Dear friends:

There will be a slight delay in delivering Part Two of Bulwarks Of The Faith, due to adding the Supplementary material on “Exposures Of The Erroneous Doctrines Of The Baptist Church”—but it will be ready for mailing before another announcement can be made. Send your orders now.

Our Publication and mail address is unchanged—always P. 0. Box 1804, Oklahoma City—but we are residing at Marietta, Oklahoma, of which more will be said later. The best meeting in many years has just been concluded in Marietta resulting in 18 baptisms and several restorations. Wilson Wallace did the preaching.

Our younger preacher, William Edwin Wallace, has left for Hickory, N. C., where he will both attend college and preach. William is a good preacher, too. All of us are!

Anent Aurora, Illinois (Chicagoland), John Gerrard, of Louisville, Ky., has accepted the work there as regular preacher, which guarantees the continued success of that work on a sound basis. Brother John knows the issues and can take care of any situation. Incidentally, the statements made in this publication about certain Chicago churches were not made in the “absence of personal knowledge”, and we have the “documentary” evidence to sustain what has been said, some other reports to the contrary notwithstanding.

Answering some inquiries — subscription “year” for TORCH does not end until twelve numbers have been received. This is No. 10—see opposite page.

Faithfully and fervently yours,

[Signature]

Address all communications to the publisher, Box 1804, Oklahoma City, Okla. Subscriptions: $1.00 per year.
THE GREATEST NAME

IN the position that Jesus Christ occupies at God’s right hand in heaven, he is declared to be "far above" all of the things mentioned in Eph. 1:20-22--principality, power, might, dominion, “and every name that is named, not only in this world, but also in that which is to come.”

What is the name that is “above” every other name in this world or in the world to come?

A twin text to Eph. 1:21 is Phil. 2:9-10: “Wherefore God also hath highly exalted him, and given him a name which is above every name that at the name of Jesus every knee should bow, of things in heaven, and things in earth, and things under the earth, and that every tongue should confess that Jesus Christ is Lord, to the glory of God the Father.”
In these two texts the glory and authority of Jesus Christ are presented. Before this, however, was his humiliation. He “took upon him the form of a servant, and was made in the likeness of men: and being found in fashion as a man, he humbled himself, and became obedient unto death, even the death of the cross.” It was following his humiliation and death that his glory came. There can be no mistake as to time: “Wherefore God also hath highly exalted him, and given him a name which is above every name.” Ephesians 1 speaks of “the riches of the glory of his inheritance in the saints,” and “the exceeding greatness of his power,” where he is seated in “the heavenly places” above all principalities, powers and dominions. There he became the head of the church, after all things had been put “under his feet” as the head “over all things to the church” which is the “fulness of him that filleth all in all.”

Now, all of this “glory” and “power” and “fulness” came after the resurrection of Christ. “Which he wrought in Christ when he raised him from the dead and set him at his own right hand.” The glory, power and fulness came not
only after the resurrection, but it came after the ascension, after God “set ‘him at his own right hand.” The text reads that God wrought this when he raised him from the dead and set him at his right hand. We cannot go back of the time set by Paul, back of the ascension of Christ, to find when he was glorified. Anticipating his ascension, Jesus upbraided the disciples for being slow to believe what the prophets had spoken, and said: “Ought not the Christ to have suffered these things, and to enter into his glory?’ and he “expounded unto them in all the Scriptures the things concerning himself.” (Luke 24:25-27) He then added, “Thus it is written, and thus it behooved Christ to suffer, and to rise from the dead the third day: and that repentance and remission of sins should be preached in his name among all nations beginning at Jerusalem.” (Luke 24:46-47) Christ therefore taught the disciples that “all the prophets” foretold that his glory would follow his suffering. We have the authority of all the prophets, of Christ and of Paul for the statement that the state of glory for Christ was after his suffering,
after he left the earth. All authority therefore compels us to look from this earth to the Christ glorified at God’s right hand, where he now speaks to us from heaven, instead of looking to this earth for some future exercise of authority. “See that ye refuse not him that speaketh: for if they escaped not who refused him that spake on earth, much more shall not we escape, if we turn away from him that speaketh from heaven.” (Heb. 12:25)

The exercise of authority in his name, said Christ in Luke 24, should begin at Jerusalem, after his ascension. In heaven at the right hand of God, Jesus Christ was given this name which was above every name that is named or known in either the present or the future state. On Pentecost Peter quoted David to bring out of prophecy these declarations: (1) Christ the son of David was to sit upon the throne; (2) but he must first arise from the dead; (3) and after his resurrection he was exalted at the right hand of God; (4) this took place after his ascension into heaven; (5) and it was in the heavens that God said to the Son; “sit thou on my right hand until I make thy foes thy
footstool”; (6) hence the concluding declaration, “therefore let all the house of Israel know assuredly, that God hath made that same Jesus, whom ye have crucified, both Lord and Christ.” The kingdom of Christ dates from this Pentecost of Acts 2. This “same Jesus” whom they had crucified had been made Lord (ruler), and had been given a name which is above every name in this or any other age.

What is the name which is above every name?

Let it be observed and remembered (1) that when Paul used this expression Jesus Christ was in his official position and Paul considered and referred to him in his official relation. He was “far above” every name that is named; he was “the head” over all things to the church, which is the “fullness of him that filleth all in all.”

Consider (2) that the authority of Jesus Christ in this position is universal “Wherefore God also hath highly exalted him, and given him a name above every name: that at the name of Jesus every knee should bow, of things in heaven, and things in earth, and things under
the earth; and that every tongue should confess that Jesus Christ is Lord (ruler) to the glory of God the Father.” Here in Philippians 2 the apostle merely reaffirms what the Lord himself had claimed and announced in Matt. 28: 18-20 at his ascension, that “all authority in heaven and in earth” was given to him.

Consider (3) that official positions require official names to designate the rank of the official. In our form of government officials range from the precinct justice to the chief magistrate of the nation. Between these are the governors of states. Taking the official scale from lowest to highest, each name connected with all the intermediary offices indicates degrees of authority and extent of jurisdiction. With the “president of the United States” we reach a name that is above every name in our form of government. In kingdom and monarchies the greatest names, or the name above every name, would be king, czar, emperor, monarch. These names express the highest official rank and relation. In all cases, the name which is above all other names is used and adapted only by the one who holds the highest official position and rank in
a certain form of government. No one has the right to use or exercise that name before he receives the highest official position. A candidate is elected to be president; he takes the oath of office; he is made president in fact; he then has the constitutional right to use the official name “President of the United States of America.” Before he enters office and after his term of office expires, he has no constitutional right to the name and can no longer use it.

In prophecy it was declared that Christ was to be king. A son of David was to sit upon the throne. (Psa. 132:11, Acts 2:29-36) He was to be “Lord (ruler) of all.” (Acts 10:36) His kingdom was to be universal. His authority was to extend over all in heaven and on earth. On Pentecost Peter declared that these prophecies were fulfilled. “God hath made that same Jesus, whom ye have crucified, both Lord (ruler) and Christ.” (Acts 2:29-36) In Eph. 4 Paul declares that “when he (Christ) ascended up on high, he led captivity captive,” and as king over all, “he gave gifts unto men.” He then clothed his apostles with the portfolio of ambassadors
of his government on the earth (Eph. 4:11; 2 Cor. 5:18-20), and began his reign over all the earth from heaven.

The prophecies concerning a son of David to occupy the throne of David did not merely designate one of David’s sons, but a particular son of David to whom God would be a Father, and who would be to God a son. 2 Sam. 7:14; 2 Chron. 17:11) In Hebrews 1, verse 5, the apostle quotes this prophecy and identifies it by the expression, “I will be to him a Father and he shall be to me a Son.” This son of David therefore was Jesus Christ, and the prophecy stated that he should sit on David’s throne while David was yet in the grave, sleeping with his fathers. On Pentecost Peter said to the Jews: “David’s tomb is yet with us”—David was still sleeping with his fathers—and “he forseeing this, spake of the resurrection of Christ.” Foreseeing what? That “God would raise up Christ to sit on his (David’s) throne.” Jesus Christ therefore acceded to David’s throne when he ascended to heaven. After identifying Christ as the particular Son of David’s sons to sit on
David’s throne, the apostle of Hebrews 1 then declares that David’s throne and Christ’s throne are one and the same throne, upon which he now sits and rules. Hear him: “But unto the Son he saith, Thy throne, 0 God, is for ever and ever: a sceptre of righteousness is the sceptre of thy kingdom.” Note he says, thy throne, and he says it unto the Son. So it is the Son’s throne, Christ’s own throne, upon which he now sits. Furthermore the text says, the sceptre of thy kingdom. The sceptre is the ruling staff. Millennialists argue that Jesus Christ is on the Father’s throne now; but when he returns to earth he will sit on his own throne, which will be David’s throne restored to the earth. But when the first chapter of Hebrews was written, Jesus Christ was the “Son” on David’s throne; but it was also his own throne—“thy throne”; and it was his own kingdom—“thy kingdom, and he held the ruler’s sceptre, exercising the authority of Lord and Christ.

These and many more scriptures show:

(1) That Christ became “Lord of all” after his ascension.
(2) That universal authority was given to him, and as Lord or Ruler over all, he then and there received the name which is above every name.

The facts stated in order by Paul in Eph. 1 and Phil. 2 are simply these: 1. Christ was raised from the dead. 2. God set him at his own right hand in the heavens. 3. There and then in the heavens, to Christ was given the official position that placed him far above all principality power, might and dominion. 4. Thus given universal dominion, his universal authority was expressed in the giving of the name which is above every name.

The names that expressed the authority of rulers on earth were already in use. Those names belong to this present age of earth and time. They are still in use, for instance “the king of England.” But Christ received a name above every name. It cannot be said therefore that to Christ was merely given the title king. That would not be a name above every name and would only have ranked him with other kings. In the word “king” there is nothing dis-
tinctive. All kings are grouped under that title. The title “king of England” is no greater title that “king of Belgium” because the titles are equal. To have simply given Christ the title of “king” would have ranked him on the level with all other kings. But that will not do, for all other kings are “under his feet.” (Eph. 1:22) The name that is above every name must express the fact that he is “Lord (ruler) of all.” He is “King of kings and Lord of lords.” Note: “King of”-“Lord of.” He is King of all kings, he is Lord of all lords—all kings and all lords are his subjects. The title Lord and Christ is simply “anointed ruler”—Christ the Lord is the Anointed Ruler, the King of kings and the Lord of lords, an official name above every name in this world or the world to come. Neither in the present nor in the future age can there be an equal to this name. No other name can express authority that it signifies. He is Lord and Christ—he is “Lord of all” and every tongue shall confess it. “All hail the power of Jesus name! Let angels prostrate fall! Bring forth the royal diadem, and crown Him Lord of all!”
Some there are who tell us that Christ has no throne and no kingdom of his own—not yet. We are told that he will set up his kingdom when he comes again. To them we put the following questions:

1. If Christ has no kingdom now, and is not “King of kings” in act and fact, how is it that he now wears the name above every name that can be named in this world? We all know the names king, czar, emperor, and these names have all been named in this world—but Christ has a name above all these in this world—now. His present official title places him above all of these.

2. If Christ is to be made king when he comes again, he must then be given an official title that will express his official position and universal authority at that time. What higher name can then be given to him than has been given to him? What name can be given to him in the future that can rise or soar above the name which he has now, which is declared to be above “every name” that can ever be given in the present or future state? Is it possible
to go “above” the highest name to crown him with a higher title?

3. Since it is declared that the name that Christ has now, is greater than all other names in this world or in the world to come, on what ground can it be affirmed that Christ will be made “King of kings and Lord of lords” when he comes again?

The higher official position requires a higher official title to designate it. What will be Christ’s higher official title when he sets up his kingdom when he comes?

The answer to these questions will show beyond the shade and shadow of a doubt the utter falsity of the theories of the future reign and kingdom of Christ on the earth. All such theories reflect on the present position and power of Jesus Christ, and are so carnal in character as to destroy the spiritual nature of the kingdom of Christ. The intrinsic and inherent substance of the future earthly kingdom theory is materialism. Jesus Christ is now King of all kings, Lord of all lords, wears the name above all names, and bears the title above all titles.
THE-SIGN OF A SONGBOOK

THE occasion for this article is the recent introduction into some well known congregations of the Jorgenson premillennial songbook, which bears the presumptious and misleading title, “Great Songs Of The Church.” Some of the congregations which have permitted misguided song leaders to introduce this book into the church have been rated for soundness on premillennialism, and all other issues, through all the years. A few years ago when the battle against these heresies was raging at its height, elders of these churches would not have permitted this symbol of millennialism, in the form of the Jorgenson songbook, to appear in the services. But there has been a lull, a sort of “cease-fire,” during which time the advocates of the millennial heresies have been consolidating their broken lines and building up their stockpiles
and promoting quietly but incessantly their various avenues of influence. One of the chief instruments of premillennial propaganda is the so-called “Great Songs Of The Church,” compiled and published by the party’s general manager, E. L. Jorgenson. If any who have read this piece to this point doubt this statement, and are about to leave off here, just give ear and eye to the evidence submitted in this issue of TORCH and you will see it, unless you are looking the other way.

Two years ago trouble over the ‘premillennial issue, which had been seething for several years in a Los Angeles congregation, came to a head. The origin and course of the controversy is the story of a songbook. Innocently the Jorgenson songbook was purchased; then came a series of song drills, conducted by its compiler and publisher, who assured them (as he always does) that he had no intention of “teaching” his premillennial views. Some of the members who knew that he was a premillennialist, however, objected to him as a preacher, but yielded to the use of his songbook and his song drills.
For several successive years he made his trips from Louisville, Ky., to Los Angeles, Calif., and always appeared at this congregation. Later it became known that all the time he had been privately teaching his theories of millennialism and had brought two of the main leaders of the congregation (who were called elders) under his influence. Without the knowledge of the loyal members of the congregation, arrangements were made for E. L. Jorgenson to become the regular preacher for this church. Jorgenson "timed" an article for publication announcing that he would reside in Los Angeles and that there would be one scriptural church in that metropolis (a premillennial church, he meant). But the plans leaked out before he arrived and a storm of protest arose from the membership of the church. In order to accomplish their evil designs, these leaders of premillennial sympathy sent Jorgenson a secret wire to come at once by plane, ahead of schedule, to appear without notice the following Lord's Day, to "take over" the situation. He came by plane; but the scheme had leaked out (it is hard to keep a secret)-and the loyal brethren in the
congregation kept him out of the pulpit by occupying it themselves. But E. L. Jorgenson stood on the floor and in the aisle that Sunday morning, between the rostrum and the congregation, and raved for more than an hour against those who stood in his way. He referred to some of them as “snakes” and “vipers” and other venomous terms. The loyal brethren calmly held to the stand, and when the Jorgenson tirade ended, they announced their refusal to accept him as their preacher and rejected the further leadership of the men who had brought him there—and discarded then and there the instrument of division that had made the opening wedge—the Jorgenson pet-millennial songbook. Jorgenson and his promoters attempted to occupy the property, but they were restrained and prevented, so E. L. Jorgenson, who has contended all along that he has never divided a church, pulled his group away and started his little premillennial church in a Hollywood hotel. So when the article which he had written for publication, thought to be exactly “timed” for the occasion, appeared, it turned out to be very “ill-timed,” a bomb set for others had exploded in his face.
There are some who are doubtless saying, why relate such a sordid story? Simply because it seals the issue on the sign of a songbook. About the time that good people in such a congregation as this Los Angeles church get their eyes opened by bitter experience to the evil symbol of this book and cast it out, some other churches in Texas and Oklahoma are taking it in. Wherever the premillennial E. L. Jorgenson “Great Songs Of The Church” is found, it can be put down that there is premillennial influence back of it somewhere-likely in connection with the song leader the church is using, or possibly in another leader, whose sympathy for the men of the millennial movement has not been revealed. But, the influence is there.

The elders of some congregations which have adapted this evil songbook have said to me: “Why, there is not a premillennialist in this whole congregation.” To which I will reply: Suppose during the days of Hitler’s Germany we had walked into a place of business and the proprietor of the place had said, “there is not a Nazi sympathizer in this establishment,” but on his desk and on the counters the sign of
the “swastika” was displayed. **What would you think?** Down to date, suppose the proprietor would say, “there is not a Communist sympathizer in my whole organization,” but the sign of Stalin’s “hammer and sickle” is monogrammed on the uniforms of his clerks, engraved on his stationery and printed on his advertisements! **What would you think?** That is what we think when brethren say, “there is not a premillennial sympathizer in this whole congregation”—but the sign of this songbook is there. It is the “swastika” of the premillennial party. Any informed member of the church travelling over the country, who stops for worship and finds this songbook, is at once suspicious and wonders who the premillennial sympathizers are in that church.

How can a mere songbook be the symbol of anything? Ask the editors of the *Christian Standard*, the Christian Church journal published in Cincinnati. The following insertion is from the *Bible Banner*, 1940:

> Your attention is called to the editorial in the Christian Standard, leading paper of the Christian Church in the nation, on the Roll-Jorgenson songbook as “a symbol of unity” between them and the Christian
Church. The Bible Banner has insisted all of the time that the use of Jorgenson’s song book was a connecting link between the Boll party and the churches. The purchase of it has furnished the money to promote the Boll party, and has given Jorgenson standing and prestige with loyal churches, an entrance into them, and a dividing wedge with both individuals and churches.

The Christian Standard has now joined Jorgenson in the promotion and sale of his book—another sectarian affiliation, and furnishes another strong ground of objection for its use in churches of Christ. It is now a tie-up between the digressives and the Bollites. The Standard thinks that by making Jorgenson’s songbook the “common hymnbook” for all the churches, Christian Churches and churches of Christ, there will be a common ground of fellowship and maybe in time instrumental music may be adopted as a common practice! He even mentions the “dispute over music in the church” as being related to the effort to make of the Jorgenson songbook a common hymnal for use in Christian Churches and churches of Christ.

What excuse does any church of Christ have for patronizing this premillennial faction, which has now formed an alliance with the Digressives, with an announced intention of making a drive on the churches to force the Jorgenson songbook to become the “common hymnal” of all the churches, as “a noble symbol of unity” between Christian Churches and churches of Christ? Truly, it is time to discontinue, immediately and permanently, the Jorgenson songbook. The brethren should see to it that henceforth E. L. Jorgenson will look to the Christian Church for his patronage.

As far back as 1938 the Bible Banner editorially exposed the sectarian affiliation, heretical content and bad character of this “noble symbol” of premillennial depression, in the article en-
Some months ago in the Firm Foundation, this writer reviewed and criticized the misnamed songbook, Great Songs Of The Church, compiled by E. L. Jorgenson. It was pointed out that by the purchase and use of the Jorgenson songbook, loyal churches are lending aid to and supporting a factious movement which would, if it could, wreck the whole church. It was pointed out that the songbook in all probability represents the main source of revenue the Word And Work (R. H. Boll’s paper) has and that it is doubtful that the paper could survive of its own strength. The article elicited both commendation and criticism—Jorgenson himself the chief complainant. . . . Jorgenson has insisted that Word And Work (the Boll paper) does not receive profit from the sale of the book. I have before me a copy of Great Songs Of The Church, the title page of which reads: “Address all orders to Word And Work, publishers, Louisville, Kentucky.” The Word And Work, mind you, publishes the Great Songs. Before me is also an ad appearing in Word And Work (itself)—the paper-advertising Great Songs, as the publishers of it. Moreover on his letterhead appears Word And Work as publishers of his songbook, as well as of the magazine. Can Jorgenson successfully deny that WORD AND WORK, which publishes the songbook, receives whatever profit is derived from the sale of the book—or will he say that he has given them away at so close a margin all of these years that there has been no profit?

The late edition bears the publisher’s title Great Songs Press. . . . But Jorgenson is playing Dr. Jekyll and Mr. Hyde. As publisher of both (the magazine and the songbook), is it possible that he does not let his left hand know what his right hand doeth? Being the publisher of Great Songs, the profits pass through his pockets. Being publisher of Word And Work the deficits
must come out of his pockets, as the paper operates at a loss, per his own statement in an issue some time ago. How can he say that he does not pay the deficits of the one with the profits of the other? (There are two pockets in the trousers, but the pants belong to Jorgenson, so what difference does it make as to which pocket holds the money?)

It is a fact that sectarian music houses furnish his songs, print his books, and are his repositories. His books are relayed to the churches through these sectarian concerns. He has chosen sectarian affiliations and sources. He has chosen a huge selection of sectarian songs without editing the error out of them and has dumped them into “Christian worship.” (Great songs of what church?).

But it is said that all of our songbooks have songs of sectarian writers and we are charged with inconsistency. There is a difference between a sectarian song and a song by a sectarian composer. When properly edited, a song may become a true song. The songs of the Jorgenson books have not been edited and are full of error and heresy. simply because the compiler and publisher is himself steeped in those sectarian errors. Song after song in “Great Songs” teaches the millennial heresy, fairly winging the doctrine into the hearts of whole congregations. There can be positively no excuse for such a songbook in our churches.

For a sample of the error it contains, observe the following verses from various songs in it:

Number 167: “Jesus is coming to earth again, what if it were today? Coming in power and love to reign, what if it were today?” Some of us have read the word of God enough to know that the Lord Jesus Christ is not coming back to the earth to reign. But other lines of this same song teach the millennial heresy with a venegance: “Satan’s dominion will then be o’er (the idea that at his coming the Lord will end Satan’s dominion and enter upon his own dominion-the millennium) ;
then, “signs of his coming multiply, watch for the time is drawing nigh.” The song is a clear perversion of New Testament teaching.

Number 126: “I know that my Redeemer liveth and on the earth again shall stand.” This is a perversion of Job 19:25. Job said centuries before Christ was born that in the latter day the Redeemer would stand upon the earth. Evidently he did. This song puts it in the future and adds the word “again” to it, which Job did not say.

Number 194: It puts the reign of Jesus with his saints after his coming, and raises “hallelujah” to its straight millennial doctrine: it is unfit to be sung in the worship of Christians.

Number 384: Premillennialism gone to seed. It even sets to music the doctrine of kingdom postponement, featuring Christ “rejected” and “disowned” when he came first, but “vindicated” and “enthroned” when he comes again!

Great Songs Of The Church is full of the Boll and Jorgenson foolish notion, set to music’s soothing lotion! (Great Songs Of What Church?) The right name for the songbook truly would be, Sectarian Songs For The Church.

There is yet another and later reason for rejecting this Jorgenson songbook, and for exposing its influence in the churches of Christ. It has been but a few years ago since the man Don Carlos Janes promoted his own missionary agency and collected money for missions from all the churches, which was handled by himself and distributed or not distributed at his own dis-
cretion and decision, In 1944 the Janes Will was probated, and approximately $40,000 was left to E. L. Jorgenson, executor without bond, to be used at Jorgenson’s discretion for the promotion of the tenets of premillennialism! On this point the *Bible Banner* commented as follows:

**A REVIEW OF JORGENSON’S DEFENSE OF THE JANES WILL**

C. B. Douthitt

(Minister, Haldeman Avenue Church, Louisville)

The Will of the late Don Carlos Janes has been printed in full in some of the papers, and many of the brethren are familiar with its content. The Will speaks for itself; it reveals clearly the heart and character of its testator, and the spirit which governed his life and conduct.

While Don Carlos Janes lived and was in good health I wrote an article in the Bible Banner of December 1941, in which I tried to tell the brethren that Janes was keeping the money which the contributors intended for the missionaries. Some of the premillennialists of Louisville became rather indignant at what I had said, but so far as I know nobody made investigation to determine whether I was telling the truth or not. After the Will was published in the papers, I decided to say nothing more about the Janes-one-man-missionary-society, believing that no one would ever rise up in defense of Brother Janes’ money-getting and money-keeping methods as revealed in the Will. I did not believe that even Jorgenson would ever try to defend Janes and his Will. But Jorgenson surprised me,
and caused me to change my mind regarding my say-
ing nothing further about the matter. 

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

I. APPRAISAL OF THE JANES ESTATE

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

II. GIFTS FOR THE PROMOTION OF PRE-MILLENNIALISM

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

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

Brother Janes stated in Item IV of his Will that he was “fully assured that the premillennial view of the Lord’s second advent is the scriptural orthodox teaching of the church from the days of the apostles" and he proceeded in the same paragraph of his Will to make provision “for the establishment of this doctrine,” after his death. He says in his Will that he had gathered “a great deal of pertinent material” on premillennialism, and we know he had plenty of money to have it published while he lived. Why did he wait till he could not longer feel the touch of the money and draw interest on it before turning it loose, even for premillennialism, which he loved almost as well as money?

Brother Joreenson says he is going to “publish the choicest part of the material which Brother- Janes had gathered, and he is going to “publish it in such a clean and Christian spirit that none can justly take offense.” If he does, he will have to leave out that letter to the Louisville radio station, in which he tried to corral the Louisville ministerial association to help him put us off the air. I am anxious to see that material which Brother Janes had gathered on premillennialism. Brother Joreenson thinks everybody will be too “confounded and ashamed” to refute it,” because of the “great and good and honorable” names appended thereto. But whether Brother Jorgenson knows it or not, there are
some who are not too “confounded and ashamed” to expose error, regardless of whose name is “appended” to it.

III. JORGENSON’S SHARE

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


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

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

V. “HOARD”

Jorgenson says: “Someone, perhaps hastily, used the hated word ‘hoard’ concerning the missionary money which he handled.” What other word expresses more accurately the Janes method of handling missionary money? He had $74,000.00 on his hands at the time of his death, and at least $34,000.00, perhaps more, was “missionary money.” Brother Jorgenson adds that this “missionary money” in “checking account” is no more than Janes might receive in a few days’ mail, and thereby would have us believe that Janes did not “hoard” even the $1700 in “checking account.” Is that the truth about “Brother Janes, his money and his Will”? Let’s look at the Will: “For some years I have had in my hands certain Foreign Missionary Trust Funds” (Janes Will, Item V). Jorgenson says “few days”: Janes says “some years.” Just a slight discrepancy, unless “few days” and “some years” are synonymous, and I hardly think they are.

Brother Jorgenson is Executor of the Janes Will. He controls money given by people who did not intend for Brother Janes to “blend” it, and keep $34,000 unblended. Instead of trying to defend the Janes method of handling missionary money, Brother Jorgenson should find as many of the contributors as he can, blend all that money into one Fund, and send the whole blended amount back to them with an apology. That is the
honorable thing to do. It is not honorable to take that money or any part of it and publish a mess of premillennial bosh, which some of the donors of that money do not believe. If I had ever given Brother Janes one dollar for missionary purposes, I now would demand that Jorgenson blend that dollar with 5% interest and give me back the whole blended amount.

Now, the Jorgenson mediums (for executing the Janes Will) are these: The Boll school of premillennialism in Louisville; the Boll premillennial paper (Word And Work) ; The Missionary Messenger (a paper to promote missions and missionaries) ; and Great Songs Press, the adjunct which publishes the Jorgenson songbook, Great Songs Of The Church. This songbook is therefore a spoke (if not the hub) in the wheel of the premillennial party, and a cog in their machinery. A percent of every dollar a church spends for this book goes directly into the promotion of the tenets of premillennialism. No wonder the Christian Standard labeled the book a “noble symbol of unity” between the premillennialists of that disgressive body and those of like sentiment in churches of Christ. And anybody who will repeat the usual line that buying the Jorgenson songbook is a mere commercial matter, parallel with buying a suit of clothes from a Jew, either does not have a
thinker or is not using it—or else is just looking the other way!

It is distressing to find otherwise good congregations with a reputation for soundness yielding to certain influences and adopting such a book. It is due in part to the fact that the colleges among us, claiming to give our sons and daughters a “Christian education” under “spiritual environment,” are using this permillennial songbook in chapel; our young people become familiar with it, are led to believe that it is the thing; and they return home to promote it and even push it, and usually get it. In this the college men are doing wrong; I wish they could see it.

In some places in some of my own gospel meetings I have been confronted with this premillennial symbol, and I have asked that another book be used for the meeting. I have fought premillennialism, with all of its insidious and sinister and subversive influence in the church, too long to have its symbol unfurled in my face in places where I am asked to preach. From the Winchester debate with Neal, Boll
and Jorgenson, down the years to Norris in Fort Worth, Webber in Oklahoma City, Tingley in Birmingham, and Matthews in Los Angeles, we have fought premillennialism to a dead standstill—and now some brethren want to fly its flag right in our faces in the song service!

It is because some of the brethren have either forgotten or lost sight of the issue, and are innocently allowing others to have their way about adopting the Jorgenson songbook, that TORCH reprints articles which enlightened the brethren and aroused the whole brotherhood as to the party symbol of this songbook—and the wrong that is committed in buying it.

Besides the bad influence of the affiliation—why should loyal churches of Christ furnish these false teachers the wherewith to promote their heresies? There can be no question about the matter, the churches should not buy the book nor use it; if in use, it should be abandoned, and they should not wait until they wear it out, but do as the Los Angeles church did—cast it out.
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