CONCERNING SEVERAL THINGS
CED E. WALLACE

THIS IS WAR

We join the thousands who know that no words can describe the horror that grips the soul when the message comes that "your son is missing in action." John was a first lieutenant in the A. A. F., First Pilot on a B-24 Liberator bomber. He went down over Italy. We cling to the hope that he is alive and will return to us. The flood of letters and telegrams coming from friends throughout the country shall receive my personal attention as fast as I can get to them. This is war and we are in it. We claim no exemptions from the responsibilities of citizenship in this great country of ours and we are taking ours with chins up and no whining.

A GOOD MEETING

We have just closed a good meeting here in Temple with the 7th St. and Ave. G. church. The editor of the Bible Banner did the preaching. I can be absolved on a possible charge of exercising my influence for reasons of personal kinship in getting him here, as this is the very first meeting we have been together throughout. In all the years we have preached, this was the first time I have ever heard him through one. In fact I have before this heard him preach a surprisingly few times. Now, I am at some loss to know just what to say. The modest editor of the Gospel Advocate blushes when we compliment each other, but I am going to risk saying that "the canny editor" and "the ace writer" really got along pretty well. From my point of view the preaching was magnificent and the size of the attendance and other reactions indicated that others thought so too. He was invited without any prompting on my part to return later in the year for another meeting. I interposed no objections, for I had none.

I lived here for about a dozen years, moved away, and came back because the brethren wanted me to and I wanted to. The church is not a large one but it is a good one. If it were much larger it would probably be too large for me. We are doing some good work in a modest sort of way and attending to our own business. We have planned no grandiloquent program for other churches to carry out.

The meeting added something both in the ways of numbers and influence to the work here.

CLASS ROOM AGITATION

I understand when I bade Brother Brigance adieu "for the duration" that he was going to say no more about the "war question." His contention is that it should not be discussed. I am informed that he merely withdrew from the paper to his class room. He has expressed to groups of students in his classes that he regrets the agitation "the Wallace brothers" are carrying on. He further avers that he is likely to do so again. Very well, so mote it be. I have not heard of him being very hard on the boys in "our schools" who are closer to knee pants than middle age, who are writing; immature books asserting that it is sinful for Christians to serve in the armed forces of the country. These books come from college presses and do the schools no good. I suppose the neophytes who write them are not agitators! Why should we keep quiet? We have always behaved very well until somebody stirred us up. By the way, it would be interesting, since we have become a subject of classroom discussion in Freed-Hardeman college, for the honored president of that school to speak up and say plainly what he thinks about the issue we have raised. We are not interested in what he thinks of us. what does he think about the issue? I think I know, but there are others who have their doubts. If he has good reasons to keep the school on the fence, he should keep Brother Brigance quiet. He has shown quite clearly that he is not on the fence.

IS HE CHANGING?

Brother Boles, of the Gospel Advocate, has come out with an editorial (the editor seldom writes one) chiding the brethren and even some preachers for their lack of hospitality to soldiers. Well, of all things! Maybe they had heard of Brother Boles' position on civil government, his attitude on the war in which our government is engaged, and decided they should not be too nice to our soldiers. As I recall, a short time ago Brother Boles wanted to affirm that the motive of the government in going to war was to destroy the lives and properties of its enemies, and that no Christian could lend support to such a thing. Would Brother Boles extend hospitality to a murderer or a potential criminal? It is possible that Brother Boles is changing. "0, the fickleness of man!" Maybe if he swings over far enough he will give his editor something to write about. It really would not be necessary, for Birmingham or Montgomery could furnish him some suitable material.

(Continued on page 3)
These grim words brought to Cled and Ola Wallace the message from our nation's capital that John, their third son, had gone down with his crew over Italy. John was Pilot of a four-motored Liberator and was on his seventeenth mission over enemy territory. He has been missing since April 21, the date in which he mentioned his love for them, and closed the letter with a terse, "I must enlist-the cause of God and man. He has his Lord, and for the cause in which was for his young bride, for the church, for the town people, too-who know Cled and Ola. With the muscles of his face tight as their noble son was brave, and they do not surrender to their sorrow. With the muscles of his face tight and quivering, his manly frame shaking and the town people, too-who know Cled and Ola are as strong as their noble son was brave, and they do not surrender to their sorrow. They are not dismayed, for God will take care of him. He was performing the functions of govenment in the cause of humanity. "For he is a minister of God to thee for good, for he beareth not the sword in vain." John was bearing the sword, but not in vain. In so doing he was one of "God's ministers, attending continually upon this very thing." God ordained the use of the sword as "a venger to execute wrath upon him that doeth evil." The sword belongs to the government for that purpose. But the only way the government can use the sword is through its citizens, for it is "of the people, by the people, for the people." And the apostle said: "For this cause pay ye tribute also." A Christian, as such, is no more exempt from one than the other. That is the way our New Testament reads. It is therefore in harmony with the will of God and Christian duty. When we stay on the side of the God-ordained mission of government, we stay on God's side.

May the God of all consolation comfort the hearts of the parents and loved ones of our noble lad, and we believe that the Lord whom he loves with all his youthful heart, and who loves him, will take care of him whether in life or in death.

---

Anent The Janes Will

Attention is here called to the excellent, true and timely article of Cecil B. Douthitt, of Louisville, Kentucky, anent the Last Will and Testament of Don Carlos Janes. His article appears on pages 8, 9 and 10 of this issue. It is not merely a contributed article—the Bible Banner indorses it one hundred percent. Brother Douthitt has lived in Kentucky all of his life, and has lived in Louisville for a decade, and he speaks of these matters not only out of his personal knowledge and experience, but out of the direct information he has obtained from loyal servants of God in Louisville, such as J. F. Kurfees, and others too numerous to mention here. Brethren all over the land who love the Cause of the Lord and who are sick of the sentimentalism of compromise over these matters will appreciate and applaud the Douthitt exposure of the fraud this Louisville millennial fraction has perpetrated on individuals and churches through all these years. Under the cloak of missionary work and in the guise of angels of benevolence they have preyed upon...
the churches, and with smooth words and fair speech, they
have deceived the innocent.

The article by Brother Douthitt furnishes a refreshing
contrast with some editorials in other leading papers. The
Gospel Advocate published J. N. Armstrong's glowing tri-
butate to the missionary man of this movement and com-
mented that the publication of the article did not mean
that they "necessarily" indorsed all of the article. But
so far as that statement goes the converse would also not
"necessarily" be untrue. They had as well, or even better,
said nothing.

The Firm Foundation, while making it plain that they
very stoutly opposed the "Boll-Janes-Jorgenson theories"
-yet remarked that missionary contributions constitutes
a matter between the donors and the James Missionary Of-
fice, and hence, not to be criticised unless by the donors
themselves. Then, since the contributions to a missionary
society also constitutes a matter between the donors and
the society, a missionary society is not to be criticised ex-
cept by the members of it or donors to it!

Leaving the premillennial angle out of the matter entirely,
we contend that the James Missionary Office is as unscript-
ural as any missionary society ever was, and far more
defective.

The Firm Foundation further remarked that it is not a
matter of surprise that Don Carlos Janes should leave the
funds of his office to promote after his death the tenets that
he had believed through his life. That being true, and know-
ing that Janes was an ardent believer of Premillennialism,
it was the duty of the Firm Foundation to warn the breth-
ren through the years of the "consistent" use the receiver
of their missionary funds would be expected to make of
them instead of furnishing a medium for deception by pub-
lishing their reports. An open forum policy may serve some
good purposes but such a policy is being carried far too far
when it serves the advantage of men who are promoting
errors and fostering heresies and deceiving myriads of in-
ocent men and women in the church. A gospel paper owes
something to the church along these lines, and owes nothing
to such men.

It is not ours to attempt to regulate the policies of other
papers, nor do we have any desire to do so, but it is ours
to speak our convictions on this and other weighty matters.
In this instance, it is our strong conviction that the papers that have aided these brethren and have not warned the
churches against what they have been doing, and are still
doing, are derelict in their duty to the churches of Christ
and to the cause of the Lord. A great many discriminating
brethren are expressing disappointment in what has been
said in some of the papers already.

With the Firm Foundation we can also say that it was no
surprise at all to us that Don Carlos Janes disposed of the
missionary estate in the manner set forth in his will. The
difference is, we knew that he would do such a thing, warn-
ed the brethren of it constantly and refused to aid and abet
his evil work by publishing his reports. Nor do we apolo-
gize for it by ill-spoken tributes now. We are not afraid of
our ground on this question. And we are not alone. Breth-
ren who know the truth will stand by it. But whether any
number of them did or did not--any man who knows the
truth ought to stand by it, if he must do so alone, a thing
no one will likely have to do long at a time. There will
always be the "seven thousand" who have not bowed the
knee to Baal.—F. E. W. Jr.
Another editorial lamentation is heard from “Jerusalem”—Nashville, Tennessee—"the Judea of the new world," you know.

This time it is editor B. C. Goodpasture accusing us of an “effort to besmear” the name of David Lipscomb, the teaching of whom, we are told, it is “bad taste and worse grace” to even criticise. A few weeks ago we were told by H. Leo Boles just how “little” anyone is who would think of criticising David Lipscomb or his teaching. To do so reveals the “ littleness” of the man who does it and the “smallness” of his mind. Thus the editors of the Gospel Advocate answer criticisms of their teaching by belittling anybody who dares to criticise anything any of them think or say or do. It is that high and "naughty" superior attitude on the part of the Gospel Advocate toward others that has stirred the feeling of resentment that exists against it in so many sections and among so many brethren.

The editor says that David Lipscomb’s “name and work will live long” after the “latest” of these “little” critics has been forgotten. That is likely very true. I am sure it is, if it refers to me—but what does all that belittling have to do with the issues raised concerning some of the theories taught by Lipscomb? This is not the first time, by any means, that his theories have been called in question.

The Lipscomb Commentaries are published by the Gospel Advocate Company. Hulen L. Jackson, of Dallas, Texas, without “casting reflections and aspersions,” simply called attention to some erroneous teaching in these Commentaries. The Gospel Advocate did not like that. Therefore, the man who dared to do such a thing is a little man with a small mind, whose very name and existence will soon be forgotten!

We disclaim any intention to cast “aspersions” on David Lipscomb and disavow any intention of an “effort to besmear” him or anyone else, living or dead. It is the Gospel Advocate that excels in that sort of thing. Some others have been crude and coarse in their efforts to smear, but with the editor of the Advocate smearing has become an art. Everything that the editor has said in reference to us, down to his slightest remarks in our direction, have been accompanied with slurs and sneers and smears. The editorial pages of the Advocate, since he has been its editor, bear witness to this fact. Discerning readers know this. It has been the general comment among brethren all over the nation. B. C. Goodpasture is the last man who should say anything about the “bad taste and worse grace” of “casting reflections and aspersions” on anybody.

If the Gospel Advocate Commentaries have been misrepresented, the language of the author of the section criticised is responsible for it—not the critic. To my personal knowledge, several men, good men, of reasonable intelligence, have wondered if David Lipscomb really wrote the things that have been criticised, or if some “editor” did not exercise too much freedom in filling out his meager and incomplete notes. On this point I have no information. But on the point which Hulen Jackson criticised, the passage in the commentary speaks for itself, and all the labored explanation of the editorial article in the Advocate has not helped the situation any.

The passage of scripture involved is Eph. 4:8-10, and it reads:

“Wherefore he saith, when he ascended up on high, he led captivity captive, and gave gifts unto men. (Now that he ascended, what is it but that he also descended first into the lower parts of the earth? He that descended is the same that ascended far above all heavens, that he might fill all things).”

Now take a look at the comments on this passage in the Commentary to which reference has been made.

“The reference here is to the Messiah who came to earth from heaven, his original dwelling place, to destroy the power of the devil; to annihilate his kingdoms. Cast out the evil spirit inseparable from them; reassert the authority of God, reestablish his rule and kingdom; make his Spirit again the life-giving and pervading influence in this world. When this work is accomplished, death will no longer riot on perishing mortals. Those in the bondage of death will rise from their imprisoning graves. Bitterness, wrath, strife will cease among men, then shall the prophecy of Isaiah 11:6-9 be fulfilled. This is the result of the reign of the kingdom of God on earth. The fullness of that reign and the rule of that Spirit will usher in the glorious millennial morn.”

Now we do not know who actually wrote the above comment in part or in whole, but some of us think we know that the comments are not true, regardless of who wrote them, whether David Lipscomb or some editor of his notes.

The reader will note that the comments refer to the “re-establishment” of the kingdom of God. That is suspicious language within itself. What kingdom was to be “re-established”? And when? Jesus did not “re-establish” any kingdom when he came the first time, he simply established His kingdom. If the kingdom to be “re-established” we should like to have more information on the point. It might be enlightening on the point that has been raised.

Then notice this part of the comment: Death will no longer riot on perishing mortals. “Those in the bondage of death will rise from their imprisoning graves... Then shall the prophecy of Isaiah 11:6-9 be fulfilled.” According to the plain meaning of words, that comment certainly asserts that the prophecy of Isaiah 11 will not be fulfilled until the resurrection of the dead-when “death will no longer riot on perishing mortals” and “those in the bondage of death will rise from their imprisoning graves.” Then, according to this comment, there must be a period of time after the resurrection for the fulfillment of Isaiah 11. That is precisely what premillennialism proposes regardless of who the author of that comment was or is, or what Brother Lipscomb was or was not. But a study of Isaiah 11 will show” that it referred to the establishment of the kingdom of Christ on earth, when, as the prophet plainly said, the Gentiles would “seek” the Lord and “trust” in him. Do Gentiles seek the Lord now? Do Gentiles “trust” God now? Or, is that to take place when “death shall no longer riot on perishing mortals” and “those in the bondage of death will rise from their imprisoning graves”? If so, “that is premillennialism,” and the Gospel Advocate did not answer the “if not, why not” on this point, either “directly” in their initial parenthesis or indirectly out of the parenthesis.
But the comment from the Commentary continues: “This is the result of the reign of the kingdom of God on earth. The fullness of that reign and rule of that Spirit will usher in the glorious millennial morn.” Here it is stated that the fulfillment of Isaiah 11 will be the “result” of the reign of the kingdom of God on earth. We have been taught that Isaiah 11 would be that reign. But the passage from the Commentary says it will be fulfilled after the resurrection “when those in the bondage of death will rise from their imprisoning graves”—then shall the prophecy of Isaiah 11 be fulfilled, and that will “usher in the glorious millennial morn.” That is simply what the comment on Eph. 4:8-10 says, in the Gospel Advocate Lipscomb Commentary. If it misrepresents the teaching of the author, some editor of the commentary did it not us. The comment certainly “usher in the millennial morn” after the resurrection. So if it does not teach millennialism, it does teach millennial-morn-ism, and “premillennial-morn-ism” at that, for it puts it after “those in the bondage of death” have arisen “from their imprisoning graves.”

In either case, the comments are untrue, and Brother Jackson can just let the “Not So” which he has written across that section stay there; and the readers can look up the Gospel Advocate of May 18 and write another. “Not So” across their attempted explanation. A labored effort, indeed, was their article—but love’s labor lost.

The editorial article in the Advocate ventures to suggest that these comments on Eph. 4:9 might “comprehend the eternal kingdom.” In that case heaven will be “the glorious millennial morn.” Does the editor of the Advocate believe that heaven will be the millennium? Do they really mean that, or are they just trying to “explain” something out of their Commentary?

In this connection the Advocate editorial article makes reference to Isa. 2:1-5 in comparison with Isaiah 11, and warns us not to “figurate” the beating of the swords into plowshares and spears into pruninghooks. So the editor thinks that the swords and spears of Isaiah 2 are literal swords and spears. Then, according to his own comparison, neither can be “figurate” Isaiah 11, and it will have to be literalized, too. If he will not allow us to “figurate” the one, we cannot allow him to “figurate” the other. So what does he have now? Just the same old millennial stock in trade, dished out by Neal in Winchester, Tingley in Birmingham, Norris in Fort Worth, and Webber in Oklahoma City. Now the Gospel Advocate in Nashville, Tennessee, takes up the refrain to tell us that “the millennium” will consist in a period of time on earth after the second coming of Christ when the “then” of 1 Cor. 15 will come to pass in a “millennial morn” consisting in a period of time on earth after the resurrection. That period, he says, may be one thousand years or two thousand years! So according to Brother Armstrong, we may have a dual millennium, when “those in the bondage of death will rise from their imprisoning graves.”

Many brethren have made the mistake of assuming that anyone who believes that the kingdom began on Pentecost is not a premillennialist. But premillennialism is not refuted by the argument that merely sets up the kingdom and starts it going on Pentecost. The theory goes far beyond that point. Premillennialists among us will admit that the kingdom began on Pentecost, but they contend that it will culminate or merge into that “glorious millennial morn” after the coming of Christ. The Gospel Advocate is now talking in the same terms, in their labored effort to explain an erroneous passage in their Commentary. They tell us now that Dan. 2:44, along with other prophecies of the kingdom, began to be fulfilled on Pentecost. But the comments on Eph. 4:8-10 in their Commentary have the “results” of the kingdom which began on Pentecost “ushering in” that “glorious millennial morn” when “those in the bondage of death” have arisen from their imprisoning graves.” We agree with them that it would be a good thing for them to stop and ask: “What is premillennialism?”

Some of us who have such “small minds” and who will so soon be “forgotten” cannot be blamed too much for drawing conclusions that such comments suggest premillennialism, especially since our attention has not heretofore been called to the difference between millennialism and millennial-morn-ism! The Advocate’s own illustration of the doctor who operated on a sister for appendicitis, but missed his diagnosis, is a very fitting one in their case. The editor has done even worse than the doctor did. He has performed a long, tedious operation, trying to remove a premillennial appendix, from the comments on Eph. 4:8-10 in their Commentary, only to find that he missed it entirely—the appendix is still there. Doctors and editors around Nashville must be a lot alike!

There is another thing that should be kept in mind. Certain consequences of a man’s theory may exist when he does not himself avow them. But it is entirely right to point out the existing consequences even though he disavows them. It is entirely right to show that the consequences exist, and expose the inconsistency of the one who holds a theory, the logical consequences of which he will not accept. It is in this connection that the consequences of the Lipscomb theory of Civil Government as set forth in the book bearing that title have been shown to be definitely premillennial. Practically all premillennialists hold the same or similar views on the question of civil governments. Some men have accepted Lipscomb’s theory of civil government who are not at all in sympathy with premillennialism, and who preach and write against it, but the fact remains that the logical ends of that theory have not been accepted when that is the case. Premillennialism calls for the very things that are taught in “Civil Government” by David Lipscomb. The two theories go together: they fit each other perfectly.

But we do not need to go outside of the good state of Tennessee for a repudiation of the Lipscomb theory of Civil Government. We need not go outside the city limits of Nashville, Tennessee. We need not go outside the Gospel Advocate’s official family. The owner of the Gospel Advocate does not believe the contents of the book, and
The Memory of Three Great Men

R. I. Whiteside

When I was a young man I spent two and a half years in Texas, farming and preaching. I then returned to Tennessee to attend the Nashville Bible School. During my stay in Texas Brother G. G. Taylor, of Kentucky, held two series of meetings near enough for me to hear much of his preaching. One meeting was held where I was preaching monthly. I thought then, and still think, that he was one of the clearest thinkers and most logical reasoners I ever heard. I was much in his company. We talked about the Christian’s relation to Civil Government. He was thoroughly committed to the idea that Christians not only had the right to take part in political affairs, but that it was their duty to do so. At that time I was definitely against that idea. One thing he said startled me beyond measure: “Well, sir,” said he, “if I were to see a beast of a man dragging an innocent girl off into the bushes to rape her, and perhaps also to murder her; I would no more mind shooting him down, if I had a gun, than I would mind shooting a wild beast.”

While I was in Bible School, brethren Lipscomb and Harding sometimes had men of opposing views to present their views in the college chapel. I remember they had Dr. Brents give his arguments in favor of ordaining elders with fasting, prayer, and the laying on of hands. Then Brother E. G. Sewell spoke against that view. Later Brother Harding and I were engaged in a conversation in which the matter of having both sides of a controverted questions discussed was mentioned. Brother Harding said: “We would like to have some able man who believes it right for Christian’s to take part in the affairs of civil government to give some lectures on that side, but we do not know who to get.”

I said: “What about Brother G. G. Taylor?” Brother Harding replied: “I do not know his position on that subject.” I said, “I do,” and then told him how I came to know Brother Taylor’s position. Brother Harding replied: “He’s the very man we want. I’ll write him.” The result was that Brother Taylor came and delivered a number of lectures, frequently reading from Brother Lipscomb’s “Civil Government,” endeavoring to show where Brother Lipscomb was wrong, He was fair and concise in all that he said. Brother Lipscomb heard all that Brother Taylor had to say, and so did Brother Harding, and no man ever received a more courteous hearing.

I have always been glad that I knew G. G. Taylor. J. A. Harding, and David Lipscomb.

* * * *

Sounds Like Propaganda

It has been adroitly whispered about that the editor of the Banner has unnecessarily “alienated” some of his “friends” by some positions he has taken, that he would have been in a much better position had he taken more “advice” from some of his good “friends.” Sounds like propaganda to me. I know the editor fairly well and he is in the habit of forming his convictions independently and saying his say without too much concern about what either his friends or his enemies might say. I do not think he is going to sell his conscience either for money or favor. He is not a good fence straddler for any reason. He would be so awkward at it the maneuver would be too obvious to deceive anybody. If telling the truth about things “alienates” some “friends,” I have an idea that he will just let them “alienate” and find him some more. He’s like that. I do not mind my friends, or anybody else who feels capable, offering me advice, but I like to feel free to take it or leave it. It is a freedom a free man cannot surrender.—C. E. W.
LOGIC—"ARGUMENTUM AD HOMINEM"

R. L. WHITESIDE

Without taking part in the discussion between writers on logic as to whether it is a science or an art, or a combination of both, we shall, for the present, consider it in its application to discourse as the art of correct reasoning. Every one uses logic, even though many have never looked into a textbook on logic. Perhaps no one has so mastered logic as to always reason correctly. But the more a person knows of the laws of correct reasoning, the easier it is for him to avoid fallacies in his own reasoning and to detect them in the reasoning of others. Not enough attention is given to the study of logic. In this matter our educators do greatly err. There is no excuse for compelling a student to wait till he reaches the university to acquaint himself with the laws of reasoning. No preacher should be satisfied to go through life without studying logic. It might be a good idea for religious journals occasionally to give a series of logic lessons, because reasoning is so intimately connected with studying and teaching the Bible. One should be able to reason correctly both in learning and in teaching. And a knowledge of the laws of correct reasoning will save a speaker or writer from being put to shame by a shrewd critic. To make a fallacious argument, even in support of the truth, gives an opponent an opening for attack. The pith is that in showing the fallacy of your argument he is likely to make many think he has disproved your position. Also, a fallacy in your sermon may be detected by some silent listener. If so, your sermon loses force with him.

But some arguments are classed as fallacies that are not always fallacies. Hill's Jevons puts the argumentum ad hominem down as a fallacy, but it is not always a fallacy. It may be as valid as any other argument. The ad hominem argument is an argument to the man; it is an appeal to his interests, his pride, his sense of justice and right, or his passions, etc. It depends upon the circumstances and the motive as to whether it is a fallacy. If in trying to save a man from disgraceful conduct, I appeal to his family pride and to his self-interest, I am using the argumentum ad hominem, but there is no fallacy. If your opponent is practicing some things that in principle are exactly like the thing he opposes, you may charge the inconsistency upon him with the hope of getting him to see the point and abandon his opposition. That is the argumentum ad hominem, but where is there any fallacy? If a man is opposing one thing and practicing a similar wrong, you may show him his inconsistency, and thereby induce him to abandon the wrong that he is practicing. Some one opposes the use of printed helps in teaching the Bible. You charge him with inconsistency, in that he uses songbooks and the marginal references in the Bible, which in principle are like the helps he opposes, hoping to get him to see the point and, abandon his opposition. You are not appealing to his prejudice, nor his passions, nor any other unholy feeling. There is no fallacy in that sort of argument, yet it is the argumentum ad hominem. But the argumentum ad hominem is fallacious when it is an unfair appeal to personal opinions, or to one's vanity or prejudice or passions. Much of the flattery from the pulpit comes under this head. It is also a fallacy when an appeal is made to a person's hatred of sectarianism to induce him to do or not to do a certain thing.

Noah K. Davis does not class the argumentum ad hominem as a fallacy, but puts it under the heading, "Modified Forms." Concerning it he says: "The argumentum ad hominem is arguing from the premises of an opponent merely to defeat him. We accept his principle? on which to base a counter argument, even if believing them false, our argument being directed against him personally, ad hominem. It aims to convict him of ignorance, bad faith, inconsistency, or illogical reasoning, and so to put him ex curia (out of court). Usually it attempts no more ... Criticism is mostly in the form ad hominem, and should be distinguished from proof of the opposite or controversy."

Henry Coppee, page 147, says: "The argumentum ad hominem is not a fallacy when the design is to teach pure truth, and when no unholy passion or emotion of man is appealed to. In this application it was used by our Savior himself to the Jews on many occasions with great force and beauty. His touching and yet searching appeal to them for the woman taken in adultery sent them out one by one before his power. Each one felt the argument and admitted the conclusion." But some one may say: "To charge her accusers with the same crime did not prove her to be innocent." Certainly not: neither did the Savior intend that it should. But he intended to stop the unholy mouths of her hypocritical accusers. He knew these men cared nothing about the woman's guilt. He knew they were after him, and not her, and were using her in an effort to get him to commit himself in such a way that they could make out a dase against him. The woman's guilt was a mere pretext. And the fact stands out clearly that Jesus stopped their mouths by charging that they were as guilty as she.

Again Jesus used the argumentum ad hominem. He healed a sorely afflicted woman on the Sabbath. The ruler of the synagogue became very indignant. Jesus replied: "Ye hypocrites, doth not each one of you on the sabbath loose his ox or his ass from the stall, and lead him away to watering? And ought not this woman, being a daughter of Abraham, whom Satan had bound, lo, these eighteen years, to have been loosed from this bond on the day of the sabbath?" Jesus virtually said: "If I am guilty, you are even more so, for you do a less needful thing. If you are justified in what you do, I am even more so."

Other instances could be given, but these are sufficient to show that the Savior frequently used a form of argument that is now condemned by some Christians. And yet some who condemn it use it in its fallacy form. To create the impression that all ad hominem arguments are fallacious, and then seek to create prejudice against an opponent by calling his argument an ad hominem, is an argumentum ad hominem fallacy.
The Will of the late Don Carlos Janes has been printed in full in some of the papers, and many of the brethren are familiar with its content. The Will speaks for itself; it reveals clearly the heart and character of its testator, and the spirit which governed his life and conduct.

While Don Carlos Janes lived and was in good health I wrote an article in the Bible Banner of December 1941, in which I tried to tell the brethren that Janes was keeping the money which the contributors intended for the missions. Some of the premillennialists of Louisville became rather indignant at what I had said, but so far as I know nobody made investigation to determine whether I was telling the truth or not. After the Will was published in the papers, I decided to say nothing more about the Janes-one-man-missionary-society, believing that no one would ever rise up in defense of Brother Janes' money-getting and money-keeping methods as revealed in the Will. I did not believe that even Jorgenson would every try to defend Janes and his Will. But Jorgenson surprised me, and caused me to change my mind regarding my saying nothing further about the matter. He has an article of defense of the Janes Will in the Firm Foundation of May 2, 1944, under the heading: "The Truth About Brother Janes, His Money And His Will-By One Who Ought To Know."

This insinuation that others have not told the truth about Brother Janes and his Will is characteristic of Elmer Leon Jorgenso. He is running true to Jorgenso form. This is the same Jorgenso that tried to stab us in the back by writing a letter to a Louisville broadcasting station, in which he tried to get us off the air. A photostatic copy of that letter has appeared in the Bible Banner. This is the same Jorgenso that withdrew from C. A. Taylor, Rubel, and others and split the Highland Church, because these men objected to Jorgenso's sermons on Premillennialism.

Since Brother Jorgenso has brought up this matter of truth-telling concerning Brother Janes, his money and his Will, it is time to look at his article and see how much truth he tells, if any.

I. APPRAISAL OF THE JANES ESTATE

He says the "Janes estate has been appraised, roughly at $40,000." Is that the truth "about Brother Janes, his money and his Will"? No. The Janes estate "has been appraised, roughly at $74,000.00. That $40,000 is only what he left in a fund which he called the "Church or Estate Fund." The Janes estate was composed of at least eight "funds," the "Mission Homes Fund," "Cold Drafts Fund," "Current Missionary Funds," "Church Tent Fund," "Church or Estate Fund," "Religious Literature Fund," "Missionary Tract Fund," and Stenographers Fund. All these funds belong to the Janes estate, according to the Will. Of course, they never should have become a part of the Janes estate in the first place; but they did. If they are not a part of the Janes estate, what right did Janes have to dispose of them along with the rest of his estate? What right did he have to make Jorgenso the administrator of them, if they did not belong to his estate?

Nothing is said in Janes' Will, or in Jorgenso's defense, about the "Sewing Machine Fund." A few years ago Brother Janes traveled over several states collecting money to buy somebody a sewing machine. Since Brother Jorgenso calls himself "one who ought to know," perhaps he knows about the "Sewing Machine Fund," and it will be interesting to hear him tell how much Brother Janes collected for the "Sewing Machine Fund." It will be more interesting to hear him tell how much was paid for the sewing machine. It will be most interesting to hear him tell who got the sewing machine. It will be most interesting to hear him tell whether or not the "Sewing Machine Fund" was "blended" with the "Church or Estate Fund." According to Janes Will, Item VI, Brother Janes was great on blending funds, when they had "accomplished the purposes." Maybe the "Sewing Machine Fund" "accomplished the purposes" and was just "blended" with something else. If these funds did not belong to the Janes estate, what right did he have to "blend" them? Whose funds was he blending?

Jorgenso says Brother Janes "inherited rather heavily" from his parents. He did not tell us how heavily, but he did say it "increased." In the Will this inheritance, plus the increase, is called the "Church or Estate Fund." Given eight funds, with the power to "blend," it is easy to make any one of them increase. This fund contained more than half the Janes estate.

II. GIFTS FOR THE PROMOTION OF PRE-MILLENNIALISM

Brother Jorgenso says, "Brother Janes did not leave gifts for the promotion of Premillennialism, in the present, common, connotation of that term." Is that the "truth about Brother Janes, his money and his Will"? Let's look at the Will: "I will that the residue of my estate, when the foregoing gifts have been met, shall be used by my Executors for the publication and distribution, by sale or gift, or by both sales and gifts, of the material, which I have gathered on the imminent, personal, premillennial coming of the Lord Jesus Christ to earth to reign gloriously where once He suffered great pain and dishonor when He was despised and rejected of men." (Janes Will, Item IV).

Now there is the gift "for the promotion of premillennialism." It is the "present, common, connotation of that term" too, because the imminent, personal premillennial coming of the Lord to earth is the theory held by every premillennialist on earth. The Russellites, Jehovah's Witnesses, the Adventists, R. H. Boll, E. L. Jorgenso and all other Premillennialists use the term in the same "present, common, connotation." By "premillennialism" they all mean the "imminent, personal, premillennial coming of the Lord Jesus Christ to earth to reign gloriously." If they didn't mean that, they would not be premillennialists.

Brother Janes stated in Item IV of his Will that he was "fully assured that the premillennial view of the Lord's coming advent is the scriptural orthodox teaching of the church from the days of the apostles" and he proceeded in
the same paragraph of his Will to make provision "for the establishment of this doctrine," after his death. He says in his Will that he had gathered "a great deal of pertinent material" on premillennialism, and we know he had plenty of money to have it published while he lived. Why did he wait till he could no longer feel the touch of the money and draw interest on it before turning it loose, even for premillennialism, which he loved almost as well as money?

Brother Jorgenson says he is going to "publish the choicest part of the material which Brother Janes had gathered, and he is going to "publish it in such a clean and Christian spirit that none can justly take offense." If he does, he will have to leave out that letter to the Louisville radio station, in which he tried to corral the Louisville ministerial association to help him put us off the air. I am anxious to see that material which Brother Janes had gathere

on premillennialism. Brother Jorgenson thinks everybody will be too "confounded and ashamed" to refute it, because of the "great and good and honorable" names appended thereto. But whether Brother Jorgenson knows it or not, there are some who are not too "confounded and ashamed" to expose error, regardless of whose name is "appended" to it.

III. JORGENSON’S SHARE

"Brother Janes left no money in his will: only much hard work and a great opportunity to glorify our savior," says Jorgenson. Is that the "truth about Brother Janes, his money and his Will, by one who ought to know"? Let's look at the Will: it speaks for itself: "I hereby name, constitute and appoint Elmer Leon Jorgenson, and his wife, Irene Doty Jorgenson, and the survivor of them, as the Executor and/or Executrix of this my Will, and direct that they be permitted to qualify as such without giving of any surety on their bond, and that they be recompensed from my estate for their services as such Executor and Executrix" (Janes Will, Item IX). Janes not only directed in his will that Jorgenson be "recompensed from my estate," he also gave Jorgenson the authority to set the amount of his compensation. With the exception of the very small portion of the estate which must be used for the purposes stipulated in the Will, Jorgenson has authority, according to the terms of the Will, to take all the rest of the estate for hard compensation, if he wants to do so. That is more than Janes left in his Will for any of the missionaries for whom the contributors thought he was collecting the money. Yet Jorgenson says, "Brother Janes left me no money in his will"? I would rather have what he left Jorgenson "in his will" than to have what he left any of the missionaries "in his will."


The following appears in the Jorgenson article: "By natural birth, Brother Janes was, perhaps, a bargain driver, and 'close,' ; by grace-for God did much for him-he became a great giver; not a tither, but more nearly (as the books show) a double tither. In him, the natural and the spiritual, the old man and the new, strangely persisted in financial matters." Brother Janes spent his time in writing to individuals and churches and traveling over the country collecting money, all of which, the contributors thought, would go to the missionaries. But instead of becoming a tither himself and giving all the money to the missionaries, Brother Janes became just a double-tither, gave 20% and kept 80%, according to Jorgenson. That battle between the "natural" and the "spiritual," between the "old man and the new" in Brother Janes, was a very one-sided war. The "old man" was four times as strong as the "new." The "old man" got 80% of the booty, and the "new" got 20%. It was by grace that the "spiritual got the 20%. When the war was over "the old man," or "natural," had $74,000.00, and if they "new," or "spiritual," ever gets any of that, it will be by the grace of Elmer Leon Jorgenson.

Brother Janes did not let the missionaries keep all their 20% of the Janes collections. The "spiritual" had to pay some of that 20% back to the "natural" in the form of "small monthly rental." Notice this from the Jorgenson article:

"Years ago, Brother Janes and Brother McCaleb raised a large 'missionary Homes Fund' to build suitable homes for missionaries then on the field. The fund was thus used; and the missionaries paid back, by agreement, the amount advanced, in small monthly rental. It was to be a circulating fund, to build missionary homes; but when the number of outgoing missionaries was reduced, and many of them returned because of war, Brother Janes, as treasurer, found himself with these funds on his hands."

Now isn't that a strange co-incidence! that Brother Janes would ever have these funds back "on his hands," when by agreement, he was to get every penny of it back "in small monthly rental"! ? The donors gave that money to build missionaries' homes; why was Janes charging them rent on their own houses? Oh, "it was to be a circulating fund." But where did it circulate? Right back into the hands of the "natural." What did the "old man," or "natural," do with it when it circulated back into his hands "by agreement"? Build more missionary homes? No, Jorgenson says Brother Janes put it on interest. What did he do with the accumulated interest? He had it on his hands when he died, and Jorgenson says "not one account has been lost." When was this money collected for missionary homes? Jorgenson says "years ago." What was the amount collected? Jorgenson says it was "large." In Item VI of the Janes Will, Brother Janes says this "Missionary Homes Fund" "long ago accomplished the purposes" and he intended to "blend" it with some other fund. But he added: "In the event I should die or should not actually blend these two Funds into one Trust Fund before my death, I direct the same shall be blended and combined into one Fund after my death." Here some facts stare us in the face: "years ago" Brother Janes collected a "large" sum of money with which to build missionary homes. When homes were provided, with a part of this money, he made the missionaries agree to pay every penny back in the form of "small monthly rental," which they did. Brother Janes got all this money back, according to Jorgenson, and drew interest on it till he died. He states in his Will that this Fund had "long ago accomplished the purposes," and it was his intention to blend it with something else; if it is not "blended" before his death, he wants Jorgenson to "blend" it after his death. Here is a Fund given by brethren to build homes for the missionaries; every penny of it is here, not "one account has been lost." But the Fund is going to be "blended," and if any homes are ever built for missionaries, somebody else will have to raise the Fund; for this Fund is going to be "blended."

V. "HOARD"

Jorgenson says: "Someone, perhaps hastily, used the hated word 'hoard' concerning the missionary money which he handled." What other word expresses more accurately the Janes method of handling missionary money? He had $74,000.00 on his hands at the time of his death, and at least $34,000.00, perhaps more, was "missionary money." But Jorgenson claims that Janes did not "hoard" the missionary money, because at the time of his death he only had "a small working balance" of about $1700 in "checking account" — hardly more than might come in a few days'
mail.” Maybe that is all he had in “checking account,” but Jorgenson himself says, in the article under review, that the rest of it was in savings banks and loaned out “in interest-bearing notes.” Then, according to Jorgenson, a man is not “hoarding,” if he puts his money in a savings bank or loans it out at 5% interest; in order to “hoard” he must have it in “checking account.” That’s a rather strange idea of the term “hoard.”

Jorgenson adds that this “missionary money” in “checking account” is no more than Janes might receive in a few days’ mail, and thereby would have us believe that Janes did not “hoard” even the $1700 in “checking account.” Is that the truth about “Brother Janes, his money and his Will”? Let’s look at the Will: “For some years I have had in my hands certain Foreign Missionary Trust Funds” (Janes Will, Item V). Jorgenson says “few days:” Janes says “some years.” Just a slight discrepancy, unless “few days” and “some years” are synonymous, and I hardly think they are.

Brother Jorgenson is Executive of the Janes Will. He controls money given by people who did not intend for Brother Janes to “blend” it, and keep $34,000.00 unblended. Instead of trying to defend the Janes method of handling missionary money, Brother Jorgenson should find as many of the contributors as he can, blend all that money into one Fund, and send the whole blended amount back to them with an apology. That is the honorable thing to do. It is not honorable to take that money or any part of it and publish a mess of premillennial bosh, which some of the donors of that money do not believe. If I had ever given Brother Janes one dollar for missionary purposes, I now would demand that Jorgenson blend that dollar with 5% interest and give me back the whole blended amount.

---

**CANONIZING CAMPBELL AND LIPSCOMB**

a. c. LAMBERT

An editor of the Gospel Advocate, who not so long ago was reported to have asked the government (which is the devil, according to his theory) to appoint him to pass on the requirements concerning Chaplains in the army for the whole church of Christ, now admonishes the small fry to modesty. This, he insists, was one of David Lipscomb’s cardinal virtues. While he, himself, calls some of us names, he says that Brother Lipscomb was “inoffensive and mild in manner toward all.” He says that Brother Lipscomb “never squabbled over salaries nor disputed about places of pre-eminence.” Evidently, to be commissioned by the government (which is the devil, according to the Lipscomb theory) to do something for the whole church of Christ is something David Lipscomb would not have asked for himself.

Since the editor referred to never mention names, and not knowing how many in the church may have criticized Brother Lipscomb’s book, Civil Government, one is made to wonder just who is meant. He charges those who criticize Brother Lipscomb with “ignorance and little mind” and with having “a very shallow and ignorant mind.” As if that were not stigmatic enough, he continues his excoriation of these “smaller minds” who have dared to take issue with Lipscomb’s theory of Civil Government. It is clearly implied in the article that he, the editor referred to, does not belong to that class of ignorant little men. Not he-he is great, but modest. And in his humble modesty he would have the government appoint him to an office of authority with power to pass ‘on all applicants for the Chaplaincy of “Church of Christ preachers.”’ Lipscomb taught that the government belongs to and is operated by the devil, and the afore-mentioned editor believes that. Can he actually believe that and at the same time believe such an appointment to be consistent with the Lipscomb theory or in harmony with the New Testament?

Concerning the Lipscomb theory, he says that Brother Lipscomb addressed “all the scholars of the Christian Church, and among them was J. W. McGarvey,” on “Civil Government.” But it appears that McGarvey “criticized” it by saying that very few of them, if any, accepted his views. The “smaller minds,” who are being excoriated by this sage for “the whole church,” should not feel so bad about it now. Remember that was an array of scholars that Lipscomb addressed, including McGarvey, and they rejected his views.

He further informs us of his own indignation. He says “the writer’s righteous indignation is gendered” because of these criticisms of Lipscomb’s teaching. So what shall the “smaller minds” do in a case like this? Could it be that the writer might be able to find something in the Bible that he has read in the Bible Banner from its editor and me on this subject that has so “gendered” his “righteous (?) indignation?” If so, since he sent out a number of letters sometime ago wanting to debate the government question, I wonder why he has not accepted the propositions covering the theory taught by Lipscomb, instead of letting his indignation get gendered so.

The circumstances really demand that Brother Boles affirm that the theory of Civil Government taught by David Lipscomb, in his book bearing that title, is in harmony with the teaching of the Bible. Will he do it? If not, he should quit talking about someone “declining” to debate.

The same attitude toward Civil Government set forth in the Lipscomb book was also advocated in a book by Charles T. Russell, and that book was outlawed during the last war. Pastor Russell’s successor, “Judge Rutherford,” spent a long vacation in the Atlanta Federal Prison for advocating the idea that the devil is the head of the government and that it should be overthrown. Lipscomb’s book teaches that the devil is the head of the government and that it is the divine mission of the church to destroy it. I feel sure that the Lipscomb book would be outlawed now if the FBI knew its contents. I wonder if the recollection of Rutherford’s experience with the United States government has had anything to do with his large-minded brother’s extreme caution in his efforts to write on the subject. Or, has the FBI already tapped him on his writing wrist? If so-in the light of his teaching—should he not “obey God rather than men,” teach what he believes, and take the consequences? That is what he has advised the C. O. boys to do. He is attempting the difficult task of defending the Lipscomb book without involving himself. But the FBI would have no difficulty in concluding that he thinks, with Russell, Rutherford and Lipscomb, that the devil is the head of the government and that the church is divinely commissioned to destroy it. Here is the statement of this editor of the Gospel Advocate: “He did not shun to declare the whole counsel of God on the subject he treated.” Then he says: “Only a very shallow and ignorant mind would ridicule the profound treatment of this lofty theme by such a wise, thoughtful and good man.”

---
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I strongly suspect the editor of the Bible Banner is one of the "shallow and ignorant" minds, and one of the "little" fellows, he is attempting to talk about. If so, I wonder again why he puts him in his list of the worthies. In commenting on the history of the Gospel Advocate he refers to its "worthy list of editors." Hear him: "The Gospel Advocate has had a worthy list of editors who have directed its policy and kept it on a high plane of editorial dignity that is characteristic of its founders." David Lipscomb was one of its founders. In the list of editors who preserved the "characteristics of its founders," he mentions the following: J. C. McQuiddy, E. A. Elam, A. B. Lipscomb, F. W. Smith, F. B. Srygley, J. A. Allen, Fay E. Wallace, Jr. (emphasis mine-O. C. L.), John T. Hinds and B. C. Goodpasture, the present editor. I suppose Brother Wallace has become all of those bad things since and because he has expressed disagreement with Lipscomb's theory of Civil Government.

As a build-up for his solemn warning to the "small minds" in the church not to criticize Lipscomb and to encourage them to accept his ideas without question, he cites a number of things characteristic of David Lipscomb. For instance: "Brother Lipscomb wore home-made clothes." But the editor whose "righteous indignation" has been "gendered," because somebody is not following Brother Lipscomb implicitly, wears store-bought clothes. Some Quakers and Mennonites wear home-made clothes. Again: "Brother Lipscomb was liberal and made many sacrifices." But not so many as a Catholic Nun makes. Another: "Brother Lipscomb has had wide influence for more than seventy-five years." But a great influence does not give one the authority of an infallible teacher. Martin Luther has had a great deal more influence than David Lipscomb for more than four hundred years.

But the above-mentioned editor says: "Frequently he is quoted and appealed to as authority on many of the questions and problems that vex the brotherhood today. He must have been a great man to wield such an influence for so long. Anyone shows his ignorance and littleness when he criticises so great and good a man as David Lipscomb."

That is exactly the way the authority of men has almost universally been substituted for the Word of God. The Catholics dare not decide religious questions for themselves. They are drilled, as this editor of the Gospel Advocate is apparently trying to drill members of the churches of Christ, in the idea that the average individual among us is incapable of doing that, and must accept his ideas from an infallible teacher. Though he probably had a "larger mind" than I (and I would dare to suggest the possibility of his having a larger mind than that editor who is taking the first steps toward the canonization of Lipscomb), still I do not hesitate to criticise Luther's man-made creeds, and his doctrine of salvation by faith alone. Is it necessarily an act of disrespect for a man to think for himself, even if he does have a "small mind?"

Another devotee, who "sat at the feet of David Lipscomb eight years," accuses me of the sacrilegious work of "digging up David Lipscomb's bones." Yet that same writer, not very long ago, made some very serious charges against the beloved T. B. Larimore. He told his readers that J. A. Harding refused to call on Larimore to deliver a sermon or to lead a prayer at the old Nashville Bible School, because Harding said Larimore was a compromiser and would not take a stand against the Digressives. Thus he charged T. B. Larimore with compromising what he knew to be the truth. Such a weakness is a reflection on a man's character. I suppose that the Lipscomb devotee regards it a very wise and noble thing for him to enter Larimore's tomb and "dig up his bones," and parade them before his readers, but if we criticise the teaching of David Lipscomb we are all but worthy of excommunication! It all depends on who is criticised and who does the criticising!

I noticed recently a little note from Brother Goodpasture of a greatly increased sale on Lipscomb's Civil Government. Perhaps, the brethren are checking up, to see for themselves the quotations that I recently made from his book, in the Bible Banner. No one, not even our brother who is so righteously indignant, has yet called my attention to a single false accusation made against the book. So, until they are able to do that in the language of the court, the objections are over-ruled.

I think our brother is more wrought up over the fact that what Brother Lipscomb said in his book is being brought to light, than over what anybody has had to say about him.
There is nothing better established, or more universally believed than the fact that Christ is coming again in person. This coming is mentioned by about every book, and almost every chapter, in the New Testament, but only Paul, as I remember, calls it a second coming. Of course, since He had been here once, when He comes again that will be his second coming, and there would be little need for the writers to so inform us.

But no writer has ever mentioned a third coming, or return of the Lord to this earth, and we conclude therefore with Paul that when He comes the second time that will be the end for this world.

But we are told that he is coming to reign upon the earth during the millennium. Is it assumed that he cannot reign upon the earth without being upon it in person? He can reign upon the earth much better from His throne in heaven than from a throne on some part of this earth. He could not be present in all parts of the earth at the same time. When He would be in Palestine He would not be present in New York, or in London, nor as close to either as He would be from His throne in heaven. Both Jesus and the Father have been transacting business on the earth for six thousand years without being here in person, and I see no possible reason why they could not so continue through a millennium. To argue that Jesus cannot reign upon earth unless He is present upon it in person is to limit His power.

Rev. 20:1-5 does not mention a personal return of Jesus to the earth, nor a personal residence in Palestine. He will reign upon the earth, but He is reigning upon the earth now, and is not here in person. For almost two thousand years He has reigned on the earth, as well as over beings in heaven, and He has not been here in person. Angels, authorities, principalities, and powers, were made subject to Him when He ascended on high, and He told the apostles that all authority in heaven and on earth was given into His hands. Paul even includes things under the earth, and said they were made subject to Him.

There is nothing in Rev. 20:1-5 which limits the reign of the Lord to a thousand years, the limit is on the part of the saints. They will reign with Him a thousand years, but that does not limit His reign. When men speak of the thousand years reign of Christ on the earth they speak without Bible authority. His reign is an everlasting reign, and His kingdom that which shall have no end. The end belongs to this world, and to man, the Lord is not limited.

There is nothing in the passage that indicates a material change in the saints when rightly understood. The change was a spiritual one, and it was in the soul, and not in the body. Neither does the prophet say that any individual saint lived a thousand years, and reigned that long. The English people have lived and reigned a thousand years in the British Isles, but no individual Englishman has lived all of that time, or reigned a thousand years. It was the souls of the saints which John saw, and souls are resurrected by the gospel. Souls die spiritually because of sin, and they are made alive by the gospel in conversion.

John did not say he saw a resurrection at the beginning of the millennium, that idea has to be read into the passage. What he did say is that he saw souls during the millennium, and they lived and reigned with Christ, and this is the first resurrection. He does not say they had received a first resurrection, he said, This is the first resurrection. That is, the saints lived and reigned with Christ, and this is the first resurrection. And they lived and reigned just like the English people live and reign in the British Isles, by succession.

This is a joint reign that John saw, cooperative reign, we might call it, Christ and His saints reigning in the world through the gospel, which the saints preach, and live before the world. The Lord gave the gospel to the church and through the gospel the saints exercise all the powers which belongs to them as saints. If they exercise worldly dominion they do as citizens of some worldly government. The Lord ordained civil governments for man's good.

"I saw thrones and they sat upon them and judgment was given unto them." What kind of thrones did John see? Material thrones? It is possible, and if they were, then material men sat upon them and ruled. Such thrones belong to man in civil governments. He did not say the saints were upon the thrones. They may have been, but if so they were civil rulers and ruled as men, citizens in the civil government under which they lived.

"They lived and reigned with Christ a thousand years." This is the first resurrection. Then this must have been a spiritual resurrection, not a literal one, that John saw. The first resurrection he saw the great white throne and Him that sat upon it, from whose face the earth and the heavens fled away; but in the first one he saw thrones, and those who sat upon them, a thing that is not hard to find in this world, even now. An imaginary theory can make a man see much more than John saw, and that is the trouble with these brethren, they must make what John said he saw correspond with the theory.

When Jesus comes the second time it will not be to inaugurate a reign upon the earth, but to end one. He began his reign on the day of Pentecost. Pauls tells us about that time and says: He must reign until He has put all enemies under His feet. Then cometh the end when He shall have put down all rule and authority, and shall have delivered the kingdom up to God even the Father. That will be when He comes the second time, the dead will then be raised and judged, and that is the end so far as any reign of Jesus in this world is concerned.

That will be His second coming, and also His last coming, the only one our Bible knows anything about. It will be for the judgment, and the dead will be raised and brought forth to the judgment, and a final separation made at that time, all New Testament writers are clear on that point. He is not coming to set up a kingdom, but to surrender one back to the Father. (1 Cor. 15:24-28).
There can be no place for a third coming of Jesus in the Bible accounts of the final judgment. When he comes the second time he will make a clean sweep, and finish His work in this world. There will be nothing left for Him to come back to, or for Him to do at some future date. If He should come at the beginning of the millennium that would be His second coming. Then if He came again at the close of the millennium for the judgment that would be a third coming, one more than any Bible writer has ever mentioned. The conclusion then is that He will not come the second time until He comes for the judgment. Therefore, He will not be here in person during the time called the millennium. He will reign from His throne in heaven where He is head over all things both in heaven and on earth, and on the same throne from which He has already reigned for almost two thousand years.

"THE DEAD IN CHRIST WILL RISE FIRST."

We are told that Paul, in at least two passages, bears out the idea of a first and second resurrection, in both of which righteous people will have a part. There is nothing in either passage cited that indicates such an idea. It is also said that one of these resurrections comes at the beginning of the millennium, and the other at the close, and there will also be wicked people in the last resurrection.

Those who thus argue already had the idea in their mind, and must make a vivid use of the imagination to find the least particle of support for it in the passages. Even the great Doctor Brents seems to have fallen for this error, and devotes an entire page in his valuable book to bolster it. Doctor Brents was a great writer, and a great thinker, but his arguments on this point are weak.

I Thes. 4-16-17 is the first passage. "The Lord himself shall descend from heaven, with a shout, and the voice of an arch angel, and with the trumpet of God; and the dead in Christ shall be raised first; then we which are alive and remain shall be caught up together with them to meet the Lord in the air."

"The dead in Christ shall rise first." They have to cut the passage off at this point, and ignore the rest of it, to get at their idea of a first resurrection, and that is childish and puny. Paul did not cut it off there. What is he talking about? First of what? First of the two classes. The apostle is writing about the dead in Christ, and we who are alive and remain. The dead will be raised before the living; are changed, then the two will rise up together to meet the Lord in the air, and so to ever be with the Lord. "We which are alive and remain shall not prevent, or go before, those who are dead, or asleep. The dead in Christ will be raised first, then the living will be changed, and the two classes will arise to meet the Lord at one and the same time.

I am surprised that any man who can read simple English can read this passage and hold that it implies two resurrections. It is inexcusable, and no man will do it who is not blinded by a theory. There are no thousand years intervening between the two events. The dead will be raised and the living will be changed, but they go up to meet the Lord at the same moment. Let Paul explain it himself, if some further explanation is needed. "Behold I show you a mystery, we shall not all sleep, but we shall all be changed, in a moment, in the twinkling of an eye, at the last trump, for the trumpet shall sound, and the dead shall be raised incorruptible, and we shall be changed". (1 Cor 15:51-52)

This is the same trump, the same resurrection, and the same change of living saints, and it is at the last trump. Two events take place, the dead are raised, the living are changed. And the dead were raised first, and this is the plain teaching from both passages.

But they make a worse blunder on the next passage—1 Cor. 15-23. "But every man in his own order, Christ the first fruits, afterwards they that are Christ's at His coming". Who are the first fruits? They answer that it must be the saints raised at the beginning of the millennium. Then who are the ones who will be Christ's at his coming? And will he not come before the millennium? Yes, they say, the Lord will come before the millennium, and since the ones who have part in the last resurrection will be his at his coming they will be his when he comes for the millennium.

Yes, they say he will be here all through the millennium, therefore, he comes before it, and these last saints will be given him at that time. Then you must have the first fruits raised too quick, before he comes, and before the millennium. Where did we learn about that? If he came at the time the first fruits were raised, and then came back for those who are his at his coming, a thousand years later, or at the end of the millennium, that makes too many comings. The Bible only mentions one return of the Lord to this earth, a second coming. This third coming is not mentioned by any of the inspired writers, and must be a bad guess.

But why speculate when Paul tells us that Christ himself was the first fruits of them that slept, that is of the dead. (See verse 9b). If Christ is the first fruits, and Paul said He was, then where do these brethren get these millions of saints they assume will be raised at the beginning of the millennium, and a thousand years before he comes the second time?

Christ was the first fruits of them that slept, and the saints will be given to Him at His coming. What coming? His second coming, the only personal coming the New Testament mentions, and in the two passages the apostle tells us just how it will come about. The dead will be raised first, then the living will be changed, and together they will rise up to meet the Lord in the air.

The saints obtain a first resurrection of a spiritual nature, and they are a kind of first fruits to the Lord when they are converted. "Of His own will begat He us with the word of truth that we should be a kind of first fruits of His creatures" (Jas. 1-18). The saints are first fruits now, not that they obtained a literal resurrection, but are partakers of His resurrection when they are raised with Him from the baptismal grave.

It has always been a strange thing to me why brethren will split hairs, and speculate over obscure passages of Scripture when there are so many passages on the very subject that are not obscure. "The hour is coming in which all that are in the their graves shall hear His voice, and shall come forth, they that have gone good to the resurrection of life, and they that have done evil to the resurrection of damnation." There is nothing obscure in that passage, nothing a speculator can twist, or wrest, and there are numbers of passages of the same report. In fact, every passage that speaks of the judgment has both the good and the bad before the Lord in the same day, and at the same hour, and it is called the last day, and the last hour, in terms we cannot misunderstand.
ANCIENT EVILS IN THE CHURCH TODAY
T. R. WILKINSON

THE EVILS OF COMPromise

Brother Witty is still working faithfully trying to mix oil and water, and in the last issue of his quarterly he repeats his same stale arguments in which he takes no position on anything, and really says nothing. Sometimes I think he is trying to prove that wrong is just the same thing as right, and then he shifts over and appears to be trying to show that right is wrong. He says it is a matter of zones, and there are three zones: the zone of faith, the zone of expediency, and the zone of vain worship.

He says some of us stand in the zone of faith and give answers that apply only in the zone of expediency; others stand in the zone of expediency and give answers that belong in the zone of faith; others, and these are the worst kind, stand in both of these zones and give answers which belong in the zone of vain worship. I do not argue with Brother Witty over his zones, he is just playing with words to keep from saying something that might alienate some of his tender conscientious readers, and perhaps to hoodwink some on the other side. What I want to know is in what zone he means to place instrumental music in the worship, missionary societies, and the human inventions practiced by the digressives?

I agree that in matters of pure expediency the law of love should govern along with sound judgment, but now just which matters of those which have caused the divisions between us does he place in the zone of expediency? If he places instrumental music and the human societies, and other human agencies, in the zone of expediency: then he has joined hands with the enemy in this fight, and does not belong with the people he pretends to fellowship. If he places them in the zone of faith then he has forsaken Murch and his plea, and condemns those who use them, and proves that they are human innovations, and therefore vain worship, since they are not mentioned in the book of faith, the Bible.

He says, some of us who stand in the zone of faith give answers which belong in the zone of expediency. Just who are the "us" and what are those answers he has in mind? Does he by any chance have in mind instrumental music, and the human societies, the things which divide the two bodies? I want to understand Brother Witty if I can, and learn what this thing is that he proposes to the churches of Christ. Does he mean to say that in our opposition to these innovations we are opposing only expediencies, and they are not matters of faith? If he does then he should not include the churches of Christ in his "us"-himself maybe, but not those who are informed on the grounds of our opposition.

Brother Witty does not represent the churches of Christ in this mess in which he has entangled himself, he is really representing the other side, and working in their interest, and the only possible effect his efforts can have is to weaken confidence in the stand we have taken. On its face the Quarterly pretends to be a joint effort of the two bodies of people to find a common ground upon which they can unite, but the pretension is a fraud and a cheat. Brother Witty may be the victim of too Murch cunning on the other side, but if has set out to deliberately work upon the churches of Christ to cease their opposition to Instrumental Music in the worship, and the societies, he could not do a better job.

Of course, he does not personally place these innovations in what he calls the zone of expediency, he leaves that for numerous other writers in the same quarterly, and in the same issue, to do for him. As a sample of what is found in various articles in the quarterly, aside from Brother Witty's own contribution, I note that a large percent of the writers began their work in the no-organ branch, or they got their education in the no-organ schools, but immediately abandoned their connections with that wing when they got into the work actively. There must have been a reason for this change of sides, and whether expressed or not the plain implication is that they are not progressive enough to suit them.

One writer, a Mr. B. H. Miller, is certain that the Lord has given no divine pattern of worship, public worship he calls it, except in the one item of breaking the bread. He says all forms of worship, except the breaking of the bread, both private and public, are almost entirely left without mention. Yes, he admits, we are commanded to worship: not in Jerusalem, or Samaria; but time and place, and just how, or under what circumstances, this "spiritual worship," which he admits Jesus enjoined, is nowhere given by uniform divine pattern, and then remarks that we may have made a great mistake at this point.

He admits that the early Christians returned to Jerusalem with great joy, and that they continued "steadfastly in the apostles doctrine, and fellowship, in breaking of the bread, and in prayer, and in singing psalms, hymns, and spiritual songs, but whether as public, or private devotions, is not stated." Thus it appears from this writer that the little matter of "spiritual worship," was left entirely to the individual, as to when, or what, or how, the Lord left it wide open for man to choose his own.

But that is not all he says in that same issue, he says of that singing of spiritual songs, whether this worship is to be public or private is not stated, and whether with or without the customary use of instruments is not specifically stated. Notice the skill with which he slips in that word "customary," as if the fact is well known that they used such instruments in their singing. Just how he thought they sang with instruments is just a little mystifying, too. I mean, of course, mechanical instruments, like an organ or a harp, or fiddle. Paul said, singing spiritual songs, but said nothing about playing them. And we can be positive that they did not sing with a musical instrument. Even the dance is not mentioned in connection with their singing, or a brass band. They were just told to sing spiritual songs, and to teach and admonish each other in so doing. I suppose it must have been in public if they were to mutually edify each other.

Now when we consider Brother Witty's connection with the movement, and the article which he wrote in this issue, going no further than he did, and add to it the further arguments contained in these other articles, there is only one conclusion possible: those who oppose the use of instruments, and the human societies are just a faction of old cranks who are making a big to do over nothing, and all that is needed to secure this much-to-be desired union is for them to close up shop, and come over and join in the good work.

Union in the work of the Lord is very much to be desired, but union without unity would be a farce. Union on the basis proposed by these brethren is the sheerest non-
sense, and a wicked farce. It is wicked because it would propose a compromise with the wisdom of man who has placed his puny wisdom above the wisdom of God, and proposes to tell the Lord what he wants of His people.

The things which you propose, Brother Witty, are impossible, truth and error will not mix, and never again will truth compromise with error as it did in the great apostacy. There are too many faithful men of God, standing as watchmen on the walls of Zion, with open eyes, and faith unfeigned, for such a compromise to get by them, and again betray the church of God to Satan's cause.

I am sure that Brother Witty thinks he is doing a good work, but he is unwittingly playing into the hands of cunning men. These men are trying to do by craft, and guile, that which they failed to do in open combat. They are smart enough to know they cannot do in that way. But with the help of Brother Witty, and others whom he can influence, they hope to break down the morale of the opposition, and by playing upon the strings of love, charity, and the desire for union, woo them over to the embrace of the digressives. Yes, it is only because of lack of love, and sweet spirited charity, and brotherly kindness, that these old fogies will not fellowship our innovations, and it is such a small thing, an expediency, over which they (these cranks) have brought about this division. Drop all opposition to these innovations and we can all be one. One—but in whose service?

THE EVILS OF HUMAN AUTHORITY

The evils which trouble our churches today are not peculiar to this age, they had them in the days of the apostles, and that must be the reason we find something in their writings which covers almost any condition that can arise. In the third Epistle of John we read about this ancient church boss, and we also learn what the old apostle thought about him, he says,

"I wrote unto the church, but Diotrephes who loveth the preeminence receiveth us not. Therefore, if I come I will remember his deeds which he doeth, prating against me and my gospel, and the book of Revelation, written at the same time, and to introduce them unto the churches, and it is supposed the apostle was asking help from this church in circulating his writing among the churches which we know was a difficult thing to do at that time.

They had not printing presses, and there was only a single copy of the books John wrote while on Patmos, and to circulate them, which was a most urgent need at that time, copies would have to be made by hand, and this required much labor, and considerable cost. John was very old and realized his days were about over, and the modern errors his books were written to combat were spreading rapidly, and these books needed to be placed in the hands of all the churches. He was simply asking help from the churches, especially strong ones like the church at Ephesus. Some of the members of the church wanted to help in the work, among them Gaius, but Diotrephes, the church boss, turned thumbs down on it. He refused to let the brethren John sent be heard in the church, and when Gaius and others took up their cause he put them to silence, and even put them out of the church.

But not content with this he "prated against" the apostle with malicious words, and used his position as church boss to silence all opposition to his course. He judged the matter himself, settled it to his own satisfaction, and decided there was nothing to bring before the church. He forced the church to accept his ruling, and put those out of the church who wanted to hear the brethren from John. That is the way church bosses work today, and we betide that brother or sister who questions usurped authority. Like Diotrephes, they silence them, and even put them out of the church as disturbers of the worship.

Just what those malicious words were that he used against John and what the apostle wanted them to do, John does not inform us, but we can have a pretty fair idea of what they were when we consider all of the circumstances, and also the methods by which the church bosses rule today. His arguments and reasons would be about the same ones church bosses use today to justify an arbitrary course in settling matters that concern the whole church, themselves.

If the business John was asking this church to help in was the circulation of the five books, or three books at that time, which he had written, their content might give us a pretty clear idea of why Diotrephes refused to let the church have anything to do with the Fatter. The Ebionites, the Cerenthians, the Gnostics, Nicodimians, and others, had filled the churches with destructive heresies, and the books John wrote were to combat those very evils which had arisen in the world after the other books of the New Testament were written. The other apostles had died before these heresies came into prominence, and they had written nothing about them, since the evils did not exist.

No doubt the plea of this venerable apostle, "brethren we are drifting," fell upon deaf ears in the church where these evils existed. Many of the younger members, and some of the older ones, and some of them men of prominence in the business world, would be saturated with them, and they wanted to be left in peace with their heresies. Diotrephes might not have been contaminated with them, but was interested in holding the church together, and now John was getting old, and he was getting cranky on some
points, and what he was advocating in those three books would bring great trouble to the church.

We know that he did prate against the apostle with malicious words, and the things I have mentioned are about the least he could have said, and they are the stock in trade of church bosses against preachers who cry out against evils that creep into churches even to this day. Such preachers soon get on the black list with the strong (?) churches, who are doing things (?) with boy pastors who are wise enough to remain quiet, but do know how to dress well, wear proper ties, and keep their shoes polished, and can meet polite society.

Don't get me wrong on this particular point. I do not object to the preachers wearing clothes, even nice clothes, neither do I object to young preachers, who preach the truth and stand up for it, nor to men who can meet the public. But it takes more than good clothes and a polite manner to make a gospel preacher who will please the Lord in His work. We know that this particular church was honey-combed with these very heresies about which John had written so loudly. And we know that Diotrephes did love the pre-eminence, did refuse to let the apostle's emissaries be heard in the church, did prate against the apostle with malicious words, and did put the brethren out of the church who wanted to help the apostle.

With this much conceded we can see what a bombshell such books as John wrote on Patmos would be in that church. It would alienate all of those who held to those heresies, and to this church boss they probably loomed as his most prominent members, and he must keep the peace at all costs. No doubt some in the church did not partake of these books. He would not consider the fact that the apostles were dead, he just remembered that Paul, Peter, and James, had passed them by without mention, and now he had already put them out, and he meant to keep a tight rein over such members, and these new books by John would encourage them to rebellion.

He had what he considered a most plausible case against John, he had raised questions in these books that no other inspired man had dared to raise, at least no other had raised them, and even the Lord Himself had never raised these questions, and the church had prospered for thirty years without these books. He would not consider the fact that these errors had not arisen in the world until the other apostles were dead, he just remembered that Paul, Peter, and James, had passed them by without mention, and now it ill became this old apostle to drag them out to disturb the peace of a church which was doing great things for the Lord.

No doubt he considered he was doing well with his church, he kept them at peace by exercising his authority over them, and no doubt some influential people had entered his membership on that very account. Then he no doubt had some fine young preachers, men who could mix with the higher-ups of the city, and some of them held to these new ideas. Even if they were errors, as the apostle was claiming in these books, what possible harm could they do just as long as the church prospered, and the people came, and gave their support?

Besides the apostle had used some harsh language in the books. He called them anti-Christ, said they knew not God, called them liars, and said they were murderers, and Diotrephes could not permit such things to be said of some of his prominent members. Of course, there were some old members in his church who wanted to hold fast to the fundamentals of the gospel, and mumbled in their whiskers about these new doctrines. But Diotrephes was the elder, and had the pre-eminence, and could keep these few old fogies under control. They probably did not pay much any way, and had little influence in the city, and if they got too hot-headed he could put them out without much loss to the church.

He could probably make the point that his church had its budget made up for the year, and every dollar they could raise was allotted to some particular work already, and this new work would unbalance their budget. He had a place for every dime they could raise, there was the local work to support, and missionary work they had contracted, and then there was the poor, the widows, and the orphans, and the church had all it could possibly handle.

Then the church had got along without these books for a long time, and prospered. and they are so drastic of these new points, and the church is already having trouble over these very points, and these books would encourage that, trouble, and cause the matter to get out of hand. The church is doing well under my leadership, and we are satisfied to let well enough alone. So he clamped down on the proposition, silenced the members who wanted to help John's emissaries, put them out of the church, and showed them he was still boss.

It was to forestall just such church bosses as Diotrephes that the Lord ordained a plurality of bishops in the churches. It is some harder for men who love the pre-eminence to boss the church where they have a number of men with the same authority, but many times they do manage it. That is also the reason the authority of the bishops is limited, they are not to be lords over God's heritage, but ensamples to the flock.

It was these church bosses that brought on the great apostasy, and the pope of Rome is an outgrowth of this very evil. Then we cannot wonder that the apostle would take this one to task, and would write as he has about the evil he was doing. They have been present in some churches in all ages and, of course, we have them today, and their work always results in evil. It is not always the older men who develop this characteristic, sometimes they are comparatively young men, should not have been appointed to such a position, but who are being pushed forward for one reason or another, who lose their heads with authority, and come to believe that they are indispensable to the church.

Let it be understood that nothing I have said in this article is meant to reflect upon the work of thousands of God fearing bishops in churches all over the land who are carrying out the work of the Lord in a manner that is most gratifying to all real lovers of the truth. Neither would I reflect upon the great work that thousands of young preachers are doing, even boy preachers, without them the church would soon be without preachers entirely. Most young preachers that I know are sound in the faith, and they stick close to the fundamental truths in their teaching, and do little speculating.

If bishops were not necessary in the churches the Lord would not have ordained them, and there is no higher office, or position, in this world to which a Christian can attain than that of bishop over the church of the Lord, and they are due all the honor we can give them.