Campbell was largely responsible for bringing Bro. N. H. Hardeman to Chattanooga and arranging for the very successful afternoon service in the Central High school auditorium, with about two thousand in attendance. He took a leading part in the plans and their fulfillment of the very successful Wallace tent meeting.

These are but a few of the things Bro. Campbell achieved and for which we hold him in high esteem. We say these things of Bro. Campbell, not for worldly praise, but for Christian commendation and in gratitude for the good that was done. John H. Gerrard, former evangelist for the Brainerd congregation of this city, followed Bro. Campbell in the work. Upon Bro. Campbell and his fine family, all of whom we learned to love, we pray God’s blessings wherever they may go.

Signed: Elders of the Northside Church of Christ:


(Continued from page 10)
COMMENDATIONS

The Bible Banner is improving all the time. We enjoy it.—Lee West, Okmulgee, Okla.

I have been enjoying your articles on the Government question.—Hugh S. Boydston, Orange, Texas.

You are doing a great work. Thanks a &.—Morris S. Thomas, Weatherford, Texas.

Keep the good work in the Bible Banner moving along. I always look forward to it.—W. L. Wharton, Clovis, New Mexico.

Still enjoying the Banner and appreciate the good work it is doing.—Lindsay Allen, Cullman, Alabama.

If you will have the articles on Civil Government published in tract form, then I shall send orders for copies to distribute.—H. I. Copeland, Sentotobia, Miss.

Your Banner is great. You are right on that Government question. I would like to meet you.—A. E. Wickham, Steubenville, Ohio.

I enjoy everything in the Banner and think it is one of the soundest religious publications in the country.—M. M. Kurfees, Louisville, Ky.

The subject of the Christian's relation to Civil Government is being rightly handled. If you have any extra copies, please send them to me.—Jas. W. Reynolds, Wellington, Texas.

Every member of the Church of Christ should read Cled E. Wallace's articles on the Christian and the Government.—M. A. Ewing, Madill, Okla.

Congratulations on the articles on the Christian and the Government. They were timely and necessary.—L. E. Watson, St. Mary's, West Va.

The articles on the Government question are the most sane things that I have read from the pens of the brethren.—L. L. Freeman, Salem, Oregon.

It would be a great tragedy in our family to miss one copy of the Bible Banner. We glory in your faith and courage and our prayers are ever with you.—Mrs. Pink Phelps, Alpine, Texas.

The Banner gets better all the time. Just keep up the good work. I have recently been in the vicinity of Searcy and they are feeling the blows that the Bible Banner is dealing. It is having effect.—Jesse T. Lashlee, Cash, Arkansas.

I want to join that great number of well-wishers in my full endorsement of your work against evil and error in and out of the church. You and yours are always welcome in my home.—Dr. C. B. Billingsley, M. D., Fort Smith, Arkansas.

Please announce the change of my address from Sedalia, Kentucky, to Dickson, Tenn., and send the Banner to Dickson from now on-just as long as it is printed and I can read.—I. A. Douthitt, Dickson, Tennessee.

To Cled E. Wallace: I am writing this to say to you that I think the work that you are doing in the matter of teaching on the question of citizenship is one of the finest I have ever read. ... Keep up the good work.—J. E. McKinzie, Abilene, Texas.

To Foy Wallace, Jr.: I wrote Cled at Austin and sent him my check for $5.00 to advance my subscription I congratulated him on his articles on the Government and I also want to thank you for your contribution to this cause.—J. W. McKinzie. (Thanks, Bro. Mc., the $5.00 received and applied.)

I have just finished reading the reprints of your editorial and Bro. Cled Wallace's articles on the Christian and the Government. They are the best articles I have seen on the subject. I agree with every detail in both articles.—Melvin E. Elliott, Taft, Calif.

I have been reading and studying everything I can find on the Government question, and what you have published in the Banner has just about changed my views. So far there has not been anyone who has answered your arguments. More power to you.—Glendon W. Walker, Throckmorton, Texas.

The articles on the Government are worth the price of the paper, and then some. I regard them unanswerable and am filing them. I had read David Lipscomb's book on Civil Government, and had the same idea, but still could not harmonize Rom. 13 with that opinion. Now it is clear to me.—R. T. Harris, Abilene, Texas.

The last issue of the Bible Banner is here and I just had to write to you to commend your's and Cled's articles with reference to Civil Government and the Christian's duty regarding the situation. Your articles are by far the best that I have ever seen on the question.—J. S. Newman, Groesbeck, Texas.

With the time-servers on one side and the Premillennialists and their sympathizers on the other side, you are doing a work that is destined to keep the church on the true course. I am for you, and any way that I can serve, please command me. I am sending many thousand copies of "The Watchman" to the Army Camps, and frequently use material from the Banner.—Flavil L. Colley, Dallas, Texas.

I very much appreciate your paper and I know that the Banner is covering a field that is covered by no other paper. ... I am fully confident that you will win just as David did over the boasting Philistine army, and when you have put them to flight, others will run them to death, like the Israelites after David had put them to flight. I want you to know that I appreciate the work of your able staff of writers and want to encourage you in your Godly fight for the truth.—Jesse A. Maddux, Pinon, New Mexico.

I am sincerely grateful to you for the articles on the Government question. I have found them very helpful to my personal study of the question, and they will enable me to help others. I am enclosing check for $1.00 for one year's subscription to the Bible Banner. I have been missing something valuable by not being a regular subscriber! In the September issue you state: "The demand for the issue containing W. E. Brightwell's article, For the Vindication of the Cause, was met by an ample printing of that issue." If it is possible to get a copy of that issue, I want one.—R. L. Bullard, Charleston, South Carolina,