“Thou hast given a banner to them that fear thee, that it may be displayed because of truth.”—(Psalm 60:4.)

“IrriTation spread over Three’ Pages

By ClED E. WALLACE

The habitually calm and gentlemanly editor of the Gospel Advocate has shed his meticulous decorum and gone about us with hammer and tongs. It is somewhat amazing. A friend of mine says we are to blame for it. Says he: “He amused himself playing editor with scissors, and never did as much as cut his finger. Now he has got himself all dirtied up; and it is all your fault.” Anyhow, he laid aside his scissors, reached down and picked up a handful of mud and spread it over three pages of the Gospel Advocate. He is all out of humor with us all the way from grammar to finances and back. About the only thing he did not find fault with is my spelling. Possibly he will get to that, and my pipe, later. My friend is a novice at this sort of thing, and it does not at all comport with his accustomed dignity and I do not want to be too hard on him for his first offense. He no doubt expects me to have something to say, however, and I shall not disappoint him. The old saying goes that whom the gods would destroy they first make mad. We are not gods and have no desire to destroy this friend who seems to be trying to turn enemy, but he is mad anyway. Well, I’m in a good humor, and feel some regret over the fact that he “has given birth to a masterpiece of juvenile snobishness” as one brother has expressed it. Or did he do it? No name was signed to the outburst of irritation, not even (B. C. G.) and I recall that a few months ago when an editorial under such circumstances appeared in the Bible Banner, it was denounced for anonymity. Since it was an editorial I am assuming that he “dood” it.

Some are reported to have said that they do not object to the doctrine which we preach but that the whole trouble with us is that we do not do it in the right spirit and the spirit is the thing. To guard against exaggeration, we do not think we have been very “ugly,” and I do not believe anybody is going to exert himself trying to prove that Brother Goodpasture is being very “nice.” He makes us one comforting concession that I think quite “nice,” modesty or no modesty. “We never thought that he condemned the premillennial heresy in terms too strong.” About the strongest terms we have ever used have been directed at that “heresy.”

What, then is the matter with our brother? His first “whimper” is that the editor of the Bible Banner and I have been guilty of saying some “nice things about each other which an outsider would feel constrained by modesty not to say.” Only he put “nice” in quotation marks to make it clear that he does not think it very “nice” after all. So what? Maybe it was some such remark as this that led the brother to use the word “juvenile” in referring to Brother Goodpasture. Possibly it is “modesty” that is leading him to say some things about us which are not so “nice.”

He chides our editor for changing his position on the “war question.” I take it that he has, since he says he has but the size of the change is not as great as his critics labor tirelessly to make it. He explained this in a forthright statement that won wide admiration. Brother Goodpasture virtually, if not more so, questions his brother-editor’s veracity and implies that the change was due to unholy motives. Now is that “nice”? I’m about to decide that he ought to lay aside his pen and return to his scissors. He is getting ink all over himself.

He thinks the “sentiments” his brother-editor expressed several years ago before he changed “will haunt him, like Banquo’s ghost.” This is about the only literary flavor I tasted in the whole three-page editorial, but it is wishful thinking. J. B. Briney made some arguments against instrumental music he was never able to answer after he changed. Foy Wallace (Jr.) made none before he changed that he has had to answer since he changed, and besides he has answered all that anybody else has made since he changed. How many have been made in the Gospel Advocate? About all the editor of that journal has done since he laid down his scissors is “whimper.” I do not think the Briney parallel is original with Brother Goodpasture. I got it several weeks ago in one of the Dorris letters which we are told are to be published. Since he thinks “his change was due neither to the caprice of youth nor to the aberrations of old age,” suppose he tells us just exactly what he thinks it was due to and see if he can be “nice” about it. And while we are on the subject of changes, he “never thought” that the “canny editor” of the Bible Banner “condemned the premillennial heresy in terms too strong.” As I recall that Brother H. Leo Boles published a change he made in this connection, I invite the uncanny editor of the Advocate to tell us something “nice” about that change. Or does modesty restrain him? I think Brother Boles made an honest change and honestly expressed it, and I think the editor of the Bible Banner did also. And I’m about to modestly express the conviction that I’m a nicer man than Brother Goodpasture is. At least when he gets ready to wash the mud and ink off himself, which is self-applied, I’m willing to help him and make no more mention of the unfortunate incident, if he’ll try to stay clean.

In his frantic effort to find something he could use to advantage, our ruffled brother thinks he has found “a divided house” in the Bible Banner to match the one we found in the (Continued on page 16)
THE WAR QUESTION AND RESTORATION HISTORY

The April Bible Banner carried an article from Cled E. Wallace offering friendly strictures on the article which recently appeared on the editorial page of the Gospel Advocate by Brother L. L. Brigance. I share in full the sentiments expressed in the good words of Cled that “my regard for Brother Brigance is such, that as far as I am concerned, anything he writes is worthy of the most serious and courteous consideration,” and as there are some other references to matters of history in the article by Brother Brigance which “seem to call for some further remarks from us,” I am both seriously and courteously calling attention to them.

For more than ten years Brother Brigance has been writing a series in the Gospel Advocate on “The History of the Restoration,” and he is probably the most conversant in that field of literature of any man among us today. This being true, and by reason of the fact that Brother Goodpasture, who is also reputed to be quite versatile in the literature of the Restoration, gave endorsement to the article by putting it in his editorial space, many brethren, including dozens, if not hundreds of young preachers, will regard certain statements involving important historical data as being final. It is for that reason, and for that reason only, that I feel the necessity of correcting them on a point of history.

Brother Brigance solemnly warned against discussing the war question at this time and averred that he was not writing a “war article,” but, very much unlike himself, he displayed a rather flagrant odor of partisanship in that he made his sole appeal to one side, and by silence exempted from responsibility for the discussion of the issue the very ones who have done the most talking, and the only ones who have any particular urge to talk. In addition to having quite unfairly discussed the discussers, he himself suggests a phase of the question for discussion by asking a question which, if answered, would necessarily involve the discussion of the whole issue from start to finish—the very thing that he says is “inopportune” and so solemnly warns against doing.

The point of history with which this article is concerned, is the statement by Brother Brigance that there were only two of the leading men in the earlier days of the church who held the view that a Christian may participate in military government. The two men named were John Shackleford and M. C. Kurfees, and he added that if there were others he does not know it. At that, since M. C. Kurfees, especially, “ranks with McGarvey,” we are still in good company and could hardly be branded as “apostate” and as having “departed from the faith” for going along with him. But instead of reflecting on our position, as obviously intended, it turns out that Brother Brigance has discounted his own credentials as a Restoration historian.

There is no commentator or scholar among the brethren of that period or later whose name is better known than B. W. Johnson. His two volume commentary on the New Testament has a wider circulation now among the members of the church than any commentary ever printed. He “ranks with McGarvey” and was contemporary with him. He received letters from numerous brethren regarding his views on “the war question,” among them he said was a letter from “our gifted soldier” Brother McGarvey. In order that his position might be understood he wrote a lengthy article to Brother Franklin which was published in the Christian Review and it was copied in the same issue of the Millennial Harbinger in which the manifesto on war appeared—to which Brother Brigance made reference. After expressing himself on various points involving the state of affairs in the nation and in the church, Johnson said to Franklin: “But upon the right of the Christian to engage in war, I must dissent from the position taken by you and other leading brethren.” He then proceeded to set forth his views on what he termed “The War Question,” as follows (the italics are his own):

“I deplore war. I regard it a monstrous evil, but in this wicked world it sometimes becomes a necessary evil. Some­times the only pathway to peace is the path of war. It is almost the sole guarantee of exemption from war, anarchy and violence, in this unjust world. Let me present briefly a few reasons for believing that the Christian, though nnder to seek it, can engage sometimes in war.

1. Is government right? Paul says it is ordained of God. All would be anarchy without it, yet in this wicked world, government could not exist for an hour without coercion. The masses may peacefully obey, but force is requisite for the wicked, the dishonest, the rebellious. If government is right, the means which must be employed to sustain it, cannot necessarily be sinful. If so, God, who ordains government, does evil that good may come. If my horse is stolen who will say that it is sinful for me to call upon the proper officers to arrest the culprit and to return my property? -Force arrests him; if he resists she puts forth her arm. If the band of thieves numbers a hundred, and a posse of five hundred is called on to arrest them, the principle is the same. Is the Christian a part of the government, or is he a citizen in the sense that he is a senator; as far as we know Zacheus remained a publican; Dionysius the Areop­gite, and the converted officers of Caesar’s household, retained their positions. Since the Christian votes, and enjoys the full fruition of the laws, he is a part of the government, and cannot refuse to sustain it in a just cause. Either he can sustain it, or he is an ingrate to his country; a State is weak in proportion to its Christian element, and a conversion of the majority of the people would result in national ruin. Are you prepared for the legitimate results of your premises?

2. Let us see how facts correspond with this theory. When soldiers came to John, seeking the baptism of repentance, he told them to use lawless violence to no man, and to be content with their wages. These were the mercenaries of a tyrant, not patriots in arms for their country. But passing beyond John; beyond the examples that might be adduced from the ministry of Christ, beyond the inauguration of the kingdom, we pause with Cornelius, a devout man, but a Roman centuri­on, the captain of a hundred soldiers; he is converted, and there is not the slightest intimation in the record that he threw in arms for his country. But passing beyond Cornelius, and his army immediately, and inspiration by omitting the fact, has failed to settle this vital question! The fact is, the first Gentile Christian was a soldier and remained a soldier. Other examples might be presented, but it must suffice to say that there is no evidence in the sacred record...
that a single soldier deserted or was dismissed from the ranks on conversion.

3. The Christian is a citizen of two kingdoms, Christ's and Caesar's. For the one, since not of this world, he can never resort to carnal weapons, but as the other is of this world, its servants must fight to uphold it. Here must we seek the true explanation of many texts that seem to teach non-resistance. Let it be understood that the nature of Christ's kingdom precludes all but spiritual weapons, but that if we are good citizens of an earthly kingdom, we must heed the ruler's mandate, and use the requisite means to sustain its government.

A single passage appears to me, when properly understood, to set the matter at rest. "My kingdom is not of this world," he said. "If it were, my servants would fight, and it may be that they might prevail, and that those in me should be slain with the sword, and that those in me should be slain with the sword." (John 18:36) Earthly governments are right; the Christian is a subject of, and must by our Saviour's own language, fight for them. —B. W. Johnson, Millennial Harbinger, 1861, pp. 586-7.

When Brother Brigance wrote it down in his "History of the Restoration" that if there were more than two reputable brethren, Shackleford and Kurfees, who defended the right of members of the church to enlist or be enlisted in the armed forces of the government, he did not know it, he was putting it down as history. We are willing to grant that he did not "know it" but why he did not know it we are not able to understand in the light of his credentials as a restoration historian, for the simple reason that the B. W. Johnson article is in the same issue of the Millennial Harbinger with the manifesto on war that he mentioned and it begins in the same opening of the paper in which the manifesto article ended. Besides, Brother Goodpasture knew that there were other "leading brethren" who agreed with Shackleford and Kurfees, why should he allow the inaccuracy to go as an editorial with his endorsement? If he, like Brother Brigance, did not "know it"—why didn't he know it? It was in the same issue and in the same opening of the paper that contains the historical document that they both "know all about."

But that is not all. At the time these two documents were published, W. K. Pendleton, A. W. Campbell and Isaac Errett were co-editors of the Millennial Harbinger, and in the same issue in which the two documents were published, Campbell inserted the following:

"Our readers will find in the present number several articles on the duties of Christians in relation to war in general. But as our brethren may not, from the general manner in which the subject is treated in said articles, find their duties in the present war so clearly indicated as they could wish, we insert an article touching the duty of Christians in relation to the present war, from the pen of our excellent brother, P. Galley, a graduate of Bethany College. As the present unhappy conflict of arms is disastrous to all the best interests of our nation, it is a matter that most deeply concerns all who have the welfare of our country at heart, and the minds of our brethren, as to the part they should take in relation to it, we have thought it desirable to lay before them, as fully as possible, the views of some of our most intelligent brethren. We believe that he is able to present them scientiously in the premises. We copy from the Christian Review.—A. W. C."

The article that followed is too lengthy to here insert but a paragraph or two will serve to reveal the "views" that the co-editor of the Harbinger was so desirous of laying before his brethren from one whom he referred to as among "our most intelligent brethren." Note a few quotations:

"But the question arises, What shall we do when the government asks us to pay tribute with the sword, or it may be with the blood of Caesar? Twenty or thirty, or two months in support of the government, instead of paying tribute money for the same purpose, what would have been Christ's answer? To me, it appears that he would have said as before, "Render unto Caesar the things that are Caesar's."

"If, then, we bear arms at the call of the government, and in its defense, shall we bring reproach upon Christ, violate the laws of the kingdom, or sacrifice any truth for which we should rather suffer shame and death? Yes, says one, we go contrary to Christ's teachings. 'He that taketh the sword shall perish by the sword.' While this teaches the consequence of an illegal use of a sword, does it not imply that there is a legal use of it? 'He that sheddeth man's blood, by man shall his blood be shed,' shows that while a man may not pre-sumptively take the life of his fellowman, yet when he does, others may by God's authority take his life. 'But the shocker to the friends' hearts! How can a man shoot down his brother?' If he does it by his own authority, he is a murderer; but if a Christian suffers himself to be implicated with the wicked in sins punishable with death, he must stand in the presence of the law and face that penalty, if I happen to be the magistrate, or assist him who is, however painful that duty may be. The law is no respecter of persons.

Brother Campbell regarded the above "views" as worthy of "laying before" the brethren from "some of our most intelligent brethren." Then, the following month, in the next issue of the paper, W. K. Pendleton, co-editor with Campbell, answered a question, as follows:

"QUESTION: Years ago, in a county and state which shall be nameless, a murder was committed under circumstances which gave to it the air of peculiar atrocity. The murderer who was a bold, daring, high-spirited man, and very popular, carried away by the wild tumult of his passions, when civil government was powerless to quell his rages, he surrounded the premises which gave to it an air of peculiar atrocity. This made it necessary for the civil officer to use force of arms to effect his disengagement. Accordingly a summons was served upon all those who were subject to this duty, and must by our Saviour's own language, fight for it. But our question is not about the propriety of executing the murderer. It is rather as to the propriety of Christians engaging in the violent arrest. This, we think, can be very well studied. In the first place, the thing to be done, is the right thing to be done, in both human and divine law. In the second place, the Christian is legally warranted and enjoined to do it, both by human and divine law. In the civil magistrate calls official on him to act; and by divine, in that he is commanded in the scriptures to be subject to the higher powers, for they are ministers of God, revengers to execute wrath upon him that doeth evil. A thing thus declared to be right in itself, a Christian may do—and a summons thus authoritatively given, a Christian must obey. Let it not be supposed, however, that a duty like this is any special element of Christianity. Christianity does not impose it. It only does not exemp us from it."

Now, it was W. K. Pendleton who said, in commenting on the two articles in the former issue of the Harbinger, that he felt inclined to answer "the abstract question" of a Christian bearing arms during the Civil War, by his heart instead of his head. Brother Cled remarks: "Had it been now when the whole nation is united in defense of its existence, his heart undoubtedly would have joined his intellect"—but it did not require such an emergency as this to accomplish that result. Only a month later his heart had already "joined his intellect" in stating that a Christian not only may but must bear arms under the circumstances named in the question. Did Brother Brigance and Brother Goodpasture "know" this?

It is evident to me that some of the brethren now are being dominated by sentiment rather than intelligence in discussing these issues.

It is not true that there were only two, or three, names among the brethren of pioneer days who stood up for the Christian's prerogatives in the relation to civil and military (Continued on page 15)
The life of Paul is interesting, dramatically so, from any point of view. "Breathes there a man with soul so dead" who cannot get a thrill out of his sudden transition from blaspheme1 to saint? His early fanatic zeal for the destruction of the church was surpassed by that holy passion which made him the dominating figure in the establishment of Christianity in the chief cities of the Roman Empire. Commissioned by Christ himself "to open their eyes, that they may turn from darkness to light," he carried on until the gospel had been preached "in all creation under heaven." (Acts 26:16-18; Col. 1:23.) The passing of the years found him a prisoner in Rome, accustomed to chains, his body covered with scars, but still "preaching the kingdom of God, and teaching the things concerning the Lord Jesus Christ with all boldness." (Acts 28:30, 31.)

THE CHURCH IN THE LIGHT OF PAUL'S LETTERS

While sundry partisans are broadcasting their divers reasons why they belong to, and propagate the dogmas of, their confining sects, it is proper that, above the din of this confusion, should be heard those compelling considerations that constrain men to be Christians. Paul was not a Baptist, nor a Methodist, nor a Presbyterian, nor an Episcopalian, nor a Campbellite, nor a Lutheran; nor was he anything of the sort. It is monkey business in religion, partisan zeal carried quite close to the point of sacrilege, to try to stamp a party label of any kind upon him. He was a member of "the church, which is his body" (Eph. 1:22, 23), and all other Christians of his time glorified God in the same body (Eph. 3:21; I Cor. 12:13). When evidences of the party spirit were displayed in Corinth, Paul charged the guilty ones with being "carnal" and walking "after the manner of men." (I Cor. 3:3.) "Jealousy and strife" (I Cor. 3:3) are the handmaids of party religion. Pride of opinion supplants the faith that comes by, and thrives upon, the Word of God. "Now I beseech you, brethren, through the name of our Lord Jesus Christ, that ye all speak the same thing, and that there be no divisions among you; but that ye be perfected together in the same mind and in the same judgment." (I Cor. 1:10.)

It was not a partisan appeal that Paul made to Herod Agrippa. His gripping words were "words of truth and soberness." "I stand unto this day testifying both to small and the powers in, the heavenly places might create all things; to the intent that now unto the principalities and of the Son and of the Holy Spirit: teaching them toobserve all things whatsoever I commanded you: and ye shall do them in memory of me." (Acts 26:22, 23.) Agrippa did understand that Paul was trying to lead him to Christ and thus make him a Christian. "And Agrippa said unto Paul, But with little persuasion thou wouldst fain make me a Christian." (Acts 26:28.) Neither Paul nor Agrippa knew anything about "kinds" of Christians distinguished by party labels. Paul was a Christian and Agrippa was not. That was the broad line of distinction then generally recognized. The church that Paul was a member of was the spiritual community of the redeemed and the goal of God's purpose. "Unto me, who am less than the least of all saints, was this grace given, to preach unto the Gentiles the unsearchable riches of Christ; and to make all men see what is the dispensation of the mystery which for ages hath been hid in God who created all things; to the intent that now unto the principalities and of the Son and of the Holy Spirit: teaching them to observe all things whatsoever I commanded you: and ye shall do them in memory of me." (Acts 28:28, 29.)

A recent writer in the Baptist Standard dogmatically asserted that Paul was a Baptist minister, or something to that effect. But it is absurd to think of Paul pleading with Agrippa to be "made known to all nations, baptizing them into the name of the Father and of the Son and of the Holy Spirit: teaching them to observe all things whatsoever I commanded you: and ye shall do them in memory of me." (Matt. 28:18-20.) Seventeen of the twenty-eight chapters in the book of Acts are devoted to Paul's conversion and ministry. He wrote fourteen of the twenty-one epistles found in the New Testament. With the exception of Romans and Colossians, they were written to churches which he established or to his fellow-workers. And the Colossian church is considered "Pauline," although not established by him personally. (Col. 1:7, 8.) They deal with the problems and perils of many churches in such a
way as to afford an exhaustive view of the church in the light of his letters alone.

Paul labored under the duress of the inspired conviction that the gospel is the power of God to save all who believe, whether Jews or Gentiles; that the “righteousness of God,” the only hope of humanity, is revealed therein. All mankind, without regard to race or other conditions, are “under the judgment of God,” condemned. They are all under sin. The gospel is a system of justification of sinners “apart from the law.” But the benefits are for those, and those only, who become servants of Christ, “whom God set forth to be a propitiation, through faith, in his blood.” (Rom., chapters 1-3.) These—all these, and none but these—constitute the church.

THE CONFLICT WITH JUDAISM

The “redemption that is in Christ Jesus” was preached first to the Jews. And Jewish bigotry and exclusiveness sought to make of the church of Christ a Jewish sect. When the Gentiles began to enter the kingdom, “there rose up certain of the sect of the Pharisees who believed, saying, It is needful to circumcise them, and to charge them to keep the law of Moses.” (Acts 15:5.) The apostle immediately accepted the challenge in behalf of Christian liberty from the bondage of the Mosaic law, and then and there began one of the gravest and most far-reaching conflicts in the early church—the battle between Judaism and Christianity. It was decided in Jerusalem, the apostles and elders and the whole church being present and under the guidance of the Holy Spirit, that the Jews might observe their national customs, but that the Gentile Christians should not be burdened with them. But in spite of this early victory, Judaizing teachers refused to accept defeat, and for years they followed Paul about over the empire seeking to enslave his Gentile converts—to the bondage of the law. Their influence was so strong that even Peter was led to play the hypocrite in Antioch in favor of Jewish bigotry, and the pious Barnabas was led away with “their dissimulation.” (Gal. 2:11-16.)

The Galatian letter carries the smoke of the great battle with Judaism. It has been called “the magna charta of Christian universalism and liberty.” When the Judaizers, the “false brethren,” invaded the Galatian churches, the fruit of intense labor and suffering on the part of the great apostle, he aimed a death blow at the effort to nationalize Christianity. “In the white heat of inspired indignation” he fought these enemies of the simplicity of the gospel. He challenged the motives of the false teachers and exorciated them as perverters of the gospel. He rebuked the Galatians and called them “foolish” for even listening to such teachers. Then he utterly and unmercifully demolished any reason any might have to try to fasten Judaism, in whole or in part, upon the church of Christ. The law was “added because of transgressions, till the seed should come.” (Gal. 3:19.) The seed was Christ. (Gal. 3:16.) It was only “a tutor” to bring the Jews to Christ that they “might be justified by faith. But now that faith is come, we are no longer under a tutor. For ye are all sons of God, through faith, in Christ Jesus. For as many of you as were baptized into Christ did put on Christ.”

There were weighty reasons why the Galatian Christians should not submit to the demands of Jewish legalists. It would be equivalent to going back to a state of infancy, when, because of maturity, the time had come for them to enter upon the inheritance. (Gal. 4:1-7.) It would be an exchange of glorious freedom as sons of God in Christ Jesus for “a yoke of bondage.” (Gal. 5:1.) There was no reason at all why they should even desire to be under the law. Paul set the matter forth under the figure of an allegory. The handmaid, Hagar, and her slave boy, Ishmael, represented the Old Covenant and the Jewish nation under that covenant. Abraham’s wife, Sarah, and her free-born son, Isaac, represented the New Covenant and the new Israel of God, the church, under that covenant. “Cast out the handmaid and her son” is the apostolic command to be done with the old order. We are not Jews, we are Christians; we are not under the law, we are under the gospel. (Gal. 4:21-31.) Finally, for Christians to hark back to Moses and the law would be a complete apostasy—a falling “away from grace.” (Gal. 5:2-6.) This was a death stroke to Jewish claims.

The conflict with Judaism in the early church echoes in many of Paul’s letters, notably Romans, First and Second Corinthians, Ephesians, Philippians, Colossians, and Hebrews. In Hebrews the argument advances through an exhaustive treatment of both law and priesthood, showing an undoubted change of both, and mounts to this thrilling climax: “For ye are not come unto a mount that might be touched, and that burned with fire, and unto blackness, and darkness, and tempest, ... but ye are come unto mount Zion, and unto the city of the living God, the heavenly Jerusalem, ... the general assembly and church of the firstborn who are enrolled in heaven, and to God the Judge of all, ... and to Jesus the mediator of a new covenant. Wherefore, receiving a kingdom that cannot be shaken, let us have grace, whereby we may offer service well-pleasing to God with reverence and awe: for our God is a consuming fire.” (Heb. 12:18-29.)

An emphatic point in all this is that the church of Christ is not a Jewish, nor any other kind of, sect. Christians are “Jews,” “the Israel of God,” “the circumcision,” but only in a spiritual sense with which flesh has nothing to do. “Think not to say within yourselves, We have Abraham to our father: for I say unto you, that God is able of these stones to raise up children unto Abraham.” (Matt. 3:9.) “For he is not a Jew who is one outwardly; neither is that circumcision which is outward in the flesh: but he is a Jew who is one inwardly; and circumcision is that of the heart.” (Rom. 2:28, 29.) “For we are the circumcision, who worship by the Spirit of God, and glory in Christ Jesus, and have no confidence in the flesh.” (Phil. 3:5.) “Know therefore that they that are of faith, the same are sons of Abraham, ... And if ye be Christ’s, then are ye Abraham’s seed, heirs according to promise.” (Gal. 3:29.) An outstanding triumph of Paul’s brilliant career, sanctified by anxiety, suffering, and toil, was the signal defeat of the powerful clique which sought to Judaize the church. In the light of his letters it is clearly all “the Israel of God,” with its membership of both Jews and Gentiles, without regard to any national observances pertaining to either.

In the light of Paul’s letters, Christianity really becomes churcanity. It is true to the extent, at least, that a man cannot be a Christian, nor have vital connection with Christ, without being a member of the church which is the true “Israel of God.” If he is a member of the New Testament church, the one so clearly set forth in these letters, then he is all that God wants him to be, and has all the vital contacts with the other world offers to human beings in this. And they are full of assurance. This is unquestionably the teaching of the apostle in the Colossian and Ephesian letters. They were written from Rome and represent “the culmination of his teaching at the culmination of his life work.” As the result of his missionary labors through the years, a great spiritual community, composed of many peoples, actually existed throughout the Roman Empire, and he recognized it as “the goal of history and of God’s purpose.”
WILL THE JEWS RETURN TO CANAAN?

W. CURTIS PORTER

This lesson is not to be a discussion of the mere fact that Jews may or may not return to the land of Canaan. It might readily be granted that many Jews have already gone to Canaan, or that many more will yet go to that land. Canaan was the promised land of the Jews in days gone by, and it is but natural that many Jews might want to establish homes in that land. But the question of this lesson is, “Will the Jews return to Canaan in fulfillment of Bible promise and prophecy?” I do not deny that some Jews may return to Canaan, but I emphatically deny that they will go there in fulfillment of any promise made to them in the word of the Lord.

God promised the land of Canaan to Abraham for a possession. In Gen. 15:1-7 we read this statement: “And the Lord said unto Abram, after that Lot was separated from him, Lift up now thine eyes, and look from the place where thou art northward, and southward, and eastward, and westward: for all the land which thou seest, to thee will I give it, and to thy seed for ever. And I will make thy seed as the dust of the earth: so that if a man can number the dust of the earth, then shall thy seed also be numbered. Arise, walk through the land in the length of it and in the breadth of it; for I will give it unto thee.” Repeating this promise to Abraham in Gen. 17:8, God said: “And I will give unto thee, and to thy seed after thee, the land wherein thou art a stranger, all the land of Canaan, for an everlasting possession; and I will be their God.”

Since the promise of Canaan was made to Abraham, many people think that promise is yet to be fulfilled, and that Abraham when raised from the dead will, with the nation of the Jews, return to that land to live forever. They read some statements which they think indicate that this land promised to Abraham has never been fulfilled. Paul in Heb. 11:13, making a statement that included Abraham, said: “These all died in faith, not having received the promises.” And Stephen said in Acts 7:5: “And he gave him none inheritance in it, no not so much as to set his foot on: yet he promised that he would give it to him for a possession, and to his seed after him, when as yet he had no child.” Since Abraham did not receive the promises and was a stranger in the land of Canaan, receiving not enough inheritance in the land to “set his foot on,” many contend that Abraham will yet receive that land. Hence that the Jews will yet return to Canaan. But people overlook the fact that the promise did not mean that Abraham in person would inherit the land but that it would be inherited by his seed. Stephen, in the language already quoted from Acts 7:5, said it was to be given “to his seed after him.” That shows the promise was not to be fulfilled to Abraham in person, but after he had passed on his seed would receive the land. And in Gen. 48:4 God said to Abraham: “Behold, I will make thee fruitful, and multiply thee, and I will make of thee a multitude of people; and will give this land to thy seed after thee for an everlasting possession.” There is no indication in any of these statements of the land promise that Abraham and his seed would receive this inheritance at once, but they tell us plainly that Abraham’s seed would receive it “after him.”

But has that promise to Abraham been fulfilled? Is it yet to be fulfilled when the Lord returns and the dead are raised? The answer to these questions can be determined by a careful study of the Bible. So let us go to the statements there made and see what God says about it. When Israel had finished their forty years’ journey in the wilderness from Egypt to Canaan and were ready to enter the land of Canaan, Moses said to them in Deut. 1:8: “Behold, I have set the land before you: go in and possess the land which the Lord spake unto your fathers, Abraham, Isaac, and Jacob, to give unto them and to their seed after them.” This shows that Moses believed that the promise referred to the inheritance of Canaan by the Jews after they left Egypt, for he told them to go in and possess the land, and he referred to the very promise God made to Abraham and to his seed after him. Joshua, who became the successor of Moses and led Israel into the land of Canaan, said in Josh. 21:43-45: “And the Lord gave unto Israel all the land which he spake to give unto their fathers; and they possessed it, and dwelt therein. And the Lord gave them rest round about, according to all that he spake unto their fathers; and there stood not a man of all their enemies before them; the Lord delivered all their enemies into their hand. There failed not ought of any good thing which the Lord had spoken unto the house of Israel; all came to pass.” Now, let us look at some of the things stated in this passage. We are told that God gave to Israel the land. But what land did he give them? “All the land which he spake to give to their fathers.” The land which he spake to give to their fathers was that described in Gen. 15 when God told Abraham to look northward, southward, eastward, and westward, and all the land that he could see would be given to him and to his seed. Now, Joshua says that God gave to Israel “all the land” that he spake would give to their fathers. Furthermore, Joshua says “they possessed it, and dwelt therein.” And to this he adds the statement that “there failed not ought of any good thing which the Lord had spoken to Israel.” Among the good things which God had spoken to the house of Israel was the promise of the land of Canaan for an inheritance. God had definitely said he would give this land to Abraham and to his seed after him. But not one good thing spoken to them failed. Hence, they received the inheritance, and Joshua adds: “All came to pass.”

How can any one read this passage from Joshua and still say that the promise made to Abraham concerning the land of Canaan has never been fulfilled? Joshua made a similar statement in Josh. 23:14. It reads like this: “And, behold, this day I am going the way of all the earth: and ye know in all your hearts and in all your souls, that not one thing hath failed of all the good things which the Lord your God spake concerning you; all are come to pass unto you, and not one thing hath failed thereof.” So Joshua knew, and all Israel knew, in their hearts and souls, that the promise of God to them had been fulfilled. They knew not one thing failed, but all had come to pass. Yet there are many preachers today that have not learned what Israel knew more than three thousand years ago; they are still looking for the fulfillment of a promise that Israel knew was fulfilled nearly fifteen hundred years before Jesus was born.

In Neh. 9:7,8 Nehemiah records an address delivered by some of the leaders of Israel in his day. They said: “Thou art the Lord the God, who didst choose Abram, and broughtest him forth out of Ur of the Chaldees, and gavest him the name of Abraham; and foundest his heart faithful before thee, and madest a covenant with him to give the land of the Canaanites, the Hittites, the Amorites, and the Perizzites, and the Jebusites and the Girgashites, to give it, I say, to his seed, and hast performed thy words; for thou art righteous.” In this statement reference is made to a covenant God made with Abraham. But what covenant is mentioned? The covenant to give the land of Canaan, specified in detail in this passage, to Abraham’s seed. That covenant was made in Gen. 15, as we have already found, and repeated a number of times thereafter. But what about this covenant, or promise, to give them the land of Canaan? The passage says that God had performed his words. But religious teachers are telling us today that God has not yet
performehis words relative to that covenant, but it must Yet be accomplished. It is just a matter of which you will believe—the Bible or modern day preachers. As for me I shall take what the Bible says about it and insist the promise has already been fulfilled.

But someone may say the land was to be given “for an everlasting possession,” and it has not thus been given. It is true that Israel has not possessed the land for the last 2500 years; yet all included in the promise of God was accomplished in the days of Joshua, for he said “All came to pass.” But does not the promise of Canaan for an “everlasting possession” mean, it is yet to be possessed by the Jews? Not at all. Not any more than it proves they have possessed it from the day they entered it with Joshua till now. They have not possessed it from that time till now, although they received it for an everlasting possession. But how can these things be? Simply because their having the land for an everlasting possession was conditional, and they broke the conditions. In Deut. 4:25-27 we read this: “When thou shalt beget children, and children’s children, and ye shall have remained long in the land, and shall corrupt yourself, and make a graven image, or the likeness of any thing, and shall do evil in the sight of the Lord thy God, to provoke him to anger: I call heaven and earth to witness against you this day, that ye shall soon utterly perish from off the land wherunto ye go over Jordan to possess it: ye shall not prolong your days upon it, but shall utterly be destroyed. And the Lord shall scatter you among the nations, and ye shall be left few in number among the heathen, whither the Lord shall lead you.”

The promise of Canaan for an “everlasting possession” was conditional; and it has not thus been given because their idolatry, a return to their own land. Well, how can these things be? Simply because their having the land for an everlasting possession was conditional, and they broke the conditions. In Deut. 4:25-27 we read this: “When thou shalt beget children, and children’s children, and ye shall have remained long in the land, and shall corrupt yourself, and make a graven image, or the likeness of any thing, and shall do evil in the sight of the Lord thy God, to provoke him to anger: I call heaven and earth to witness against you this day, that ye shall soon utterly perish from off the land wherunto ye go over Jordan to possess it: ye shall not prolong your days upon it, but shall utterly be destroyed. And the Lord shall scatter you among the nations, and ye shall be left few in number among the heathen, whither the Lord shall lead you.”

But some one may ask, Does not the Bible contain promises that the Jews would return to that land from which they were driven because of their descendants? Since that dispersion from the land, has not God promised to regather them to Canaan? Oh yes. There are many such promises made through Old Testament prophets. Isaiah, Jeremiah, Ezekiel and many other prophets held out to the Jews, after their dispersion because of their idolatry, a return to their own land. Well, then, does not that prove they are yet to return to Canaan? It proves no such thing. For remember this: A return of Israel to their own land is recorded in the books of Ezra and Nehemiah. And this return to their land took place after their dispersion among the nations. Furthermore, every prophecy of their return to the land of Canaan was delivered either before the period of Babylonian captivity, or during the Babylonian captivity, or before the restoration from Babylon had been finished. This is very significant, for a restoration to their land has been accomplished since the delivery of every prophecy relative to their return. Since their return from Babylon was completed, no promise was ever made by any Old Testament prophet that the Jews would return to Canaan. All of their prophecies concerning a return were fulfilled when the Jews went back from Babylon. And there is not a promise in all the New Testament that the Jews will ever inherit the land of Canaan. Men take prophecies that have already been fulfilled and apply them to the future. This is a poor way to deal with the word of the Lord. Hence, many Jews may go back to Canaan, but no Jew will ever go to that country in fulfillment of any promise in the word of the Lord, as all such promises were long ago fulfilled.
By Premillennial Fellowship I mean the fellowship Premillennialists insist on maintaining with those who do not hold to that doctrine. In the church of Christ today there is a sizeable group of people who so insist, and to establish their claim, they tell us that one’s standing with God is not endangered by believing in Premillennialism. And for that reason they insist that it would be downright sinful to break the fellowship between those who are on opposite sides of this question. It is my purpose to look into this matter and, if possible, discover the merit, if there be any, in the persistent outcry against a breach of fellowship between the two groups.

(1) It will, I think, be helpful to the effort to look into the history of Premillennialism, and its present record, both of which are matters of common knowledge in the South and especially here in Texas.

CHRISTADELPHIANISM

“A little more than a half century ago the seeds of Christadelphianism were planted in Texas soil. However, in the North, the planting was done much earlier. History, I believe, gives the credit (?) for the planting to a Doctor Thomas, who brought them from England, and in the early years of A. Campbell’s career he planted them. And it has been reported (how reliably I do not know) that Thomas said that Campbell made his discoveries just in advance of the same discoveries Thomas made, and that because of it, to espouse the same gospel with Campbell, would make him a follower of Campbell. This he could not do “since God did not make him to be a follower, but a leader, of men...” Doctor W. A. Oatman evidently obtained the “seed” from Doctor Thomas, and from his planting, Christadelphianism sprang up and flourished throughout the west central and central Texas. Quite a few brilliant young preachers of the church of Christ espoused the doctrines and, under Doctor Oatman’s training, soon became outstanding defenders of that faith. It was a new doctrine to these unsuspecting Texans who were caught off guard and swept off their feet by the zeal and ardor of these young preachers, who “went everywhere preaching” their new found doctrines. In those days we seldom heard the word “Premillennialism.” *And if we had, we would hardly have dared to speak it-it was too big a word! So we just called them “Otmanites.” They wrought havoc in the churches of the Lord. They called themselves Christadelphians. Today they would be called Premillennialists. They, unlike the present day edition, flaunted the fellowship of their erstwhile brethren, and taught openly that whenever one learned a new vital truth (which meant when one had been converted to Christadelphianism) he should be baptized again. Thus drawing the line deep and wide, they cared nothing for the fellowship of those whom they believed to be in error. Like a “shooting” meteor, they raced across the religious “heavens” and into the night, and are now almost forgotten. The McGary-Oatman debate, which was published in book form (but now, it seems, is utterly lost) was their undoing. It gave us boy preachers the weapons with which to knock the chip off their shoulder they so defiantly wore.

BRADLEYISM

The calm which followed the Christadelphian storm was short lived. The storm clouds again began to gather. One A. S. Bradley came to Texas from Arkansas, in which state Christadelphian influence was still rather strong, and Bradley had fallen a victim to it without the brotherhood knowing it, and soon began teaching a modified version of the future kingdom theory, but artfully camouflaged, and the storm broke again. Unlike Dr. Oatman who openly showed his contempt for any fellowship between his followers and the church of Christ, Bradley was insistent that there was no cause for a breach of fellowship over his teaching; that it was his honest conviction based on his study of the Bible, and that it contravened no cardinal doctrine held by the church of Christ-they were just his own conclusions. This plea has lived on despite the death of him who coined it. While Bradley placed less emphasis on the Land Promise to Abraham and its asserted unfulfillment (though he, when pressed, would affirm it) he underscored heavily the beauties and glories of a thousand years reign with Christ here on the earth. The terms millenium and millennialism were rather common terms in his vocabulary. Evidently, he had made himself believe that he had improved Christadelphianism. But after all, it was the same old hurtful theory. His destructive work is still to be found throughout the section of country where he operated. However, when in what looked to be the height of his career, his debate with C. R. Nichol toppled him from his throne for all time to come, and Bradleyized Christadelphianism is no more!

PREMILLENNIALISM

The term “Premillennialism” is too broad a term to use here without some qualifying observations. It mystifies instead of clarifies what particular brand of Premillennialism is meant. It is a fact that most, if not all, the major religious bodies have within their ranks members who hold some kind of Premillennialism. It is also a fact that hardly any two groups of these Premillennialists agree on what the term means or on the proofs employed in its establishment. Take for instance the Baptist. Many of them will unhesitatingly tell us that they are Premillennialists. This is also true of some in the church of Christ. But there is wide disagreement between the two groups on almost every point and proof of the doctrine. Neither group commends or accepts the findings of the other group. And so, all the way around. The Premillennialist group in the church of Christ is headed by R. H. Boll and has come to be known and referred to as—

BOLLISM

Boll is just another member of the Premillennial family. Many of his followers seem to think the doctrine was discovered by him. Indeed, if we accept Boll’s word as final in this matter, one would have ground for so thinking. Hear him: “But while maintaining his liberty and independence, he does not propose to ignore the positions generally held by his brethren; and in whatsoever he feels bound to differ with the views generally current he does not do so because of loving to differ, or counting himself wiser than others, but simply and solely upon the ground of God’s word.” (Kingdom of God, p. 11.) Keep in mind that this is a cool and deliberate statement made almost at the beginning of his book, and is under the heading of “The Position of the Writer,” and can mean no other than that he has made discoveries of things not held by...
his brethren generally, and that he proposes to, and does, make effort to establish his views regardless of what his brethren believe regarding these matters. His statement can but mean that he is going to introduce into the brotherhood his findings, and does not propose to be interfered with or estopped.

In this effort he insists that he will be guided solely by God's word, in which he finds his discoveries revealed. But does he? I submit with all due respect, that regardless of his good intentions in the matter, he utterly fails to live up to his pledge; for, even a casual reader of his book, quoted from above, cannot help concluding otherwise. Throughout the entire book there is a persistent open and defiant, almost a vicious, "leading of the witness," that would not be allowed by any Court of Justice in the land, More on this point later. But does he actually allow God's word to lead him? The evidence against it is so strong that I am compelled to question it. I am compelled to say that he could have reached the conclusions he has reached regarding the kingdom question without even one time opening his Bible. In fact, I think it impossible for any man to even wring the conclusions he has drawn from an open Bible. On the other hand, the evidence is so abundant and clear that his entire theory was borrowed from the old Christadelphian store house by way of the Blackstone-Lowe route, that an ordinary reader would have to look at the title of the book before he could be sure which author he was reading from. The brand of Premillennialism which has and is disturbing the peace of Zion through the efforts of Boll and his co-laborers, is nothing more than the old outmoded doctrine of Christadelphianism with a new dress on. It is Bollized Christadelphianism—nothing more.

FELLOWSHIP

Hear Boll's denial of being a fellowship breaker: "His study of the word of God has led him to no clash with the teaching held by his brethren in the church of Christ, in any matter of fundamentals or any point of obedience, or congregational practice, or in anything that. should affect the fellowship in the Lord Jesus Christ" (K. of God, p. 11). "His brethren in the church of Christ." Does he have "brethren" other than these? So it would seem; for it is evident that both he and his co-laborers have a healthy fellowship with many others of "his brethren" in other bodies, provided they hold to the doctrine of Premillennialism. It is a known fact that in every discussion we have had with those who hold to that doctrine, Baptist or otherwise, we have had with those who hold to that doctrine, Baptist or whatever it is, these pining-for-fellowship brethren array themselves solidly against us by lending their influence publicly and privately, to our opponent. So much so that one would never dream that there had ever been any fellowship, or that they even now are insisting that it be not broken. Boll himself admits freely that his discoveries are not held by "his brethren" generally. In those matters then, there is no fellowship between him and his brethren. Where then, and in what, is fellowship to be found? He insists that in "fundamentals, in points of obedience, congregational practice" he is in full agreement with "his brethren in general." Let us look into this.

These points of agreement as summed up by Boll consist of the beginning time of the church, baptism for the remission of sins, and the Lord's day worship of the church. Does he mean that these constitute all the marks of identity? If so, they are "the whole counsel of God," and Paul claimed freedom "from the blood of all men" because he had "declared all the counsel of God." That is, one must declare "all" the counsel of God in order to be free from the responsibility of those to whom he preaches being lost. What Paul preached here, was the counsel of God, and had to do with the salvation of those to whom he preached. But he says he preached "the kingdom of God" (Acts 20:25-26). Therefore, preaching the kingdom of God is a part of "all the counsel of God," and is fundamental—Boll to the contrary notwithstanding.

But let us look a little closer into this matter. This system of Bollized Christadelphianism contends for the following: That Christ came to earth to establish His kingdom, and because He ran into human opposition he found Himself unable to do so, and established the church instead. (Did it require less power to establish a church than a kingdom? It must have.) Not being able to set up His kingdom because of human opposition, He was denied the promised seat on David's throne. (2) That the kingdom Christ purposed to establish at His first coming, was not established because of human interference, but will be at His second coming, and that in spite of all interference, and will rule over the whole earth, and will last for one thousand years. (3) That Christ's second coming will be in two installments or phases, the first of which He comes "for His saints," and in the second, He comes "with His saints." (4) That it takes both comings to constitute His "second coming." (That is, one coming plus one coming equals one coming! Strange logic! Stranger mathematics!) (5) That all living Jews will be saved and restored to their former land and worship. (6) That there will be two resurrections. The first composed of those "in Christ," the second, "the rest of the dead." (7) That the judgment of Matthew 25 is not the general judgment but of "the nations," the Gentiles, and in which there will be neither Jews nor Christians. These are just a few of the strange teachings of Boll and his co-laborers, and for which Boll serves notice on his "brethren in the church of Christ" that he will not cease to "maintain his liberty and independence." Yet in the face of all this, he insists on being fellowshipped.

Boll insists that "these points of doctrine involve no congregational practice, and there is nothing in them that should raise a barrier between brethren who may differ concerning them. They are subjects for profitable, brotherly investigation and discussion." He insists that he has learned his peculiar doctrines from the Bible; we are just as insistent that he has not, but has learned it from men. He insists that these are not harmful, while we are just as insistent that they are. He insists that we are causing the trouble by attacking him and his views; that if we would let him alone there would be no trouble. Where then is to be found the profit in "brotherly investigation" he speaks of?

He insists that his teaching challenges no practice of the church. That is not true. His position on the kingdom voids the Lord's Day Communion, which is a "practice of the church." Note this: "I will not drink henceforth of the fruit of the vine, until that day when I drink it new with you in my Father's kingdom." (Matt. 26:29.) If the kingdom has not come, then Christ has not drunk "with you." That would rob the service of its every benefit to us. But Christians have enjoyed this communion with Christ. (I Cor. 10:16, 17.)

This future kingdom question not only challenges the communion practice of the church, it destroys it completely. The whole theory is vicious in that it makes Christ a weakening and a false teacher. He said that some to whom He was speaking would not taste of death till they should see the kingdom come with power (Mk. 9:1). And this was said after the time Boll says Christ had changed his teaching about the kingdom's coming. If there had been a change of program, Jesus knew it, yet He continued as He had all along, to teach the near coming of the kingdom. No church practice changed by these doctrines? Why, it challenges its-teaching at every point. It strips Christ of His kingly crown; drags Him from David's throne where Peter says God had placed Him. It changes the Old Testament prophet's statement about the restoration of the Jews, and Joshua's truthfulness when he said God had given them everything He had promised to give them. It rebukes
John for saying he was a brother in the kingdom. Premillennialism digs at the very foundation of the remedial system.

The Boll brand of Premillennialism sets up an entirely new system of interpretation. It interprets the plain passages of scripture in the light of difficult passages. It assumes the meaning of a doubtful passage, and usually the point assumed is the point to be proved. Everyone knows that the universally accepted rule is that the difficult passage must be interpreted in the light of and in harmony with the passage that is clear. By the use of such methods any theory can be promoted with some degree of success.

On practically every Old Testament prophecy bearing on the kingdom, it is a notable fact that Boll takes issue with all of our Bible scholars as to the meaning of these passages. That is also true of New Testament scriptures of like character. He goes further than that. He takes issue with the apostles themselves in their interpretation of Old Testament scriptures. That, of itself, ought to have some sobering effect on anyone who aspires to be a teacher of men. Strange that one man should in a few years make the startling discovery that all were wrong, and that he had learned the true meaning of these scriptures without any help save the Bible. I tell you frankly, no man would have ever learned the Boll meaning of these scriptures without a speculator to help him—and Boll did not.

As a sample of Boll’s vicious handling of the word of God, take his effort on John 5:28,29, which is found in “The Second Coming,” by R. H. Boll, page 42. He is asked the question: Does not John 5:28,29, teach that all the dead will be raised at one time, in the same hour?” Boll’s answer: “If you had only John 5:28,29, such would be the natural impression; but when we have other scriptures distinguishing between resurrections, it leads to a re-examination of the statement in John. A close reading shows that John does not say that both the wicked and the righteous will be “raised together, at the same time.” (We pause here for comment.) No, the words you underscore are not used by John. Even a casual reading would show that. Then why is so critical a reading advised? I am presuming that if those words were in the text Boll would believe that all would be raised at the same time, but since they are not there, he does not believe that such will be the case. But Boll does believe that there are two resurrections (and to that John must agree) with a thousand years between them. Since he cannot believe there is only one resurrection taught here because those words are not there, why do you believe there are two resurrections then when the words actually declaring that fact are not there? “A close reading” shows that John does not say that the righteous and the wicked will be raised a thousand years apart. I ask: Why then do you believe such will be the case? Now, listen to this from his pen: “It is a poor principle of interpretation to deny the plain meaning of what God says because we cannot make things fit.” (Boll, in Second Coming, p. 47.) So says Boll; so say I. But that is exactly what he is trying to do here. “Verily, thou art the man,” and no amount of turning and twisting will clear him from his own charge.

Since Boll thinks it necessary to re-examine John’s statement, I will do so. I wonder why he wants John re-examined instead of Rev. 20:5, which is his main proof text of two resurrections? And too, Rev. 20:5 is a much controverted scripture, in the light of and in harmony with the passages that are clear. Whatever Matt. 27:52,53 teaches or implies, it has absolutely no bearing on John’s statement, for those who “came out of their graves” when Jesus arose, according to Boll himself, will not be in their graves when Jesus speaks the sleeping dead to life as John records. Such smearing of God’s truth is common in this unholy attempt to save a graceless theory by a de-luded man.

In disagreement with the church of Christ on almost every identifying mark, comes the arrogant demand that fellowship with them must not be broken, notwithstanding they themselves set the example by breaking it when they withdrew fellowship from those brethren in Kentucky. Where there is no agreement there is no fellowship to break. Just why fellowship with the church of Christ as it is today, according to Boll, is desired by them is one of the unsolvable questions of the age. Is it thought that being in fellowship with the church gives them greater opportunities to proselyte to their cause? Or are they trying to reform the church? Surely not, for after all the confusion ceased by those who are “moving heaven and earth” to make Premillennialism look respectable, they themselves, admit that their conjured up theory “will end in failure.”

---
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ANGLO-ISRAEL: QUINTESSENCE OF LITERALISM

FANNING YATER TANT

Richard Brothers (1775-1824), "a half-pay officer of eccenthric habits in the British Navy," has given to the world one of the most amazing religio-political theories to be found in all history. It was this odd character who was the first, in modern times, to advocate the singular theory that the British nation is in actual fact and truth the real Israel of God. He claimed that the Anglo-Saxon race was descended from the "ten lost tribes" of Israel; that he, himself, was a lineal descendant of David, and the rightful claimant to "David's throne." That very shortly God would overthrow all the enemies of Israel (England), and that he, Richard Brothers, would become the ruler of the whole world.

Quite understandably, the Britishers confined this man to a lunatic asylum, but, even so, he secured and retained many admirers. Outstanding among them was C. Piazzi Smyth, astronomer-royal for Scotland, who made certain measurements of the Great Pyramid of Chizeh, and deduced from these mathematical computations that Brothers was right in all his claims except one—namely, the matter of the royal line of David. Smyth believed that the Great Pyramid established the right of Victoria, then Queen of England, to the throne of David, and that while Brothers was absolutely right in claiming descent from the ten lost tribes, he made a mistake in thinking he was the rightful heir to the throne.

Brothers and Smyth and their followers argued that Britain must be the true Israel, or else great numbers of the promises made to Israel in the Bible would have to go unfulfilled. And once having determined their position, they set to work with great diligence in the fields of ethnology and philology to find evidence to corroborate their contention. It was claimed that the very word "British" was itself the "new name" prophesied for Israel in Isaiah 62:2; the Hebrew word for "man", is "ish" and the word "Brit" is the Hebrew "B'rith" meaning "of the covenant." Hence "British" means "man of the covenant." Furthermore, it was claimed that the "mark of Dan" could be found all over Europe-evidence of the one time journeys of Dan in those regions. For instance, the rivers of Europe: Don, D (a) neiper, D (a) neiser, Danube, etc.; also his mark is seen in Denmark (Dan's mark), London, Edinburgh, London, and a great host of similar names.

It was, however, much more on passages of Scripture than on historical occurrences and linguistic similarities that Brothers and his followers relied for proof of their theory. And in their application of the selected passages they have given to the world an undying demonstration of the absurdities to which the literalist can go in his insistence on a literal, word-for-word fulfillment of prophecies.

*Hastings Encyclopedia of Religion and Ethics* lists the chief proof-texts of Anglo-Israelism, and shows how an almost child-ish insistence on literalistic application of the passages is necessary for any sort of support for the theory. Here they are:

Jeremiah 3:12: God's word should be proclaimed to the north. (Britain is to the north of Palestine.)

Isaiah 49:10: Heat or sun should not smite them. (Britain is foggy and cloudy most of the year. The sun rarely ever shines upon the people there.)

Isaiah 24:15: God's name should be glorified in the isles. (Britain is an island kingdom.)

Micah 5:8: The remnant of Jacob shall be as a lion among the nations. (Britain is traditionally the "lion," even using the symbol of a lion in her coat of arms.)

Isaiah 49:19-20: Colonies should be established. (Britain is the world's greatest colonial empire.)

Genesis 48:19: One of Joseph's sons, Manasseh, was to become a separate nation. (Who can deny that this refers to the United States?)

Genesis 22:17, 24:60: Israel should possess the gates of her enemies. (Britain possesses the "gateways of the world—Gibraltar, Suez, Aden, and—until recently—Singapore.)

It can be seen that there would be a very subtle appeal in this sort of theory to the self-esteem of the British people. While in the past the British attitude has never been exactly what one would describe as an inferiority complex, nevertheless, it would be quite a boost to their sense of well-being to have "scriptural proof" that they, and they alone, are God's chosen—destined to be the conquerors of the world and "the master race." As might be expected nearly all of the 2,000,000 people who have accepted this delusion are Britishers-members of the Church of England. Indeed, it is almost exclusively an intra-church movement within the Anglican Church. Americans, with some few exceptions, seem to have been more amused than allured by the theory.

"The whole movement is chiefly interesting as a reductio ad absurdum of too literal an interpretation of the prophecies," says the *Jewish Encyclopedia.* To students of religious psychology it is a most interesting study in the extent to which credulity can be stretched. For its followers must not only completely pervert and misapply in the most grossly literalistic fashion imaginable every passage of scripture they use; but, they blithely and naively set aside as false the incontrovertible and established facts of history.

There is no agreement whatever among competent ethnologists concerning the origin of the British people. There is not the slightest doubt among philologists concerning the origin of the English language. Here are the facts: the original inhabitants of the islands were primitive Celtic tribes; in 449 A.D. and the years immediately following the isles were invaded and conquered by Anglo-Saxons, a group of peoples from southern Germany, in whom there is not the faintest trace of Israelitish blood, either in physical features, in language, in customs, or in religion. On the contrary, the Anglo-Saxons are of the Japhetic race, and are definitely not Semitic. The Anglo-Saxons conquered the Celts, and remained masters of the isles until 1066 A.D. In that year, and the years following, the Normans under William the Conquerer over-ran them. The Normans were of Scandinavian origin. These three strains—Celtic, Anglo-Saxon, and Scandinavian—make up the heritage of the modern British race. The present ruling house of England, far from being the "house of David," is German. It came out of Germany less than two hundred and fifty years ago, and until the last war even continued to wear its German name of "Hanover." The name was changed to "Windsor" during the heated days of the last war when anything that even suggested Germany was unpopular in Britain.

Yet these authenticated facts of history are blissfully ignored by the advocate of Anglo-Israelism. They don't fit in with his theory; they are contrary to his interpretation of the scriptures; hence, they must be false! The historians of the world have perpetrated a giant hoax! The Bible plainly describes "Israel," and that description fits Britain!

This theory is the most refreshing piece of naivete we have seen in many years. And at the same time it contains a solemn warning to the followers of Russell, Rutherford, and Brother Boll. For it shows the logical conclusion of too great an insistence on "literalistic" ideas of an earthly kingdom. The Anglo-Israelites have carried premillennialism to its next phase in the search for an earthly kingdom. Instead of waiting for the Lord to establish such a kingdom when He comes, they already have it going and ready for Him—with a lineal descend-ant of David (King George VI) now occupying "David's throne" in the city of London!
“The germ theory” in the resurrection has been held up to ridicule, in the Banner of February, 1943. So far as a “germ theory” is concerned, it may be largely bunk, as germ theories usually are. But in exposing that “theory,” Brother M. V. Showalter has detoured into various other fallacious paths of theorizing. That there is a very close analogy between planting and growing grain and the burial and resurrection of the physical human body, is evident in Paul’s comparisons in I Cor. 15. The lessons thus taught are the cause of much speculation.

The comparison of the morning glory seed and its flower to the earthly and resurrected forms of man’s physical body, is not a parallel by any means. The seed of the morning glory is not mature in the flower, but in the ripened seed, which is found to be exactly like the seed that was planted. That was Paul’s lesson in verses 35-38 regarding the wheat seed: the ripened grain is exactly like the seed sown. And note his statement: “God giveth it a body as it hath pleased him.” What pleased God? “To every seed his own body.” What is the lesson? A refutation of the then ancient Brahman doctrine of reincarnation—that man’s spirit would return in another body. With what manner of body will they come? Paul says: Each in his own body. He has never had but one body.

Then, verses 39-41 are considered as “a parable.” They are statements of facts, whether parable or not. But the purpose of the statements is evident. Man’s body is flesh: in the resurrection, God pleases to give him “his own body,” which is flesh. But the doctrine of “metempsychosis” was, and still is, quite prevalent among the Oriental people. That is, the passing of souls at death into bodies (flesh) of animals, birds, fishes, even trees and rivers. But it pleased God to give every one his own body. The flesh of beasts, birds and fishes is not a suitable abode for the soul of man, so men will not come in the bodies of animals.

Another fallacy quite prevalent among religious people is the idea of and hope for an angelic body, a heavenly body, a celestial body: as angel or seraphim. Again, Paul explains that celestial and terrestrial bodies are as radically different in glory as are the glories of the sun, moon and stars. Moons do not become suns, stars do not change to moons, but each one functions in its own sphere. Likewise, the human soul need not expect to be installed into an angelic body, for it pleases God to give each his own body, which is not angelic. The glory of the earthly body cannot be exchanged for the glory of the heavenly, for the heavenly body is a spirit, while the earthly body is flesh.

A play is made on the pronoun “it.” He reasons that applying “it” to the body buried and raised contradicts verse 37, that we do not sow the body that shall be. But the matured grain is a duplicate of that seed planted. The body of a sixty-year-old living man is not composed of identically the same ingredients that constituted it when the man was twenty years old, but it is the same body. The resurrected body may be made of different dust, even as is the old man’s body, but it pleased God to call it the same body. Brother Showalter says, “It is only an expletive, an ornament, an appositive.” Leave it off, and read: “So also is the resurrection of the dead. Sown in corruption, raised in incorruption; sown in dishonor, raised in glory; sown in weakness, raised in power: sown a natural body, raised a spiritual body.”

Does that change the meaning of the thing sown and raised? Paul said, the resurrection of the dead is “so”; like the glory of planets and the bodies of human beings, not interchangeable in the passing from this life to the next. The object sown or buried is the object raised or resurrected. There is no logic on earth that can successfully refute that fact or reason it away. If the body that has been buried is not raised from the dead, the Corinthians were correct in saying: “There is no resurrection of the dead,” for it is “the body apart from the spirit that is dead.” There is nothing else to be resurrected. If there is, what is it? The spirit and soul of man cannot be resurrected, for it “returned to God who gave it,” and will never be in a condition to admit of a resurrection.

“There is a natural body, and there is a spiritual body,” regardless of men’s arguments to the contrary. Jesus was in a natural body until death: he was raised in a spiritual body. A spiritual body is not a spirit. (Luke 24:39.) The resurrected body of Jesus was a sample of eternal life, or of the body to be used in eternity. John said he saw eternal life. “The life was manifested, and we have seen, and been witness, and report to you the eternal life, which was with the Father, and was manifested unto us.” (I John 1:2.) Phil. 3:20-21 is also troublesome. “The words, ‘that it maybe’, are not in the original.” Here is the wording of the original, translated by George Ricker Berry: “Who will transform our body of humiliation, for it to become compared to his body of glory.” Does that change the meaning of the A. V.? His body was glorified in His resurrection. (Luke 24:26; John 2:22;12:16.) Hence, John saw eternal life in the resurrected body of Jesus.

The resurrected body of Jesus was perfect; freed from all the stains and effects of sin of the world. The bodies of resurrected saints are to be like His, “for we shall see him as he is.” “It doth not yet appear what we shall be” in all phases of eternal existence, but there is no doubt about our bodily condition, we are assured of that. I cannot see this: “The fact that His body arose indicates rather that ours will not rise.” Peculiar reasoning, without any sustaining evidence. What will be resurrected?

A horrible (?) picture is painted of Jesus going to the eternal realms bearing in His hands the prints of the nails, and in His side a spear wound, to be seen by the redeemed throughout eternity. Even so: the redeemed will never forget that manifestation of love that redeemed their souls from sin; and in the resurrection, redeemed their bodies from the results of sin-disease, marring, blindness, deafness, deformities, imbecilities, etc.—when they come forth to be like Him, “perfect in every respect. (Rom. 8:23; John 3:21.)

Did Jesus go to heaven in that perfected, physical, human body? If He did not, where is that body? It cannot be corrupted, returned to dust (Acts 2:27), any more than His soul could remain in Hades. It must then be preserved eternally in some celestial museum of fine arts, so the redeemed of earth may look upon it: or, where is it? It must be somewhere. When was the change made from that body to a celestial body? Which inspired writer describes that change, or even alludes to it? “We have seen in the passing from this life, to the next. The object sown or buried is the object raised or resurrected. There is no logic on earth that can successfully refute that fact or reason it away. If the body that has been buried is not raised from the dead, the Corinthians were correct in saying: “There is no resurrection of the dead,” for it is “the body apart from the spirit that is dead.” There is nothing else to be resurrected. If there is, what is it? The spirit and soul of man cannot be resurrected, for it “returned to God who gave it,” and will never be in a condition to admit of a resurrection.

“The heartening fact is that the Bible does not so teach! What does it teach? Listen, while Peter talks on Pentecost. “God had sworn by an oath to him (David), that of his loins, according to the flesh, he would raise up Christ to sit on his throne. This Jesus hath God raised up.” Jesus was the name of the “man,” Christ was His official title.
The **man** was crucified, buried, resurrected. He was still a man, although now perfect. (Heb. 8:9.) He was both human and divine. What part of Jesus was “the seed of David, the flesh, or the inner man? Everyone knows that He was David's son “according to the flesh.” That “flesh of David” was crucified and buried. The inner man went to Hades, not to the grave. No part of Jesus was a son of David except his fleshly body: His spiritual part was Son of God.

Peter declares that “the fruit of David's loins, **according to the flesh,**” was raised up from the grave, that it should see no corruption. He says more, of this same “fruit of David's loins”; He was exalted by the right hand of God. That is the physical, as well as the spiritual man, Jesus. “David has not ascended into the heavens,” but “the fruit of his loins” has. That “fruit” is the physical body, the man, Jesus. He often called Himself, “The Son of man;” no doubt, to refute just such ideas as are being taught regarding His relinquishing life in His physical body. “This same Jesus” (the man), “whom ye crucified, God hath made both Lord and Christ.” They did not crucify the inner man, the spirit, the soul, of Jesus. He, himself, taught that men could kill the body, but had no power over the soul.

Those of you (us) who contend so vehemently that Jesus Christ is now reigning on David's throne, should digest this **truth:** If the physical body of Jesus, the body which God prepared for Him (Heb. 10:5), when He was “made flesh, and dwelt among us,” did not ascend to heaven, as Peter declared, and is not now seated, still a physical body, on the throne of David in the heavens, then that promise and oath of God to David never has been fulfilled, and it never can be. His physical body was the only evidence of His having “taken on Him the seed of Abraham,” and it is the only part of Him that is the seed of Abraham.

All the promises of God to Christians depend upon Christ's resurrection; and His resurrection consisted of His fleshly body coming forth from the grave in a perfected, eternal state. God is a spirit: Christ possesses a spiritual body. Saints become spiritual inwardly in this life: their fleshly bodies become spiritual in the resurrection, but they do not become spirits. Their perfect fleshly bodies, made spiritual, are fitted for an eternal life on “the new earth wherein dwelleth righteousness.” What use would a spirit have for an earth? (Psa. 115:16.) John declares as anti-Christ they who deny that Christ **cometh in the flesh.** (II John 7.) Thayer upholds that rendition. On Patmos, in the eternal realm, John saw “a Lamb standing as it had been slain” (Rev. 5:6), which is a symbol of a crucified and risen Redeemer still in the flesh, as He will also come again. “There is one Mediator between God and man, the **man,** Christ Jesus;” He is still “man.”

If this be materialism, make the most of it. A materialism that culminates on the new earth in the heavenly realm, is in harmony with all of God's teaching and dealing with fleshly man. He has never approached man except **through** the avenue of the fleshly senses, and has thus appealed to his inner man. With the body and spirit separated, man is not man; he is a dead body, and a disembodied spirit, wholly impotent, so far as the human mind can know. Paul prayed “that your whole spirit and soul and body be preserved blameless unto the coming of the Lord.” (I Thess. 5:23.) If both soul and body can be cast into hell, the body must of necessity be raised from the dead, or a spoonful of dust be thrown into the flames, with a sol. We presume that God will go right ahead with his own plans about the matter, regardless of what all of us combined may think and say and write about it. I will await His pleasure, which Paul said, was to 'give to-every one his own body,' If I am fooled, I'll gladly take what He provides me.

## NOT OF WORKS

**T. R. Wilkinson**

“By grace are ye saved, through faith, and that not of yourselves, it is the gift of God. Not of works, lest any man should boast. (Eph. 2:5-8.) Not of works, to a Baptist, means not by baptism. Baptism is works, they say, and it seems to be about the only thing they ever classify as works.

Not of works in this passage does not mean baptism, **or any other command of God.** It means works commanded or taught by men, works that men originate, like the mourner’s bench, prayer for sinners, the entire Baptist church, including the Baptist name. There are two kinds of words mentioned in the Bible, there are works that will save a sinner, and works that cannot save.

Man's works will not save, man cannot originate a plan of his own that will save, and that is why the Baptist church never can save any one. But God's commands are not man's works. They are works of God, and when man obeys them he is doing the works of God. Jesus came into the world to do the Father's work. He said “I must work the works of him that sent me.” When Jesus did the work God sent him to do, it was God working through him, and it was therefore the works of God.

When we do what Jesus commanded us in the gospel that is not our work, or works, but the works of Christ. That is true in regard to baptism; as well as other things. It is said that Jesus made and baptized more disciples than John, though Jesus himself baptized not, but his disciples. Jesus did the baptizing through agents, when he sends men out to baptize it is not they who baptize, but the Lord who sent them. They baptize for him, they are his agents, and when a man **submits** to baptism, they submit to the Lord.

James says by **works** a man is justified, and not by faith only. Peter says in every nation he that fears God and works righteousness is accepted of him. Paul says work out your own salvation with fear and trembling. But Paul shows there are two kinds of works, one that will save and one that will not save. Speaking of the Jews he said they were ignorant of God's righteousness and went about to set up their own righteousness, not submitting themselves to the righteousness of God. He gives this as a reason why they could not be saved.

This brings out clearly the two kinds of works, the works of God, and the works of men. Which side does baptism belong on? Does it belong, to the works of men or the works of God? Do you **say** it makes no difference, that Paul meant to exclude the works of God? Then you must also exclude faith, for it also is work. Jesus said, this is the work of God that you believe on him whom God hath sent. Faith is work, even more so than baptism, if possible. Baptism is the only command in which man is passive when he obeys it.

Man is active in believing, or in faith. Repent is also in the active voice. They are something man is commanded to do, and must do for himself or be damned. But be **baptized is in the passive voice. We submit to baptism,** the Lord has sent out agents to baptize people for him, and when we submit, we are baptized of, or by the Lord, and we are passive.

In Titus 3:5 we read, “Not by works of righteousness which we have done, but according to his mercy he saved us by the washing of regeneration and the renewing of the Holy Ghost,. We cannot save ourselves by our own works, but in baptism we submit to the Lord, and he saves us through his righteousness, the washing of regeneration, which can only mean **baptism.**

Baptism is the only washing connected with the gospel, and the Lord applies it himself through his chosen agents. Ananias was sent to Saul by the Lord, and he asked him, “**Why tarriest thou, arise, and be baptized and wash away thy sins,** calling upon the name of the Lord;.”
In an article in the March number of the Apostolic Times, after quoting Matt. 5:38,39;7:12, R. A. Craig inquires: “Should we not, under all circumstances, obey this teaching?”

If the Scriptures cited were all that Inspiration says on the subject, and if those passages alluded to “all circumstances,” and every form of evil, then one would be logically obligated to answer the question in the affirmative; but since all those factors do not inhere in those verses, one must broaden one’s vision to encompass more “of the whole counsel of God” in order to answer scripturally.

Among the innumerable forms of evil alluded to in the Scriptures, we need only refer to one other form to see that there is at least one other circumstance and form of evil that are not alluded to in the passages quoted by Brother Craig, for we read: “Be subject to every ordinance of man for the Lord’s sake: whether to the king, as supreme; or unto governors, as one sent by him for vengeance on evil-doers and for praise to them that do well.” (I Peter 2:13,14.)

-Note that being “subject to every ordinance of man” is only qualified by the government’s divine mission “for vengeance on evil-doers and for praise to them that do well;” hence, “be subject” comprehends that mission, which is in sharp contrast to the assumption of a theory that obedience is contingent upon the nature of the thing to be done; instead, the Christian’s obedience is contingent only upon whether vengeance is on “evil-doers” or on “them that do well.” “Circumstances” and nature of the evil involved determine whether it is prudent to depend on the slow processes of God’s power of persuasion to correct or whether God’s power of force is called for. And contrary to another assumption of the same theory, “to be subject” is not merely for the Christian’s own sake, to escape punishment; but it is “for the Lord’s sake,” with all that it implies.

We may know this is a different form of evil and under different circumstances to that alluded to in the verses quoted by Brother Craig because Inspiration calls for a different treatment of it. Obviously it is an evil of such a nature that God does not call immediately for the golden rule to restrain, but assigns it to His other power—that of vengeance through the human agency of temporal government.

True, Christians are admonished to “abstain from every form of evil” (I Thess. 5:22); yet, unlike the theory, the God of heaven does not depend solely upon that admonition to restrain all forms of evil “under all circumstances.” Neither does He teach Christians to depend solely upon that admonition in dealing with all evil-doers “under all circumstances.” Instead, He tells them “to be ready unto every good work” of, and “to be subject” to, and to “obey” His temporal power of vengeance. Revealing the nature of that power, He specifies that it is “to thee for good.” And the only Scriptural restriction to that obedience turns on whether vengeance is on “evil-doers” of the nature implied or on “them that do well.”

Having thus cited “circumstances” and a class of evil not alluded to in the passages on which Brother Craig’s question is based and hence not comprehended in the form of his question, we are now, with reverence and awe, prepared to answer his question negatively. His other questions are sufficiently hypothetical to be covered either explicitly or implicitly in this answer, except the following, to which we now give attention: “When Jesus was led up of the Spirit into the wilderness to be tempted of the devil (Matt. 4:1-10) and was offered, by the devil, all the kingdoms of the world, ‘if thou wilt fall down and worship me’, did the kingdoms of the world belong to the devil? If not, then where was the temptation?”

The theory to which Brother Craig’s question belongs ignores the important truth that Divinity knew that the devil was a liar. “When he speaketh a lie, he speaketh of his own: for he is a liar, and the father thereof.” (Jno. 8:44.) So while it is true that the devil said what Inspiration says he said, yet what the devil said is false. A theory that depends to any extent upon the testimony of the devil must be hard pressed. The devil is not solely dependent upon temporal governments and irreligious people for his designs. “And no marvel; for even Satan fashioneth himself into an angel of light.” (II Cor. 11:14.)

Furthermore, that school of thought fails to observe another principle of truth. Temptation may be either relative or absolute, depending on the character of the subject of temptation. Absolute temptation is both subjective (appealing to the subject) and objective (a design of the tempter), while relative temptation is only objective (a design of the tempter). Referring to Christ, we are told: “For we have not a high priest that cannot be touched with the feeling of our infirmities; but one that hath been in all points tempted like as we are, yet without sin.” (Heb. 4:15.) “But every man is tempted, when he is drawn away of his own lust, and enticed.” (James 1:14.) Hence, when man is tempted, it may be either with or without sin, depending on the character of the man, whether “he is drawn away of his own lust” or not. The text does not say, when every man is tempted, he is drawn away of his own lust. “But every man is tempted, when he is drawn away of his own lust, and enticed.” But Jesus’ temptation was not dependent upon any element of truth in the devil’s proposition; because being “without sin” on his part, it had no appeal, for there was no sinful lust to make it appealing to Jesus.

So, therefore, the “all points” in Jesus’ temptation refers to the scope of temptation; not to temptation that involved sin or lust on his part; hence, not to temptation that depended upon any element of truth in the devil’s proposition. And it is repugnant to every conception of the attributes of Jesus to assume by a theory or any other way that his temptation involved more than the designs of the devil. So the argument, however unwittingly, for the devil on that point, goes for naught. And Inspiration places the question beyond all controversy as it anticipates the false claim and arrays against it a statement that is not based on what the devil said, thus: “There is no power but of God.” (Romans 13:1.)

When the scholars of the illustrious revision committees translated into plain English terms the Scriptures on which the Christian’s relation to national defense is based, that very act was in itself an expression of scholarship on the general
subject that involves God's two powers for governing mankind in this age: First, that of the gospel of persuasion that seeks to govern mankind to a superlative degree in obeying the principles of Christian morality which relate to himself and to his fellowmen, and in seeking to govern man far beyond and above any earthly relationship, even to render obedience to inspired commands that relate exclusively to God and to the subject of obedience, to meet in this life, the divine terms of acceptance of the grace of God for the salvation of the soul in the age to come; Second, another power of God of a different nature to seek to restrain by force and vengeance the form of evil with which the United Nations are now concerned. Hence, as to the claims that are made on the score of scholarship, on other questions no less than this subject, it is often necessary to distinguish between scholarship, as such, on the one hand, and the theory of some scholars on the other. Yet with grateful respect for scholarship, as such, let us use it, not abuse it; profit by it, not overlook the plain import of texts because of the position of some scholars.

The following is right on the subject and I am sure Brother Craig was well acquainted with its author: "It is a significant fact that when the Lord placed his own teaching in Matthew 5:38, against the ancient law recorded in Exodus 21:23-25, which required 'life for life, eye for eye, tooth for tooth, hand for hand, foot for foot, burning for burning, wound for wound, stripe for stripe; He confined his modification of that law to the point of personal resentment in returning evil for evil.'"—M. C. Kurfees, in "The Law of God on Capital Punishment.

Brother Craig defines what he means by his caption, "Questions For Warmongers." He means "brethren who write voluminously advocating that a Christian can, in defense of his country, take up his gun and kill his enemy." His reference to "his gun" and "his enemy" implies that he ignores the important distinction between personal resentment and national resentment, whereas the New Testament makes that distinction. This is not meant for personal resentment of Brother Craig's caption, but it is a suggestion that his phraseology referring to his "brethren," without their permission, may not be becoming an extreme pacifist. It has been observed that some pacifists are often as belligerent as some warmongers.

The writer has associated with brethren who have written "voluminously" on the subject, prompted no doubt by the international "circumstances" with attendant evils alluded to in the Scriptures, but he does not realize that they are warmongers. It is one thing to try to emphasize what the Scriptures teach on the subject; it is quite a different thing to sit in judgment on another's conscience to tell an individual Christian what to do. That has not been done so far as this writer knows. It is fully realized that no one can obey God in any matter with a conscience protesting against that obedience. But we are sure that an urgent duration and postwar aim should be to teach Christians all over the world, especially some of the United States, that the powers that -be do not belong to the devil, but occasionally the devil gets in some men of authority in such powers. That is the very reason for their divine mission of "vengeance on evil-doers and for praise to them that do well." May God overrule such discussions to His glory and our edification.

(Continued from page 3)

government. The number a proper research would reveal might be surprising. But suppose that such were true? If, as it is intimated by Brother Brigance, practically all of the thousands of preachers have been tee-totally against participation in civil and military government, the practice of the church has certainly reflected on their influence. It does seem that a few of those preachers, and some now, would have been able to train their own sons to get themselves shot or otherwise mar-tyred for such a great cause. Instead, as in the case with even Brother Boles and Brother Goodpasture, they have let their own sons, along with thousands of other members of the church, go into various phases of military service. So, as the whole matter stands, according to brethren Brigance and Goodpasture, the preachers have universally talked their way but the church (including the families of these same preachers) have practiced their way! So why should we worry about history?

One point stands out in all that has been written, namely: Paul's language in Romans 13 makes it right to bear the sword for the government when it is done to execute wrath against the evil doer in the performance of the true mission of government, and the one who thus bears the sword is a minister of God doing the thing that God ordained and thus made right to do. All admit this much. But it is contended that it is wrong for a Christian to do it. It resolves itself, therefore, into the proposition that it is wrong for a Christian to do right-and to do a thing that God, through Paul, says is right! I would suggest here a re-reading of the paragraph in B. W. Johnson's article, italicized by himself, concerning the Christian being "an incubus to his country," and consider his question to Brother Franklin: "Are you prepared for the legitimate results of your premises?"

As for the question Brother Brigance expressed a desire to hear answered, the answer is contained in the documents of Restoration history from the pen of men that he did not "know" about.

But there is one thing that many will feel should be done. Since Brother Brigance and Brother Goodpasture are both historians, and have permitted what is now known to be a historical inaccuracy, and a vital one, to be printed on the editorial page of the Gospel Advocate-they should make editorial correction of it. While it is true that the Bible Banner goes into the hands of the majority of the preachers and reaches thousands of "the leading brethren" in the church all over the United States and Canada, it is also true that a great many who saw the statement in the Gospel Advocate will not see the facts herein published. Is the Gospel Advocate willing for the error to stand? We shall see.

From Magnolia, Arkansas

"I want to thank you personally for your attitude and articles on the Christian's duty to his government. I am like Brother Cuthbertson in that I object to attempts to make Jehovah's Witnesses out of the brotherhood. They are saying that they do not believe in strife, but with the arrogance of Pharisees they belittle and smear those who differ from their pet hobby. The so-called pacifist should never call a policeman, should never vote, should not accept any of the rights of a citizen.

I am glad to say that there are not now 14 members of the church in the camp at Magnolia. Several of them have volunteered to work on dairy farms and the government offers them this opportunity, so they tell me."—W. L. Jameson, Jr., Secretary, Board of Election Commissioners, Magnolia, Arkansas.

(NOTE: The conscientious objectors are given the opportunity to work on dairy farms and earn their own livelihood—but the Gospel Advocate is still appealing to the churches to contribute $35.00 per month to each conscientious objector, and boasts of the total number, including the list in camps operated by certain sects. It is beginning to look like some of them are turning out to be conscientious objectors to dairy farm work as well. I do not believe the elders of the churches nor many of the members will be simple enough to contribute money to that kind of a thing, even if the Gospel Advocate does sponsor the scheme.-Editor.)
Gospel Advocate. He pounced on it "gleefully." But we have not challenged anybody for a debate. So he loses his point and ignores ours. He talks of Brother Boles' challenge, which was also issued to two staff writers on the Gospel Advocate and ignores their replies. When we challenge somebody on our staff for a debate on some point of issue, then he may be able to talk to the point, if it is possible for him to stay on a point long enough to talk about it.

Our mad brother spills some ink on himself with this slur. "Yet there may be those who think he ranks higher as a 'grammarian' than as a financier." Wonder how many people will think that "nice"? I can now understand why he would "gleefully" ignore the Dorris letters. I am under the impression that Brother Goodpasture's pocketbook is of ample size and regularly fed by two good salaries. I am glad he is a successful business man and enjoying prosperity. If it were otherwise, I would be too much of a gentleman to say anything about it. But I think I can say under the circumstances, that it takes more than a big pocketbook and a pair of scissors to make a good editor. I hate to see a "nice" man like Brother Goodpasture go along with the "wild boys" and unmentionables we have had to take along "to the woodshed." Are we just now finding out where his heart is? I'm afraid the reaction will not be too good among the friends of the Gospel Advocate. Everybody knows who has been most interested in our editor as "a financier." Some of them did not sign their names and the one unmentionable who did covered himself and some others with infamy and is not recognized by a single congregation in the large city where he lives. If Brother Goodpasture wants to join that sort of company, he is certainly standing in the need of prayer.

Now about those "conscientious objectors" he is so concerned about. He accuses us of distorting the facts because of our use of the number fourteen. Well, you know they are not registered with the Bible Banner. The Gospel Advocate is their medium. We only quoted the number and took it for granted that the ones who were writing the appeals had the number right. We are willing to accept corrections even at the risk of being eluded for making a "change." A member of the Board of Election Commissioners of Columbia County, Arkansas, writes us an unsolicited letter with the following information:

"I am glad to say that there are not now fourteen members of the church of Christ in the camp at Magnolia. Several of them have went up to dairy farms, and the government offers them the opportunity to work on dairy farms. All of them have this opportunity, so they tell me."

Seems to me "the devil" is pretty nice to "these boys." I hope somebody does not cry about the terrible hardships they are suffering in having to milk cows. According to our latest information from the Gospel Advocate there are "about one hundred" of these boys the churches are called on to support. The call is for $35 for each boy per month. For only one hundred that would be an outlaw of $42,000 per year the churches are called on to hand over. To keep these boys from bearing arms? No, no, so they will not be compelled to do non-combatant service in the army. The government would pay them more than $35 per month with each for non-combatant service as soldiers. Another thing. These conscientious objectors are in sectarian camps. Is the Gospel Advocate calling on the church to support these men through sectarian organizations? Surely, Brother Goodpasture, as allergic to change as he is, is not changing the life-long policy of the Gospel Advocate!

Brother Goodpasture's editorial has some other "nice things" in it. In a controversy some ten years ago some editors and others, including ours, made some rather warm remarks, some of which were not too "nice." It seems that our editor was on both the giving and receiving end of this scrap. In due time the storm blew over and the hatchet was buried. With something akin to ghoulish glee, Brother Goodpasture, "nice" man that he is, digs up that hatchet and tries to scalp us with it. I think he is less likely to hurt himself with his scissors. Juveniles who like to hack at cherry trees should not be allowed to play with hatchets.

Concerning "Brothers Dorris and Boles" Brother Goodpasture has this and other things to say:

"These venerable brethren are amply able to take care of themselves, as is evidenced by the facts that the 'ace writer' has, according to his own admission, 'no stomach whatever for the sort of discussion' Brother Dorris sought, and the 'canny, editor' has declined to meet Brother Boles on the 'war question.' Brother Dorris plans to bring out his letters in booklet form later. The attention (more accurately, lack of attention) the 'ace writer' has given them may serve as advance publicity."

The "facts" about the Boles' challenge have been fully set forth in the Bible Banner. They stand without change. As to Brother Dorris, I am risking a bit more "advance publicity" at the risk of an upset stomach. Evidently nothing can turn Brother Goodpasture's stomach. I now have seven of those letters, totalling about 65 typewritten pages. So they are to be published! I doubt it, but if they are, they will fully verify what I have said about them and justify the condition of my stomach. Since Brother Goodpasture likes them, endorses them, and relishes their publicity, I suggest that he put the first one in the Gospel Advocate. It will reveal his taste in literature. I assure you "as advance publicity" that nothing like it has ever been seen in the Advocate. He calls our position on the "war question" a "very dangerous baby indeed" and remarks that "it has its head and tail up and shoots at both ends." In the line of "literary form" get this:

"Since the baby's eating apparatus is located at the front end, Brightwell will be expected to feed the child. Foy, of course, will look after the other end."

Brightwell, incidentally, is on the staff of the Gospel Advocate of which Brother Goodpasture is editor.

"The reason the doctors failed to find anything wrong with you, is, they examined the wrong end. Your defects are all located in the upper end, not the lower end. We all know that the end the doctors examined is as sound as a dollar and in good working order."

There is more and worse of this sort of thing in the Dorris letters, and Brother Goodpasture is surprised that I have no stomach for that sort of discussion. I owe an apology to the readers of the Bible Banner for letting them see this much of it. My only excuse is that Brother Goodpasture likes them and is giving editorial notice that the whole mess is to be published! I assure you "as advance publicity" that nothing like it has ever before been seen in the Advocate. He calls our position on the "war question" a "very dangerous baby indeed" and remarks that "it has its head and tail up and shoots at both ends."

In the line of "literary form" get this:

"Since the baby's eating apparatus is located at the front end, Brightwell will be expected to feed the child. Foy, of course, will look after the other end."

Finally, what have we done to call for all the mudslinging? We hold that the government has a divine right to defend itself and its citizens against alien attack and that Christians can rightfully support the government in its legitimate processes even to the extent of bearing arms. Brother Goodpasture says:

"This editor teaches Christians to be in subjection to the powers that be in everything that is in harmony with God's revealed will. If it comes to a clash between the powers that be and God's will, we ought to hearken to God rather than men. The editor is willing to suffer whatever consequences this course may bring. He will not retract and join the popular side when the going becomes hard."

It might be enlightening if "this editor" should develop "a stomach" for more details in the development of this general principle that everybody accepts. Or maybe he plans to have Brother Dorris supply the details.