Some Editorial Charity

Cled E. Wallace

The editor of the Gospel Advocate has twice within the month departed from his customary impeccability to take an editorial swing at us, which quite naturally provokes a reply. This is a free country and we are in favor of editorial swings by anybody who feels the urge to swing and feels capable of taking the consequences.

The brother’s effort to be “charitable” in dealing with us is most touching, and we should, I presume be duly appreciative. Some of the readers of the Gospel Advocate have probably learned for the first time that somebody has been challenged for a debate and in an effort to evade it have resorted to a “dodge” which “is a very lame excuse, a mere subterfuge.” This is “the most charitable thing that” the editor can think to say about it. What are we to suppose he could say were he to lay aside his cloak of charity?

Brother Goodpasture speaks vaguely of “the issuer of the challenge” and has some “charitable” remarks to make about the “lame” antics of the challenged. Under the circumstances, it seems to me that the public is entitled to some information on the question of who’s who and why.

Since I am in possession of some information on these matters, I am going to accommodate the public. “The issuer of the challenge” is Brother H. Leo Boles. He submitted an affirmative proposition to the editor of the Bible Banner for him to sign. He did not invite him to submit an affirmative proposition of his own. The proposition submitted to him was unacceptable and he plainly said so in a letter to Brother Boles. He further asked Brothel Boles why he should pick on him if he wanted a debate. Why not keep it in the Gospel Advocate family? Brother C. R. Nichol, Brother R. L. Whiteside, Brother Walter E. Brightwell are on the Gospel Advocate staff. They agree with the editor of the Bible Banner on the “war question” as does also Brother Leon B. McQuiddy, the publisher of the Gospel Advocate and the employer of its editor. I am wondering just how far Brother Goodpasture’s “charity” extends.

Sure enough, Brother Boles took the cue from our editor and submitted his challenge and his same proposition to Brother C. R. Nichol and Brother R. L. Whiteside. The proposition was unacceptable to them. Of course there couldn’t be anything wrong with the proposition and it is to be inferred that these brethren rate the same degree of charity from the editor of the Gospel Advocate that the editor of the Bible Banner does. They are both on his staff. What does he propose to do about it? Then there is Brother G. C. Brewer who seemed ready a few years ago to shed most of his blood in defense of our liberties. Maybe Brother Boles could get a debate out of him?

Brother Boles was indefatigable in his efforts to get a debate, so he wrote me a challenge and submitted the same proposition for me to sign. I informed him that I would await the outcome of his correspondence with the others. He wrote me that they had “declined” and wanted to know what I proposed to do about it. I reckon I must be also a dodger, a lame excuse maker and given to “mere subterfuge.” I replied that these men were better and abler than I, and I would not presume to ignore the reasons they had given for declining his advances. I suppose that Brother Goodpasture’s mantle of charity hovers over me too. He obviously thinks we have saved our lives by allowing our “discretion” to ham-string our “valor.” In fact we are told that C. R. Nichol, R. L. Whiteside and Foy E. Wallace, Jr., are Falstaffs fleeing for their lives before the doughty H. Leo Boles. When did the editor of the Gospel Advocate assume the role of a comedian? The terrible Leo has roared and we shake in our boots and flee for our lives! “That’s not the role of a comedian? The terrible Leo has roared and we shake in our boots and flee for our lives! “That’s not the way I heered it!” Brother Boles says he has been “declined.” My information is that Brother Nichol is still waiting, after some weeks, for a reply to the letter he wrote Brother Boles in response to the challenge. It would be good reading if Brother Goodpasture would tell his readers just what Brother Nichol said to Brother Boles. The time is premature for him to hop up on his desk, flap his wings and crow. And I would not blame the “good brother from Texas, whose name need not be mentioned in this connection” if he decided he did not want it mentioned in such a connection.
The fundamental mistake of all premillennialists is in a twofold misapplication of both the Old Testament and the New Testament scriptures. First, their utter disregard for the proper division of the Word regarding the gospel dispensation as related to the fulfillment of Old Testament prophecy. Second, their arbitrary interpretation of symbolic language in which they commit the unpardonable blunder of forcing a literal application of figurative expressions. These two mistakes are unwarranted on the part of any man who professes to know the Bible. Yet it is amazing to see the extent to which certain men in the church who have gone into premillennialism have themselves, men who ought to know the gospel, fallen into both of these egregious errors. A more outstanding example of it could not be found than the recent published address of R. H. Boll in Chattanooga, Tennessee, which document is now under review in these columns, and of which review this is the fourth installment. The editorial of the December Bible Banner covered the scope of Boll’s premillennial beliefs in a general summary of his teaching on sundry points which he has endeavored to evade. A survey of Point No. 1 in his category on “the essential point in premillennialism” was carried in the January issue, covering the subject of the Second Coming of Christ; and Point No. 2 on the “Times of Restoration” was discussed in detail in the February issue. We now come to other passages which he has listed in that category, as we examine them one by one.

"WHEN THE NATIONS SHALL LEARN WAR NO MORE"
(Isaiah 2:1-5)

The characteristic deliverance of this leader of premillennialists in the churches, R. H. Boll, of Louisville, Kentucky, is as follows: "If there is ever to be a time ..., when the nations shall learn war no more (Isa. 2:4) ... 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." Thus deposes R. H. Boll in plain exhibition his own disregard for the inauguration of the gospel dispensation on the day of Pentecost. Now, let us take a look at this passage in full:

The word that Isaiah the son of Amoz saw concerning Judah and Jerusalem.

2. And it shall come to pass in the last days, that the mountain of the Lord’s house shall be established in the top of the mountains, and shall be exalted above the hills; and all nations shall flow unto it.

3. And many peoples shall go and say, Come ye, and let us go up to the mountain of the Lord, to the house of the God of Jacob; and he will teach us of his ways, and we will walk in his paths: for out of Zion shall go forth the law, and the word of the Lord from Jerusalem.

4. And he shall judge among the nations, and shall rebuke many people: and they shall beat their swords into plowshares, and their spears into pruninghooks: nation shall not lift up sword against nation, neither shall they learn war any more.

5. 0 house of Jacob, come ye, and let us walk in the light of the Lord.

When a New Testament writer quotes an Old Testament prophecy and says “this is that” it “must and will” settle the issue with all who are not so blinded by some theory as to be unable to see, but verily “there are none so blind as those who cannot see.” But as the Lord said to His disciples, let us say to all whose minds are yet receptacles of truth, “Blessed are your eyes for they see: and your ears for they hear.”

It is divinely fortunate that Isaiah 2:1-5 is among those Old Testament prophecies referred to in the New Testament as having being fulfilled. More than that, Jesus Christ is Himself the One who alluded to it in the record of one of his personal amanuenses, Luke, the writer of the gospel book that bears his name. Here it is: “Then opened he their understanding, that they might understand the scriptures, and said unto them. Thus it is written, and thus it behooved Christ to suffer, and to rise from the dead the third day; and that repentance and remission of sins should be preached in his name among all nations, beginning at Jerusalem. And ye are witnesses of these things. And, behold, I send the promise of my father upon you: but tarry ye in the city of Jerusalem, until ye be endued with power from on high.” (Lk. 24:45-49.)

In this passage Jesus declares that two things are written: (1) That the Christ should suffer and rise again. (2) That in His name repentance and remission of sins should be preached among all nations beginning at Jerusalem. Now where was it written that preaching the remission of sins to all nations would begin at Jerusalem? There are two places only where such was written-Isaiah 2 and Micah 4, duplicate prophecies in the Old Testament. This quotation of the Lord’s is therefore a direct allusion to Isaiah 2:1-5.

Scrutinize the passage: Verse 1 states that it was a vision concerning Judah and Jerusalem. Verse 2 declares that these events should occur in the “last days,” and foretells that they would come to pass at the time the church would be established, and when “all nations” should flow into it. Verse 3 specifies that in this new dispensation, the Word of God would be the standard of judgment among the nations, both Jew and Gentile. The passage then heralds peace—that nation shall not lift up sword against nation in this new dispensation—that the Jew and the Gentile would not be at enmity in the new covenant, the two nations would be merged into one new nation in Christ; in the dispensation of the gospel they would be judged by the same law—the new covenant. The rivalry between the two nations having ceased, the one nation would not lift up sword against the other nation, they would learn war no more—that is, their enmity having been abolished they would no longer be spiritual belligerents; the state of war between them having ended, peace in Christ would exist. With the middle wall of partition which separated them, the law of Moses, having been broken down, their future spiritual state was expressed in the imagery of beating their swords into plowshares, their spears into pruning hooks, and of learning war no more. This beautiful delineation is climaxed with the announcement that the two once rival nations would in the new covenant together “walk in the light of the Lord.”

That this passage refers neither to some future millennium nor to the carnal wars of earthly nations, but rather to the
spiritual relation of Jews and Gentiles in the gospel dispensation, the context clearly shows. And that fact becomes even more evident when it is compared with other passages. We proceed to make these comparisons.

Since the antecedent declaration of the prophet Isaiah is that these events would occur “in the last days,” it is expedient to settle that point first. What and when are the last days of Isaiah 2:2? Here we have a “this is that” of the New Testament. Forecasting these same things the prophet Joel said, “And it shall come to pass afterward (in the last days) that I will pour out my Spirit upon all flesh.” (Joel 2:28.) Quoting this prophecy on the Day of Pentecost, Peter said: “But this is that which was spoken by the prophet Joel: and it shall come to pass in the last days, saith God, I will pour out my Spirit upon all flesh.” (Acts 2:16-17.) The prophet Joel said that this event would be “in the last days.” The apostle Peter said “this is that”—therefore the last days began on Pentecost in Acts 2. And the prophet Isaiah said that the events mentioned in Isaiah 2:1-5 would also occur “in the last days.” But the prophet Joel and the apostle Peter combine to declare that this meant Pentecost—therefore, Joel 2, and Isaiah 2, merge in Acts 2. Having thus proved that these prophecies have been fulfilled in the gospel dispensation, Brother Boll was just as wrong as he was vindictive when he put on record the statement that “if there is ever to be such a time as that—then Christ must and will come before that time.” Jesus Christ and His apostle, Simon Peter, both declared that the Day of Pentecost was “such a time as that,” R. H. Boll to the contrary notwithstanding.

But we are told that war has not ceased and that swords and spears have not been beaten into plowshares and pruninghooks, therefore this prophecy cannot have been fulfilled. To which we reply that the kind of war referred to in Isaiah 2 did cease, and the kind of swords and spears referred to in that passage were beaten, not literally but figuratively, into plowshares and pruninghooks.

For a comparison let us look at another passage from an Old Testament prophet. Deep in Babylon, with God’s exiled people, Ezekiel foresees the new dispensation and the new covenant in a similar array of metaphors. Read his graphic delineation.

20. Therefore thus saith the Lord God unto them; Behold, I, even I, will judge between the fat cattle and between the lean cattle.
21. Because ye have thrust with side and with shoulder, and pushed all the diseased with your horns, till ye have scattered them abroad;
22. Therefore will I save my flock, and they shall no more be a prey; and I will judge between cattle and cattle.
23. And I will set up one shepherd over them, and he shall feed them, even my servant David; he shall feed them, and he shall be their shepherd.
24. And I the Lord will be their God, and my servant David a prince among them; I the Lord have spoken it.
25. And I will make with them a covenant of peace, and will cause the evil beasts to cease out of the land: and they shall dwell safely in the wilderness, and sleep in the woods.
26. And I will make them and the places round about my hill a blessing; and I will cause the shower to come down in his season; there shall be showers of blessing.

In the above description the “cattle” is translated “sheep” in the standard revised version. The reference to the “flock” also indicates that Ezekiel is using the figure of sheep to picture the people of God. With this in mind the passage falls into the following parts:

First: There would be a time when God would judge between “sheep and sheep.” But why sheep and sheep? In the Old Testament the Jews only were God’s sheep, but in the new dispensation there would be “other sheep.” Jesus said, And other sheep I have, which are not of this fold (the Jewish fold) ; they also I must bring (the Gentiles), and they shall hear my voice; and there shall be one fold (the church) and one shepherd (Christ). That is what Ezekiel meant by “sheep and sheep” —

Jew and Gentile. But Isaiah 2:4 called them “nations’—Isaiah said God would “judge between the nations,” while Ezekiel said that He would judge between “sheep and sheep.” So whatever “sheep and sheep” means in Ezekiel, that is what “nations” means in Isaiah.

Second: In further comparison, Isaiah 2 states that “the law of the Lord,” inaugurated at Jerusalem, would be the standard by which God would “judge between the nations,” and Ezekiel refers to the “covenant of peace” as the standard by which God would judge “between sheep and sheep.” Thus far the passages are parallel.

Third: In this new dispensation, according to Ezekiel, God would “set up one shepherd” to rule over the “sheep and sheep,” and “he shall feed them, even my servant David, he shall feed them and he shall be their shepherd.” Will Brother Boll or any of his partisans, or any premillennialist, dare to assert that this David is the literal David? As much as they insist on the literal application of the prophets, not one of them will so assert. They boo at what they call “spiritualizing” the prophecies, but here they will be found spiritualizing, for the literal David was long dead when Ezekiel prophesied this, and everybody knows, even a rank premillennialist, that Christ is this David—the spiritual David-whom God would set over “sheep and sheep” to be their Ruler. Well, if that is figurative, why not see the figurative application all the way through?

But as Ezekiel refers to the rule of Christ which God would “set up” over the sheep and sheep, Isaiah calls it the “law of the Lord” to judge between the nations or decide between many peoples. Get it—“nations” and “many peoples” in Isaiah’s language, but “sheep and sheep” in Ezekiel’s language; the “law of the Lord” in one, the “covenant of peace” in the other. Again, the passages run parallel, so far, so good. Already the thoughtful reader must have begun to see the imagery of both prophets to be that of the gospel dispensation and of the new covenant.

Fourth: Continuing the comparison, Ezekiel says that under the new covenant God will cause “the evil beasts to cease out of the land: and they shall dwell safely in the wilderness and sleep in the woods,” while the counterpart of the comparison in Isaiah 2 says that under the “law of the Lord,” in the new dispensation, “they shall beat their swords into plowshares and their spears into pruninghooks.” One prophet uses the figure of animals and the other prophet uses the figure of weapons and implements. Is the beast that ceases out of the land a literal beast? Anybody who has a thinker and is using it, knows that it is not. Then why make the swords and spears, plowshares and pruning hooks literal weapons and implements? The “evil beast” referred to the character of men—under the “law” the character of men would be so changed by its influence that it would be like causing the wild beast to lose its ferocity. And in the same way, the peace was made between the Jew and the Gentile, when the “middle wall of partition” was broken down (Eph. 2:14) and the two old nations became one new nation in Christ. Out of Zion and from Jerusalem “the law of the Lord” did “go forth.” It was then that the rivalry between Jew and Gentile was brought to an end. They learned war no more, because nation did not lift up sword against nation any longer in the figure of speech employed. In the same figure, their swords were represented as beaten into plowshares and their spears into pruninghooks—the enmity was abolished, the two nations merged into one new spiritual nation in Jesus Christ, and became “one new man”—the one body, the church.

All that is needed to put the finishing touch to this argument is the statement of Paul to the Ephesian Gentiles, Read it:

“Wherefore remember, that ye being in time past Gentiles in the flesh, who are called Uncircumcision by that which is called Circumcision in the flesh made by hands; that at that time ye were without Christ, being aliens from the common-
wealth of Israel, and strangers from the covenants of promise, having no hope and without God in the world: but now in Christ Jesus ye who sometimes were far off are made nigh by the blood of Christ. For he is our peace who hath made both to be one, and hath broken down the middle wall of partition between us; having abolished in his flesh the enmity, even the law of commandments contained in ordinances; for to make in himself of twain one new man, so making peace; and that he might reconcile both unto God, in one body by the cross, having slain the enmity thereby; and he came and preached peace to you who were afar off and peace to them that were nigh. For through him we both have access by one Spirit unto the Father. (Eph. 2:11-18.)

In this penultimate passage the vision of Isaiah is absorbed by the argument of Paul—peace between the Jewish and the Gentile. With Isaiah they were “the nations” and “peoples,” with Paul they were Circumcision and Uncircumcision, Jew and Gentile. In the imagery of Isaiah it was swords and spears, plowshares and pruninghooks—weapons of war and implements of peace. But in the argument of Paul it is “the middle wall of partition” broken down. In the vision of Isaiah the influence that would smelt their weapons of war into implements of peace was “the law of the Lord.” In the syllogisms of Paul the thing that breaks down the wall of partition between them is the gospel of Christ.

Does anyone think that the wall that Paul mentions is a literal partition of brick and mortar, or lathe and plaster, or stucco and sheetrock? Oh, no. Then it is a figure of speech. Well, if “walls” and “partitions” are not literal in Paul’s argument, why contend that “swords” and “spears” and “war” in Isaiah’s vision of precisely the same thing are literal? If the language of the one is figurative, why not the language of the other?

That these comparisons from Isaiah, Ezekiel and Paul may be summed up by the reader, and in order to settle the argument, so far as these passages are concerned, forever, I submit them now in parallel arrangement, side by side. Look them over.

**ISAIAH 2:1-5**

1. It shall come to pass in the last days.
   2. The Lord’s house, the church, shall be established.
   3. Out of Zion shall go forth the law, and the word of the Lord from Jerusalem.
   4. By the new law he shall judge and rebuke the ‘nations’ and the peoples (plural).
   5. In the new dispensation, under the new law, they shall beat swords into plowshares, spears into pruninghooks, shall not lift nation against nation, and learn war no more.
   6. All are invited to come to the house of the Lord, to be taught of his ways, to walk in paths and in the light of the Lord.

**EZEKIEL 34:20-26**

1. When Christ the new David shall be their Shepherd.
   2. One fold and one shepherd shall be “set up” over them.
   3. And I will make with them a covenant of peace.
   4. By the new covenant he will judge between sheep and sheep (plural).
   5. Under the new covenant there will be peace, evil beasts to cease out of the land, no more a prey, they shall dwell safely in wilderness, and sleep in the woods.
   6. God will make them and the places round about the Lord’s hill a blessing, there shall be showers of blessing.

As the above comparisons stand, this is the sum: When Peter quoted Joel 2, it proved that its fulfillment had occurred in Acts 2. And when Jesus quoted Isaiah 2, it just as definitely proved that its fulfillment would occur in Acts 2. And when Paul Pointed out so plainly to the Ephesians how and when the “peace” between the Jews and the Gentiles was made and thus the “war” or enmity between them had ceased, it results in blending them all together into one fulfillment—namely, that Joel 2, Isaiah 2 and Ephesians 2 merge in Acts 2! And the two premillennialists who published their perversions of these, and other passages, in Chattanooga, should add “two and two,” and seeing what the sum of it is, they should be convinced that they are wrong.

In the light of these passages, thinking reader, what do you think of that Boll edict now: “If there is ever to be a time ... when the nations shall learn war no more (Isa. 2:4). . . . 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.” Methinks the brother has his “ifs” and his “musts” all mixed up with his “will” and is trying to bind God down to his own imaginary scheme of things.

It must be evident to all whose hearts are open to the truth that the passage in Isaiah refers neither to “the millennium” nor to “carnal warfare,” and that settles several questions in one.

In the succeeding issues we shall continue the review of this Bollistic document, examining one by one those passages referred to by R. H. Boll himself as being “the essential point in premillennial teaching,” until they have every one been taken from him, and until they have been set forth in their proper teaching—for they do not belong to him. We shall not leave him a single “point” in his premillennial teaching—not one.
"THE JEWS AND THE KINGDOM"

T. B. WILKINSON, DUNCAN, OKLA.

What kind of kingdom did Jesus come into the world to establish? A proper answer from the Bible to this question will deal a death blow to premillennialists and their dream kingdom. Did Jesus come into the world to restore the material kingdom to Israel, and sit on David's material throne in Jerusalem? If He did then He temporized with Pontias Pilate in the shadow of the cross and deceived him.

Pilate asked Him the direct question, "Art thou then the King of the Jews?" Jesus answered that He was, but immediately added, "My kingdom is not of this world. If my kingdom was of this world then would my disciples fight that I should not be delivered unto thee, but now is my kingdom not from hence." In this He disclaims any thought of establishing a material kingdom in Jerusalem, or anywhere else in the world. David's kingdom was an earthly kingdom, it was of this world, and if Jesus came to restore it, He came to set up an earthly kingdom, and what He said to Pilate was an evasion of the truth.

Did Jesus temporize in the shadow of the cross? Did He purposely mislead, and deceive, Pilate? Was His answer a clear evasion of the question in Pilate's mind? If not, then Jesus did not come to the earth to restore the kingdom to Israel in a material sense, or to resurrect the material throne of David. We know what the Jews expected of their Messiah when He came, and what Jesus' own disciples expected of Him until they were disillusioned on the day of Pentecost. They expected just what Brother Boll, and all other premillennialists, expect Him to do when He comes back the second time.

The Jews were mistaken; Paul declares that they were blinded, they misunderstood the nature of the kingdom that He came to the world to establish. But they understood it just like Brother Boll understands it today, or misunderstands it. Their misunderstanding caused them to reject the kingdom He did establish, and murder their King, and thereby lose their souls. Brother Boll cannot crucify the Lord again, but he can reject the kingdom, and lose his soul.

And he can divide, and rend, and tear, His spiritual body, and crucify it before the world, and keep men and women from accepting the kingdom today. It is as harmful today as it was then, and that is why Satan keeps it alive in the world. It keeps men out of the kingdom the Lord established when He came, and what Jesus' own disciples expected of Him until they were disillusioned on the day of Pentecost. They expected just what Brother Boll, and all other premillennialists, expect Him to do when He comes back the second time.

Brother Boll and others like him are the worst enemies the Jews have in the world today. He is promising them salvation after the flesh when the Lord comes, and tries to make Paul say something different. All Israel, with Brother Boll, means Israel after David's "Ye shall die in your sins, and where I am you cannot be." David's kingdom was an earthly kingdom, it was of Abraham are they children, but in Isaac shall thy seed be.

"He is not a Jew which is one outwardly—but he is a Jew which is one inwardly, and circumcision is that of the heart, in the spirit." (Rom. 2:28-29.) "For if they which be of the law are justified, faith is made void, and the promise of none effect." (Rom. 4:14.) "If ye be Christ's, then are ye Abraham's seed, and heirs according to the promise. For ye are all the children of God by faith in Christ Jesus, for as many of you as have been baptized into Christ have put on Christ. There is neither Jew nor Greek for ye are all one in Christ." (Gal. 3:26-29.) I affirm that there is no promise to the Jews in the gospel after the flesh, not one. I challenge all the Bollites, Russelites, Webberites, Millerites, or any other Jew baiter on this earth to find one promise to the Jews in the gospel, after the flesh.

It is true that Jesus came to them first, but they received Him not. But to as many as did receive Him to them he gave power to become sons of God, even to them that believed. Of course, they thought they were already children of God because of their fleshly birth, but the Lord said they were mistaken. It is true that the kingdom was first offered to them, and for eight years the gospel was preached exclusively to them, but still they rejected Him.

Then He had said, "The kingdom of God shall be taken from you and given to a nation bringing forth the fruits thereof." From the day of Pentecost the apostles preached to Jews only, offering them salvation through Christ which was the Deliverer the prophets had promised would come, and whom the Jews crucified.

I am told that Paul said, "So all Israel shall be saved, for it is written, There shall come out of Zion a deliverer, and turn away ungodliness from Judah." Yes, Paul did say part of that. He said, "So all Israel should be saved," but the balance of that verse is a quotation from the prophet. But he has already told us that they are not all Israel who are of Israel, and he is not a Jew which is one outwardly.

That Deliverer is not one that was to come, but He had already come when Paul wrote this, and he was preaching to the Jews salvation through that Deliverer, and begging them to accept the Deliverer that had come. But they crucified that Deliverer because He refused them their temporal kingdom, and preached a kingdom that is not of this world. But as many as received Him were saved, and of those who believed not He said, "Ye shall die in your sins, and where I am you cannot come," and that is still true.

In this kingdom of God which He established, and which Paul preached in much tears, there were neither Jews nor Greeks, but all were one in 'Christ. The man who denies that the Deliverer has come to Zion to turn away ungodliness from Jacob is a plain antichrist, and repudiates the blood of Christ. Paul's only hope for the Jews was that he could persuade them to accept the Deliverer who had come, and be saved through His gospel, and he never at any time held out the least hope for them in any other deliverer.

They were broken off, but they can be grafted into the good olive tree again by faith in Christ. Not a Christ that is to come, but a Christ that did come, Whom they rejected. Unbelief in that Christ will break them off, and where He is they cannot come, but faith in Him will graft them in again. What the Jews need to do is look back to Calvary, and reverse the judgment they rendered there, and the man who promises them a deliverer to come is their enemy, and the enemy of that Deliverer that did come-they are antichrist.

Were the Jews right in expecting the Messiah to restore the material kingdom to Israel? If so, then Jesus was wrong when He said His kingdom was not of this world. David's kingdom was of this world; it was a kingdom like the other nations around them had, with a material throne, and a material king. .

Jesus' kingdom is not like the kingdoms of this world—it is a kingdom over, and above, all earthly kingdoms. He is King of kings, and Lord of lords, and His government is above all others. The old prophet said the mountain of the Lord's house would be established in the top of the mountains, or over all other governments, and above them. Paul said He was seated (Continued on page 7)
THE MAIL MAN BLOWS HIS WHISTLE

CLED E. WALLACE

When I write I have in mind to teach, exhort, warn, reprove and even furnish a little spicy and wholesome entertainment to my readers. The mail man's whistle brings me both reward and punishment. The kind of letters people write, even some preachers, is revealing. Under the circumstances I think the readers are entitled to peep into some of these letters. I do not expect everybody to agree with all that I say. Sometimes the same mail brings both bouquets and brickbats. Some correspondents dissent and criticize and do so in a respectful manner. This I appreciate regardless of my personal opinion of their information, judgment or logic. A few preachers seem to entertain the idea that they can break down our morale by performing sapping operations, employing ugly, abusive letters as their weapons. I say "our" because I am not the only one who is receiving such letters. These men evidently hope to hide behind the immunity generally accorded personal communication. Under the circumstances, which the reader may judge a lot of it, trying to cram some of us oldsters into the slurry, I have said. So, that's it! Some of the brethren think I am sharp, I trust they will serve to awaken you to the great responsibility of your influence in the church of our Lord and Master. When I have reached the age that Brother Doggett has and has lived a long time and has written very many letters, but he never wrote one in his life to any man, such as the one he received from this "minister" of a church of Christ. He did not answer this one and being Christians, we do not return his bitter feelings.

Brother J. F. Doggett, of Tupelo, Miss., writes in a milder vein but says in a letter to me: "You sound just a little bit like Hitler." From which I infer that he doesn't like Hitler much, and that sounds a little like me. I don't either. He further remarks that "The fact of the matter is Bro. Wallace, your position is too weak to defend, from a Bible viewpoint, as you of all people should be able to see." Well, be patient with me. When I have reached the age that Brother Doggett has and had time to accumulate the knowledge and wisdom that he has, maybe I too will "be able to see it." He assures me that he has "written in a good spirit" but immediately adds as if he had some doubts about it: "If there are things in this letter that seem sharp, I trust they will serve to awaken you to the great responsibility of your influence in the church of our Lord and Master. ... I only hope you read it and think on the things I have said." So, that's it! Some of the brethren think I am asleep and are trying to wake me up from a Rip Van Winkle slumber by sticking pins in me, so I can think.

Brother James D. Bales has plenty of fault to find with both our position and our style. He quite regularly bombards the editor and me with personal letters and other material. My personal letters from him recently would cover two pages of the Bible Banner and he sends along other typewritten material, setting forth his objections as a conscientious objector, that would cover seven pages of the Bible Banner. Of course if brethren have time to write us in such volume and it serves to let off a little steam, it is all right with us. But why should Brother Bales write us so much? He writes for the Gospel Advocate and is connected with the 20th Century Christian. Why doesn't he say what he has to say in his own papers? We do. He wrote in capital letters at the top of a long epistle to me: "I READ YOURS NOW YOU READ MINE." I did, but think how many more people read mine than read his. Some of the brethren seem to think that we have both time and inclination to carry on lengthy private discussions with any and all who are moved to sit down to a typewriter. We have neither. I received two letters in one mail from Brother Bales in which he expresses deep concern about me and my ways. He exhorts me along this line:

"Why make the wise crack and the derogatory statements which you make in your articles? You are not writing for a comic, for amusement, but for edification, examination of error, proclamation of truth, to convert people to the truth. Why waste time and space, why often insult your opponent and try to amuse brethren? All the funny remarks and broad charges (such as those against the conscientious objector) may amuse the brethren who agree with you, they may disgust others."

What I have written, I have written and I am willing to leave it to the judgment of those who read what I write whether or not it is insulting or disgusting. The brother finally volunteers this fatherly advice: "State the error and then analyze and refute it. Let your arguments and scriptures attack the position: not your sarcasm and jokes." I appreciate the young brother's efforts, but I am afraid he is "wasting time and space," a lot of it, trying to cram some of us oldsters into the straitjacket of his ideas about modern journalism. It may be that I ought to write like he does, but there are at least two reasons why I do not. I couldn't if I wanted to and I don't want to. I think I'll just have to continue to be myself and go along my own way amusing some and disgusting others. I might be able to make some suggestions looking toward the improvement of his own writings, but he is not likely to receive the letters, this one or any other from me in one day giving him the unsolicited information.

Brother C. E. W. Dorris of Nashville, Tenn., editor of some commentaries for the Gospel Advocate Company, proposes to purge me with strong medicine, a sort of mail-order cure although I didn't order it. He has written me four typewritten letters totalling about forty pages. I disposed of the first one in three lines, suggesting that surely he did not expect me to reply to such a document. The others were at least as bad and went unacknowledged. The letters are bitter, abusive and vulgar. There are passages in them that I would no more put in the paper than I would tell a smutty joke in the pulpit. This sounds like exaggeration, but I have the letters as evidence in case they are needed. His publisher must be proud of him. Men must be in a deplorable state of mind who can persuade themselves to write such letters. I have information to the effect that at least one of these letters was seen in the Gospel Advocate office and was receiving quite a bit of discussion. It seems to be quite widely known that I have received such letters. Since they are likely to become famous I shall risk a few quotations:

"You brethren have convinced me that none of you are brave enough to make a good sergeant at arms in a Pecker-wood Club."

"When you fail to volunteer and refuse to 'face friends' and brethren in open discussion, do you not thereby prove to the world that you are both a moral and religious coward?"

"Hitler could take a half dozen pecker woods and run all of you away from home."
“You brethren have twisted yourselves so badly that you have about ruined yourselves for everything except material out of which to make corkscrews.”

“My guess is that you know that if you meet your own brethren that they will knock your theory into a cocked hat, yourselves out of the ring and into Scott and White clinic and bore you for the hollow horn.”

“It looks like you brethren can’t keep from ripping your breeches to save your lives. Did you know that you have ripped them so badly that a part of your anatomy has become a very laughable object to people walking down the street behind you? I suggest that before you go out on the street again that all three of you put on leggings that will go as high up as possible, a long tail coat that will go as far down as possible and a mother Hubbard dress that will go at least a foot and a half below possible. If you will do this you will be O.K. provided you behave yourselves and not rip your mother hubbards as you have your pants.”

Now some prurient minds might crave to see some of the real bad parts of these letters. I decline to accommodate you. You’ll have to call on Brother Dorris. I really think Brothel James D. Bales should give us a rest and work on Brother Dorris some and see if he cannot improve his style of writing. Both are conscientious objectors and maybe Brother Dorris would listen to Brother Bales. He doesn’t seem to think much of us.

Brother Dorris is a sadly disappointed man and expresses himself this way:

“When I entered into what I supposed would be a heated correspondence, I did it with much fear and trembling, for the reason I thought that a fellow could shake a red rag in the face of an old cow’s brother and get by with it as easy, if not with more ease, than he could escape a hot fracas by throwing a monkey wrench into the cogs of your war machine. But, lo, and behold! when the wrench went into the cogs, you were ‘like a lamb dumb before his shearer, so opened you not your mouth. It must have knocked the wind all out of your sail’.”

I do not mind admitting that I am not the kind of a man Brother Dorris thought I was. I have no stomach whatever for the sort of discussion he has tried to badger me into. There is not a man living I would talk to as he has to me. He offers me five dollars, then ten dollars if I will do thus and so and boasts about it in the paper. I do not want any of his money. He can buy war savings stamps with it!

Men who write bitter letters quote Paul to the effect that “the weapons of our warfare are not carnal.” Some of them do not hesitate to hurl bitter, carnal words. What kind of weapons do they think carnal words are? A man who employs words that “eat as doth a gangrene” is not qualified to go around quoting Paul on “the weapons of our warfare.” He should listen while somebody quotes these words of Paul to him. “Let no corrupt speech proceed out of your mouth, but such as is good for edifying as the need may be, that it may give grace to them that hear.” “Let your speech be always with grace, seasoned with salt, that ye may know how ye ought to answer each one.”

The Bible does not say that the men who are defending our country are murderers but it does say that “Whosoever hateth his brother is a murderer.” According to their own logic, some men who write letters against war might as well go and join the Army. And when they write us, should we be as bad even as they think we are, and they as good as they think they are, they might emulate “Michael the archangel, when contending with the devil he disputed about the body of Moses, durst not bring against him a railing judgment, but said, the Lord rebuke thee.”

THE JEWS AND THE KINGDOM

(Continued from page 5)

at God’s right hand, far above all principality, and power, and might, and dominion, and every name that is named not only in this world but also in that which is to come.

Daniel said when He ascended on high, and came to the Ancient of Days, there was given Him dominion, and glory, and kingdom, that all nations, and peoples, and tongues, should serve him. (Dan. 7:13.) Brother Boll and his brethren say Daniel was mistaken, He was not given the dominion and the kingdom when He ascended, but it will be given to Him when He leaves heaven again, and comes back to live upon the earth for a thousand years this time.

If the Jews were blinded when they expected a material king, and a material kingdom, Brother Boll is blinded today in the same identical way. If their blindness kept them out of the kingdom, and caused them to be lost, it will do the same for Brother Boll. It is the same old bait the devil used to catch the Jews that Brother Boll has swallowed, and the same old hook is inside the bait, the devil’s hook.

STATUS OF ROMAN CATHOLICS

(Continued from page 11)

“Pope Boniface VIII hath a decree extant in the canon law running thus: ‘We declare, say, define, pronounce it to be of necessity to salvation, for every human creature to be subject to the Roman Pontiff.’

4. Her doctrine is contrary to the oath of allegiance to the United States of America.

“That he will support the constitution of the United States and that he doth absolutely and entirely renounce and abjure all allegiance and fidelity to every foreign Prince, Potentate, State or Sovereignty whatsoever; and particularly by name the Prince, Potentate, State, Sovereignty whereof he was before a citizen or subject.” (Oath of Allegiance.)

“The case is simply this: The oath of naturalization requires the candidate for citizenship to swear that he does absolutely and entirely renounce all allegiance and fidelity to every foreign Prince, Potentate, State, or Sovereignty. Now, the Pope of Rome is a sovereign of Europe—a foreign Potentate, issuing bulls, laws, or briefs, throughout the world: often of pledging to spread the power of the pope and from the power of the church. The pope claims to have the right to control all civil liberty and all mental slavery.

The doctrine of making the pope a supreme judge in controversy—giving him all legislative, executive and judicial powers, of pledging to spread the power of the pope and persecute all who oppose him, is the paragon of tyranny on earth. The pope claims to have the right to control all civil liberty in the world. The bishops vow to help him retain such power. In such a system not one single element of free government or civil liberty can be found.

(This lecture is based largely on arguments taken from the Campbell-Purcell Debate.)
We come now to the investigation of the second proposition by which Catholics try to prove their point about the Bible. They steadfastly affirm that:

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

It is a fact well known that the first translations of the scriptures (New Testament) was from the old Syriac scriptures. This old Syriac language very closely resembled the language spoken by our Lord. Then came at an early date, the Egyptian, Ethiopian and the Gothic versions.

Toward the close of the fourth century, the old Latin version of the scriptures was found to be so full of errors that Saint Jerome was chosen to prepare the Latin Version which is known as the Vulgate. The Vulgate was finished in 385 A.D. This Vulgate was claimed by the Pope and declared by him to be perfect. The Pope, instead of declaring the word to be inspired, declared the translation made by Jerome was perfect. So, it is easy to see that the claim by Catholics that there was no Bible until the fourth century is unfounded. It was the Vulgate that was made in the fourth century and not the Bible. The Vulgate is simply a translation of the Bible. Instead of the Catholics preserving for us the Bible, they preserved for us a Latin translation of the Bible. The Vulgate is just a translation of the Bible-translated from other copies of the Bible.

The American Revision Committee gave us the “Revised Version” of the Bible in 1900. Is there anyone so simple as to think this committee gave us the Bible? No, they just gave us a translation of the Bible. The Catholic Church did not preserve the Bible for us. They simply preserved a translation of the Bible.

But do we have to depend on the Vulgate to know that we have the Word of God? Certainly we do not. We have our Bible absolutely independent of the Catholic Church. We would have our Bible if the Vulgate, a Latin translation, had never been made. This Vulgate has nothing to do with our getting our Bible. The Vulgate has no more to do with our knowing we have the Bible than does the Revised Version, Goodspeed’s Version, Martin Luther’s translation, or any other translation. Of course, the Bible must be translated. Yet we do not translate it from the Vulgate, a Latin translation, but from the original Greek.

There are hundreds of manuscripts to be found today. They are not originals, but copies made from copies of originals. The three most important copies are:

1. The Vatican. This manuscript is held by the Roman Church in Rome. It is not quite complete but an excellent copy.

All Protestant scholars have access to this manuscript. They may go there and read the Word in the Greek language. They can use it in making translations of the Bible. However, Catholic scholars will not use it. They will not use it because of their foolish notion that the Vulgate is perfect.

2. The Alexandrian. This is an excellent manuscript and all scholars have access to it, but Catholic scholars will not use it. They will not use it because they have been led to believe that the Vulgate, a Latin translation, is perfect.

3. The Sinaiatic. This manuscript was formerly at St. Petersburg, Russia. However, it has been purchased by the government of England for $50,000.00 and is now in the British Museum in London. This manuscript is said to be the best manuscript in existence. The Testament is complete. It was written in Greek on the skins of antelopes and was written before the fourth century. This is the oldest and most complete manuscript on earth and the Catholic Church never had it. Too, the Alexandrian manuscript was never in the possession of the Roman Church. Thus we have the best manuscript in the world and the oldest manuscript in the world and the Catholic Church never had and will not ever use it because they foolishly believe that the translation made by Jerome is perfect. Thus you see that we have our Bible independent of the Catholic Church. Catholic priests know this to be so and will not even deny it in open debate. Yet they hope that folk that hear them preach will not investigate for themselves.

The Rheims-Douay version or translation of the Bible is the one used by English-speaking Catholics. This English version is made from the Latin Vulgate and not from the original Greek. It is only a translation of the Vulgate.

The Catholic Church claims that the translation made by Jerome was perfect. Yet Jerome accepted only thirty-nine books in the Old Testament and they accept more. Why? Jerome is infallible when he suits the Catholic Church and fallible when he does not.

But remember this one thing: all the disputed books in the Catholic Bible are in the Old Bible and not in the New. Should we admit that they belong in the Bible they would not affect Christianity. Christianity comes from the New Bible and not the Old.

In the New Testament there are about 370 allusions to passages in the Old Testament and not an allusion to a passage in the questioned books. There are about 263 direct quotations by our Lord and His Apostles from Old Testament books and not a quotation from one of the disputed books. Does this seem strange? Not once did the Lord nor His apostles recognize these books inserted by the Catholic Church. No inspired man ever refers to the apocryphal books.

The Jews who held the Old Testament scriptures do not accept these books.

Now let us see what we have learned about these books that have been placed in the Catholic Bible.

1. They were rejected by Jerome, the translator of their Bible.

2. No inspired man ever refers to them.

3. They are rejected by the Jews who preserved the Old Bible for us.

This ought to settle the matter to all who desire to know the way of God. This does settle it with all who are willing to be governed by the facts in the case.

The Macabbees were inserted in the sixteenth century.

We come now to the examination of their third proposition which is:

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

If their effort to prove that man cannot understand the Scriptures unless interpreted for him by the Pope and his
Cardinals, they cite II Peter 1:20-21: “Knowing this first, that no prophecy of scripture is of private interpretation. For no prophecy ever came by the will of man: but men spake from God, being moved by the Holy Spirit.” Thus they claim that “private” judgment is outlawed. By private judgment they mean the right to read and understand the scriptures for oneself.

Now let us ask a few questions and then see what Peter was teaching. First: Why cite scripture to us if we cannot understand it? You say we cannot understand the scriptures and then cite scripture to prove your point. If I cannot understand it then your argument that I can’t understand it is wrong. Now which proposition, Mr. Catholic, do you believe? You say I can’t understand the scriptures unless officially interpreted. Then you cite scripture to prove your point. Why, again, I ask, do you cite scripture? This is another instance wherein the Catholic priest hopes that you will not think. That you will just take his word for it. Second: Can we understand this passage to tell us we can’t understand this passage? If I can understand this passage why can’t I understand other passages?

The truth is this passage ruins the doctrine of the Catholic Church. This passage does not say that scripture cannot be understood. It does not say that the Bible has to be interpreted by the Pope. It does teach that no one man or set of men can set their “private” judgment over the Word of God. That is just what the Catholic Church tries to do. They set the “private” judgment of the Pope over individual study. That is here condemned. The Catholic Church claims special right to interpret the Bible for the world and Peter says that no man has that right. Yet the Catholic says that I can understand this passage. And by us all, it is understood-understood as condemning the “private” judgment theory of the Pope of Rome. The truth taught by Peter here is this: No prophet spake his own words or will, it was not his private judgment but the Word and will of God. He was moved by the Holy Spirit.

That the scriptures were written for all the people and not a selected few may be seen from the following facts:

1. We are told to read. “Till I come give heed to reading, to exhortation, to teaching.” (I Tim. 4:13.)

2. We are told to study. “Study to show thyself approved unto God as a workman that needeth not to be ashamed, rightly dividing the Word of God.” (II Tim. 2:15.)

3. To let the word dwell in us. “Let the word of Christ dwell in you richly; in all wisdom teaching and admonishing one another with psalms and hymns and spiritual songs.” (Col. 3:16.)

4. To desire the sincere milk of the word. “As new born babes long for the spiritual milk which is without guile, that ye may grow thereby unto salvation.” (I Pet. 2:2.)

5. That the old scriptures were written for our learning. “For whatsoever things were written afore were written for our learning, that through patience and through comfort of the scriptures we might have hope.” (Rom. 15:4.)

6. The scriptures were written to admonish us and not just for the Pope. “Now these things happened unto them by way of example; and they were written for our admonition, upon whom the end of the ages are come.” (I Cor. 10:11.) Please note that in the last two passages cited we are told that the scriptures admonish and comfort us. Written for us and not for the Pope and his Cardinals. The Bible is for everybody.

7. Jesus said go preach to every creature. “Go into all the world and preach the gospel to every creature.” (Mk. 16:15.) Why preach to every creature if they cannot understand it? Again Christ said, “He that believeth not shall be damned.” (Mk. 16:16.) Will Christ damn a man for not believing a message that he cannot understand? It is to be taught the whole world—“teach all nations.” (Matt. 28:19-20.) This gospel should be preached to the whole world and the Pope’s notions have nothing to do with it. The Pope is simply trying to keep you from taking the Bible for what it says. He knows that the Bible condemns him and the whole Catholic system and thus he tells us we don’t know what the Bible means when we read it. The Bible means what it says. Do not be afraid to take the Bible for what it says regardless of what the Pope and the Roman Catholic Church might have to say about it.

8. Take a look at special letters of the New Testament and you can see that the Pope has no right to his “private” judgment. Read the letter to the Churches of Galatia. Not to the Pope but to the Churches of Galatia. These churches could read and understand the letter addressed to them. They did not have to wait until the Pope or some priest explained it. In fact there were no priests and no Pope when the Galatian letter was written. Again Paul wrote to all that are in Rome. (Rom. 1:7.) He did not write to just a few but to all that are in Rome. All were addressed and all could understand. Too, Paul instructed that the First Thessalonian letter be read to all the brethren. (I Thess. 5:27.) “I adjure you by the Lord that this epistle be read unto all the brethren.” Why read it to all the brethren or to any of the brethren, if they could not understand it?

IV. We now come to the study of the next proposition, namely, the claim that the Catholic Church is authority in religion and not the Bible. That the Pope is the vicar of Christ on earth and that his decisions are infallible. That the Bible is authority only in the hands of the Catholic Church.

In this connection I am willing to settle the matter by the Bible. I am willing to be governed by it. We could both agree that the Bible is authority and read what it says and the argument would be over. But instead the Catholic sets up an arbitrary authority—the Catholic Church. But we ask, “How will you prove that the Catholic Church is authority? Will you try to prove it by the Bible?” The answer is “Yes”. They take the Bible which they say is not authority to prove that their church is authoritative. That is silly. If the Bible is not authority how does it prove that the Catholic Church is authoritative? We deny that the Catholic Church has any authority from God and challenge the Pope and all his priests to prove it. Will they quote the Bible? If so, why? Why quote the Bible if it is not authority? Can they take that which is not authority to prove that their church has authority? The Catholic argues in a circle. He proves his church is authority by the Bible and then proves the Bible authority by his church. So round and round he goes. Mr. Catholic meets himself coming back.

As before stated the Roman Church vests all power in the church, with infallibility resting in the Pope. Too, the Pope was not even considered to be infallible until 1870—just seventy-three years ago.

They claim that Peter was the first Pope and all others are his successors. In order to establish this they must first prove that Peter was preeminent among the apostles.

The Catholic Church therefore makes an effort to prove the primacy of Peter. They say that Christ made him the first Pope. To prove their point they quote Matthew 16, verses 18 and 19. “And I also say unto thee that thou art Peter and upon this rock I will build my church; and the gates of Hades shall not prevail against it. I will give unto thee the keys of the kingdom of heaven; and whatsoever thou shalt bind on earth shall be bound in heaven; and whatsoever thou shalt loose on earth shall be loosed in heaven.” This is a fine passage of scripture but it does not teach what Catholics read into it. It does not say that “Peter is the foundation of the church.” It does not say that the “church was built on Peter.” The Church of Christ was not built on Peter but on Christ. “No
other foundations can any man lay, than that which is laid, which is Jesus Christ." (I Cor. 3:11.) The foundation is Christ, not Peter.

Christ said, "Thou art Peter (petros) and upon this rock (petra) I will build my church." The Greek word "petros" is a noun in the masculine gender. The word "petra" is in the feminine gender. The church was to be built on "petra" and not on "petros." "Petros" is the word by which Peter is called. Too, since the feminine gender could not refer to Peter it must refer to the confession he made. The church was not built on Peter-so away goes the very foundation of Roman Catholicism.

But the Catholic claims that Peter was given the power to "bind and loose"-he was given the "keys" of the kingdom. Yes, this is true. But did you not know that this same power was given to all the apostles? "And when he had said this he breathed on them, and said unto them, Receive ye the Holy Spirit: whose soever sins ye forgive, they are forgiven unto them: whose soever sins ye retain, they are retained." (Jno. 20:22-23.) The word "key" is a symbol of power and authority. All the apostles were given the same power and authority. Peter was not preeminent in any sense, over the rest of the apostles. Too, Jesus Christ taught equality among the apostles. "And I appoint unto you a kingdom, even as my Father appointed me, that ye may eat and drink at my table in my kingdom; and ye shall sit on thrones judging the twelve tribes of Israel." (Lk. 22:29-30.) Please notice that the Lord says this is for "you," for all of the apostles and not just for Peter. "Ye" shall sit on thrones "judging." "Ye," not just Peter. All the apostles were equal in authority.

God delegated "authority" to His Son. Christ acted for Jehovah. Christ came not to do His own will but the will of God. Thus Christ was the representative of Jehovah on earth. When Christ left this world He delegated authority-"keys of the kingdom"-to all the apostles and not to Peter alone. To hear the apostles is to hear Christ. To reject them is to reject Christ. "He that receiveth you receiveth me, and he that receiveth me receiveth him that sent me." (Matt. 10:40.) We hear the apostles through the Word of God.

Paul says that he was equal with Peter. "I, for I reckon I am not a whit behind the very chiefest apostles." (II Cor. 11:5.) Paul is not a "whit" behind Peter, the Catholic Church to the contrary notwithstanding.

The guiding influence of the Holy Spirit was given to all the apostles. (Read Jno. 14:26; 16:5-15; Luke 24:45-49; Acts 2:1-4.) God sent the Holy Spirit to twelve men on Pentecost and not to one man. To all the apostles and not to Peter alone.

A casual reader of the Bible can easily see that Peter was not a Pope. In the first chapter of the Book of Acts when it was time for a selection to be made to fill the place from which Judas by transgression fell, all the apostles had a part in the matter and not Peter only. Why did not Peter appoint some one to take the place of Judas if he was the Pope? By reading Acts, first chapter, you can easily see that Peter was not a Pope. However, Catholic priests hope that you will listen to them and not read for yourself.

In Acts 8:14 the record says that Peter was sent to Sama-ria. Please notice that the book says they sent Peter and John. Who sends the Pope around today? Who has the power to send the Pope? The Pope does the sending today. Peter does not look much like a Pope in this passage, does he? In fact he was not a Pope.

In the early church a question arose over circumcision. (Acts 15.) The matter was taken to Jerusalem (not Rome) before the apostles and elders. The matter was brought before, not the Pope and his Cardinals, but the apostles-all of them—and the elders. That does not look like a Catholic Church, does it? Too, you will probably note that the apostle presided over this council and not Peter. James not Peter. James says, "Wherefore my judgment is, and his judgment was accepted and the letter was written to the Gentiles, that they abstain from pollutions of idols, and from fornication, and from what is strangled, and from blood. This was a decision rendered by the Apostle James and not Peter. Thus showing that Peter was not preeminent and surely not the Pope.

Secondly, in order to prove that the Pope is the vicar of Christ on earth, representing Christ from Rome, it is necessary to prove that Peter was at one time Bishop at Rome.

It is claimed by Catholic priests and the Pope that Peter was in Rome from A.D. 43 to A.D. 68 and acted as Pope. This is a mere assertion which cannot be proved, and few will dare try, except where no one has a chance to reply.

To show that this is but an assertion, that is, that Peter was Bishop in Rome from A.D. 43 to A.D. 68, let it be understood:

1. History does not prove that Peter was Bishop at Rome from A.D. 43 to 68; in fact, history does not prove that Peter was ever at Rome at any time, much less from A.D. 43 to 68.

2. The scriptures do not state Peter was at Rome. Then if history does not prove and the scriptures do not state he was in Rome, it rests upon a mere assumption born of a desire to substantiate a theory accepted by the Roman hierarchy.

In order that it may be clearly shown that the claims of Catholicism concerning Peter's sojourn in Rome from A.D. 43 to 68 is untrue, you will note:

1. Peter was imprisoned in the city of Jerusalem in A.D. 44. (Acts 12.) How, then, could Peter be Bishop at Rome and at the same time be in jail in the city of Jerusalem?

2. In A.D. 58 the Apostle Paul wrote the Roman letter addressing it to the Church of God at Rome, and saluted 27 persons and did not so much as mention Peter. Why did Paul ignore the Pope? If Peter was Pope in Rome in A.D. 58 as Catholics claim, why is it that Paul would salute 27 persons by name and not one time mention Peter, the Pope?

3. While in Rome Paul wrote Philemon, Philippians, Ephesians and Colossians, but makes no mention of Peter. A strange way to treat the Pope, if Peter was Pope.

4. Near the close of Paul's life in A.D. 67, Paul writes to Timothy and says only Luke was with me. (II Tim. 4:11.) Too, he says all men forsook me. (II Tim. 4:16.) What happened to the Pope? Was he so ashamed of Paul that he wouldn't even stand by him? Remember also that A.D. 67 is the very time they claim that Peter was the Pope, and yet he forsook Paul, and wouldn't even stand by him in his hour of trial.

5. The Apostle Peter makes no mention of Rome in his works. Is it not strange that when Paul was in Rome he mentioned Rome and yet if Peter stayed in Rome he never mentions it? Again I repeat, history does not prove that Peter was in Rome during any time of his life, and the scriptures do not state it.

A perfect religion requires perfect authority. Perfect authority presupposes perfect love, perfect wisdom and perfect justice.

"A careful study of the lives of the Popes reveals anything but these three characteristics. For example! war between contending aspirants for the Papacy was quite common in early days. At one time Benedict the 9th, Sylvester the 3rd and Gregory the 8th all claimed to be Pope at the same time. Pius the 2nd lead a vile life and excused himself on the grounds that David and Solomon had been guilty of the same indiscretions. Alexander the 6th was brazen enough to acknowledge the paternity of a son after he had become Pope and made his own daughter his private secretary. And what shall I say of the woman, Joan, who is said to have worn man's raiment, deceived her subjects, and occupied St. Peter's chair for about two years and a half? From these facts it is quite evident that we could hardly go to the Papacy for perfect love, wisdom and justice; therefore, we must reject the Papacy as the source of authority in religion."-Center Shots at Rome by George Partnership.
In conclusion, we have seen first the scriptures assert their own authenticity. Second, we have our Bible independent of the Catholic Church. All they gave us was a translation out of the Latin into the English. Third, the scriptures can be read and understood by all who desire to know the truth. Fourth, the Catholic Church is not authority. Do not be afraid to read and study your Bible and do what it says. The Bible plainly condemns the claims of the Papacy on almost every page.

We now come to the discussion of the fifth and last proposition.

V. Are her teachings compatible with the principles of American Democracy?

Please remember that I am discussing the system and not those who profess it—the creed and not the people. It will not do to wave the flag and talk of great Catholic patriots of our country. In America most members of the Roman Catholic Church have risen above the system. This is caused by the influence of our schools and Christian people. The system can be seen in its true light only where Rome has a majority. You cannot judge Nazism from the Hitlerties in this country. You need to look at Germany to see its true color.

That the Roman Catholic Church is opposed to the true spirit of American democracy I prove by the following points:

1. Her doctrine of a judge in controversy.

The council of Trent decreed “That the oral traditions of the Catholic Church” (meaning the Roman) “are to be received, pari pietatis affectu ac reverentia suscepti ac veneratur.”—Council of Trent, 4th Session.

Then she asserts: “It belongs to the church to judge of the true sense and interpretation of scripture: and that no person shall dare to interpret it in matters relating to faith and manners to any sense contrary to that which the church has held, or contrary to the unanimous consent of the fathers.” (Zb. Id.)

Alexander Campbell said:

“In all monarchies, save that of Rome and Mahomet, a judge is not constitutionally a judge of his own case. But the Roman judge of controversy is the whole church, says my learned opponent, and her councils affirm with him. The whole church judging the things between what parties? Herself and the heretics! What a righteous, infallible and republican judge, is the supreme judge of controversy in the Catholic church! The controversy is between two parties—the church, or the clergy on one side; and the heretics or the reformers on the other, as they may happen to be called: say the church and the heretics. And who is umpire, who is supreme judge of both? One of the Darbies, indeed, the church herself! This is the arduous—the beau ideal, of civil liberty, and republican government, in the supreme Roman hierarchy. It will not help it to place the ermine on the Pope. He is that instant ex parte judge. And besides, he is executive of the church. If the Pope is to be judge, and executive, and lawyer, in the case as he frequently is, what a splendid picture of a republican president or judge have we got in the Roman church!”

2. The oath of allegiance to Rome.

Campbell also said:

“This ghostly despotism is to be sustained and defended, too, by the whole church. By vows, oaths, and pledges, the most solemn and binding that religion can suggest or human ingenuity devise. Their oath, which is the same in all countries, I will now read so far at least, as relates to this matter. * * * To the honor, the preservation, and safety of the holy Roman church and to our Lord, the lord N. Pope N. and his successors, canonically coming in. I will neither advise, consent, or do anything that they may lose life or member, or that their person may be dispossessed, or any injuries offered to them, under any pretense whatsoever. The counsel which they shall intrust to me, withal, by themselves, their messengers, or letters, I will not knowingly reveal to any to their prejudice. I will help them to defend and keep the Roman papacy, and the royalties of St. Peter, saving my order, in all the legions of the apostolic see, going and coming, I will honorably treat and help in his necessities. The rights, honors, privileges, and authority of the holy Roman church of our lord the Pope, and his foresaid successors, I will endeavor to preserve, defend, increase, and advance. I will not be in any counsel, action, or treaty in which shall be plotted against our said lord, and the said Roman church, anything to the hurt or prejudice of their persons, right, honor, state, or property; and if I shall know any such thing to be treated or agitated by any whatsoever, I will signify it to our said lord, or to some other by whom it may come to his knowledge. The rules of the holy Fathers, the apostolic decrees, ordinances, or disputes, reservations, provisions, and mandates, I will observe and obey all my life, and cause to be observed by my successors, Heretics, schismatics, and rebels to our said lord, or his foresaid successors, Z will to my utmost power persecute and oppose.”—Pontifical Roman, Edt. Antwerp, A.D. 1626.

Alexander Campbell said: “Here then is the most solemn pledge and vow given by every bishop of Rome, that he will to the utmost of his power persecute and destroy heretics and schismatics! Does not this indisputable fact, alone, sustain my * * * proposition, and prove that the genius of the Latin church is anti-American and essentially opposed to the existence of all free institutions?”

3. Her claims to control civil government.

“This is the doctrine which Barronius, with a Roman confidence, doth so often assert and drive forward, saying, & that there can be no doubt of it, but that the civil principality is subject to the sacerdotal; and that God hath made the political government subject to the dominion of the spiritual church.”—Epis. Patrac. Sess. 10. p. 133. Barronius, Annals, 57, 23. “Again Bellarmine says: ‘By reason of the spiritual power, the pope, at least, indirectly, hath a supreme power even in temporal matters’.

“A.D.1585.—The bull of Pope Sixtus V against the two sons of wrath, Henry, King of Navarre, and the Prince of Conde, beginneth thus: ‘The authority given to St. Peter and his successors, by the immense power of the eternal king, excels all the powers of earthly dominion of the spiritual church.’”

“Again Campbell says: ‘As this is the genius of our government? Are these the doctrines of the United States? Here you have kings hurried from their thrones, and subjects released from their allegiance, without ceremony, by the Vicar of Christ and the head of the church! Who is this that sets aside oaths, and religious obligations, in the name of the Lord? ‘Why,’ says the modern Roman Catholic, ‘do you bring up these old things?’ Not so very old! But will the bishop mention the council that ever repudiated this doctrine? He thereby deprives the queen of her pretended right to the kingdom, and of all dominion, dignity, and privilege whatsoever; and absolves their subjects from their oaths of allegiance, and forbiddeth them to pay any obedience to the authority of any pope, whomsoever they be, and set free all persons, as well jointly as severally, from any such oath, and from all duty whatsoever in regard of dominion, fealty and obedience, and do charge and forbid all and everyone of them that they take the suppression of their admissions, laws, and commands’—Bulls Sitchi V. Contra Henr. Navarre, R. &c.

Again Campbell says:

“Is this the genius of our government? Are these the doctrines of the United States? Here you have kings hurried from their thrones, and subjects released from their allegiance, without ceremony, by the Vicar of Christ and the head of the church! Who is this that sets aside oaths, and religious obligations, in the name of the Lord? ‘Why,’ says the modern Roman Catholic, ‘do you bring up these old things?’ Not so very old! But will the bishop mention the council that ever repudiated this doctrine? He thereby deprives the queen of her pretended right to the kingdom, and of all dominion, dignity, and privilege whatsoever; and absolves their subjects from their oaths of allegiance, and forbiddeth them to pay any obedience to the authority of any pope, whomsoever they be, and set free all persons, as well jointly as severally, from any such oath, and from all duty whatsoever in regard of dominion, fealty and obedience.”—Camp. Hist. anno. (1570.)

“That this was not peculiar to one individual, but of the spirit of the system, appears from the following facts: Pope Clement VI did pretend to depose the Emperor Lewis IV.

“Pope Clement V in the great synod of Vienna declared the emperor subject to him, or standing obliged to him by a proper oath of fealty.—(Clem. lib. ii. ft. 9.)”

(Turn back to page 7)
The February issue of the Bible Banner printed the full text of an article in the Gospel Advocate in which the editor of that paper ran amuck on the government issue and committed the Gospel Advocate to the position of the conscientious objectors. The fact that the editor of the Advocate has abandoned his ethical policies and has resorted to "sarcasm" in consecutive jabs at the Bible Banner is good evidence that the Bible Banner is having effect in Nashville, Tennessee. A man well acquainted with affairs in that city recently said that the Bible Banner is covering Nashville like a newspaper! That may account for the repeated jabs from the irate editor of the Advocate, so we will handle him as psychopathically as his periodical animadversions may warrant.

"A Challenge to Discuss"

That all may know what we are replying to, the full text of the last jab up to now is inserted below. Here it is for what it is worth:

THE BROTHER "HAS SOMETHING"

A good brother from Texas, whose name need not be mentioned in this connection, writes: "Your editorial of February 4 is fine. The truth is still the same as in 1936, come what may. There is another inconsistency that appears on the "war question" that I would like to see you give some attention. Those who are leading the fight have been challenged to debate, but have given the answer, "They better agree among themselves before the war is over what issue needs debating," and some people have fallen for this and think that settles the question. When did such all the premillennialists agree, and would it be wrong to debate them until they did? If that principle be true, then we might just as well let the denominations go.

Yes, we have been told that a challenge to discuss the "war question," even after the war is over, has been declined on the ground that those associated with the issuer, of the challenge were not agreed, in all respects, on the question. The most charitable thing that can be said of this "dodge" is that it is a very lame excuse, a mere subterfuge. Accepting it as a guiding principle, no discussion could be had with the "Christian Church," for they are divided into several belligerent groups. By the same token a denominationalist could decline to meet a preacher of the churches of Christ in debate on the identical ground that they are not "agreed among themselves" on certain questions. Not only so, but in the first century, an Epicurean philosopher, a Jewish rabbi, or a worshipper of idols could have declined to "dispute" with Paul on the grounds that there was division in Corinth and defection in Galatia.

Was it Falstaff who said, "The better part of valor is discretion, in the which better part I have saved my life"? In making what the Gospel Advocate calls "a challenge to discuss the 'war question'" Brother H. Leo Boles sent similar, if not identical letters to C. R. Nichol, R. L. Whiteside, Cled E. Wallace and the writer. It now appears that a whispering campaign has been going on about these exchanges. The editor of the Advocate says that he has "been told" that "a challenge was "declined." Has he "been told" that the letter from one of the above men on his staff to Brother Boles containing some important questions regarding the proposition was not answered, though an answer was requested?

"The Issuer of the Challenge"

Since some of the contents of the letters have apparently gained considerable currency by having been passed around, handed out and otherwise publicized, there is no longer any valid reason for withholding the full facts from our columns on the grounds that it was a private exchange. If the Gospel Advocate so regarded it, the editor should not have made public reference to it in his paper. The Bible Banner is not only willing but glad to let everybody in on the contents of that exchange. Here they are:

Dear Brother Wallace:

It seems that there is much confusion in the brotherhood on the question of Christians engaging in carnal war. I would like to make a thorough study of this question for the benefit of the great host of members of the churches of Christ; I would like for this study to be an inquiry and investigation into all the arguments that may be produced on both sides of the question. I am not making any challenge in the spirit of a debate; I am humbly making inquiry of you as to whether you have the time or inclination to make this study with me. I believe that you and I can discuss the question and still be friends as we are brethren in the Lord.

If you do not care to join me in this investigation of the Bible proof on the proposition will you suggest a reputable brother who has the time and inclination to enter upon a discussion of this question. I want the discussion to be written so that it may be free from all personalities, quibblings, and bitterness that sometimes are brought into a debate. It is my desire that the discussion be as thorough as we can make it. After it is published in the Gospel Advocate, Firm Foundation, and Bible Banner I would like to see the discussion in book form for future study of members of the church. We have no book covering this subject and it seems to me that the brotherhood would be eager to study both sides of the war proposition. I am here submitting a proposition which is brief and definite enough to bring the issue to the fore. Brother Wallace, I trust that you will not think that I am seeking any notoriety, any victory, or conquest in a debate. I am anxious to give to the brotherhood the best that can be had on the proposition; I would like to investigate every argument that can be presented on the affirmative side of the proposition.

Here is the proposition: The Bible Teaches That Christians Should Respond To The Call Of Their Government In Time Of War To Destroy The Property And Lives Of Its Enemies.

It may be that you do not think the question is of sufficient importance to take the affirmative side and attempt to prove the above proposition, however, I think that it is an important question and that the peace and good will of the brotherhood can be maintained better by discussing in a brotherly way the above proposition. Please let me hear from you as to what your wishes are with respect to such a discussion.

I wanted to see you and discuss this with you before I left Norman, Oklahoma, but did not have the opportunity to do so.

Remember me in Christian love to your family.

Yours fraternal,

H. Leo Boles.

P.S. It may be that the Firm Foundation and the Bible Banner do not care to publish the discussion; I can see that it would occupy so much space that a monthly like the Bible Banner would not care to publish it after it had appeared in the Gospel Advocate. If these publications do not care to carry the discussion, the Gospel Advocate will carry it anyway.
Dear Brother Boles:

This is the first reasonable opportunity I have had to answer your letter of October 8. My reaction to your suggestion is that there would be no need to go outside the Gospel Advocate for such a discussion as you propose. You and Brother Goodpasture are on one side of the c&c$ion, such men as R. L. Whiteside and C. R. Nichol are on the other side. Why not keep the discussion in the family?

As for the proposition you have worded and suggested, I do not think any discerning man would accept such a proposition. In the first place it fixes a motive that no good man, to say nothing of a Christian, could possess, and which I certainly would disclaim. I certainly do not believe the statement you have drawn and could deny it in any way you might choose. In the second place, whether it is the "duty" of an individual to join the armed forces depends on various considerations. You could as well insist that all who believe that it is all right to accept non-combatant service should join up for that service. All that is beside the question. In the third place, it does not allow for discrimination in the thing the government is doing—whether it is carrying out the mission of government or one that has become an outlaw, criminal nation instead. In the fourth place, the issue does not pertain to Christians as such; being a moral issue, it is an individual issue, and if a Christian individual cannot participate morally in it, no individual could morally participate in it.

The question of war is not the fundamental issue—it is only collateral to the main issue. The issue is the individual's relation to civil government. The military issue grows out of that—whether it is a local war on criminals and outlaws through police action, or, as a national matter, whether a national body is guilty of "a dodge" and "a mere subterfuge" certainly operates against brethren Nichol and Whiteside as much as it does against brother Cled and me. Will the editor of the Gospel Advocate publish what passed between H. Leo Boles and C. R. Nichol? We would all like to know who on the Advocate staff is doing the dodging and subterfuging.

"The War Question"

As for the proposition that was submitted for discussion—we have all heard of challengers submitting propositions which the submitter knew that no intelligent man could or would affirm. Sectarians have very frequently pursued that course. Unfortunately, brethren sometimes do. Just why should Brother Boles write out a proposition for another man to affirm? If he wants a debate, why not write out what he wants to affirm? Personally, when I want to debate I will reserve the right to word my own proposition.

Let the wording of the proposition submitted by Brother Boles be applied to non-combatant service: "The Bible Teaches That Christians Should Respond To The Call Of Their Government In Time Of War To Make Warplanes, Tanks, Guns, And All The Munitions Of War, To Destroy The Property And Lives Of Its Enemies."

There are some conscientious objectors who will deny this proposition if Brother Boles will affirm it. If he will not affirm it, he puts every non-combatant worker in the same place that he has put the soldier. Is this the position of the Gospel Advocate? If so, say so. If not, let Brother Boles withdraw his proposition and Brother Goodpasture his jabs.

Everybody knows that this government is not waging war for the purpose of destroying the property and lives of its enemies, but in defense of the property and lives of its citizens, and of its very existence, we are made to wonder if Brother Boles is the logician that he is reputed to be. His proposition does not indicate it.

I have been told that Brother Boles has declared both publicly and privately in various places where he has held meetings that it is even wrong for the members of the church to buy war bonds. But have you noticed a certain clause in his proposition? Go back and read it—"that Christians should respond to the call of their government. Whose government? If Christians respond to the call of their government—it belongs to Christians, does it not? What becomes of the contention that civil government belongs to the devil? If it belongs to the devil, no Christian should support it, much less defend it. Who wants to support the devil? But if the government is "theirs," and Brother Boles says it is, then it may turn out according to his own "logic" that they should defend it "in time of war" as well as enjoy its prosperity in time of peace. If it be replied that Christians are commanded to support the government, we merely repeat, that is why we know it is not the devil's government, because no Christian has ever been commanded to support and serve the devil.

After all, is that the really the proposition the Gospel Advocate wants to debate?
Sneaking of things we have “been told”—I am reminded that it has been told, and so far has not been denied, that while Brother Boles was president of David Lipscomb College an armed officer was employed to patrol the premises of the school. What was the purpose of that? Was it to “destroy the lives” of criminal invaders and make widows and orphans out of their wives and children, in case he had to shoot? If not, why did the school of which Brother Boles was president employ such an officer—and why did he tote a gun? Is it right for the president of the school to pay such an officer, but is wrong for him to buy war bonds? And if a member of the church could be that officer, can a member of the church not also be a soldier? If not, why not?

May be, perhaps, Brother Boles would like to switch propositions and affirm:

“The Bible Teaches That a Christian College Should Employ An Armed Officer to Destroy the Lives of Its Enemy Intruders.”

What is the difference between a Christian College providing police protection for its students and the government providing military protection for its citizens? If one armed officer should not be enough to protect the school, for instance, the women and girls in the dormitories, in case of an emergency, would it be right to increase the armed force? Somebody in Nashville should offer that five or ten dollar proposition for “chapter and verse” to Brother Boles instead of us.

Anyway, these questions are based on what we “have been told” and are therefore as legitimate as Brother Goodpasture’s editorial.

“Not Agreed Among Themselves”

We have said repeatedly that the issue is not one of war, but of government. The war question is only corollary to the main issue. We all know that both Brother Boles and the editor of the Advocate know enough about the rules of procedure to know that the one who seeks a debate should submit the proposition he is willing to affirm. He says that he is not seeking victory, but his proposition certainly smacks of seeking an advantage. If they are really desirous of being fair, neither their proposition nor their procedure indicates it. Since it is Brother Boles who seeks the debate, the proper procedure is for him to submit a proposition on the government question that he will affirm. When he does so fairly and squarely, my hunch is that he will not have to go outside the Gospel Advocate staff to get his debate.

The effort of the Gospel Advocate to show that their disagreement among themselves is no ground for us to “decline” to debate with them only proves that they feel the weight of the outstanding fact that the Gospel Advocate is a divided house on the government question. The effort to parallel debating with premillennialists, digressives and denominationalists is no parallel at all. Those of us who oppose Boll, Neal and Norris are not divided on the issues involved. If the Gospel Advocate were divided on the use of Instrumental Music, Boll for it and Nichol against it; or Goodpasture for it and Brightwell against it—and should challenge the Christian Standard for a debate, the Standard could very reasonably and ethically say, “You brethren debate it-keep the debate in the family!” If Boll should be a premillennialist and Nichol against it; or Goodpasture a premillennialist and Brightwell against it—and the Advocate should challenge Word and Work for a debate on the issue-Boll and Jorgenson could very logically and ethically reply, debate it among yourselves! So Brother Boles should go ahead and answer Brother Nichol’s letter. The attempted parallel is not even a good “dodge,” and the most charitable thing that we can say is that his attempted parallel is a lame effort to cover up the division that exists among themselves on the issues involved.

“A Good Brother from Texas”

Concerning “the brother” from Texas, who the editor thinks “has something” but “whose name need not be mentioned in this connection,” it is not necessary for him to “mention” his name—I can give you his name, initials and post office address. Furthermore, if it will accommodate his curiosity, I will put letters from Tennessee, Kentucky, Alabama, Georgia and Texas, against any “brother” whose name or names he wishes to reveal, for intelligence, ability or love for the cause of Christ. For instance, one “good brother” from Alabama observes “a vast difference in the style and mood employed by Brother Goodpasture” in his article on support for the conscientious objectors “and the few instances he has felt the urge or necessity of writing on the premillennial question.” Another perfectly good brother from Kentucky (who has no connection with the Bible Banner but who has been disappointed in weaknesses of the Gospel Advocate) remarks that the “editorial page in the Gospel Advocate looks like a nice piece of propaganda designed to reflect on the defense of the church against the perniciousness of premillennialism.” He has somewhat to say of the “innovendo” and “strategy” employed by the editor and suggests that someone on the Advocate staff should affirm that “human governments are guilty of murder in ‘executing wrath against the evildoer’ in defending the rights of free peoples against the unwarranted aggression of the Axis.” He adds the remark that they have “no attempt to meet arguments, and the reason is obvious to reflecting minds.” Just to be liberal, we will give the editor two for one in any number of comments he may wish to publish from “a good brother” anywhere from California to Carolina, Maine to Miami, or from Tennessee to Texas.

Among enclosures received is a clipping from the Nashville Banner referring to David Lipscomb College as being “not quite up to the Bison standard of other years, due to the loss of players to the armed forces.” That sounds like Brother Boles needs to hold a debate out at David Lipscomb College to keep them from giving their students to the armed forces—they ought to send them to, the concentration camp. It is quite possible that they received the impression that “armed forces” are all right from Brother Boles, “their erstwhile preceptor,” when the college employed an officer to protect them “back in 1920-30” while Brother Boles was president. That brings up the editor’s question: “Who taught them?” “Yea, verily!”

In the same letter from this “good brother” it is noted that the “Central Church (in which Brother Goodpasture has continued interest) has special services for service men, and if they are murderers why not quit fellowshipping them”—and withdraw from them? That is another place for Brother Boles to have a debate-the Central Church in Nashville. Then comes the Gospel Advocate’s own report of the establishment of the church for soldiers, where soldiers will make up most of the membership, and perform the functions and services of the congregation. How does that harmonize with the position of the editor? It can be construed only as a reflection on his convictions or his courage and it will cause the people generally to lose confidence in anything he may say or do. It is not a debate that they most need.

“Another Inconsistency on the War Question”

Comes also the report that Abilene Christian College will carry on a government schedule for enlisted men. We have the impression that the influence of this college has been for the conscientious objectors. If so, what will they teach these soldiers? Will they teach them to be conscientious objectors? That their enlistment in the armed forces is wrong? If they do not, they will not be true to their convictions on “the war question.” If they do, what will be the result? Does the government know their teaching on these questions? Consistency, did somebody say?
Last, and also least in importance, are the speeches of Doctor George S. Benson, president of Harding College, Searcy, Arkansas—the great government economist! The great Doctor Benson is touring the country trying to reform the functions of civil government. You should read the report of his speeches in Dallas, Texas. He tells the business men of Dallas that “the right place” for “mundane authority” should be “in the people” and not in the “bureaucrats”—and he tells them to a “t” how to get it done. In speaking of this government he uses the term “ourselves”—revealing that he really does think we belong to it or that it belongs to us. Now, in the words of the editor of the Advocate, “the question is”: When this great government specialist, Doctor Benson, gets the government to functioning according to his ideas, will it still be a vassal of the devil?

Everybody knows that Harding College is a conscientious objectors college, according to the teaching of J. N. Armstrong, who has brought them up to believe that civil government belongs to the devil. But the president of the college is trying to convince the devil how to run his government, and he actually uses the words “ourselves” in doing so. That puts him in league with the devil! Now, what does Brother Armstrong think of the president of his school?

“The Better Part of Valor”

The thing so evident in the minds of the brethren far and wide and which has provoked so much comment everywhere is the fact that when premillennialism and digression formed an alliance in the Davidson Movement, a movement that threatened the whole church, the editor of the Advocate was as meek as a mouse until the invasion was stopped. Was that the discretion that saved the valorous Advocate’s life?

The colleges likewise bowed to this movement. Lipscomb, Harding and Abilene colleges all royally entertained the man Davidson, and aided his movement. Clinton Copyright Davidson was made a member of the board of Harding College. In Texas, Jesse P. Sewell was his harbinger and Abilene College was his host. They are responsible for the harm that resulted to the cause of Christ in these parts from this movement. Though the character of the movement has been revealed and acknowledged, we have not seen any retractions or apologies in print from these leaders among us who promoted it. It will be remembered in the years to come that during all of these times, which were times of crisis and days of stress for the church, the Gospel Advocate silently allowed others to fight that battle. It is also a matter of record that everything the editor of the Advocate has said since that time has carried insinuations against those who fought that battle. Even now the sole effort to be to attempt to discredit those who still fight these battles, and to weaken the defense that has been made for the truth and for the church.

After all, it may not be the government issue as much as some other things that smolder in the mind of the editor of the Advocate, which occasionally burst into flame and besmirch him to sally forth with his jabs. So long as that is his method, it is quite all right with us. We are disposed to give our readers the benefit of anything he cares to say in his garbled references to what we say, with our respects appended thereto. See if he passes.

**“THE WEAPONS OF OUR WARFARE ARE NOT CARNAL”**

(EDITOR)

A certain brother has conscientious scruples against bearing arms for the government in this crisis, but who has no scruples against making these armaments in the factories, in stating his objections to combatant military service, writes: “I am doing all that I can to win this war in a non-combatant way.” Another brother writes that he is “opposed to taking up carnal weapons, but will do any work necessary to win the war.” What kind of weapons will these brethren use in a non-combatant way in doing the work necessary “to win this war”?

Are the tools they use and the work they do to win the war spiritual? If not, they are carnal. A little reflection on this point will reveal to any thoughtful person that non-combatants are themselves using carnal weapons.

But those who are opposed to active military service in the struggle to preserve the independence of this nation very frequently and fluently quote II Cor. 10:3-5. The passage reads: “For though we walk in the flesh, we do not war after the flesh: (for the weapons of our warfare are not carnal, but mighty through God to the pulling down of strongholds:) casting down imaginations, and every high thing that exalteth itself against the knowledge of God, and bringing into captivity every thought to the obedience of Christ; and having in readiness to revenge all disobedience, when your obedience is fulfilled.”

We are told by the authorities that it takes ten men doing non-combatant service to support one man in combat. There are brethren who argue that the one man in combat is violating II Cor. 10:4 in the use of carnal weapons in carnal warfare, but the ten men in non-combatant work who support him do not violate that passage. But the tools that are used by the ten men in making the armaments are just as carnal as the guns that are used by the one. Who can make himself believe that the ten men who use carnal tools to make carnal weapons to support one man in carnal warfare are innocent, but the one man who uses them is guilty?

If the passage under consideration applies to members of the church participating in the military service of the government in which they are citizens, one thing is certain—the non-combatant participant is as guilty as the combatant participant in this war. But that is not Paul’s point. Such an application misses the meaning of the passage. What are the carnal weapon’s and warfare of II Cor. 10:4? Compare a few passages in which the same word is used. In Rom. 15:27 Paul says: “For if the Gentiles have been made partakers of these spiritual things, their duty is also to minister unto them in carnal things.” In this passage “carnal” is the opposite of “spiritual”. Again, in I Cor. 9:11, Paul writes, “If we have sown unto you spiritual things, is it a great thing if we shall reap your carnal things?” The same word in II Cor. 1:12 is rendered “fleshly.” So any fleshly thing is carnal in this sense. It is in that sense that reference is made to the carnal ordinances of the law in contrast with the spiritual nature of the new covenant.

Then what is the meaning of Paul’s assertion that “the weapons of our warfare are not carnal”? He was simply referring to the nature of the conflict in which the church at Corinth was engaged against the forces and influences of paganism, idolatry and Judaism—it was a spiritual warfare, not a carnal one. Preserving the play on the words of the preceding verse, in his illustration the members of the Corinthian church were serving as soldiers, but the nature of their campaign was spiritual, hence their weapons were not carnal.

Is non-combatant service spiritual? If not, it is carnal, and somebody loses a proof-text in the effort to condemn combatant service while justifying non-combatant service. It shows the inconsistency of the contention that the one man in combat service does wrong, while the ten men in non-combat service do right. The plain fact of the matter is that II Cor. 10:4 does 
not apply to participation in the civil and military services of the nation, and any such use of it is a misapplication of the text.

Commenting on the passage, B. W. Johnson says that “the weapons of our warfare are not carnal” means that the might of the church is not human strength and human armaments, but spiritual weapons by which souls are rescued from the philosophies of the false teachers. MacKnight, the translator and commentator, says that the passage refers to the weapons by which the church made war on heathen religions, that the gospel was not a weak, fleshly, carnal weapon, but the mighty instrument of Paul in overthrowing the fortresses of religious error and casting down human imaginations by the force of spiritual weapons.

Paul visualized a spiritual conquest, a pulling down of spiritual strongholds. The teachers of error, idolatry and Judaism were the invaders at Corinth. They had thrown up siege-works against the truth and had threatened the church with destruction. Paul regarded these adversaries of the truth as besiegers. He himself was the commander of the faithful garrison and he declared his determination to wield his weapons against the besiegers and their strongholds and pull them down. But the nature of the conflict was spiritual, therefore the weapons of the warfare with which he would overthrow Satan’s siege were spiritual weapons. He did not propose to machine-gun paganism out of them nor shoot the gospel into them. Nor does anyone propose to do so today. Being a spiritual warfare, his weapons were not carnal, so he would “lead” their “thoughts” into the “captivity of Christ.” All who accepted the gospel were led into this happy captivity, but “the revenge of disobedience” would be inflicted upon the rebellious recalcitrants who rejected the gracious terms of the gospel.

If there is an argument to be derived from this passage on “combatant or non-combatant service” on the part of citizens of an earthly government, the forceful figure of military operations against aggressors would be in favor of the combatant service of a citizen rather than the conscientious objector to it.

The proposition of the initial editorial of some months ago on this issue holds: Every passage used to prove that a member of the church cannot participate in defensive warfare, under any circumstances, is in the scriptures used and not the mistaken conclusions are therefore based on a misapplication of the scriptures used. I have not yet seen an argument that furnishes an exception to this proposition.

For an additional thought on carnal and spiritual weapons, the MacKnight-Pendleton Commentary suggests that “carnal weapons” referred to “methods of slander, detraction and misrepresentation” employed by the enemies of the truth that Paul preached, but Paul declared that he used no such carnal weapons in dealing with his opponents. In that view of it, there are some now who are certainly using carnal weapons in their opposition to carnal warfare. Conscientious objectors, mentioned in another article in this issue, who referred to Brother Whiteside as “an old devil”, is an example. And he added that if it “sounded harsh” he meant it “at its worst.” But they do not believe in carnal weapons! Wonder if they think that is spiritual!

A major trouble with some of these combatant non-combatants appears to be that their conception of a carnal weapon is restricted to gunpowder, bombs and bullets. But in all the premises of the case, one thing stands out: The ten non-combatant men who use carnal tools to make carnal armaments to keep one combatant man fighting are as much participants in carnal warfare as the one man is who fights for the ten who furnish him the arms. The argument is therefore reduced to an issue between the conscientious non-combatants and the conscientious objectors. Let them settle it among themselves. It is their debate.

If the editors of the Gospel Advocate, for instance, Goodpasture, Boles, McQuiddy, Brightwell, Nichol and Whiteside, were disagreed among themselves on the use and the non-use of instrumental music in the worship, why challenge the Christian Standard for a debate on the subject? The Standard editors could very properly say, debate it among yourselves— if Goodpasture is on one side and Brightwell is on the other, or Boles is on one side and Nichol is on the other—let Goodpasture and Brightwell or Boles and Nichol debate it.

So it is with the government question. Some have who insisted that we ought to debate the “war question” with all who challenge us have attempted to draw a parallel on debating with representatives of the Christian Church the various issues on which disagreements exist. But their parallel is as pitifully weak as their arguments, as their arguments are short of logic and as the scriptures they use are short of proper application. There is no disagreement among us on the opposition to the innovations of the Christian Church. But there are vast differences, a bedlam of confusion, among those who oppose the Christian’s participation in the war effort—a wide disagreement indeed among themselves. Some are all-out non-resisters, declaring that it would be wrong to even offer physical resistance in the protection of their homes against a murderous invader. Others are not full-fledged non-resisters but are non-combatants. Others aver that it is right to pay war taxes but wrong to buy war bonds. There are others among them who can conscientiously vote, run for office, hold jobs in the government of the people, but cannot have anything to do with the military end of it—except to receive its protection. Then there are those who conspire the whole works, both the civil and the military government, to the devil, and will have nothing to do with any of it—except to receive the pensions or whatever the devil’s government has to give them. All of these sentiments are represented among those who want to debate “the war question”—so let them debate it, among themselves.

A prominent man among us, whose name is as wide as the church, and incidentally who lives east of the Mississippi river, writes me that some of the young men seeking notoriety as editors “have much to learn” but are “evidently enjoying the attention” they are getting or think they are getting. That is perhaps true, but the younger ones should perhaps be pitied as much as blamed. Some older men of whom we were persuaded better things are the leaders, in what the younger ones are doing. But no amount of abuse and badgering can aggravate the BIBLE BANNER into descending to the level of their discussions. We are not interested in the “carnal warfare” they are themselves waging. The BIBLE BANNER has withstood assaults of that kind, one after another, from the beginning. Some have been inherent foes of the Cause we defend; others are former friends who have fallen out with us because we did not see fit to commit the BIBLE BANNER to some of their fanatical extremes. There is nothing that could justify us now to engage in the kind of fight required to meet them on such a plane. Though fully confident that we could take care of any or all of them on any ground they might choose, I am personally not interested in doing so. Any consolation any of them may find in boasting of “pinnig our ears back” or of “whipping them down” they can have in whatsoever measure they may be able to convince themselves of their ability to do such a thing. My personal sentiments toward the things they are saying and doing can best be expressed in the closing words of Moses E. Lard’s review of J. B. Jeter’s book on “Campbellism”: “These are a few of the effects to be ascribed to Mr. Jeter’s book; and with this simple statement of them we now take leave of both him and it, feeling that in one we part from a misguided man, in the other from a graceless thing.” In much the same spirit we shall leave these lampooning papers and incondite editors to their own bad temper and bad manners.