One of my school-boy text-books had this: "Words are the signs of ideas." I later learned that the way some speakers and writers use words, the "signs" are there in plenty, but the ideas are not. Perhaps we should think of words as vehicles for thought—not of thought, for they sometimes go out empty. They are the vehicles by which we convey thoughts to others. This requires the selection of the right words, and their proper arrangement in sentences. In the Millennial Harbinger in 1862 J. W. McGarvey had an article in which he discussed the difference between the two Greek words that are translated repent, or repentance. At the close of the article he said: "In conclusion, let me express the hope, that all our thinking brethren will turn their attention to the closest investigation of familiar words and themes, so as to attain a still clearer understanding of the word of truth, and a still purer speech." You will notice that Brother McGarvey's appeal is to "our thinking brethren." Giving heed to that appeal is needed today more than ever, for many of our schools of today do not make close students of the English language.

I suppose all of us are wrong many times in both pronunciation and the use of words, but we can strive for improvement. My good friend and teacher, the lamented R. W. Norwood, used to say, "If we were not good guessers, we would never be able to understand one another." Brother McGarvey, eighty-three years ago, saw the need then of "the closest investigation of familiar words and themes." We can all learn the meaning of familiar words, and we can so arrange our sentences as to enable the reader or hearer to see clearly the thoughts we wish to convey. One might as well speak in a foreign language as to use words the people do not understand. The sentence should be so clear and pointed that people see the thought and feel its force without having their attention attracted to either the crudity or the polish of the language. To illustrate: If in looking out through a window you notice the glass, the glass is not clear. To try to see what some writers mean is like trying to see an object through fog or smoke. Words within themselves are not powerful: they are powerful only when they convey thoughts to the hearts of people. I like to study a man's thoughts; but if he tries to convey his thoughts in unfamiliar words or in long complicated sentences so that I have to study to see what he is trying to say, I turn to something else. There is nothing like getting to the point and staying with it.

Years ago I had an experience that was worth much to me, though at the time I did not realize it. I wrote a series of articles, each one limited to a certain number of words. I wrote each article without regard to the number of words I used, and sometimes went fifty percent above my limit. To cut out one third of the words without sacrificing a single point or argument, required careful revision; but I succeeded in doing it, and the articles gained in pointedness and force by the operation. To any young man who desires to be a writer I recommend a similar course. Use few adjectives; when possible avoid the use of adjectives of many syllables. Take for example that gem, the twenty-third Psalm; notice that it has only three adjectives, all one syllable words, and they are woven in with such skill that you see the picture without noticing the words—"green pastures", "still waters", "no evil." Now, suppose you rewrite that Psalm after the style of some men in their writing, speaking and praying. You would begin something like this: The great omnipotent, omniscient, and omnipresent Jehovah is my loving, faithful, beneficent, and ever-to-be adored Shep-
herd; I shall never want for any good thing. He gently makes me to take my repose on velvety carpets in the beautiful, verdant pastures, etc., etc. How would that sound? About like some things you see and hear.

It is surprising how many blunders even preachers make in their misuse of familiar words. Some years ago a preacher of some ability and considerable experience was telling me about preaching the Sunday before in a small town. The brethren were discussing the propriety of changing their order of worship from time to time; lest some might think their custom was the scriptural order. This preacher gave this advice, as he related it to me: "No, brethren, if it is your custom to do things in a certain order, I would not change the custom; you know Paul says, 'custom to whom custom is due.'" Be careful; you might make as bad a blunder.

About a generation ago, the pious and scholarly O. A. Carr, in an article, lamented the growing wrong use of the word service—"the song service," "the praise service," "the communion service," etc. He wondered how long it would be before brethren would be talking about "the prayer service." If he had lived a few years longer, he would have heard that absurd expression used almost universally; and he would have heard brethren using the equally absurd expression, "the worship service." And he would have heard brethren speak of a sermon as a message. We are picking too many things out of denominational garbage cans.

One preacher of wide reputation is reliably reported to have said that a man who had engaged in labor strikes could not be an elder, for Paul said an elder must be "no striker." We should pay some attention to the study of words.

None of us pronounce all words perfectly. More than once my attention has been called to some common words I failed to pronounce correctly, and I profited by the criticism. I am not a fanatic on pronunciation; but there are some common Bible words that are often mispronounced.

Occasionally even now you will hear some one quote Paul as saying, "For as often as ye eat this bread, and drink this cup, ye do shoo the Lord's death till he come." So far as I can learn the word "shew" was never pronounced shoo, but always sho, just as we pronounce "saw" so. Webster tells us that the spelling shew is especially British, but they pronounce it sho. It sounds bad to hear some one sho the Lord's death. And it sounds equally bad to pronounce draught so as to make it rhyme with fraught. It is pronounced draft. Draft is the usual spelling in America. No, the disciples did not take a drawt of fishes, and what you eat does not pass out into the drawt. Do not make yourself ridiculous.

A brother asked a University professor to go with him to hear a preacher of wide reputation. On their way home the brother asked the professor what he thought of the sermon. The only answer he received was the one word "sacrifiss." Evidently the professor did not think much of the ability of a preacher who did not know how to pronounce a Bible word.

More than one brother in recent months have used the expression, "our fallen nature." I do not know what they mean by that expression, and I doubt that they know; but it sounds as if they were tinctured with the doctrine of inherited depravity.

"Let us consider one another to provoke unto love and good works; not forsaking our own assembling together, as the custom of some is, but exhorting one another; and so much the more as ye see the day approaching." (Heb. 10:24, 25) For speakers and writers to quote that passage, and begin at once to talk about neglecting the assembly is a curious thing. They should know, but evidently do not know, that there is a considerable difference between forsaking and neglecting. A man might neglect to provide for his family as he should without forsaking it: to forsake is to abandon, to desert. To forsake the assembly is to show complete apostasy.

When I was young I heard it said that the people after the flood decided to build a tower so high that they could climb up it into heaven. I had an idea that that foolish notion was dead; but recently I read an article that advocated the notion that these people were trying to go to heaven on their own plan. Well, will curious notions never cease? Their proposed plan is plainly stated in Genesis 11:4. They said, "Come, let us build us a city, and a tower, whose top may reach unto heaven." Now, if they wanted to climb up that tower into heaven, why would they want to build a city to leave behind? Their purpose is plainly stated. Read the verse: "And they said, Come, let us build us a city, and a tower, whose top may reach unto heaven." It was their plan for unity. They wanted a centralized rallying point. God had commanded, "Be fruitful, and multiply, and replenish the earth"; but they did not want to "be scattered abroad upon the face of the whole earth." And because their plan ran counter to God's plan, he confounded their language so they could not understand one another's speech. "So Jehovah scattered them abroad from thence upon the face of all the earth." All man-made schemes for unity fail. If people would study what to say instead of studying something to say, it would help.
THE PREMILLENNIAL PROPAGANDA PARTY

It is frequently remarked now that premillennialism is dead and that Bollism is a thing of the past. It is true that the schism has suffered defeat and the schismatics have been set back, but as Satan in Job's day retreated only to return, the leaders of the millennial schism receded from certain public positions only to regroup their reinforcements.

Certain examples of this fact are outstanding. For instance, Clinton Davidson having failed to gain control of the papers and the preachers now operates through Harding College and its president, George S. Benson, his mouth-piece. Now a Bixler-McCaleb affiliated party in Chicago is in formation to attack another flank of the church. O. D. Bixler and Harding McCaleb, avowed premillennialists, who have now openly espoused the cause of R. H. Boll, are reported now to be asking for several hundred thousand dollars "missionary money." In years past Don Carlos Janes travelled among the churches gathering up money for the missionaries. He used the mails also for his fraud. The brethren were warned years ago by such men as M. C. Kurfees, F. W. Smith, F. B. Srygley, and other men of unquestioned integrity, but because it was for "mission work" the brethren ignored the warnings and filled the coffers of this millennial group with steady contributions. Janes died-and left $40,000 "missionary money." E. L. Jorgenson to be used for the specified purpose of promoting premillennial propaganda by the printed page. And the innocence of thousands of brethren, who had for many years been warned, turned to amazement! They simply could not believe that these pious brethren could do such a thing! But they did it, just the same.

The Janes Will instructed the administrator, E. L. Jorgenson, to promote premillennialism through the avenue of reprinting the alleged millennial notions of certain pioneers-so his trusty is now featuring his "Precious Reprints" in Word and Work and the Missionary Messenger. Precious Reprints-fourty thousand dollars worth! Reprinted incidentally, of course, in the Boll and Jorgenson owned and controlled magazines.

So within the churches of Christ there is now a fully organized Propaganda Party-as deadly determined by every means, method or manner to fasten their ism on the churches as Propaganda Minister Josef Paul Goebbels ever was to make Nazis of all the German people. And this party now has the money with which to do it-the missionary money, misappropriated missionary money, misobtained missionary money-left to this millennial party by the legal will of Don Carlos Janes. So now the Word and Work (R. H. Boll's paper) is allegedly being sent free to all the preachers, that is, free to them-being a promoter of premillennialism the circulation of this magazine as millennial propaganda easily comes within the provisions of the Janes Will.

Now appears also a new Chicago formation—an affiliated party who on the heels of the Janes Will are reported to have the unmitigated audacity to ask for several hundred thousand dollars for "missionary work." The sad thing is, if it is true, that too many brethren will respond (any will be too many) through ignorance, indifference or simple stupidity. The famous Barnum statement that the people like to be humbugged does not apply to the public only; it applies to the church as well, the proof of which is seen in the response to schemes in the church all the way from send-me-a-dollar begging broadcasts to Don Carlos Janes, Barney Morehead and Jimmie Lovell missionary mediums. And now it appears that the 0. D. Bixler-Harding McCaleb missionary machine is about to be set in motion in Chicago. We should raise our voices in unison to say, Remember the Janes Will! It is a monument to misplaced confidence and misappropriated missionary funds. But when men like Kurfees, Smith and Srygley warned the brethren of that missionary racket, they were abused to the degree of vilification, and the editors of some gospel papers, who should have known better, published the reports of these premillennial missionary promoters, and furnished the medium for their propaganda, thereby becoming particeps criminus to the greatest imposture of all time of designing men who descended like vultures on the church.

Before the brethren take on another organized missionary scheme, whether an individual or a group, read C. A. Norred's article on page five of this issue.

As for "Precious Reprints"—it sounds sweet, but it is pure premillennial propaganda. Precious Reprints is reputedly a reproduction of alleged millennial views of early preachers in the church. If such views on their part could
be definitely established it would only mean the reprint of a lot of early errors. Did the brethren contribute missionary money to D. C. Janes for such a thing as that?

But one of the best evidences that "Precious Reprints" in the manner and connections in which they are reprinted are misrepresentations, if not actually misquotations, is in the fact that the quoters have through the years refused to reprint certain articles and statements of the very men whose views and writings they prostitute and pervert. Why do they refuse to "reprint" certain articles, and paragraphs of articles, from the utterances of Alexander Campbell while pretending to reproduce his views? For years they have been urged to do so, but these "reprints" will never see the light of type in Word and Work, Missionary Messenger, or any other printed medium financed by the erstwhile missionary money of the churches now comprising the residue of the Last Will And Testament Of Don Carlos Janes. The tactics of these brethren are the same as the wiles of 'J. Frank Norris, who falsified the records to make it appear that Alexander Campbell agreed with him on the design of baptism, the establishment of the kingdom and premillennialism! His perfidy in so doing was no greater than their improbity in doing so.

As an example of some "precious reprints" that will never be reprinted at any price by these premillennial propagandists, a few juicy extracts, of which kind there are many more, from pens of the departed which they are wont to quote, but which they do not and will not quote, are here submitted:

Alexander Campbell:

The doctrine of two literal resurrections is no where taught in the scripture, unless it be taught in this passage: and certainly to select out of the midst of so many symbols, as we find in this passage, one phrase, and make it not only literal and unfigurative, but also to found on it the doctrine of two distinct corporeal and literal resurrections, would be a dangerous precedent — and without a parallel in sound criticism and good sense — not only in the Bible, but in other similar composition in the world. Where have we a first and second resurrection in any other passage of Jewish or Christian scriptures besides this? And where have we a hint of more than one literal resurrection from any prophet or apostle? I know of none. It appears therefore like building a castle upon the ice to found the theory of two proper resurrections upon such data as this passage affords. — Millennial Harbinger 1841 P. 194.

"Who, then, enlightened in the Christian religion, can pray 'thy reign come, or thy kingdom come?' I want no other proof of the darkness that yet covers much of Protestant Christendom than the papal ceremonial hEDdominal abuse of 'the Lord's prayer,' as it is named in many hundred synagogues in this so-called 'Bible enlightened land.'" 1851, Page 21:

“The kingdom has come and the king has been on the throne of David now more than 1800 years; still, myriads are yet praying ‘thy kingdom come’! Some qualify it by such awkward phrases as ‘thy kingdom come into the hearts of this people:’ ‘thy kingdom come in its ultimate glory.’ But this is to desecrate and mystify the scripture style.”

“David foretold that his son would be a king and sit upon his throne — not on earth, but in the heavens.”

“With this induction of all the passages that sneak of the throne of David. and all that is said of the anointing or coronation of the Lord Jesus, can anyone find a vestige of authority for the assumption that Jesus Christ will descend from the throne of God in the heavens, to sit up anything called a throne of David, in literal Jerusalem; and thus, in the form of a man, reign as a prince and priest over one nation and people, for any national, temporal or spiritual purpose!”

“God reigned on earth in the persons of Judah’s kings on David’s throne. But after the Jews said — This is the heir, come let us kill him and seize the inheritance” he translated the throne of David to heaven and placed his Son upon it, and there it will continue as the seat of the Lord Jesus Christ till all enemies fall before him.” 1849, Page 291-4:

MoSES E. Lord: “It is strenuously maintained that, as a nation, Israel is yet to be restored to divine favor. With those ‘entertaining this view I cannot agree. As a nation, Israel, in my opinion will never be restored. The only restoration that awaits them is individual — on the condition above one, or all, who then live in Christ, can they ever regain the divine favor — it will be as individuals and not as a nation. They will then exist as constituent parts of the church, and not dwell apart by themselves as a nation. The individual Christianization of the Jew is one thing; their re-nationalization, quite another. In that, I believe up to a large number; in this not at all.” Commentry on Romans, P. 347.

“The future salvation of Israel does not imply their restoration to their ancient home in Palestine. The former is a great necessity, the latter is none . . . . the gospel is not designed to prepare men for an earthly Canaan, but for a heavenly.” Commentary, Page 371.

Robert Milligan: “According then, to the testimony of Peter, Jesus Christ was, on the day of Pentecost, seated on the throne of David, not in Jerusalem, as the Jews anticipated, but in heaven at the right hand of Cod.” Millennial Harbinger, 1856, P. 69.

These are but a few of many passages that could be reprinted from the pens of the men claimed by these perverters of the pioneers for the prestige of their unworthy faction. If they insist on rejecting these “reprints” on the ground that these men forsooth said something else, then we could with as much consistency reject anything else they said on the ground that they said this. I am not a Campbellite, but I have the writings of Campbell, just about the whole of them, and I am not disposed to sit around and allow these perverters of the word of God and the writings of men, under the pious pretention of “Precious Reprints,” to dishonor their names in an effort to dignify themselves and their theories.

As for this new premillennial propaganda party, we stand ready to meet their challenge to the church on whatever ground they elect to lay the gauntlet — and they shall not pass! - F. E. W. Jr.
Early in 1945 I undertook gospel labors with Cornell Avenue Church of Christ in Chicago, Illinois. Having heard that Bollism had been a troublesome factor there I naturally undertook to assure myself that that problem would not be allowed to stand in the way of my work. For instance, in my initial correspondence with Brother J. D. Clemens I made pointed inquiry as to the influence of Bollism there. Also, I discussed the matter with him in conversation on my initial visit there. He not only spoke freely against Bollism but assured me: "The Boll people here have taken a beating and are anxious to drop the matter." Also, I made special inquiry of a former preacher with the church there. He assured me that in personal conversation Brother E. E. Hayes, another Cornell elder, had said that he would be unwilling to permit a believer in the future kingdom theory to preach at Cornell. Under these conditions I accepted the invitation to labor with Cornell Church. And I hasten to say that when I went to Cornell I went entirely without prejudice and in the firm conviction that I would abstain from bringing up the Boll question in any way. I earnestly felt that if the people who had agitated the matter in the past had reached the place where they were willing to drop the matter I wanted to help them as much as possible. I soon found, though, that Cornell was being used to promote Bollism. I found, too, that I myself was being worked into such a position as would make me subservient to the Boll interests there. I accordingly resigned my labors there. Feeling that the actions of the Boll people in my work at Cornell afford a comprehensive view of the general methods employed by the Boll people I respectfully beg the privilege of submitting this formal and public statement.

1. My Cold Reception.

Although I had been received cordially on my initial visit I found certain leaders cold and uncooperative on my arrival for the beginning of my labors. Particularly did I find that just prior to my arrival such appointments had been made as completely blocked me in every turn I tried to make in my work. (Later it was explained to me that a man then in Florida wrote just prior to my arrival and informed an ardent Boll man in Cornell that it had been found that I might give trouble on the Boll question.)

2. The Cornell Radio Program.

For some time Cornell has maintained a Sunday morning broadcast from the studio of one of the stations there. And it is in point to say that I found after beginning my work that this broadcast had been the storm center in the Boll controversy in the past. Not knowing all this but simply endeavoring to be sure that I understood the things expected there I asked the elders to make clear my status to the radio work of the church. They assured me, in correspondence which I can produce, that under the elders of Cornell I would have full charge of the program. On my arrival brother Clemens asked me to read the minutes of the recent meetings and take notice of certain new arrangements. As I read I was amazed to see that O. D. Bixler, a Boll sympathizer and preacher with Brookfield Church, twenty-five miles out in the suburbs, had been appointed Program Director of the Cornell broadcast! This appointment not only violated the agreement of the elders with me but put me where I could easily be drawn in on a Boll broadcast. And I wish to say that at no time when Bixler, along with Brother J. H. McCaleb, had any conference with the Station Manager was I invited to be present. Of all the incoming correspondence, Brother Bixler permitted me to read one letter! And he requested that I confine my address to twelve minutes of the thirty embraced in the broadcast! (The significance of this amazing arrangement will become clear in the further elements of this story.)

3. Norman Davidson Moves Into View.

The proper sequence in this story requires that it be said here that Cornell fell down in their financial promises to me. About two months after my arrival in Chicago Brother Norman Davidson returned from his winter sojourn in Florida. Several weeks later he called me and explained that in connection with Cornell's deficit with me he was mailing me a rather sizable check. In that same conversation he invited me to visit him for lunch. When I visited him the next day he almost immediately asked me how I would feel about R. H. Boll's being invited to visit Cornell. I explained that that was entirely in the hands of the elders. To my astonishment he appeared to be overjoyed. Then he explained that the previous January he had arranged for Boll to visit Chicago, had paid all expenses of the trip and had him speak at Cornell and in the radio service. Then he spoke at some length in heated denunciation of Northwest Church and Central Church, in Chicago, for expressing strong disapproval of Boll's appearance on the radio and for refusing to have anything further to do with the Cornell broadcast. He then confided to me.
that he was dedicating his remaining years "to putting Brother Boll back on his feet with the church."

When I asked him if Brother Hayes approved of the Boll visit in January he replied: "Yes! Brother Hayes loves Brother Boll very much. It will be sweet music to his ears that he is coming back." When I asked him if Brother Clemens had approved in the matter, he said: "Yes. Brother Clemens is the man that sent me to you!"

In this conversation we also discussed the radio work. He informed me that he was contributing twenty-five dollars each month. After an extended eulogy of Bixler and the assurance that although Bixler might believe the premillennial theory he was never known to teach it, he offered me this advice: "And don't ever cross him. And don't make any suggestions to him. Let him make all the suggestions."

(1 should like to add here that as diplomatically as I knew how to do so I declined to accept the Davidson check.)

4. The Showdown.

Soon after my visit with Davidson I went to Valparaiso, Indiana, for a meeting. There I not only encountered the criticism that the Cornell broadcast was administered by a Boll man but was shown premillennial literature that Bixler had mailed to Mrs. Elmer Lewis, Route 2, Valparaiso, Indiana. Immediately, August 15. I mailed the Cornell elders my resignation effective as of September first. Brother Rowland called me by long distance telephone and requested that I hold matters and confer with the elders on my return to Chicago. In the conference Brother Rowland, who ardently believes the premillennial theory, voiced his appreciation of my work and expressed the hope that I could disregard my discouragements and remain at Cornell. I then reminded them that I had come to Cornell with the distinct understanding that the premillennial theory would not be agitated one way or the other. Then, expecting to introduce Bixler's literature as evidence, I stated that I was going to Cornell with the distinct understanding that Bollism would not be agitated one way or the other. Then he assured me that Bollism had never been known to teach it, and he told me that I was simply imagining things!

I offered him this advice: "And don't ever cross him. And don't make any suggestions to him. Let him make all the suggestions."

Immediately at the end of the conference I called Brother Rowland and assured him that my resignation would have to be final. He accepted my words with courtesy and kindness. As I had gone there with the understanding that Bollism would not be agitated one way or the other I left without making any public reference to the matter. To a few persons who feared that Bollism was being promoted there, and who earnestly approached me for information, I frankly stated that I was leaving because of Bollism.

5. Blackmail!

Soon after leaving Cornell I received through the mails an anonymous letter written on the stationery of Norman Davidson. After piling paragraph on paragraph in defamatory denunciation for my leaving Cornell the writer moved on to this threat: "Should any article criticizing Cornell appear in any paper. I would like to advise you that I shall see that every leader in your church there has a true and complete statement of all that happened around here;—also of some things which have happened at other places where you have been." This letter was not only mailed elsewhere but was made to carry the additional statement that my failure to reply amounts to my admission of guilt in the matter. Although the elders at Cornell must know about the letter I have received no letter from them disavowing the letter or offering any corrections of the false statements it embraces. Neither have I learned of any such letter sent by the elders to any other persons receiving the libelous document mailed out on the stationery of Norman Davidson.

Certainly such action taken to prevent criticism of Cornell must indicate that certain things there are not as they should be. What are these conditions? In the succeeding paragraph I shall endeavor to set them forth as fully and frankly as possible.

6. Conditions at Cornell.

The present leadership of Cornell is in the hands of H. A. Rowland and J. H. McCaleb, ardent Boll men who frankly declare their intention of having premillennialism heard at Cornell.

The condition is made worse by O. D. Bixler, a general field man for Bollism who is permitted to employ Cornell's resources in that work. (Observe, for instance, his control of the Cornell...
And the situation is made infinitely worse by Norman Davidson. Davidson holds no membership in any Chicago church. He endeavors to control, through, through the use of his money. And he is dedicating his remaining years to putting Boll back on his feet before the churches. And he is taking over Cornell in that work. After his return from Florida I found myself unable to confer with the elders or function in the work except under his interference and domination.

But the very worst thing of the entire arrangement is that in spite of the conditions just recited certain persons are carefully leaving the impression that Cornell is not supporting Bollism. In this way good people in the membership at Cornell, but new arrivals in the city, and even preachers, will be beguiled, even as I was, into giving support to the work. This particular feature makes the situation at Cornell especially injurious.

This is my story. I humbly disavow any spirit of retaliation—my one desire is that all interested persons may know the actual conditions at Cornell.

And I find myself unwilling to close this formal statement without passing beyond the particular condition at Cornell to a general consideration of the matter. The fact is that I am made to look on conditions at Cornell as exhibiting the general character of Bollism, for they disclose the narrowness, intrigue, and personal bitterness which have made themselves so conspicuous in the heresy wherever it has gone.

SOME STATEMENTS VERIFIED

FOY E. WALLACE JR.

It is reported that George S. Benson, president of Harding College, Searcy, Arkansas, has upon several recent occasions accused the editor of the Bible Banner of falsehood with reference to his (Benson's) previous premillennial views and other sectarian notions. Letters have come to me asking verification of certain statements attributed to me. I herewith submit the evidence, in part. Much more could be said. For the present, testimony of B. G. Hope and George B. Curtis will suffice on the point of veracity involved.

Under the heading of "What I Learned In Brother Benson's Classes," Brother Hope deposes as follows:

I have had a number of conversations with Brother Benson and have also carried on a correspondence with him concerning Premillennialism. The following are some of the things that I have learned:

I learned that Brother Benson believed the "theory" as taught by R. H. Boll in 1925. He stated in an ancient history class that he believed it. Brother Benson ridiculed the idea of not taking the thousand years as mentioned in Revelation literally. He also criticized those who opposed the theory.

I learned that people may be possessed with demons today just as they were in the days of Christ.

I learned that miracles might be performed today. As proof he mentioned a case in China where a denominational preacher claimed to have cast out a devil. According to Brother Benson, it is up to the Lord as to whether he will save some without baptism. I would just as soon say that the Lord might save without baptism as to say that he may perform miracles today. It is not taught that he will do either.

I learned that Brother B. F. Rhodes said that Boll might prove to be right in the end but he could not say that he believed it. At this point, I asked Brother Benson how this statement could be made to harmonize with the one that appeared in the Gospel Advocate in the fall of 1936 which stated that the Bible teachers would teach the students how to expose the theory. I could not understand how a man could teach preachers how to meet a thing and at the same time say that it might prove to be right in the end. What would you think of a preacher who would say that he could not say that he believed that a man was saved by faith only but the sectarianists might prove to be right in the end? Would loyal churches desire the services of that sort of preacher?

B. G. Hope.

In addition to the foregoing I have a letter from Brother Hope as recent as March 9, 1946, in which he states: "When I make such a statement I do not misrepresent what he said and I have a signed statement that I did not misrepresent him." In the same letter Brother Hope says: "I know he made the statement for I was in the class."

As further evidence I reprint a statement made by our well known and esteemed gospel preacher, George B. Curtis. Relating some facts concerning a special meeting at Fort Smith, Arkansas, Brother Curtis avers the following:

One of the surprises to me of the whole day was Brother Benson's attitude toward miracles. Brother Hope confronted him with the testimony, which Brother Benson did not deny, that he, Benson, believed in the possibility of performing miracles today, and that he cited an example of the casting out of a devil by a 'Seventh Day Adventist from a Chinese, as proof. He was also confronted with the statement that he, Benson, under the influence of Earl Smith for a time accepted the teaching of Boll. Brother Benson did not deny this. This contradicts all of his bulletins. —Geo. B. Curtis.

These brethren are telling the truth. I believe in them and have confidence in their personal integrity. They were witnesses to what occurred and what was said in these matters and have signed their names to the facts.

There is another matter concerning which it may be necessary for me to state the facts, accompanied by the written testimony of witnesses, which I prefer not to publicize, but Brother Benson's repeated and continued misrepresentations of the matter may compel me to do so, which will be very much more to his embarrassment than to my own. The extent of my interest in any of these matters is for truth and honor and righteousness.
IS AN ALIEN A SINNER

R. L. WHITESIDE

By an “alien” I mean one who has not obeyed the gospel, and is therefore not in the kingdom of Christ. Is such a one a sinner in the sight of God? Do not dismiss this as an idle or foolish question; for it has to do with the very basis, or reason, for the scheme of human redemption. When Jesus came into the world, Gentiles were “alienated from the commonwealth of Israel, and strangers from the covenants of the promise.” (Eph. 2:12) Were the Gentiles sinners at that time? If not, neither are they sinners now. Jesus came to call sinners to repentance; does that call now come to Gentiles and Jews? Are you wondering why I am saying these things? It is because of a theory held by some brethren, and also by the followers of Russell and Scofield.

Years ago a good brother, in answering a question in a gospel paper, said that it did not make any difference how many times aliens married and divorced; for they are not in covenant relationship with the Lord and therefore disobeyed no law of God. If that be so, how can they be regarded as sinners? And more, in God’s sight are aliens married? If I mistake not, Mormons say Gentiles, or aliens, are not married. The theory is that aliens are under no law of God. How then do they become sinners? One brother said they become sinners when they hear the gospel and disobey it. If that be so, then the gospel makes more sinners than it prevents, for the greater number who hear the gospel disobey it. Besides, if people become sinners only when they hear and disobey the gospel, then the one who obeys the gospel as soon as he hears it is never an alien sinner, for he does not become a sinner by disobeying it. Cornelius and those with him, and also the jailer, obeyed as soon as they learned what to do. They did not have the least inclination to disobey. If the theory is correct, they were not sinners at all. From what, then, were Cornelius and the jailer saved?

One preacher in a sermon which I heard, said, “When a man becomes a Christian, he obligates himself to do right.” Look at that statement closely and see what is implied in it. If the statement is true, then a man who is not a Christian is under no obligation to do right—no obligation even to believe! A man does no wrong when he is under no obligation. Hence, if the statement is true, an alien is not a sinner. Well, the Lord will not damn a man who is not a sinner. Why then should any one obligate himself to do right by becoming a Christian?

Several years ago I had a debate with a follower of Pastor Russell. One proposition I affirmed was that baptism is for the remission of sins to Jew and Gentile alike. My opponent believed that baptism was for the remission of sins to the Jews, but not to Gentiles. If you do not yet see the grounds for his contention, you will see later. But in his contention he was more consistent than the brethren I have mentioned: for according to their theory, how can an alien, a Gentile, have any sins to be remitted?

In Scofield’s foreword to the book of Acts we have this:

“Acts is in two chief parts: In the first section (1:1-9:43) Peter is the prominent personage, Jerusalem is the center, and the ministry is to Jews. Already in covenant relationship with Jehovah, they had sinned in rejecting Jesus as the Christ. The preaching, therefore, was directed to that point, and repentance (i.e. a change of mind) was demanded. ……

In the second division (10:1-28:31) Paul is prominent, a new center is established at Antioch and the ministry is chiefly to Gentiles who, as strangers from the covenants of promise (Eph. 2:12) had but to ‘believe on the Lord Jesus Christ to be saved.”

Here you have the theory stated plainly. The Jews had sinned in rejecting Christ, for they were in covenant relations with the Lord, and therefore needed to repent: but the Gentiles had not been in covenant relations with the Lord, but were “strangers from the covenants of promise” and therefore they did not need to repent, but only to believe to be saved. But if the Gentiles were not sinners, from what were they saved by believing? But no matter who advocates this foolish theory, it is so crooked that it is bound to twist itself around over itself at some point. No non-Christian today, whether Jew or Gentile, has ever been in covenant relations with the Lord. If the theory is true, no man now needs to repent, neither can he be baptized for the remission of sins.

It is true that the Gentiles were not under the covenant given at Sinai, but they were sinners. Jesus said to Pilate, “He that delivered me unto thee hath greater sin.” Pilate, though not so sinful as the Jewish council, was himself a sinner, and yet he was not a Jew; he was an alien, an alien sinner. Paul was sent to the Gentiles “to open their eyes, that they may turn from darkness to light, and from the power of Satan unto God, that they may receive remission of sins and an inheritance among them that are sanctified by faith in me.” (Acts 26: 16-18) The Gentiles were in the power of Satan and needed remission of sins. Could they receive remission of sins without repentance?

Read the list of sins charged against Gentiles. (see Rom. 1:18-32) Both Jews and Gentiles were all under sin. (Rom. 3:9) Paul charges that the Gentiles in time past were disobedient to God. (Rom. 11:30) He also says, “We being Jews by nature, and not sinners of the Gentiles” (Gal. 2:15) There is no distinction between Jew and
Gentile—"all have sinned." (Rom. 3:22) Jews are not now in covenant with God any more than Gentiles are. If people cannot sin unless they are in covenant with the Lord, then there are no sinners outside the church! A man would have to become a Christian before he could sin. Get such an idea in the mind of an alien, and what have you? When he hears the command to believe, he can consistently say, "Why should I do what God says? I am not under his jurisdiction." Or, if a man obligates himself to do right when he becomes a Christian, he is under no obligation to do anything that is right so long as he is not a Christian. Get an alien imbued with such ideas, what then? On what grounds can you who hold such theories appeal to any one to become a Christian? So far as I can see you have no grounds for such appeal. I know of no theory more absurd and vicious.

But one may ask, "What about I John 3:4?" The Common Version reads: "Whosoever committeth sin transgresseth also the law: for sin is the transgression of the law." More accurately the American Standard version reads: "Every one that doeth sin doeth also lawlessness; and sin is lawlessness." To be lawless is to live without law—without being governed by law. Can a man without revealed law sin? Paul says, "For as many as have sinned without law shall also perish without law." (Rom. 2:12) Paul was here referring to Gentiles. They did not have a revealed law, nor were they in covenant with the Lord, yet they sinned. John further defines sin: "All unrighteousness is sin." (I John 5:17) In the long list of sins Paul charges against the Gentiles is the sin of "being filled with all unrighteousness." (Rom. 2:29) It is plain therefore that any rational being who fails to do right sins, whether he is in covenant relation with the Lord or not. Some things are right, and some things are wrong within themselves. The moral law applies to all intelligent human beings, and cannot be disregarded without guilt, nor can a foolish theory make it of no effect.

But why go on? More than enough has been said to convince any thinking person; and if a man will shut his eyes to truth no amount of reasoning will make him think.

---
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Readers of the Bible Banner, as well as readers of other religious papers published in the brotherhood, are aware of the fact that some preachers among us have espoused the heresy of “no judgment after death.” The men who have been preaching this heresy are Thomas L. Conner, Marshall Conner, Tracy Wheeler, James F. Brents and Lowell Blasingame. The preaching of this theory has caused division in the body of Christ. To protect the church against further division and trouble, warnings against these men have been sounded in a number of religious papers. Churches should beware of them and refuse to use them that the cause of truth may not be hindered by their heretical preaching.

And now E. C. Fuqua, Fort Worth, Texas, editor of The Vindicator, in the October and November issues of his paper, presents another false theory concerning the judgment. He believes in a future judgment—a judgment after death—but he thinks it will be for the church only. I do not get his paper, but a friend has mailed me the articles from these two issues with a request that I give them some review. Bro. Fuqua seems not to be sure of himself or of his position. In his articles we note such expressions as “it seems” this way and “perhaps” it is so. Or “this may mean” so and so. He did not write, he said, to teach his idea, but “to present data for all of us to study.” And concerning a certain idea he said: “Is that true? I’m just studying the question.” It seems to me that he should have “studied the question” a little before he endeavored “to present data for all of us to study”. He did not write, he said, to teach his idea, but “to present data for all of us to study.” And concerning a certain idea he said: “Is that true? I’m just studying the question.” It seems to me that he should have “studied the question” before he rushed into print with it. In the columns of his paper is no place to “study a question” that he seems so uncertain about. He should first be sure he has the truth on the question before he takes a chance of causing trouble with a theory that is in the uncertain realm of speculation. By doing so he might save himself from embarrassment and the church from division.

No Judgment For The World

While “studying the question” in print Bro. Fuqua reaches the following conclusion:

‘The Lord shall judge his people’. (Heb. 10:30). I know of no passage where he is to judge those not his people. Those not his people are the men and women of the world, and I find where the world ‘hath been judged already.’ (John 3:18). It is impossible for the same people to be judged for the same offence twice. But the offence for which the world is ‘judged already’ is the sin of unbelief. (John 16:9.) Naturally, that cannot be judged again. Therefore there is no future judgment of the world as such.” The Vindicator, October, 1945.

Inasmuch as Bro. Fuqua “knows of no passage” that states the Lord is to judge “those not his people”, and those who are “not his people” are “the men and women of the world,” then he knows of “no passage” that states the Lord is to “judge the world.” And this position he reaches in his conclusion when he says: “Therefore there is no future judgment of the world as such.” It appears to me, however, that if he had “studied the question” a little before he endeavored “to present data for all of us to study”, he would not have made this blunder in print. There would be no reason for me to make a statement that “I know of no passage” that states the Lord will “judge the world” when it is so easy to find just such a passage. Can it be possible that Bro. Fuqua does not have a Bible concordance? If he was unable to remember such a passage in the book of God, he could have easily found it by consulting a concordance for a few minutes before he wrote. I shall, therefore, help him to find the passage that he does not know, even though I am amazed at his lack of knowledge about this. In discussing the matter of unbelief and unrighteousness, Paul asked the question: “Is God unrighteous who taketh vengeance?” And he immediately replied: “God forbid: for then how shall God judge the world?” Rom. 3:6. This statement definitely informs us that God shall “judge the world.” Why Bro. Fuqua did not know of this passage, or why he was unable to find it, I do not know. But I do know that it says the very thing that he claims will never be. It declares a future judgment of “the world.” Likewise, when Paul delivered his great sermon in the city of Athens and, by the authority of God, called upon “all men everywhere to repent,” he continued: “Because he hath appointed a day, in the which he will judge the world in righteousness by that man whom he hath ordained; whereof he hath given assurance unto all men, in that he hath
raised him from the dead.” Acts 17:31. In this passage a number of verbs are used in the present perfect tense—“hath appointed” a day; “hath ordained” a man; “hath given” assurance; “hath raised” him from the dead. But the judgment is put in future tense—“will judge” the world in righteousness. This, therefore, is “future judgment” for “the world.” Yes, it states in unmistakable terms that “he will judge the world.” This passage Bro. Fuqua did not know was in the Bible. for he knew of “no passage” that states that God will judge “the world.” Here it is, Bro. Fuqua; take a look at it. And don’t ever be guilty of saying that you hereafter know of no such passage in the Bible.

Yes. Heb. 10:30 says “the Lord shall judge his people.” But that gives no grounds for Bro. Fuqua’s conclusion that he will “judge his people only.” His reasoning on this very closely resembles the reasoning of denominational preachers on the subject of salvation by faith. They read that men are “justified by faith.” Rom. 5:1. Then they decide this means “justified by faith only.” What right would Bro. Fuqua have to refuse them this conclusion? He has drawn one just like it concerning the judgment. If “the Lord shall judge his people” means he shall “judge his people only”, then why not justified by faith” mean “justified by faith only”? Men are “justified by faith” but they are also justified by other things; and the Lord shall “judge his people” and he shall judge others also. This is clearly shown in the two passages already given that declare the Lord “will judge the world.” But there are many other passages that tell us the same thing. Let us take a look at some of them. In John 12:48 Jesus said: “He that rejecteth me, and receiveth not my words, hath one that judgeth him: the word that I have spoken, the same shall judge him in the last day.” “The last day” is the resurrection day. John 11:24. So Jesus mentions men who are to be judged on the day of the resurrection. Who are they? They are men who reject him and receive not his words. The preceding verse shows them to be unbelievers: “If any man hear my words, and believe not, I judge him not; for I came not to judge the world, but to save the world.” John 12:47. Jesus did not come the first time to judge the world, but unbelievers, those who reject him and refuse his word, will be judged by that word in the last day. I wonder if Bro. Fuqua thinks these are the Lord’s people. If not, then he is beginning to discover some Scriptures that reveal a future judgment of the world-those not the people of God. And I wonder what he thinks of the men of Tyre and Sidon who did not repent but who lived in the “long ago” before Jesus came to earth. Jesus said they would be present “at the day of judgment” with the men of his generation who rejected him. Mat. 11:21, 22. Were the men of Tyre and Sidon in the “long ago” who did not repent the people of God? If not, then here is a future judgment for others besides the Lord’s people. And what of the wicked men of Sodom and Gomorrah whom God destroyed by fire and brimstone in the days of Lot? Were they the Lord’s people? Well, Jesus said they would appear in “the day of judgment” with men who lived in the days of the apostles. Mat. 10:15. This will be a judgment of people other than the Lord’s, I am astonished that Bro. Fuqua has read the Bible so long and did not know of these passages.

But he found that the world “hath been judged already.” John 3:18. What about this? He has made the same mistake that heretics in my section of the country have made—he has assumed that the word “judgment” has only one meaning. But it has a number of meanings that must not be overlooked. He read from the American Revised translation. The King James Version reads: “He that believeth not is condemned already.” The verb “judge” comes from the Greek krino (and from such derivatives as ana-krio, dia-krio and kata-krio) and has such meanings as select, approve, determine, pronounce, examine and decide, and condemn. The noun “judgment” comes from the Greek words krima (and its derivative kata-krima) and krisis (and its derivatives ana-krisis, dia-krisis and kata-krisis) and has such meanings as a trial, a selection, a decision, a decree, a sentence, a condemnation sentence, condemnation and punishment. From these facts you can see that a man is entirely wrong when he thinks only one meaning can be used for these words. The heretics in my section of the country seem to think these words always refer to a trial to determine one’s guilt or innocence; and since a man’s destiny is determined while he lives, they have decided there will be no judgment after death. They overlook a number of definite meanings of the words. And Bro. Fuqua seems to make about the same mistake. We might take his method of reasoning on John 3:18 and turn him over to the other heretics who say no one is to be judged after death. John 3:18, reading from the Revised Version, says: “He that believeth not hath been judged already.” And Bro. Fuqua decides this means that all judgment is over for the unbeliever—as soon as he becomes an unbeliever judgment is completed for him and he will not be judged at the second coming of the Lord. In Rom. 8:1 we read: “There is therefore now no condemnation to them which are in Christ Jesus.” The world “condemnation” is from the Greek
“kata-krima” which is often ‘translated “judgment.” So we might read it this way: “There is no judgment for them which are in Christ.” And we might decide, following Bro. Fuqua’s method of reasoning, that when a man gets into Christ he has no judgment. Hence, he is not being judged at all now while he is in Christ. Furthermore, Jesus said concerning death state, all the unrighteous must be taken out? If only the righteous dead are to be resurrected and thus lifted out of the death state, all the unrighteous must be left there.”

“If they are ever to be separated from the Hadean state by a resurrection, I fail to find the passage.”

“There is to be no withdrawing of them from Death and Hades, but together with those places-as inmates therein-will go into perdition, without one sight of Jesus Christ.”

“So long as the wicked are taught to believe that they will be resurrected at the same time with the righteous, they will entertain a ‘hope’ that they will finally be saved.”

“For those who die out of the Lord (out of Christ), there is no hope-not even of a resurrection.”

After reading the foregoing quotations no one can mistake Bro. Fuqua’s position about the resurrection of the wicked. He simply teaches there will be no resurrection for them. He is getting dangerously close to Christadelphianness. They teach “no resurrection for the unbeliever.” They believe that such unbelievers cease to exist when they die and remain forever dead. Bro. Fuqua thinks they will still exist but will be sent on to their eternal destiny without a resurrection.

First, I wish to notice his statements about death and hades. He bases these upon the record found in Rev. 20:11-14. Here he reads that “death and hades were cast into the lake of fire.” He thinks the righteous are first raised out of death and hades, but the wicked are left there. Without being taken from death and hades they are simply dumped, with these places, into the lake of fire. And “if they are ever to be separated from the Hadean state by a resurrection,” he says, “I fail to find the passage.” Perhaps I can be of some help to him. I won’t have to search long for the passage. In fact I won’t even have to leave the one he was looking at-Rev. 20:11-14. Verse 13 says: “And the sea gave up the dead which were in it; and death and hell (hades) delivered up the dead which were in them: and they were judged every man according to their works.” Were there any wicked dead in death and hades? Bro. Fuqua agrees that such is true. But he says they were “left there.” He fails to find any passage where they were taken out. In the vision that John had he saw “the dead which were in” death and hades “delivered up.” Yes, “the sea gave up the dead which were in it.” Are any of the wicked dead in the sea? If so, they will be given up, and that will be a resurrection of the wicked. Are any of the wicked dead in hades? They are to be “delivered up.” Hence, the very statement that Bro. Fuqua “failed to find” is in the passage he was reading. John did not say that “death and hades delivered up the righteous dead but the wicked dead remained.”

No Resurrection For The Wicked

While Bro. Fuqua “studies the question” in print he reaches the conclusion that there will be no resurrection for the wicked. The following quotations are taken from The Vindicator, November, 1945.

“Those who die out of the Lord-out of the church of Christ-have no promise of a resurrection at all.”

“The place the lost dead are in-Death, and Hades-will ‘be cast into the lake of fire.’ The question is, Will those dead be in those places at that time? or will they first be taken out? If only the righteous dead are to be resurrected and thus lifted out of the death state, all the unrighteous must be left there.”
But he said: “Death and hades delivered up the dead which were in them.” That takes all the dead out of hades to be judged, and Bro. Fuqua is wrong again. Why he “failed to find the passage” when he was looking right at it I do not know. But it is there, “as any one can plainly see.”

Furthermore, he says that these wicked inmates of hades “will go into perdition without one sight of Jesus Christ.” It is astonishing what positions a man will take when once he starts teaching a heresy. Now we must conclude, according to Bro. Fuqua, that no one will see Jesus Christ when he comes except his people. The wicked will have no resurrection, and neither will they see Jesus—they will go into perdition “without one sight of Jesus Christ.” I suppose he “failed to find the passage” that says the wicked will see Jesus.” Surely, he would not have made his statement if he could have found a passage that stated otherwise. And yet there are passages that state the very opposite of what he says. Let me help him locate them. When Jesus was being tried before the Jewish council, Caiphas, the high priest, said to him: “I adjure thee by the living God, that thou tell us whether thou be the Christ, the Son of God.” In answer to this demand Jesus said: “Thou hast said: nevertheless I say unto you, Hereafter shall ye see the Son of man sitting on the right hand of power, and coming in the clouds of heaven.” Mat. 26:63, 64. Jesus said: “Ye shall see the Son of man coming in the clouds of heaven.” By using the second person, plural pronoun “ye” Jesus showed that other members of the Jewish council, as well as Caiphas would “see the Son of man coming in the clouds of heaven.” These were wicked men—the Jews who by wicked hands crucified the Lord—but they will see Jesus when he comes. This upsets Bro. Fuqua’s method of study, for he says the wicked will go into perdition without one sight of Jesus Christ. Furthermore, this proves a resurrection of these wicked men, for they have been dead nearly two thousand years; yet Jesus said they would see him when he comes in the clouds of heaven. If this does not suffice as proof that the wicked will see Jesus at his coming—but it should to all who believe the Bible—we might look at another passage. In Rev. 1:7 we read: “Behold, he cometh with clouds; and every eye shall see him, and they also which pierced him; and all kindreds of the earth shall wail because of him.” The language here used is conclusive. “Every eye shall see” Jesus when he comes in the clouds. Do the wicked have eyes? If so, they will see him. It cannot be limited to the righteous—it includes both the righteous and the unrighteous. But Bro. Fuqua might think this means only those living when Jesus comes. He might say that both the righteous and the wicked who are living at that time will see Jesus, but the wicked dead will not be included—“they will go into perdition without one sight of Jesus Christ.” The Lord evidently knew that some one would take a position like this. So he replied to it in advance. Not only does the passage say that “every eye shall see him” but “they also which pierced him.” This refers to the Roman soldiers who pierced his side as he hung upon the cross. These have been dead for many hundreds of years. They are dead now. But the Bible says these men who pierced Jesus will see him come in the clouds. Will Bro. Fuqua list these as the Lord’s people? They were murderers of Jesus Christ. But they will have to be raised from the dead before they can see Jesus in the clouds of heaven. The passage not only proves Bro. Fuqua to be wrong when he claims the wicked will not see the Lord, but it also proves he is wrong when he says the wicked “have no promise of resurrection at all.” It “seems to me” that Bro. Fuqua could have found these passages if he had “studied the question” just a little before he wrote his articles.

Many other passages also prove there will be a resurrection of the wicked. Jesus said that the people of Sodom and Gomorrha, who have been dead nearly four thousand years, will appear in the day of judgment with men who lived 1800 years after their death. Mat. 10:15. They cannot meet this later group of people in the day of judgment without a resurrection from the dead. As long as this statement of the Lord remains in the Bible I shall know that Bro. Fuqua’s position is entirely false. And Paul declared: “There shall be a resurrection of the dead, both of the just and unjust.” Acts 24:15. This boldly denies the theory that only the just will be raised. If men of the world, unbelievers, are unjust, this passage refers to them and declares they will be raised from the dead. Likewise Jesus said: “Marvel not at this: for the hour is coming, in the which all that are in the graves shall hear his voice, and shall come forth; they that have done good, unto the resurrection of life; and they that have done evil, unto the resurrection of damnation.” John 5:28, 29. Bro. Fuqua thinks, as he “studies the question” in print, that “‘all that are in the tombs’ may refer to the righteous dead only.” But this is entirely out of the realm of possibility, for Jesus said some of them “have done good” and others “have done evil.” Those who have done “evil” are wicked, and will come forth “unto the resurrection of damnation.” The righteous are those who have done “good,” who will come forth “unto the resurrection of life.” It is a resurrection of both good and evil—righteous and unrighteous—and Bro. Fuqua’s theory will not stand the light of eternal truth.
In the October, 1945, issue of The Bible Banner some matters affecting Houston, Texas churches were published, at the request of all of the elders and ministers of the Norhill and Heights churches. Since that time two false charges have been made by the guilty church and friends of its tactics. These two charges can mislead sincere people. For the sake of people of that character I submit herein evidence on the two charges.

First, it has been circulated that the Norhill and Heights churches tried to force the Central church into the 1945 Houston Music Hall meeting, in which twenty Greater Houston white churches of Christ united in presenting Foy E. Wallace Jr. in a meeting, exposing modern millennial theories. The Central church alone dissented-violently and publicly, making personal charges against brother Wallace.

The charge of attempting to “high pressure” Central into the meeting is false. Since it was my letter of Dec. 19, 1944 to the Central elders and preacher that produced the explosion, I am in the best position to deny that any undue “pressure” has been put on Central to support the meeting or Wallace. You can read that letter on pages 33-34 of Oct., 1945, Banner.

Certainly I urged Central to officially support the meeting. The letter gives the reasons. What has happened has proved the merit of the appeal. Yet, in that letter, in paragraph 2, I made it clear that I believed that “each church is free under God to run its work without outside interference.” I recognized the independence of Central, and herewith deny that any “coercion” was stated, implied, or even existed in my heart. Nothing in that letter, or the one following it, was intended in any sense as a threat, to have the weight of force. To those of you who hear this charge made, I would suggest that you read the letter I wrote and you will see the difference between attempted use of force, as charged, and my individual appeal to Central to protect itself from suspicion—which appeal by me was intended to be the end of the matter.

R. O. Kenley, attorney and Central member, has been quite active in circulating the “coercion” charge, charging that there was a “conspiracy” to attack Central. He has repeatedly sent out letters to brethren over the country making these charges—though he has not in one of the several such letters I have received from him pointed to so much as even one quotation in my Central letters to prove his charge.

Through my four years in Houston, Kenley has often talked to me about being a friend of brother Wallace—but has said more hard things about Wallace than any man, barring none, that I have ever heard. It didn’t take me long to take issue with that, which took me out of Kenley’s good graces, which was one of the best things that could have happened to me. Kenley has also said harder things about the Central Church and Burton Coffman than anyone I have heard on that subject—yet now claims (I have it over his signature) that it was all in fun. But Houston preachers know better, and several of them have told me that he wasn’t joking when he talked to them about the Central Church and Burton Coffman.

Here is an interesting sidelight. When, a long time ago, I took issue with Kenley for such personal reflection on Wallace, he said: “If he is wrong on the war question, he is wrong on everything.” Now, I am not here arguing that question, but showing you the man, Kenley, for whom I formerly had respect. If that is true of Wallace (according to Kenley), it is true of all others who take the same position on that question. But Kenley doesn’t take that extreme and absurd position on all other preachers and brethren generally—including Burton Coffman. This one sidelight combines with other incidents here to show his inconsistency and “hate Wallace” complex. He has often told me that “I have no more confidence in Burton Coffman than you have,” and there are too many Houston witnesses to the incessant and damaging talk about Central that brother Kenley has done for any one now to believe his “it was all in a joke” version. He has entirely forfeited my confidence. He does not have enough influence in Houston to deserve this mention or the attention of The Bible Banner, but some away from here-seeing his name in print so often, and receiving the flood of copies of his letters here and there-may be deceived by his charg-
es and should be here warned of how he has "worked both sides of the street." I place him before you to show you the source of much of this "coercion" talk.

Let this be understood by all: after my personal, individual appeal to Central, the matter would have stopped, regardless of Central's decision. But when Central publicized its personal charges against brother Wallace, that is what brought "coercion"-demands from Norhill and Heights elders for proof or retraction. The Norhill and Heights churches never tried to force the Central Church to support the meeting, but they had the right to insist that Central either attempt to sustain or else retract its publicly made charges against a preacher that they, and the rest of the churches here, supported in the meeting. This is the coercion that Central is trying to cover up, and make it appear that they were being coerced into supporting Wallace.

Now, regarding the second charge, that all of this should not have been published: Central publicized this matter before anyone else did. Central elders, Lawrence Rutledge and Fletcher Dailey, and preacher, Burton Coffman, brought these charges before a public meeting of Houston preachers and others. Then, Coffman and some of these elders carried on a campaign of slander, singling out individuals over the town for their stories. News of this spread over the country. Heights and Norhill elders tried to adjust the matter with Central here, but Central ignored the effort, refusing even to acknowledge the letter.

It was not, then, purely a local affair, but had become public and widely scattered. Publishing the facts was the only means left of turning the spotlight on this source of scandal-mongering. If Central elders and preachers are to slander the reputation and character of a gospel preacher, it is well for people to know what they are doing. Turning the light on these reputation and character assassins will make other back-biters more careful and protect honest people from being "taken in."

I have noticed an oddity just here. Some brethren deplore disturbance among churches, regret the necessity for Central circulating slander on Foy Wallace. They don't "regret the necessity" for Central circulating slander on Foy Wallace. They don't say that they think Central was-and is-"too hard" on brother Wallace when said elders over their signature attacked his reputation, and elders and preachers publicly attacked his character, and when Burton Coffman privately circulates falsehoods about Wallace-all of which evidence we have ready for anyone wanting to challenge my statements. Yes, it is queer to me that anyone would object to our turning the spotlight on these slanderers, only after having made efforts to adjust matters locally, but they do not register any objection to Central elders and preacher publicizing their false charges. It is queer that some brethren will deplore the disturbance among churches, but will not deplore a church slandering a gospel preacher. To me, that "locates" them.

But people away from Houston should not be deceived into thinking that there is any "disturbance" in Houston. Matters here are "quiet" and churches are not dividing into warring camps. We are united here. But the Central Church is gradually moving to a position of isolationism here, perhaps not so "gradually."

The second Music Mall meeting with Wallace and Doran was supported by all white and two colored churches in Greater Houston, except Central. There has been no flood of protests, and what few have endorsed Central's campaign of slander are about those expected to do so. None of us have enjoyed having to brand Central as a source of slander, and it has been particularly painful to me, since I had held a meeting there in 1941 and had been deceived into thinking higher of the leadership than they deserved. I had to learn "the hard way," but have learned.

It is my belief that sincere people, though regretting all of this, as we all do, will come more and more to the conviction that publicity for slanderers is the best tonic. If they do not believe that, they do not believe the principle of Galatians 2: 14. I am willing for the world to know that I have no confidence in the fundamental soundness of brethren who believe that a church should be shielded from publicity in its private and public slander of a gospel preacher, and who believe that the preacher should not be protected from such slander by a church.

---

THE QUARTERLY BIBLE BANNER

The number of the Bible Banner previous to this issue was dated October, and covered the last quarter of 1945. This issue is dated March, for the first quarter of 1946. The next issue should be mailed in June, for the second quarter of this year. By that time we hope some past and present difficulties and handicaps will have been eliminated and regularity of publication restored. Meanwhile, thanks to all for kind consideration.-F. E. W., Jr.
IT WON'T BE LONG NOW

The months of delay will soon be over. The many handicaps and hindrances to publication have been overcome. By the time this is being read the presses should be rolling off the long expected book — and the second book will follow soon.

I. "MODERN MILLENNIAL THEORIES EXPOSED"

A series of ten gospel sermons delivered in Houston, Texas, during the recent Music Hall Meeting—January 21-28, 1945, supported by twenty churches of Christ in Houston—By Foy E. Wallace Jr.

1. The Infallible Book—Is the Bible Verbally Inspired? Is it Scientifically and Historically true?
2. The Infallible Faith—Is the New Testament Complete, Or Do We Need Later Revelations?
3. God’s Prophetic Word—Are The Prophecies Of the Old Testament “Unfulfilled Prophecy” or Have They Been Fulfilled?
4. The Hope Of Israel—Will National Israel Be Restored? Will Jerusalem Become the Capital Of a World Kingdom of Christ on Earth?
5. The Church Age—Was the Kingdom of Dan. 2:44 Established on Pentecost, or Was It Postponed Until Christ Returns?
6. The Throne Of David—Is Jesus Christ Now King On David’s Throne?
7. The Second Coming Of Christ—Is It Premillennial And Imminent? Is Jesus Coming Soon? Will Christ Reign On Earth One Thousand Years?
8. Anglo-Israelism—Does The Bible Support The Claim That the Anglo-Saxons Are Israelis And That They Are God’s Modern Covenant People?
10. The Consequences Of Millennialism—Are These Millennial Theories Vital To Christianity? Are These Theories Destructive Of The Gospel System? Are Those Who Teach These Theories “Fundamentalists”?

II. "MODERN DENOMINATIONAL DOCTRINES EXPOSED"


1. Viewing The Walls—A Doctrinal and Historical Perspective.
3. The Great Apostasy—The Origin and Errors of The Roman Catholic Church.
4. The Sins of Sectarianism—The Doctrines and Dogmas of Orthodox Denominationalism.
5. Bible Baptism—Immersion or Affusion? Holy Spirit or Water? Essential or Non-essential?
7. The Security of Believers—Is It Possible For A Child of God to Fall Away And Be Lost?
8. A Legal Question—What About The Thief on The Cross?

Two 400-Page Books — $2.50 Each

ORDER ONLY FROM

ROY E. COGDILL, 1511 Harvard, Houston, Texas