It appears that the fight is on again in a big way; the fight to foist R. H. Boll with his divisive future-kingdom theories on the church; or at least to open the doors of the churches so he can walk in and operate unopposed. It is a strange coincidence that this new assault is led by another Davidson. The other time it was Clinton Davidson of New York. This time it is Norman Davidson from Chicago. These Davidsons are unrelated, according to the flesh, so far as I know, but they appear to be twins in their attitudes and aims concerning Brother Boll and those of us who oppose his speculative career. Brother Clinton left Louisville many years ago and is reputed to have made a lot of money in New York. About the same time Brother Norman left Nashville and is reported to have made a lot of money in Chicago. I am not even mildly inclined to criticize these brethren for their business success. Brother Clinton formed some plans and made some connections aimed at clearing up about the same thing Brother Norman calls "an un-Godly mess" and settling an "un-Godly issue." (Spelling his). Brother Clinton made a "survey" and was frankly amazed at the encouraging attitude of the brethren. He even invaded Texas with the help and connivance of some brethren who should have known better than to be taken in by such a scheme. Some of them beat a humiliating retreat and confessed that they were deceived. A few stuck to their guns and defended themselves and Brother Clinton in an unconvincing, if not apologetic way. The whole movement was a fiasco and resulted in further discrediting Brother Boll and his divisive movement. I am about convinced that when Brother Bell's friends try to help him they do him more harm than good.

I do not claim to be as transcendent as some of these wipers up of "un-Godly messes" appear to think they are; nor do I pretend to be wholly free from bias, for I feel a deep hostility toward the activities of these Davidson twins. As impartially as I am able to view the matter, it seems to me that at least a part of Brother Clinton's trouble was unsoundness in doctrine, due partly to ignorance of the principles involved; and a childish misunderstanding of the mental attitude of the brethren. He is reputed to be a great salesman in his field. He got out of it and made the wrong approach to a hostile prospect with a shoddy scheme of religious wares. He failed to make a sale. I do not blame him much for the disappointment and chagrin he obviously felt. But the worst tactical blunder I believe I have ever witnessed was to follow defeat with an anonymous attack on the character of the editor of the Bible Banner. Of course the brethren saw through that too. Being of a charitable disposition, I have never felt that Brother Clinton was a bad man at heart. He was obviously in an unfamiliar field, without the information he thought he had, and was poorly advised if he took any advice. I understand that he is now enjoying some success and prestige as a sort of a godfather to Harding College, a position which is better suited to his capacities.

Since the Davidson twins think all brethren ought to be free to express their honest opinions, I think I may venture to say that it is my honest conviction that the failure of Brother Clinton in "posing as a deliverer of the church, to save it from the menace of" strong opposition to future-kingdom theories, was a mighty good thing for
the cause of truth.

And now Brother Norman takes up the fight and proposes to make a valiant and life-long struggle, if necessary, to revive the lost cause. Being more than mildly interested in the matter, I have read his letters to Brother McQuiddy, (copies of which are in my hands) with some interest and more amazement. Are Brother Boll's defenders utterly incapable of learning anything from the mistakes of the past? Do they simply have to repeat all the blunders which contributed to their former failures? Brother Norman seems to think so. A venerable brother of unquestionable ability and integrity read the letters and remarked to me: “They sound half crazy.” Just why is it that when some brother who is smart enough to make money decides to swing the church to the support of Brother Boll, he is so far off the beam that it makes our job ridiculously easy? This last contender who positively knows that the Lord is pleased with him and sorely displeased with us, cannot even spell premillennial, or at least he didn't in his letter. There is a fanatical glow in his lack of logic, that ought to easily accord him a place on the opposite side of “the lunatic-fringe” from where we are reported to be. He has a call from the Lord to attend to brethren. Is the cause of truth struggle, if necessary, to revive the lost cause. and proposes to make a valiant and life-long

Being more than mildly interested in the matter, I have read his letters to Brother McQuiddy, (copies of which are in my hands) with some interest and more amazement. Are Brother Boll's defenders utterly incapable of learning anything from the mistakes of the past? Do they simply have to repeat all the blunders which contributed to their former failures? Brother Norman seems to think so. A venerable brother of unquestionable ability and integrity read the letters and remarked to me: “They sound half crazy.” Just why is it that when some brother who is smart enough to make money decides to swing the church to the support of Brother Boll, he is so far off the beam that it makes our job ridiculously easy? This last contender who positively knows that the Lord is pleased with him and sorely displeased with us, cannot even spell premillennial, or at least he didn't in his letter. There is a fanatical glow in his lack of logic, that ought to easily accord him a place on the opposite side of “the lunatic-fringe” from where we are reported to be. He has a call from the Lord to attend to this particular job and has pledged the Lord that he will employ his energies, his time and a sizable amount of his money to remove the disabilities under which Brother Boll is laboring due to lack of fellowship on the part of some of the brethren.

I propose to present a bird’s-eye of the situation as revealed in these Davidson letters. The editor will doubtless pay his respects to a variety of the details. I haven't caught him yet staying out of a scrap as perfectly made to his order as this one appears to be. To begin with Brother Davidson begs the entire question by assuming that the issue between us and Brother Boll is a minor one, that it is just a squabble over “unfulfilled prophecy” and unimportant opinions and proposes to naively clean up the “un-Godly mess” by hush-hushing the whole controversy. It isn’t that simple. In the first place, I do not believe that he could state the real issue if his life depended on it. He does not know what it is. As recently as a few months ago he wrote a letter of inquiry to the editor of the Bible Banner revealing an amazing lack of information regarding it. All he is sure of is that he thinks Brother Boll should be allowed to hold and to teach his theories whenever and wherever he wishes. He would expect him to, under the proposed peace plan, and would lose respect for him if he didn’t. And he thinks the brethren will swallow that! We are not too worried over the fellowship feature. If the truth is taught on the kingdom question, the brethren will attend to the fellowship part of it. Brother Boll’s position denies that the scheme of redemption the prophets foretold is the plan of salvation revealed in the New Testament. If he wants a discussion of that issue through mediums that will reach all sides, I trow he can get it.

There are inherent weaknesses in both Brother Davidson's attitude and plan of procedure which will defeat him. He appeals to “fair-minded” brethren. Is he fair-minded? He admits that we are right. He has “never accepted any of the pre-millenial teachings” (spelling his), therefore Brother Boll is wrong in his teaching but the great sinners are those who criticize Brother Boll and he gets off without even a mild rebuke. He proposes to keep on teaching the false doctrine and has $40,000 of the Janes' will to back him up in it, but the Gospel Advocate is responsible for the “un-Godly mess” for starting it and carrying it on through the years, and did it for selfish and political reasons. The present editor, Brother Goodpasture, doesn’t want a settlement because he has “made capital” out of the “mess” and wants to stay on the popular side. A host of the preachers he claims are on his side are a set of craven cowards he thinks he can make brave men out of. Brother Hardeman with his great prestige could have settled things a long time ago had he wanted to, but he didn’t want to. Clay Pullias is “extreme and rabid.” Some of the rest of us are moved by a desire for preeminence, personal hatred and hypocrisy, and he quotes the editor of the Firm Foundation to prove it. In other words he and his co-conspirators have a monopoly on righteousness, and the rest of us are just about totally depraved. This attitude will defeat him. A leader given to such a degree of exaggeration might magnify unduly the amount of support he thinks he has. Brethren generally are not that gullible.

It is quite interesting that he claims the support of Brother H. Leo Boles and the editor of the Firm Foundation. Brother Boles is dead and cannot speak for himself but he is on record that Romans 16:17 should be applied to Brother Boll and that ought to off-set Brother Davidson's unsupported claim. As for Brother Showalter, he can speak for himself. If he doesn’t we might do him like he threatened to do the editor of the Bible Banner when he was editor of the Gospel Advocate—“smoke him out.” I'm sure there are many of the brethren who would really like to know if Brother Showalter told Brother Davidson what Brother Davidson says he did. I wouldn’t for a minute classify Brother Showalter with Brother Davidson's “bunch of cravens.” When he tells what he said, whatever it was, it is likely to have an interesting bearing on this new fight which Brother Davidson has started. It looks a little like he has made some sort of a “mess” already and it doesn’t look al-
Together godly from where I sit viewing the landscape o’er.

Brother Davidson wants a Christian settlement that is fair to everybody, that compromises nobody’s convictions, and interferes with nobody’s freedom of thought and expression. That is, most everybody. It doesn’t include some of us, especially Clay Pullias, N. B. Hardeman, B. C. Goodpasture and whoever else belongs to a tribunal of a few powerful preachers who constitute “a religious hierarchy,” whatever that is, wholly given over to dictation. Well, we are rather vocal, have mediums of expression and a reputation for saying what we think. What does Brother Davidson propose to do with us? He is going to “by-pass” us! He just thinks he is! Wherever he tries to “pass” we will be right “by.” No, brother, that just won’t work.

But speaking of “dictation” and popery, reminds me of that fishing trip Brother Davidson took with Brother Burton. Brother Burton is also reputed to have lots of money and some of the ambition that too often goes with it. I imagine the fish got their bait while they were talking about Clay Pullias. One fellow I heard of didn’t like to go fishing because there was always some fool along who wanted to fish. These two promoters of peace and advocates of brotherly love did not waste all their time fishing. They enlivened their dull moments by liquidating Clay Pullias. It seems that Clay thought Brother Davidson misunderstood the call he got from the Lord and wasn’t willing to go along. Naturally, Brother Davidson, being a mild and peace loving man, concluded that Clay was “extreme and rabid” and something ought to be done about it. He feared he “might have some opposition there.” It appears to be a grave offense to oppose either Brother Boll or Brother Davidson. It would not be quite consistent to disfellowship Brother Pullias and he was not easily by-passed, so Brother Burton hit on the brilliant idea of smothering him under a board.

Brother Burton evidently thinks he has some influence with the board and Clay is working under it “and will have to do what he is told.” I wonder what Clay thinks of that! It is a challenge I don’t think Clay Pullias can afford to “it y-pass.” Clay Pullias is right and R. H. Boll is wrong, but Boll must be allowed to express himself and Pullias must be smothered under a board. Burton assured Davidson “in no uncertain terms” that he was “certainly not going to have any trouble of any kind, or opposition from that source,” meaning Pullias. I’m fairly easy to get along with, but I would smart under an insult like that, crawl out from under the board and be a free man in Christ even if I had to go on relief, so help me God. The spirit of this movement seems to be “You’ll do what you are told or else.” The movement is wrong in its aims and wrong in its methods. It mouths the sweet words of peace and fellowship while it insults some of the noblest advocates of truth both living and dead. “Doth the fountain send forth from the same opening sweet water and bitter?” This Chicago fountain tries hard to be sweet but he can’t for being bitter. The brother assures us, or tries to, that he has no axe to grind. I wonder what made him think of that in the connection in which he used it. I have a little knowledge of both text-book and practical psychology. I am just wondering what kind of a weapon was he trying to grind on Leon McQuiddy and G. H. P. Showalter, and of all men J. F. Kurfees. Brother Kurfees evidently dulled the edge on something. Brother Norman will need a pretty sharp axe or whatever lethal weapon he proposes to use, to chop off all the heads he yearns to see bleeding on his platter. There are not enough boards to smother all of them under.

These letters to Brother McQuiddy present a peculiar combination of wheeling and threats. “Please don’t turn me down!” But if you do “I tell you he had best be prepared for a real fight—and in this, he will not be fighting preachers who are afraid of him, and whom he can ruin, if he wishes to do so.” This is a gratuitous insult offered to Brother Goodpasture. I know what he thinks of this. He doesn’t like to be insulted. The brother started out with a plea for peace and winds up with a challenge for a “real fight.” I have an idea that is exactly what he is going to get. He asked for it. “I am not afraid of anyone,” he defiantly shouts. I don’t think the threat will scare Brother Goodpasture, but if Brother Davidson jumps on him, and he needs any help, we are willing to scotch for him and forget some of the minor unpleasantness of the past. That latest improved model of peacemaker has made a threat of all-out war with no quarters asked or given. This is the kind of bronce we like to ride, especially when he has the Boll brand on him. If Brother Goodpasture can’t ride him, we think we can, unless he can pitch as well as he can snort. I reckon we’ll just have to wait and find out whether we are going to have “a real fight” or get by-passed.

**NOTICE**

This is the last issue of the Bible Banner we can send to those who have not renewed their subscription. Remember the Special Offer. One dollar sets all delinquent subscriptions one year from date of this issue.

**THE BIBLE BANNER**

Box 1804 — Oklahoma City, Okla.
The New Davidson Movement

The past decade, more than any other since the church has had existence on this continent, has been characterized by the constant effort of certain groups of men to change the church. A few men among us are determined to change it. Periodically their efforts come into the open. When repulsed they retreat, only to await the opportunity to renew the attack and repeat the attempt. When ominous clouds on the horizon portend imminent movements, the eyes of all apparently turn toward the Bible Banner. Those who want to protect the church against these movements look to it as the only medium available through which to combat offensively and defensively the invasions and aggressions of these groups of men. Even some who criticise the Bible Banner for what they term its "personalities" and the editor for what they call his "methods" are among those who always maneuver to get the Bible Banner to do and say certain things which they want done and said but which for personal reasons they will not themselves do or say. We have frequently received pages of typewritten matter marked "good material for the Bible Banner" from one who would not permit the matter to appear in an article over or under his own signature. Such men want certain things said, done and published, but they want the Bible Banner to "take the rap" for it. Very well — if it needs to be said or done, we will say it and do it, not for any man's sake but for the sake of Christ and his Cause.

On page 18 of this issue the reader will find letters from Norman Davidson of Chicago, to Leon B. McQuiddy, owner and publisher of the Gospel Advocate, Nashville, Tennessee. These letters are printed and published herein from copies sent to me by a prominent man in the church, with the clear implication that the matter deserves Bible Banner attention and treatment. We think so too, and though we do not believe that he would say over his own signature the things necessary to be said, we believe they should be said and if we must be "used" to say things that some others ought to be willing to say, let us be used, not blindly at all, but knowingly and willingly for and of the Lord.

I.

This new millennial movement stems from Chicago, but it is the same old thing. For months rumblings from the direction of the Windy City have been heard, with the clanking of maneuvers where they have been drilling for the new offensive against the church. It is the old Premillennial Propaganda Party in a new rehearsal and dress parade, sponsored by the same old premillennial personnel but headed ostensibly by a new leader, Norman Davidson, as a front. Doubtless Norman has been deceived, deluded and duped. We predict that he will retreat from the field under fire and exposure, somewhat disillusioned. I have known Norman Davidson a long time. I regret to see him take up the Clinton Davidson campaign of calumny as he is evidently doing in his initial attacks on me and others. I knew him when he also went broke in Nashville, when he confided to me his financial and personal frustration to the point of despair. He left Nashville to recover his losses and retrieve his fortune. By way of California and Chicago he succeeded and came once more into "big money." It is bad grace for him now to attempt to discredit another man because of financial misfortune, in order to aid the Boll party. During the time of his absence and obscurity the church hardly knew of him or heard from him. His wife quit the church and joined the Moody Institute, a group of out-and-out premillennial sectarians in Chicago. Having regained his fortune, Norman now returns breathing out threatenings against faithful gospel preachers who were preaching the gospel all the time he was absorbed in making money, and waving his greenback currency in our faces he vows to spend fifty thousand dollars of it to vindicate R. H. Boll and the leaders of the premillennial movement, forcing them and their premillennial doctrines bodily on the church.

True to form, he is writing letters. He makes appointments with elders of churches for an interview, then writes letters all over the country telling what these elders said. Already his letters to various brethren have been sent to me, recently from Florida, with the information that the elders of the Central church in Miami have denied his version of what they said and accuse him of misrepresentation. This
should serve as a warning to elders everywhere, in all the churches. Norman Davidson has become just another meddler and a divisionist. Anything elders or preachers tell him will be twisted and perverted into a misrepresentation and will be misused. The proper thing for elders to do is to refuse his appointments, send him and his Bollism back to Chicago, where his scheme was hatched.

Another letter from Norman written to a party in Florida is in my possession. In it he states that he knows certain editors of papers “who do not like Foy,” and he thinks he can get the mailing list of their subscribers to circularize their readers. That again runs true to form—Clinton Davidson used mailing lists of other papers to propagandize the subscribers. Yet they talk of “fairness” and “ethics!” But remember this, brethren—if you receive letters from Norman Davidson, or printed matter from him through the mail, he will be getting to you through a paper to which you are a subscriber. Do you think it is “ethical” and “fair” for the editor of that paper to so use his list? Ask him about it.

In the same letter Davidson refers to the Bible Banner publishing only one side. To this we repeat the proposition which R. H. Boll has repeatedly turned down: We will publish both sides of any correspondence, articles or discussion which R. H. Boll will publish in his own paper. Is that fair? or do they want the other fellow to furnish all the space?

It is also significant that, like Clinton Davidson, in his letters Norman makes it a point to drag in “the financial record” of “Foy Wallace.” He says he “KNOWS,” and puts it in capitals. Well, what of that? Everybody else knows, for we have put it in the paper more than once. He does not know anything that is true that I have not myself already told. Assuming a deep spirituality, he deplores personalities but begins his campaign, like Clinton Davidson, with personal attacks and mud-slinging. He blames the defeat of leaders of premillennialism and Bollism on the Bible Banner, and in an effort to contrast conditions before and after he uses the abbreviation B. W., then explains in parenthesis that it means “BEFORE WALLACE” (capitals his). So the brother is against personalities, but he casts his whole campaign on a personal plane. He pleads for spirituality and love, but deals in bitterness and hate. He argues against brethren “fighting each other” but he serves notice on us all that he is ready for a “real fight.” So he wants to fight—well, he can have it, if he insists. We are veterans in that line. Clinton Davidson undertook to subdue us by intimidation.

He made threats to expose us and to sue us. He proposed to revolutionize journalism and dictate the policies of all the papers and to control them by methods of force, money and intimidation. He claimed to have polled the brotherhood with a straw-ballot in the form of questionnaires and advertised 95% on his side. He circulated questionnaires over the brotherhood like circulars at a country carnival, and the evidence is strong enough to believe that he was the promoter and circulator of the anonymous letters that shocked the moral and spiritual sense of everybody who has any sense of honor or common decency. He went so far as to consult his “eminent legal counsel” and made numerous threats to sue us into submission. We sent the brother word that we would meet him and his “eminent legal counsel,” whenever he wished to make an appointment with us and gave him the number of our post office box and domicile as well. Somebody gave him some good advice and he dropped his legal ideas, changed the expression on his face, and began to talk deeply spiritual. He travelled over the brotherhood, was banqueted by the schools and bragged on by men, even in Texas, who ought to have known better. Contrary to his pious pretentions and spiritual sentimentalism, he privately left behind him everywhere he went a sluice of slime, in gossipping about certain men whom he had marked for destruction, causing brethren who would have otherwise received him with a measure of grace to turn away from him.

Copyright Clinton Davidson did not know the church. He was ill-advised by some who thought they did. His schemes did not work. And now his name is “a hiss and a byword” over all the brotherhood. When this high-pressure, super-salesman of insurance realized that his schemes and methods to give the church a general house cleaning job, modernize it, reorganize it, reform it, even if he had to prove that we are grand rascals, and sue us to do it, would not work in churches of Christ, he decided to abandon this “negative” work, settle down to something more “constructive,” stay in his own front-yard, and attend to his own business. Where is Clinton Davidson now? He came in like a lion and went out like a lamb. Suppose the Bible Banner had not waged the fight on Clinton Davidson’s schemes? Suppose he had been left to his promotions? What if his hand had not been called on every move he made? Everybody knows that he would have delivered the church to Premillennialism and to the men who promote it.

And now Norman Davidson begins his crusade for the vindication of R. H. Boll in the same way. Frankly, I am disappointed in him. He is acting more like Clinton Davidson than Norman Davidson. He dons the uniform and adopts the nomenclature of the other Davidson.
His voice may be the voice of Jacob, but his skin is that of Esau. He talks of money and influence, of intimidations and power. He threatens preachers who stand in his way, and attacks their character. It is a significant fact that the course of action of the two Davisons is identical.

I

Before launching his assault Davidson decided to go to Louisville and interview J. F. Kurfees, the very worthy brother of the lamented and illustrious M. C. Kurfees. Out of this interview came his decision to "by-pass" such men as Kurfees and all the preachers who have opposed the Boll party. Still he seeks a "settlement"—so he says. He proposes a "settlement" of the issue by just leaving out men who are by his own admissions major parties to the controversy. Besides the impossibility of doing such a thing, it would not be a settlement of the controversy if he did. It would only be a shifting of vantage points and positions.

What kind of "settlement" does Norman propose? Here it is. I quote from a letter written by J. F. Kurfees, relating details of Davidson's interview with him. Brother Kurfees says: "In conversation with Brother Davidson about his work in trying to settle the trouble, he said he would never ask or expect Boll to make any change in his teaching—that should Boll make any change, he would lose confidence in him. So that's that."

And that's it. By his so-called "settlement" of the "Boll trouble," Norman Davidson does not ask and does not expect Boll and Jorgenson to quit teaching premillennialism—he would even "lose confidence in" them if they did! So he is merely attempting to create a favorable condition in the church for them to teach their false doctrine. That is some settlement!

In the letters on page 18 repeated reference by Norman to what he calls the "ungodly mess," the "ungodly condition," and the "ungodly issue" will be found. He has the word "ungodly" on his mind or else his vocabulary is so limited that he talks in terms of near profanity to express his "ungodly" feelings. As to the "mess"—what mess and whose mess? There is nothing wrong with the church—it is all right. Because a few men in Louisville find themselves in a mess is no reason for trying to scatter the mess over the church. It is their own mess. Let them clean it up and fumigate and deodorize their own surroundings.

When there is poison in the body, doctors "localize" it to prevent its spread. The premillennial poison in the church has been localized to "penthouse" confinement, in Louisville, and seeing the "mess" they are in Norman wants to spread it over the body by lifting the quarantine, and letting these premillennialists out, giving them freedom to enter every church at their will to teach the "ungodly" doctrine of premillennialism.

If the situation were reversed—if Boll had made a success—and those of us who have opposed premillennialism were isolated as Boll and his party are, would Norman and Clinton Davidson be concerned about it? Would they be trying to get a "settlement"? Oh, no! It would be settled just as they want it. Despite all pretentions of piety there is one thing these men have never been able to do—namely, to conceal the partisan fact that their sole effort is to vindicate R. H. Boll and make it possible for him to teach his premillennialism in the churches.

It will be observed that the whole tenor of Norman's letters is the use of force through the pressure of money and influence. Norman proposes to "force" a settlement. How? By spending fifty thousand dollars of his money, and all of his time if necessary, in putting on the pressure. He is determined to have a "settlement." Before what tribunal? Delirious already over visions of the "eclesiasticism" and "hierarchy" and "intimidation" he finds in "our brotherhood," he is forming another hierarchy to "settle" the issue for "our brotherhood." With money and threats he seeks to intimidate us into submission and warns everybody, including the president of David Lipscomb College and the editor of the Gospel Advocate against "opposition to me." Opposition to him! Who is he? Upon what meat has Norman been feeding that he has grown so great? I knew him when he sat on a bench out in a campus park, and wept on my shoulder over losing his money, when his brain was fighting the suggestions of the river bridge. Now, regaining his money, forgetting his own humiliation, he speaks unkindly of another's misfortune and talks of "opposition to me!" Better that he had remained broken in purse that he might be humble in heart and contrite in spirit. His money threats will have no effect at all—the other Davidson tried it and failed. We are not afraid of their money nor their scandal. We have no money of our own and want none of his—but we have the truth, and it is more powerful than their silver and gold, their stocks and bonds. Let them have their money—it is but filthy rags—give me the precious truth.

III.

It will further be noted that the Bell Telephone Company and Western Union have already picked up business from the Davidson fund to force R. H. Boll on the church. The wires were hot between Chicago and Louisville until the interview with J. F. Kurfees cooled them off. Then says Norman, he had a "long" telephone
conversation with G. H. P. Showalter from Chicago to Austin. Plenty of money can do things like that.

But he says Brother Showalter agreed with him, promised to furnish him a medium and that Brother Showalter had volunteered to say that those who have opposed Boll have done so for notoriety and personal gain. We have no evidence other than Davidson's report, that he said it. And since he misrepresented elders in Miami, he may have misrepresented Brother Showalter. It would have been better for Norman to let Brother Showalter do his own talking. The other Davidson placed Brother Showalter in an embarrassing position. The whole millennial party from Boll down to Jorgenson and Janes have used him and now Norman is at it. We think the veteran editor of the Firm Foundation will scorn the further flattery of this element, and put a stop to the use that is being made of him, his name and his paper. It is time to do it- and this is the opportunity to do it. The cause demands it. Several hundred of his friends will be gratified if he does and disappointed if he does not. On this point a letter from Yater Tant to Brother Showalter is timely and impressive. I pass it on.

June 3, 1946

Dear Brother Showalter:

I have seen recently a copy of a letter written by Brother Norman Davidson of Chicago which I feel does you a serious injustice. Brother Davidson refers to a telephone conversation he had with you, and quotes you as making statements which I feel confident you did not intend, as he is using them. In his intense desire to gain recognition for Brother Boll, it is understandable that he would read into whatever statement you might have made a meaning and an interpretation that was never intended. In doing so, I fear he is putting you before the brotherhood in a light that will certainly subject you to an avalanche of criticism.

Referring to his telephone conversation with you concerning the premillennial fight, Brother Davidson says, "he (Showalter) said he thought the thing 'never should have been an issue'; that it had always been a matter of personalities, and not of convictions; that numerous preachers had made capital for their own gain, thereof ... that before the issue was started in the G. A. office, numerous outstanding preachers whom he mentioned by name, had all held this (Boll's) position; but that they were now opposed to it- and not as arising out of any conviction what:soever.

Because I am confident you did not make the statements Brother Davidson is ascribing to you in any such light as he is presenting them that I write to you. He told me last summer that the remainder of his life was going to be dedicated to the removing of the "high-handed popery" which led to his being disfellowshipped all these years. He said he had with you, and quotes you as making statements which I feel does you a serious injustice. Brother Davidson so on more than one occasion. Any attempt to restore peace to the church on the assumption that the whole controversy arose merely over a "matter of personalities, and not of convictions will be a flaming challenge to the integrity and sincerity of every gospel preacher, living and dead, who has ever spoken one word against premillennialism. Surely anyone can see what terrific consequences will result throughout the whole brotherhood when any such flagrant challenge is laid down!

Because I believe your name is being used in a way contrary to your known position and convictions, I write you this letter. With every good wish to you and to the Firm Foundation and my friends will be gratified if he does and disappointed if he does not. On this point a letter from Yater Tant to Brother Showalter is timely and impressive. I pass it on.
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Because I believe your name is being used in a way contrary to your known position and convictions, I write you this letter. With every good wish to you and to the Firm Foundation and
nialism? The answer is, abuse and maldecition from many, broken confidences and severed ties from others, and a feeling of animosity, if not the actual enmity of some whose friendship we have both coveted and cultivated. But now is the time and the opportunity for us all to unite in putting down once for all the threat of premillennialism to the church and “personalities” should not keep us from doing so.

IV.

At this point we pause, to bow our head, as Norman Davidson attempts to use the name and influence for his scheme of one so recently dead—the name and reputation of H. Leo Boles. After all, Brother Showalter is living to tell us what he said to Norman Davidson, but Brother Boles is not. We do not know what Brother Boles said to Norman Davidson, and we will never know. We do not know what Norman told Brother Boles with reference to his “plans” to elicit anything that Brother Boles may have told him. But we know what Brother Boles said before he died. The following statement is taken from an article by him in the Gospel Guardian, October 1935, entitled “The Issue Now and Then” in which he refers to R. H. Boll by name and says that Rom. 16:17 should be applied to him and to the leaders of his party. Fortunately, we are not left to depend on what Norman Davidson “feels” that Brother Boles attitude would be. Brother Boles left his words on record.

“Conditions have changed in the brotherhood generally since this discussion, (Boll-Boles Discussion), due to the extremes to which the leaders of this movement have gone. They have gone beyond the boundary not only of true but of reason and brotherly love. They have exalted these theories to a level with the word of God. They have gone out from the faithful brethren in the Lord. Some of them have gone to the extreme of fellowshipping the denomina- tions and affiliating with denominational preachers who blaspheme the church of our Lord. It it not fair to the present situation to quote me in 1927 from the book “Unfulfilled Prophecy,” which expressed the attitude then and apply these quotations to the extremities to which these brethren who have so far departed from the faith, have gone in exalting their theories.

The language used in that book could perhaps be applied to some of these brethren now, who do not press these theories to the division of the church and who are not aligned with the contingency doing so, but it cannot apply to those who are wedded like Ephram of old to their idols and who have suffered division to come rather than recede from their theories. A discussion of these questions now, must, as a matter of fact, be held in light of the issue now-not then. Later developments reveal the character of the movement even from incipency and justifies the attitude of such men as F. W. Smith and M. C. Kurfees, who were criticized for their attitude on the issue.

The New Testament teaches clearly and emphatically how to regard those who have departed from the faith or those who have corrupted the teachings of Christ. “Now I beseech you, brethren, mark them that are causing the divisions and occasions of stumbling, contrary to the doctrine which ye learned; and turn away from them. For they that are such serve not our Lord Christ, but their own belly; and by their smooth and fair speech, they beguile the hearts of the innocent.” (Rom. 16: 17, 18). This is not difficult to understand. It belongs to every child of God and every Christian should help to carry out this “injunction of the Holy Spirit. The peace and harmony of the church of our Lord demand that this Scripture be obeyed by every child of God.”

Now, that is clear enough for anybody to understand, and if Brother Boles said anything to the contrary in private to Norman Davidson on his sick bed, it could be accounted for only on the basis of one of two things: First, that Davidson misrepresented matters and deceived him as to both his plans and the Boll “statement,” or else because of the weakened mind of a man whose body death had already seized. The effort of Norman Davidson and his pre- millennial friends to capitalize on the purported statements of a sick man, and to make him a posthumous witness for their cause, comes with exceedingly poor grace. But some of us have by experience learned, and therefore know, that there is nothing too small and unethical for these men to do to add the prestige of names to their party and to bolster a failing cause. The honor of several good men of the past is involved in this controversy whose testimony was published in the special issue of the Gospel Guardian January 1936. It may become necessary to reprint that important edition.

V.

We are informed by the Norman Davidson letters that we would all be “amazed” to know how many preachers have indorsed his scheme. But that is not a new story. His brother in perpetration, Clinton Davidson, attempted the same hoax. We all remember his boasted “questionnaires” and “surveys” in which he claimed 95% of the preachers, but it turned out to be only 95% of the ones who answered his questionnaire, and it was revealed that actually less than one percent of the preachers even answered his questionnaires!

Let Norman give us the names of the preachers he claims. They should not object, unless they are of that “bunch of cravens” he mentions. We will gladly open the columns of the Bible Banner to the preachers to say if they have indorsed Norman Davidson’s schemes. This issue of the Bible Banner goes to about 5,000 preachers. If they should answer on a postcard, I opine that Norman would be as much “amazed” as Clinton was “dazed” with the results. Since Norman is boasting of his own bravery—not being a “craven” who can be “intimidated” he should be willing to bring this amazing army of preachers he has enlisted out into the open and let us take a look at them.
VI.

We are told that Boll has made “a statement.” That is not new. His statements have been many through the years, and all alike—namely, something about “stressing” the issue, and “agreements” one way or another, but none of them of any more consequence than a Hitlerian treaty—a mere scrap of paper stalling for advantage. The forthcoming statement purports to be a mild admission of “overstressing” the issue and a condescending assurance that the issue will be henceforth handled with care, which means hypocritical caution; discussed with diplomacy, which means downright deceit; and withal a “promise” not to “press” the issue too much. But teaching false doctrine at all is pressuring it too much. Besides, it leaves R. H. Boll to judge how much he should “press” it, when and where, as in all former “agreements” that he has made the past thirty years, for which some brethren fell, but which meant nothing at all.

Keep in mind that Norman Davidson has said that he would not “ask or expect” Boll to quit teaching premillennialism and would “lose confidence in him” if he did. Then how much should he teach it? Let us see.

1. They have a paper pledged to the promotion of premillennialism.
2. They have a school sponsored and supported for the dissemination of premillennialism.
3. They have a will—the Janes will—probating $40,000 in “missionary money” for the propagation of premillennialism.
4. Both Boll and Jorgenson say that they will be true to that “trust.”

Therefore, they must “press” it $40,000 worth! Is that “overstressing” it, or “pressing” too much? A paper, a school and a will for forty thousand dollars worth of premillennialism! Then Norman Davidson as a front with $50,000 for which some brethren fell, but which meant nothing at all.

“rules” on “how the subject shall be referred to in the pulpit” to avoid offense! So they propose to have the preachers preach by a set of man-made rules. But he does not believe in an “ecclesiasticism,” nor a “hierarchy.” He only wants a regimentation of preaching—a sort of religious O.P.A. to put a “ceiling” on “pro and con” preaching on premillennialism! In other words, in order to restrict the preaching of error, by a compromise Norman would limit the preaching of the truth.

To the surprise of several of us, some who have committed themselves against premillennialism in general and Bollism in particular, fell for a proposal to draw up a statement to be signed by the editors and college presidents agreeing to put the millennial question on a par with Paul’s argument on “eating meat.” Let each one hold his “faith” to himself! So believing premillennialism would be like eating meat—it is all right, but for the sake of those who do not know any better than to believe it is wrong, don’t teach it! The parallel works the wrong way. Premillennialism is a false doctrine and is in no sense on a par with the question of the eating of meats.

It has been proposed that the presidents of the colleges accept premillennialists on the faculty on the condition that they agree not to teach the doctrine. The weakness of such a thing is apparent to anyone who knows the doctrine and is thinking with any depth. The very fact that a man believed premillennialism, though he did not teach it, would prevent his teaching certain vital and fundamental truth. Premillennialism denies the gospel. I am ready to affirm it with R. H. Boll or any representative they will put forward and indorse. No man can believe it and teach the fundamentals of the gospel. Therefore, the proposition to permit premillennial teachers to remain on the faculty of the schools under an agreement not to teach the doctrine, is to accept a teacher who by reason of his belief of error cannot teach the truth.

Our information is that Brother Clay Pullias, president of David Lipscomb College, flatly refused to accept such a proposition and on the grounds stated—that no man who believes the premillennial theory can teach truth that must be taught, and no premillennialist therefore has the right to remain on the faculty of one of our schools. This is what Norman calls a “rabid attitude.” But we all rejoice, and I personally rejoice, that Brother Pullias, as president of David Lipscomb College, has taken that stand. He should be supported in it by all who stand for truth against error. His stand is a rebuke to the proposal to put the premillennial theory on par with the meat question if the proposal did come from one who thinks he is strongly opposed to premillennialism. It is a compromise of the issue and represents light thinking.
Another sample of “statements” submitted for the group of signatories selected to “settle the issue” for the church is to the effect that “both sides” agree to preach only what is “stated” in the “words” of the text. This suggestion appears also to have been made by a rather prominent man, known to oppose premillennialism—but it evidences shallow thinking nevertheless. Where is it “stated” in the “words” of the text that the church was established on the first Pentecost after the resurrection of Christ? Nowhere. Yet we affirm the proposition in debate, and the Bible teaches it. Somebody has unwittingly submitted a statement that would keep him from preaching that the kingdom was established on Pentecost. The truth of a proposition does not depend on its being “stated” in the “words of the text.” A proposition thus stated would not be debatable. The issue is—does the Bible teaches the doctrine of premillennialism, we will not require him to find the “word” pre-millennialism in the “text.” Just show us the passage that teaches it, and we will not only cease to oppose it, we will promptly embrace it, and begin at once to teach it.

It seems strange to me that the brethren who are dilly-dallying with “statements” binding premillennial factionists to an agreement not to teach false doctrine are about to tie the hands of gospel preachers in the preaching of the truth. Entering into such agreements and signing such statements amounts to saying: Because we have made a rule that R. H. Boll cannot teach his “brotherhood,” but threatens the editor of the Advocate with “a real fight” if he dares to oppose his request was not “fear” of becoming “unpopular.”

Hardeman College does not even “want” unity; he poses as the embodiment of all fairness, yet insists that an editor agree to publish before seeing it a statement involving important issues fraught with grave consequences. Why should he want an editor to agree to publish an article before seeing it? That alone is evidence enough that something is seriously wrong with the statement, the article, and the author and writer of them—and there would be something wrong with an editor who would do it. It is to the credit of the editor that he refused to do it, but it is no indication of sincerity in a man who would demand such a thing. The fact that he demands it is reason enough to refuse it.

IX

As a sample of ignorance and misinformation, Norman refers to a supposed meeting in “the Gospel Advocate office” in 1925 in which “Foy Wallace was present” when a complete agreement was agreed concerning the whole Boll matter,” but because M. C. Kurfees opposed a “settlement” so “bitterly and violently” we all “gave up.” I will personally take the witness stand on this point and say that if Norman Davidson does not know any more about “the whole Boll matter” than he does of that supposed meeting, he is too ignorant of the whole thing to be heard and ought to stop talking. No such meeting as he refers to was ever held in the “G. A.” office or anywhere else “in which Foy Wallace was present.” In 1925 I was yet a young preacher and had crossed the Mississippi but twice in my life. I became editor of the Gospel Advocate in 1930 (still a young man) but no such meeting as Davidson refers to was ever held and no such agreements were ever made by me or by anyone else in my presence. As for M. C. Kurfees, he was a great and good man, whom it was never my privilege to know or even see. I do know his brother, J. F. Kurfees, mighty well, and believe him to be one of God’s noblemen today.

It is obvious that Norman Davidson does not know anything about premillennialism. He does not know anything about Bollism. He does not know anything about the history of the things concerning which he proposes a settlement. He is simply a partisan admirer and follower of R. H. Boll and does not know what he is doing. It is no compliment to Boll and his party to put him out in the front to represent their case and plead their dying cause. If they must initiate such a crusade for vindication, they should get a better informed man to lead it. Or do they think to capitalize on his innocence and use his $50,000?
X

Let us take a close-up look at two phases of this situation—the inherent character of the movement and both internal and external workings of the men who are promoting it.

The prophet Amos would not be in demand as a speaker in these Unity meetings of today. He once asked a simple but embarrassingly direct question, which if applied to modern unity movements would explode their meetings with atomic effects. I would not want to be involved in any movement or meeting where Amos and his question were not welcome, or would be ignored. The question is: "Can two walk together except they be agreed?" To try to walk together without agreement is neither a worthy nor a workable endeavor, and is utterly futile. We should not desire to walk with anybody who is not in agreement with God, and agreement with God automatically puts us into fellowship with all who are in agreement with him. Fellowship with men is not attained by campaigns and pressure: nor by putting up thousands of dollars to promote the effort: nor by mouthing puny and poetic peons on peace in so-called unity meetings. Fellowship with the only ones whose fellowship is worth seeking or accepting is on the basis of "the truth, the whole truth and nothing but the truth." No appeal to men for unity, direct or indirect, can be consistently made on any other ground, and only by an effort to effect such an agreement. The only means is the truth and the only method is teaching it.

Why concentrate efforts at fellowship on a man or a group of men who are teachers of error? Why expend fifty thousand dollars for the fellowship of one man who has always been a teacher of the worst sort of error? If it is suggested that to do so will bring peace to the church, we reply that such a compromise could not bring peace to the church. Do you ask, who said so? I reply that God said so—through Amos. Agreement on the truth is the only basis of unity. Teaching the truth is the only way to effect it. But teaching the truth on issues is the last thing wanted in these unity meetings. That is true of this movement launched by Norman Davidson to induce the church to fellowship Boll with all of his evil doctrines. Does Boll want fellowship? Does Davidson want unity? Only as a means to an end. There is something else they want—namely, to silence opposition to the teaching of R. H. Boll, or render impotent whatever teaching is done against him and his doctrines. That is the trouble with all of these unity meetings and movements. The method is wrong, and that usually means that the motive is wrong. Unity is not the motive of unity meetings! If unity were the motive, both scripture and common sense dictate that the X-ray of teaching should be turned on the issues that cause the disunity. Fifty thousand dollars worth of unity without agreement is a cheat. But obtain agreement and unity will be found wrapped in the same package. God's plan is right.

What has become of that unity movement with the Christian Church? It failed because it was not motivated by a desire for unity. It was a skin game on both sides by little unrepresentative, self-appointed groups that promoted it. They were using unity as a smokescreen, behind which they were maneuvering for positions of advantage, from which they could steal members from the other side. The ones they could catch were not worth it; the ones worth catching would not swallow their hook. They were stalemated by their obviously wrong motives. They even watched each other. Thieves cannot make a living stealing from each other. They ought to get on an honest basis.

Norman Davidson is launching a giant fishing expedition. He has pledged fifty thousand dollars for expenses. I am sure that he will need all of it. The hook will be in plain sight, if and when he gets around to displaying his tackle, instead of merely talking about his plan and what it will cost. It appears that his bait will be the forthcoming statement of R. H. Boll, which he so much wanted the editor of the Gospel Advocate to agree to publish before seeing which is evidence enough that there is a trick in it. If not, why does he not want the editor to see if before he agrees to publish it?

But we have seen R. H. Boll bait on the hook before. He has promised this and that in time past, many times, but has always succeeded in riding out on a technical interpretation of his promises. I think it appropriate that only legal bait be used this time, and entirely right to demand it, and the truth is the only legal bait.

In his forthcoming statement, Boll will need no technicality, according to those who have seen it, for he does not promise anything. And Davidson says that if he did promise to quit teaching premillennialism he would lose confidence in him. Why should Boll promise anything? parries this outfitter of this fishing expedition, sans bait. There is no reason at all, for several reasons.

(1) True fellowship does not rest upon human promises.

(2) If Boll promised anything— he would not keep it. He never has.

(3) If he promised, and kept it, the keeping it would involve suppressing his convictions. One must be honest, else neither God nor man can use him.

(4) If Boll promised to change his teaching, he could not keep his promise with or without the aid of conscience. He has reinterpreted practically the whole Bible to sustain his theory, including some of the plain passages, so that he has virtually disqualified himself for teaching the gospel in its purity and simplicity. He could stop
teaching his speculations by not teaching at all; but he could not merely leave out his theory and 
preach the truth. He has woven whatever truth 
he does teach around his theory until the roots 
are crossed and mingled. For decades he has 
cemented his conceptions of God and religion 
together with the mortar of Judaism in the form 
of modern millennialism. His premillennial build-
ing cannot be remodelled. He would have to 
build from the ground up. Sad, indeed, but such 
is the penalty for the years he has spent in spec-
ulation and false doctrine.

It is idle to talk about fellowshipping Boll, if 
he will agree to hold his teaching as an “opinion.” 
How can somebody hold anything as something 
which he believes it is not? It is not an opinion 
with him. If anybody wishes to be technical, 
and say that it could not be conviction, because 
faith comes by the word of God, let it be stated 
this way: If it is an opinion with him, he does 
not know it; and he will never find it out, no 
matter how many of us try to point it out to him. 
In so far as making him the proposition of hold-
ing his peculiar teachings as an opinion is con-
cerned; or his ability to differentiate between 
faith and opinion, truth and error, and preach 
only the unadulterated gospel, after all these 
years, it is idle to talk about it.

Davidson says that he does not believe the 
Boll theory. It is logical to deduce from that, 
that he thinks the theory is false; and by the 
same token, those who teach that it is false are 
teaching the truth on the question. But he does 
not want Boll to quit teaching what he admits is 
false teaching. There are evidently a few things 
Davidson has overlooked or else never did know. 
He overlooks the question of Amos. Why seek a 
fellowship on a false doctrine and disagreement 
on such a doctrine? Davidson is himself already 
on record that it is a false doctrine. So, accord-
ing to Davidson himself, we all know what the 
truth is and who holds it, and he places himself 
in the awkward position of expecting those who 
are right to agree with the one who is wrong. He 
does not believe the Boll doctrine, yet he will 
spend fifty thousand dollars to get him fellow-
shipped. Can you feature that? Evidently he 
does not think the doctrine is important. Then 
why not get his friend Boll to drop it? But he 
will “lose confidence” in him if he does, he says!

We believe that it is important and that it is 
our duty to combat erroneous teaching. Truth 
is important. Error destroys it. And some of us 
have the conviction that the truth is important 
足够的 to be preached, and that only those who 
do preach it should be supported and fellow-
shipped. How could any honest man dispose of his 
conviction while fellowshipping Boll in the preach-
ing of false doctrine? Davidson is asking us to 
reverse ourselves on this whole question of pre-
millennialism and what to do with it. If Boll 
should change his views he would not have to pro-
mise anything, and the whole thing would take 
care of itself promptly and to the joy of all. If 
Boll does not change his views, there is nothing 
that he can promise and nothing that Davidson 
or anybody else can do about fellowshipping him, 
without changing our convictions. Does Davidson 
think there can be convictions on the wrong side 
of a thing, but none on the right side? That con-
victions of those who are wrong should be re-
spected but not those who are right? If he tries 
to argue that it is indifferent, he is simply wrong 
-badly wrong-as badly wrong as Boll himself. 
Premillennialism is not an indifferent question. 
It is not a mere harmless theory. It is not mere-
ly different “views on unfulfilled prophecy.” 
Any man who talks in such terms immediately 
exposes his ignorance of premillennialism and 
all related issues. There is no error taught 
which has more completely vitiated the gospel 
of Christ than premillennialism. If there is such 
a thing as a harmless error, premillennialism 
and Bollism do not fall in that class.

It is a strange doctrine. It has been an issue 
through the years yet has never in all of its his-
tory built a single church or church house in its 
own name! The Cuckoo lays its eggs in nests 
built by other birds, and lets the other birds 
hatch them. Premillennialists are content to lay 
their eggs of speculation in nests built by others. 
But they raise more fuss and feathers about their 
status quo in those borrowed nests than any re-
ligious group on earth! The premillennialist has 
no church that he can call his own. But he man-
ages to get a precarious foothold in every church.

In this sense he is an exception to the rule 
that birds of a feather flock together. True, he 
thinks more of his premillennialism than he does 
of the church of his adoption. He thinks more 
of his premillennialist friends in other churches than 
he does of his brethren in the church to which he 
clings. He often shows it when assailed; but at 
all other times he is busy feeling sorry for him-
self, because he is mistreated, misunderstood, 
 misrepresented, and disfellowshipped! The man 
who is always being misunderstood is, in truth, 
too well understood for his deceptions to work. 
They demand the fellowship of those whom they 
neither love nor trust. They plead for a fellow-
ship in which they are misunderstood. The only 
reason they do not go out, is because they do 
not have anywhere to go!

If all the premillennialists flocked together, 
their number would be imposing; although they 
are a minority where they are, they would com-
pose a considerable brotherhood. But the tie 
that binds them in mutual admiration would not 
enable them to function as a unity. Those things 
upon which churches are built do not pertain to 
premillennialism nor compose their theory. 
Their doctrine creates disturbance within a 
church, but does not form the basis of a church. 
For that reason they have no church. They
that makes cowards of its best friends! No wonder they want the stigma removed! But that is the stigma. If they cannot bear the stigma, they prove themselves unworthy.

One of the worst things about the doctrine is the ambiguity it generates. It makes cowards, martyrs, dodgers out of its followers. That is the only fruit the doctrine can bear. The seeds of cowardice inhere in the nature of the doctrine. In the very nature of it premillennialism is a sensuous, Judaistic, materialistic, fatalistic speculation, which exposes its adherents to the criticism of all who are really the spiritually minded. Premillennialism affords them no defense, no haven, no ultimate alternative. They cannot step out and build upon premillennialism. It affords no foundation upon which to erect the slightest type of structure. They are shut up to being the self-pitying martyrs their own indulgence in forbidden mysteries of their system makes of them.

It makes its votaries and its sympathizers, ridiculous. Here we have a man promoting fellowship with Boll, who says he does not believe his doctrine. What a strange anomaly! If he is willing to spend $50,000 to silence the tongues of those who believe what he himself claims to believe on this question, through friendship for a man who has made his own religious bed, how much would he be willing to spend that the mouths of these same preachers might be opened wide to preach the truth on this and all other items of truth, so that all others might know the truth and walk therein; that would automatically bring all into real fellowship with God with each other, the only true fellowship. Alas, my friend, thy much money hath made thee mad!

Splitting an atom may be a sensation as a phenomenon, but premillennialism is more phenomenal. It will split the personality of both its followers and sympathizers! Here is a man whose convictions are on one side and his money on the other side: and by his own testimony as to his belief, his money is on the wrong side! For many years, before I really knew what premillennialism was, I heard preachers discuss Boll. Often times one who was asked what he thought of Boll, would reply: “I do not believe his doctrine, but I think he has been mistreated.” I was a boy, and did not join in the discussion; but I afterward learned that there was something badly wrong with the man who was always being mistreated. Now I know what it is: He is a premillennial-made martyr: the victim of his own bad doctrine and wrong attitude toward the church.

XI

Judged by the rule of Jesus, Davidson stands condemned. Since Davidson’s money is on the Boll side; and since Jesus says that where a man’s treasure is, there will his heart be also:
his heart is on the Boll side. Premillennialism not only splits congregations and personalities, it divides the hearts of those who sympathize with the victims of it.

They are not all liars who deny believing it, even if their actions and manifest sympathies do make their words sound ridiculous. Technically, many of them do not believe the doctrine. Few people do, because few people can. It is too complex, and there is no uniformity of brands. But many who deny vigorously that they believe it, are so steeped in the disease, and its consequences that the result is the same as if actual belief of the doctrine existed.

A few of them as individuals have gone out from us. But they do not find rest, wherever they go. Unless we press the fight against this error, they may return and bring many other spirits with them more evil than themselves; for the over-all weakness of premillennialism is that it provides no home for its adherents. Nature produced one bird without a nest-building instinct. The field of reckless speculation has presented the religious world with a self-made orphan, without the ability to provide himself a home, or to live at peace with anybody else.

The doctrine of R. H. Boll is his; not God’s. The onus is his; not ours. He must bear his onus. There will always be a stray cat crying in our alley. There is only one thing worse than hearing him cry out there—that would be taking him in! If we take him in, he will take us in. Experience, observation, and an understanding of the nature of the doctrine blend their voices in chorus: Let them be what they have willed to be, a troublesome and outcast minority!

But there is one thing they could do for the welfare of all concerned, including their own comfort: They could be honest and ethical. They could prevent all the strife and turmoil and confusion by doing the decent thing of withdrawing quietly into groups to themselves. There they could live in quietness and tranquility with their pet doctrines and peculiar dogmas, and not be faced with the prospect of answering in the judgment for deception, confusion, and division of the body of Christ. So far as I am concerned, that is exactly what they will have to do, if they expect to enjoy peace.

XII

Finally, let us look at the two Davidsons.

First, Clinton Davidson. Years ago he left Louisville in pursuit of a fortune. He joined a wealthy, digressive, modernist Christian Church. After twenty years, having made his fortune through insurance and holding companies, he appears again on the scene to vindicate R. H. Boll.

Second, Norman Davidson. Years ago he left Nashville in pursuit of a fortune. During the years of his obscurity if he did anything for the church nobody heard of it. After twenty years of silence, having made his fortune, he appears on the scene again to vindicate R. H. Boll!

Their courses of action are identical. Clinton Davidson took vows and made pledges to the Lord that he would do so and so. He started out with threats to “destroy” certain preachers who were in his way, of whom I was first on his list. He said he had the money with which to do it. He started on me, and never got to the second man on the list!

Now Norman Davidson begins with vows and pledges to the Lord and starts with threats against certain preachers and he begins on me! My prediction is that he will not get to the second man on his list, last as long nor get even as far as Clinton. He had better stop where he is, apologize for the blunders and sins added up to his credit at this stage, get back to Chicago and make some vows to redeem his wife from the clutches of the premillennial Moody Institute, and save her soul and his own before it is too late. It is inexcusably inconsistent for him to say that he is not—himself a premillennialist while he leaves his wife to one of the rankest sectarian institutes of premillennialism known today and pledges the Lord to vindicate the rank-est premillennial factionist leader ever known or heard of among churches of Christ. He would far better make a vow to do what he can with what he has to save others from the error that allured and led his wife away, and to defend the church of the Lord against it.

As it stands, this new Davidson movement, like the old one, is simply another effort to create a favorable condition for Boll, Jorgenson, and their groups to teach the false doctrine of premillennialism in the church, a scheme to force Boll and his premillennialism on the churches of Christ. They went out from us because they were not of us, but the Davidsons take vows and make pledges to drag them back and force them on the church. With all of their own money plus the $40,000 will of Janes and Jorgenson, they can never do it. Overpass, underpass, or by-pass—they shall not pass!

—F. E. W. Jr.
A VAST DIFFERENCE

R. L. WHITESIDE

In some remarks, prefacing the reprinting of the Janes collection "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' " (this phrase is in the Janes will), Jorgenson says, "that these same differences—both in faith and teaching—have continued all along among disciples and that never before, so far as history discloses— at least in this latest 'Restoration'—have they been urged to draw the line." (Word and Work, April 1945) Yet it seems that Jorgenson had forgotten that just one year earlier he mentioned as believing that Christ would come before the millennium, Lard, Creath, Milligan, Harding, Brents, and Sommer; but said "'Premillennialism': as conceived of by many today, these men might disavow." This is a significant expression. Things are tacked on to the premillennial theory these days that the men mentioned never dreamed of. Yes, there is a vast difference.

1. They did not continually harp on the millennium.

I think it can be safely affirmed that everything all these men said about the millennium would be a small amount compared with what Boll has said. On this point Brother Harding said to me, "Brother Boll needs to pray for wisdom." And that was before Robert had written his pamphlets and tracts on his theories. Since then he has kept up an almost constant agitation in Word and Work, in addition to his pamphlets and preaching. None of the men mentioned did so. And there is a wide difference in what these men believed and what Boll and his converts believe.

2. These men believed in Jesus as the Christ—that Jesus is the Christ; but Boll's faith is different.

In commenting on Revelation 12 Boll says, "This mystic man-child is not simply the child that was born in Bethlehem, but the Christ as including both Himself, the Head, and the church, His spiritual Body, which is one with him." (Word and Work, Jan. 1930) Peter said to Jesus, "Thou art the Christ, the Son of the living God." (8:27) "This mystic man-child is not simply the child that was born in Bethlehem, but the Christ as in the expression of an opinion; it is an emphatic contradiction of what God says.

4. Boll's teaching on the imminency of Christ's second coming is likely to discredit in the minds of thinking men the teaching of the apostles.

Notice these statements: "The apostolic church was taught to wait and look for the coming again of the Lord Jesus." "The apostolic church was in an attitude of waiting for Jesus." "They were hoping for Him and they were looking for His return in the days of the apostles." (Second Coming by R. H. Boll pp 7, 8, 10) And notice the implications of this strange statement: "The apostle Paul was looking forward to it in his day. He taught the Thessalonian brethren and others to wait and look and long for it, and the apostle Paul knew as much about God's plans as any man on earth, for he was an inspired apostle.
and he knew no more than that the coming of the Lord Jesus was continually to be expected." (pp 32,331 If the apostles had taught the brethren to expect the Lord to come in their day, they would have raised false hopes. That would have discredited their claim to be inspired of God, for God never raised any false hopes. But Paul did not so teach the Thessalonian brethren, though it seems that some, misunderstanding Paul's first letter, and others, claiming spiritual guidance, taught "that the day of the Lord is just at hand." In his second letter Paul corrects that mistaken notion. "Now we beseech you, brethren, touching the coming of our Lord Jesus Christ, and our gathering together unto him; to the end that ye be not quickly shaken from your mind, nor yet be troubled, either by spirit, or by word, or by epistle as from us, as that the day of the Lord is just at hand: let no man beguile you in any wise: for it will not be, except the falling away come first, and the man of sin be revealed, the son of perdition." (Chapter 2:1) Paul goes on to say more about this falling away and the man of sin. And so "the coming of our Lord Jesus Christ, and our gathering together unto him" would necessarily be considerably in the future when Paul wrote second Thessalonians. They knew, when they read this letter, that the coming of the Lord was not "just at hand." And so, Boll contradicts Paul, a thing the brethren Jorgenson mentioned would not have done.

5. Years ago, when Brother Nichol and I wrote "Christ and His Kingdom, a Review of R. H. Boll," some brethren who should have known better, accused us of misrepresenting Brother Boll. If we erred at all in that Review, it was in failing to make our Review as strong as his per-versions really demanded. When a man teaches that no Old Testament promise or prophecy refers at all to the kingdom of Christ as we have it today, none refers to the church, none refers to the gospel plan of salvation as preached by the apostles, his theory is so absurd that no one could make it more so by misrepresenting it.

In this article I cannot follow all the ramifications of his future kingdom theory, but will make a few quotations and comments. "But the trouble is that neither in detail nor otherwise can we trace the fulfillment of the prophecy of Daniel 2 in anything that has ever happened in the past." (Boll's Kingdom Book p. 14) "This is the stone which has been forming throughout the present age and which in due time comes down to smite the image and assume the control of the earth." (p. 20) "For in God's time Israel will come into her own according to all the words that he spake by his holy prophets from the days of old." (p. 32) So "due time"-"God's time"-to establish the kingdom is yet future. Why then did Jesus and John preach as they did? John preached, "Repent ye; for the kingdom of heaven is at hand." (p. 62)

ed up, Jesus came into Galilee, preaching the gospel of God, and saying, The time is fulfilled, and the kingdom of God is at hand; repent ye, and believe the gospel." The time is fulfilled"; what time? Whose time? "due time?" "God's time?" When Jesus said, "The time is fulfilled" he knew what he was talking about.

Boll says, "When John the Baptist lifted up his voice in the wilderness of Judea and announced 'the kingdom of heaven is at hand' he used a phraseology which was already common and current among the Jews, and which was perfectly understood by all." The fact is, the phrase "kingdom of heaven" is not found in the Old Testament. On what grounds did Boll affirm so confidently that the phrase was "common and current among the Jews?" And how does he know that it was perfectly understood by all the Jews? He could not know the truth of what he so emphatically affirms. "Perfectly understood by all," and yet Jesus called the Pharisees blind guides! Again, "But if the Jewish expectations had been utterly wrong (...), even then a sense of justice would suggest that God would not have left the people under such misapprehen-sion without a clear protest and correction." Whose sense of justice? Does he mean to say that man's sense of justice would suggest what God should do? But when Boll reaches the end of Matthew 12, he forgets this sense of justice. The Jews had reached the climax of their hardness of heart; and so, Boll tells us, that Jesus in his parables (Matt. 13) set forth new truth. Notice this: "These parables are really an announc-ement of the new and unexpected aspect the kingdom would assume during an anticipated age of the king's rejection and absence from the world." And yet Jesus did not tell them that he was not now talking about the kingdom they expected, but a new and unexpected phase of the kingdom. In this case what would Boll's sense of justice suggest as to why Jesus did not tell them he was now talking about the new and unexpect-ed aspect of the kingdom, not about the kingdom they expected? Again: "In the teachings that follow in Matt. 18, 19, 20, the references to the kingdom bear variously upon one or the other of these features-the present spiritual aspect, as the kingdom shares the incognito of the king onto the one hand; and the glory to come on the other." So we are to understand that Jesus changed his talks from one aspect of the kingdom to the other; yet he never did say which aspect he was talking about. Why did not Boll's sense of justice suggest that Jesus would tell which aspect he was talking about? Well, he could not make any point by such suggestion. All this nullifies the point Boll sought to make when Jesus did not at the start tell the Jews that he was not talking about such a kingdom as they expected.

6. The way Boll butchers up Matthew 25:31-46 is a shame.
That he tells us will be a judgment of the nations that will be in existence when Jesus comes again. He will separate the good nations, the ones that have treated his disciples right, from the bad nations, nations that did not help his needy disciples. The baby sprinklers used to make a similar play on the word nations in Matthew’s account of the great commission. “Teach all nations, baptizing them”—baptizing the nations, and nations included infants; but in the Greek the word nations is a neuter noun, but the pronoun them is masculine. So they were to baptize people, not nations as such. In Matthew 25: 3146 the word nations is neuter; but all articles, participles, and pronouns in the passage are masculine. Take the last verse: “And these (masculine in Greek) shall go away into eternal punishment; but the righteous (masculine in Greek) into eternal life.” Jesus will not be dealing with nations, or governments, as such, but with people.

7. In Word and Work, of July 1944, Brother Boll prints seven pages under the heading of “The Jerusalem Conference.” I could not see why some brethren were so stirred up by what he said in that issue; for he set forth the same ideas in his book, “The Kingdom of God,” published about twenty years before he published the article that so excited brethren G. C. Brewer and S. H. Hall.

In discussing this “conference” Boll says in his book: “About the middle of Acts, occurs an event of first importance. The acceptance of the Gentiles into the church into the favor of God as joint-sharers of the blessings of Israel’s Christ—was a terrible perplexity to all believing Jews. It was in fact a mystery. It had never been revealed that such a thing would happen. (Eph. 3:4-6) That the Gentiles were to be blessed in messianic days was no mystery; that had been previously revealed. But the observant reader of the prophets will notice that it is always after the national restoration and exaltation of Israel, and always through restored Israel and in subservience to Israel that the Gentiles were to be blessed.” You can see why Boll puts the prophecy James quoted as yet to be fulfilled; his theory demanded it.

After quoting James’ short speech up to the close of the quotation from the prophets, Boll added, “The critical words upon which the question of the meaning turns are in the first line of James quotation from the prophets—‘after these things I will return’—The fact is significant, however, that the prophet from whom James quotes this, never used the words at all—James purposely added these words, as summing up the teaching of the prophets on the point in hand. This being the case the words are to be regarded as meaningful, and are not to be slurred as being only a conventional and meaningless introductory formula, but are to be given their full weight of meaning in the connection in which James brings them forward.

So you see that more than twenty years ago Boll doctored up James’ speech and quotation to make it harmonize with his theory. It is true that in his Word and Work article he discussed matters more at length, but really said nothing new, unless it be an enlargement of what he conceives to have been the purpose of James’ speech. He asserts that the speeches of Peter, Paul and Barnabas had settled the question about the salvation of the Gentiles. This he does not know—it is merely a reckless assertion. But it furnished a basis for saying to the puzzled Jews that the coming in of the Gentiles would not interfere with their coming glory, and quoted Amos to show that their glorious kingdom would yet come. And so James’ speech was not about Gentiles at all. But Boll ignores James’ “wherefore” in verse 19. “Wherefore my judgment is, that we trouble not them that from among the Gentiles turn to God: but that we write...” No, James did not make a speech about the future of the Jews and then drawn a conclusion about the present standing of the Gentiles.

8. In brief Boll’s plan for the millennial kingdom is this:

The Messiah (composed of Jesus and the church) will rule. The Jews, nationally converted, will be the citizens. As such they will enforce the decrees of the Messiah; they will be the police force. Other nations will be subject peoples, not citizens. Of the Jewish believer, Boll says, “So far as his own scriptures had taught him he was looking for the earthly and spiritual deliverance of his nation through Christ; and as a result of Israel’s blessings, the Gentile nations to the ends of the earth would render homage to Israel and her God and her king, and would receive their blessings through her.” Yes, only through the Jews can anybody then receive anything. But notice how Boll makes God and Christ tribal Deities—“her God and her king.” Other places we have “Israel’s Christ,” “Israel’s Messiah.”

But if you know the plan of the ancient Roman government, you have an idea of Boll’s millennial government. Rome had its rulers and citizens, then its subject peoples. These subject peoples paid tribute, but really had no legal rights. In Boll’s millennial kingdom all other nations will be subservient to the Jews. This subservience puts every body but Jews in a degraded position. Subservience is a strong word.


Let me pick out some of the essential points of Boll’s theory, stated in his own words, and you reprint extracts in which the men you mentioned taught the same thing. I charge that you misrepresented them when you said they believed and taught the same things. But do not quote... (Cont. on p. 21)
(Printed as received, without correction of errors)

Dear Leon:

I saw Bro. H. Leo just before he became ill and talked with him at home half a day. He agreed to help me, in every possible way, in what I set before him. I sincerely feel the Boll statement would have been fully acceptable to him and that we could settle the issue.

I expect to have notes made of this, and tie it in with my introductory remarks to show his interest, and to verify my statement that he had agreed to help.

(Signed) N.

Nashville, Tenn.
Jan. 30, 1946

Dear Bro. Davidson:

Your two letters have been received. I have been in bed for four weeks and am still in bed; I will have to remain in bed for some weeks yet. I am dictating this letter while in bed.

I appreciate your writing me and the thoughts that you suggest. May the Lord abundantly bless you in your efforts to restore peace in the brotherhood.

Yours fraternally,

(Signed) H. Leo Boles

CHICAGO
March 21, 1946

Mr. Leon McQuiddy
Nashville, Tenn.

Dear Leon:

I was surely grieved at Morford’s death, as I am sure you were. Was so sorry that I had to leave before the end came. From a worldly point of view, he was one of the very finest, men I ever knew, and about the most likeable; but my deepest grief concerning him is that he died absolutely without any spark of hope. Personally, I had tried my utmost to interest him in his soul’s salvation, but I could never get any where at all with him along such lines.

Since my return here, I have been away constantly, on one trip after another, but I hope now to have a breathing spell of a few days so I can devote some time and thought to the Boll matter.

Concerning your suggestion of submitting this to Bro. Hardeman, after much thought, I have decided that I will not do so. I feel that, with his great prestige and influence in our Brotherhood, he could have settled this un-Godly issue long, long ago, had he wished to do so. But, apparently, the thing was of no consequence to him and, as far as I can learn, he made absolutely no effort of any kind to stop all the terrific amount of discord which has developed in our midst therefrom. So, since he has manifested no interest in the past, I do not feel that he should be consulted now, as whether or no the issue shall be settled.

In other words, I do not feel the settlement should be made to hinge upon Hardeman’s say-so concerning it. If he feels it should be settled now, well and good; but if not, I certainly am not going to cause my efforts toward affecting a true Christian settlement. In the past, I sincerely feel there has been absolutely too much Dictation on the part of a few influential preachers, as to what our membership shall do. Personally, I have long felt that there was something very nearly approaching unto a religious hierarchy in our Brotherhood. All such I propose to by-pass, in my efforts in this matter, and I want to bring the decision as to what shall now be done, up to a tribunal of a few powerful preachers, but to the great rank and file of the membership of our Brotherhood. Certainly the preachers have done nothing about this un-Godly mess, except to make it worse and worse; now I want to go to all the church leaders, and also to all the balance of the membership.

Unto all these I shall appear, as unto fair-minded and just men, to stop making the matter of difference of opinion, or interpretation, or conclusion (or whatever term you might wish to use) in matters of unfulfilled prophesies, a test of fellowship; neither should we brand as “un-sound” those who may happen to differ in their positions on such. I further shall appeal unto all the host of the preachers, who have told me, in confidence, that they sincerely feel no “lines” would be drawn over such matters, but who say they are afraid to come out and take such positions openly.

I shall appeal to all such not to come out, without fear, and take a stand on this like true Christian men, and not like a bunch of cravens. Leon, in days long gone by, when I tried to influence you toward more consecrated life, and you were—not, at that time, interested therein, you said to me “The trouble with me is that I see and come into contact with too many preachers.” Though I regretted what you said, yet, I realized that there were, indeed, many preachers who make a matter of “politics” of their religion, or who are jealous largely by what they feel to be their own selfish interests; or who are jealous of others. (However, in passing, I never felt that excused you; our relations to Christ are a personal matter. Though all the world be false to him, or fail him, yet, we can still, personally, stand and walk with Him. May He help you and me to do just that, regardless of what many others may do. More and more, as the days rush so swiftly by, do I realize my utmost need for Him; You too, my life-long friend need Him more now,
than ever before in your life. In the ache of your heart over the terrible illness of her whom you have loved so dearly and long, you do need Him, more than ever before in your whole life. I would beg you that you and I both love Him, as we have never before done, and that we real and truly live for Him, in all those words might mean.)

But, getting back to the matter of preachers, and their weaknesses and failings; I sincerely blame the present torn-asunder condition in our Brotherhood, on the weakness of our preachers to their desire for “preeminence,” which they have hoped to attain by posing as deliverers of the church, to save it from the menace of premillennialism, which is just about to destroy it! Therein, with my whole heart, I believe they have been wrong!

Further, in all the spirit of love for you which I have held since the days of our childhood, I would tell you that I sincerely feel that The Gospel Advocate has been wrong in steering and spreading, through writings within its pages, this discord in the hearts of brethren, I think that our religious papers, like our preachers, have been guilty of playing politics in this matter.

Yes, I feel that the Gospel Advocate, too, has wanted to be on the “popular” side. As proof of that, I would recite the following to you. Throughout all the years, there have been numerous articles published in the Advocate, all of which, that I ever read, have tended to increase the feelings which have existed toward those who hold different conclusions in matters of prophesy, and to justify the present “dragnet of lines.”

While I have never accepted, myself, any of the premillennial teachings, yet I have always regarded, and treated, Bro. Boll and others who agree with him, as brethren.

Well, several months ago, since there had appeared in the advocate, again, articles which would tend to widen this breach. I wrote to Bro. Goodpasture and asked him if he would publish an article on this subject which I would like to see, that he might have been lucky articles galore, written by numerous writers, all of which had been published in the Advocate; but they all represented one point of view, which happened to be the popular one. Bro. Goodpasture knew that, if I should write an article of my own, instead of justifying the present ungainly conditions. I would condemn them, and instead of arguing for them, I would argue against them. So, though he had accepted for publication numerous articles from other brethren, yet he refused to publish one which I might write. Leon, I say to you that anyone would have a hard time to convince me that the reason for such refusal was not that he feared I might write something which might be unpopular. Why do you think so?

Personally, I feel it is high time our religious papers quit following the Catholic way of only letting their readers hear what they want to hear. Where there are differences of opinion, or different views on various matters, I think every member of our great Brotherhood is entitled to have before him every point of view, so that he may decide for himself thereabout! In all such matters I sincerely believe in individual freedom. I repeat that I feel there has long been, in our Brotherhood, something very close kin to a religious hierarchy, if not actually such! I am absolutely against all such!

Leon, I want the Advocate to publish the Boll statement, together with my introductory remarks: I sincerely feel that your readers are entitled to read it! I think you should publish it, as a news item of universal interest, so that your readers may have a chance to decide for themselves as to the merits of the things presented.

Further, since this whole un-Godly mess started in the Advocate Office, I think that you owe it to the One who died for you, to do all that the Advocate can now do to end it, and to make every possible effort toward restoring the peace which certainly should exist among all sincere followers of Him! In bygone days, the Advocate led the way unto discord among brethren (one of the things we are told the Lord hates), and division in His beloved Body. Now, I truly feel the Advocate should lead the way back to the paths of true love among brethren, and tender-hearted tolerance and forbearance and unity.

I know, well, that you put Bro. Goodpasture absolutely in charge of the Advocate. (That I feel he has done an exceedingly fine job there, I have told you before, on several occasions.) I have always tried to “put myself in the other fellow’s shoes,” so I can understand why, as a matter of general principle, he might be unwilling to publish something which he had not read before agreeing unto its publication. Also, he does not happen to know me as well as you do, so I can understand and appreciate why he might refuse to publish something from me, without first reading it, so I am certainly not “falling out” with him therefor.

But can’t you tell him through how many years my life has been an “open book” unto you, and what you have read thereupon, and that you do not feel he would be “sticking his neck out” in agreeing beforehand to publish anything I might send out over my signature? And you also might tell him that I recognize, fully, the utmost importance of the introductory remarks, so I have asked several of the straightest thinkers and best balanced men in our Brotherhood (none of them on the premillennial side), to assist me in suggestions of wisdom, and in “censor” of what I might write. I assure you that what will go into this introduction will have behind it a big lot of careful thinking, from all points of view, together with much earnest prayer that that which may be issued shall in all ways be pleasing unto Him, and in accord with His leadings. Believe me, my only desire in this matter is to serve Him to the very best of my abilities, and that this terrible blot and blemish upon His church may be removed!

I am so exceedingly busy now with my work for the furniture factories whom I serve that I probably will not be able to complete the introductory remarks until just time for publications, which I hope may be in June. With sincere regards.

(Signed) Norman

CHICAGO

April 1, 1946

Mr. Leon McQuiddy
Nashville, Tenn.

Dear Leon:

As burdened as I know your heart is, I certainly hate to worry, or bother you, about anything. But if you can do so. I would much appreciate a reply to my letter of March 21.

I am planning to leave here next week, on a trip to be gone a number of weeks, and have much to do before I can get away. So I would like to know your decision as soon as possible.
so that I may plan accordingly. I surely do hope that you wont turn me down. Certainly there could be no possible objection to your publishing the things contemplated, as a "news item." Of course, Bro. Goodpasture would have the privilege, and right of making any kind of comments he might wish, in his editorial expressions of views thereabout.

Please dont turn me down! I know me well enough to know that I absolutely seek no leadership, "pre-eminence", nor anything else, except to please my Lord. I know He is displeased over the present discord and bitter feelings in our Brotherhood, so I know that my efforts toward real unity and Christian love are pleasing unto Him.

With Sincere Regards,
(Signed) Norman.

April 23, 1946

Mr. Leon B. McQuiddy
Nashville, Tennessee

Dear Leon:

Was sorry that I missed seeing you recently, on our way South. Would have stayed another day, but had reservations made ahead, so could not do so.

My heart truly bleeds for you in the great trial through which you are passing. Having had several close relatives who have died with cancer, I know just what it means. In this instance, I am sure that he has since converted you. So I am exceedingly great surprise that he felt the settlement could be settled on the basis of that which is included in the statement, and he pledged himself to render me every possible assistance toward this end. He positively did not, in his expressions to me, express one single word which might indicate that he felt the settlement should be made, if Boll will agree to quit teaching his views. To the contrary, he made it very clear that he felt it would not be necessary for either side to compromise their convictions in any way.

As I told Bro. Goodpasture, I just do not think he wants to see this terrible situation settled, unless he is able therein to win a victory over Boll; I further told him I felt he had "made capital" of it for so long that he was just not willing to now drop the matter. He does not think there is any possibility of settlement except on his terms—but he may get an exceedingly great surprise: I really think he will. Fortunately, settlement of this matter is not at all dependent upon the Gospel Advocate. Bro. H. Leo, when I spent half a day with him at his home, discussing this whole matter, he said, very definitely, that he thought the thing could be settled on the basis of which is included in the statement, and he pledged himself to render me every possible assistance toward this end. He positively did not, in his expressions to me, express one single word which might indicate that he felt the settlement should be made, if Boll will agree to quit teaching his views. To the contrary, he made it very clear that he felt it would not be necessary for either side to compromise their convictions in any way.

The entire attitude of Bro. Goodpasture is entirely different from that which you showed and expressed to me. I have no reason to feel that he has since converted you. So I am expecting from you the letter which you promised me. Please don't forget the Florida address, and I would appreciate your sending to me in the near future. In conclusion may I say that I do, truly, hate to bother you, or write anything which may upset or distress, in those dark hours through which you are now passing. May His blessings be upon you, and may His arms sustain you!

In deepest sympathy and most sincere regards,
(Signed) Norman.

Hotel Pontiac, 89th and Collins,
Miami Beach, Fla.
May 6, 1946.

Mr. Leon McQuiddy
Nashville

Dear Leon:

I have your letter of the 1st. As I have said before, I have surely hated to disturb you in any way, during this time when you have had such a heavy load on your heart. Whenever you feel equal to it, I will be glad to hear from you.

There have been some further developments in the matter on which I have been working, which may be of interest to you. I told you of Clay Pullias' extreme and rabid position, and that I feared I might have some opposition there. However, A. M. Burton has been down here for a couple of weeks. He and I have been fishing tonight, and have had a number of long talks. He says that he certainly would like to see this issue settled; he is most highly pleased with what I have done so far, and the progress made, and says he feels there is an exceedingly good chance this old sore may be healed now.
Concerning Clay’s attitude, he expressed considerable surprise, and said that was not his attitude at all. He further said that he felt sure the Board of D. L. C. would not “go along with” Clay, but that “Clay is working under the Board, and will have to do what he is told.” He assured me in no uncertain terms that I am certainly not going to have any trouble of any kind, or opposition from this source. I am further hopeful of getting endorsement from the D. L. C. Board, of what I am after; Bro. Burton said he would be glad for me to write the Board, in detail, concerning the whole matter. He further said that a settlement of this would be perhaps the best thing which could be done in our Brotherhood.

In a long phone conversation with Bro. Showalter, he told me he would more than gladly publish my introductory remarks and the Boll statement: he said he thought the thing should never have been an issue; that it had always been a matter of personalities, and not of convictions; that numerous preachers had made capital for their own gain, thereof. He further said that Boll was not, by any means, the first to promulgate these views; he said that before the issue was started in the G. A. office, numerous outstanding preachers whom he mentioned by name, had all held this position; but that they were not disfellowshipped, nor was there any “marking” until the Advocate took the thing up.

I am planning to go to Austin, and work with Bro. Showalter and associates, before time for publication, which will not be until after Aug. 1, or maybe after Sept. 1. There are a considerable number of other very outstanding preachers in various parts of the country, whom I expect to see, too. So, after I get back from there, I shall be quite busy with some extensive travelling on this matter.

With again my deepest sympathies, and regards,

(Signed) Norman.

P. S. I told A. M. I feared Bro. Goodpasture meant to “fight” me in this matter. He replied, “I don’t see how he can afford to!”

A VAST DIFFERENCE
(Cont. from p. 15)
from Sommer; I do not regard him as a good witness. I could not tell why, but it is not because of any thing he said on the matters before us.

10. Over a period of several years I have a number of times had this proposition published: The gospel plan of salvation preached by the apostles is the scheme of redemption foretold in promise and prophecy.

I have had only one little nibble, and he asked if I would affirm that all prophecies referred to this plan of salvation. That was only a dodge, and I think the brother knew it. I wonder. Do all future kingdom advocates know that the proposition states the truth? Is that the reason none of them will deny it?
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Because of the limited paper supply it has been impossible to bring from the press a large number of these books. Secure your copy at once.

ADDRESS ALL ORDERS TO:
MRS. C. R. NICHOL, Publisher, Clifton, Texas
Off The Press---Now Being Mailed

“GOD’S PROPHETIC WORD”-”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 Israelites 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”?

400 Pages, Clothbound — Price $2.50

Order Only From

Roy E Cogdill, 1511 Harvard, Houston, Texas
I. A SPECIAL RENEWAL OFFER

Due to the irregularities of the past two years, we offer to set forward all renewals one year from the July issue. This means that all delinquent subscriptions, no matter how far in arrears, will be advanced one year from the July number for the sum of $1.00. All delinquent subscriptions, in this way, will be eliminated, and the slate will be wiped clean. We want all to take advantage of this offer. Let us advance your subscription one year from July for one dollar on the basis of a new subscriber. We feel that we owe this consideration to many on our list, and in order to simplify the deal, we extend this consideration to all back subscriptions. Those who have recently sent in renewals will be given this same benefit—it will be retroactive to all subscriptions received the past quarter.

But this offer will require the immediate discontinuance of all past due subscriptions not renewed at once on this offer. So send your renewal now.

II. A WORD TO PREACHERS

It is the desire of the editor of the Bible Banner, and his associates, that all gospel preachers in the U.S.A. and abroad receive the Bible Banner. We want their names on the list—every gospel preacher whose name and address is known, or can be learned. This will be made possible, without obligation to any preacher of the gospel. But as a return consideration we make one request of those preachers who are in sympathy with our aims and purposes, just a small favor—namely, that you mention the Bible Banner privately to a few brethren where you live and send at least one new subscription, and as many more as may be conveniently done. This is not a condition, only a friendly request.

III. A TALK WITH OUR FRIENDS

There are thousands of people who are as deeply devoted to the issues promoted and defended by the Bible Banner as are its editors and publishers. Our hearts beat in unison in a common cause. We firmly believe that the Bible Banner can be a greater medium for good in the defense of the gospel than ever, and more effective as a deterrent to departures and corrective of errors in the future than it has even been in the past. And it will scarcely be denied that during the ten years of its publication (including the Gospel Guardian) it has been the strongest single influence against error in teaching and practice. These issues are not dead. They continue to arise in multiple form. A lapse into lethargy at this critical period would in any event be disastrous and could be fatal. The service rendered by the Bible Banner has been universally recognized and generally acknowledged. We cannot now relent; we must never recede. I call upon my friends and its friends to give us a hand, and a heave—let us go forward!

Faithfully yours, in His cause and kingdom, FOY E. WALLACE JR.