WHOSE THRONE DOES CHRIST OCCUPY?

CLED E. WALLACE

“He that overcometh, I will give to him to sit down with me in my throne, as I also overcame, and sat down with my Father in his throne.” (Rev. 4:21)

Future kingdom advocates generally make a distinction between the Father’s throne and the throne of the Son. They are positive in their assertions that Christ is now on the Father’s throne but that he will occupy his own throne when he comes again and sets up the kingdom the prophets foretold. They think a man is rather short-sighted and lame in his knowledge of the scriptures who cannot see this.

It is admitted that the kingdom the prophets foretold was the kingdom of Christ, the Messiah. This kingdom was “at hand” when John the Baptist was preaching. He called it “the kingdom of heaven.” “Repent ye: for the kingdom of heaven is at hand.” (Matt. 3:2; Mark 1:15.) Jesus preached the near approach of this same kingdom. “The time is fulfilled, and the kingdom of God is at hand.” (Mark 1:15.) Jesus called it the “kingdom of God.” God is the Father. We are told that because the Jews rejected their Messiah that his kingdom has been postponed until Jesus comes again to establish the kingdom and usher in the millennium. This is bound up in the term pre-millennialism. Whose kingdom is it to be? The kingdom of Christ. Whose kingdom is it to be? The kingdom of God. Are there to be two kingdoms with God reigning over one and Christ reigning over the other? Certainly not. Premillennialists do not so contend. The kingdom of Christ has a throne. Whose throne is it? It is Christ’s throne. The kingdom of God has a throne. Whose throne is it? God’s throne. If the kingdom of Christ and the kingdom of God are one kingdom, why then cannot the throne of God and the throne of Christ be one throne? Where then goes the distinction that is made between the throne of the Father, on which Christ now sits, and his own throne which he will presumably occupy after he comes again? It goes the way of the whole future-kingdom theory. It is as unsubstantial as a mere flight or fancy. One might as well and with as much reason argue that Christ cannot sit on his own throne, because he is to sit on David’s throne and how can it be his and David’s both! Even David sat on his throne and the Father’s throne at the same time. Solomon sat on Jehovah’s throne and David’s throne at the same time. “And Solomon sat upon the throne of David his father: and his kingdom was established greatly.” (I Kings 2:12.) Whose throne? David’s. Whose kingdom? Solomon’s. “Then Solomon sat on the throne of Jehovah as king instead of David his father, and prospered; and all Israel obeyed him.” (I Chron. 29:23.) Whose throne? Jehovah’s. Whose reign? Solomon’s. It should not be too straining on the eyes to see in the light of this how Christ can sit on the Father’s throne, David’s throne and his own throne all at the same time. Besides all this, Paul calls the kingdom “the kingdom of Christ and God.” (Eph. 5:5.) Why then cannot the throne be that of Christ and God, and David’s too?

I think all admit that the church Christ said he would build has been established. Whose church is it? Jesus said: “Upon this rock I will build my church.” My church. It is the church of the Lord and congregations are called churches of Christ.” (Matt. 16:18; Acts 20:28; Rom. 16:16.) It is also called “the church of God” and “churches of God” is an expression found in the sacred writings. (I Cor. 1:2; I Thess. 2:14.) If it is easily recognized that the church of Christ and the church of God are one and not two institutions; the kingdom of God and the kingdom of Christ are one and not two kingdoms; then the throne of God and the throne of Christ are one and not two thrones. A man who cannot see that must be looking some other way.
“THE ESSENTIAL POINT IN PREMILLENNIALISM”-NO. 2

The invariable practice of the promoters of certain systems of heresy is to disguise some parts of their teaching. They become vague in their expressions on certain phases of their teaching—not because they do not have the ability, to express themselves clearly, but because it serves their immediate purpose better not to do so. They purposely obscure the weaknesses of their theories which they realize will be received reluctantly until they can gain sympathy and win a favorable audience. Such was the character of the effort made by R. H. Boll in his radio speech in Chattanooga, Tennessee, which was printed and distributed, and published in Word and Work, and which was reprinted in the Bible Banner last month.

This has been the method that Brother Boll has adopted in many of his meetings. Assuming to preach what he believes about the second coming of Christ, he frequently puts forward only those truths generally believed and accepted by us all, and with a flourish exclaims: “Now, what is wrong with that?”—as though he neither believes nor teaches anything more than that! He would thus attempt to create the impression that he is being opposed and persecuted for preaching the second coming of Christ, though all who are in any degree familiar with the actual peculiarities of his teaching, know that in order to serve his purposes in these instances he has withheld and suppressed the objectionable parts of his doctrine.

That lack of common honor and honesty in dealing with argument is outstanding in the Bollistic document now under review. He gives “the essential point of premillennial teaching” under two heads, as follows:

The essential point in premillennial teaching is—
1. That the Lord Jesus 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 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. 8:23).
   - 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.

About the mildest thing that can be said of the foregoing deliverance is that it is a reflection on the information, if not an insult to the intelligence, of his hearers and readers. For instance: “The essential point in premillennial teaching is—that the Lord Jesus Christ will return from heaven!” No one knows better than the author of that declaration himself that the statement is not true. We all believe “that the Lord Jesus Christ will return from heaven”—but we do not believe any part of premillennialism, and that fact is no part of premillennialism, much less the number one “essential point in premillennial teaching.” Brother Boll has not increased confidence in his integrity by putting out such a manifestly insincere statement. For years he has complained that his beliefs have not been properly stated by his critics. Now, let him ask himself the question seriously—if he has fairly represented the belief of those who oppose premillennialism in that assertion of his. His own answer to the question will determine the degree of his honesty in making such a point-blank assertion. It is no wonder that he turned it loose as an assertion only, offering nothing whatever, even as a reference to sustain it.

Having dealt, however, with that No. 1 blank point in a previous editorial, we proceed now to deal with his No. 2 category. He asserts, but only asserts, “that if there is ever to be a time” for certain things mentioned in the New Testament to occur—“then Christ must and will come before that time.” Well, of course, if He must come before that time, He surely will—anybody knows that. The form of language indicates that the author of it was feeling rather vindictive when he wrote that, or said it, and it leaves the impression that he is trying to make the Lord do something because a theory of his own requires it—He simply must (or my theory is wrong), therefore He will, Lord, you simply must save my face! I have said you would, Lord, now don’t let me down!

Let us analyze these listed items under No. 2, and see what “must” occur from the passages cited. First in order is:

THE RESTORATION OF ALL THINGS—ACTS 3:19

Peter declares in this passage that the heavens must receive (receive) the Christ until that which all the prophets have spoken “since the world began,” shall be accomplished—yea, and all the prophets from Samuel and them that followed after.” Now, if the prophets predicted the millennium—and Brother Boll says they did—then Jesus must stay in heaven until the millennium is over. This is a must that Brother Boll has overlooked. Let us look at the passage itself in full:

12. And when Peter saw it, he answered unto the people, Ye men of Israel, why marvel ye at this? or why look ye so earnestly on us, as though by our own power or holiness we had made this man to walk?
13. The God of Abraham, and of Isaac, and of Jacob, the God of our fathers, hath glorified his Son Jesus; whom ye delivered up, and denied him in the presence of Pilate, when he was determined to let him go.
14. But ye denied the Holy One and the Just, and desired a murderer to be granted unto you;
15. And killed the Prince of life, whom God hath raised from the dead; whereof we are witnesses.
16. And his name through faith in his name hath made this man strong, whom ye see and know; yea, the faith which is by him hath given him this perfect soundness in the presence of you all.
17. And now, brethren, I wot that through ignorance ye did it, as did also your rulers.
18. But those things, which God before had shewed by the mouth of all his prophets, that Christ should suffer, he hath fulfilled.
19. Repent ye therefore, and be converted, that your sins may be blotted out, when the times of refreshing shall come from the presence of the Lord;
20. And he shall send Jesus Christ, which before was preached unto you:
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21. Whom the heaven must receive until the times of restitution of all things, which God hath spoken by the mouth of all his holy prophets since the world began.

22. For Moses truly said unto the fathers, A prophet shall the Lord your God raise up unto you of your brethren, like unto me; him shall ye hear in all things whatsoever he shall say unto you. 

23. And it shall come to pass, that every soul, which will not hear that prophet, shall be destroyed from among the people.

24. Yea, and all the prophets from Samuel and those that follow after, as many as have spoken, have likewise foretold of these days.

25. Ye are the children of the prophets, and of the covenant which God made with our fathers, saying unto Abraham, And in thy seed shall all the nations of the earth be blessed.

26. Unto you first God, having raised up his Son Jesus, sent him to bless you, in turning away every one of you from his iniquities.

Let it be observed, first, that Brother Boll did not in his printed and published article quote this passage nor any part of it. He merely gave “Acts 3:19-21” as a reference and asserted that it is one item in that category of what he styles “the essential point in premillennial teaching.” Let it be observed, second, that he did not include verse 18 in his reference. We wonder why—or do we? That verse contains the statement, “He hath so fulfilled,” and does not help the future fulfillment “must” of Brother Boll. Let it be observed, third, that the remainder of the passage below verse 21 was not included in his reference, and that is significant, for it mentions the fulfillment of the very thing that Brother Boll says must yet come. I propose to prove this. But I want the readers first to see that Brother Boll deliberately excluded from his reference the portions of the passage which reveal that those things were fulfilled in the first coming of Christ and not at His second coming. Since he did not quote any of the passage, it would have consumed no more space to have included in his reference these important verses. Let it be observed, fourth, that he says the “time” of restoration, whereas the text says “times”-Peter says the times of the restitution, or restoration, of all things spoken by the prophets. Why does he use the singular “time” when the text uses the plural “times”? The difference has a lot to do with the theory! If the heavens retain the Christ until the “time” of the restoration, He might come at the beginning, but since Christ stays in heaven until the “times” have been accomplished, then Christ does not leave heaven until it is over, and it ruins the Boll theory. Nor do I think that Brother Boll accidentally used the word “time” instead of the word “times,” as it is in the text, because it is the invariable rule of the premillennialists to call it the time of the restitution. But let the readers remember the difference, and call their hand every time they do it. It may finally make an impression on them.

“HE HATH SO FULFILLED”—ACTS 3:18-26

Let us now look into “Acts 3:19-21” and see if it holds within its bosom “the essential point of premillennial teaching.”

1. The “things” of verse 18 and the “times” of verse 21 are all embraced in the events of the gospel dispensation “which God before had showed by the mouth of all the prophets” and which, says Peter to the Jews, “he hath so fulfilled.” The term “hath fulfilled” is past tense and shows that “those things” belonged to something already come to pass. The word “so” indicates how “those things” had been fulfilled-namely, in connection with the first coming of Christ, His suffering (incarnation), resurrection and exaltation in heaven. (Verse 18.)

2. Moses referred to these times when he spoke of the prophet that God would raise up-Jesus Christ. (Verse 22.)

3. All the prophets “foretold of these days”—the days of this One of whom Moses spake-the Lord Jesus Christ. So “these days” and the “times” refer to the same period—like gospel dispensation. (Verse 24.)

4. These “days” and these “things” are the same as included in the promise to Abraham: “And in thy seed shall all families of the earth be blessed.” Paul specifically declares (Gal. 3:8-9) that this promise has been fulfilled in the gospel dispensation. And Peter specifically declares that God fulfilled all of these things which had been thus foretold when He “raised up His Son Jesus” and “sent Him to bless you, in turning away every one of you from your iniquities.” (Verse 26.)

5. Therefore, the heavens must retain Christ until the times of the restoration of all things have been completed. The passage does not say that the heavens must retain Christ until the times of the restoration begin. The passage states that He will stay in heaven till the “all things” are restored-from the beginning of the times of the restoration to the completion of them. Brother Boll has it backwards—the second coming of Christ marks the end of the times of the restoration instead of the beginning.

The times of the restoration are in process, we are living in them, now. If the passage refers to the millennium, as Brother Boll asserts, then he is faced with the dilemma that Christ will stay in heaven entirely through the millennium—for the heavens must “receive” Him until the “all things” are restored, till the end of the times.

Hear McGarvey on the passage: “The sending of Christ to them refers no doubt to His final coming; and it was dependent on their obedience, as we can know from later utterances, though Peter’s hearers could not know it at the time, in the general way that a certain amount of work in the saving of men was to be accomplished before his coming. This is indicated by the qualifying remark, ‘whom the heaven must receive until the times of the restoration of all things whereof God spake by the mouth of his holy prophets since the world began.’ It is difficult to determine the exact meaning of the word restoration in this place; but it is limited by the expression, ‘all things whereof God spake by the holy prophets,’ and consequently consists in the fulfillment of the Old Testament predictions; and the remark gives assurance that Jesus will not return again till all these predictions shall have been fulfilled.”

If Brother Boll, or any other premillennialist, has ever attempted to off-set the weight of this argument against their bald assertion that “Acts 3:19-21” embosoms “the essential point in premillennial teaching,” it has not been seen in print. According to that prince of exegetes, J. W. McGarvey, and in fact the text itself, the times of the restoration begin with the suffering of Christ in verse 18 and end with the coming of Christ in verse 21.

ACTS 2-ACTS 3-AND I COR. 15

There are two statements in the quotation from McGarvey that should be given some emphasis. First: Whatever is comprehended in the times of the restoration must consist in the fulfillment of Old Testament predictions, since that expression is limited to the “all things whereof God spake by the holy prophets.” Second: The passage is the proof that Jesus will not come again until all these predictions shall have been fulfilled. Let us consider the passage from that angle.

The prophets prophesied the end of death. Hosea said: “I will ransom them from the power of Sheol: I will redeem them from death: 0 death, where are thy plagues? 0 Sheol, where is thy destruction?” (Hos. 13:14.) Again, Isaiah says: “He hath swallowed up death forever; and the Lord Jehovah shall wipe away tears from off all their faces.” (Isa. 25:8.) In the fifteenth chapter of I Corinthians, the very chapter in which he discussed the abolition of death and the end,” Paul adapts these two prophecies, and with one sweep of the pen he refers them to the final resurrection, when death shall have been destroyed. The conclusion is inevitable: The heavens must retain Christ until all things spoken by the prophets “since the world began” are accomplished; the prophets prophesied the aboli-
tion of death; Jesus therefore stays in heaven until death is no more. But death has not been destroyed as long as there is one dead person in-the grave. Therefore Jesus stays in heaven until the last dead person is raised. But the Corinthian passage also says, “for He must reign till He hath put all enemies under His feet,” and “the last enemy that shall be destroyed is death.” Likewise Peter declares in Acts 2:34 that Christ will sit at God’s right hand in heaven until the last enemy is put down. Death is the last enemy. Therefore, Jesus must sit at God’s right hand in heaven until death is destroyed, according to Peter in Acts 2; He must reign in heaven until death is destroyed, according to Paul in I Cor. 15; and the heavens must retain Him until death is no more, as the prophets predicted, according to Peter in Acts 3:19-21. It must be plain to all that there cannot be a millennium with Jesus Christ on earth between His second coming and the final resurrection of the dead.

But Brother Boll says: “If there is ever to be such a time (and the word of God bears that out)—then Christ must and will come before that time.” It is evident that Boll’s “must” does not agree with the “must” of Paul and Peter, in the passage cited. Peter says the heavens “must” retain Christ until all these things shall have occurred. Paul says that Christ “must” reign in heaven until the end of all these things. But Boll says that He “must” and He “will” come before that time. To the brethren in Chattanooga, Tennessee, and everywhere else, as far as the church is known—which must be you going to take? Is It is Paul and Peter versus R. H. Boll. I am persuaded that his “must” is but the child of his own perverted “will.”

BOLL-BRENTS-AND LIPSCOMB

Concerning the assertions of R. H. Boll on the passage from Acts 3:19-21, there is only one thing more that deserves attention. It is the common practice of these men to seek to add prestige to their theories and give influence to themselves by quoting garbled extracts from McGarvey, Lipscomb, Lard, Brents, Campbell and others. We have already quoted McGarvey, and that settles any reference to him. In this issue appears an excellent article from T. B. Wilkinson entitled “Doctor Brents and Brother Boll,” which takes care of both of them from my viewpoint. I also insert below an article in full from The Vindicator, published by E. C. Fuqua, Fort Worth, Texas, which is a complete answer to their constant twisting of a passage from the writings of David Lipscomb. Later on in this series we shall insert “some of the utterances of Campbell” and others, since they so often refer to them. This is not being done to prove the argument by what men say, but to prove the utter unreliability of these men among us who attempt to deceive the brethren by perverting the writings of dead men. Beyond that point I am not interested in what men, as such, have taught. But Brother Fuqua takes care of the Lipscomb quotation. Read it:

DAVID LIPSCOMB DISTORTED

In Word and Work, December, 1942, Brother Boll quotes from Brother David Lipscomb, and misapplies his language. He quotes the statement in an effort to show that Brother Lipscomb taught the Premillennial theory. But the quotation grants him no suffrage: “Jesus had been to earth and returned to heaven. Heaven must receive him until ‘the times of the restoration of all things’ Then ‘the times of the 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 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 under creation rebelled against him. When Jesus 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.”—Queries and Answers, page 360.

That quotation clearly shows that the “restoration of all things,” when the will of God shall “be done on earth as it is in heaven,” has reference to the “New Heavens and the New Earth” (II Peter 3:13), that will come into place at the coming of Christ. Before that time nothing of the kind will ever take place, for the condition described will be eternal, not for just a thousand years. That is what Brother Lipscomb taught.

That ought to settle that. While I do not personally subscribe to everything Brother Lipscomb taught, he certainly did not teach premillennialism. He taught the exact opposite of that theory, as Boll and his man, Hoover, both very well know. In the above quotation Brother Lipscomb has the “times of the restoration” completed where Boll and Hoover have it beginning. It assuages man; the laws of their theory not help their cause. It is the sincerest folly for these men to try to read into the scriptures they quote, and the writings of dead men, that earthly program of things which they themselves have so recently fabricated out of their own imaginations and wishful thinking.

Here we pause—but only to pause-in the next article we shall resume the examination of this Boll-Hoover Chattanooga document. We propose to examine in detail every passage referred to in it, and to completely expose the fallacies and inaccuracies in which that document abounds. It shall not pass.

“DOCTOR BRENTS AND BROTHER BOLL”

T. B. WILKINSON

Doctor Brents wrote a sermon on the millennium which has been a source of great comfort to premillennial preachers, and how they love to refer to it as justification for their wild theories. But I doubt if a single one of them will endorse the positions Doctor Brents has set out in this sermon, and I am sure that if he were alive today he would blush with shame to see himself held up before the church as an endorser of their wild speculations.

Doctor Brents was a great writer, and his book has been a great help to young preachers of the gospel for many years, but he was only a man, and wrote as a man, and his sermon on the millennium is about as wild a guess as I have ever seen from any man. But Brother Boll appeals to him, and many admirers of Brents might think that if he taught something like the theories of Boll there must be some good in it, and very few know anything about what Brents did teach.

In his Gospel Sermons, page 330, we have his sermon on the millennium, and here is what we find in brief. Jesus will come back to the earth in the clouds and take up a personal residence upon the earth for a thousand years reign. The righteous dead will all be raised with immortal bodies, the righteous then living will all be changed and given immortal bodies, and they shall reign with Christ for the time of the millennium. The wicked will not be raised at that time, and
the wicked then living will all be killed with the sword that proceeds out of the mouth of the rider of the white horse.

The bodies of the wicked will not be buried, but will lie upon the earth until they are devoured by the fowls of the air, and the beasts of the field. The devil will be bound during the thousand years, and cannot go out to deceive the nations of the earth until the thousand years are finished. Then he will be loosed, and shall go out and deceive the nations, and gather them for battle, and shall encompass the camp of the saints, and fire shall come down from God out of heaven and devour them, and the devil will then be cast into a lake of fire.

This is about the sum of his arguments on what he understands will happen during the millennium. There are a number of questions that his sermon raises in the mind of the reader that he does not attempt to explain for us, leaving it, I suppose, for the reader to figure them out as best he can. He makes no provision for any class except the wicked and the righteous. We do not know whether he means to kill the infants, idiots, and other irresponsible souls, with the wicked, or change them with the righteous, and let them reign, too, over whatever it is that they are to reign during the millennium.

He fails to inform us what they will reign over, or who, and I am sorry for this omission for I was anxious to see this point cleared up. It is not the wicked for they were all killed when the reign began, and were devoured by the beasts and the fowls, and it is not the righteous for they will be doing the reigning. I am sorry he failed to clear up this point for if we are to reign we ought to have something, or someone, to reign over to make it even interesting.

Satan was chained, and locked up in prison during the entire one thousand years. Just why, he does not explain, except to say it was to keep him from going out to deceive the nations. But he has already informed us that there were no nations left for him to deceive, the righteous had all been changed and given immortality, and the wicked had all been killed, and fed to the wild beasts. It looks to me like the Lord has locked him up at the wrong time; it was a barren old world, even of the wicked, and the only souls left upon it are these immortal saints who are reigning with their Lord over in Palestine, and certainly there was no chance for Satan to deceive them.

But hear him again. At the end of the millennium Satan will be loosed a little season, and shall go out and deceive the nations which are in the four quarters of the earth, the number of whom is as the sands of the sea. Now we are mystified again. Where did those nations come from that he found when he was released? Undoubtedly they were not children of these immortal saints who had been reigning, and the wicked could not beget children after they were devoured by wild beasts. He has accounted for everything but the idiots, and irresponsible, including the infants, and maybe they had fathered these nations.

This is the learned Doctor Brents, truly a great man, with exceptional ability, trying to fix up a theory that will bring the Lord back to the earth to reign as material king a thousand years before the end of time and the judgment.

But he does tell us that the wicked who were killed at the beginning of the millennium will be raised when it is over, and given indestructible bodies. Maybe he means to have them raised before the devil is turned loose, and reinstate them in their nations, just as they were before the Lord destroyed them, and then turn Satan loose on them a second time and let him deceive them over again.

This must be what he means to do, since we cannot find any other possible source for these nations which he deceived during this second spree he was allowed among them. If this is true, Satan should find his job an easy one this time, they were his already, and had already been killed by the Lord once, and fed to the beasts, and the Lord had condemned them at the beginning of the millennium.

Then the Lord has nothing whatever to offer these nations who are still here after the millennium closes, even if we grant that there can be any such nations. Maybe that is where Russell got his idea of a second chance, Satan got a second chance, so why not the wicked people the Lord condemned back there and killed with a sword, and fed to the wild beasts? Russell says they will get a second chance, but the salvation offered them will be of a poorer grade, and of course they will never get to reign like the saints did.

I am glad that Doctor Brents calls it speculation. If he had been writing a burlesque on premillennialism he could not have done a better job. An empty reign of the saints on the earth for a thousand years with no one for them to reign over is about the most senseless theory that a human mind can think up.

Fire came down from God out of heaven and devoured them, and yet the Doctor had given them indestructible bodies when he raised them at the end of the millennium. But is the Lord satisfied He has done enough to these wicked people? Apparently He is not, for the Doctor informs us that He now raises them with all the rest of humanity, and has them brought before Him in judgment, and sent away to a lake of fire, forever and ever.

The wicked were raised at the end of the millennium, according to Brents, but he does not mention that they got a second chance. I suppose that Boll also agrees with this point, but they both have to admit that the wicked got a second chance at sin, raised a monstrous rebellion against the immortal saints sitting down there in Jerusalem minding their own business, only they had no business since there were no people for them to reign over, and fire came down from God out of heaven and devoured them.

I believe that if I had to make a choice, I would prefer Russell to either Brents or Boll. He does have a theory that gives the saints something to do besides sitting upon thrones. He has them preaching a second grade salvation to the wicked. But not Boll, or Brents. They have them on thrones for a thousand years with no one to reign over, and the devil locked up a thousand years to keep him from deceiving anyone when there was not a soul upon earth that he could deceive. They mess it up worse than Russell does and then walk off and leave it as if to say, Here it is, see what we have done to it; fix it if you can. Yes, I am sure there is more sense to Russell's speculations.

But I do wish Brother Boll would come out and tell us, since he has endorsed Brents, or rather has called upon Brents to endorse him, whom the saints shall reign over during that thousand years? Do they reign over each other, taking turns at the thrones? There were no other living souls on the earth at the time, according to Brents, and he might tell us why the Lord had the devil locked up when there was not a soul upon earth that he could deceive. Also, where the nations came from that the devil did deceive when he was loosed. Speculation? Well, Brents was fair enough to admit that it was only speculation, but not Boll.
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AN EDITOR TIPTOE AROUND A VEXING PROBLEM

CLED E. WALLACE

The following insertion is an editorial excursion which lately appeared in the Gospel Advocate, Nashville, Tennessee. In order that our readers may see the significance of the stand the editor of the Advocate has taken, and ponder the full import of his editorial declaration, his article is copied in full.

SUPPORT FOR THE CONSCIENTIOUS OBJECTOR

At long last it seems that the vexing problem of feeding the conscientious objector has been solved! In a recent exchange, an “ace writer,” with peculiar insight and financial wizardry, proposes a tangible solution of the matter. He suggests: The men who are responsible for teaching these boys (the fourteen conscientious objectors in the camp at Magnolia) the kind of impractical idealism that put them where they are, and are shuddering themselves into chills over the terrible persecutions they are suffering, ought to feed them.” Yes, we think that the men who taught them should feel an obligation to feed them.

The question is: Who taught them? If we could answer that question, we would know to whom the appeal for support should be made. “This scribe” is not personally acquainted with any of these fourteen boys or the sources of their instruction. But there are certain possibilities in the case. The most reasonable supposition is that they have been studying the New Testament. (Since the present writer, according to two “fellow associate editors” lifted only a “belated” and “timid voice” in defense of the conscientious objector, he can hardly be charged with having taught them. With his teaching it was a matter of being “too little and too late.” Yet he is not unwilling to “do his part” for the boys. It is possible to contribute to the relief of less worthy cases of impecuniosity!

It is remotely possible that some or all of these boys read a certain expression of “sentiments” under the ominous title of “War Clouds” back in 1936. They may have been made “conscientious objectors” by such sentiments as these: “It is to be greatly deplored that some brethren will write articles that even point in the direction of Christians engaging in carnal warfare. It is distinctly noticeable [and still is-B. C. G.] that any such advice from Jesus and the apostles has been conspicuously absent from their articles. They arrive at their conclusions by deduction, patriotic effusions, and other belligerent war-like ratiocinations rather than New Testament teaching. . . . No matter what one might do under this or the exigency, no man [italics mine-B. C. G.] can produce the Scripture that gives a Christian the right to go to war, much less to make it a wartime duty. . . . It would comport far more with the gospel of Christ for our preachers to be exhorting Christians to follow Christ and the apostles even to prison and martyrdom than to be instilling within them the spirit of militarism, war, and hell. No, I am not a patriot-I am a Christian. [we might ask: Is it impossible to be a “patriot” and a “Christian” at the same time? If one becomes a patriot, does he cease to be a Christian?-B. C. G.]” (Foy E. Wallace, Gospel Guardian, March-April, 1936, page 5.)

Again, these boys may have read a frantic appeal which appeared in the Bible Banner of May, 1941, under the intriguing and pacific title, “Put Thy Fist, Brother.” This article was written in a “big brotherly” spirit along about the time an abortive effort was made to take “some adolescent editors” to the journalistic woodshed for an editorial drubbing. Naturally these boys would conclude that if it was wrong to use as relatively harmless an instrument as the human fist on one’s fellow man, it certainly would be wrong to use a more deadly instrument on him. Although the article was apparently written to calm the spirit of a brother who was coming to the rescue with his fist, yet it might easily be given a wider application by these “freak specimens.” Ponder this advice: “We have become partakers of the divine nature, and fists and clubs and abusive language are definitely out. If any literal blood is shed in this conflict [with the “adolescent editors”—B. C. G.], it will be ours, not theirs.” All this was said primarily for the benefit of a “magnificent giant who has had army training”; with the “big brotherly”—yea, fatherly—admonition, and in language almost Abrahamic, he further urged: “But remember, son, that we are not in that sort of a fight.” But these “misguided boys” might be expected to make a personal application of it!

If these boys at Magnolia were influenced by the foregoing “sentiments” in becoming “conscientious objectors,” they will feel forsaken when they reflect upon the radical change in their erstwhile preceptors. They, along with others, will feel that when the hat is passed, the authors of the aforesaid pronouncements should “chip in.” It seems a bit strange that they are suffering, ought to feed them.” Yea, verily!

A recent article of mine on “Who Is Doing the Agitating?” has “woke up” the cautious, mild-mannered editor of the Gospel Advocate. It has agitated him to the point where he has made one of his rare, personal appearances on the editorial page of his own paper. A lot of people, including me, who are in sympathy with the editor’s point of view, and who are not, are delighted. He has written a colorful editorial that everybody will read without yawning. It is by far the peppiest thing we have ever seen from his pen. The fact that it is pointed at me and the editor of the Bible Banner does not in the least dampen my satisfaction. We have occasion to feel flattered that he took us as subjects on this his first venture into racy writing and actually adopted our style in doing so. Even if he did do some skillful tiptoeing around a “vexing problem,” I think he ought to be rewarded with a few extra subscribers for his unusual effort. He has furnished us with some entertainment and something to think and write about. The fact that I regard the editor of the Advocate as a very gracious gentleman and entertain a high personal regard for him will serve to guarantee that anything I say about him or what he has written will be free from personal animosity.

He is trying to fix the blame, if there be such, for the current phenomenon of “conscientious objectors.” Our friend thinks he can hardly be charged with having taught them and he seeks to place the blame on the editor of the Bible Banner, me, and the New Testament. He thinks “the most reasonable supposition is that they have been studying the New Testament.” Well, if that is where they got it, they are right, and the rest of us, including Brother Goodpasture, are wrong. “These fourteen boys” are a sublimated variety of “conscientious objectors,” if I understand the matter. They will not do even noncombatant service in the Amy. They enter a detention camp under sectarian auspices and preachers and editors call on the churches to feed them. Does the editor of the Gospel Advocate think the New Testament demands this course of all Christians subject to military call under the laws of the land? Does he think there is anything a Christian can do to help win the war? Suppose he settles down and tells us just what it is, if anything. Tiptoeing will not quite satisfy...
anybody on either side of this “vexing problem.” Going to sleep behind an editorial desk on the question, will not help much either. Since he has adopted our style and sailed into us, which we do not at all resent but rather feel gratified over, I think the readers of the Gospel Advocate will expect him to be somewhat more specific in dealing with some questions. Does he think it right for the government to defend its existence by force of arms? Does he think the members of the armed forces are either actual or potential murderers in the discharge of the duties such a connection involves? If there are any members of the church among them, should they be disciplined by the church and withdrawn from in case they decline to sever a connection? Everybody knows what we think about these things, but there are a lot of people who would like to have a frank statement from the editor of the Gospel Advocate about what he thinks of them. We will not be too critical of the style he uses in telling us, just so he tells us. He has proved that he can get racy when he wants to. I do not mind saying that I am both surprised and delighted.

Now, if I am partly responsible for the “poorly educated” consciences Brother Showalter says “these fourteen boys” have, and Brother Goodpasture seems to think maybe I am, then I ought to help feed them. Being of a generous nature, and inclined to be tolerant even toward brethren with “poorly educated” consciences, I might even toy with the idea of giving them a handout anyhow. However, if they are performing all the useful services some brethren are writing me about, it seems to me that ought to entitle them to something to eat and wear and a place to sleep without going outside to pass the hat. But if it is necessary for Brother Goodpasture to “pass the hat” to keep them from going hungry, in spite of the magnificent services they are rendering the government, responsibility or no responsibility, I’m willing to “chip in.” The hungry ought to be fed when possible regardless of the state of their consciences. However, I decline to help make heroic figures of them.

Brother Goodpasture thinks we have changed and seems inclined to taunt us with a charge of inconsistency. I take it that he does not mean to imply that any conviction we currently express lacks genuineness or is in any degree counterfeit. What we have said at all times has been boldly expressed and widely read, and at times hectically discussed. Personally, I am not inclined to do any dodging, nor do I think the editor of the Bible Banner is. We claim to be men of conviction and if either of us says a thing today that contradicts something we said yesterday, of course a change of views is implied. We do not make any claims to inspiration, nor do we think that any view we may express on any theme is necessarily a final and fixed decree either for ourselves or others. We are certain that the Bible is always right.

Brother Goodpasture obviously thinks he has made out a clever case against us. It is a mild expression to say that I doubt it. He digs up some old issue of the Bible Banner and fishes out some advice that I gave to a brother of mine. Under the provocation of a vicious and insulting attack a certain “unmentionable” published a scurrilous attack on our brother who expressed a willingness, if not some “unmentionable” published a scurrilous attack on our brother who expressed a willingness, if not some “unmentionable” published a scurrilous attack on our brother who expressed a willingness, if not some...
THE SIMPLE POWER OF THE LORD'S SUPPER

CLED E. WALLACE

The Lord's Supper is a striking example of "the simplicity and the purity that is toward Christ." (2 Cor. 11: 3.) It fits admirably into the simplicity of the whole New Testament order of things. The humblest disciple, even though he be illiterate, can refresh himself in its simple power. Its richest meaning is easily accessible to him. A group of lovers of the Lord gather quietly and reverently about the table of the Lord. On the table are the things, and only those, which the Lord directed. The details of its observance were divinely specified. To make the Lord's Supper an annual affair as a sort of continuation of the Passover is to miss, at least in part, the significance of both. The Lord's table is set on resurrection day. That day is the Lord's day. It is the first day of the week. When the first day of any week arrives, to the devout disciple that is resurrection day. For the Passover, God specified the day of the month; for the Lord's Supper, he specified the day of the week. When the day of the month, which came once each year, arrived, devout Jews observed the Passover. When the day of the week, which comes once each week, arrives, devout Christians observe the Lord's Supper.

"And upon the first day of the week, when we were gathered together to break bread, Paul discoursed with them, intending to depart on the morrow; and prolonged his speech until midnight." (Acts 20: 7.) These Troas disciples did not assemble to hear Paul preach. Incidentally, Paul did preach, but they would have met on that day "to break" had Paul not been there. It does not bear any marks of a called or special meeting to hear Paul preach. Paul tarried in Troas seven days so as to be present at this regular meeting of the disciples to break bread. If nothing more was involved in the meeting than hearing Paul preach, it might have been called and held any time during those seven days of waiting. If Paul was present for their regular assembly to break bread, he had to wait for the first day of the week. The natural conclusion to be drawn, without a notion of some sort to defend, is that the first day of the week was the regular meeting day of the Troas disciples. And it was so with other churches. "Now concerning the collection for the saints, as I gave order to the churches of Galatia, so also do ye. Upon the first day of the week let each one of you lay by him in store, as God hath prospered him, that no collection be made when I come." (I Cor. 16: 2.) The scholarly Mac-knight says that the original expression should be fairly translated, "upon the first day of each week." Religious people generally meet for some purpose on the first day of the week. Why? In the New Testament discipiles met for the express purpose of partaking of the Lord's Supper. No reason at all exists for observing the institution on one Lord's day which does not exist on every other Lord's day. It is a peculiar interpretation that makes "often" mean about once a year. Besides, if there is nothing definite in the New Testament as to the time of observance of the Supper, then we are without rule or guidance. Each man may do that which is right in his own eyes. There would be no regularity in the practice of independent congregations, and within the congregation, individuals might conclude that once in a lifetime is sufficient. Confusion, therefore, would likely result in keeping an ordinance which is vital to the spiritual life and growth of the Lord's people. It simply does not fit the character of a memorial ordinance to be this indefinite as to the time of its observance. "And let us consider one another to provoke unto love and good works; not forsaking our own assembling together, as the custom of some is." (Heb. 10: 23.) Let that assembly be on the first day of the week, the Lord's day; and let us be sure that when we assemble, it is "possible to eat the Lord's Supper." (I Cor. 11: 17-20.) Each week had its Sabbath for the Jew, and each week has its Lord's day for the Christian. No Lord's day should pass without the Lord's Supper.

Concerning the Time of Its Observance

The Jewish Passover was impressive and definitely commemorative. The details of its observance were divinely specified. Through all the generations of Jewish history it harked back to that fateful night in Egypt when the death angel passed through the land to slay the first-born of man and beast, but exempted every house where the blood was on the door. It was an annual observance, because divine specification made it so. The very day of the month and the part of that day were matters of legislation. That day did not always come on the same day of the week, but that made no difference in an annual observance like the Passover. The day of the month was the thing. To make the Lord's Supper an annual "Easter"...
THE USES OF THE WORD CHURCH

GLED E. WALLACE

The denominational press and popular speech betray some confusion regarding the proper use of the terms "church" and "churches." In speech and press "church" often means a denomination such as the Methodist Church, Presbyterian Church, Baptist Church, etc. Or sometimes the term "church," or "Christian church," is used in a general sense to include all sorts of organizations in religion, Protestant and Catholic, who accept Jesus Christ as the divine author of Christianity. "Churches" sometimes refers to the denominations themselves; and sometimes to the congregations within the denomination or under its jurisdiction. Then nearly everybody seems to go to church, and refers to the meetinghouse as the "church." It is quite singular that none of these uses is found in the New Testament. It is somewhat astonishing and rather disconcerting to find so many religious people using these Bible terms, and yet rarely ever using them in a Bible sense. It reflects a wide departure in both speech and practice from that perfect system revealed in the New Testament.

The term "church," or "churches," is said to occur one hundred and ten times in the New Testament. These occurrences are sufficient in number and clear enough in character to remove all confusion as to the origin and nature of the New Testament institution. In our English Bible the word "church" is not found at all in the Old Testament. The first instance of its use is in Matt. 16:18, where Jesus said: "Upon this rock I will build my church." The word is always translated from the Greek word ecclesia; but the word ecclesia is not always translated "church," even in the Bible. It is found many times in the Greek translation of the Old Testament and often refers to the congregation of Israel. Why is it never translated "church" in the Old Testament if the same word is often, if not always, translated "church" in the New Testament? This much seems certain: Our translators recognized that when Jesus promised to build his ecclesia, it was something entirely new and different from anything in the Old Testament designated by the word ecclesia or any other word. They denoted the difference by the new word "church." Had they uniformly translated the word ecclesia, "assembly," or "congregation," we could almost, if not quite, as easily have discovered the difference in the context. The New Testament church had no established existence in the Old Testament; nor at any time or place prior to the coming of the Holy Spirit on Pentecost.

The word ecclesia, according to Thayer, harks back to ekkaleo. Ek is a preposition which means "from" or "out of." K kaleo means "I call." Ecclesia, then, means an assembly or congregation. In the community or city government of the Greeks, the citizens were called together to deliberate on matters of common interest. This was the original ecclesia. It was not the church of Jesus Christ, however. When Demetrius and his excited silversmiths managed to fill the Ephesian theater with a howling mob, it is said that the ecclesia, or assembly, was in confusion; and the town clerk spoke to it; quieted it, and finally dismissed it. He did not dismiss the church of the Lord, even if he did dismiss an ecclesia. Party passion can make a church of the Lord disgrace itself by acting very much like this Ephesian ecclesia did. It has happened.

Sometimes in the New Testament the word "church" means a congregation, literally assembled, and probably includes only those who are thus assembled. "For first of all, when ye come together in the church, I hear that divisions exist among you; and I partly believe it." (1 Cor. 11:18.) "As in all the churches of the saints, let the women keep silence in the churches; ... for it is shameful for a woman to speak in the church." (1 Cor. 14:33-35.) The apostle here evidently refers to assemblies of the saints literally come together.

But the word is not always used in such a restricted sense. The church of God which is at Corinth (1 Cor. 1:2) was the church seven days in the week, even when the members were not literally assembled. They were the called out of the Lord at Corinth, "even them that are sanctified in Christ Jesus." There were such churches in many localities. Hence, we read about the churches of Christ (Rom. 16:16); the churches of God which are in Judea in Christ Jesus" (1 Thess. 2:14); the churches of Galatia (Gal. 1:2); and the seven churches that are in Asia" (Rev. 1:4.) These churches are not denominational bodies differing in such matters as doctrine, organization, and worship. They were the same in kind. For instance, we read about Paul and Barnabas appointing for them elders in every church." (Acts 14:23.) Paul was not a general supervisor of denominational or interdenominational activities.

The word church has still a more extended range of use in the New Testament. "So the church throughout all Judea and Galilee and Samaria had peace, being edified; and, walking in the fear of the Lord and in the comfort of the Holy Spirit, was multiplied." (Acts 9:31.) The word church is here used in the singular number, and yet it obviously includes all the churches and Christians in the territory designated. Why should a single one be excluded? And yet they were never all literally assembled in one place nor did they all belong to the same congregation. But they were the Lord's ecclesia or called out people in the territory described in the text.

The Lord Jesus is said to be "the head of the church, being himself the savior of the body." (Eph. 5:23.) All Jews and Gentiles are reconciled in this church, which is the body of Christ. (Eph. 2:13-16; Col. 1:18; Eph. 1:22, 23.) The word church is thus extended to include all of the Lord's called-out people wherever they may be found. It is not, then, a literal, physical body, but a spiritual body with a spiritual basis of association and communion. It is the holy temple of the Lord built of spiritual stones, a habitation of God in the Spirit. In this universal use of the word church there is not a Christian in all the world who does not belong to it. And it follows that he became a member of it at the same time and in the same way he became a Christian. "For ye are all sons of God, through faith, in Christ Jesus. For as many of you as were baptized into Christ did put on Christ." (Gal. 3:26, 27.)

Inasmuch as some Baptists are inveighing against this use of the word church, we call attention to some things some scholarly Baptists have said on the question. Some years ago the then editor of the Baptist and Reflector said:

The word church is used in the New Testament one hundred and ten times; in ninety-two instances out of the one hundred and ten it refers to a local congregation; in the other cases it refers to a spiritual body, over which Christ is head, and in which every Christian is a member.

The Baptist and Reflector used to know the truth on this point. Some who now write for that paper do not.
THE TRUE STATUS OF THE ROMAN CATHOLIC CHURCH

G. K. WALLACE

I.

Since the title of this article calls for facts rather than rhetoric, I shall proceed at once to prove that the Roman Catholic Church is not the true apostolic church but that she is the greatest of all sects.

1. The word Roman indicates that she is a sect and not the ancient and apostolic church. That Jesus Christ established a church is not doubted. That it was and is the universal and ancient apostolic church is not questioned. To prove that the church of our Lord is the Roman Catholic Church is not within the power of man. The word Rome shows that it was born in Rome and not from above. The word Roman means something local and particular. Catholic means universal. How could there be such a thing as a local universal church?

Bishop Purcell said, “Catholic is the name of our Church and we only prefix the word ‘Roman to signify that she is in communion with the see of Rome.” That does not help matters in the least. Our communion is to be with the mother of us all. “But the Jerusalem that is above is free, which is our mother.” There is no such thing as a mistress of all churches found in the Bible. The Church of Christ has no queen to reign over her. We have no see (seat of episcopal power) on earth. God is our father and He is in heaven. The term Roman Catholic is a contradiction. That is just the same as saying “local universal.” How could a church be both?

2. The word Catholic does not appear in the New Testament. There is no more authority for using it than for the word Mormon, Methodist or Baptist. Mr. Purcell asked, “Is not the epistle of James called Catholic?” I reply, no, it is not called Catholic by any New Testament writer.

3. There is not one thing peculiar to the Roman Catholic Church that can be found in the New Testament.

The question now is simply a matter of church identity. Now see if you can find a single one of the following Roman dogmas in the New Testament. They cannot be found anywhere either in the Old or New Testament. This argument outweighs volumes produced by the Catholic Church. Put all the folios and authorities they bring up against the Word of God, and they will be found as light as the chaff of the summer threshing floor. Study carefully the following chart:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Roman Catholic Church</th>
<th>Church of Christ</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Pope</td>
<td>Christ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cardinals</td>
<td>Cod</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Patriarchs</td>
<td>Holy Spirit</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Primates</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Archbishops</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Archdeacons</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Monks</td>
<td>Apostles</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Friars</td>
<td>Prophets</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nuns</td>
<td>Teachers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Image worship</td>
<td>Evangelists</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Relics</td>
<td>Faith, repentance, confession, baptism</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Invocation of dead</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Veneration of Mary  Sing, pray, give, Lord’s Supper
Purgatory           Teach
Transubstantiation  Heaven and Hell
Extreme Unction      Easter and Lent

Not one of the offices enumerated as belonging to the Roman Catholic Church was known in the days of the apostles. Not one can be found in the New Testament. May I now ask: How, then, can we suppose that the Roman Catholic Church with all these appendages, is the apostolic church? The Roman Catholic Church is not the primitive, universal institution of Christ. There is not one point or doctrine peculiar to the Catholic Church to be found in the Bible. It is a sect in the true import of the word. It is an apostate Body from the Church of Christ.

But someone now asks: When did the Roman Catholic have its beginning? I reply by saying that is not my problem. You name the day of her birth. She is not my daughter. I do not have to show when the Roman Catholic Church started. I know it did not start with Christ and the apostles. You can find the Roman Catholic Church in history but not in the Bible. This is the point. Drive them to the wall and press the point. There is not one thing peculiar to Catholicism in either the Old or New Testament.

II.

The counter argument made by Catholics to the question of church identity is to deny our right to use the Bible. They say we have no right to quote it as authority. In fact, they say we do not even know that we have a Bible except as we are told by them. This, then, brings up our second proposition.

Is the Catholic Church responsible for giving us the Bible or is our possession of it in spite of her effort to keep the Bible in an ancient and dead language?

This subject then is simply this: Catholics and the Bible. As stated, the Catholic objects to us using the Bible as authority in matters religious. He is loud in his claim that only the “Catholic Church” is authority and that the Bible is authority only in the hands of Catholic priests. The following propositions are by them asserted:

1. No New Testament book proves its own authenticity. No man even knows that he has a Bible except as told to him by the Catholic Church. The Catholic Church says which book is authentic and which book is not.

2. The world can have no Bible independent of the Catholic Church.

3. The Scriptures must be officially interpreted by the Roman Church before any man knows what they mean.

4. The Catholic Church and not the Bible is authority in religion. That the Pope is the vicar of Christ on earth and his decisions are infallible.

Now let us examine these claims one by one. If they are true they ought to be accepted. If they are not true the Catholic Church has nothing on which to stand.

First: Do the Scriptures assert their own authenticity? Do they assert their own inspiration?
That the scriptures are inspired is not doubted by anyone who believes them. But are they inspired of God or of the Catholic Church? Paul says that they are inspired of God. "Every scripture inspired of God is also profitable for teaching." (II Tim. 3:16.) The marginal reading is, "Every scripture is inspired of God." Notice what the text says: "Inspired of God" not the Pope of Rome. "Inspired of God" and not the Catholic Church. Peter says that what Paul wrote was scripture. (II Pet. 3:16.) He said men wrest Paul's writings as they "do the other scriptures." How are these scriptures inspired? Not by the Pope but by Jehovah.

There was no Pope in Rome until 600 A.D. Were all scriptures uninspired for over five hundred years? Too, the Pope was not declared to be infallible until 1870—just seventy-three years ago. Think of a group of fallible men voting one of their number to be infallible. God did not say the Pope is infallible. He was declared so to be by a group of men who were fallible. Since these men who voted the Pope to be infallible were fallible-subject to mistakes—how do even Catholics know that these fallible men did not make a mistake when they thus voted? Surely a man is prepared to believe anything, who can believe that the Pope is infallible. But fallible man, the Pope, could not and cannot have anything to do with the inspiration of the scriptures.

The message Paul spake did not come from man. "For I make known unto you brethren, as touching the gospel which was preached by me, that it is not after man. For neither did I receive it from man, nor was I taught it, but it came to me through revelation of Jesus Christ." (Gal. 1:11-12.) Again Paul says the things he write are the commandments of God. (I Cor. 14:37.) Paul got his message by "revelation" and God "commanded" him. Yet the Catholic Church has the effrontery to say that his message was not inspired until the Pope of Rome declared it to be. "All" he wrote was inspired. Paul and Peter, or the priests of the Roman Catholic Church? As for me I will take what Peter and Paul have to say and challenge every Catholic priest on earth to come out from behind his "petty-coat" and deny what I teach in public debate.

John wrote that we might believe. (Jno. 20:30-31.) What he wrote was true. (Jno. 21:24.) How dare some man, the Pope, say that this was not inspired until he so declared it. What John wrote is the truth even if no one had ever heard of the Pope. It was the Word of God when John wrote it and John wrote it hundreds of years before there ever was a Pope.

The Apostle Peter was an eyewitness of what he wrote. "For we did not follow cunningly devised fables, when we were known unto you the power and coming of our Lord Jesus Christ, but we were eyewitnesses of his majesty." ... And that voice we ourselves heard borne out of heaven, when we were with Him in the holy mount. " (II Pet. 1:16-17.) Peter saw and heard what he wrote—heard the voice from heaven. Yet Catholics say no scriptures assert they are inspired. Paul says "all" he wrote came by "revelation." Peter saw and heard what he wrote. Thus all that Peter and Paul wrote are thus declared to be inspired. Now whom will you believe? Paul and Peter, or the priests of the Roman Catholic Church? As for me I will take what Peter and Paul have to say and challenge every Catholic priest on earth to come out from behind his "petty-coat" and deny what I teach in public debate.

Jesus plainly says that the apostles would speak by inspiration. (Matt. 10:20.) "It shall not be you that speak, but the spirit of your Father that speaketh in you." That settles it. What they spake and wrote came from God. That is not nearly it. That is it-all of it. To deny that the scriptures were not inspired until the Pope declared them to be, is to deny the plain Word of God.

All the books of the New Testament were written before the close of the first century. Every writer sealed his book or books by the blood of his martyrdom, except John. John died a natural death. But the point is this: these books—all of them were written in the first century, and yet the Catholics say they were not inspired until some time in the fourth century. That in the fourth century the Pope of Rome declared them to be inspired. Now, look and listen-there was no Pope until the year 600 A.D. Yet they claim the Pope declared these books to be inspired nearly two hundred years before there was a Pope. When Catholics make such claims they hope and pray that you will not stop to read and investigate. They are afraid of honest investigation of their claims on the polemic platform. They thrive better in the dark. "Men love darkness rather than light because their deeds are evil." Where is the Catholic priest that will come out on the platform and discuss these things?
I CORINTHIANS 15:36-41 AND THE GERM THEORY

M. V. Showalter

“If Christ hath not been raised, your faith is vain.” With these words the Holy Spirit makes the resurrection of Christ the supreme basis for Christianity. Christ arose, and thus beyond cavil proved that we shall rise. The early Christians asked, How are the dead raised? What sort of body have they?

Among recent religious writings I read: “Wheat and corn may be planted together but they will not get mixed. When the corn comes up, it will be corn; and when the wheat comes up it will be wheat. The flesh of birds and beasts may mingle with the dust of man’s body, but they will not be mixed in the resurrection.” “The germ in a grain of wheat is very small compared with the rest of the grain, but that little germ is what survives when the body of the grain dies and goes back to dust. Paul declares this to be a similitude of the resurrection.” The American Indian believed in a happy hunting ground for man after death. The above philosophy goes him a few dozen. It would argue an Elysian Field for each seed and beast and bird, and incidentally for man. Just as the life germs pass away and leave their seed bodies, so pass away the life germs of men. Every form of life here on earth is to be resurrected then, eh?

The writer seems unaware of the fact that the dust particles of man are largely cereals and flesh. We build our bodies out of wheat, corn, oats, bird, beast, fish, etc., particles which they had assembled from earth particles. In the resurrection, per him, those dust particles are not to be mixed with man’s dust. Well, then, when their dust is taken out, there is practically none left for man. Too bad that he charges Paul with teaching that.

That same writer says: “The resurrection body sustains a similar relation to the natural body that the flower of a morning-glory sustains to the seed of the morning-glory. In some way or other, according to God’s wisdom and power, the spiritual body of the resurrection comes out of the natural body that is sown in the grave.” And: “When Jesus was raised from the dead, he had the same body that he had before, only it was changed.” “Talk about mixed figures and conglomerate ideas, there they are. That writer has his reader picture a morning-glory flower and its seed as a type of the resurrection body and its natural body. Then he tells him Christ had the same body after the resurrection that he had before (truth). “only it was changed.” Changed to what? In what respect changed? Changed as morning-glory seed relative to its flower? The Bible says there was no change in His body. “It is I.” “Handle me, and see.” Could those men “handle” a spirit? Could they even discern a spirit? In spirit form Christ is one with God. God is spirit. “No man hath seen God.” Man cannot see God and live (Ex. 33:20). Had Christ been resurrected in spirit form all who saw him would have died.

Another writer says correctly that Christ ate and drank with His disciples after His resurrection. But he later affirms: “So far as we know He did not retire for rest or food as was His wont in the days of His flesh.” Here he says the resurrected body was different, but just above he had argued identity of the two. He thinks Christ appeared “suddenly” with the disciples, vanished “suddenly” from the two at Emmaus, although neither the word suddenly nor its equal appears in the text. He seems to think, as do some, that the resurrected body of Christ could pass through a solid door as readily as the sun’s rays can pierce the atmosphere. The Bible does not so teach. Christ’s behavior in the instances named above is no more a puzzle to Bible students than His conduct at other times “in the days of His flesh” (see Lk. 4:38; Jno. 8:59, 10:39).

Such il-logic and such incongruous statements are too frail a basis for faith. They argue a feeble effort to sustain an unscriptural concept of the resurrection.

The writer quotes: “It is sown a natural body, it is raised a spiritual body.” He then avers identity of the sown body and the raised body. He reasons here on the word “it.” Per him, the “it” that is sown is the “it” that is raised. He cites the identity in the case of Christ’s resurrection as proof that ours will be identical. If this verse teaches identity of the two, it contradicts verse 37 just above, which says that we do not sow the body that shall be. And verse 42 says: “So also is the resurrection.” Besides this, the “it” in that passage is only an expletive, an ornament, an appositive with the subject. “A natural body is sown, a spiritual body is raised (raises itself)” is a structural translation of that passage. There is no “it” in the sentence nor scripture for that philosophy.

One man quotes Phil. 3:20, 21(q.v.), He then avers: “This is the change from mortality to immortality.” Oh, that Paul had only used the word for resurrect instead of the word for change just here! He could have done so had ‘that been the idea he wished to convey. Since he did not say resurrect, he evidently did not mean resurrect. He said change (or its equivalent). The change he here treats is, “according to the working whereby he is able to subdue all things unto himself.” The power by which Christ subdues all things is the gospel (Rom. 1:16). The last enemy he subdues is death (I Cor. 15:26), The power he uses in subduing ends at death. But the resurrection comes after death. Also, the words “that it may be” (vs. 21) are not in the original (see AVS). They may do violence to the thought-if wrongly used. Study the sentence structurally, omitting that clause and the thought is improved. So the “change” of Phil. 3:20, 21 is not the resurrection of the dead.

If the body used by the risen Christ in Palestine was changed, was different, from the natural one, it was His spiritual body, for there were only the two. There is no mediating state. If that was His spiritual body it went into heaven thus and will be thus throughout eternity. It will show the nail prints in His hands and feet, and the sword mark in His side forever and forever. Redeemed souls will look upon those cruel marks whenever they see Him there-if that philosophy be scriptural. If that experience of our Lord is a type of our resurrection, it means that every age, stage, and condition of human bodies placed in tombs on earth will be there. If one is buried eyeless he will never behold the beauties of heaven, nor see his blessed Lord. If he were deaf when he was buried, he will never hear the anthems of praise that are sung, nor the hallelujahs that resound throughout the courts of heaven. The scarred, the maimed, the crippled, deformed, armless, legless, wounded, the babe and even the pre-natally dead, every age even unto Methuselah will be there and manifest, open, seen and known thus throughout eternity, as when buried. If that were true, John certainly blundered when he said: “It is not yet made manifest what we shall be,” for Christ looked like He did at death and so shall we. Just as you saw your friend at the grave, so he will be manifested in the resurrection. Such are necessary deductions when we carry that philosophy to its finality. The heartening fact is that the Bible does not so teach. We should not then accept such teaching nor advocate such errors.

Our Lord walked the Judean hills in His crucified body, resurrected. He thus fulfilled David’s prophecy that His body would not decay (A. 2:31). David thereby teaches that Christ’s body would be handled differently from human bodies in gen-
eral. Or else, why should such behavior be named? The fact that his body arose indicates rather that ours will not rise.

In I Corinthians 15:35 the writer anticipates the querist with the two-fold question: "How are the dead raised? And with what manner of body do they come?" In verse 42 he says: "So also is the resurrection of the dead." Between these are verses 36-41. These latter constitute the lesson which is "so" (thus) likened to the resurrection of the dead. What is that lesson? Wherein is the likeness of things here said to the resurrection? We must learn that lesson thoroughly if we would know its application in the verses following.

Verses 36-41 are illustrative, parabolic. A parable is a thing well or easily understood by the hearer or reader with which the author compares the lesson he is teaching. It is a reasoning from the known to the unknown. A parable may contain two or more possible lessons, yet only one of them fits the setting. When several parables are used, four in this case, to teach one certain lesson, they each must teach that lesson. A lesson represented in one of these parables, which is not apparent in each of the others cannot be the lesson of the four. In this case the "so" of verse 42 includes all four parables, and can only mean that each and all of these parables teach the one lesson which the author would have us learn.

These six verses contain the following illustrations, parables: (1) The grain and its plant body; (2) Different flesh bodies-men, beasts, birds, fish; (3) Earthly bodies and heavenly bodies; (4) Varied glories among heavenly bodies.

Now what lesson inheres with all these illustrations? That lesson must be evident in each one of them. It is given emphasis by being repeated the four times. By using four parables the author lessens the liability of error by the reader; he increases one's culpability if he fails to get the proper lesson. The lesson here taught must answer the dual question of verse 35 above.

In the seed there is a life germ which, properly conditioned, is reproduced in the plant. Among flesh beings there is a semen, which properly conditioned, results in a man, or beast, or bird, or fish. Truly there are such relations here in this physical world. Should we then conclude that a germ in the physical man develops into the spiritual being which comes forth at the resurrection? Is that the lesson of those illustrations? Are there not other possible lessons to be had from those parables? A writer on this theme recently says: "that little germ is what survives when the body of the grain dies and goes back to dust. Paul declares this to be a similitude of the resurrection." If that is the lesson of verses 36-38, what is the lesson of verses 39-41? These latter three verses say nothing of the plant and its germ. They treat three other illustrations. Can that writer see in the terrestrial and celestial bodies a relation such as there is in the life germ of a seed and its plant? Or of semen and its sperm body? Or of a certain plant such as you had beheld while strolling, you do not become alarmed. You accept his word. He knows. We should accept it by faith. The manner of body and the how of that body we know not, save that the resurrection body is different-as are these things in nature. Amidst our activities here we meet with different bodies, even among those called by the same name. God gave all these their forms, constitutions, and characteristics. That same God has decreed a resurrection body which man cannot envision. It is different from the natural body but just as real. Its form, constitutions, characteristics, are not those of the natural man. Otherwise we would know them.

POSTSCRIPTS

I still think the Bible Banner is the paper the brotherhood needs.-Loyd L. Smith, Lawton, Okla.

I appreciate the work you are doing in the Bible Banner, and the high plane upon which you are making your fight.—J. L. Ferguson, Kansas City, Mo.

I appreciate your attitude toward the discussion of the war question. Some of our brethren are hurting their influence simply by the manner in which they try to discuss the question. Insults do not make logic.—Chas. S. Tinius, San Benito, Texas.

We love the Bible Banner because it boldly defends the whole truth of the New Testament with no apologies therefor.—W. K. Dyer, Chattanooga, Tenn.

I enjoy reading the Bible Banner. I appreciate your exposures and think we should know them.—H. M. White, Cairo, West Va.
On page 6 of this issue will be found the full text of an editorial in the Gospel Advocate by B. C. Goodpasture, consisting in an assortment of discomposed quotations from several articles by Cled E. Wallace, W. E. Brightwell and me. Brother Cled has very effectively attended to the part of this three-pronged editorial brusque that refers to him. It is my intention in this article to properly attend to the part of it that refers to me. W. E. Brightwell, a member of the Gospel Advocate organization, is abundantly able to take care of the part of it that involves him.

The readers could hardly penetrate some of the references, incomplete quotations, garbled phrases taken out of their setting, and numerous other implications, and get a correct impression of any of the matters referred to by Brother Goodpasture. Quoting from a former statement of mine, the editor injects comments of his own in brackets and inserts his several B. C. G.'s. Aside from being poor literary form, it is bad manners to do that, and indicates a bad case of editorial jitters.

**THEY HAVE BEEN STUDYING THE NEW TESTAMENT**

It is significant that the editor commits the Gospel Advocate editorially to the position of the Conscientious Objectors of the concentration camp variety. He thereby exposes to the public a divided house in the Gospel Advocate organization. The publisher and owner, Leon B. McQuiddy, is not a conscientious objector. He does not even hold the noncombatant view, and he has had and is having difficulties with those in the Gospel Advocate organization who do hold those views. Besides the publisher himself, there are important men in the organization and on the staff such as W. E. Brightwell, C. R. Nichol, R. L. Whiteside, and others who are definitely opposed to the position to which Brother Goodpasture has committed the Advocate.

The editorial is a commitment against all phases of military and government service, combatant or noncombatant. The editor says that he thinks the fourteen young men in the detention camp are "conscientious objectors" because "they have been studying the New Testament." Then the New Testament put them there, and if it put them there it puts every other member of the church there. If these conscientious objectors are right, it is wrong to do noncombatant service for the government, or to render any kind of service whatsoever to assist the government in this crisis. Brother Goodpasture says they are right, that the New Testament teaches their idea and sustains their conscience.

If the editor believes that, and according to his article he surely does, he should by all means exert his full influence as editor, preacher and member of the church to the making of conscientious objectors and should appeal to all of our young men to enter the concentration camp. Does not the fact that only fourteen have been interned from our ranks become a slam on the extent of the Advocate editor's influence or else a reflection on the performance of his duty under his conscience?

"FREAK SPECIMENS OF HUMANITY"

Among the examples of misrepresentation by incomplete quotation, with which the Advocate editorial abounds, is the reference to "freak specimens," a term used in the now famous government article in the March, 1942, issue of the Bible Banner. The aggravated editor resents the use of that expression and leaves the impression that we have referred to all who oppose our position on civil and military government as "freak specimens of humanity." As a matter of record that expression was used to describe only a certain type of mind that cannot consent, for conscience sake, to do any useful thing for the government and must therefore be quarantinedinterned for the duration. We merely ask the readers to take note of the fact that the personal application was made by the editor himself-we did not do it.

In his reference to some of these matters the editor of the Advocate is, as he very well understands, replying to W. E. Brightwell as much as he is to us. Brother Brightwell is a member of the Gospel Advocate organization. Will he be accorded the privilege of defending himself in the Gospel Advocate? Or has Brother Goodpasture taken advantage of his editorial portfolio to club another member of the organization?

"WAR CLOUDS"—"BACK IN 1936"

Much has been made of that short statement of mine in the Gospel Guardian in 1936. I have had my disposition to suppress my words. Rather have I had the desire to correct the mis-statements and misapplications of that little article and to set the matter right. In proof of this I here insert that statement in full, without the deletions, brackets and B. C. G.'s of another editor. Read it:

With the clouds of war hovering over the nations of Europe and possibly threatening the whole world again, it is to be greatly deplored that some brethren will write articles that even point in the direction of Christians engaging in carnal warfare. It is distinctly noticeable that any such advice from Jesus and the apostles has been conspicuously absent from their articles. They arrive at their conclusions by deduction, patriotic effusions, and other belligerent warlike ratiocinations rather than New Testament teaching. It has also been noticeable that those who would defend the Christian's participation in war have either been to war themselves or have had relatives in the service. It seems like an effort at self-justification. I sympathize with any man, young or old, who has seen and experienced the horrors of war, but I do not sympathize with the effort to lend it New Testament sanction. No matter what one might do under this or that exigency-no man can produce the Scripture that gives a Christian the right to go to war much less to make it a war time duty. I know that Paul said, "Be subject to the powers that be," but Paul refused to be subject to them on certain questions. The question, therefore, is how shall a Christian be subject to the powers that be? To prove the Christian's duty of war participation the answer would have to be-in everything: for if not in everything, one exemption grants others, and the premise is gone.

If war is incompatible with Christianity, then a Christian's participation in it is impossible. It would comport far more with the gospel of Christ for our preachers to be exhorting Christians to follow Christ and the apostles even to prison and martyrdom than to be instilling within them the spirit of militarism, war and hell. No, I am not a patriot I am a Chris-
tian. Were I a citizen of Germany, France, Italy, or England, still I would strive to be not a patriot, but a Christian. God help us in time of war to remain Christians, live or die.

Now, the above statement was not made by "Foy E. Wallace, Gospel Guardian, March-April, 1936, page 5." at all, as the Advocate says it was, it was made by Foy E. Wallace, Jr. Nor do I have any disposition to escape the responsibility for the statement. At the time it was written I held the noncombatant viewpoint—but I was never a C. 0. I had taken for granted the noncombatant view, having heard it expounded by my seniors from my youth up. The piece I wrote reveals how fully I had accepted and how fervently I felt that sentiment. The article also indicates that it was only a sentiment, for not one single argument nor the slightest effort to prove or disprove anything was made. On the contrary the article logically yielded to the opposite view of the military question by the admission that the “deductions” were all in favor of the other side. It thus conceded what was deductible in the premises. As for “belligerent warlike ratiocinations,” my sentiments are still against such as that, and I am no more sentimentally disposed now than I was then to militarism and war.

I have never preached a sermon on the subject. That is more than the “agitators” can say for oftentimes when they have only one sermon to preach, they preach on the war. From the conscientious objectors’ viewpoint, however, I suppose that is what they really ought to do, nothing deterring them, and if Brother Goodpasture thinks they are right, he should be doing the same thing. But they certainly cannot charge the agitation to us.

That the terrors of war are deplorable is a fact admitted by all. So are the horrors of crime. But the latter fact does not mean that the due processes of government, even to the extent of capital punishment, are wrong. Neither does the former fact mean that the prosecution of this war against international criminals is wrong. Brother Showalter aptly said that there is no difference in the application of that principle in time of peace and in time of war—one is municipal law enforcement and the other is national law enforcement. Obviously, if it is right for the government to exist, it is right for its citizens to defend its existence. If civil government is right, military government cannot be wrong, for the existence of the former depends upon the potentialities of the latter.

Regarding the point (?) which is “noticeable” on relatives, some who were and are of lesser kin to me had been enlisted in the army and the navy prior to the publication of that statement than any who are enlisted in the armed services now. So that much-mentioned point goes out—and the assertion that I made about the relatives of those who held the views that I now hold goes out with it. The assertion was an unwarranted reflection upon all who served the country in time of need or who had relatives doing so. I not only retract that statement, I apologize for making it. Let the free-for-alls make of that and of this what they will—they have my consent.

In reference to the statement that no man (italics B. C. G.7) could cite apostolic precept and example for participation in military service, since I am the man who said that it could not be done, I certainly felt that I am the man to show that it could be done, and Z have done so. The proof of it is found in the articles on “The Government-Civil and Military” which have appeared in the Bible Banner, and those arguments need not be repeated here. That is not the purpose of this article. It is sufficient to say that while those arguments have been talked around and about, they have not anything like been answered.

“WHO TAUGHT THEM?”—BACK IN 1927

It is a matter of common knowledge that there are numerous brethren among us, including a number of preachers, who insist that there is nothing essential or fundamental one way or the other in the teaching of R. H. Boll, that his theories are harmless. They contend that he and his group should be accorded fellowship among the churches, and that they should be invited to conduct meetings among us as a means of maintaining a working and worshipping fellowship. The editor of the Gospel Advocate does not believe that, and the Advocate does not advocate that course. But in 1927 at the close of the Boll-Boles discussion, which was published in the Gospel Advocate, Brother H. Leo Boles stated that there was nothing about the teaching of R. H. Boll fundamental enough to warrant a breach of fellowship and that the “differences” were not serious enough to keep him from fellowshipping them “as brethren in the Lord.” That certainly was an admission that the purity of the gospel and the integrity of the church were not involved in the issues that had been discussed between them. Does Brother Boles hold that view of the matter now? No. Several years later he retracted that statement and affirmed that Rom. 16:17-18 should be applied to R. H. Boll and his group. But Boll and his group had not changed either in teaching or in practice, nor had the circumstances changed—Brother Boles had changed.

The Gospel Advocate likes to refer to my statement in the Gospel Guardian “back in 1936” on the government question, which does not express my views now. But they have been very careful not to refer to the statement of H. Leo Boles in the Gospel Advocate “back in” 1927, on the Boll question, which does not express his views now. The Word and Work (R. H. Boll’s paper) and J. N. Armstrong do that for them—they refer to it very often—but the Gospel Advocate maintains a sphinxly silence on that point. Brother Boles say that it is unfair for the premillennialists and their sympathizers to always be quoting a statement of his that he has retracted. But the Gospel Advocate is very eager to quote a statement of mine that I have retracted. Not that I object—indeed, they would do well to feature it more and what they have said less, for short as the article was it appears to have been more effective on that side of the question than anything they have written. The point is, they object to the use that brethren Boll and Armstrong make of a statement that Brother Boles had retracted, but they turn right around and make precisely the same use of a statement that I have retracted. What is the difference? The only difference that I can see in the two cases is that it took Brother Boles nine years between 1927 and 1936 to change his mind on the Boll question, while it took me only six years between 1936 and 1942 to change my mind on the government question. But until this day the Gospel Advocate has never let the H. Leo Boles retraction of that 1927 statement see the light of type. It was left for our own magazine, the Gospel Guardian, to do that with Brother Boles’ consent. And the Gospel Advocate won’t even talk about it.

In reference to “support for the conscientious objects” the editor of the Advocate says: “The question is: Who taught them?” He intimates that perhaps we should support them as “it is remotely possible that some or all of these boys read a certain expression of ‘sentiments’ under the ominous title of ‘War Clouds’ back in 1936.” Very well, another question is: Who taught certain brethren, including a number of preachers, that the teaching of R. H. Boll is harmless? At the time the statement was made Brother Boles was president of, and Bible teacher in the David Lipscomb College. Is it not “remotely possible” that “some or all of these boys” who are so weak on premillennialism may have heard and read the “sentiments” of H. Leo Boles in that amicable declaration of fellowship on the Boll question “back in” 1927? So Brother Boles and the Advocate are, according to the logic of its editor, obligated to succor and support the Bollites lest they too shall “feel forsaken” when they “reflect upon the radical change in their erstwhile preceptor.” Canny or not, I still say that sauce for the goose is salad dressing for the gander!
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The Advocate editor seems to think that if a man ever taught an error of any kind he should be required to contribute to its support the rest of his natural life—that is, when it refers to the other fellow. If that is true, we shall insist that the Gospel Advocate is in the same boat with the Bible Banner. But the Bible Banner can do something to remedy the situation that the Gospel Advocate cannot do. If Brother Goodpasture decides that it was the Gospel Guardian “back in 1936,” and not the New Testament, that made “conscientious objectors” out of “these fourteen boys” in the Magnolia detention camp, and will furnish us their names, we will send them the Bible Banner to correct the mistake and the misapplication of principles in that 1936 issue of the Gospel Guardian. That is better than they can do for the Bollites up to now, for the Gospel Advocate has never once published Brother Boles’ retraction of his mistake buck in 1927. The Boll sympathizers could never find out anything about that retraction by reading the Gospel Advocate.

On the matter of Christianity and Patriotism, the editor of the Advocate does not commit himself. He merely brackets these two questions: “Is it impossible to be a patriot and a Christian at the same time? If one becomes a patriot, does he cease to be a Christian?” My answer is, No-to the contrary, it is quite possible to be both a Christian and a patriot at the same time. The statement, “I am not a Patriot—I am a Christian,” is a form of expression that a Bible student or anybody else acquainted with literature understands. Jesus said, “Labor not for the bread that perisheth but for that which endureth unto eternal life.” Is it impossible to labor for temporal bread and spiritual bread at the same time? Paul said: “Christ sent me not to baptize but to preach the gospel.” If one baptizes does he cease to preach the gospel? Really, I thought everybody knew by now that in an elliptical expression one member of the sentence is denied that the other may receive an emphasis. So it is with my statement, and no more than that was intended even at the time it was written.

Now let the editor of the Advocate answer two or three questions: When members of the church enlist in the armed forces of our government do they become actual, or potential, murderers? If no, what makes military service wrong? If yes, should the church withdraw fellowship from murderers?

“RATHER BE RIGHT THAN CONSISTENT”

A few years ago someone wrote F. B. Srygley that what he had lately written was inconsistent with what he had formerly written on the same subject. Brother Srygley’s reply was: “I would rather be right that to be consistent.” He certainly did not mean that he could be inconsistent and right at the same time, for to be right a man must be consistent. Brother Srygley meant that he would rather change and be right than refuse to change merely to be consistent with what he had said in the past and be wrong. That is precisely the reason why so many become grounded to error and stay that way—fear to change even when facts and fairness require it. So I have simply become consistent in order to be right. But if the Gospel Advocate is consistent with its recent editorial, it must espouse the “conscientious objectors” position. In the light of that editorial it cannot even assume the noncombatant position. The Goodpasture editorial commits the Gospel Advocate to the concentration camp.

The simple truth of the whole matter is that since 1936 I have changed my views on some phases of the government issue. Am I alone in making such a change? I have recently talked with men who are older than I am and wiser than I will ever be, who did the same thing in a similar period of their lives—who went to school to David Lipscomb, but who later abandoned his views on Civil Government. I have given the reasons for my own change. I have done so in a straightforward, unequivocal manner. I felt that it was my duty to the church, to our many thousands of readers, to the government of which I am a citizen, to my sons whom I desire to rear to be both good Christians and good citizens, and therefore to myself, to set these matters right. My statements have been forthright and upright, but they have not in some quarters been thus accepted. It was anticipated that some papers and some editors would get ugly about it. In fact, they do not have to “get” ugly—they stay that way. But we did not expect the polished editor of the Gospel Advocate to descend to that plane. Men who feel the necessity of resorting to weapons of insinuation and aspersion, with veiled implications, must know the weakness of their contention and realize their inability to sustain it on the high plane of argument. Personally, I have no reply to make to their slurs.

Reverting to a reminder in a final word: I have no objection to the Gospel Advocate quoting what I said in 1936 on the government question, if every time they quote me they will also quote what H. Leo Boles said in 1927 on the Boll question. If they do not—the Word and Work and J. N. Armstrong will. And if Word and Work and J. N. Armstrong do not—I will.

(Note: As we go to press another editorial jab appears in the Gospel Advocate of February 18. That editorial will be properly attended to in the next Bible Banner. We will see who is guilty of “a dodge” and “a mere subterfuge.”—F. E. W., Jr.)