Some time ago I wrote an article to show the command, “Thou shalt not kill,” had nothing to do with government action against criminals or in matters of war, but was a prohibition against murder. Letters have come to me about the matter. Some accuse me of appealing to the Old Testament in support of legal executions and war. Not so; I was showing that those who appeal to that Old Testament command to prove that legal executions and war are wrong, are miserably perverting that command. One good brother wrote me that he was surprised that I would admonish Christians to go to war. Is a man admonishing Christians to go to war when he proves that a passage has been misused against war and legal executions? I have an idea that this brother expected his letter to be published, but that might get both him and the Gospel Advocate into trouble with the government. It seems to me that the government has been too forbearing for its own safety.

Cannot this question of war be discussed without calling people ugly names? If I should say that a Christian, in obedience to his government, may go to war, am I therefore a war-monger? One preacher applies that term to brethren, and others, who think they can go to war. Of course, he did not know the meaning of the word monger. I have it on reliable authority that a certain preacher said in a sermon, “Let the alley rats do the fighting; we Christians have nothing to do with it.” Whether it be right or wrong to engage in a defensive war, the fact remains that the very flower of the manpower of our nation is in this war. “Alley rats!” and yet he is preaching every Sunday, morning and night, to fathers and mothers who have sons in the armed forces of this nation!

When I started in the Christian life I soon became saturated with the idea that Christians should not go to war. I saw that to vote was to pledge myself to back up my vote with whatever power I could use. I still think that to vote for men to fill our offices is to pledge myself to sustain them in all legal affairs of government. As I learned more I kept meeting up with other truths and facts that I could not ignore.

1. The law of self-preservation is imbedded in our nature; God made us that way for our own good. We may never feel the need of resisting evil men further than to lock our doors; that is resisting evil men. I have never heard any man argue that it is wrong to lock our doors. Self-preservation is a law of our being-it is a God-given law. I cannot believe that God is the author of two conflicting laws.

2. God has not changed His nature. I can see how God can change His laws respecting service and worship without changing His nature, just as a government may change some laws without changing the fundamental nature of the government; but there are fundamental principles in a government that cannot be changed without changing the nature of the government. That, it seems to me, goes without argument. And so with God and His government. Will anyone say that God has fundamentally changed with reference to war and legal executions?

3. The war on criminal nations, war of defense, is not different from war on criminal individuals and gangsters. Shall all efforts to suppress crime cease? Would you be a “conscientious objector” to appearing in court as a witness against a man accused of a capital crime? But you may say you would have to appear. Now would you? If so, you could refuse to give any evidence that would hang the criminal. Would you do anything to protect your wife and little children from a beast in human form? You may argue that you would not, but you would.

4. Paul’s example weighed much with me. Paul was a Roman citizen; and so far as we can learn, he was the only writer of the New Testament that was a Roman citizen. When the Roman soldiers rescued him from the mob in Jerusalem, did he tell them that he did not want anyone to be hurt on his account? He saved himself from a beating by avowing his Roman citizenship. When he learned that the Jews plotted to kill him, he promptly called on the chief captain for protection. The chief captain sent him to Caesarea with soldiers to protect him. (Acts 21:27-36; 23:12-33.) Here is a case wherein sinners, heathen, did a good deed to a servant of the Lord, in fact, two good deeds-they rescued him from death, and then protected him from death. And Paul had called for that protection. And yet we are told that Paul would not be allowed to protect anyone from violence, not even one of these soldiers. Paul would enjoy the fruits of what others did, but would not be allowed to do a similar good deed. Oh, yes, I know your answer; they are sinners, and it was their duty to do what they did. And that makes a strange situation—sinners may do good deeds that Christians are prohibited from doing! Here is the picture: A Christian is being unmercifully beaten while Paul stands by; the Christian calls on Paul for help. But Paul says, “No, I am a Christian; call on some of these sinners for help.” We enjoy the fruits of what sinners do for us, but must have no part in gaining these fruits! It reminds me of a story

(Continued on page 3)
THE ESSENTIAL POINT IN PREMILLENNIALISM"-No. V

The bare and bald assertions of any premillennialist on any prophetic passage is their proof of what that passage means regardless of any number of plain and unequivocal passages that may be adduced as evidence on the same point. The plain passages must yield to vague interpretations and all rules of Biblical exegesis and hermeneutics must stand aside before the "must" and the "will" calendar of arbitrary assertions. The one who follows the teaching of any premillennialist, and Boll is no exception to the rule, must take his word for it. Their attitude is always the same. In substance they say: "Just park your reason here and come with me!"

Having examined one by one the Old Testament proof-texts (?) of the Bollistic Chattanooga document, exposing the absolute absurdities of its assertions, let us now analyze the New Testament passages "cited," with the same result-the complete collapse of the arguments claimed by R. H. Boll himself and upon which he has staked his premillennial cause.

"WHEN THE GROANING OF CREATION SHALL CEASE" (Rom. 8:18-23)

According to R. H. Boll's pronunciation, "the groaning of creation" cannot cease, if Christ does not start an earthly millennium when he comes! He insists that all of us, including the Lord himself, must take his word for that.

It is in order, as in the other cases, to take a look at the passage, to see if his reference has even an inference of the thing that he asserts it "bears out."

18. For I reckon that the sufferings of this present time are not worthy to be compared with the glory which shall be revealed in us.

19. For the earnest expectation of the creature waiteth for the manifestation of the sons of God.

20. For the creature was made subject to vanity, not willingly, but by reason of him who hath subjected the same in hope.

21. Because the creature itself also shall be delivered from the bondage of corruption into the glorious liberty of the children of God.

22. For we know that the whole creation groaneth and travaileth in pain together until now.

23. And not only they, but ourselves also, which have the first-fruits of the Spirit, even we ourselves groan within ourselves, waiting for the adoption, to-wit, the redemption of our body.

The Bollistic Chattanooga document asserts that this passage contains the "essential point in premillennial teaching" by assuming that when the "groaning" is lifted from "the whole creation" it will be the millennium! That depends, at least in part, on the meaning of "the creature" and "the creation," and the "bondage" and the "adoption" and the "redemption" which are referred to in the text.

1. The creation does not include the children of God, because verse 19 says that it waits for the manifestation of the children of God, and verse 21 also mentions it in contrast with the children of God.

2. The creation does not include Paul, because in verse 23 he says "but our rational also," thus referring to the creation in contrast with and over against himself. And he further states that it shall be delivered into the liberty of the children of God, which could not mean that the children of God will be delivered into themselves.

3. The "creation" does not refer to mankind since Paul holds himself and the children of God over against and in contrast with the creation by saying "not only so, but we ourselves." If it means mankind, then Paul and the children of God would be no part of mankind.

4. It does not refer to the sinner for sinners will not be "delivered from the bondage of corruption into the glorious liberty of the children of God."

5. The conclusion is that the creation refers to the world, apart from humanity, in its cursed state, represented as "groaning" (figuratively) until the time that the children of God shall be delivered from the earthly, corruptible existence into the liberty of the incorruptible, resurrection or eternal state.

Beginning with the 15th verse of the chapter the apostle assures the Roman Christians, living under the yoke of the virtual slavery of a pagan power, that they had not received the spirit of slaves, as before their conversion, to serve in fear, but the spirit of children, who by adoption can claim all the privileges of a child, and an heir. The Holy Spirit and their own spirit, through divine revelation, had united in a conjoint testimony, one giving and the other receiving the witness to this fact (verse 16). But if we are to be joint-heirs with Him, shall we be exempted from His sufferings?, No; joint-heirship must be had upon the condition of joint-suffering—if we are heirs with him, we must suffer with him (verse 17). But these sufferings are insignificant when compared with the benefits of the resurrection state which shall be so much greater and which shall be "revealed in us" in the resurrection from the grave (verse 18). But during this "present time" the world itself, is under the blight of sin and suffers corruption and decay (verses 19, 20), until the children of God receive their new adoption—the redemption of the body from death and corruption (verses 21-22), when they shall be manifested in the resurrection without the bondage of earthly existence (verse 23) in the "new heavens and the new earth" (II Pet. 3:13).

The apostle then declares that we are saved in this hope (verse 24) of deliverance from the grave and the glory that follows: and we are willing to wait and suffer in this world for such a redemption (verse 25).

For premillennialists to insist that there will be a millennium between the "redemption of the body" and the "new heavens and the new earth" is but another example of arbitrary assertion. Premillennialists themselves put "the new heavens and the new earth" in their scheme of things, after the millennium. (See Neal's "Light in a Dark Place" and Tingley's "Unveiling the Future." They order is: (1) the second coming; (2) the first resurrection; (3) the millennium; (4) the second resurrection; (5) the "new heavens and earth,"
the final or eternal state. In their own order of things, therefore, "when the groaning of creation shall cease" can refer to the "new heavens and the new earth" just as well as it can refer to their manufactured millennium-and that is the truth of "the matter in Rom. 8, as in II Pet. 3. The admissions of premillennialists on this point are fatal to their theory, and when Rom. 8:18-23 is paralleled with II Cor. 4:17 to 5:4, and II Pet. 3:8-13, it can be readily seen that these grand passages set forth the glories of the eternal state in the home of the soul, and not an earthly state robbed of its earthliness here on this earth and in this world.

So, stripping the Bollistic document of Rom. 8:18-23, we will now take up the references in that document to Revelation.

"WHEN THE KINGDOM OF THE WORLD SHALL BECOME THE KINGDOM OF THE LORD AND OF HIS CHRIST"

(Rev. 11:15)

This outline of the essential point of premillennialism puts the two references from the Book of Revelation as follows:

"...when Satan shall be dethroned, bound and imprisoned (Rev. 20:1) — when the kingdom of the world shall become the kingdom of the Lord and of His Christ (Rev. 11:15) — if there is ever to be such a time as that (and the word of God bears that out) - then Christ must and will come before that time.

It is evident to anyone familiar with premillennial doctrine that the only purpose the author of the millennial document under review could have had in throwing the two passages together in the above fashion was to confuse the reader, create a vagueness and raise a smoke screen. I make this charge for this reason: R. H. Boll and all premillennialists know that in their own scheme of things Rev. 11:15 refers to the end of time and not to the millennium. I say this is conceded by their own theory, for in Rev. 11:15 the seventh trumpet has sounded and the end of time has come. Why, then, should R. H. Boll refer to Rev. 11:15 and, with his pious gesture, declare that "Christ must and will come before that time"? It only amounts to saying that Christ must and will come before the end of time! What has that to do with any point of premillennialism? Absolutely nothing. But quoting the passage in that connection gives it the sound of teaching premillennialism, and the use of it in the connection in which it is used is sheer hypocrisy and crass deception. Read the passage:

"And the seventh angel sounded; and there were great voices in heaven, saying, The kingdoms of this world are become the kingdoms of our Lord, and of His Christ; and He shall reign for ever and ever." (Rev. 11:15)

Notice the structure of this verse: The kingdoms of this world are become the kingdoms of our Lord and of His Christ. It is evident that "our Lord" in the passage is not Christ, for it says "and of His Christ." Then, the expression, "and He shall reign, for ever and ever" cannot refer to the reign of Christ, for the pronoun "He" refers to "our Lord" as its antecedent. It therefore reads: The kingdoms of this world are become the kingdoms of our Lord (God) and of His Christ (Jesus); and He (God) shall reign for ever and ever.

In Corinthians 15:24-28, Paul pictures the end, when Christ at his coming, delivers the kingdom to God, when death, the last enemy, has been destroyed, when all things are subdued and Christ himself, having delivered the kingdom to God, is subject to the Father-and God is "all in all." Rev. 11:15, even by premillennialists, must be assigned that place-at the end. It is too late for the millennium. It pictures the time when God is "all in all" and He (God, not Christ) shall reign for ever and ever. That will be in eternity, not in time, in heaven, not on earth.

There seems to be no limit to the devices of deception to which these theorists in the church will resort to beguile the simple.

In our next, we shall expose their misuse of the twentieth chapter of Revelation, after which will come the closing number of this series on "Some Utterances From Alexander Campbell," concerning which they have made so many intimations. The simple truth of the matter is, that R. H. Boll and his party have nothing in fact or in fancy upon which to stand, and not one single "point" will be left in their "premillennial teaching.

Premillennial Articles Commended

"Dear Brother Foy: Brother Allen Robertson has just brought into the office sixty-five copies of the Bible Banner for each month, January, February, March. I want to thank you for this donation. I shall hand them to our boys and urge their reading of every line and especially of your review of R. H. Boll. Your comment on Isa. 2 is, without doubt, the truth regarding "swords" and "spears." Such has been my conception of the passage for a number of years. I hope all may be well with you. N. B. Hardeeman.

(Note: The copies of the Bible Banner were sent in response to a request from the body of young preachers at Freed-Hardeman College-a very fine group, indeed.-Editor.)

CONCERNING WAR

(Continued from page 1)

I heard years ago. A group were going to raid a watermelon patch. When they got to the fence, one said, "You boys go on in and get the watermelons, and bring them out; I will wait here; you see I am a member of the church." I think you see the point.

I know that Paul says that we should not return evil for evil, nor avenge ourselves, but to give place to the wrath of God, and that vengeance belongs to God. But that, like the command of the Old Testament, "Thou shalt not kill," is a command against an individual's taking matters in his own hand; Paul goes on to show that God executes wrath on evil doers through the agency of the civil government. And here is one work in which some brethren will not cooperate with God; they will have no fellowship with Him in that sort of thing.

5. And here is another thing that confronted me. I am a citizen of the United States. Can a man afford to be a member of any organization of any sort unless he is willing to perform all the duties that belong to members of that organization?

I would not be radical on the subject; I merely state some problems. But I must not close without this one other note about Paul: When Festus, at the request of the Jews, would send Paul to Jerusalem to be judged there, Paul said, "I am standing before Caesar's judgment-seat, where I ought to be judged: to the Jews have I done no wrong, as thou also very well knowest. If then I am a wrong-doer, and have committed anything worthy of death, I refuse not to die; but if none of these things is true whereof these accuse me, no man can give me up unto them. I appeal unto Caesar." (Acts 25:9-11.) In that appeal Paul invoked all the powers of the Roman government both civil and military. And also in that plea he was resisting the evil designs of the Jews,
WHO WANTS A DEBATE?

CLED E. WALLACE

Whoever wrote that three-page outburst of irritation in the Gospel Advocate, over the way the Bible Banner carries on, could not have been very sincere in his demands to meet Brother Boles on the “war question.” It is a fact that Brother Boles sent written challenges to the editor of the Bible Banner, C. R. Nichol, R. L. Whiteside and me. Brethren Nichol and Whiteside are on the Gospel Advocate staff. Brother Nichol got replies from the challenged, at least one from each one on his list, but he didn’t get a debate and seems inclined to do a little crowing over the matter. On the assumption that the opposition has fled the field and left Brother Boles in undisputed possession of it, it is pertinent to ask what Brother Boles is doing with the field. How much information has he or the editor of the Gospel Advocate given their readers on the “war question”? Since they are willing to debate it, why are they so reluctant about discussing it in their own paper? About all they have said about it so far is that they had rather obey God than men, as though they had a monopoly on that holy sentiment. Begging a question comes a lot easier than discussing it.

Does Brother Boles really want to debate? What did these men, two of whom are staff-writers on the Gospel Advocate, say to Brother Boles in answer to his challenge? It would be right “nice” if Brother Boles would tell the readers of the Gospel Advocate. They could not accept the proposition Brother Boles submitted for them to affirm because it did not define the issue, nor did it even represent their views. They made that clear. Their objections did not even rate a reply from Brother Boles. He evidently did not want to meet Brother Whiteside to ask them to frame a proposition they would be willing to affirm, for him to consider. The editor of the Gospel Advocate took over and suggested that we fled from the battle “as the better part of valor.” He thinks we did not fight and run away to live to fight another day, we just ran away. Some are likely to wonder whether the Advocate wanted a debate, or just something to crow about, and decided they could crow better without a debate than with one.

A little over a year ago, Brother D. A. Sommer of the Macedonian Call submitted propositions to Brother Boles for a debate on some matters of difference between them. Did Brother Boles debate? He did not. He objected to the propositions submitted to him, and he was not very gentle in the way he said so. He said in a letter to Brother Sommer: “Permit me to make reply in a kind and frank manner.” As I read that letter, it may be called “frank” but I cannot see that it is over-loaded with kindness. Said Brother Boles to Brother Sommer:

“There are indefinito and very evasive and unskillfully drafted. You either have written these propositions so that you knew that I would not accept them or else you did not know how to draft propositions for debate. . . . Why waste time in discussing such a clumsy proposition? Your fourth proposition sets forth no issue in a definite way between us. I am persuaded that you knew this.

“If you really want to debate you can get it. I have no time to waste with anyone who is not a Christian gentleman and one who will not maintain Christian conduct during a discussion. Many preachers do not know, it seems, how to treat an opponent in a courteous and Christian way. If you are not willing to do this you need not make a reply to this letter; if you are willing then you may sign the enclosed propositions and we will arrange a suitable time and place in Indianapolis for the discussion. Your signing the two enclosed propositions will be proof that you sincerely desire a discussion.”

It appears in this case that Brother Sommer was the challenged party. Brother Boles made it pretty clear that he thought Brother Sommer was trying to get out of a debate by submitting “evasive and unskillfully drafted” propositions which were too “clumsy” for him to even consider and he was “persuaded” that Brother Sommer “knew” that he was dodging the issue. Evidently, somebody did not “really want to debate” for neither Brother Sommer nor Brother Boles “got it.” The desire for debate was not smothered in Brother Boles by his failure to lure Brother Sommer into the open “in a kind and frank manner.” He challenged Nichol, Whiteside and Wallace on the “war question.” It is my impression, and I think I know, that they think Brother Boles’ proposition was “very evasive and unskillfully drafted” and “clumsy” to boot. They are quite sure that it does not set forth the “issue in a definite way between us.” And somehow I have picked up the idea that they are “persuaded” that Brother Boles “knew this” when he submitted the “clumsy” thing and that it would be a waste of time to debate it, even if they believed it, which they didn’t.

The idea of asking a man to affirm a proposition he does not believe, and then crowing around about him not wanting to debate because he will not affirm it! I am wondering if there is any way for me to get it over to the readers “in a kind and frank manner” that such maneuvering is pretty childish.

Brother Boles seems pretty sure that Brother Sommer did not want a debate and knew how to get out of it. If he can get that idea over “in a kind and frank manner” some other polemic Chesterfield might be able to prove that Brother Boles does not really want to debate. But it is absurd for some people to think he does. The way he has gone at it would at least lend plausibility to that thesis. He is somewhat arbitrary. He says in effect: “Here is a proposition I have. written out for you, I want you to affirm. If you are not willing to accept it, there is only one conclusion to draw. You do not want to debate, and prefer to run rather than stand and fight.” I have known sectarians to resort to such tactics but I “really” did not expect it of Brother Boles.

Besides, I am not so sure that we could get a debate out of Brother Boles if we “really” wanted one. He has “no time to waste with anyone who is not a Christian gentleman.” I was under the impression we could qualify along that line until I read some recent personal attacks on the editorial page of the Gospel Advocate, but now I doubt it. I have heard that Brother Boles “passed on it” although I was under the impression that Brother Goodpasture was the editor and did not need to be “passed on.” If he was out fishing for “a Christian gentleman” to debate with, I am wondering, in view of the editor’s opinion of us, which he seems to have “passed on,” why he did not confine his challenges to Nichol and Whiteside and leave us out of it.

Since the matter of gentlemanly conduct has come up, it seems that whoever wrote that bitter editorial about us has already “passed on” those Dorris letters to me and given advance notice of their publication. They appear to have the endorsement of the Gospel Advocate. When they appear, they are going to be a sensational revelation to the public of the Advocate’s idea of “a Christian gentleman” and “maintaining Christian conduct during a discussion.” Since the Advocate endorses these letters, I think it ought to publish the first one in its columns as a sort of foretaste of what the public is about to receive. When this happens, I’m not too sure that Brother Boles will thank Brother Goodpasture for yoking him up with Brother Dorris and making a public exhibit of them as two of a kind. I already think the editor has done Brother Boles an injustice. Under the circumstances, as nasty a stink as they will raise, I’m not going out of my way to prevent the publication of these letters. If the Advocate and its editor think they can survive the repercussions without getting some of the bad smell on them, they can’t say I did not warn them. Personally, I think it is a threat that hasn’t scared anybody. I do
not believe the letters will be published as they were written. I am preserving the originals for comparison. I already feel a deep sense of regret over the fact that the editor has already lowered the standards of a high-class journal like the Gospel Advocate to the level of endorsing such a riot of abuse and downrightness "nas'ness." And he has said some things on his own in the way of personal digs, that are too little to merit a reply from me and I am content to leave it to the reader to find an answer for it in his own mind.

The editor of the Gospel Advocate is in all probability a lot better than the editorial he inserted when under the spell of irritation. We devoutly hope that events justify that view, both for his sake and that of the Advocate.

He assumes too much for himself at the expense of others. "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 assumes in this that he and the brethren who agree with him on the government question have a virtual if not a complete monopoly on loyalty to God. I think I am as loyal to God as Brother Goodpasture is. If "the powers that be" clash with God's will, I am also minded to "hearken to God rather than men." I also think that Brother Goodpasture is poorly informed as to what God's will is in some things that have come up for discussion. Besides if "this editor" is concerned with "God's revealed will" and is anxious "to hearken to God," he should not "war according to the flesh" and employ "the weapons of the flesh" like he did when he wrote that editorial, if he wrote it. If he thinks that Brother Dorriss was using a spiritual weapon when he wrote those letters, then I fear he is in a bad way. I think that both Brother Goodpasture and Brother Dorriss are warring "according to the flesh" and that they ought to buffet their bodies and bring them into subjection.

THE RANTING OF A RADICAL

C. E. W.

It is unfortunate when a teacher, preacher or editor becomes so radical that sober-minded people feel inclined to discount anything he says on any subject or ignore it altogether. I think many people whose right minds will feel that Brother James L. Lovell's answer to a sister's question about "war" is pretty raw. He says to her in a late issue of the West Coast Christian:

"Sister, I could be wrong too, but if I could get my religion working before I grabbed a gun, I would rather see my wife and child raped and killed; myself burned at the stake. My home destroyed, my nation captured, than to take the life of one person. If I could get my religion working before I grabbed a gun, I would rather see my wife and daughter, his life and home, and the life and liberty of his whole nation. I think more of my women folks and my nation than that and I believe that God does. Jimmie would just look on and do nothing about it, even if he could, unless the extremity of his wife and daughter made him forget that he had religion. I Jimmie used to be sheriff of a county, I understand, and carried a gun. I do not know how much "religion" he had then, but I'm inclined to think, judging from the way he writes, that he had more sense than he has now. He must feel mighty holy talking like he does! If he knew how many people are ashamed of him, he might pipe down. By the way, Brother Goodpasture, Jimmie has changed too. What do you think of him? I suppose he is also hearkening to God rather than men and "is willing to suffer whatever consequences this course may bring." Personally, I do not think God told Jimmie to write a fool thing like that. Wonder if he would lock his door to keep an intruder out? He seems to be a complete washout as far as affording any protection to his wife and daughter is concerned in the most heart-breaking extremity that could come to them. They have my sympathy and I do hope that if they ever face any such danger, that some friendly sinner will be on hand to do them a good turn their husband and father's "religion" will not allow him to afford them. As for the nation there are not enough people in it with Jimmie's sort of "religion" to endanger it. I'm not worried about him being "burned at the stake." He is too green to burn.

That brings up something else. I learn from Brother Goodpasture, or whoever wrote that three-page fit of temper in the Gospel Advocate, that we wickedly distorted facts when we stated something to the effect that David Lipscomb College enjoyed the protection of an "armed officer" or something like, during the administration of Brother Boles. Brother Boles has finally denied it, or at least denied that he had anything to do with it. If we were misinformed about it, or even lied about it, that does not eliminate the temptation to make some further observations and ask some more questions. There seems to be a question of veracity involved in this that we will leave for others to settle among themselves. Some say they did, Brother Boles says they didn't. So what? I suppose we are justified in concluding from Brother Boles' late denial that it would be against his principles to have an armed guard to protect lives and property at David Lipscomb College, even if he were needed. There is a dormitory out there full of girls. It would be wrong to have an armed watchman at night empowered to prevent by force, if necessary, an intruder entering the dormitories where girls slept or prevent burglars from plying their trade in the buildings. If this is still the condition out at the college and it is generally known, some criminal or pervert might conclude that he could have easy picking out that-away. One result might be that some father in Arkansas or Kentucky might conclude that he had better send his daughter to a school where it was considered right for her to have some protection. She could need more than Brother Boles' prayers. He has a definite connection with the Gospel Advocate organization. Its office is in the building of the McQuiddy Printing Company. If I am not badly misinformed, lied to in fact, a watchman is employed to make regular rounds to see that nobody enters there who has no business there. It is my understanding that Brother McQuiddy owns a controlling interest in the Gospel Advocate and Brother Goodpasture has some stock in the company. If they can enjoy such protection, why would it be so terrible for the young women in a David Lipscomb dormitory to enjoy it? Or has Brother Goodpasture or Brother Boles persuaded Brother McQuiddy to dismiss the watchman? "After all, if we may judge the future by the past," I suggest that before another graceless thing like that goes in the Gospel Advocate, somebody ought to have Brother McQuiddy to "pass on it."
WIPING OUT A STIGMA

CLED E. WALLACE

It appears from an editorial in the Gospel Advocate, and from ten thousand letters that publicity director James L. Lovell has scattered about over the country, that “we” have a “stigma” on “our slate” that ought to be wiped out “soon.” Plans are in operation to clean the slate. It appears that “our slate” is so badly stagnated that “plans” for cleansing it had to be inaugurated, or “initiated upon a nation-wide scale.” It could not be expected, of course, that a plan on such a wide “scale” involving “we” and “us,” could escape the notice of an enterprising journal like the Bible Banner.

It seems to be in order to make some comments on the nature and size of the “stigma,” and the “plans” that have been “initiated” to remove it. The Gospel Advocate and publicity director Lovell are the main sources of our information. Brother Goodpasture has made it clear that he thinks that I am a lame duck, when it comes to sticking to “facts,” but I assure him that I do not willfully misrepresent facts and shall not do so in this case.

Here are some of the facts that have grown into a nation-wide “stigma” which is declared to be “a reflection on the church.” We have “around one hundred boys” “in conscientious objectors’ camps.” “These camps are operated by a National Service Board for Religious Objectors, under the supervision of the Friends, Brethren, and Mennonites.” According to Brother Goodpasture, the boys “we have” in these “camps” went there because their “consciences rule against their taking part in war.” If I understand the matter, they sought the refuge of “camps” under sectarian auspices, rather than do non-combatant service in the army. They are not ordinary conscientious objectors against bearing arms, but a sort of sublimated variety. If I am wrong about this, the Gospel Advocate will no doubt correct me in a nice, gentlemanly way, as is its wont in these latter days. It appears that “the Friends, Brethren, and Mennonites” have “spent nearly $15,000” on “our” boys because they had to. “The government demanded this.”

“The stigma upon the church” has been located by “our” “Service Committee for Conscientious Objectors” “in the minds of the Friends and others.” Now, of course, I am in no position to speak for “the church” like a “Service Committee” is, but I am a part of the church, and my understanding of such matters is that I do have a right to speak for myself, and do not feel inclined to let anybody else do my speaking for me, not even a “Service Committee.” If I had “a poorly educated conscience” like Brother Showalter says these boys have, and voluntarily sought refuge under the wings “of the Friends, Brethren, and Mennonites,” if it stirred up “a stigma,” I think I would feel bound to accept the responsibility and not saddle it off on “the church,” or allow anybody else to do so if I could help it. If I couldn’t do anything else, I would at least offer to alleviate the immediate embarrassment of those on whom I had thrust myself, by making a personal note to be paid after the war, if it should take me the rest of my natural life to lift the obligation. Should I ask for and receive support from “the denominations,” I think the “reflection” would be on me and not on “the church.” I am inclined to think that somebody has located “the stigma” in the wrong place.

Speaking of stigmas, in view of what Brother Goodpasture has said and has not said, I am wondering if he does not think that the greatest stigma that reflects on the church in the present crisis is in the large number of our, running into Che thousands, who are in the armed forces of our great country. His sympathy seems to be reserved for a few who refuse to put on a uniform, and run to “the denominations” for “support,” and create such a crisis or “stigma,” that some of the brethren feel impelled to organize a “Service Committee” to operate on “a nation-wide scale” to “wipe” it “from our slate.” The thousands of men in the army who are “our boys,” have created no such crisis, or any other kind; or is it so big, that even with its attitude toward government and war, the Gospel Advocate hasn’t screwed up courage to take hold of it? Possibly the Advocate thinks it “the better part of valor” to string along with a “Service Committee” newly organized among us to operate “on a nation-wide scale,” because a few of “our boys” are being supported by the denominations. It is something, when as few as “around one hundred boys” require an operation on such a wide scale, when even “many” of them are making arrangements whereby they “will be nearly self-supporting”! And some of them are supported by their parents. Just how many, are we to suppose, are left?

It reminds me of a story. A boy was leading a calf along a road and came to a narrow bridge. The calf walked up on the bridge and balked. No effort could get him forward or back him up. A man came up from behind in a car. The boy asked the driver to toot his horn and maybe the calf would go on across the bridge. The horn sounded and the scared calf jumped over the railing of the bridge into the creek bed and broke his neck. The boy said: “Mister, that was a whale of a toot for such a little calf.” It looks to me like the Gospel Advocate and Jimmie Lovell are doing some mighty loud tooting, considering the size of what they have to toot about.

If the Advocate is right in its position, even if it has been rather shy and insinuating, it puts the greater part of “the church” under a rather ugly “stigma.” Those of us who are “taking part in war,” and the Advocate admits it is on the unpopular side, are in direct disobedience to God, listen to men rather than to God, and “our boys” who are bearing arms are murderers in fact, or “slated” for it. How do the fathers and mothers of these boys feel about that? Brother Goodpasture has declined to answer questions designed to get an expression from him as to whether he thinks these boys ought to be withdrawn from by their congregations. Why? Is it something connected with “the better part of valor”? Let something be said that “reflects” on a sublimated variety of “conscientious objectors,” and he writes editorials about that, and you would think he is about to “call mourners;” but what has he said about “our boys” who are fighting and dying on Guadalcanal and in Africa, in defense of our liberties, that does not reflect on them? If we could think of some way “to handle a matter of this kind and do it scripturally” we might be tempted to organize a “Service Committee,” to operate “on a nation-wide scale” to remove the “stigma” Brother Goodpasture and others are trying to fasten on “our boys” in the army. There are more than “around one hundred” of them. However, we cannot think of any way to scripturally do a thing like that, so we shall try to get along the best way we can without a big horn to toot with. We may not be able to make as big a noise as a “Service Committee” can, with Jimmie Lovell as the official tooter, but we shall try to lift our voice to where it can be heard through rifts in the tumult. I do not recall hearing anybody affirm that Brother Goodpasture is an “ace-writer,” or even a “canny editor,” nor do I think anybody will be reckless enough to deny that Jimmie is an ace-tooter, even without the assistance and backing of a “Service Committee.” If I were on that committee, I would suggest a sub-committee to keep Jimmie’s horn tuned up so that it would not sound too raucous.
where "facts" are involved. He blew one too, without the aid of a committee, that shows his lack of responsibility when it comes to "publicity."

"If I could get my religion working before I grabbed a gun, I would rather see my wife and child raped and killed; myself burned at the stake, my home destroyed, my nation captured, than to take the life of another."

He means by "another," one who is hell-bent on perpetrating such criminal horror. Jimmie would not interfere, not he! He might hurt "another"! He is in "special charge of publicity" for the "Service Committee," to remove a "stigma" from "the church." I do not think the "stigma" is where he and Brother Goodpasture think it is. In his yen for "publicity," Jimmie has publicized the warped condition of his own conscience. What does Brother Goodpasture think about it?

The "Service Committee" evidently felt the need of some excuse for its existence. True, "Brother I. B. Bradley offers to receive and disburse funds." "A similar offer is found in the Firm Foundation." "Some wish to give through the treasury of their local congregations." Some wish to send directly to the young men. Some in the church are sending funds to service boards of the Friends and others." This was not enough. "We" must have a "Service Committee." "It has been necessary for the supporters of this work to assume a specific designation."

"Very well, "we" have it. There is no emphasis on organization," except "we" have a chairman, a treasurer of funds, a corresponding secretary, special counsel, auditor of accounts, and a director of publicity! Our aims are modest. "We are co-ordinating our efforts to do a work which we feel we should do." "We" do not propose to do much except carry on propaganda "upon a nation-wide scale" and seek "to co-ordinate efforts." "We" do not demand it, but "we should appreciate receiving a record of special gifts sent through any agency." If "around one hundred boys" with such vivid consciences, had known what a "stigma" they were about to stir up, they might have preferred to crawl off somewhere and die of hunger, rather than stir up a "nation-wide" crisis and dirty the "slate" of the whole church. As little as I think of the choice these "around one hundred boys" have made, I do not hold them wholly responsible for what has followed. Jimmie has been in a lather off and on-mostly off-for a long time because the brethren wouldn't "let" him work, or do anything, and now he has gone and done it, and is getting help from unexpected sources, the Gospel Advocate for instance. How have the mighty fallen! The Gospel Advocate must enjoy its role, playing tail for Jimmie's kite, but I doubt it.

But something had to be done! "There is no emphasis upon organization," is a sop the brethren are supposed to swallow. But "those who have been reading the religious journals published by members of the church know that there has been expression of strong feeling that we should not permit others to supply money which it would be the pleasure of many among us to supply." I did not know that such an effort was being made, or had been made. I do not recall it. Surely, one of the saints who would "see" his wife and daughter outraged, at his nation and home destroyed, and himself burned at the stake, before he would employ his powers to stop it, or even help, would not misrepresent a thing like that! Maybe he plans in future publicity, to tell us who has expressed "strong feeling that we should not 'permit' others to supply money," etc. Even Z have said I might chip in something, if Brother Goodpasture decided to pass the hat, but at the time, I did not dream that I was inviting Jimmie Love11 to come down tooting a horn for a committee! I hope Brother Goodpasture does not write an editorial, trying to prove that the whole scheme grew out of that little suggestion on my part.

The editor of the Gospel Advocate does not wish the brethren to be alarmed. So he hands them this sedative. "When this particular work is completed, this committee will be disbanded." Now, I'm not so sure about that. I may know Jimmie better than Brother Goodpasture does. He may not yield his "publicity" place so easily. It may take more than a suggestion from the Gospel Advocate to make him yield up his horn after he has tooted it a few times. Why should the committee disband when "this particular work is completed"?

A little job like that may just whet its appetite for wider conquest. It might be decided that, if it could operate to remove "a stigma" occasioned by the need of "around one hundred boys," that a greater stigma upon "the church" existed, because of the neglected condition of a few thousands of lost souls throughout the nation. Jimmie might need some sort of a "Service Committee" with "no emphasis upon organization," of course, to do some mission work, the churches are failing to do. With a committee like that back of him, he could make a "publicity" noise like a State Evangelist. It seems that individual effort, and congregational activity among us, cannot operate properly without a few shots in the arm from a "Service Committee" of some sort. I'm just a humble sort of a Christian, and would not presume to dictate to anybody else, but I'll try to get along, a while anyway, without a committee. You know, when brethren begin to make "plans... upon a nation-wide scale" and organize a committee to co-ordinate the efforts of either churches or individuals, they are stepping out of bounds. They usually wind up by getting into such a habit of meddling with the churches and their affairs, they can't quit. A scriptural church ought to be able to remove any stigma that reflects on it without the help of an outside self-organized committee. Besides, a committee's main business seems to be to tell the brethren about their stigmas, and other ailments, which can usually be cured by sending money to the committee. A committee with "plans on a nation-wide scale" likes to handle other people's money. When I give anything I try to do it so that somebody gets it besides a committee. I don't like committees. If the brethren generally do not have any better judgment than this particular "Service Committee" seems to have, it is a stigma that needs to be removed, but it is entirely too big a job for a committee to tackle.

To Brother Goodpasture

1. Do you want America to win this war?
If so, aren't you obliged, and those who stand with you, to pitch in and help—either firing guns or aiding and abetting in one way or another those who actually are doing so?
If not, we are appalled.

2. Should members of the armed forces accepting combat duty be withdrawn from by their local churches?
If not, why is it wrong for Christians to prevent the despoilation of their security?
If so, what are you waiting for?

3. Were these queries answered in your recent "Gospel Advocate" blast?
If so, just where?

A. B. KEENAN, Detroit, Mich.
Daniel's Vision of the Kingdom

W. Curtis Porter

Through prophetic vision God often made known to men the things that were to occur in the future. The kingdom of Jesus Christ, and his reception of it at the hands of the Father, were thus pointed out to the prophet Daniel. He says: "I saw in the night visions, and, behold, one like the Son of man came with the clouds of heaven, and came to the Ancient of Days, and they brought him near before him. And there was given him dominion, and glory, and a kingdom, that all people, nations, and languages, should serve him: his dominion is an everlasting dominion, which shall not pass away, and his kingdom that which shall not be destroyed." (Dan. 7:13, 14.)

We have in this passage a number of thoughts presented that are of great significance, and they are worthy of our careful consideration. Two great persons are mentioned: one said to be "like the Son of man" and the other called "the Ancient of days." Both are referred to by the personal pronoun "him." "They brought him near before him." The one who is said to be like the Son of man "we at once recognize as the Son of God, Jesus the Redeemer of man and the Savior of the world. But who is the other that is called "the Ancient of days?"

A description of him is given in verses 9 and 10. Here we read: "I beheld till thrones were cast down, and the Ancient of days did sit, whose garment was white as snow, and the hair of his head like the pure wool: his throne was like the fiery flame, and his wheels as burning fire. A fiery stream issued and came forth from before him: thousand thousands ministered unto him, and ten thousand times ten thousand stood before him: the judgment was set, and the books were opened." This event was seen in another vision that Daniel had, and the description of "the Ancient of days" is such that it can only apply to God. So in the vision of our text Daniel saw the Son of man come to the Father who is called "the Ancient of days."

But the manner of his coming to God is also described, for Daniel saw him come with the clouds of heaven. There are just two events on record in the book of God that picture Jesus Christ as coming with the clouds. One of these was his ascension to heaven. We have it mentioned in Acts 1:9-11 in these words: "And when he had spoken these things, while they beheld, he was taken up; and a cloud received him out of their sight. And while they looked steadfastly toward heaven as he went up, behold, two men stood by them in white apparel; which also said, Ye men of Galilee, why stand ye gazing up into heaven? this same Jesus, which is taken up from you into heaven, shall so come in like manner as ye have seen him go into heaven." The other event is mentioned even in this passage—his second coming—"for he will come in like manner as he went away." Since he went away in the clouds of heaven, he will also make his second advent into the world with the clouds of heaven. This we are definitely told a number of times. In Rev. 1:7 we read: "Behold, he cometh with clouds; and every eye shall see him." And Jesus tells us in Matt. 24:30 that "then shall appear the sign of the Son of man in heaven: and then shall all the tribes of the earth mourn, and they shall see the Son of man coming in the clouds of heaven with power and great glory." So Jesus ascended to heaven in the clouds, and he will come the second time in the clouds of heaven.

The incidents, therefore, mentioned in the vision of Daniel regarding the kingdom either took place when the Lord went to heaven, or they will take place at his return to earth, for Daniel saw him coming with the clouds of heaven.

But what happened when he came with the clouds of heaven to the Ancient of Days? "There was given him dominion, and glory, and a kingdom." This took place after he came with the clouds to the Ancient of Days and after he was brought near before him. When, therefore, did Jesus receive this kingdom? There are many who contend that this will be fulfilled at the return of Jesus from heaven, when he descends with the clouds. It is claimed that he will then establish his throne in Jerusalem, receive his kingdom, and reign over all the earth. But the very language of the text shows the impossibility of such an interpretation. The kingdom, according to Daniel, was given him when he came to the Ancient of Days, when he came to God. But at the second coming of Jesus he will not be coming to God in the clouds—he will be coming from God. The kingdom was not received, according to Daniel's vision, when he came from God but when he came to God. And the only time that Jesus ever came to God in the clouds of heaven was when he ascended to heaven. At that time he was given dominion, glory and a kingdom. This agrees perfectly with the parable uttered by Jesus in Luke 19:11-27. In this we are told: "As they heard these things, he added> and spake a parable, because he was nigh to Jerusalem, and because they thought that the kingdom of God should immediately appear. He said therefore, A certain nobleman went into a far country to receive for himself a kingdom, and to return." (Vs. 11 and 12.)

The nobleman in this parable certainly represents the Son of God. The "far country" to which he went represents heaven. The "return" of the nobleman represents the second coming of Jesus Christ. Now note the fact that he received the kingdom in the far country after he went away and before his return. Denominational preachers today often insist that Jesus received his kingdom while he was on this earth; that he became king during that time; that he ruled upon his throne; that his disciples were his subjects; the world, his territory, and his will, his law. Hence they insist that no kingdom was received after he went away. They tell us that when he returns he will receive his millennial kingdom (whatever that is, but the Bible knows nothing about it) and reign on the earth. Now, I should like to know this. If Jesus set up his kingdom while he was on the earth before he went to the far country, and if he will set up another kingdom after his return from the far country, then what kingdom did he receive after he went to the far country and before his return? There is some kingdom thus to be received. The kingdom Jesus spoke of was not received while he was on earth, nor will it be received after he comes back from heaven; for he "went into a far country to receive for himself a kingdom, and to return." This is the same kingdom that Daniel saw given to him after he came with the clouds of heaven to the Ancient of Days. It cannot be, as a gentleman told me recently, the glorified kingdom, for we will not reach the glorified state before Jesus returns. The only kingdom it can be is the kingdom that came with power on the day of Pentecost, according to Mark 9:1 and Acts 2:14, over which Jesus is now reigning as king, and into which all have been translated who have been delivered from the power of darkness. The passages clearly show that Jesus did not establish his kingdom during his personal ministry and that he will not do so at his second coming, but he received it after he went to heaven in the clouds.

But this kingdom was received, Daniel says, "that all people, nations, and languages should serve him." If this prophecy is yet to be fulfilled at the second coming of Christ, all nations have no right to serve him now, for it was received that they might do so. But do all nations have a right to serve him now? Note another prophecy, uttered by the prophet Isaiah, that mentions the same thing. He said: "And it shall come to pass..."
in the last days, that the mountain of the Lord’s house shall be established on the top of the mountains, and shall be exalted above the hills; and all nations shall flow unto it.” This agrees with the prophecy of Daniel that when the kingdom is received, or when the mountain of the Lord’s house is established, it will embrace all nations, that all nations will flow unto it, or all nations, languages and people will have a right to serve the Lord. Does this condition now exist? Are all nations embraced in his terms and provisions now? If so, then the kingdom has been already received. But all nations were not thus embraced during the personal ministry of Jesus. During that period he gave his apostles a commission that said: “Go not into the way of the Gentiles, and into any city of the Samaritans enter ye not: but go rather to the lost sheep of the house of Israel. And as ye go, preach, saying, The kingdom of heaven is at hand.” (Matt. 10:8-7.) They were not told to preach the kingdom of God has already come, but the kingdom is at hand. The expression, “at hands,” means near. In other words, the kingdom of God was soon to come. Nor were they allowed to proclaim the message to all nations. If the kingdom had already been received, they could have proclaimed it to all nations. But they were not allowed to preach to the Gentiles, nor even to the Samaritans; but were to preach to the Jews only, to the lost sheep of the house of Israel. But after Jesus arose from the dead he met his disciples and said to them: “Go ye therefore, and teach all nations, baptizing them in the name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Ghost: teaching them to observe all things whatsoever I have commanded you: and, lo, I am with you always, even unto the end of the world.” (Matt. 28:19.) Mark records the same commission in these words: “Go ye into all the world, and preach the gospel to every creature. He that believeth and is baptized shall be saved; but he that believeth not shall be damned.” (Mark 16:15, 16.) And Luke says: “Thus it behooved Christ to suffer, and to rise from the dead the third day: and that repentance and remission of sins should be preached in his name among all nations, beginning at Jerusalem.” (Luke 24:46, 47.) All these statements show that all nations were not embraced before Jesus arose from the dead. Nor could they begin immediately to proclaim the terms of that commission. The Lord said to them: “And, behold, I send the promise of my Father upon you: but tarry ye in the city of Jerusalem, until ye be endued with power from on high.” (Luke 24:49.) They had to wait in Jerusalem till the power was received. It came on the first Pentecost after the resurrection of Christ, and there and then they began to preach repentance and remission of sins in the name of Christ to all nations. Subsequently they went into all the world with the gospel, and Paul tells us that during his lifetime the gospel was preached to every creature under heaven. No geographical boundaries placed any restriction on gospel application. No race, or tribe, or color of men was excluded from its provisions. It is for every creature in all the world. Jew and Gentile and Samaritan alike were reached with the gospel of Jesus Christ. The kingdom of Jesus had been received by him in heaven before the Ancient of Days; he had dispatched his power to the apostles on earth; and they went forth with a message of hope for every nation, and tongue and people. Let earth rejoice that the kingdom has come, that Jesus now reigns as king in heaven, and that he invites men of every land beneath the sun to serve him. This benefit is not something that is postponed till his second coming, but it may be enjoyed now by all the nations of all the earth. Kingdoms have arisen and fallen, empires have been often overthrown, and nations have been forgotten in the rush of time; but Daniel tells us that the Lord’s “dominion is an everlasting dominion, which shall not pass away, and his kingdom that which shall not be destroyed.” And since we have received a kingdom that cannot be moved, let us serve God with reverence and godly fear.
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HAS THE CONDITION AT HARDING COLLEGE IMPROVED?

E. R. HARPER

In this article I shall do as I have always done when writing about Harding College, confine my remarks to principle rather than personal attacks upon the character of the men. In their bulletin you will find in their references to me such expressions as “political dictator,” “the Fuehrer,” “a wolf in sheep’s clothing,” and “deliberate hypocrisy.” Such attacks have never come from me, in private conversation, over the radio, or in my writings. I am interested only in the truth as it concerns the position that Harding College takes.

REPORTING A MEETING

Harding College students speak again. Read the following report and decide if such men are safe as the heads of the Bible department in our schools.

“A personal report of a meeting held in Brother J. N. Armstrong’s office on the night of June 1, 1942, with Brethren J. N. Armstrong, Batsell Baxter, T. H. Sherrill, Emmett F. Smith, and myself present. Written by me sometime after the meeting occurred, giving from memory things that were said and impressions made upon me.” Signed-Q. H. Gately.

“A few days before the meeting transpired, Brother Armstrong asked Brother Smith and myself to meet with him the following Monday night at his home. Later, however, he said for us to meet him in his office in the administration building of the college at about eight o’clock-giving as his reason that we would have more privacy.

“Brother Smith and I went over to the meeting together and found Brother Sherrill and Brother Baxter already there, although no mention had been made to us of their presence before that time. Brother Armstrong opened the meeting by explaining that he thought the lack of friendly feeling between him, Smith and me, was due to a misunderstanding of what he really believed, and he wanted to clear up that misunderstanding and pave the way for more amiable relations between us.

“Brother Armstrong then began reading from several pages of notes, which provided evidence that he had carefully planned his part of the meeting, endeavoring to prove that his views on the premillennial return of Christ were no more radical or different than several of the pioneer preachers and scholars of the church, by reading numerous excerpts from their writings. Some of these men were Lipscomb, Harding, Hinds, Larimore, and Brents. As I didn’t know exactly what these men taught I stated that it didn’t matter what these men taught, if it was not right. Brother Sherrill laughingly asked if I was trying to put myself ahead of them in scholarship, but no Bible proof of their statements was presented.

“Brother Armstrong went on to show that although they believed in different phases of Premillennialism that they were not disfellowshiped but rather held in high esteem. To that I replied that if they taught Premillennialism, they should have been. Whereupon Brother Armstrong asked me, What was so wrong and bad about Premillennialism? When I told him that the primary premise of Premillennialism was two bodily resurrections and the Bible taught only, one, he said that he wasn’t so sure but that the Bible taught that there would be two. He then brought up Rev. 20:6 and commented that as the Bible named the first resurrection there must be a second one implied. When I remarked that that passage was figurative, he asked, how I knew, and if it were, what did it really mean? When I said I didn’t know exactly, he said that if I admitted that I didn’t know, how could I be so positive’ that there were not two resurrections mentioned?

“Brother Armstrong went to I Cor. 15:23-24 to prove that there would be time between the coming of Christ and the end of time. This was provoked by my statement that I understood from the Bible that there would be no time measure after Christ’s return. He went into the Greek to prove that the ‘then’ in verse 24 carried with it the idea of a lapse of time. Smith and I, after some quibbling, were forced off our positions by our lack of the knowledge of Greek. Brother Smith brought up John 5:28-29 to show that there was one resurrection. After which I used Acts 24:15 to a good advantage to supplement his arguments. When Brother Baxter endorsed our position on that, Brother Sherrill commented that we should make those passages harmonize with the more plain passages of I Cor. 15:23-24.

“Another inquiry from Brother Armstrong concerning the evils of Premillennialism brought from me that they had pushed their theory to the dividing of churches. When asked for names Brother Smith, Brother Baxter and I named Louisville, Ky.; Winchester, Ky., and Dallas, Texas. Then Brother Armstrong insisted that the divisions in those places were caused by the opponents of Boll and his men, that Boll never split any church and that everything would be forgotten soon if men like Foy E. Wallace, Jr., and E. R. Harper would quit disturbing everybody about it. He then brought up how that Brother Harper had caused trouble in the church at Morrilton, Pine Bluff and Camden. Brother Baxter, who had preached there regularly last winter cleared that situation up by mentioning that apparently there were two factions there and indicated that they had been for a long time. But we all agreed on the fact that Brother Harper has done some good there by his meetings in the past three years. No one present knew very much about the condition that Brother Armstrong said existed at Pine Bluff, but as I am well acquainted with all the happenings in Camden, we quibbled about that for some time. I remarked that I knew that the leaders of the church there were disagrees with an attempt to undermine the meeting by sending literature to the town condemning Harper. Brother Armstrong countered with the statement that so far as he knew only a very few bulletins were sent and they had been requested by members of the church at Camden. He (Brother Armstrong) and Brother Sherrill both cautioned Brother Smith and me not to believe everything that Brother Harper told us. They did not seem to realize that we had seen the documentary evidence about those things that Brother Harper has in his possession.

“Brother Smith and I then questioned the prudence with which the school has been operated in favor of the Premillennial bunch.

“Brother Armstrong said we should be broadminded enough to hear both sides of the issue and suggested that the reason so many prominent Premillennialists have appeared before the college assembly was that he had had others to speak against the theory such as C. R. Nichol and L. Leo Boles. He said

...
that he would be glad to have one of them come again and lecture a week against the theory but he thought that the following week there should be some one of the Boll faction to speak for it. He further stated that he would never consent to any kind of a debate being held on the subject before the college assembly, giving as his reason that the spirit of debating is detrimental to the cause of Christ and would do more harm than good.

"That part of the meeting being over Brother Sherrill then tried to explain the reason for calling off a debate between Brother Smith and me the previous week. It was one of a group of practice debates supervised by Brother Sherrill on Premillennialism with Brother Smith taking the false side. Brother Sherrill gave as his reasons that he found out that we were going to expose Brother Armstrong’s position on the subject and that we had invited several preachers from the state. He said that it was not open to outsiders, although the week before when we debated on a different phase of the same subject there were over twenty-five visitors from out of town (Searcy) that are known to be Premillennialists.

"This statement true as to facts."

(Signed) —“Q. H. Gately, ‘EMMITT SMITH.’”

(NOTE: Brother Smith and Brother Gately are both preachers. Brother Gately is a graduate, and Brother Smith has had two years at Harding.-E. R. HARPER.)

SUMMARY OF FACTS

1. Brother Armstrong is not understood by his own students, according to himself.
2. He begs for a more friendly feeling between him and the preachers.
3. He tried to prove that his views on “the premillennial return of Christ” are no more radical than others. (We have been told that he did not have any such views.)
4. He contends that we should make no difference between the Premillennialists and those who oppose it.
5. He demands of the boys to know what is wrong with Premillennialism, when he should be the one to show them what is wrong with it.
6. He defends the “two resurrections” theory, giving Rev. 20 as the proof.
7. He declared that there would be a “space of time” between the “coming” of Christ and the “end.” His proof was I Cor. 15:23-24, and he tried to prove it by the Greek.
8. He denied that Boll and his men have divided the church but declared that the division was brought about by those opposed to him, and defended Boll and the Premillennial group.
9. He admitted that the school has been operated in favor of the Premillennial group. Keep that in mind.
10. He would be glad to have one who opposes Premillennialism to speak if the next week they would have Boll or one of his men.
11. He refused to have any kind of a debate before the student body on the Premillennial question because it would do more harm than good.
12. Sherrill called off a “practice debate” on the question because they were going to “expose Brother Armstrong’s theory” on the question. But their bulletin said that he had no theory, that he had never in a long life time, preached, taught, or written on the subject. Yet they knew his theory and were going to expose it.
13. It is plain to be seen that Brethren Sherrill and Armstrong tried to “browbeat” these boys, but they failed.
14. Let Sherrill meet me and stay off of these students. I will affirm that J. N. Armstrong is a Premillennialist, and will do it in Searcy.

 Efforts are being made to “agitite” and “stir up” the churches to respond to a post-war plan of religious work. This, like many other uncertain sounds,” started on the West Coast and is being relayed to us via Lubbock. The article by Brother Brewer announcing this plan was deemed so important, that it was published in two or three papers and was commended by at least one editor and one other doctor. The prominence given to the plan demands that it be given some attention. In scrutinizing it to discover its merits—which, by the way, become demerits when observed in the light of God’s word, there are some things that are to be noted and especially notice that they are contrary to the New Testament. The quotations I make from Brother Brewer’s article are taken from the Gospel Advocate, February 18, 1943.

Just who has jurisdiction in the selection of “missionaries” to the various countries is not made clear by the article, this point should be clarified.

Notice this quotation, it astonished me: “Some Christians are today beginning to prepare for such a campaign of missionary work as the world has never known.” If that statement is true, and I reckon it is because it is from the pen of Brother Brewer, some Christians are getting ready to do something they should not do. What is it about this newfangled “campaign of missionary work” that the “world has never known”? Have these Christians hatched up some new method of approach, a system of diplomacy such as the “world has never known”? Are these Christians so ambiguous and egotistic as to think that they will outrun the apostles and operate on a bigger scale and accomplish more than they did? Paul’s preaching turned the world upside down, what will happen when this plan is unleashed? It is not clear what there is about this plan that the “world has never known,” but I assert that whatever it is it will be unscriptural, and most probably when we find out what this new thing is, we will discover that it is not even new but that the denominations have had it for many years.

Brother Brewer’s article further informs us, quote, “the Lubbock Church sponsors this plan.” It is elsewhere in the article called a “movement.” Now it is obvious and cannot be reasonably contradicted, when other churches participate in this plan, they put themselves under the sponsorship of the Lubbock church, to the extent that they participate in the Lubbock sponsored plan. Please excuse me, I don’t want the church where I preach to be under the sponsorship of the Lubbock church in any way. I don’t mean any reflection on the Lubbock church—I am unacquainted with that church, it is just a scriptural principle that one church cannot sponsor another regardless of how small or how large.

The Bible dissents from the post-war feature of the Lubbock plan. I quote from the article, “in the fear that financial conditions will be in distress and that money will not be as free as it now is, these churches are urged to set apart a certain amount and to put it into a sinking fund which will be used to evangelize the other nations when the opportunity comes.” According to the article the plan will not go into operation until the war ends. Note what Paul said, “Behold, now is the acceptable time; behold, now is the day of salvation.” (II Cor. 6:2.) All the gospel work we have resources to do should be done now, because now is the day of salvation. We know not when the Lord will come and the world will ‘kid. If He comes before the war ends and examines the work of His servants, (Continued on page 13)
There is an effort made in the press to make it appear that the teaching that defends Christians in support of national defense to the extent of the government's divine mission is, from the standpoint of the Scriptures, parallel to defense of Premillennialism. It is therefore incumbent upon all, who oppose Premillennialism and also defend obedience to the government in "every good work," to speak for themselves. So in this capacity only, we quote and comment, omitting for the sake of brevity, the names of both papers and writers.

"It is always right to obey God, but who is ready to affirm that God has always told all men in all ages to do the same things?" No one whose position does not assume all that, is logically obligated to "affirm" all that; besides, all that is irrelevant. But we are vitally concerned with the important fact that commands of Inspiration to Christians in this age are sufficiently broad and inclusive to involve specific commands of the "minister of God," the temporal government, especially commands that pertain to its divine mission, and all such commands are comprehended in the following inspired command:

"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.) Thus, the command is so associated with the mission, the command is only modified by the government's divine mission; hence, scriptural obedience or disobedience to the command of the "minister of God" turns only on whether vengeance is on evil-doers or on them that do well. Hence, in the light of that mission, Christians are not to render blind obedience. Besides, Christianity contemplates Christians having "their senses exercised to discern good and evil." (Heb. 5:14.) So we are to discern between the government's divine mission, which is "to thee for good" (Romans 13:4), and departures from that mission, and to be governed accordingly. This divine principle calls for the exercise of human judgment, whether one elects to be a combatant or a non-combatant, but no more in the one course than in the other.

Acting under this principle and using such judgment, conscience, and evidence that he has, this writer in the present world war, has cast his lot with the United Nations. All Christians in all countries and islands of the sea may, under the same divine principle, decide for themselves as to whether the country in which they hold citizenship is fulfilling its divine mission as set forth in the New Testament, or abusing that mission, and be governed accordingly. This leaves the matter exactly where God's word leaves it. If it results in a brother fighting against brother, who is responsible for it? Precisely the same principle obtains in the case of religious divisions. All religious people are parties to division, for they are on one side or the other. God knows where to place the responsibility for such divisions. That the Scriptures sanction one side of a religious division in some cases, is seen in the command to "mark" and "turn away from" some religious people, which spells division. So it is just as unscriptural to condemn all sides to all wars as it is to condemn all sides to all religious division, for God has no more plainly legislated concerning spiritual affairs than temporal affairs; and may this truth be impressed.

That "the government does the bearing of the sword" through its armed citizenry; and that "the Christian does not resist the government or rise in rebellion to it" is not the issue. But the implication that the Christian's obedience is thus limited to merit passive obedience is the precise issue. By contrast to that implication, we quote an inspired command to Christians:

"Put them in mind to be in subjection to rulers, to authorities, to be obedient, to be ready unto every good work." (Titus 3:1.) But if as alleged, only non-resistance is called for, then what is the practical purpose of the inspired admonition "to be ready unto every good work"? Behold what absurdity a human theory involves when placed alongside the truth of Inspiration! Pray, tell me how a Christian can be only passively submissive to and at the same time "be ready unto every good work" of the government. So the passiveness of that theory does not tally with the intense concern implied in that inspired admonition.

As to the claim that the Premillennial "we" in the place of the textual "they" of Rev. 20:4 is parallel to the implied "we" in the place of the textual "he" of Romans 13:4, it is respectfully denied. For to the extent that Christians bear arms under the command of Romans 13:1; I Peter 2:13, 14; Titus 3:1; to that extent they are practically a part of the subject referred to in the text. In fact, the marginal reading suggests "it" for "he" referring to the government.

Again we quote: "If you say that 'we' are the government, then Romans 13 would have to be understood as saying that we obey ourselves." That is the first time I have ever seen an implied denial, so far as Christians are concerned, of Lincoln's famous definition: "Government by the people, of the people, and for the people." And according to that brand of logic, one could not obey the by-laws of a business organization of which one is a member, for that, too, would be obeying one's self. Civilization makes certain well-understood demands of all civilized people. Cannot one who is a member of that body-politic obey such demands? In spite of the assumption of his theory to the contrary, I am persuaded that the author of that theory is a civilized brother, but evidently has not given close thought to this subject.

I quote: "There is not a command, suggestion, or thought in Romans 13, or in the entire Bible, that a Christian, as such, must or should bear arms in carnal warfare." If assertions were proof, that would settle it. Indeed, one is not obligated merely on account of being "a Christian, as such." That fact alone neither qualifies nor disqualifies one scripturally; other factors may be involved. While one should be no more religiously than a Christian, that fact has nothing whatever to do with a Christian being several things not religious in other spheres. For example, like Paul and others, a Christian may hold citizenship in a temporal government. That fact and also whether the government is performing its divine mission (not violating it) are the obligating factors.

Furthermore, most of us are citizens of a temporal government by natural birth, for which we are not responsible. This citizenship in point of time (not in point of importance) has priority over spiritual citizenship. Hence, it is incumbent upon all who may dissent from this position, to prove by the Scriptures that a citizen of a temporal government renounces that citizenship by becoming a citizen of the spiritual kingdom. This logically places all such dissenters in the affirmative. May they speak to the point.
The foregoing article by Brother Stonestreet is to the point, and is right. The author of the article referred to in the Gospel Advocate should consider his parallels more carefully before breaking into print. The thing that kills his parallel is the fact “we” are not a part of the “they” or of what John was referring to in Revelation 20. But we are a part of the government under which we live and are therefore an integral part of the “he” of Romans 13. For instance, it was Paul who wrote Romans 13. But Paul was a Roman citizen and said so. Therefore, according to this brother’s article, Paul was himself a part of the “he” of Romans 13. Since it is admitted that “he” refers to the government, and Paul was a part of the “he,” and the brother says that “the government does the sword bearing,” it follows from his own argument that Paul could have been a sword-bearer as “a minister of God for good,” but a Christian today cannot be one! That just about kills his little lecture on what God has told men “in different ages” to do-wonder if he thinks Paul lived in “a different age” from the age in which we are living! Could the Roman citizen, as a Christian, who was a part of that “he” (government), do a thing that an American citizen, as a Christian today, cannot do?

The attempted argument that Christians are not a part of the “he” of Romans 13 would force the conclusion that there were no Roman citizens who were Christians, and no Christians who were Roman citizens. That makes it hard on Paul, the Roman citizen. On the other hand, if there were some Christians who were Roman citizens, and hence a part of the “he” (the government), and some Christians who were not Roman citizens, and hence not a part of the “he,” it follows that some Christians could be “a minister of God for good” in bearing the sword and some could not! According to that “brand of reasoning” some Christians could do a thing that other Christians could not do. The inevitable conclusion from the brother’s own argument (?) is that in order to be exempt from the responsibility of sword-bearing one would have to be an alien! In this “age” that would automatically exempt him, It has been very appropriately suggested that those who are arguing on the conscientious objector’s side of this question should, in order to be consistent, register as aliens.

The preacher who wrote the article referred to by Brother Stonestreet doubtless performs marriage ceremonies like all other preachers. When he does so, whose agent is he? Who gives him the authority to perform wedding ceremonies? The Bible does not. In that capacity he acts as a minister of the state. Therefore, when this preacher performs a marriage ceremony, as a civil officer, he makes himself a part of that “he,” of which he has said no Christian is a part. So that makes it hard on him, as well as Paul. As a civil officer in executing a marriage license he is in the same category with all other civil magistrates, doing the same thing. So, since the “he” of Romans 13 is the civil magistrate, what becomes of his contention that he, himself, is not a part of the “he”? But since he is a part of the “he” by his own official acts, then “he” could act in the capacity of a minister of God who “beareth not the sword in vain,” when it is “for good.”

The brother’s contention that a Christian is no part of the government (and if his line of thought does not mean that it does not mean anything) will force him to surrender his credentials as a civil magistrate in performing ceremonies. Let all parties contracting marriage in the section where he preaches be so advised. And the government, too, for I hardly think the government would pass out such credentials to anyone who admits that he is not a part of the government. If I believed that way, I wouldn’t accept the credentials nor would I perform such offices in and for the government.

It is becoming more and more evident that there are a lot of “Christians” (mostly among the preachers) who think it is quite all right to claim the privileges of a citizen, but altogether wrong to bear the responsibilities of one. Not being a part of the “he” of Romans 13 does not bar them from the privileges, it only exempts from responsibilities!

As for trying to parallel our contention on the government issue with the efforts of some who defend Premillennialism, that is absurd. They are in reverse gear in that effort. The very background of Premillennialism is the contention that all human government belongs to the devil and must be overthrown in order that Christ may set up his own government on earth, which will be the millennium. Russell taught it; Rutherford taught it; the Jehovah Witnesses cult still teach it—and some of our brethren appear to teach it. It is on the record that J. N. Armstrong teaches that all human government will be overthrown and there will be a period of time when no government will exist on earth except Christ’s own government. Whether it will last “one thousand or two thousand years,” he says he does not know—but that it will be the fulfillment of Dan. 2:44, he thinks he does know. All Premillennialists have similar ideas of it. So the silly attempt to link our contention with Premillennialism becomes a boomerang. The brethren who are opposing participation in civil and military government are themselves the ones who are yoked with the Premillennialists, for that is Premillennial doctrine in the very essence of it, including all shades and colors, forms and phases.

A man who cannot make better discriminations than that ought not to try to write-and a paper that will publish such an article as an argument on their side of the question must be hard pressed for something on the subject.—EDITOR.

(Continued from Page 11)
A new campaign of calumny has apparently been opened. The old one was born of the Davidson Movement and promoted by Premillenialists, their sympathizers, Boll devotees, and unity-meeting compromisers the brotherhood over. The new one appears to have been launched in the editorial pages of the Gospel Advocate and promoted by its editor.

While the fight was raging to keep the church from being delivered bodily into the control of a digressive-premillennial group, led by Clinton Davidson, the Gospel Advocate was too timid to participate in it. It would not violate editorial sanctity by taking part in the fight for the right against the insidious influences of the Davidson-Witty-Murch propaganda. The Gospel Advocate at that time appointed ‘an editorial committee’ to appease the Davidson element, and stated its policy. It was strictly a non-personalities policy, a virtual non-controversial policy. Later, it was felt necessary to ‘re-state’ its policy, and ever-so-often after to remind the readers of that policy.

But the Gospel Advocate has abandoned its policy. Perhaps the appeasement committee passed on it, or perhaps they did not—but the Gospel Advocate has abandoned its policy and has descended to the plane of low personalities. It is conducting a campaign of calumny—the most ignoble of all personalities, the kind that attacks character, not by open indictment but by veiled quotations, low insinuations and slimy slurs.

If the Gospel Advocate feels that it can afford to engage in such, it is their privilege to pursue that course. But the cause the Bible Banner upholds does not require it. We have often debated with men who would in the humiliation of defeat resort to personalities and mudslinging. We have always replied that the truth does not require that sort of thing, and men do not resort to it except when they have been defeated in their efforts at argument. Sectarian preachers may feel that they can afford to engage in such, but gospel preachers who are Christian gentlemen cannot do so.

If we should answer everything in the articles it would have no bearing on the issues involved. They are outstanding in two respects only: 1. The absence of argument; 2. The example of how an editor of reputation as a gentleman can act when he gets mad and loses his equilibrium. Readers of the Gospel Advocate have so expressed themselves to us in conversation and in letter. Therefore, so far as we are concerned, the Advocate and its editor are welcome to whatever they think they may gain by such a course. In pursuing it, they will rally around them the scattered remnants of the Davidson element, but in so doing they have also put the ‘Gospel Advocate’ (?) in the same class with certain other papers published by the ‘unmentionables’ among us. The Advocate is doing it to its own hurt.

“A DIVIDED HOUSE”

In an effort to mitigate the spectacle of a house divided against itself, as the Gospel Advocate surely is, reference was made to “important men” connected with the Bible Banner. Among the ones mentioned were E. G. Creacy and Yate-Tant, personal friends of the editor. After reading the editorial, Brother Tant made a trip from Chicago to Indianapolis to see me and spent two or three days in my meeting. He told me that he was “thoroughly disgusted” with the Goodpasture editorial, and thought everybody ought to be. As for Brother E. G. Creacy, the following words in a letter received from him will speak for itself.

Dear Brother Wallace:

I will write you a few lines tonight. I have had it in my system for several days to write to you since reading Brother Goodpasture’s editorial in the May 13th issue of the Advocate. I deeply regret that Brother Goodpasture became so ugly and personal in his attempt to answer your article in a recent issue of the Bible Banner. The idea of a man—a Christian—in his position? and with his reputation of being so nice and sweet, descending so low as to say the unbecoming things he has said. He refers to the fine magazine you published, as the “now defunct Gospel Guardian,” but when you published it, he praised it (Gospel Guardian, February, 1936, page 32). Has Brother Goodpasture changed? How can he slur a gospel magazine now, that he praised at one time? Among the un-Christian things he says, this one is in the list: “Yet there may be those who think he ranks higher as a grammarian than as a financier.” Brother Wallace, I want you to know that I do not approve such un-Christian attacks.

Brother Goodpasture has definitely convinced me that he is more interested in stabbing you, the Bible Banner, and trying to discredit the great work you have done in defending the church against the many isms and fads of the present day, than he is in defending the Conscientious Objectors. When has Brother Goodpasture ever fought a battle to save the church? When the Davidson Movement threatened the church, Brother Goodpasture was as silent as the grave-yard. Finally, by the help and encouragement of a good Brother (whose initials I can give), he did write one fairly good editorial against the Witty-Murch foolishness, but that was after the Bible Banner had killed the thing.

I have read all you have written, and I have read a lot that others have written. I haven’t seen any sign of bitterness upon your part, but I have seen plenty of it upon the part of some who are attacking you. While I cannot say that I am convinced that a Christian can consistently engage in carnal war, I think you have given us something to think about and to consider in the light of New Testament teaching. I believe you are sincere, and with pure motives. You have fought hard, suffered much, and I know you have done more than anyone (perhaps more than all others combined) to save the church from Premillennialism and its attendant evils. I love and appreciate you, and detest the ugly attacks upon you. I remember you regularly at the throne of grace. May you live long, enjoy good health, and continue to be humble and clean. Power be unto you.

Your true friend and brother in Christ,

E. G. CREACY.
even members of the church. What has that to do with the Gospel Advocate being a divided house? Not a thing. It is just a sample of some of the "subterfuge" and the "dodging" that the Advocate editor talks about. If the printers of the Bible Banner were the owners and publishers of it, as McQuiddy is of the Gospel Advocate, and were in disagreement with us on the issues, and we should challenge the editor of the Advocate for a debate on issues upon which we ourselves were divided, the cases would be parallel. But in the first place, the printers of the Bible Banner are neither its owners nor its publishers, and they have no connection whatever with it; and, in the second place, the Bible Banner has not challenged the editors of the Gospel Advocate nor anybody else for a debate on the issues. But Leon B. McQuiddy is the printer and the publisher and the owner of the Gospel Advocate. He does not agree with its editor on the issues and its editors do not agree among themselves on the issues. If that were the situation with us and we should challenge them for a debate, they could very consistently say (and don't you think they would?)—"you men debate it among yourselves." Now, that is precisely the status of the Boles "challenge" as it respects us. Where is the parallel? There is none.

The Advocate's effort is no more than a smokescreen to hide behind. The fact remains—an embarrassing fact—that the Gospel Advocate is a divided house on the war question, and it is poor grace for them to be challenging anybody else for a debate.

There is another embarrassing fact—namely, up to the latest information Brother H. Leo Boles had not even answered the letter from C. R. Nichol, one of his staff-members he challenged for the debate. They talk about somebody "refusing" to debate when they will not even answer letters from their own editors whom they challenged, who did not refuse to debate, but who left the way open for negotiation. "Does Brother Boles really want to debate" the government issue?

CONCERNING PROPOSITIONS

It has been pointed out in another article in this issue, that Brother Boles has himself refused to debate a proposition submitted to him by D. A. Sommer. He was challenged to affirm it is scriptural to teach the Bible through a human organization like David Lipscomb College. Brother Boles said the proposition was not fair. Still, it is a fact that David Lipscomb College is a human organization, and men teach the Bible in it, and I presume "through it," since the College pays "the dean of Bible" and "instructors" of Bible. Anyway, Brother Boles refused to debate the proposition. He demanded that Sommer do the affirming himself on a proposition that Brother Boles wrote out for him! He wanted Sommer to affirm that it is wrong for members of the faculty to teach the Bible in the college.

When the digressives want Brother Boles to affirm that it is wrong or sinful to use instrumental music in the church, Brother Boles refuses on the ground that he would be affirming a negative. But he submits the same kind of a negative proposition to Sommer, and says: "If you are sincere sign it." He says that Sommer knew that he would not sign the proposition which Sommer submitted to Boles, but he turned around and submitted one to Sommer that he knew Sommer would not sign. And he does the same thing with us—he submits a proposition which he should know that nobody would accept, and which Nichol and Whiteside both told him no man of their knowledge would affirm—but Nichol left the way open for negotiation of propositions and requested an answer, but Brother H. Leo Boles did not even answer his letter. Still the editor of the Advocate talks about somebody "declining" a debate!

Brother Boles writes the propositions, names the place, method and manner of the debate, and with an impressive gesture says: "Doing everything I say will be the proof that you are sincere."

There are two questions which require the attention of the Advocate if they can leave off the personalities long enough to answer them: First, why does Brother Boles not debate D. A. Sommer? Second, why does Brother Boles not answer C. R. Nichol?

"THE VENERABLE BRETHREN"

Brother Goodpasture refers to Brethren Boles and Dorris as "these venerable brethren." That, in itself, without any other cause, would let me out of a debate with him. I do not care to debate "venerable brethren." The word "venerable" means: (1) "Claiming veneration or respect through age..." (2) "Capable of being venerated—generally implying advanced age..." (3) "Respect mingled with awe, excited by the dignity, wisdom or superiority of a person, by sacredness of character..." (4) "To regard with reverential respect, or with admiration and deference as being hallowed, ... especially if accompanied with age..." (5) "Rendered sacred by religious, historic or other association that should be regarded with awe..."

I don't think anybody, except the editor of the Advocate, could read the Dorris letters and still call him "venerable!" As for Brother Boles, since the Advocate does regard him as "venerable," no one could blame me for "declining" to debate him on any proposition. It is entirely becoming in me to turn him over to men on his own staff who are nearer his age than I am. Just let him answer C. R. Nichol's letter, or tell us why he does not.

But B. C. Goodpasture is not "venerable." He is not an old man, and I am not an old man—in fact, I am younger than he is by several years. Does Brother Goodpasture want to "challenge" me for a debate? If he does, it might get some consideration, provided he will not draft a proposition that he knows nobody will accept, like Brother Boles says Brother Sommer did, and like Brother Nichol says Brother Boles did. I wonder what kind of a proposition he would be willing to affirm, since he seems to be so much interested in a debate, and has taken up the cudgel for his "venerable brethren."

It won't do them any good to start talking about the Boles' challenge all over again. He has never let his readers see the Boles' challenge in anything like its true light—he has not published the exchanges, and has not let his readers see what Nichol said to Boles. If they ever see it, I predict that it will be in the paper that "publishes facts that no other paper publishes."

We may yet find out how bad the editor of the Gospel Advocate wants a debate. Since he is already crying over the treatment his "venerable brethren" have received at our hands, that is another reason for me, a young man, not to debate with these old men. I am not wanting to debate anybody on the subject, but if nothing else will satisfy them, and B. C. Goodpasture wants to try his hand at it, I might waive the reasons for not doing so and take him on under provocation. But according to the terms Brother Boles dictated in his letter to Sommer, I have the right to name the place, dictate the arrangements and word the proposition!

CONCERNING ABRUPT CHANGES

The Advocate still talks around on the subject of "changing"—but it is still silent on H. Leo Boles' "abrupt change" on the Boll question. In 1927 Brother Boles said in the deliberation of debate, after a full investigation of the subject, that there was nothing in the teaching or practice of R. H. Boll that would keep him from fellowshipping him as a very worthy brother in Christ. But in 1936 he came out with the statement that Rom. 16:17 should be applied to R. H. Boll and his party,
that they should be “marked” and “avoided.” Who changed? Boll did not. The issue did not. There was no change in teaching or in practice during those few years. Men on the Gospel Advocate staff such as J. C. McQuiddy, F. W. Smith, F. B. Srygley, and M. C. Kurfees had already taken that stand seven years before. The Gospel Advocate had dismissed R. H. Boll as front page editor. The line had been drawn—R. H. Boll had been “marked.” H. Leo Boles knew all of that. The situation was no different in 1936 than it was in 1927 when all the other editors of the Advocate, except S. H. Hall, disagreed with the statement that Brother Boles made at the close of that discussion. The simple fact is, Brother Boles changed his attitude on the subject between 1927 and 1936. Was that an “abrupt change”? Between 1936 and 1943, a period of some seven years, I moved over into a consistent position on the government issue. The editor of the Advocate calls that an “abrupt change.” But between 1927 and 1936, a similar period of time, Brother Boles moved over into a consistent position on the Boll issue. And we can’t get the editor to tell us what kind of a change that was—he won’t talk about it, he just talks around it! But leave it to us and “Banquo’s ghost,” we will not let them forget it. Every time they mention an “abrupt change” we will remind them and everybody else about it. Sauce for the goose is salad dressing for the gander!

Incidentally, instead of something in the past haunting me, it is what we are writing now that is haunting the editor of the Advocate.

“WATCHMAN, WHAT OF THE NIGHT?”

On the matter of the “armed officer,” or watchman, out at David Lipscomb College, it was stated in two or three articles that “I have been told” that during Brother Boles’ administration such a watchman was engaged. Brother Goodpasture had mentioned several things that he “had been told,” so I gave him a sample of some things that I “had been told.” He now tells us that Brother Boles tells him that he did not employ an “armed guard” for the College. Well, we were not told that soldiers stood at the gates with bayonets! But we were told that the watchman on the premises carried a gun, and that it was done while Brother Boles was president. I now reaffirm that to be the very thing that I have been told again since the denial of it. It may be true that Brother Boles did not employ him, but he must have been employed by somebody. A young man who was a student in the college during the time that Brother Boles was the president has told me again that he went around with the watchman on his beat more than once, and not only saw the watchman’s pistol but handled it. There are people in Nashville, Tennessee, who have said that there was such a watchman at that time. There are people out of Nashville who have written to us to testify that they were students at that time and can verify the fact that there was an armed watchman. Of course, it is possible that Brother Boles and the college merely employed a watchman and left it up to him as to whether he would hire him or not. It is even possible that Brother Boles did not know, or want to know, that the watchman had a gun. But everybody knows there was a watchman, and some people say that they know there was a gun! So, you had better “hold on, Abner!”

On a question of veracity it might be a draw, and in that case we would all be left to form our own opinions and pass up the argument. The issue would then be reduced to the simple question: Why have a watchman, if he is not armed? If force should become necessary, what could an unarmed officer do? “Call out the police force,” says one; “let the sinners do it, we are all members of the church here on this campus!” And if the president of the college should hear some ominous noises, and inquire: “Watchman, what of the night”—the watchman could only reply: Danger, president, but there is nothing I can do about it!

There are two solutions to the situation. First, since it is being argued that it is right for sinners to do it, but wrong for Christians, the College could employ a sinner for a night watchman and let him be armed to protect the Christians. Or, second, as one writer and speaker, who has become more or less prominent in the discussion of these things, said that it would be all right to use “a whip” because Jesus drove them out of the temple that way—then, if the watchman is a member of the church, the College could just buy him a whip! True, a watchman with a whip would be at a decided disadvantage if he had to face a criminal armed with an automatic, but that is just one of the “consequences” Brother Goodpasture says one must take to keep from “changing” when “the going becomes hard.”

Since Brother Boles will not affirm that it is right for a Christian College to employ an armed watchman, maybe he would affirm that it is wrong for a Christian College to employ an armed watchman. So, they can still have the debate out at the college—among themselves, and advertise to all parents everywhere that the girls in a Christian institution cannot have the protection that they enjoy at home and elsewhere in society.

I certainly do not envy the position in which these brethren have placed themselves before sensible people.

In the not too distant past the equipment of the McQuiddy Printing Company was guarded by a watchman—the very equipment that prints Brother Goodpasture’s editorials against resistance was protected by a man prepared to resist a burglar. Consistency, 0, consistency, thou art a jewel!

AN EDITOR WHO WILL NOT CHANGE

Finally, the editor of the Advocate announces to the world that he has stated his views once for all and that he will not under any circumstances change, even when to do so would put him on “the popular side.” In a previous issue of the Advocate we were told that there were only two-just two-of the able pioneers who held our views on this issue. That sounded very much like we are the ones who are on the unpopular side. In that article the popular side was pictured as the side that Brother Goodpasture is on—and it was an editorial, too. But now he has “abruptly” become a martyr, is on the unpopular side, and says that he will not shift to the popular side. We are doing better than I thought we were in making converts on the issue!

If it is such a reproach to change views on a subject of this kind—why does Brother Boles challenge his fellow editors for a debate in order to try to “change” someone else? But the editor of the Advocate will not under any circumstances change. He assures everybody of it—and you can lay to that, as very the seaman would say. What an adamant editor! He reminds me of the fellow who would never admit that he was wrong, and when he fell downstairs head first, he jumped up and said, “That’s the way I come down all the time!” When a man says that he cannot be wrong on a thing, and under no circumstances will he ever change, does it represent the spirit of investigation? When the evidence turns against him it surely puts him in an evil situation. Such a statement will be taken by most people as evidence of a bitter, prejudiced and vindictive mind rather than a love for the truth and a willingness to accept it. It is just another position in which the editor of the Advocate places himself that I certainly do not envy.

If the Advocate “really wants to debate,” the venerable Brother Boles ought to negotiate with Brother Nichol or Brothel Whiteside—neither of them has “fled the field” as yet.