

EPIPHANY STUDIES

IN THE

SCRIPTURES

**"The Path of the Just is as the Shining Light,
That Shineth More and More
Unto the Perfect Day."**

SERIES VII

GERSHONISM

12,000 Edition

**"And the Rain Descended; and the Floods Came; and the Winds Blew,
and Beat upon that House; and it Fell; and Great was
the Fall of it" (Matt. 7:27).**

**PAUL S. L. JOHNSON
PHILADELPHIA, PA., U. S. A.
1938**

To the King of Kings and Lord of Lords

IN THE INTEREST OF

HIS CONSECRATED SAINTS,

WAITING FOR THE ADOPTION,

— AND OF —

"ALL THAT IN EVERY PLACE CALL UPON THE LORD,"

"THE HOUSEHOLD OF FAITH,"

— AND OF —

THE GROANING CREATION, TRAVAILING AND WAITING FOR

THE MANIFESTATION OF THE SONS OF GOD,

THIS WORK IS DEDICATED.

"To make all see what is the fellowship of the mystery which from the beginning of the world hath been hid in God," "Wherein He hath abounded toward us in all wisdom and prudence, having made known unto us the mystery of His will, according to His good pleasure which He hath purposed in Himself; that in the dispensation of the fullness of the times He might gather together in one all things, under Christ."
Eph. 3:4, 5, 9; 1:8–10.

COPYRIGHT 1938
BY PAUL S. L. JOHNSON

AUTHOR'S FOREWORD.

AS INDICATED several times in this series of books, the Great Company, as Epiphany Levites, is divided into three general groups—Kohathites, Merarites and Gershonites. In the preceding volume we treated in some detail of the Merarites in their two general subdivisions, the Mahlites and the Mushites, particularly the Mahlites. Apart from general descriptions we will not in this series of books treat of the Epiphany Kohathites in detail. We have given more or less of details on them as a whole, and more especially on their general branches, in *The Present Truth*, *e.g.*, on the Amramites, Izecharites, Hebronites and Uzzielites. To these we refer those of our readers who desire to learn more about them. Their not being organized under corporations or committees, as is the case with the Merarites and Gershonites, our writings on them as a rule deal with the errors of the leaders of various of their groups, as can be seen from our reviews of Carl Olson's, Adam Rutherford's, Milton Riemer's, Hugo Kuehn's, Emil Sadlac's, G.K. Bolger's and others' writings. Some of their errors, like the World's High Priest not functioning until the Millennium, the advancing light ceasing with our Pastor's death, judging after the time, etc., we have refuted in various volumes of this work. Their revolutionizing against less of the Truth than the other Levites, and their not revolutionizing at all against the Lord's arrangements for doing His work, are the main reasons why we have dealt less with them than with the antitypical Merarites and Gershonites, though some of their leaders have gone out of their way to attack the Epiphany Truth, which has led to our replying to their attacks. Accordingly, they will have shorter distances for retracing their steps than the other Levites.

The Gershonites, in harmony with typical Gershon, Levi's firstborn, in their Libnite branch were the first Epiphany Levites to be manifested as such, and that in

their two British leaders; for the Libnite Gershonites are British, and exist in three sub-groups, corresponding to the three sons of Libni: the Bible Students' Committee (antitypical Jehiel); Berean Bible Institute, of Australasia (antitypical Zethan), and the Old Pathites (antitypical Joel). The Shimite branch of the antitypical Gershonites are likewise divided into three sub-divisions: the P.B.I. (antitypical Haran), the Dawnites (antitypical Haziël) and the Watchers Of The Morning (antitypical Shelomith, or Shelomoth). In this book we treat especially of five sub-divisions of the two groups of the Gershonites, since apart from incidental references, we do not treat at all of the Australasian branch of the Libnites.

As distinct from the Merarites, the Gershonites are compromisingly tolerant, while the Merarites are bigoted. Hence, comparatively, the Gershonites are unstable, like water, and therefore have failed to excel as they should, as the firstborn, have done. This quality of tolerance is good when exercised in loyalty to the Truth; but when it is permitted to control, it makes one indifferent to Truth and tolerant to error, as can be seen in the present state of the P.B.I., which tolerates all sorts of error and fellowships with all sorts of errorists, even with the sifters and siftlings of the 1908-1911 Contradictionism sifting, even to the degree of having one of the three of that sifting's main leaders preach in their churches and of partaking with him and his siftlings in conventions. When these Gershonites are cleansed they will do a very influential and blessed work in the upbuilding of the Epiphany Camp. These two good things, their cleansing and subsequent fruitful work, find a share in the prayers and hopes of the author,

PAUL S. L. JOHNSON.

Philadelphia, Pa., May 12, 1938.

CONTENTS

CHAPTER I. LIBNIISM

A SHEARNO-CRAWFORD CONSPIRACY. THE COVERING LETTER, REPORT AND RESOLUTION OF ELEVEN TABERNACLE ELDERS. THE CONSPIRACY BECOMES PUBLIC. EXPERIENCES IN, AND FINDINGS ON, THE LONDON BETHEL AFFAIRS. MANAGERIAL OFFENSES. A DECEITFUL LETTER. RELATIONS OF THE MERARITES AND THE GERSHONITES. THE BIBLICAL SETTING OF THE GERSHONITES. 7

CHAPTER II.
SOME LIBNITE GERSHONITE ERRORS EXAMINED.
WM. CRAWFORD ON JUSTIFICATION. WM. CRAWFORD ON THE END OF ALL THINGS. 51

CHAPTER III.
EARLIER DOINGS AND ERRORS OF THE SHIMITE GERSHONITES.
ANOTHER HARVEST SIFTING REVIEWED. TWO PROPOSED CONVENTIONS. IN DEFENSE OF PEACE AMONG GOD'S PEOPLE. THE PURPOSES OF THE P.B.I. EXAMINED. 89

CHAPTER IV.
OTHER EARLIER DOINGS OF THE SHIMITE
GERSHONITES.

P.B.I. REVOLUTIONISMS AGAINST GOD'S ARRANGEMENTS. SALIENT POINTS OF P.B.I. HISTORY.	183
---	-----

CHAPTER V.
OTHER EARLIER ERRORS OF THE SHIMITE
GERSHONITES.

SOME OTHER P.B.I. TEACHINGS EXAMINED. THE DAWN'S CALLED, CHOSEN AND FAITHFUL EXAMINED. "ANCIENT ISRAEL'S JUBILEE YEAR" EXAMINED.	269
---	-----

CHAPTER VI.
CHRONOLOGICAL ERRORS OF THE SHIMITE
GERSHONITES.

"WATCHMAN, WHAT OF THE NIGHT" EXAMINED. FURTHER P.B.I. CHRONOLOGY EXAMINED. SOME OF CARL OLSON'S CHRONOLOGICAL ERRORS EXAMINED. SOME RECENT P.B.I. CHRONOLOGICAL CLAIMS EXAMINED. SOME MORE RECENT P.B.I. CHRONOLOGICAL CLAIMS EXAMINED. SOME MISTAKES IN PTOLEMY'S CANON. ZEH—NOT THESE, BUT THIS. SOME P.B.I. ERRORS ON JEREMIAH AND DANIEL.	347
--	-----

CHAPTER VII.
SIN-OFFERING ERRORS OF THE SHIMITES.

THE SENSE IN WHICH THE CHURCH IS A SIN-OFFERING. THE TWO SIN- OFFERINGS IN LITERAL PASSAGES. THE TWO SIN-OFFERINGS IN SYMBOLIC PASSAGES.	461
---	-----

CHAPTER I.

LIBNIISM

A SHEARNO-CRAWFORD CONSPIRACY. THE COVERING LETTER, REPORT AND RESOLUTION OF ELEVEN TABERNACLE ELDERS. THE CONSPIRACY BECOMES PUBLIC. EXPERIENCES IN, AND FINDINGS ON, THE LONDON BETHEL AFFAIRS. MANAGERIAL OFFENSES. A DECEITFUL LETTER. RELATIONS OF THE MERARITES AND THE GERSHONITES. THE BIBLICAL SETTING OF THE GERSHONITES.

THE LEADING of Azazel's Goat from the door of the Tabernacle to the Gate of the Court had its beginning in Britain in the work of the World's High Priest toward H.J. Shearn and his partisan supporters; for the sixth sifting, whose slaughter weapon is Revolutionism, was started by him and Wm. Crawford. This cannot be properly understood without an understanding of their revolutionism, both in the London Tabernacle and in the London Bethel affairs. For a long time we refrained from giving the general Church an account of their revolutionisms, because we did not see that it was the Lord's due time to set forth these matters in so public a manner. However, we have lately [written in June, 1920] received many indications from the Lord that it is His due time that it be set forth; and, accordingly, it is done here, not as a matter of wreaking vengeance because of a personal grudge, which we do not have, but for the necessary enlightenment of the Church; so that the Faithful, especially in Britain, may be enabled better to take their stand on Shearno-Crawfordism, which we understand is the theory and practice of the bad section of the Libnite (free, wilful) branch of the Gershonite Levites. The P.B.I. having, in the year 1920, endorsed them, the American and other brethren should be guarded against them, especially since Wm. Crawford is writing tracts repudiating some of our Pastor's teachings. In this chapter we shall set forth their revolutionism

both with respect to the Tabernacle and the Bethel; and shall show that their wrong-doings as to the Tabernacle, leading up to the trouble in Britain following our arrival there, began in the summer of 1915. Their specific activities during that time may be summarized as follows: the agitation connected with their effort to change "that Servant's" Tabernacle arrangements was originated, and then engineered, by Wm. Crawford and H.J. Shearn, the former supplying the ideas, and the latter setting into activity the executive processes. It was an effort made by two of our Pastor's representatives, who *knew* that he opposed their views, and who, as his representatives, should have sought to conserve his powers: (1) to intimidate him into giving up his controllership in Tabernacle affairs by the thinly-veiled threat that things would go radically wrong unless he surrendered such control; (2) to withhold such control from the Ecclesia, if surrendered by "that Servant"; (3) to lodge it with the elders (Presbyterianism); (4) to decrease J. Hemery's influence and activities in the Ecclesia, despite the voted resolution of its overwhelming majority to the contrary; (5) to divide the Ecclesia into small, uninfluential groups, especially if their clericalistic plan failed of success; (6) to gain for themselves the ascendancy over the other elders, and thus control all. Hereafter we will refer to the three managers by their initials.

Their efforts to gain controllership over the general British work through controlling the London Bethel were of several years' standing, and had success so far as J.H. was concerned, whom by their votes and intimidations they had shorn of the priority of influence among the managers arranged for by "that Servant." In this sphere of their activity they ignored many of "that Servant's" arrangements for the direction of the general work, J.H. co-operating with them, whenever it was to his interests so to do; others they set aside; others they modified; they introduced some of their

own without his knowledge or consent, and retained some of them despite his written disapproval. Their wrong activities as to the London Tabernacle and Bethel were parts of a conspiracy having two branches: (1) presbyterianizing the entire British Church under their controllership; and (2) securing freedom from the controllership of the W.T.B.&T.S. for the British work, and gaining it for themselves. To secure these ends they resorted to intrigue, deception, collusion with various parties opposed to some of "that Servant's" policies, hypocrisy, "dishonest and secret diplomacy," depriving opposers of, or limiting them in, and rewarding supporters with opportunities of service, all the time posing as "that Servant's" representatives and supporters. Small wonder that the Lord so arranged matters that H.J.S., W.C. and their partisan supporters were the first agents of the sixth sifting, and the first section of Azazel's Goat to be led to the gate of the Court, and to be delivered to the fit man.

The letters of the three British managers and other British brethren in the Towers from 1914 to 1916, describing the handicaps and sufferings of our beloved British brethren, most deeply wrought on our sympathy, appreciation and desire to sacrifice in their interests. These qualities moved us to speak to the Lord on our having an opportunity of serving and comforting them. Twice before—in 1908 and in 1913—our dear Pastor had arranged for our taking the European trip; but Providence in each case hindered it. The Lord was pleased to indicate in the summer of 1916 that we suggest to our dear Pastor that, if he contemplated sending an American pilgrim to Britain, and that if he thought it to be the Lord's will for us to be that pilgrim, we should be glad to go; but that if he thought it not to be the Lord's will, we should be glad not to go. In this spirit of loving trust we left the matter in the Lord's hands, assured that He would

indicate His will through His Steward. The night of Aug. 26, 1916, at Nashville, Tenn., we mentioned the matter to our Pastor. Though he had previously told Bro. MacMillan of his intention of sending us to Europe, he first informed us of his decision at Dayton, O., Oct. 7, 1916.

As previously told, we arrived at Liverpool, England, Nov. 19, where at the wharf we were met by J.H. and others; and after a service at Liverpool, in which we discoursed on our Pastor's last days, with J.H. we left the same evening for London, where we arrived about 10 P.M., and were met by six members of the Bethel family, including H.J.S. Once on the way to London J.H. started to tell us of the trouble at London; but before he could utter much over a half-dozen words, divining his purpose we interrupted him with the remark, "Not a word about that." Nothing more was attempted on that line during the rest of the journey; so that we could honestly answer "No," to the question, which we felt sure we would be asked, and which, true enough, we were asked, "Did Bro. Hemery at Liverpool or on the way to London tell you of the difficulties between the managers?" In Harvest Siftings he said we spoke very much of things in general, and much of ourself in particular while in Britain. This is true. And the Lord evidently used this activity of ours to win our way into disarming the suspicions of those with whom we had especially to deal in a way that a silent or taciturn person could never have done. Our very frankness and sociability gained for us information that, humanly-speaking, never would have become ours, had we acted otherwise. If we talked much we listened and watched more, gaining much needed information for our work as investigator, executive and pilgrim.

W.C. being absent on a pilgrim trip until Nov. 21, we had no formal meeting with the managers until

the afternoon of that date. Nor did we let them know anything of our special powers, nor of our special intentions as to the British Tabernacle and Bethel before our first formal meeting with them. However, we kept our eyes and ears open, and gained much information on conditions at Bethel, and the atmosphere toward our Pastor, his arrangements and the Society. We saw that quite a different spirit prevailed among some, especially H.J.S. and his family, from what we were accustomed to see among brethren. The censorship having delayed the arrival of the Executive Committee's letter to the managers on our visit, at our first meeting with them we showed them our copy of it; then we showed them our letter of appointment; and then our credentials. They thus at once recognized that we came as a special commissioner of the Society with full powers "in the business and affairs of the Society." We then laid before them our suggestions on advertising our public meetings. J.H. was given by the Executive Committee the work of arranging for our pilgrim services. The announcement of this fact visibly and unfavorably affected H.J.S., who had charge of the Pilgrim department. Our suggestions on our pilgrim activities were accepted, and we then encouraged the three brothers to join heartily with us in giving an impetus to the waning work, and the discouraged hearts of the British brethren. There was almost nothing being done in the Pilgrim, Colporteur and Volunteer work, when we arrived in Britain. The Photo-Drama was not being exhibited; the Pastoral work, of course, had not yet started; and the newspaper work was dwindling. Almost everything was at a standstill; and the Lord put it into our heart to seek to arouse the British brethren to new life and zeal; and to set into vigorous operation the various branches of the work; and by God's grace this was accomplished in a large measure in spite of many hindrances, until J.F.R.,

with his habitual capacity to blunder, and J.H., with his smooth tongue to deceive, busybodied, whereby confusion came on all hands.

As soon as H.J.S. and W.C. learned of our powers they made extraordinary efforts, including on the former's part our entertainment every night for over a week with a 9 o'clock dinner, to win our favor toward them, and to turn us against J.H. Their course resulted in the opposite of their purpose. They began to speak against him to us, which made us sympathize with him, because we saw their unbrotherly course toward him. They had for years intimidated him, until he had become almost a zero among the managers. This course of theirs made us at first unopen to some of their charges against him that later we found in good part to be true. Accustomed to treat our fellow-pilgrims with great respect and deference, we were hurt at their conduct toward him; and thus by their actions were turned more and more into believing them to be systematic evil-doers. This, of course, made us look with increasing disfavor upon their plans, as also the character of their plans worked this effect on us.

In Vol. IV., Chap. III, we described how the correspondence on the Tabernacle arrangements was by H.J.S. and J.H., on Nov. 23, put into our hands. At our second meeting with the managers (Nov. 23) we recognized that our task in the Tabernacle was not to be an easy one; for we could see the set purpose of H.J.S. and W.C. to carry through their manifold designs, if possible. Armed with the correspondence of both sides, after the meeting of Nov. 23, we went to our room; and kneeling in prayer, we told the Lord that of ourself, we, a stranger in a strange land, were unequal to the task before us; that if He would give us the necessary wisdom and strength, we would faithfully seek to be an eye, mouth and hand for Him in the British work. We have every confidence that

the Lord answered that prayer. A series of most remarkable providences surrounded us during our stay in Britain, until after we had under our Lord, and in co-operation with other priests, delivered the British Libnite Gershonite and Mahlite Merarite sections of Azazel's Goat to the fit man, when every door to further usefulness began to close, and shortly was completely closed; then the only thing for us to do was to return to America. We are very confident that in Britain we accomplished the good pleasure of our Lord. Our Levitical brethren would not, of course, agree with this; and they have succeeded in bewildering a considerable section of the British Priests on the subject, our mistake on the Steward giving a measure of color to their claims. But our record is on High; and we feel confident that in due time God will bring forth our righteousness as the light, and our judgment as the noonday. Until then we can, amid Levitical misrepresentations, quietly wait on the Lord; nor will we wait in vain!

In order to clarify the Tabernacle situation we should explain the unique position of our Pastor to that Ecclesia. In others than the Ecclesias connected with the various headquarters he had no further powers in local affairs than that of an advisor; but at the Brooklyn and London Tabernacles, at the New York Temple, etc., not only from financial considerations, but more especially because the Lord so willed it, he controlled their general arrangements. The reason that the Lord willed this is that He desired His special eye, mouth and hand free from the control of everybody except Himself, that thus unhampered he might fulfill his duties as that Servant. For him to have been subject to the particular Ecclesias of which he was a member would contain dangerous probabilities, which, becoming actual, would have resulted in injury to the general work, and would have seriously interfered with His office functions as that Servant.

Therefore the Lord, who was the Head of those Churches, arranged to control their affairs through His personal representative, that Servant. Hence in such Ecclesias the latter did not conduct matters exactly as Vol. VI shows should be done in all other Churches.

H.J.S. and W.C. led a movement to change the Divinely ordained arrangements for the London Tabernacle, especially in so far as they concerned our Pastor's controllership therein; and by their course greatly sinned against the *Lord*, whose Headship in that Church they in unholy ambition sought to set aside in the peculiar form in which He was pleased through "that Servant" to exercise it. This in brief is the heart of their offenses as to the Tabernacle. But connected with their general plan was a number of details bearing plain evidence of Satanic activity. It was the partial knowledge of their purpose that caused our Pastor, Oct. 21, 1916, at Dallas to warn us against certain responsible British brethren, and to promise us details after both of us would meet in Brooklyn, Nov. 6, 1916. His delaying telling us these details was doubtless due to his wishing first to read the Tabernacle correspondence from London, which he expected there.

After reaching London, and reviewing carefully the correspondence on the Tabernacle, Nov. 23-25, we drew up eight questions on which we based many others, and thoroughly questioned the three managers for about three hours on the afternoon of Nov. 25. As a result of this examination the conspiracy of H.J.S. and W.C. stood out so plainly as treachery to our Pastor that in sheer shame they hung their heads, and then, disowning their child, they threw the blame for the whole matter on the other nine signatory elders. Of course we knew this was untrue; but tactfully took the occasion to administer a verbal beating to the two erring managers over the backs of

the other nine elders. Apart from *disapproving* the wishes of the other nine elders (!) we refrained from giving a decision that day, believing that we had better await further developments. Within a week, however, we told the two managers that their plan was pure Presbyterianism; and that standing for the congregational order of Church government, we could not give it our approval. At first we refrained from pointing out the worst features of their course, hoping to bring them to repentance by easier methods. We herewith submit the eight questions that were the basic ones of those that we asked them Nov. 25: (1) What is your individual position in the matter of the Society's relation to the Tabernacle congregation? (2) What is meant in the resolution by the expression "Tabernacle arrangements"? (3) When and how did this discussion of "Tabernacle arrangements" among the elders originate? (4) Exactly what is desired to be done, and, through the thing done, achieved, by those who have passed the resolution? (5) Are all 11 elders who voted for the resolution a unit as to what they want, or do some desire more than others? (6) Have you any tangible ground in an action of the congregation that it desires the changes desired by the 11 elders who passed the resolution? (7) What is your individual position as to the desirability of the changes sought by the majority of the elders? (8) What would be the effect of the changes on the relations of the Society and the Church?

We continued our investigation of the agitation culminating in the sending of the correspondence to Brooklyn, fact after fact coming to light, until we had an accurate knowledge of the entire movement. We learned from many sources, especially from the minutes and notes of the Secretary of the Ecclesia, and from Bros. Hemery, Thackway, Cronk, Guard, Jr., and others, the background out of which the entire movement arose, as well as the various ramifications

through which it passed, and found it to be sinister indeed! There was some dissatisfaction among some of the elders, especially H.J.S. and W.C., that they had very little opportunity to discourse before the Tabernacle congregation, our Pastor guarding the pulpit against amateurs, because he did not wish to give the impression to the British public that immature speakers were the recognized public exponents of the Truth. Hence J.H. in our Pastor's absence almost always filled the pulpit. To allay this discontent the latter, Aug. 12, 1915, sent a letter to each manager distributing the services as follows: J.H. to speak twice a month, and each of the other Managers once a month, with an occasional opportunity for other qualified elders to speak. But the two did not edify the congregation so well as did J.H., hence not a few remained away when they spoke. For this H.J.S. and W.C. blamed J.H.! The two then began quietly to inoculate the other elders with the thought that they—the other elders—ought to have more opportunity to speak to the Ecclesia; and thus they set themselves forth as the champions of a freer pulpit. This elicited a favorable response from a number of elders who thought that they ought to have had more opportunities to appear before the Church. The two continued to set forth the claim that the Tabernacle arrangements were not Scriptural, and that, if they were, the elders would be on more of an equality—as though God organized His Church with all elders having equal talents, spirit and opportunities! Matters continued to go on in this way, until the time was thought ripe to discuss the Ecclesia's arrangements in an elders' meeting, H.J.S. and W.C. claiming that, the *Ecclesia* having very lately assumed its current expenses, the *elders and deacons should control its affairs*. Accordingly, the evening of Oct. 22, 1915, and an elders' meeting, were considered the proper time and place to consider the matter, as the

following quotation from a letter of H.J.S. shows: "At an elders' meeting held on Oct. 22, 1915, the question was discussed, in view of the Church now paying its own expenses, as to whether the limitations now upon the Elders and Deacons should be withdrawn—leaving the congregation free to place *the control of its services and activities in their hands!*" Real, clericalistic logic—that which infers that, because the *Ecclesia* pays its own expenses, its *board of elders and deacons* should control all its services and activities!

The ball thus started rolling, it was, Oct. 29, 1915, at a joint elders' and deacons' meeting given another push, when through a "packed" deacon "a suggestion was made that the affairs of the Church should be *entirely in the hands of the Elders and Deacons*, SINCE THE CONGREGATION WAS BEARING THE FINANCIAL RESPONSIBILITY." Some more Levite Logic! We quote further:

"On Sunday, Nov. 28, 1915, at a Church meeting (not annual business meeting) the feeling was expressed [by some other "packed" brothers!] that some change of policy might be desirable in respect to the appointment of the speakers for the Tabernacle Sunday services. It was moved:—'that in view of the congregation now paying the Tabernacle expenses [what a fine hobby to ride to self-exaltation was the thought that—'in view of the congregation now paying the Tabernacle expenses, etc.!'] the Church suggests [the sequel shows whether the Church or certain elders filled with unholy ambition did the suggesting] that the services of the elders be extended to the filling of *Sunday* Tabernacle appointments.'" Our Pastor did not wish the Truth to be given a black eye before critical London by the sample Truth-Church of Britain having its pulpit filled by incompetent speakers. Hence he arranged differently from what his two *misrepresentatives* tried to put into

vogue by their revolutionism. To the credit of the congregation, which believed in its keeping faith with our Pastor as it had agreed, the Shearno-Crawford motion was lost by an almost unanimous vote, which proved that they, not the Ecclesia, desired the change. Our quotations are from H.J.S.'s letter of Jan. 11, 1917.

Baffled by the Ecclesia's stand, they next thought of dividing up the large congregation into a number of small ones, as this arrangement was more in harmony with their purposes, and could be given an appearance of great concern for the brethren living quite a distance from the Tabernacle. Our Pastor wanted as a sample British Church a large Ecclesia at Britain's and the World's metropolis, because, the British public being always favorably impressed by numbers, our public work would thereby be advantaged. This advantage was no concern to the two conspirators; for rule or ruin seemed to be their policy; or as Milton puts the sentiment into Satan's mouth: "Better to rule in hell than serve in heaven!" Accordingly, they manipulated matters so that at elders' meetings held Dec. 3, 1915, Jan. 7, 1916, Feb. 4, 1916, and Feb. 11, 1916, lengthy discussions occurred, first on a resolution offered by H.J.S., and then on others springing out of it, advocating two such separate churches. During these discussions text-bookism was advocated and in part sanctioned. H.J.S. and W.C. giving their influence to the side of text-bookism, against our Pastor's and the Ecclesia's known policies. Ultimately the text-bookistic phase of the matter led to a deadlock among the elders, as to what should be done with scheduling the meetings of the two separated ecclesias; but the final aim and result of policies of the two was the creation of two text-bookistic ecclesias as separate and distinct from the London Tabernacle. By this course they decreased as per their plan the influence of our Pastor and J.H. It is

illuminating to note that in all their moves they were favored loyally by four elders who were quite out of harmony with our Pastor's policies in the Tabernacle and the Berean Studies. This is quite apparent from the action of these four, who not only favored, with the two, the above-mentioned separated ecclesias, but who in an elders' meeting, May 5, 1916, tried to set aside Berean Lessons and a resolution favoring their continuance. Thus we see that a sectarian, text-bookistic and clericalistic revolutionism characterizes their theories, acts and fruits.

Still they continued their efforts to change that Servant's arrangements. Toward midsummer of 1916, H.J.S. approached Bro. Thackway, one of the leading elders of the Ecclesia, on his plan to have a freer pulpit. Bro. Thackway expressed substantial agreement with H.J.S. This fact H.J.S. tried to utilize for his plan. Phoning about midsummer to Bro. Thackway that he wanted to discuss with him a plan whereby he hoped to secure the former's exemption from the draft, Bro. Thackway agreed to the consultation, as he desired the exemption. But the exemption matter seemed to be a decoy; for little was said on exemption, except at the end of the conference Bro. Thackway was informed it could probably not be gotten; and much was said on changing Tabernacle arrangements, so as to give *other* elders than the managers frequent access to the pulpit. Bro. Thackway being sympathetic, H.J.S. asked him whether he would introduce a resolution to the effect that the elders discuss the desirability of changing them, remarking that he did not want to introduce the resolution because of *his official relations to that Servant!* Bro. Thackway consented; whereupon H.J.S. drew forth from his desk a typewritten resolution treating of the matter. This motion was presented by Bro. Thackway at an elders' meeting Sept. 1, 1916. Criticisms of our Pastor's arrangements then followed,

especially by four elders as to the restricted pulpit, one central meeting place for Sundays, the assistant pastorate, and our Pastor's concern for the public. Then W.C. presented a "muzzling" motion, which he originated, and got the Advisory Committee, of which he was chairman, to recommend, to the effect that none of the elders should individually inform Bro. Russell of the elders' deliberations. It was finally decided to hold another meeting Sept. 16 for further discussion. Bro. Thackway again opened the discussion covering the above four points anew. Then H.J.S. began to reel off by the yard supposed arguments against the arrangements of him whose representative he was. Some of his claims were that the arrangements complained of were "unscriptural," injurious to both Ecclesia and elders, clericalistic as to J.H., degrading as to the other elders, insufficient as to the needs of the brethren, etc., etc., etc. As is manifest in this case, it is remarkable how many sophistries a clericalist can invent to gain his ends! Following H.J.S.'s long speech, the thought was expressed that our Pastor would not agree; but he said he had a letter from him (dated Oct. 22, 1915) that showed that he would agree. Getting the letter he read a little of it, which made all present conclude that our Pastor would agree. But failing to read the next sentence, which, with what had been read, proved that unless the congregation would assume all of the Society's Tabernacle obligations, *e.g.*, the debt on the building, etc., he would not agree, H.J.S. *deliberately deceived* the elders, as we proved to the Ecclesia at the time that we found out the trick that he played on his brother elders. Later the resolution to embody the matter in a letter to Bro. Russell was offered by H.J.S. and seconded by W.C.; and the Secretary was instructed to meet with them and work up the matter with them, they doing the work, and he writing a brief letter. They requested of the Secretary

that their names as mover and seconder be withheld from our Pastor, saying that they "did not know how Bro. Russell might take it." They likewise asked him to conceal how the section of his letter was read to the elders; but at a later elders' meeting, Oct. 20, H.J.S.'s course of writing into the letter to Bro. Russell the statement that J.H. first brought that letter to the elder's attention was challenged and changed.

Sept. 20, 1916, another elders' meeting was held to work on the letter, report and resolution that were proposed to be sent to our Pastor. Some of the elders began to see through the scheme. Several had written to our Pastor since the last meeting, telling of the movement and its purposes. W.C. proposed and H.J.S. seconded a motion that each elder be asked to tell whether he had written Bro. Russell. J.H. refused to put the motion. On his declaring that he wrote him Sept. 17, H.J.S. and W.C. were beside themselves with rage, the former bursting out with: "All confidence between us is lost!" and threatening to resign. Sept. 29 and Oct. 6 other meetings occurred to revise the proposed correspondence, and other elders began to get their eyes open. Between Oct. 6 and 13 Bro. Thackway, recognizing that H.J.S. was using him as a catspaw, withdrew from the whole matter, so informing each elder by letter. Oct. 13 the final draft of the correspondence was signed by 11 of the 18 elders. Oct. 14 (Saturday) H.J.S. wrote a letter to the other seven asking them to sign. Monday, Oct. 16, this letter reached them, and all refused, making a deadlock. Oct. 20 another meeting was held, but no converts either way were made. Bro. Seeck, the Secretary, wrote his accompanying letter Saturday, Oct. 21; but despite the intention of H.J.S. and W.C. to send it Oct. 21, according to the Secretary's notes the correspondence was not mailed until the following week, perhaps Monday, Oct. 23. Thus the correspondence left the London Bethel about 8 days

before our Pastor's death; and the British censorship delayed its arrival at Brooklyn until after his burial.

A "covering letter" of the most deceitfully flattering kind, and a report, calculated to intimidate our Pastor by hints of a threatening disaster to the Ecclesia, unless the suggested program was accepted by him, were sent with the resolution, which we herewith give: "It is RESOLVED as follows: The elders consider it to be in the best interests of the Church meeting in the London Tabernacle that [1] the arrangements governing its affairs be organized on the lines laid down in Volume VI, which they accept as the Scriptural method [thus they told our Pastor that his arrangements were *unscriptural*], [2] and they desire to submit this suggestion to Bro. Russell for his opinion and advice before bringing the matter forward at the annual church meeting shortly to be held [thus they persisted in a course that they knew our Pastor would disapprove, and that the Church had almost unanimously disapproved, as shown above]. [3] At the same time the elders especially put on record their earnest desire that Bro. Russell continue as Pastor [yes, indeed, but shorn of his pastoral powers!], and [4] that the unique standing of the London Tabernacle in relation to the Society's work remain unchanged [an impossible thing, since the Ecclesia's unique relation to the Society's (his) work was due to his unique relation to it]. [5] Further that all the speakers at the preaching services be periodically selected by the board of elders [this meant that not the Ecclesia, but the elders, should determine who should speak to it! Clericalism!], [6] and that the names of the brethren selected be submitted to Bro. Russell, so that (in view of the responsibility of the service) they may hope to receive such pastoral advice as he might think appropriate to offer." [Henceforth our Pastor was to be reduced to an *adviser*, not *controller*, in Tabernacle affairs!]

The resolution did not ask that J.H., our Pastor's and the Ecclesia's choice as assistant Pastor, be as such set aside; for that would have been dangerous to suggest. This was to be taken care of after "all of the speakers at the preaching services" were "periodically selected by the board of *elders!*" The covering letter, report and resolution of H.J.S. and W.C., next to Harvest Siftings, constitute the most hypocritical piece of literature that we have seen turned out by any Levitical leader during the time of the present Levite ascendancy.

Our secret opposition to their Tabernacle plans provoked their secret and later open opposition to us. Dec. 24 we addressed the Tabernacle congregation as the Society's special representative, suggesting that they elect and assign whom they wished as speakers, whom they should select only from the standpoint of Scriptural qualifications, just as they pleased, without any further advice from the members of the Bethel family, adding, however, that they should not give to the elders, but reserve to themselves, the power of selecting and appointing all elders to their respective services. However, we did not in any way reveal the activities of the 11 elders to the Ecclesia. We then strictly charged the managers and other Bethelites to abstain from efforts to influence the election in any manner, specifically cautioning them to refrain from speaking on the subject to any one in the congregation. This we did in order to give the Ecclesia the freest opportunity of expressing its preferences. We refrained from doing that from which we asked others to refrain. H.J.S.'s violation of this charge was the direct means of letting the Ecclesia know, what we had thoroughly concealed from it, only a few elders knowing of our stand, *i.e.*, our opposition to the plan of the 11 signatory elders. Thus in spite of our efforts to keep the trouble secret, he brought it into

the open by disregarding the charge of the Society's special representative.

Of the two erring managers, H.J.S. was by far the better-hearted and more reasonable. W.C. was, we believe, the most stubborn Levite with whom we have had to deal. Our loving efforts to bring them to repentance failed utterly in the case of the latter, but did in part succeed with the former, until W.C. got hold of him, when he changed for the worse. Christmas afternoon in Hyde Park and Kensington Gardens, H.J.S. and ourself took a walk. During this walk, which lasted several hours, we made perhaps the most loving effort of our life to rescue a brother from a wrong course. At the end of our conversation he acknowledged his wrong-doing, promising betterment, among other ways, by the expression: "You will see, dear brother, that I can eat humble pie." We embraced him in our joy of heart (Jas. 5:20), assuring him that we felt sure he would do the right thing. A few days later W.C. had changed him, and he contended that he had done no wrong. This prompted us to advise the former Dec. 31, and the latter Jan. 1, not to stand for election to eldership in a Church against whose liberties they had so greatly sinned. Both refused to stand aside, the former giving as his reason that he would thereby become liable to conscription, both offering not to serve, if permitted to stand for election. We consented to such an arrangement on condition that they would to us as the Society's representative privately acknowledge their wrongs, and promise to abstain from such wrongs in the future. Both refused to make such acknowledgments. Their refusal caused us to give them up as hopeless cases, *i.e.*, deliver them to the fit man, Jan. 14, 1917, being the date of this act.

In the meantime Bro. Thackway became busy with a set of resolutions that were directly contradictory to the plan of H.J.S. He wanted our advice; but

we refrained from speaking either way, because of our above-mentioned suggestion to the Bethel family. Had H.J.S. and W.C. apologized, we would have intervened in a way to prevent their exposure, but not prevent these resolutions from being voted on. Their refusal to apologize, and H.J.S.'s bringing out the trouble before the Church prompted J.H., who acted as our representative and at our suggestion, to state that if H.J.S. should defend his course, as to his clericalistic activity, he (J.H.) should express to the Ecclesia, Jan. 21, 1917, our disapproval, as the Society's commissioner, of the whole movement culminating in the above-quoted resolution; and he suggested that, if the Ecclesia desired it, we would as the Society's representative give our thought on the entire movement. The Ecclesia voted to hear us the following Sunday, Jan. 28. While addressing the Ecclesia we, through the answers given to a series of our questions, learned how, in reading part of a letter of our Pastor, through suppressing the sentences following, H.J.S. made the nine elders believe the letter to mean the opposite of what it did mean, thereby enlisting their support of his plan. The knowledge of this deliberate deception of his fellow elders, coming on the heels of that of many others of his wrong-doings in the Bethel and Tabernacle, of which we had but recently learned, filled us with righteous indignation. And we administered to him before the Ecclesia the severest rebuke that we have ever given a human being. This rebuke was in a sense premature, because, contrary to our impression that the full facts had been laid before the congregation the Sunday before, the Ecclesia knew but little of the facts of the case. The majority of them, however, had learned to know that more or less wrong had been done, especially by the two managers. About 30 to 40 were much dissatisfied at our rebuke of the two. Some

of these wrote and cabled J.F.R. and aroused his opposition to us.

In H.J.S.'s answer to us, Jan. 28, he asked the Ecclesia to "disregard the statements of this stranger in their midst." This prompted us to have our letter of appointment and our credentials read to the Ecclesia that evening by the Secretary of the Church, that the Church might know what powers "this stranger in their midst" had. This deepened the unfavorable impression against H.J.S. and W.C.

Feb. 4 the Ecclesia passed an anti-textbookism resolution and required each of the signatory elders to promise submission to the arrangements of the Ecclesia. Thus before the Ecclesia the clericalistic movement was killed; and its two prime movers were not to be voted on as elders, until we should be heard again, and that on the facts of the case, which, contrary to our impression on Jan. 28, had been but meagerly given to the Ecclesia. It was voted that we be invited to give the facts to the Ecclesia Feb. 18. Accordingly, we then appeared a second time before the Church on this subject. For three hours we spoke, first clearing away the dust that our opponents had thrown into the eyes of many; then accusing them of seven general wrongs, consisting of many particulars, against various ones concerned. They were the following: I. They engineered the whole clericalistic movement by inaugurating and then advocating it, making the rough draft of the letter, report and resolution, moving and seconding the resolution, seeking to secure the signature of all the elders, holding it for signature, and sending it to Brooklyn. II. Disloyalty to their Fellow-elders, in that they deceived them into signing the resolution, and then gloated over it. III. Disloyalty to J.H. as Assistant Pastor by seeking to set him as such aside, and by seeking equality with him in the Ecclesia, both of these things being against the known wishes of that Servant and of the Ecclesia.

IV. Disloyalty to the Ecclesia, by seeking to get control over it, and by seeking to set aside its almost unanimously voted wishes against having a "wider pulpit platform." V. Disloyalty to that Servant by designating his arrangements as *unscriptural*, by seeking to take away his controllership of Tabernacle arrangements, including his appointment of speakers, and by seeking, contrary to his known policy, to divide the Tabernacle congregation into a number of small and uninfluential churches. VI. Disloyalty to the Truth, by seeking to practice clericalism, by countenancing textbookism and by encouraging and co-operating with the advocates of these. VII. *Conscious* disloyalty to their office, by asking Bro. Thackway to introduce a resolution which H.J.S. said was against his office functions; by objecting through fear of the consequences to their names appearing in the communication to Bro. Russell as mover and seconder of the resolution; by seeking to muzzle the elders from communicating individually to our Pastor on their activities as to the resolution; by severely rebuking J.H. for informing our Pastor of their doings; by reading the garbled section of Bro. Russell's letter, whereby the elders were deceived into believing that our Pastor favored their objects; and by objecting to Bro. Russell's being informed as to how his letter of Oct. 22, 1915, came to be shown the elders. Every one of these particulars coming under the general heads above given were proven by witnesses on whom we called from among the congregation as we proceeded. When we finished, W.C. made a short reply, and two weeks later, in our absence, made a long reply. The congregation unanimously voted us confidence, thanks and appreciation for our labors on its behalf; and in spite of every pressure to the contrary from "the channel," has maintained its stand that the two were unworthy of being elders. J.F.R.'s Investigative Committee was unanimous

in its decision that they were unworthy of eldership in the Tabernacle congregation. We believe that this decision is the Lord's mind on the subject.

Against the mass of facts that we marshaled against them they took refuge in the usual plea of wrongdoers against their expositors: "He was too severe on us." After over 21 years' removal from the events connected with the Tabernacle trouble we are of the opinion that, while we did deal severely with them on Jan. 28, 1917, there was full justification for our severity in the gross and wilful sins of which they were guilty. Had we to do it over again, we would, in view of the evil use that they have made of our severity, proceed more mildly than we did, not that they deserved it, nor that we did wrong in being so severe as their conduct drove us to be, but not to give them an occasion to deceive guileless people into believing that they were martyrs at our hands; for the Scriptures most severely arraign them, and justify us in the entire transaction. Do the Levites condemn us? Well, we can bear this; for without fail in due time the Lord will bring forth our righteousness as the light and our judgment as the noonday. Until then faith, hope, love and obedience can wait; and when that time comes the Priests and the Levites will rejoice together, recognizing that our work as to the Tabernacle affair was that of co-operating under our Head with some of the Under-priests in leading a section of Azazel's Goat to the Gate of the Court and to the fit man, and that it was a means in God's hand finally to lead to the cleansing of many (Num. 8:7).

We will now briefly set forth our experiences connected with, and our findings in, the London Bethel matter. At our second meeting with the managers, Nov. 23, we saw the unconcealed and ill-tempered efforts of H.J.S. and W.C. to discredit J.H. in our estimation. This was continued privately at our 9 P.M. dinners as well as in the managers' meeting of

Nov. 25, though for the most part in that meeting the two managers were on the defensive, in view of our detailed questioning on Tabernacle conditions. Whereas before hearing our decision adverse to their Tabernacle plans, they sought hard to win us to their program, treating us in every way as having powers of attorney in "the business and affairs of the Society"; after hearing our decision they began a whispering campaign against us; especially did W.C. do this, among others with his father-in-law, F.G. Guard, Sr., a prominent British brother. They pointedly defied us on arranging the program for the Manchester Convention. In this J.H. co-operated, though he pled ignorance of their intentions on the subject, a plea which we accepted. We will give a brief description of the controversy on the program. H.J.S. late in November showed us the program which he had arranged for the Manchester Convention, Dec. 30–Jan. 1. It was a program very different from those that our Pastor arranged, both here and in Britain. First, the Society's representatives occupied on the program less time by far than elders of various Classes. The only British pilgrim of the Society apart from the managers was left off the program entirely. Nor was H.J.S. on the program. In other words, additional to elders as leaders of the Convention Testimony Meetings, thirteen talks on the program were given to local elders, and three, including the chairman's address, were given to the Society's representatives. We suggested that less addresses be given to local elders and more to the Society's representatives. Second, the Convention baptismal service was to take place the evening *before the Convention began*, depriving the candidates of the inspiration of the Convention uplift prior to their symbolizing. Third, there was no place on the program for Harvesters' Day. We suggested that in these particulars the program be altered in harmony

with our Pastor's arrangements. These we were told *were not suitable for Britain*, though, on our request to see programs of conventions held while our Pastor was in Britain, we were shown a number that were just as we suggested Convention programs should be. We even wrote to them emphasizing the necessity of making the changes that we suggested. Later the managers held a meeting in which, according to a letter that H.J.S. wrote us Dec. 11, and that we received Dec. 14, apart from putting himself and ourself on the program, they declined to follow our suggestions. At once we saw that the managers were defying us, and were asserting their authority as superior to ours. Thus they challenged us to battle.

Remembering what our Pastor, Oct. 21, at Dallas, Tex., had told us about responsible British brethren refusing to follow his directions as to the British work, and remembering the wrongs that we were day by day learning, we decided, after most careful and prayerful consideration of their action, that we must not allow such a defiant course to stand; otherwise our mission in Britain, so far as the Bethel and Tabernacle matters were concerned, would end in total failure; for we saw that, if we should weaken on this point, we would be weaker to resist them on their next point, while they thereby would be made stronger to resist us. Hence we decided to act energetically, which we did to their surprise; for as H.J.S. told our secretary, they thought us a weakling. Our decision, confirmed by the principles of the Word and a number of Providences, was reached Dec. 19, and on Dec. 20 in a managers' meeting, after the pertinent part of H.J.S.'s letter was read to them, we told them that by their action they had set aside our credential-powers, and hence we insisted on their reversing their decision, and printing the program exactly as we had suggested. To H.J.S.'s reply that the matter would have to be discussed first, we answered to the effect

that not one word of discussion would be permitted, that it was for them to carry out the suggestion of the Society's Special Representative, who had full charge of its "business and affairs in every country to which he was sent," and not to discuss whether it should be done or not. Then W.C., contrary to many an act of his before we announced our opposition to their Tabernacle plans, pretending ignorance, said he did not understand that we had such authority. When we reminded them of our credentials and some of their acts in harmony therewith, he said he did not remember such powers to be mentioned in the credentials. These were then again read to the managers. Then telling them that our suggestions must be carried out we left the room. They discussed matters a while; then H.J.S. and W.C. came to us, seeking to change our mind, which they could not succeed in doing. We took the program out of H.J.S.'s hands, and gave it to J.H. to carry out as we suggested; for we feared that H.J.S. would not change it as we desired. This experience with the managers made us miss the afternoon meeting at Oxford, as the dear ones there will doubtless remember that we failed to come in time.

Saturday evening, Dec. 22, we had another meeting with the managers, at which W.C. being defiant, but H.J.S. making a half apology and promising to follow our suggestions in the future, as a token of our forgiveness we asked him to attend to the program, which we then revised, making it as much like our Pastor's program as the circumstances of a Convention just 8 days ahead would permit. A letter was to be dispatched by H.J.S. immediately to Manchester to secure the place for the baptismal service for the changed time. This letter for some reason that we could not certainly learn, but that we fear was due to H.J.S.'s and W.C.'s manipulations, failed to reach Manchester until the day before the Convention,

Dec. 29, too late to secure the baptismal place for the changed service; for technicalities relating to the renting of such places prevented changes on such short notice. W.C. by a whispering campaign sought to injure us with certain prominent British brethren for our action as to the program, of course following the usual Levitical propensity of misrepresenting the facts; and he succeeded with certain of these, as several of them later on told us.

Another matter that affected us against these brothers was their attempt through our secretary, F.G. Guard, Jr., a brother-in-law of W.C., to divert us from our duty and unduly to influence us in their favor. After it became known to them that he was to travel with us as a helper, H.J.S. asked him to seek to influence us favorably to themselves as against J.H.! They also sought through him the afternoon of Dec. 22 to change our mind on the Convention program. As their mouthpiece he sought earnestly but unsuccessfully to induce us to accept their view of the program, and to keep our hands off Bethel and Tabernacle matters, warning us that, if we did not confine our efforts to the pilgrim work, they by a secret campaign would undermine our influence. Among other things he said with reference to the program: "Brother, surely you would not foist an *American* institution on British brethren." We replied, "We are neither British nor American; we are Spiritual Israelites, and this is an arrangement of Spiritual Israelites." F.G. Guard, Jr., was a thorough example of the double-mindedness of the Great Company. For awhile after he had been with them he would side with them; then after our explanations he would take our side against them. This double-mindedness continued until he ceased being our secretary, when partly under family influence he went over entirely to their side. Next to J.H. he gave us more information on the Bethel wrong-doings of the two than any one else;

while Bro. Seeck, the Secretary of the Ecclesia, gave us the most information on Tabernacle matters. Indeed, the latter gave us a well arranged documentary history of the Tabernacle trouble that has been of invaluable help to us in tracing the work of the two during their several years of activity against our beloved Pastor's Tabernacle arrangements.

We asked J.H. to draw up a list of the Bethel offenses committed by the two. This he did and presented them in a managers' meeting the evening of Jan. 8, 1917. Most of those against himself H.J.S. admitted. To most of those against himself W.C. gave very evasive replies, which under our questioning became apparent as sophistries. H.J.S. for his part promised that he would not do such things in the future. W.C. would promise nothing. His attitude, however, was less defiant than at the managers' meeting the evening of Dec. 22. The charges that J.H. brought against them impressed us deeply. We learned after the meeting that H.J.S.'s answers before the Ecclesia to Bro. Thackway's resolutions, offered Jan. 7 to the Ecclesia, publicly divulged the trouble; and thus their offenses, their secret whisperings for weeks and his public statement began to create an acute condition outside of Bethel. This prompted us to awaken the two early Jan. 9—early because we had to leave early on a pilgrim trip—and to tell them frankly that their influence would be destroyed, if their course became clearly known to the British Church. We assured them that we would help them out of their predicament, if they would promise betterment. When the evening before W.C. asked us to withdraw our advice that he do not allow his name to be voted on as elder, claiming that as an elder he could better secure exemption from military service, we, in view of his offenses and impenitence, refused to agree, telling him that his course was one that doubtless required some such corrective experience. The morning

of Jan. 9 he renewed the request. H.J.S. asked also to be permitted to stand as a candidate for elder, both offering, without our suggesting it, to abstain from occupying the pulpit, if elected. Reminding them of their grave offenses against the Ecclesia, we yet promised that we would reconsider the matter. This we did with the result that we offered to accept their proposition, if they would privately to us as the Society's representative acknowledge and apologize for their wrong-doings in Tabernacle and Bethel matters, and promise betterment for the future. As to this W.C. wrote us to the following effect: that while he did not see any wrong-doing on his part in the matters charged against him, nevertheless, since we, as the Society's representative, required an apology from him, he was sorry for the whole affair. His letter, clothed in the most evasive language, was an insult instead of an apology. This caused us to drop him as hopeless, Jan. 14, 1917—delivered him to the fit man.

H.J.S. wrote a long letter Jan. 11, which will be quoted in part later on, defending himself as righteous altogether, in a false argument based on false premises, among other things, telling us that on the following Monday, Jan. 15, he would send to Brooklyn a copy of his letter of Jan. 11, with his "formal resignation." This letter prompted us to give him up as a hopeless case, Jan. 14, as we have already shown.

We herewith submit a list of their wrong-doings in Bethel matters, together with their offenses against us as the Society's representative, remarking that J.H. and F.G. Guard, Jr., gave us decidedly the most of the information thereon. Some of the charges are in J.H.'s own language. All three managers will remember that he brought and read them as charges against the two in the managers' meeting the evening of Jan. 8. In his handwriting he gave us a copy of them, which we yet have.

The following are W.C.'s managerial offenses:

1. "He paid all household accounts contrary to the regulations that call for two managers to sign the cheques and put them into the hands of Sr. Hemery for payment."
2. "He pays little attention to instruction of the regulations that no money be paid except by the voucher system."
3. "Without authority from Brooklyn or vote of other managers, he appointed his wife housekeeper."
4. He opened privately addressed mail of others.
5. He had a key which he knew opened J.H.'s roller top desk: J.H. missed things therefrom.
6. Created an unfavorable atmosphere at Bethel.
7. Taught the Ecclesias, contrary to the Scriptures and Bro. Russell, that the Church is actually, not reckonedly, purchased, *i.e.*, that there is not now an imputation of Jesus' merit, but an outright purchase.

The following are H.J.S.'s managerial offenses

1. "Kept I.B.S.A. things as a private matter."
 - (1) Correspondence unsubmitted to other managers.
 - (2) Association books kept in his private safe.
2. "Gradually all things pertaining to Classes and meetings came under his care, including Class difficulties."
3. "Assumed the right of making all arrangements for Conventions."
4. "Kept back from J.H. some doctrinal matters, *e.g.*, question box."
5. "Chose and rejected work at will, without authority," *e.g.*, 1. Military matters; 2. Colporteur work.
6. Foisted the boarding of his whole family upon the Society, contrary to Bro. Russell's arrangements.
7. With his family helped make an oppressive atmosphere at Bethel.

The following are their combined offenses:

1. They disregarded Bro. Russell's desire that J.H. have priority of influence.

A. Bro. Russell desired J.H. to have priority of influence, as can be seen from his offices:

- (1) Secretary of the Society in Britain. (2) Vice-president of I.B.S.A. (3) Chairman of the managers. (4) Bro. Russell's private Secretary. (5) Assistant Pastor. (6) His signature necessary on all cheques. (7) Commended above others in Bro. Russell's letter to Congregation.

B. Their contention for equality and crowding him out of some of his rights prove this charge.

2. "Came into office to carry out programs of their own."

3. "Persistently refused to give J.H. supervision of mails," which Bro. Russell charged should be done.

4. Attempted financial control.

- (1) Secured power with J.H.'s consent, against our Pastor's arrangements, to make cheques valid for I.B.S.A. money without J.H.'s signature.
- (2) Began to make the I.B.S.A. banking account large instead of nominal, contrary to our Pastor's instructions, which limited the deposits to the value of the shares issued, *i.e.*, £23, £1 for each of the 23 shares issued.
- (3) Sought to make the I.B.S.A. independent of the W.T.B.&T.S., through the "scheme," which we exposed and published in Harvest Siftings Reviewed.

5. Worked in collusion against J.H.

6. Disregarded Bro. Johnson in his official capacity.

- (1) Set aside the amendments he made to the Manchester Convention program.
- (2) Privately and publicly disparaged him.
- (3) W.C. sought to entrap him into accusing W.C. of opening one of Bro. Johnson's letters.

- (4) Disregarded his advice to refrain from standing for election as elders.
- (5) Disregarded his advice to acknowledge wrongdoing against Bro. Russell and the Tabernacle Congregation as to the Resolution and Bethel matters.
- (6) Attempted to use the first and second steps of Matt. 18:15-18 against Bro. Johnson for an official act against their wrong-doing, even arranging for the witnesses of the second, before taking the first step.
- (7) W.C. sought to discipline a Bethel Sister for giving Bro. Johnson information as to a letter of his that she said she saw unopened, after it came to the office, but that W.C. said came to the office opened by the string that bound the package of letters containing it, the torn edges of the letter indicating that it was opened, not by a string, but by hand.
- (8) Kept up an espionage system on Bro. Johnson and those who were helping him.
- (9) Falsified to and against him.
- (10) In general were oppositional to him.

In a long letter dictated Jan. 11, 1917, in answer to ours of Jan. 9, to the effect that we would withdraw our advice against his standing for election as elder, if he would apologize as above set forth, H.J.S. attempted to prove himself a faithful representative of "that Servant," endeavoring to carry out his desire (?) to be relieved of non-financial Tabernacle responsibilities, and by inference blaming us as the troublemaker. H.J.S. tried in that letter to twist our Pastor's correspondence, through which he suggested various ways of relieving the Tract Fund of expenses, into meaning that our Pastor desired to be relieved of his *non-financial* obligations to the Tabernacle Congregation. A few familiar facts will show all how grossly

H.J.S. in his letter distorted the entire situation. All of us recall how greatly the financial support of the Tract Fund decreased during 1915 and 1916, necessitating in the former year the borrowing of \$100,000.00. To keep the work going our dear Pastor had to curtail expenses right and left. Among other ways of saving, instead of the Tract Fund being longer responsible for the finances of the London Tabernacle, he asked, June 10, 1915, the Tabernacle Congregation to assume all current expenses, and the interest of the \$20,000 mortgage on the Tabernacle, for which he had been bearing responsibility. This fact and that of giving H.J.S. and W.C. each opportunity to preach in the Tabernacle once a month—despite his having J.H. occupy the pulpit twice a month, and having him act as his pastoral representative in the Ecclesia; despite his advising other strenuous economies; and despite his not mentioning such a purpose—H.J.S. distorted into being a part of a new policy whereby our Pastor was, supposedly, seeking to surrender all his Tabernacle responsibilities. All of H.J.S.'s agitational acts leading up to the resolution movement prove that he had no such thought of our Pastor's purpose about certain changes that the latter made as to Tabernacle speakers and finance, until some time between Sept. 1 and 16, 1916, when he used it as so much propaganda. Surely, if our Pastor did not wish to maintain his control of Tabernacle arrangements, he would have mentioned it; and surely there would have been no occasion for H.J.S. and W.C. to conspire for over a year to create such sentiment as was calculated to win support for their scheme and to intimidate our Pastor into surrendering to their wishes, all the time being fearful that he would learn of their acts! H.J.S.'s letter, like Harvest Siftings, is an illustration of how Levites will distort the plainest facts to gain their selfish ends and justify their patent wrongs. The letter consists of five typewritten pages, each one 11×8 inches, single spaced,

and, of course, our limited space prohibits our publishing it entire. However, we will with bracketed comments give entire that part of the letter that seeks to prove that in his activity against our Pastor's Tabernacle arrangements, he was seeking to carry out our Pastor's supposed wish to be relieved of all controllership in Tabernacle matters! This part of the letter follows in its entirety:

"I must now endeavor to show you what were the factors which, consciously or subconsciously, controlled my action.

"28, April, 1915. A letter from Bro. Russell dated April 28, 1915, and addressed to this Office, made very clear and emphatic the necessity for retrenchment; in the last clause he states—'Curtail all expenses accordingly. If this means the stopping the printing of B.S.Ms. entirely, do so.'

"22, May, 1915. A further letter to the managers in Bro. Russell's handwriting and dated May 22, 1915, ends up as follows:—'Surely avoid debt, if it necessitates closing down every department. Use judgment.'

"10, June, 1915. In a letter dated June 10, 1915, and signed by Bro. Russell himself, he says:—'The fixed charges of interest on mortgage and light and heat and janitoring [of the Tabernacle] should be computed and laid before the Congregation. Congregational work and the Society's work should be kept separate and apart. The Congregation should be able now, without any solicitation or effort, to pay more than the interest and running expenses, and for the Sunday evening teas, etc. This would leave the Society the care of the Bethel and its expenses, which should be cut down to the lowest reasonable figure.' Surely, this means that Bro. Russell desired the Society to be relieved of the responsibility of the Tabernacle. The foregoing impressed me with the view that Bro. Russell thought it wise for the Society's affairs in Great Britain to be so ordered and conducted as to enable a

closing down to be effected quite readily at any time, and this thought was endorsed by Bro. Russell's action in reference to the lease on these premises, which he tried hard to be relieved of at this same time. [He desired only relief from financial responsibility to avoid debt, as the tenor of all letters so far quoted, in the light of decreasing gifts to the Tract Fund, proves.]

"12, Aug., 1915. Towards the end of Aug. the three managers received a letter (a copy sent to each) dated Aug. 12, 1915, and signed by Bro. Russell, in which he said, among other things:—'I have reason to believe that by now Bro. Hemery would find efficient assistance in Bros. Shearn and Crawford for the preaching services at the Tabernacle. I would not wish the pulpit there ever to be occupied except in a very decorous manner and by some one reasonably qualified in the use of the English language and of some natural ability. *For the time being*, I would like still to continue Bro. Hemery as my representative in that pulpit and to know that he would be occupying it one-half the time, leaving the other half to Bros. Shearn and Crawford, or occasionally some other Brother from the Congregation upon whose qualifications you three Brethren managers would unitedly agree.' And later on Bro. Russell says:—'I think, dear Brethren, that the right time has come for us *to set our house in order*.' [Not one word in the quotations refers to his desiring to be relieved from controlling the Tabernacle arrangements. The reverse is proven in the first of these two quotations; for therein he arranged for its appointments.]

"20, Aug., 1915. On Aug. 20, 1915, a letter was sent from the managers in which we stated: 'The Tabernacle Congregation very heartily fell in with the suggestion that it should take responsibility for the finances incurred in the regular running. Enclosed is a copy of the resolutions passed by the Congregation on the suggestion of the elders. [True, but this does not

imply that he wished to be relieved from controlling the Ecclesia's arrangements. It shows, on the contrary, that the Ecclesia came to the relief of the depleted Tract Fund by "doing its bit."']

"22, Oct., 1915. The next word upon the matter was from Bro. Russell in a letter dated Oct. 22, 1915, and reads as follows:—'In respect to the Tabernacle arrangements being turned over to the Congregation, we reply that if they are ready to take up *all the obligations of the Society* connected with the Tabernacle [this included its assuming the mortgage, which it has not assumed], including interest payments, etc., we will be very happy indeed to turn over the entire management of the Tabernacle to the Congregation. *Kindly advise us if you believe this to be the thought. Until such time* [italics ours], of course, the Society [himself] will continue the management of the Tabernacle according to its [his] judgment.' Here, again, Bro. Russell made known his wish for the Society to be relieved of the Tabernacle responsibilities. This important information was never made known to the Congregation, or in any way acted upon, but it showed to me that Bro. Russell contemplated a different policy for the Tabernacle, and was ready for it so soon as the Congregation was ready. [The last quotation proves a number of things: (1) That someone, whose identity we were never able to establish, suggested to our Pastor that the Congregation have charge of its arrangements, since it was paying its current expenses. How like H.J.S.'s and W.C.'s contentions on the same subject this contention is. (2) Our Pastor offered the Ecclesia that privilege, if it would shoulder all the financial obligations that the Society (himself) had assumed for it. This, of course, included the mortgage, and perhaps the past payments on the building, and the past interest on the mortgage, none of which the Ecclesia had yet assumed; (3) that our Pastor instructed the three managers to find out

whether the Ecclesia wished to assume such obligations, which it had not dreamed of doing; (4) that if the Ecclesia was not willing to assume these, the Society (himself) would continue to manage the Tabernacle as hitherto. H.J.S. complains that this offer was never made known to the Ecclesia. If not, he was as much responsible for it as anyone. Deep down in his heart he knew that such an offer would have caused consternation to the Ecclesia, for two reasons: (1) It wished our Pastor to continue to control its arrangements; (2) it could not well have assumed such heavy financial obligations. On his having been told that the Ecclesia wanted to assume all its financial obligations and thereafter take control of its arrangements, financial stress prompted our Pastor to make the offer in order to obtain relief from the stress, if such was the Ecclesia's thought. The first sentence of the quotation on which we are commenting is that part of one of our Pastor's letters which H.J.S. and W.C. read to the elders Sept. 16, 1916, and by which they deceived the other elders into believing that our Pastor wished to rid himself of controllership of the Tabernacle arrangements. The rest of the quotation, which gives the reverse impression from the one that they wished to convey to the elders, they concealed from the other elders, on the plea that the rest of the letter was private! It was while we were addressing the Ecclesia, Jan. 28, 1917 [Corrected, see E10, p. 318], on the course of the two, that we discovered and then exposed this trick, to the complete rout of the two managers. This foiled their plot.]

"At an elders' meeting held on Oct. 22, 1915, the question was discussed, in view of the Church now paying its own expenses, as to whether the limitations now upon the elders and deacons should be withdrawn—leaving the Congregation free to place *the control of its services and activities in their hands*. [Italics ours.] The matter was deferred for consideration of the new board of elders. In the event of the question being

raised at the business meeting, it was decided to tell the Church that the elders had the position under consideration, and their decision would be sent Bro. Russell.

"The action you now take exception to was really the fulfilment of this obligation. [There was no obligation imposed on anybody by the fact that the elders at H.J.S.'s and W.C.'s instance discussed that question and deferred action thereon. Had these two brothers been true to their duty, they would have felt obliged to report to our Pastor that they, his representatives, were trying to betray him. Their obligation was the reverse of the course they took; while such a discussion on the part of the elders put them under no obligation. Even had the elders commissioned them to betray our Pastor, would such a commission have obligated them to carry out the commission? How shallow is his reasoning!]

"29, Oct., 1915. The next expression of desire on the part of any of the Congregation for a change in policy was expressed by one of the deacons at a joint elders' and deacons' meeting, held Oct. 29, 1915, when a suggestion was made that the *affairs of the Church should be entirely in the hands of the elders and deacons* [italics ours], since the Congregation was bearing the financial responsibility. The Chairman, Bro. Hemery, in reply, stated that an entire change of policy would be involved, and the Church had not asked for it at the time it took over the finances. Such a change would need more discussion and thought. The elders were already considering the proposition, and it would be further considered by the new board.'

"28, Nov., 1915. On Sunday, Nov. 28, 1915, at a church meeting (not annual business meeting), the feeling was expressed that some change of policy might be desirable in respect to the appointment of speakers for the Tabernacle Sunday services. It was moved:—"That in view of the Congregation now paying

the Tabernacle expenses the Church suggests that the services of the elders be extended to the filling of Sunday Tabernacle appointments.' [This was one of our Pastor's functions, as a quotation given above proves.]

"The Chairman, Bro. Hemery, stated that to a limited extent the alteration was in operation. Bro. Russell, as Pastor, reserved to himself the appointment of the speakers at the Tabernacle services, but recently expressed that Bros. Shearn and Crawford should serve more frequently in this way, giving Bro. Hemery opportunity to serve provincial classes.' [This he also did increasingly.]

"This motion was lost by a considerable majority and the Chairman intimated that the feeling of the minority would be expressed to Bro. Russell. [J.H. denied that he ever made such a promise.]

"The result of the vote on this occasion would have been very different, in my estimation, had the expression of Bro. Russell's mind—as given in his letter of Oct. 22—been made known to the Congregation. [Different, we opine, in that its vote would have been about unanimous.]

"I have no knowledge of Bro. Russell's having been informed even of the feeling of the minority, and nothing which has transpired since would indicate that this was done. [We much doubt the statement as to our Pastor not having been told the sentiment of the minority.]

"March and April, 1916. The next thing of interest bearing upon this matter was the raising of the sum necessary to pay off the mortgage upon the Tabernacle by debenture bonds, which were fully subscribed for by the friends in Great Britain. This took place in March and April, 1916. [This was another step of our Pastor to relieve the depleted Tract Fund.]

"1, Sept., 1916. The feeling that the time had come for some alteration in the arrangements governing the

Tabernacle greatly increased during the year [in the hearts of a few ambitious elders and deacons, seemingly with almost no others], so much so that when the subject was approached at the elders' meeting, held on Friday, Sept. 1, 1916, it was unanimously agreed to hold a special elders' meeting on Saturday afternoon and evening, Sept. 16, to go fully into the question. [Above we showed how H.J.S. used Bro. Thackway as a catspaw to arouse the elders' interest.]

"16, Sept., 1916. At this meeting, Bro. Hemery suggested that, as *the question of the office of Assistant Pastor was involved*, he would willingly retire during part of the proceedings, but at the unanimous request of the elders he remained in the chair. A resolution submitted to the meeting was carried UNANIMOUSLY—the chairman not voting. It was suggested that a majority and minority report be drawn up for submission to Bro. Russell for the expression of his mind upon the matter. [This proves that the elders were not unanimous on changing matters.]

"21, Oct., 1916. A majority Report, including a Resolution proposed by myself and seconded by Bro. Crawford and signed by eleven out of eighteen elders, was sent to Bro. Russell, a copy of which you have seen.

"If you will kindly note carefully the various dates mentioned in the present communication, you will observe that—so far as is known to me—[?] the first suggestion of alteration in policy came from Bro. Russell himself in his letter dated Oct. 22, 1915. [This statement is out of harmony with the facts of the case; for before his letter was received, the elders, as H.J.S. above showed, discussed the question Oct. 22, 1915.] The obligations referred to in that letter could not be the financial obligations, as these were all [?] undertaken by the Congregation on Aug. 8, 1915, and Bro. Russell advised. [Above we showed that there were financial obligations, *e.g.*, the mortgage, that the

Ecclesia had not assumed; and that undoubtedly our Pastor wished the Ecclesia to assume this so as to relieve the Society amid its heavy financial obligations, while contributions were decreasing.] Had I not been aware of the foregoing facts, I should not have acted as I did, but in the circumstances I feel I was entirely justified.

As we read this letter we saw at once through its sophistries: and H.J.S.'s attempt to palm himself off as a faithful representative seeking to carry out the supposed wishes of "that Servant"—to be freed from controllership of the Tabernacle arrangements—while actually betraying him, disgusted us. This made us give him up as unhelpable by us; for the hypocrisy of the letter was too transparent to have any other effect. From that time on we expected one evil thing after another from him, and our expectations were not unrealized.

The Bethel and Tabernacle offenses of the two and their persistent opposition to us in our loving efforts to right British matters, culminating in their attempt to apply Matt. 18:15-18 to us for our *official* acts against them, as the Society's special representative, finally forced us to dismiss them as managers, as a necessary remedy for the British situation. The Church knows the rest: How J.F.R. busybodied, among other things, appointed, to judge on the facts as between them and us, an Investigation Commission, that justified us and condemned the two managers respecting both the Bethel and Tabernacle matters; how J.F.R. with characteristic arbitrariness and self-opinionatedness rejected his own Commissioner's findings; how he sided with the dismissed managers as against us; how he sought to reinstate them; how the Lord prevented his setting aside our solution of the British situation; and how J.F.R., as a smoke screen to hide his own usurpations, misrepresented the British situation in Harvest Siftings, to the whole Church. Does anyone

wonder how J.F.R., who knew the above-stated facts as to the wrong-doings of these two managers, could have taken sides with them as against us, whom, next to our Pastor, he once considered his best friend? The answer is simple: "Birds of a feather flock together." He was guilty of similar wrongs; therefore as their soul-mate he instinctively felt his heart kinship to them and his hostility to us, who opposed the usurpations of him and them alike. Hence, in the battle that we were waging for Truth and Righteousness against Revolutionists in their rebelling against the Lord's arrangements given through "that Servant" (Ps. 107:11), he instinctively felt that we must be crushed, if he would retain the fruits of his usurpations, and, of course, took the side of his like-minded and like-acting fellow-revolutionists! In this spirit he wrote Harvest Siftings, which, because of its gross wickedness, will be an eternal monument to his infamy; for it is one of the main features of that *smiting* referred to in Matt. 24:48-51.

The bulk of the British Church, from its knowledge of the facts of the case, despite J.F.R.'s efforts at whitewashing the two managers, steadfastly rejected them as proper representatives of the Lord and of the Church. By them our solution of the British situation has been accepted, though the majority of them adhere to the Society. Does one wonder why our Pastor's solution of the trouble between A.H. MacMillan and J.F.R. on the one hand and H.C. Rockwell on the other hand; and our solution of the quarreling British managers' claims, have both resulted in the antitypical Mahlites Merarites in both America and Britain gaining control of the Society's affairs? We answer: God evidently designed the antitypical Mahlites to control three of the four Corporations, or Associations (symbolic wagons, Num. 7:1-8), which were to fall to the lot of the antitypical Merarite Levites *i.e.*, Elisha was to get Elijah's mantle. Hence, He used our Pastor to

solve the American situation, and us to solve the British situation in ways that providentially resulted in the achievement of His purpose, though neither our beloved Pastor nor ourself at the time understood the uses the Lord was making of each of us.

But the antitypical Gershonites were to get two symbolic wagons, or chariots (Num. 7:1-8). So we should expect to find these in evidence. Nor have our expectations been in vain; for in America the P.B.I. is the corporation of the antitypical Shimite Gershonites, and in Britain a Committee of seven growing out of, and acting in sympathy with, Shearno-Crawfordism, having the two as members, is the Association that corresponds to the wagon of the typical Libnite Gershonites. As Gershon was the eldest son of Levi, and as Libni was the elder son of Gershon, so in Shearno-Crawfordism the antitypical Libnite Gershonites as the first set of antitypical Levites were manifested. The spiritual kinship of the P.B.I. (two of whose directors, I. Hoskins and J.D. Wright, knew of the wrongs of Shearno-Crawfordism, as can be seen from the findings of the Board's majority, June 20, 1917, given in Vol. III, Chap. VII) and "The Bible Students' Committee" (the name of the Shearno-Crawfordistic Committee in Britain) can be recognized from the very hearty endorsement that the P.B.I. gave the British Committee in the Herald of July 15, 1919, 210. Its sending I. Hoskins and R.E. Streeter to Britain to give them pilgrim and perhaps other help is also to the point. The sympathy of H.J.S. and W.C. with the P.B.I. can be seen in the first and third letters in the Herald '19, 112. Notice how in his letter W.C., *i.e.*, Wm. Crawford, approves getting back to "the Old Paths." As an evidence of his insincerity as to the "Old Paths," we need only mention the fact that at about the time of writing that letter he published a tract against our Pastor's view of the Church being under the cover of Jesus' imputed

merit, claiming that the Church is actually purchased—the heresy with which we charged him before the Board on our return from Britain. The initials H.J.S. at the end of the third letter on that same page stand for H.J. Shearn, ex-manager of the London Bethel. We believe that the P.B.I. and the "Bible Students' Committee" are well mated in their mutual sympathy; for no other Corporation has so grossly sinned against "that Servant's" Charter arrangements as the P.B.I.; and the members of no other Committee have so grossly sinned or justified sins against "that Servant's" Bethel and Tabernacle arrangements as these two of the "Bible Students' Committee."

This Committee published a number of circulars, one in May, 1919, another in July, 1919, and a third in Aug., 1919, making as a Committee, an offer of service to Non-Society-Adherents in Britain, somewhat after the manner of the Fort Pitt Committee's open letter of Mar., 1918. In these circulars, instead of a confession of their gross sins and a promise of amendment, on the part of H.J.S. and W.C., they complain that the Golden Rule was generally violated in what the connection implies was the course of the bulk of the British brethren and ourself toward them. Then, in their circulars, with gross hypocrisy, they offer to serve the brethren *in harmony with "that Servant's" arrangements*, which their main leaders, H.J.S. and W.C., so grossly violated. This is an illustration of the hypocrisy of the Libnite Gershonites, in their seeking to "draw disciples after them," even as the P.B.I.'s similar offer, accompanied with their agitating for and their making a charter different from "that Servant's" charter, is an example of the hypocrisy of the P.B.I., the Shimite Gershonites. It is because of such hypocrisy, revolutionism and other gross wrong-doings on their part that as a mouthpiece of the Lord we invite all God's Priests to sever themselves from these two institutions as parts of Little Babylon.

The Bible Students' Committee is seeking to get together as many British brethren as they can, even as the P.B.I. is trying to get together as many brethren as they can the world over. Additionally, the Bible Students' Committee is flirting with the Society for a reunion, even as the Greek Catholic Church has been flirting with the Roman Catholic Church for a reunion. In both sets of Babylon, not principle, but expediency, is the moving factor for reunion. In fact, we expect a co-operation of all the Levites against the Epiphany-enlightened Priests and against The Present Truth. Such a co-operation of Levites will act in the same spirit as the Papacy and the Federation have worked and will work against the Faithful. We understand that in Aug., 1920, fruitless efforts were made to bring about a reunion in Britain. It did not materialize in any other way than in the way the Prophet tells us those will be united who are folded together as full dry thorns fitted for the fire.

The British and American Gershonites, as the firstborn of antitypical Levi, had the opportunity of becoming the chief antitypical Levites. But ambition to be somebodies and revolutionism as the grossest Levitical rebellion have hindered this, resulting in their becoming the lowest in honor and usefulness in service among the antitypical Levites, as was the case with the typical Gershonites.

CHAPTER II.

SOME LIBNITE GERSHONITE ERRORS EXAMINED.

WM. CRAWFORD ON JUSTIFICATION. WM. CRAWFORD ON THE END OF ALL THINGS.

HIDING himself behind the name, The Old Paths Publications, W.C., a former British manager, whose revolutionary course as such has been described in Chapter I, and who was the first Levite to be forced out of the Holy into the Epiphany Court for his gross revolutionisms against the Lord's arrangements for the London Bethel and Tabernacle, has been publishing a series of tracts, one of which, on justification by faith, has been sent us by one of our correspondents. It will be recalled that one of the charges that we then brought against him was his denial, in opposition to our Pastor's teachings, of the Scriptural doctrine that our Lord's merit is during the Gospel Age *imputed* to the justified; and another was his affirmation that the Church is actually purchased. But the tract shows, even as we should expect of so stubborn a sifter, that he has gone into error on many other points connected with justification. The following are some of these other errors: (1) The Millennial-Age and Gospel-Age justifications are, respectively, *physical* and by *faith*. (2) The Ancient Worthies' and our justification are *exactly alike*. (3) Faith is the only thing that is imputed in justification. (4) Christ does not impute His merit for us Godward. (5) God and Christ do not impute that merit to us. (6) From Pentecost onward God for eternity holds as inalienably His the ransom's merit by right of our actual sale. (7) God must retain it or undo the ransom. (8) The doctrine of Christ's depositing His merit with the Father is untrue. (9) Christ's imputing its credit as a loan for and to us is erroneous.

(10) God alone justifies. (11) The justified receive Adam's, not Jesus', right to life and life-rights. (12) The life-rights of the Church will in the Millennium purchase Adam and the world.

Most of his errors are due to his confusing the work of the Ransomer, High Priest, Advocate, Mediator and Father. If we keep the distinctions in mind between the office works implied in these names, as set forth in Vol. IV, Chap. V, we will see through most of the fallacies of his position. Another thing that will help one to see through his fallacies is a well-rounded view that takes all the pertinent factors into consideration—a thing that he does not do. A third thing helpful in this connection is the teaching of Lev. 12, to the effect that the Little Flock developing Truth was gradually purified from error during the reaping period and was entirely free therefrom at its end, while W.C. in part holds on to the immature views of the early part of the Harvest to the denial of its mature final views. Without naming our Pastor, he almost throughout his tract opposes and seeks to refute our Pastor's mature findings—revolutionism. The above-mentioned twelve points, in addition to the two errors with which we charged him twenty-one years ago, show how he has progressed further in error. We will take up these points in the order given and refute them with Scripture, reason and facts from various viewpoints.

(1) His first wrong teaching is the following: The Millennial justification is physical in contrast with the Gospel Age's justification as being by faith. Thus stated, his view is soon seen to be both imperfect and specious, hiding, perhaps designedly, the real distinctions in these two forms of justification. The contrast between these two justifications, if the second is called justification by faith, is the following: justification by works as against justification by faith. Again, the Millennial justification will be physical, mental, moral and religious, not simply physical, if one would point out

the sides of human nature that are to experience justification. Hence he has given, from the standpoint of the sides of man's nature to experience justification, a very incomplete definition. But if the nature of the condition of justification, as to effects, in these two Ages is to be contrasted, the proper distinction is: the Millennial justification will be *actual*; the present one is *reckoned*, not actual. But his teaching denies a reckoned justification, because of the latter's inevitable implications as to the *imputation* of Christ's merit and a reckoned purchase by Christ as now operative, in contrast with the actual application of Christ's merit and an actual purchase operative in the Millennium. Thus we see the cloven hoof in the clumsy and illogical contrast that he tries to make between Millennial and present justification. He thus runs true to form.

(2) His next error is that the Ancient Worthies' and our justifications are exactly alike. As a matter of fact, they are alike only on one point, namely, the instrumental cause of justification in both cases is alike, *i.e.*, faith is the only part of righteousness which God has required both classes to exercise in order tentatively to impute righteousness to them. And it is the only thing that He has imputed to both classes as righteousness, and therein their justification (tentative) is much alike. God did not, as W.C. contends He did, impute the robe of righteousness to the Ancient Worthies; for the good reason that such a robe was not then in existence. The tract under review cites Job 29:14, where Job says: "I put on righteousness and it clothed me; and my judgment was as a robe and a diadem," as a proof that the robe of righteousness was imputed to the Ancient Worthies. But it confuses *God's* imputing the robe of righteousness in justification (Is. 61:10) with the Ancient Worthies' and our putting on (clothing ourselves with) the graces, of which righteousness, duty love, is one, in the work of sanctification (1 Pet. 5:5; Col. 3:12).

Clearly, Job 29:14 and its connection prove that Job refers here to sanctification, not to justification. As we will show under the next point, Christ's righteousness is imputed, first tentatively, then vitalizedly, in our justification, a thing that was not a part of the Ancient Worthies' justification. The only thing that in justification covered their sins was faith (Rom. 4:3-8), which is not the robe of righteousness; while in our justification faith and the robe of righteousness cover our sins (Is. 61:10; Rom. 4:23-25). Nor was there, nor could there have been, a tentative or vitalized imputation of Christ's merit Godward in the justification of the Ancient Worthies (since it was not yet in existence), while there is such an imputation in our justification. Again, life was not imputed to the Ancient Worthies in justification, while it is in our tentative and vitalized justification. The proof of these three points we will give under our third line of argument. Thus, while in one respect these two justifications are similar, in three other very material respects they are quite unlike, which must be kept in mind.

(3) The tract's third error is that faith is the only thing imputed in justification. As a consequence, it denies that Christ *imputes* His merit Godward *for* us, and that God has Him impute it *to* us. It most confusingly mixes up the ransom with justification, whereas it is not the Ransomer, but the Advocate—Attorney—who acts on our behalf in justification. Justification is a feature of a court scene, which implies God as Judge, His justice as the law, the sinner as guilty defendant and Christ as Attorney, who satisfies justice in its twofold demands on the defendant: (1) who has broken the law and thus is guilty, justice, therefore, demanding his death, and (2) additionally, justice demands his perfect obedience to its laws, which demand the sinner cannot meet. As Advocate, Jesus satisfies both of these demands of justice—(1) His death, the evidence of which is His blood, offered as such in heaven

after His ascension, satisfying its demands for the sinner's death, and (2) His righteousness as a perfect human being satisfying the demands of justice for the sinner's perfect obedience to all its laws. The tract under review entirely ignores this second part of the Advocate's work Godward and usward, and that for the good reason that it denies what unanswerably flows from it, *i.e.*, the only way that Christ's righteousness can be instantly bestowed, as it is in a faith-justifying dispensation, Godward and manward combinedly, is by imputation; because there cannot be an instantaneous *making* of a depraved character righteous, as distinct from *imputing* it righteous. It must, therefore, if it is done instantly, be done by imputation, both Godward and manward; for an actual giving of it instantly would be nonsense in a character-production process, an annihilation of such a process! Hence Christ's human, not new-creaturely, righteousness is in justification as a part of His merit imputed for and to the believer tentatively before and vitalizedly after consecration; for if Christ's human righteousness is imputed to us, it must have before been imputed *to* Divine Justice for us, the former implying the latter. Therefore there are three imputations in justification: (1) the merit of Christ's death and righteousness imputed to God's justice *for* us; (2) His righteousness imputed *to* us; and (3) faith—a part of righteousness—imputed to us for righteousness, *i.e.*, all that the Father insists on our having, if He would justify us. The Advocate's work, therefore, destroys the main erroneous positions of the tract under review, *i.e.*, that faith is the only thing imputed as righteousness in justification, which, without the Advocate, in the case of the Ancient Worthies was the only thing imputed; for it proves that Christ's righteousness is therein imputed Godward and manward.

Additionally, the idea of substitution which is the special feature of the Advocate's work—that of our

Attorney appearing in Court for us as clients—wherein He substituted His death for our death sentence, and a sufficiency of His righteousness for our lacks in righteousness to satisfy instantaneously the two demands of justice on us for our instantaneous justification, and wherein He later substitutes as much of His righteousness as is needed to cover our post-justification sins instantly (1 John 2:1, 2) unanswerably proves that all of the acts in the heavenly Court that produce justification for us are imputative and from the nature of substitution cannot be otherwise. The Ransomer's work can be by the loan of His credit—a reckoned purchase—or by an actual purchase; but the Advocate's cannot be otherwise than by imputation; for the Advocate's work is that of substitution, which in its very nature must be imputative. How could another's death become ours except by imputation? How could another's righteousness become instantaneously ours except by imputation? But His death does become ours (Is. 53:3-12; 1 Cor. 15:3; 2 Cor. 5:19; 1 John 2:2); and His righteousness does become ours instantaneously (Rom. 4:20-26; 10:4; 1 Cor. 1:30; 2 Cor. 5:21; Gal. 2:16; 3:22; Phil. 3:9; in the first and in the last three citations the expression faith of Jesus Christ means the faithfulness, righteousness, of Jesus Christ as a human being). These considerations on the Advocate's work—substitution—overthrow practically every point of the tract under review in its attacks on our Pastor's teachings on justification. Its errors on this point, let us repeat, are due to its failure to recognize that it is the Advocate's, not the Ransomer's work to effect justification by faith during the Gospel Age. It is the instantaneousness of the Advocate's securing all the features of justification that limits the Advocate's work to this Age; for the Millennial justification will require the thousand years to accomplish, and therefore there will then be no Advocate.

We further disprove the proposition that faith is the only imputed thing in justification by another line of thought—everything in the Gospel-Age justification is a matter of imputation. Thus the removal of death that we experience therein is not an actual, but a reckoned thing. So, too, the bestowal of perfect and eternal life that we receive therein is also not actual, but reckoned; otherwise we would not be dying, which we do even apart from sacrificing, and would have perfect bodies (John 5:27, 28; 1 John 5:12). Moreover, our perfection is not an actual, but a reckoned thing (Heb. 10:14); otherwise we would be actually flawless. Admittedly, faith is imputed as righteousness in the present Age (Rom. 4:3-8, 23-25). Undoubtedly, the Bible teaches that Christ in His human righteousness is made our righteousness (Rom. 3:21-26; 10:4; 1 Cor. 1:30; 2 Cor. 5:21; Gal. 2:16; 3:22; Phil. 3:9; as pointed out above the expression, faith of Jesus Christ, in the first and last three of the above passages means, the faithfulness, righteousness, of Jesus Christ as a human being); and as we showed above, this cannot be possible in a faith-justification dispensation except as an imputed matter. Above we proved that the use of the merit by the Advocate Godward, in the Court picture, is also an imputed matter; for in a substitution of one for another the substitute's merits cannot be given, they must be imputed to the other. And, finally, a seventh fact proves this: Not His full merit, but only so much of the Substitute's merit is imputed to each one as is needed to bring up his deficiencies to perfection. This principle is manifest from certain features connected with the ransom, but not of the entire ransom-price itself, in the jubilee type: The varying prices paid to redeem, not a debt (which required the whole sum—typical of the debt of the human all surrendered in death and met in the ransom), but a slave or a piece of property, dependent on the length of time to the next jubilee, were typical

of the varying amounts of the ransom-merit required for the reckoned purchase to bring people from varying degrees of imperfection to perfection. Such a transaction types how the credit of parts of the ransom-merit are loaned to *individuals*, squaring each of them with human perfection, which is typed by the jubilee condition—restitution. That this same principle of dealing applies to the Advocate's picture is evident from 1 John 2:1, 2, where the Advocate is shown to make good before Divine Justice our sins of weakness and ignorance committed even after we entered the state of both tentative and vitalized justification, the Advocate's picture proving that imputation, not an actual or reckoned buying, is the pertinent act. These seven things connected with justification, covering its every aspect in the present Age, demonstrate that in justification, not only is faith imputed for righteousness, but also Christ's merit (His death and righteousness) is imputed Godward and usward. But they prove more than this. They prove that the buying of the Church by our Lord is not an actual, but a reckoned thing, which fact destroys practically every error of the tract under review in its opposition to the Scriptural views of our Pastor, and, prove our Pastor to have taught correctly on the pertinent subjects, as by 1914 he did on all reaping subjects.

(4) and (5) The two errors of the tract marked (4) and (5) above, *i.e.*, that Christ does not impute His merit for the Church Godward, but pays it over to God in a finished actual purchase, and that God does not impute Christ's merit to us, are disproved by the two preceding points and need no further discussion.

(6) The sixth error of the tract is this: From Pentecost onward God for eternity holds as inalienably His the ransom-price by right of an *actual* sale. The tract attempts to prove this by Heb. 9:12. But the eternal redemption here spoken of was obtained before Jesus entered the Most Holy; "*having* obtained eternal

redemption," therefore it has no reference to putting the blood on the antitypical mercy seat, let alone binding it to remain there eternally. It refers to His sin-offering merit, which Paul calls our eternal redemption, because it was to secure the latter by its sprinkling on the mercy seat and altar. No Scripture teaches the thought of the tract under review, that God from Pentecost onward must forever hold the ransom as inalienably His. In elaborating this point the tract mixes up the sin-offering with the ransom figure, and utterly neglects to discuss the only feature pertinent to justification—the Advocate's work of substitution—in connection with the discussion of the pertinent point; but claims as proof of its contention that the blood remained on the mercy seat. While the merit used in ransoming and in making atonement is one and the same, the acts differ: the one purchases, the other reconciles. W.C. uses the point that the blood was left on the mercy seat, where it took away God's displeasure at our sins, to prove that nothing was imputed to us of Christ's merit in justification. But he forgot that the same blood was sprinkled upon the altar to reconcile it (Lev. 16:18). This altar represents the humanity of Jesus and the Church. The sprinkling of the bullock's blood on that altar did not type the imputation of Jesus' merit to Himself, for He did not need it for perfection. Rather, it typed His imputation of His merit to us, as distinct from His imputing it to God to take away His anger at our sins (sprinkling it on the mercy seat). These two things complete the first part of our reconciliation to God, making us pleasing *to God*; while the sprinkling of the goat's blood on the altar types the performing of the second part of our atonement, making God pleasing to us, which occurs through the perfecting of our characters by our sacrificial suffering—the antitypical Goat's blood. This consideration completely refutes his point taken from the blood remaining on the mercy seat, as

a proof that Christ's merit is not imputed to us in addition to its being placed on the antitypical mercy seat. The same thing is proven by Lev. 9:9, and is implied in v. 12. Aaron's sons' presenting the bullock's blood to Aaron types the Little Flock's offering their tentatively-received justification—tentatively reckoned perfect bodies, right to life and life-rights—to Christ in consecration; and Aaron's sprinkling it on the altar represents our Lord's performing that part of His; work of vitalizing our justification that consists of His imputing to us the amount of His merit needed to make us pleasing to God; and thus He completes the first part of the *at-one-ment*, which first part has these two steps: (1) by the blood covering the antitypical mercy seat, taking away God's anger at our sins; and (2) by the blood on the antitypical altar, making Him pleased with us as righteous (by Christ's imputed merit). The sprinkling of the blood not only on the book, but on the people, in principle, disproves this sixth error (Heb. 9:19-23). These considerations destroy the sixth error of W.C.'s tract and lend further proof against the tract's third, fourth and fifth errors.

(7) His seventh error is that God must retain the ransom-price or the ransom work would be void. He uses this point against the thought that Christ gets His ransom-merit back from the Father and then loans the credit of it to the Church now, and will give it to the world in the next age. In P '29, 44, par. 6, we give seven facts that prove that God does this very thing. We herewith quote those proofs:

"We know that God gives back to Jesus the ransom price as an asset after Jesus uses it to purchase Adam's forfeited assets, from the following facts: (1) In the priesthood figure, not only did Aaron sprinkle the blood on the mercy seat (satisfy justice), but he made atonement for the altar (made our humanity reckonedly perfect). (2) In the mediator figure, not only did Moses sprinkle the book (satisfy justice), but he

also sprinkled of the blood of the bulls and goats on the people (typically lifted the people up to perfection by typically bestowing of his merit on them). (3) John 6:27-58 and 3:15, 16 also show the double giving; for John 3:15, 16 shows that the ransom of the Son cancels the sentence ("not perish") and gives perfection ("eternal life") and John 6:27-58 shows that the meat which endureth unto everlasting life is given by the Son. And that meat is His flesh (v. 27). In v. 33 He shows that this is His humanity and that it gives life to the world, not simply forgiveness of sins. V. 50 shows that His humanity, if appropriated by a person, will keep one from death, frees from and keeps free from the sentence. V. 51 shows that His humanity is that which He will give for the *life* of the world, that is, for the bestowing of everlasting life upon him who appropriates ("eats") it. John 6:27-58, therefore, shows that our Lord's death not only cancels the sins of the Church and the world, but also bestows life everlasting on the one who appropriates that which He laid down, that is, His humanity and His right to life and life-rights. In these verses His flesh stands for His humanity and His blood for His human right to life and human life-rights.

"(4) The same is taught in the Lord's Supper: Our eating of the bread represents not only that we appropriate forgiveness, but that we appropriate what He was—a perfect human being with His right to life and life-rights—'This is [represents] My body which is given for you, etc.' This is evidently represented in the Lord's Supper, even as John 6 gives the key to the understanding of that Supper. (5) Heb. 10:14 shows that by His merit He perfects the humanity of the Church, not only that He secures its forgiveness. (6) Jesus, being the Second Adam, as a Father gives life that is His own to the world, as well as imputes it to us, in addition to securing forgiveness. (7) In justification the same things work: God forgives us and the

righteousness of Christ is imputed to us as our righteousness (Rom. 3:21, 22; 10:4; 1 Cor. 1:30; 2 Cor. 5:21; Gal. 2:16; 3:22; Phil. 3:9). These seven proofs show that Jesus' merit not only cancels the sentence, but also gives perfect humanity with the pertinent rights imputedly to the Church and actually to the world." So far our quotation from P '29, 44, par. 6. We might add to them both proofs previously given above, from Lev. 16:18 and 9:9, 12. Also the Jubilee type shows this. To cancel a debt before the Jubilee required its full payment: The whole ransom must be reckonedly paid to God to secure us from bankruptcy resulting in slavery to God unto death—the antitype of the debt; but to release one from slavery or one's property from others' ownership before the Jubilee required a graded payment, dependent on the varying lengths of time to the Jubilee. This types the fact that only so much of the ransom-merit is imputed for and to one as is needed to make him perfect. The above ten proofs demonstrate the falsity of the seventh error, whose folly is now manifest.

Moreover, his seventh error is transparent nonsense for it implies that one having received full payment in a business transaction, cannot use the purchase price for some other financial matter without voiding the first transaction. In business such things are constantly being done; and who is so foolish as to claim that the later transactions void the earlier? Moreover, there would be no ransom-price available for the purchase of the world unless God and our Lord by a reckoned, not an actual purchase, had so arranged as to let Jesus have a claim on the deposited merit in order later to purchase, actually, the world; for if to make operative a faith-justification method of salvation, our Lord had to surrender forever His claim on His merit by an actual purchase, such an arrangement would have estopped His having the ownership of that merit to purchase the world for a works justification method

of salvation. The tract seeks to evade the force of this fact by the claim that the world is not purchased by Christ's ransom-merit, but by the Church's life-rights! The mess it makes of this matter we will consider later. But this evasion shows the straits to which W.C. is put by his errors on justification.

(8) His next error is the teaching that it is untrue that Christ put His merit on deposit with the Father. This error directly contradicts the proper translation of Luke 23:46.

(9) His ninth error is: Christ does not impute in the Advocate's figure, or in the ransom figure lend to us the credit of, His merit. Above we have given abundant proof that He does. To prove its point the tract under review claims that one cannot pay a debt by a loan. Then it gives as an illustration of its meaning: a man lending to his creditor for a week the amount of his debt and claiming that he thereby discharges his debt. If that illustration fitted the case that it is alleged to illustrate, of course it would prove the tract's point; but it utterly fails to fit the case. The following is the actual situation: The whole race is involved in the debt of Adam—it stands in full against each and all. It, therefore, requires as much to purchase one as to purchase all. God sees that the race so involved in debt consists of two classes: (1) a faith class, capable of development in character fit for spiritual natures of varying orders; and (2) an unbelief class capable of development no higher than perfect human nature. He desires to help each to attain his highest possibilities. Therefore He determined to deal with the faith class under faith-exacting conditions which they can endure and which will fit them for various spiritual natures—conditions too strenuous for the others to endure because of their lack of faith, whom, therefore, He decides to try under conditions not so exacting as to faith, as under such only can they be successful. But all alike have

the same debt against them, whose full equivalent our Lord has, in their interests. It being necessary to test these two classes under two different dispensational provisions, and it taking all Christ's merit to free one or all in the first dispensational process, some arrangement had to be devised to make it available for the second; otherwise the one and same debt owed by those under the second would have no corresponding-price available to free its subjects. To meet this situation, God arranged for Christ, not actually, but reckonedly to purchase the Church, as follows: (1) to deposit the ransom-price into God's hands (Luke 23:46); (2) to appear before God to purchase (reckonedly) only the Church (Rev. 5:9; 14:3, 4), by imputing the credit of His deposit with God for the Church. God could accept a loan of the credit of this deposit without violating Divine Justice, and that for three reasons: (1) The Deposit covered the full debt involved; (2) it left that price fully in His hands; and (3) Christ previously pledged Him that He would put all on whose behalf He loaned the credit of the Deposit into death as humans forever—either into the sacrificial death (Little Flock), or the ministerial death (Great Company), or the second death,—so that God would actually, as long as they lived, have in His hands the full value of their debt to Him, as security for His full rights in them.

These three things made God fully satisfied by a loan of credit to us which was covered fully by the ransom-price as security. And since this remains in God's hands until the pertinent persons are all dead forever as humans, the involved acts are properly to be regarded as a reckoned purchase. This, also, when all the pertinent persons are dead, leaves the deposit free from claims of the formerly outstanding loans of credit; for the formerly outstanding loans will be no longer loans, the death of the pertinent persons freeing the merit from the embargoes on it; for beings

(the human beings) who are dead forever in the hands of Justice can no more have the loans formerly made for them, their human all now being forever in the hand of the creditor as owned by Him, which cancels the loans. Hence at the end of this Age the deposited merit will be free from all embargoes formerly resting on it by virtue of the outstanding loans of its credit. Hence Christ, owning this deposit, has it available for an actual purchase of the world, which He will make, to cause the works-justifying process of salvation to operate. The many proofs that we gave above of imputations, which in the ransom figure assume the actuality of a reckoned purchase by a deposit, by a surrender of temporal control over the deposit to God and by loans of credit from our Lord to us, prove that the Gospel-Age arrangement was made effective as above described, and conserve the ownership of the ransom with our Lord actually to purchase the world in the next Age. How utterly unfit to the actual conditions as above described is, therefore, the tract's illustration to prove one cannot pay a debt by a week's loan of the amount of the debt. Our proofs above demonstrate the imputation and the reckoned purchase by Jesus as Advocate and Ransomer.

(10) The tenth proposition as given in the tract is in part erroneous. It is this, *viz.*, God alone justifies. While He is the most important agent in justification, He is one of three agents therein. The complete truth on the subject is this: Three agents justify, but each from a different standpoint: (1) God as Benefactor and Judge alone is the originating and efficient cause of justification (Rom. 8:33); (2) Christ alone is the meritorious cause of justification (Rom. 3:22-26; 5:1; 10:4; 1 Cor. 1:30; 2 Cor. 5:21; Gal. 2:16; 3:22; Phil. 3:9); (3) Faith is the only instrumental cause of justification, *i.e.*, the only agent that lays hold on and appropriates justification (see passages just referred to and numerous others).

(11) The next error of the tract under review is: The justified received Adam's, not Jesus' right to life and life-rights. It falls into this error as follows: Jesus purchases Adam's forfeited rights, which would then be His assets after the purchase; therefore the Church receives Adam's, not Jesus' right to life and life-rights. We have already discussed this question (P '29, 44, 45). Above we gave many proofs to the contrary. Jesus' merit purchases Adam's life-rights; but the Scriptures clearly show, in part by the proofs that we gave under (3) and (7), that it is Jesus' right to life and life-rights that are imputed to us and that will be given to the world. It is the bullock's blood that was sprinkled on the altar—Jesus' and the Church's humanity, but here sprinkled only for the Church's humanity (Lev. 16:18; 9:9, 12). It will be the blood of the antitypical Bullock and Goat that will be sprinkled on the antitypical people—the world (Heb. 9:19-23). Thus He is not only the propitiation for the Church and the world (1 John 2:2), but life for the Church and the world. Adam is not the father of our and the world's justified humanity. Jesus is the reckoned Father—life-giver—of our humanity (John 5:27, 28; 1 John 5:12), and will be the actual Father of the world (Is. 9:6); for He, not the Adam who sinned, and who forever lost life for us, is the Second Adam, the Second Life-Giver, who gives eternal life (1 Cor. 15:45-48); for, as per P '29, 44, 45, quoted above, God arranged with Jesus to have the right of imputing or giving His, not Adam's, rights. Adam's are not used at all in these acts, reckonedly or actually.

(12) The final error of the tract under review that we will answer is this: The life-rights of the Church will purchase Adam and the world in the Millennium. The tract's author thinks that this is true, because the Church is the antitype of the Lord's goat as a sin-offering. This error, in the first place, is based on a confusion of the ransom and the Church's share in the

sin-offering; and is supposed to be taught by the type of Lev. 16. But its propounder has seemingly forgotten that it is the merit of the antitypical Bullock that constitutes the merit of the antitypical Goat, and not, as he says, the merit of the antitypical Goat that constitutes the merit of the second sin-offering's blood-sprinkling. The type of Lev. 9 was given for the express purpose of denying that it is the Church's merit that atones (Lev. 9:7); for Lev. 9:7 shows that it was the bullock's blood that made atonement for everyone in Israel: priests, Levites and Israelites, though the goat's blood was connected with it in this service. Please read our Pastor's remarks on this in T 79. The proper thought is this: Christ's merit is by and through the second sin-offering—the humanity of the Church—made available for the purchase of the world; thus Christ's merit through the Church's sin-offering purchases the world, makes propitiation for the world (1 John 2:2), seals the Covenant worldward (blood of bulls and goats; Heb. 9:19-23), gives the right to life and life-rights (Second Adam), etc., etc., etc.

But the real mess that W.C. makes of his thought that the Church's life-rights will purchase—ransom—Adam and the world, comes out in the way the tract tries to explain how the life-rights of 144,000 persons can ransom Adam and his race: He puts it like this: Christ and the Church as the Mystery have but one individuality; hence the 144,000 life-rights are a corresponding price for Adam and the race. This is a total error. They are indeed one Company, one Body, and have but one will and, therefore, but one identity, but they have 144,001 individualities. Each member of the Christ is an individual ("We being many are one Body"), though they have only one identity—the Head. The Body's human life-rights are those of 144,000 individuals. Hence these cannot be the corresponding price—the purchase-price—of

the life-rights of Adam (his lost race never had life-rights or the right to life). A corresponding-price—a perfect human being with the right to life and life-rights—is the purchase-price for Adam; and this corresponding-price, including among its life-rights the right to beget a race with the right to life with its accompanying life-rights, covers all the needs of the race lost in Adam by that particular life-right. Thus our Lord alone ransoms the Church by a reckoned purchase and Adam and his race by an actual purchase. The Church shares in the ransom, not from the standpoint of its merit being the ransom-price for the world, but from the standpoint (1) that: Her sacrifice, as sharing in His sufferings, makes Christ's ransom-price available for use in purchasing the world; and (2) as members of His, sharing with Him in the ownership of His human merit, or as His Bride, sharing with Him, Her Husband, in all His possessions (and this thought underlies all pertinent types and literal Scriptures); but (3) not by her own human life-rights being used as the purchase-price is Adam and the world ransomed; for these are the life-rights of 144,000 individuals, and no amount of juggling with words can make them a corresponding-price to Adam's forfeited rights. Christ's merit and Christ's merit alone is the ransom-price. A humble spirit would never have taught the error that we have just refuted.

Before closing this subject we desire to refer to an error that is not held by W.C., so far as we know, but that a correspondent of ours has allowed to deceive her into endorsing the teachings of an elder whose views we refuted in P '29, 44, 45, under the title, *Some Ransom Considerations*. She says that she was led to endorse his view which denies that Christ's righteousness is imputed to us, because, she says, it is impossible to spot the robe of Christ's righteousness. If she had understood that our Lord imputes to each one, not all

of His human righteousness, but only so much as is needed to bring up his imperfect qualities to perfection, she would perhaps be able to see how we can spot our own robes, which are called Christ's righteousness, because He supplements our lacks of perfection until we are brought up to perfection. *E.g.*, Paul may have lacked ten per cent of perfection; hence (as the Jubilee type, as above explained, proves) our Lord would in his case impute but ten per cent of His human righteousness, which would make him reckonedly perfect and would constitute with his ninety per cent of perfection his robe (Col. 2:10; 2 Cor. 12:9). So viewed, our robe of righteousness, properly called, Christ's righteousness, can be spotted, not in that part of it which our Lord imputed, but in that part of it which we in ourselves had of good, though imperfect, and therefore had to be supplemented by as much of Christ's merit as is needed to make us reckonedly perfect. Our sins do not spot His merit, but our good.

Let us be on our guard, Beloved, especially on the ransom and sin-offerings; for these are Satan's chief target, and he above all things seeks to make the *Feet* dash against that Rock (Ps. 91:12). If we dwell—are faithful—in the secret place—the antitypical Holy—we will be kept safe (Ps. 91:1-6).

In the Oct., Nov. and Dec., 1932, Berean Bible Student is published an article entitled, The End Of All Things, written by W.C., who was the first Levite to be led to the gate, who now masks himself under the name of The Old Paths Publications, and who in this, as in other tracts of his, forsakes the old paths as they were pointed out to the Lord's people by that Servant and points to new and devious paths for their feet. Apart from the one just examined and the one that we are now about to examine, we will not devote any more space to the examination of the numerous errors in his many other articles and tracts. Now to the one before us. We will first quote G.K. Bolger's

endorsement of it (an endorsement of revolutionism) and his analysis of it, so that our readers may see what the teachings of the article are. Then we will give our understanding of the main pertinent points as a basis for our refutation of its positions. G.K. Bolger's comments are as follows:

"If the reader will turn to the Comments on Daniel, chapters 2 and 7, and Revelation, chapters 12, 13 and 17, he will be instantly convinced that the present study is indeed a *supplementary* contribution which establishes more firmly than ever the Truth already brought from the 'storehouse' by our beloved Pastor. It bears the unmistakable evidence of having been produced by one of the faithful 'scribes' (writers) of whom Jesus spoke in Matt. 13:52, who, 'instructed in the Kingdom of Heaven' is like 'a householder who bringeth forth out of his treasury *things new and old.*' In order that the reader may visualize beforehand the salient features that are *different*, as well as those points that are *identical* with the views already given of the 'Gentile beast' in 'Studies in The Scriptures,' the following outline is herewith given: It must be borne in mind throughout this study that the 'Four Beasts' of Daniel are identical with the *first four* [heads] of the 'seven beasts' [heads] of Revelation which depicts but *one beast* 'having seven heads,' and also an 'eighth, which is *of the seven.*' It is therefore evident that the seven stages of the one long period of Gentile dominion, are most vividly represented by *seven heads* upon the *one Gentile beast*, whose *first head* was Babylon.

"First Head, Babylon, represented by Nebuchadnezzar.

"Second Head, the Kingdom of Medo-Persia.

"Third Head, the Kingdom of Greece.

"Fourth Head, Imperial Rome.

"Fifth Head, Papal Rome.

"Sixth Head, Protestantism—the English 'Mother' church and her daughters.

"Seventh Head, 'The League of Nations'—*not as now seen*, in the making—but as the 'image of the Beast,' possessing *life and great power*.

"Eighth Head, Papacy, the Man of Sin, Son of Perdition—the beast that was, and is not, and yet now is' restored to *temporal power*—having 'ascended out of the bottomless pit.' This 'head' will be the last 'end' of the Gentile 'beast,' which 'goeth into perdition'—utter destruction, oblivion."

Thus it is seen that G.K.B. credulously swallows this view, hook, line, sinker, bobber and pole, just as he did Adam Rutherford's view on, Behold the Bridegroom. Though recognizing that it differs materially from our Pastor's, he claims that it substantiates his view and while at it he betrays him with Judas-like kisses, "our dear Pastor," as he has often before done while advocating teachings contrary to his. As a means of furnishing a firm foundation for our refutation of these "new views," we will make some general remarks on the fourth beast of Dan. 7, and on the beasts of Rev. 12, 13 and 17.

Not only in general does Studies, Vol. III, pp. 19-226, cover the main features of Rev. 12, 13 and 17, but specifically on page 131 do we find a diagram that gives us a partial key to the seven-headed and ten-horned beast of Rev. 17 and a fairly full key to the seven-headed and ten-horned beasts of Rev. 12 and 13. Please see the diagram. The foregoing remark leads to another consideration that must be kept in mind to enable us to see daylight on the subject of Daniel's ten- (eleven, counting the little—papal—horn) horned beast and the three seven-headed and ten-horned beasts of Rev. 12, 13 and 17. While in general they represent the Roman government, they represent it from four not just identical standpoints. The ten horns of Daniel's beast are not the same ten

horns as those of the three Revelation beasts. The following are the eleven horns of Daniel's beast: The Roman Republic; The Roman Empire; The Western Empire; The Kingdom of the Heruli; The Kingdom of the Ostrogoths; The Papacy; The Exarchate of Ravenna; The Kingdom of the Longobards; The Holy Roman Empire; The Kingdom of Naples, and The Kingdom of Italy. The seventh, eighth and tenth of these did not hold sway over the city of Rome; the others did; and all of them held sway over more or less of Italy. The reason why we begin with the Roman Republic is because the fourth beast of Daniel 7 had it as its first form to come under the scope of Scriptural prophecy. Again, the seven heads of the beasts of Rev. 12 and 13 are not just the same as the seven heads of the beast of Rev. 17, though much alike. The diagram (Studies, Vol. III, 131) shows that he there counts Rome as a republic as the first head, and this is correct for the beasts of Rev. 12 and 13, but it is not correct for the beast of Rev. 17. Why, one may ask, should we differentiate between the ten (eleven) horns of Daniel's beast and the ten horns of the three Revelation beasts? We answer that the ten horns of the Revelation beasts are contemporaneous and exist at present (Rev. 17:12-17), while the fact that three horns were plucked up to make way for the little horn proves that all of the horns of Daniel's beast were not mainly contemporaneous, but arose successively, just as the seven heads of the (Rev. 12, 13) beasts are not contemporaneous, but arose successively, and those of the Rev. 17, except two, are not contemporaneous, but all arose successively. Again, most of the ten horns of Daniel's beast exist no more, while the ten horns of the Revelation beast all now exist. Briefly, we would say that we understand the ten horns of the Dan. 7 beast to represent successive powers that ruled in Italy, either in or outside of Rome, while the ten horns of the Revelation beasts

represent the *ten language nations* of Europe, reigning for most of the time contemporaneously (Zech. 8:23). The connection shows this passage to apply at the end of this Age. Europe for centuries has consisted of more than ten nations. There are now over twenty of them there. But for centuries Europe has consisted, and still consists (as Zechariah says), of ten language nations—"ten men of all the languages of the [European] nations," even as Israel, with Hebrew as its national language, though citizenized in many nations, is spoken of as an eleventh man in the same verse. These ten language nations are as follows: Greek, Turkish, Slavic, Magyar, Scandinavian, English, Hispanian, French, Germanic and Italian. There is, apart from scattered Israel, no other language group existing governmentally in Europe than these ten. Thus Zech. 8:23 gives us the key to the ten horns of the three beasts.

But why, one may ask, do we claim a difference between the seven heads of the beasts of Rev. 12 and 13 and the seven heads of the beast of Rev. 17? We reply: From the diagram in Studies, Vol. III, 131, we see that Rome as a republic was the first head of Rev. 12 and 13. This cannot be true of the first head of Rev. 17; for Rome as a republic had ceased to be before our Lord's birth, Augustus being the first Roman Emperor, and Tiberius, his successor, being on the throne years before our Lord's baptism and death (Luke 2:1; 3:1-3), while, according to Rev. 17:9, 10, the Roman Catholic Church, which did not arise until nearly three centuries later, sat on all seven of the heads of the Rev. 17 beast, *i.e.*, was supported by all seven of these heads. Hence its first head came after Rome as a republic ceased to exist. Moreover, it was only after the Dioclesian persecution ceased, 313 A.D., that the Roman Catholic Church began to be supported by the Roman Empire, *i.e.*, after Constantine, the first Christian Emperor, came to the throne.

Hence the Pagan Roman had changed into the so called Christian Roman Empire, when the Roman Catholic Church began to sit on the first of the heads on which she has sat. Hence, from the standpoint of Rev. 17, we may call the first head of its beast, the so-called Christian Roman Empire. Its next five heads are the following: The Western Empire, the Kingdom of the Heruli, the Kingdom of the Ostrogoths, the Papacy and the Kingdom of Italy founded by the House of Savoy in 1870, which, as our Pastor correctly taught, is the seventh head of the beasts of Rev. 12 and 13. A marked difference between the eleven horns of Daniel's beast and the seven heads of the three Revelation beasts is this: all of these heads ruled at Rome; but not all of Daniel's horns ruled at Rome, though all ruled in Italy.

What is the seventh head of the beast of Rev. 17? It must have come into existence years after 1870; for the angel's statement (Rev. 17:10) to the effect that the sixth head—the Italian Kingdom as the seventh of the Rev. 12 and 13 beasts—was in existence, was made from 1891 onward to 1914; and, as we will show that the State of the Vatican recently established is the eighth head, the seventh must have already come. What, then, is it? We reply: It is the Fascist Italian State, which, having overthrown the Italian Constitution adopted under the House of Savoy and having destroyed parliamentarianism, an essential part of the Italian Kingdom, has organized an entirely different form of government from the limited monarchy established by the House of Savoy. Its establishment followed the Fascist Revolution of late Oct., 1922, whose climax was the Fascists' march to, and occupation of Rome. Hence it is another kingdom and is the seventh head of the Rev. 17 beast. The viewpoints of the pictures of Rev. 12 and 13, beginning with the Rome republic, when Rome first came to view in prophecy, and stopping short of the Time of Trouble,

1914, naturally do not contemplate the Fascist Italian State within their scope; while the Rev. 17 viewpoint, embracing exclusively the period of the Roman Catholic Church in its being supported by the Roman State (the woman seated on the seven heads), begins with the time of Constantine, shortly after 313, and ends with the harlot's annihilation in Armageddon. From this last viewpoint, we understand the Fascist Italian State to be the seventh and the Vatican State to be the eighth, head of the Rev. 17 beast.

There are some contrasted expressions that should be kept in mind while thinking on the subject of the beasts in Revelation. One of these is this: Whereas in Rev. 12, 13 and 16 the Roman government *as a political power exclusively* in its various phases is meant by the dragon, beginning with Rev. 13, and always afterward, the expression, *the beast*, applies to it as it exists *in the papacy*, one of its heads. Hence from Rev. 12 onward, the civil power as distinct from the papacy is called *the dragon*, while in contrast the papacy invariably from Rev. 13 onward is called *the beast*. This contrast can be seen especially as between chapters 12 and 13 and also in chapter 13, and is very manifest in Rev. 16:13, as it is also in part seen in Ps. 91:13. This also applies to chapter 17. Thus the sixth head of the beasts of Rev. 12 and 13 and the fifth and eighth heads of the beast of Rev. 17, are the papacy; and, while at the same time it thus is meant by certain heads, it also from Rev. 13 onward is called *the beast*. Another peculiarity of contrasted expressions that should be kept in mind is the clear-cut distinction that Rev. 17 makes between the Roman Catholic Church and the papacy, which most people look upon as the same. The Roman Catholic Church is a denomination. The papacy (in its full sense) is the hierarchy, which has as its head the pope, and which has usurped control of the Roman Catholic Church. The Roman Catholic Church existed before the papacy. This distinction is shown in several

ways in Rev. 17. The Roman Catholic Church is the harlot who sits on the beast (Rev. 17:3), which is the papacy. Again, she is the woman who sits on the seven heads, one of which, as well as the beast, is the papacy (Rev. 17:9).

The seven heads are defined (v. 9) first in a figurative way, as seven mountains, and then, literally, as seven kings, which word in prophecy is frequently used for kingdoms (Dan. 2:44; 7:17, 24; 8:20; 11:5, 6, etc.), while in many passages, the word, mountain, is used figuratively to represent a kingdom (Dan. 2:35; Is. 2:2, 3; 11:9; 25:6, 7, 10; 30:29; 56:7; 57:7, 13; 65:11, 25; 66:20, etc.). The time that God's people began to expound, etc., the message of Vol. III as to the Roman government in its various heads was especially from 1891, when Vol. III was published, onward; and since the papal head ceased to be in 1870, the beast from 1891 until just recently could truly be spoken of as *having once been*, as *not longer being* and as *later coming to be again* (vs. 8, 11). This was repeatedly done by them, as all of us know, from 1891 onward. All of us know that they spoke of the beast (papacy) *being* from 539 until 1870, then of its being out of existence as a temporal power, and then as coming again later into existence as a temporal power. Certainly the papacy originally, when it became the fifth head, ascended out of the abyss—error (Rev. 11:7); and in its second time of becoming a head—the eighth—it came out of the abyss—error, especially its claims to temporal power by Divine right as an alleged necessity of its office requirements (v. 8). God says it goes to destruction.

At the time when God's people were expounding the message of, and matters germane to Vol. III, they taught that the so-called Christian Roman Empire, the Western Empire, the Kingdom of the Heruli, the Kingdom of the Ostrogoths and the Papacy—the five kings—had fallen—ceased to be—and that another

(the sixth of the Rev. 17 kings, or heads) reigned, *viz.*, the Italian Kingdom of the House of Savoy. They also, without understanding its character, forecast the coming of another—the seventh—which has proven to be the Fascist Italian State. They did not know exactly the length of the stay of what proved to be the Fascist State, but from v. 10, as well as from the chronology, they knew that its stay would be short. It will probably last until the symbolic earthquake, although it could fall before, and if it should, the papacy would get exclusive power in Rome; for if another power should do this before Armageddon, there would be nine heads—a thing contradictory to the Scriptures (vs. 9-11). The Lord's people often mistakenly spoke of an eighth *beast* coming, calling it a headless beast, mistakenly understanding that it would be the form of government following the Revolution. Their mistake on this point is, of course, not shown in the angel's speech. On the contrary, the first time the angel says anything about the eighth (king, *i.e.*, head) he speaks of it as an already existing thing—"The beast ... is himself an eighth [king]." This proves that the true interpretation would not be clearly declared by the Lord's people until the beast as the eighth (king, *i.e.*, head) would be here. The fulfilment has finally enabled us to understand its character and the time of its coming, as we knew and declared beforehand, on the basis of Rev. 17:9-11, that some kind of an eighth power would come. The angel's statement, therefore, proves that now is the due time for the Lord's people to declare, especially to one another, the presence of its eighth king, or head.

The beast (v. 11)—the papacy—which was until 1870, and which, at least from 1891 onward until recently, was spoken of by God's people as not being, *i.e.*, not existing as a temporal power, becomes the eighth *king*. We add the word *king* after the word *ogdoos* (masculine), *eighth*, because the masculine adjective

ogdoos requires a masculine noun for completeness, and the connection (vs. 9, 10) shows that the angel is speaking of the heads as representing *kings*—*basileis* (plural), *basileus* (singular). The word *beast* (*therion*), being neuter in Greek, cannot be supplied after the word *ogdoos*, whose masculine form cannot be used with the neuter *therion*. If *therion* were to be supplied, the word form for eighth would be *ogdoon*. Moreover, the facts of the case disprove the reading, *eighth beast*; for nowhere do the Scriptures speak of such a thing, when treating on this subject. Nor can the word *head* (though it is the proper symbol for the thing meant—v. 9) be inserted after the word *ogdoos*; for the Greek word for *head* (*kephale*), used in this connection, is feminine, and to agree with it the Greek word for eighth would have to be feminine in form which, therefore would have to read *ogdoe*. Hence, properly, the connection shows that *basileus*, *king*, must be supplied after the word *ogdoos*—eighth. Hence the following is the proper translation: "And the beast which was, and is not, is also an eighth [king] himself, and is [one] of the seven." The papacy, as the fifth king of the Rev. 17 beast, is self-evidently, as the eighth, one of the seven kings—kingdoms. Praise be to God for the next clause: "and he goes down into destruction."

The above points, vindicating our Pastor's view and adding to it certain harmonious things that have occurred since his death in fulfilment of Rev. 17, give us a basis from which it is easy to refute W.C.'s views, as expressed in his booklet, "The End Of All Things," and republished in the Oct., Nov. and Dec. Berean Bible Student. We will now proceed to refute the view, first refuting it on general lines and then refuting its more or less essential details.

(1) W.C.'s view sets aside that Servant's demonstrably true views on the three seven-headed beasts of Revelation, on the two-horned beast of Rev. 13 and on

the image of the beast of Revelation, and sets in their place demonstrably false views. This is Azazelian revolutionism—just what we should expect to come from one who has the unenviable lot of having been the first member of Azazel's Goat to be led to the gate and the fit man in the Epiphany. In this action he has shown that he pays our Pastor the same contemptuous disregard that he accorded him in his place as that Servant in charge of the London Bethel and Tabernacle. Certainly the Lord would not use such an one to bring forth things new.

(2) W.C. claims that Bro. Russell's view has not been sustained by historical facts; hence, he claims, it must be set aside for one that is (allegedly) so sustained. He has not put himself to the pains of pointing out even one particular wherein our Pastor's view of Daniel's and Revelation's beasts is unhistorical. We are certain he cannot do this. Above we have shown it to be thoroughly in harmony with the fulfilled facts of history. Hence his claim for the necessity of a contrary view falls to the ground.

(3) W.C.'s view violates the Bible's usage, that only one beast is used to symbolize one government, though it may symbolize that one government's varying forms by a number of horns or heads; but never does the Bible use one beast to represent a number of successive governments, as W.C.'s view holds. Nebuchadnezzar's metallic image is used to represent a number of successive governments by its various parts; but never is a beast in Biblical symbols so used. Thus the various beasts of Daniel 7 and 8 in each case represent but one government. This is true of the four beasts of Revelation, as Bro. Russell's Biblically and historically corroborated view proves. Hence pertinent Biblical usage defeats W.C.'s view.

(4) Neither the Babylonian, Persian nor Grecian empires (nor the Pagan Roman Republic and Empire, which made Rome a universal government) ever supported

the Roman Catholic Church, because as universal empires (as such the four beasts of Daniel are presented) they were out of existence centuries before the Roman Catholic Church arose; nor as existent non-universal kingdoms have they, since their destruction as universal empires, ever supported the Roman Catholic Church. But all seven heads of the beast of Rev. 17 have supported the Roman Catholic Church ("on which the woman sitteth," Rev. 17:9). Therefore the Babylonian, Persian and Grecian empires cannot be three of the heads of the beast of Rev. 17. Nor can republican nor imperial Pagan Rome be one of these heads, since they never supported the Roman Catholic Church, which first began to receive support from the Roman beast when it became nominally Christian, under Constantine, and that after the last Pagan Roman persecution ended, in 313 A.D. No sophistry of W.C. on the preceding empire's being (allegedly) assimilated into the later picture can meet this point. It simply annihilates his entire view so far as Rev. 17 is concerned; and it does the same with his view of the red dragon's and beast's heads of Rev. 12 and 13; for he makes them the same as those of the Rev. 17 beast. That the heads of the red dragon of Rev. 12, which are identical with the heads of the Rev. 13 beast, are not the same in every case as those of the Rev. 17 beast, is evident from the facts that all seven of the latter supported the Roman Catholic Church while the pagan head (Pagan Rome) of the red dragon persecuted both the Roman, as well as the True Church.

(5) As proven above, the ten (yea, eleven) horns of the Daniel 7 beast are not in most cases identical with the ten horns of the three Revelation beasts, as is evident from the fact that most of these eleven horns are now extinct, whereas all of the ten horns of the three Revelation beasts still exist. But W.C.'s view, requiring these to be identical, is by their diversity proved to be false. As a matter of fact, the Roman

beast, coming into such varied contact with God's people in fulfilled prophecy, both before and during the Gospel Age, had to be given from varied standpoints. These four beasts, in each case, give a different viewpoint of the Roman beast and to make them identical is a demonstrated fallacy. Above we have pointed out these differences, against which W.C.'s view impinges with disastrous effects upon itself.

(6) The fact that three other beasts in Dan. 7 are used to identify Babylonian, Persian and Grecian empires as separate and distinct from the fourth beast, which, generally speaking, is used to point out the same government (the Roman Government) as is symbolized by the three ten-horned and seven-headed beasts of Revelation, proves that the Babylonian, Persian and Grecian empires are not symbolized in these three Revelation ten-horned and seven-headed beasts, which argument, from the standpoint of separate beasts being used to symbolize separate governments, disproves completely W.C.'s view.

(7) The scope of the book of Revelation, as a symbolic-prophetic history of the Christ, precludes the Babylonian, Persian and Grecian empires from symbolization in a symbolic-prophetic picture of the Christ, since the Christ never came into factual contact with those empires by reason of their non-existence setting in before the Christ began to exist; while the Revelation beasts are introduced into the symbolic-prophetic history because of the Christ's coming into factual contact with its four beasts—the fourth being the two-horned beast. Hence those three empires cannot be symbolized by three of the seven heads.

(8) Nowhere in the Bible nor in Bro. Russell's writings does the expression of the thought, "*the Gentile beast*," occur, as representing the four universal monarchies of the Times of the Gentiles. It is an invention of W.C., to palm off his error under review, and is contrary to the Biblical use of figurative beasts,

each one used exclusively to designate one particular government.

(9) Protestantism never was, nor is now, a government. Therefore it cannot be one of the seven heads, all of which symbolize governments ("Seven kings," Rev. 17:9). Protestantism is a designation of a number of religious denominations opposed to Romanism, some of which have been married to governments. But it is not a government. If it were such, all of the Protestant denominations would not only be under one political unit, but would have to be that political unit. But such things have never been the case; hence Protestantism cannot be the sixth head, inasmuch as all seven heads are kingdoms—governments (Rev. 17:10, 11).

(10) The League of Nations is not a government—a kingdom (Rev. 17:10, 11); therefore it is not, nor can be, the seventh head, which, like the other heads, must be a kingdom. It is a very loose association of governments, not even having the cohesion of a real alliance of governments. This association of governments is very little more than a debating club on international matters. It has no sovereign authority, nor has it a citizenry, which a government always has. It has very little more than advisory powers, *i.e.*, beyond advising it has bluffing powers, when a small power offends or is in the way of an ambitious large power; but when a strong power wrongs a weak power, *e.g.*, Japan wronging China in the Manchurian and Shanghai affairs, it has not even bluffing powers—it is utterly impotent. It is merely a football kicked about by the stronger powers, particularly France. It lacks all the essentials of a government, prominent among which are sovereignty and citizenry, both of which it lacks, its members being nations and not citizens of one or more nations. Hence it is no government, and therefore cannot be the seventh head of the three Revelation ten-horned and seven-headed beasts.

To adapt G.K. Bolger's language, above quoted, to

the facts of the case, we would say that these ten points thoroughly prove that the article under review "bears the unmistakable evidence of [*not*] having been produced by one of the faithful scribes [writers (?)] of whom Jesus spoke in Matt. 13:52." We might let the case rest on these ten points, but will answer W.C.'s main details, referring to these as they are paged in his booklet, and not as they are reproduced in the Berean Bible Student. On page 3 he says that the degeneracy symbolized by the change of the metals (from more to less valuable ones) in Nebuchadnezzar's image is that from absolute power to democracy. This is untrue to facts; for Persia was more autocratic than Babylonia, since the Persian monarch was so absolute, beside being regarded infallible, that his law could not be altered. Moreover imperial Rome from 155 A.D. onward and papal Rome were the most autocratic governments that ever existed. Bro. Russell's thought is better—increasing governmental degradation is represented by the progressive degradation of the image's metals. Contrary to W.C.'s claim, God's ideal for qualified man, apart from his own government, which must be absolute, is not that of an absolute monarchy, but that of a democracy, as is evidenced by the democracy that He established in Israel as between man and man politically (under His own theocracy), and that will follow the Little Season after the Millennium. While with *destructive* power the stone kingdom did not smite the image until the Times of the Gentiles were fulfilled, it certainly made verbal—Truth—attacks on it from 1874 and 1878 onward; the latter kind of a smiting W.C. denies by saying that the smiting began in 1914. His claim that chronology does not extend beyond 1914 contradicts not only our Pastor, who pointed out April, 1918, from the parallel dispensations, but also many other chronological fulfillments, pointed out in *The Present Truth for the Epiphany*.

His making the Church of England the mother of the

Protestant churches (p. 31), is "a rare bird" in mental gymnastics and natural law; for this alleged mother must have had four daughters: the Lutheran, Reformed, Baptist and Unitarian churches, respectively 17, 14, 13 and 4 years before she was born! Moreover, the Bible calls the Roman Church the mother of Protestant churches (Rev. 17:5). His statement (p. 14) that "each phase of Gentile rule ... is the embodiment of its predecessors, and the Gentile rule, as a whole being one unit, the last phase is the embodiment of the lot," is a clear sophism, contrary to the facts of the case, as proven by the facts showing that the four universal monarchies were not a unit and are set forth as separate and distinct in the Bible. None of the four points that he offers in proof demonstrates this view: (1) The fact that the metallic image (p. 14) is one and that its five parts cover the whole Times of the Gentiles, does not, as W.C. claims, prove that these were a unit; for we have shown the opposite from the four separate beasts, which are the things by which he must prove them to be the Gentile unit rule. (2) Nor does the fact (p. 15) that all parts of the image are destroyed in the end prove his Gentile unit rule, for as universal empires Dan. 7 shows they were each destroyed in turn to make way for the succeeding empire. Rather, as our Pastor shows, the remnant kingdoms that have survived after these universal empires were destroyed are the things that will be destroyed in the end of the Age, *e.g.*, the present little kingdoms of Iraq and Persia, the republic of Greece and Europe's ten language nations.

(3) The Roman Catholic Church sitting on the seven heads does not prove his Gentile unit rule, as he claims (p. 15), for several reasons. First, she never sat on the first three of his alleged heads, for these alleged heads became non-existent hundreds of years before she came into existence. Second, because if one does a number of acts, some in the past and some

in the present and some in the future, the present tense is the one to use to cover all of the acts. Thus, at the time the angel spoke five of the heads had fallen, one was then present and the seventh was future. Hence the propriety of using the present tense, "sitteth," as a *universal* present to cover the past, present and future acts of the woman mentioned in Rev. 17:9. This disproves his pertinent contention.

(4) His fourth point (pp. 16 and 30) in proof of his alleged Gentile unit rule, *i.e.*, that the fifth head of the Rev. 13 beast is described with certain characteristics of the lion (Babylonia), bear (Medo-Persia), leopard (Greece) and dragon (Rome), falls to the ground when we remember that the papacy in fulfilling the pertinent 1845 years parallels actually acted out at the parallel times the characteristics of the four beasts of Dan. 7. Please see the Edgar chart VII on the Four Empires' Parallels, in the Berean Manual, page 12; and the detailed discussion of these in the Great Pyramid Passages, Vol. II, 199-204 (new edition); 226-233 (old edition). Thus the four proofs that he offers for his "Gentile unit rule" are in each case shown to be no proofs of his position. Like other Levite leaders he blames (p. 17) Bro. Russell for teaching the deliverance of the Church by Oct., 1914, and fails to state that he corrected this mistake quite a while before Oct., 1914. In this course the Levite leaders disparage Bro. Russell as nominal-church writers do. Again (p. 28), he applies Dan. 8:24 to Pagan Rome and the Jewish nation, and v. 25 to our Lord's death; whereas our Pastor rightly applies v. 23 to the papacy and the devastation of v. 24 to the papacy's devastating of the Gospel-Age saints and v. 25 to the end of the Gospel Age, when the beast will war with the Lamb and the Lamb will overthrow him (Rev. 19:19). He perverts the Truth for his errors!

The last point in his booklet that we will examine is

the following statement with reference to the two-horned beast (Rev. 13:11): "According to the Diaglott translation, the word *two* should be omitted, as it is not found in the original text." This statement, in both of its parts, is not true to facts; for the word *two* is found in the original text according to every recension of the original text made since recensions have been printed. Nor does the Diaglott translation intimate that it is no part of the original text; nor does it omit the word from its Greek text, from its word-for-word translation, nor from its idiomatic English translation proper. The following are the facts: While retaining the word *dvo* (*two*) in its Greek text and in its two translations, it brackets the word in the Greek text and the word *two* in the word-for-word translation immediately under the pertinent Greek word, and puts an asterisk beside the word *dvo* referring to a note at the bottom of the page, to the effect that Vatican Manuscript No. 1160 omits this word. The Vatican MS. No. 1160 is not the Vatican MS. that text critics, antitypical Amram Gershonites, signify by the letter B, which is No. 1209, and which so far as it goes is the most exact of existing MSS. of the New Testament, and whose readings, as far as it goes, the Diaglott gives when it varies from Griesbach's Greek text, the Greek text of the Diaglott; but this MS. from Heb. 9:14 onward lacks the rest of this epistle, the two Timothies, Titus, Philemon and Revelation. The readings of the Sinaitic, the second most exact of our MSS., were not yet available when the Diaglott was edited by Dr. Wilson. Accordingly, its main authority at that time for the book of Revelation was the Alexandrian MS., the third best New Testament MS. that we have. And Dr. Wilson, therefore, in Revelation offers the variants of Vatican MS. No. 1160 whenever it differs from his Greek text, not to indicate that his text is wrong, but to show that that MS. varies from his text. The fact that he kept the word, *two* in his

idiomatic English translation proves that he considered that reading to be correct.

Not only is the Vatican MS. No. 1160 an unimportant one, but when later the Sinaitic MS. was found it read just like the Alexandrian MS. on this word, even as do all other more reliable MSS. So little weight is to be placed on this variant reading that no recensionist since the art of printing has been used has given it as his text in this passage, though such recensionists as make it their business to print at the bottom of their pages *all sorts* of variants, like Tischendorf and Von Sodom point it out, but only as an unimportant and negligible variant. Souter, who next to Tischendorf and Von Soden gives the largest number of variants does not give this as one. Even the R.V. and the A.R.V., which indicate even many unimportant variants in their margins, pass this one by in silence. We looked up this word in every worthwhile recension of the last two centuries, and in none of them is it omitted from the text. Hence the word *dyo* (*two*) belongs in the text of Rev. 13:11 and, therefore, is found in the original text. What follows from this? It completely refutes W.C.'s claim that the two-horned beast is Protestantism, as the two horns as well as the beast itself are unexplainable from that standpoint; hence to palm off his theory he tries to eliminate the word for *two* from the original text! The fact that the two-horned beast is called *another* beast than the ten-horned and seven-headed beast of Rev. 13, is also against his view; since his view of Protestantism as being the sixth head would require it to be symbolized by the ten-horned and seven-headed beast and not by another beast, just as the papacy, the real sixth head of the red dragon and of the first beast of Rev. 13, and the fifth and eighth head of the beast of Rev. 17, is symbolized in these three beasts and not by a separate one. Against his seventh head, the League of Nations, which, borrowing from J.F.R., he claims is the beast's

image, it must also be said that his sixth head, Protestantism, did not make it; for it was made by Romanist, Greek, Protestant and heathen *governments*, not religions. Thus his whole position, in so far as it differs from that of our Pastor, utterly collapses and is demonstrated to be another piece of Jambresian folly, indorsed by the Jambresite, G.K. Bolger, who, barren of ideas, borrows from others, as he formerly indorsed Adam Rutherford's folly on, Behold The Bridegroom, part of which W.C. also borrows, *i.e.*, on the Bridegroom's tarrying. Accordingly, another Azazelite attack on our Pastor's teachings falls manifestly and incurably to the ground. We will review no more of W.C.'s errors, which abound in his numerous tracts. He left the B.S.C. (Bible Students Committee), which is in the charge of H.J.S. But there is a doctrinal looseness among its adherents. The B.S.C. recommends the P.B.I. Herald and presumably endorses its errors on the Chronology, Revelation and Daniel. Many of the members of this committee, like F.G. Guard, Sr., W.C. and others, have left the B.S.C. and have fallen into serious errors. *E.g.*, F.G. Guard and numerous others have endorsed the Sin-offering, Mediator, and Covenant errors of the 1908-1911 sifters, which errors are making much headway among the P.B.I. The Shimite Gershonite errors of doctrine and arrangement we will discuss in the rest of this book.

CHAPTER III.

EARLIER DOINGS AND ERRORS OF THE SHIMITE GERSHONITES.

ANOTHER HARVEST SIFTING REVIEWED. TWO PROPOSED
CONVENTIONS. IN DEFENSE OF PEACE AMONG GOD'S PEOPLE. THE
PURPOSES OF THE P.B.I. EXAMINED.

A YEAR and a half ago [written Aug., 1918] the wrong-doings of certain leading British brethren, who refused to desist from their course at private exhortation, and who, in hopes of crushing us, published misrepresentations abroad, forced us to appear before the British Church as the exposers of their evil course. Within a year the wrong-doings of the Society's leaders, who also refused to desist from their course at private exhortation, and who, in hopes of crushing us, also published misrepresentations abroad, forced us to appear before the whole Church as the exposers of their evil ways. And now, for the third time, we are forced to appear before the Church as the exposers of the wrong-doings of certain leaders among us who have refused to desist from wrong ways at private exhortation, and who in part, to crush us, published misrepresentations against us at the Asbury Park Convention after having, for some time past, carried on a "political" campaign of "whispering" against us, the fruit of which campaign it was designed to reap at the Convention in the ousting of three brothers (R.H. Hirsh, R.G. Jolly, who stood with us, and ourself) from the Pastoral Bible Institute Committee, etc. Doubtless the hearts of many friends were deeply grieved at the attacks made upon us by H.C. Rockwell and I. Hoskins, the former in his sermon, the latter as Secretary-Treasurer, *officially* reporting without the Committee's authorization, the majority of whom repudiated his utterances in his address to the Elders and Deacons, and in

his address before the whole Convention, Saturday, July 27, 1918, and then again the next day. Their general charges and spirit were so much like those of J.F.R. that for the most part those who witnessed these, and heard our answer, were by Monday convinced that we were being harvest-sifted and unbethed anew. Hence we consider this third attempt to crush us the same in spirit as the other two, and, accordingly, call it "Another Harvest Sifting." Therefore this chapter, which is a brief review of this third movement, is called "Another Harvest Sifting Reviewed." In brief, our loyalty to that Servant's ideals, arrangements, charter and will, and to the interests of the Church against the efforts of certain leaders to put some of them aside, have made us the target of this, a third widespread attack.

Earnestly and long, but, of course, not perfectly, have we by kindness, long-suffering and reasoning, sought to hold these brothers back from their course; but seemingly it was all in vain! The responsibility of foisting this trouble on the Church is wholly theirs. As by the British and American "Society" leaders, the troubles were set afloat by a campaign of "whispering," and then by public attacks before large numbers of brethren, ourself keeping silent all the time, and trying to persuade them to do likewise; so has it been in this trouble, which was rudely thrust upon the recent Convention according to illy-thought-out preparations, despite the promises of the one mainly responsible for the publicity to keep the trouble from the Convention. Had the evil been limited to the Convention, we would, so far as exposures are concerned, rest content with what we answered there; but alas! the matters have been spread broadcast, and the wrongs and evil effects connected with them are so great, that duty to God and the Church forces us to place before the Church a brief summary of the wrongs that have been committed. If conditions would permit, gladly would we bury

the evils out of sight; for they are not told with pleasure, but with profound grief that such things could be privately and publicly committed among us. They are told in the hope that their recital will arouse in the Church the spirit of repentance; for the evil qualities out of which these wrongs have flown are, alas! not limited to the Committee members more or less involved. These qualities (of which the following are examples: grasping for power, lording it over God's heritage, the spirit of fear and compromising, assassnatory slander, contentiousness, partisanship, arbitrariness, legality and worldliness seeking to corrupt the Church's organization) are quite widespread among us, and the Lord calls upon us to set them aside.

Our motive in reciting these things is not to chastise anyone, but to arouse the Church to a sense of danger from Satanic working on our weaknesses to our spiritual injury, to earnest, humble prayer and heart-searchings as preparatory to assembling in solemn Convention to investigate these things, and to devise ways and means of helping all concerned to put these evils aside. Abundant are the evidences of God's displeasure upon us and of His withholding blessings from us for these wrongs. In God's name, therefore, let us assemble ourselves in Convention that unitedly we may learn to understand the spiritual diseases that are working havoc in our midst, and the treatment and remedy for their cure. If, in His spirit, we make the effort, He will surely bless us therein. What the situation requires is much humility, candor, honesty, love, and a clear view of the nature of the evils and means of putting them aside, combined with persistent determination, by God's grace, faithfully to use His Spirit, Word and Providence to make the diagnosis, prescribe the remedies and accept the treatment. Since the Convention some, with distress, learned what took place there. They have learned that there were, to put it

mildly, questionable acts committed, that the old Committee appointed by the Fort Pitt Convention was dissolved, because a group of four of its members wanted to get rid of the other three, who blocked their unscriptural, papistical and revolutionary course in certain particulars, that this was accomplished by questionable acts and methods, that the supporters of the Group, as well as some of the Group, used methods like those that J.F.R. used before and at the shareholders' meeting last January, that these same methods prospered unto the undoing of the old Committee, and unto the electing of a Committee consisting of about six members slated for the Committee by the Group, that some exposures were made Sunday, July 28; and as a result, the Convention, refusing longer to be bossed and driven by the Group and some of their partisans, and, becoming apprehensive that all was not gold that was given a glitter, not only refused to be clotured and stampeded into forming a new society and into adopting a program for what would be another spurious *first* smiting of Jordan; but also withdrew from the new Committee powers that the old one had, *i.e.*, the power to publish a periodical and to have an Editorial Committee. Thus, those who came to the Convention seemingly to discredit others, left the Convention with their own credit far from being enhanced, and besides shorn of much of their power. Alas! that against these foretold results they refused to take kindly forewarning, which would have been heeded, if they had exercised the necessary meekness.

By the Group are meant the following persons: I.F. Hoskins, I.L. Margeson, F.H. Magee and J.D. Wright, the first of whom committed in his attacks the added wrong of disparagingly mentioning names, *i.e.*, of R.H. Hirsh, R.G. Jolly and ourself, though H.C. Rockwell started the attack with an attempt at assassination of us. Both in justice and charity we are glad to say of F.H. Magee that he, both to others and to us,

expressed strong disapproval of the attacks of I.F. Hoskins and H.C. Rockwell. We will not, we cannot, believe of J.D. Wright that he approves of their course. While not presuming to judge the hearts, in justice to all concerned, we ought to state on whom it seems to us the varying degrees of external responsibility rest. From our knowledge of the facts, the most guilty of the Group seems to be I.F. Hoskins, with I.L. Margeson as a close second. These two seem to have done the main part of the planning, whose climax and purpose were reached in the Convention business meetings, July 27. It is but fair to say of F.H. Magee that he is too honest a man, and too noble a Christian, knowingly to have entered into the plots of the other two. It seems to us that he has been measurably deceived into a course favorable to the plans of the other two, and has been skillfully used as a tool in the furtherance of their plans under the influence of some false impressions, which he honestly believed to be true. We do not believe that J.D. Wright entered into the plotting at all. But, unfortunately, like F.H. Magee, he generally supported the policies of the two on the vital questions of principle that divided the Committee. Of these four we use the word Group, not disparagingly, but to have a brief term to designate them in their working together.

After he came on the scene, H.C. Rockwell seems to be almost on a par in the plotting and wrong-doing with the two. These three, in not a few particulars, closely resemble J.F.R., W.E. Van Amburgh and A.H. MacMillan, respectively, in the roles they played. The *cunning and brutality* of H.C. Rockwell's attack on us, on the Convention platform at Asbury Park, lasting over a half hour, and made Saturday morning in his sermon on "The Sevenfold Mission of the Church," with Is. 61:1, 2, as text, were in spirit and in main accusations, *i.e.*, in charging "insanity," selfish ambition for leadership, etc., a reproduction of

J.F.R.'s "Harvest Sifting." This attack was a part of a *deliberate plan* to drive us out of the Pastoral Bible Institute Committee, and to destroy our influence among the brethren. These three and some of their supporters, by their words and acts, for quite a while before the Convention, gave R.H. Hirsh, R.G. Jolly and ourself enough clues of their plans to enable us to understand their main purposes in having called a Convention, though not before the Convention was voted for. The three main purposes of their arranging for the business features of the Convention were: first, to get rid of R.H. Hirsh, R.G. Jolly and ourself; second, to stampede the Convention into endorsing their policies of forming a Society with a Charter DIFFERENT from that of that Servant and of organizing the Church for what would be another SPURIOUS FIRST SMITING OF JORDAN; and third, to obtain from the Convention for their Committee *all the Powers of the Society's Board of Directors*; whereas the old Committee was limited in its sphere of activity, according to the instructions of the Fort Pitt Convention, to those features of work that the friends in general, by their responses to the Committee's letter, stated to be their understanding of the Lord's will as to the kinds of general service necessary for the Church, *i.e.*, Pilgrim service, which, of course, includes conventions and a periodical.

Deeply do we deplore the necessity of using names. We will not plead in our defense for mentioning names the fact that some of the Group and some of their supporters did this first, both before and during the Convention. All will bear us record that we did not speak of the facts and names until after they had told their interpretation of facts, and mentioned names PUBLICLY at the Convention. The names, thus being made widely public through the course of these three themselves, to use their names here will now do them no wrong. Then, again, not to use names would work

injustice, especially to F.H. Magee and J.D. Wright, as that would in the setting given to matters below impliedly set forth that they are as guilty as some others, whereas they are not. Then, again, the matter cannot be presented with the necessary clearness without giving names; still further, the right of publishing this paper, whose object is the calling of a diagnosal and remedial Convention, which all sober minds, after reading this paper, will recognize as a crying need, cannot reasonably be demonstrated without mentioning names. All will recall that under similar conditions last year, those who constitute the Group strongly advocated the calling of an investigative and curative shareholders' meeting. Therefore, they cannot consistently object to such a Convention under similar conditions now; nor were they blamable for using names and stating the acts of the Society's wrongdoers under like circumstances last summer. In fact, the use of names and the mention of evil deeds of those who wrong the entire Church is a duty, and is not to be confused with evil speaking. See "Manna" comments for July 14.

IN OBEDIENCE TO THE DECISION OF THE MAJORITY OF THE OLD COMMITTEE, AND ALSO IN OBEDIENCE TO THE MAJORITY OF THE CONVENTION COMMITTEE, that sample copies of "The Bible Standard" be distributed Friday night, July 26, at the Convention, R.H. Hirsh announced to the conventioners the fact that he had the long-desired first issue of the paper for them. He then left it to a vote as to whether they desired it then. After an almost unanimous affirmative vote of the Convention, he invited them forward to receive the paper. This course greatly angered I.F. Hoskins and I.L. Margeson, whose rage almost caused them to make a counter-announcement, for they had for a long time been delaying the publication, partly for reasons best known to themselves. Then, in the little back room, they fell upon us, upbraiding us for our part in

the matter. Among other uncomplimentary remarks, by which they characterized the course of the majority of both Committees in this matter, I.F. Hoskins used, several times with heated emphasis, the expression, "This is Rutherfordism." Quickly seeing the similarity but in another sense than he meant, we replied to the following effect: "Yes, Brother Hoskins, it is Rutherfordism, just as two Board members, J.F.R. and W.E. Van Amburgh, and one not on the Board, A.H. MacMillan, sought to set aside the voted decision of the Board's majority, so you and I.L. Margeson, two members of the Committee, with the assistance of one not on the Committee, H.C. Rockwell, are now doing. It is Rutherfordism, indeed." In fact, it was Rutherfordism repeating itself; but, strange to say, this time it is among ourselves.

The comparison was so complete and apparent that I.F. Hoskins did not answer us. Since that night, with his statement, "This is Rutherfordism," in mind, we have made a careful study of the history of our Committee since its appointment Jan. 6, 1918, comparing it with the history of Rutherfordism in the Society. As a result of this study, we have gathered together, under twelve divisions, or heads, one hundred and fifty particulars (to which we could add more, if necessary), wherein Rutherfordism in the Society finds its counterpart in Rutherfordism in the Committee. In this comparison J.F.R., or his representatives, correspond to the Group, or their representatives. It is sad to contemplate these points of comparison; because they prove that some of those who protested against J.F.R.'s wrong-doings have, in spite of having his example before their eyes as a warning, and in spite of their protest against it, imitated it so closely, as these twelve divisions and one hundred and fifty particulars indicate. Could these brothers have fallen into the same evils as J.F.R. while living close to the Lord? Do not their knowledge of, and protest against his wrong-doings increase

their own guilt? He, at least, did not have a similar example as a warning before his eyes. How are the mighty fallen! Let the daughter of Zion weep for the iniquity of the children of her people! In these correspondencies, not the number of persons involved, but the nature and quality of the acts are the points of comparison. Arranged in parallel columns, these twelve divisions, placed as heads over the one hundred and fifty particulars, are presented to the brethren for consideration, as follows:

THE DEADLY PARALLEL.

[After reading number 1 in the first column, please read number 1 in the second column, etc.]

RUTHERFORDISM IN THE SOCIETY.

I. J.F.R. persisted in taking up and acting on subjects outside of the sphere of an executive and manager in the Society's affairs to the disruption of the Board of Directors.

(1) He persisted in discussing the suppression of certain interpretations of the Lord's Word, *e.g.*, "that Servant's" interpretation of the Parable of the Penny.

(2) He sought to combine in various acts the Board of the Society and the Board of the People's Pulpit Association.

RUTHERFORDISM IN THE COMMITTEE.

I. The group persisted in taking up and acting on subjects outside of the sphere of activity prescribed by the Fort Pitt Convention, even to the disruption of the old Pastoral Bible Institute Committee.

(1) The Group persisted in discussing the suppression of certain interpretations of the Lord's Word, *e.g.*, The Evil Servant, Elijah and Elisha, etc.

(2) I.F. Hoskins and H.C. Rockwell, immediately after the conviction of the Society leaders, introduced, for the Committee's favorable action, a plan to make

RUTHERFORDISM IN THE
SOCIETY.

(3) He planned securing legal action to drive the Board's majority and Bro. Johnson from Bethel.

(4) He advocated a spurious *first* smiting of Jordan as an indispensable thing in the first book-publication of the Society, as the chief part of its program of work.

(5) For months he insisted on dissolving the *Society*, *i.e.*, making a one-man affair of the *Society*, despite the fact that "that Servant's" writings, will and charter made what, during his life, was a Society *in name only*, a Society *in fact*, at his death.

(6) These acts sidetracked the consideration and accomplishment of some of the work that he was authorized to do.

(7) The obtrusion of these matters divided the

RUTHERFORDISM IN THE
COMMITTEE.

overtures to effect a reunion with the Society.

(3) These two planned securing legal action (through a firm of New York corporation lawyers) to recover control of the Society after the conviction of the Society's leaders.

(4) Some of the Group and some of their supporters advocated, as an indispensable thing that our first periodical number set forth what would be a spurious *first* smiting of Jordan as a chief part of the Committee's future work.

(5) For months these four insisted on forming a Society, *i.e.*, dissolving the Committee, despite the fact that the Fort Pitt Convention voted down a motion to form a Society.

(6) These acts sidetracked the consideration and accomplishment of some of the work that the Committee was authorized to do.

(7) The obtrusion of these matters divided the

RUTHERFORDISM IN THE
SOCIETY.

Board into two parts.

II. False and wrong motives were charged, especially against Bro. Johnson, to the disruption of the old Board.

(1) Bro. Johnson was falsely accused of aspiring to control the work and the Board, whereas, he pushed J.F.R. ahead and advised against himself being made a Board member and President.

(2) Bro. Johnson was falsely accused of being led by the spirit of ruling or ruining.

(3) Bro. Johnson was falsely accused of trying to delay the work of the Society.

(4) Bro. Johnson was falsely accused of being in a clique with certain members of the Board (whereas, the accuser was thus guilty) to disrupt the work of the Society.

(5) Bro. Johnson was falsely accused of seeking

RUTHERFORDISM IN THE
COMMITTEE.

Committee into two parts.

II. False and wrong motives were charged, especially against Bro. Johnson, to the disruption of the old committee.

(1) Bro. Johnson was falsely accused of aspiring to control the work and the Committee, whereas, he pushed others to the front and advised against his being elected an officer.

(2) Bro. Johnson was falsely accused of being led by the spirit of ruling or ruining.

(3) Bro. Johnson was falsely accused of trying to delay the work of the Committee, *e.g.*, the publication of "The Bible Standard"; whereas, he pushed it at least as much as any other member of the Committee.

(4) Bro. Johnson was falsely accused of being in a clique with R.H. Hirsh and R.G. Jolly (whereas the accuser, with the Group, was thus guilty), to disrupt the work of the Committee.

(5) Bro. Johnson was falsely accused of seeking

RUTHERFORDISM IN THE SOCIETY.

to divide the Church by J.F.R., who later did divide it.

(6) Bro. Johnson was falsely accused of seeking a following by J.F.R., who won a following.

III. J.F.R. attempted to suppress the presentation of any Biblical thoughts to the Church, unless he favored them.

(1) He did this among the Pilgrims by a resolution of his own to suppress what was new, apart from Vol. VII and what he favored, on pain of their being out of harmony.

(2) This he did among the elders by requiring them to submit to Vol. VII and the Society policies' tests.

RUTHERFORDISM IN THE COMMITTEE.

to divide the Church by those who are now dividing it.

(6) Bro. Johnson was falsely accused of seeking a following by the Group that is winning one.

III. Led by I.F. Hoskins, the Group attempted to suppress the presentation of Biblical thoughts to the Church, unless they favored them.

(1) This was done by a resolution of the Committee forbidding Committee members to teach anything new, particularly on types, symbols and prophecy, not set forth in that Servant's writings, unless agreed to by the Committee, on pain of their being out of harmony with the Committee.

(2) In harmony with this resolution, I.F. Hoskins largely created such a sentiment among a number of the elders of one of our largest Churches as led to the presentation of two resolutions in elders' meetings, and also one in the Church, calculated to prevent the presentation of uncensored new thoughts

RUTHERFORDISM IN THE
SOCIETY.

IV. J.F.R. insisted on setting up false standards of teaching authorization to the disruption of the old Board.

(1) He advocated that nothing be taught additional to that Servant's writings except what the Churches (frightened into believing by his propaganda) had first approved, thus making the Church, not the Lord, at the mouth of the teachers "set in the body," the arbiter of what was meat in due season.

(2) He advocated and decided that nothing be taught additional to that Servant's writings except what *he* sanctioned.

(3) He advocated that nothing be anywhere taught additional to that Servant's writings, except what the Editorial Committee first approved.

(4) He advocated that nothing be taught that might occasion disagreement among Truth people,

RUTHERFORDISM IN THE
COMMITTEE.

to that Church, which very wisely rejected the resolution.

IV. The Group insisted on setting up false standards of teaching authorization to the disruption of the old Committee.

(1) The Group advocated that nothing be taught additional to that Servant's writings except what the Churches had first approved, thus making the Church, not the Lord, at the mouth of the teachers "set in the body," the arbiter of what was meat in due season.

(2) The Group advocated and decided that nothing be taught additional to that Servant's writings except what the Committee sanctioned.

(3) Several of the Group advocated that nothing be anywhere taught additional to that Servant's writings, except what the Editorial Committee first approved.

(4) The Group advocated that nothing be taught that might occasion disagreement among Truth people,

RUTHERFORDISM IN THE SOCIETY.

despite the fact that he admitted that we were in a sifting, which, of course, means that God wants, by disagreements, to separate the classes, *i.e.*, Little Flock, Great Company, etc.

(5) He attempted to boycott in Pilgrim work those Board members and others who stood for Biblical principles in these matters.

(6) Reliable information proves that by July 29, 1917, he had discussed boycotting in Pilgrim work members of the Old Board and others.

(7) Later information proved that he did boycott in Pilgrim work members of the old Board and others.

V. He greatly exceeded his authority in grasping for power, largely treating the Society's work as though it were his private business, to the disruption of the old Board.

(1) He signed his own name instead of that of the Society to the Society's

RUTHERFORDISM IN THE COMMITTEE.

despite the fact that they admitted that we are in a sifting, which, of course, means that God wants, by disagreements, to separate classes.

(5) Several of the Group attempted to boycott in Pilgrim work those Committee members and others who stood for Biblical principles in these matters.

(6) Reliable information proves that by July 29, 1918, some, if not all, of the Group discussed boycotting in Pilgrim work two of the ousted Committee members.

(7) Later information proves that they have boycotted in Pilgrim work some members of the old Committee.

V. I.F. Hoskins greatly exceeded his authority in grasping for power, largely treating the Committee's work as though it were his private business, to the disruption of the old Committee.

(1) I.F. Hoskins signed his own name, instead of that of the Committee, to

RUTHERFORDISM IN THE
SOCIETY.

correspondence with which he was charged.

(2) Unauthorized by and unknown to the Board, he made contracts, in some cases using donated private funds, of whose existence he said nothing to the Board, to meet the expenses.

(3) He accepted some donations which he kept as a private fund, apart from the Society's funds, to meet expenses, unauthorized by the Board; all this being unknown to the Board as such, until about July 26, 1917, when some of them, by a seeming accident, found it out.

(4) Apart from one time, he gave, and required to be given, no exact report of receipts, expenses and balance on hand; and when asked at various times to give or furnish information on these matters, he gave the Board no exact information.

RUTHERFORDISM IN THE
COMMITTEE.

the Committee's correspondence with which he was charged.

(2) Unauthorized by, and not reporting it to, the Committee, I.F. Hoskins rented, and in part furnished, a room for office purposes, seemingly using a private fund, of whose existence he said nothing to the Committee, to meet expenses.

(3) I.F. Hoskins accepted some donations, as *treasurer*, which he kept as a private fund, apart from the Committee's funds, to meet expenses unauthorized by the Committee; all this being unknown to the Committee as such, some of whom first found it out July 26, 1918, by a seeming accident.

(4) Apart from one time, I.F. Hoskins has given the Committee no exact report on receipts, expenses and balance on hand; and when asked at various Committee meetings on these matters, gave the Committee no exact information. (While claiming to make a report to the

RUTHERFORDISM IN THE SOCIETY.

(5) Long after the Board had asked for such an accounting he continued to keep some of the Society's money deposited in his own name.

(6) He insisted on signing some contracts in his own name.

(7) Without authorization of the Board he paid for work which he was not authorized to have done.

(8) He assumed authority to deal with class matters not given him as his duty.

(9) In pursuance of such unauthorized acts he set Board members in an unfavorable light and caused

RUTHERFORDISM IN THE COMMITTEE.

Convention as Secretary-Treasurer, unauthorized to do so by the Committee, he told the Convention that he did not have the figures with him, and therefore could not give more than an approximate report of the finances on hand, nor did he say anything of the amounts received and expended.)

(5) Months after the Committee instructed I.F. Hoskins to transfer its funds in the bank to its name, he continued to keep the Committee's money in his own name in the bank.

(6) I.F. Hoskins insisted on having the Committee's telephone taken out in his own name.

(7) Without authorization of the Committee I.F. Hoskins paid for work which he was not authorized to have done.

(8) I.F. Hoskins assumed authority to deal with matters in a class not given him as his duty.

(9) Through the preceding act, through a letter which he wrote, and which was read in a class meeting,

RUTHERFORDISM IN THE
SOCIETY.

injury to nearly all
concerned.

(10) He withheld from
the Board important comm-
unications addressed to the
Board.

(11) Against repeated
remonstrances he continued
to control Pilgrim
appointments without
consulting the Board; and
sought to prevent other than
his Pilgrims from addressing
classes.

(12) He appointed many
persons to the Pilgrim office
without authorization of the
Board.

(13) He advocated and
did things calculated to
injure prominent brethren
with the Church, including

RUTHERFORDISM IN THE
COMMITTEE.

I.F. Hoskins set one of the
Committee members in an
unfavorable light, to the
injury of nearly all
concerned.

(10) I.F. Hoskins
withheld from the
Committee a communication
(and information respecting
it until it was eked out of
him) addressed to it by our
largest Church inviting the
Committee to establish its
headquarters in the city of
that Church.

(11) Against repeated
remonstrances I.F. Hoskins
continued alone for two
months to make Pilgrim
appointments without
consulting the brother who
jointly with him was
charged with the duty of
making these appointments;
and he sought to prevent at
least one Church from
having Pilgrim service
unless he made the
appointments.

(12) I.F. Hoskins
appointed persons to act as
Pilgrims without authoriza-
tion of the Committee.

(13) I.F. Hoskins advo-
cated and did things
calculated to injure promi-
nent brethren with the
Church,

RUTHERFORDISM IN THE
SOCIETY.

public attacks on them,
mentioning their names.

(14) In many instances he
interfered in the private
affairs of the Churches.

(15) He used his office to
make for himself a place in
the Church.

(16) He became the chief
opponent of the brother who
most favored him.

(17) He publicly
disparaged the presentations
of Pilgrims with whom he
did not agree.

(18) He even publicly
mentioned their names as
the holders of opinions from
which he dissented.

(19) He continued to
speak against them after
being warned against the
injustice.

(20) He indulged in
sarcasm at the expense of
one of these.

(21) He winked knowing-
ly to his sympathizers and
sneered in disparagement of
others.

(22) He wrongly told of

RUTHERFORDISM IN THE
COMMITTEE.

including public attacks on
them, mentioning their
names.

(14) In more than one
case he interfered in the
private affairs of one of our
Churches.

(15) I.F. Hoskins used his
office to make for himself a
place in the Church.

(16) I.F. Hoskins became
the chief opponent of the
brother who most favored
him.

(17) I.F. Hoskins publicly
disparaged the presentations
of Pilgrims with whom he
disagreed.

(18) I.F. Hoskins even
publicly mentioned their
names, as the holders of
opinions from which he
dissented.

(19) I.F. Hoskins
continued to speak against
them after being warned
against the injustice.

(20) I.F. Hoskins, in one
instance at least, indulged in
sarcasm at the expense of
one of these.

(21) He winked knowing-
ly to his sympathizers and
sneered in disparagement of
one of them.

(22) I.F. Hoskins

RUTHERFORDISM IN THE
SOCIETY.

his disagreement with the Board and Bro. Johnson to others.

(23) At first for months in his public utterances, without mentioning names, He said things calculated to undermine various brethren.

(24) These underhanded attacks also came out in "The Tower."

(25) He tried to force through the Board cut-and-dried programs.

(26) He doctored the minutes to suit himself, *e.g.*, those of the People's Pulpit Association, so as to make them sanction the holding of an annual meeting adjourned from early in Jan., 1917, to July 27, 1917, the date on which he caused to be expelled R.H. Hirsh and I.F. Hoskins from the Association and its Board.

(27) He unnecessarily used from the Society's contributions extravagant amounts of money to put up himself and some of his fellow conspirators at

RUTHERFORDISM IN THE
COMMITTEE.

wrongly told of his disagreement with R.H. Hirsh, R.G. Jolly and P.S.L. Johnson to others.

(23) At first for months in his public utterances, without mentioning names, I.F. Hoskins said things calculated to undermine various brethren.

(24) These underhanded attacks also came out in "The Bible Standard."

(25) I.F. Hoskins tried to force through the Committee cut-and-dried programs.

(26) I.F. Hoskins doctored the Committee minutes so as to make motions favor things that he wanted, contrary to the majority's intentions in passing them, which procedure the Committee had repeatedly to correct.

(27) During the Convention I.F. Hoskins unnecessarily used from the Committee's contributions extravagant amounts of money to put up himself,

RUTHERFORDISM IN THE
SOCIETY.

high-priced hotels.

VI. J.F.R. sought to lord it over God's heritage, to the disruption of the old Board.

(1) He sought to withhold from the Church the discussion of timely Scriptural subjects.

(2) He sought to withhold properly authorized and revised Volume VII from the Church by disregarding the rights of the Board to control and of the Editors to revise it, and by disregarding the needs of the Church.

(3) He claimed and sought to obtain for himself practically all the power of the Society's Board to control in the general work, which means that he

RUTHERFORDISM IN THE
COMMITTEE.

H.C. Rockwell and others of his supporters at a hotel where for each of them he had to pay \$6 a day.

VI. A number of the Committee, usually the Group, sought to lord it over God's heritage, to the disruption of the old Committee.

(1) The Group sought to withhold from the Church the discussion of timely Scriptural subjects. (It is but fair to state that later F.H. McGee and I.L. Margeson voted to rescind the objectionable resolution.)

(2) I.F. Hoskins, I.L. Margeson and H.C. Rockwell sought to withhold the properly authorized and revised "Bible Standard" from being published by disregarding the rights of the Committee's majority to control in the matter, and disregarding the needs of the Church.

(3) They claimed and sought to obtain for the Committee (which would usually mean the Group) *all the power of the Society's Board to control the*

RUTHERFORDISM IN THE
SOCIETY.

could introduce any feature of work that he desired.

(4) He claimed and sought to obtain for the Editorial Committee, which he dominated, more power in the teaching office than that Servant received from the Lord, or ever used; *i.e.*, power to exclude from the Church any teaching not sanctioned by "The Tower" Editorial Committee.

(5) By forbidding the teaching of things unsanctioned by the Editorial Committee (dominated by himself), he arrogated to himself more power than that Servant received from the Lord, or ever used.

(6) He attempted to withhold, and succeeded in withholding, the service of faithful Pilgrims from the Church, as far as he was able.

VII. J.F.R. sought, in several "business" matters, to prevent carrying out the decision of the Board's majority, to the disruption of the old Board.

RUTHERFORDISM IN THE
COMMITTEE.

general work, which means that they could introduce any feature of the work that they desired.

(4) They claimed and sought to obtain for the Editorial Committee more power in the teaching office than that Servant received from the Lord, or ever used; *i.e.*, the power to exclude from the Church any teaching not sanctioned by "The Bible Standard" Editorial Committee.

(5) By forbidding the teaching of things unsanctioned by the Committee, they arrogated to themselves more power than that Servant received from God, or ever used.

(6) They attempted to withhold, and succeeded in withholding, the service of faithful Pilgrims from the Church, as far as they were able.

VII. I.F. Hoskins and I.L. Margeson, supported by H.C. Rockwell, sought in several "business" matters, to prevent carrying out the decision of the Committee's majority

RUTHERFORDISM IN THE SOCIETY.

(1) With the assistance of W.E. Van Amburgh and A.H. MacMillan, he sought to prevent the publication of the first reply of the Board's majority, wherein they defended themselves against their ousting and J.F.R.'s circular letter of July 19, 1917, to the Class Secretaries.

(2) With the assistance of these two he sought to prevent the distribution of this same reply, July 26, 1917.

(3) With the assistance of the same two, he sought to disparage the Board's majority relative to the publication and distribution of the reply, as well as to disparage the reply itself.

VIII. Through misrepresentation and violation of confidence faithful and prominent brethren,

RUTHERFORDISM IN THE COMMITTEE.

to the disruption of the old Committee.

(1) These three sought to prevent the publication of The Bible Standard before the Asbury Park Convention, despite the votes of four members of the Committee, who voted that the paper be published in time to announce the Asbury Park Convention.

(2) The same three sought to prevent the distribution of The Bible Standard at the time *that* the majority of the large Committee and of the Convention Committee decided that it be distributed, July 26, 1918.

(3) These three, through I.F. Hoskins, their leader, sought publicly to disparage the course of the Committee's majority relative to the publication and distribution of The Bible Standard, as well as to disparage the paper itself.

VIII. Through misrepresentation and violation of confidence faithful and prominent brethren, refusing

RUTHERFORDISM IN THE
SOCIETY.

refusing to countenance wrong principles and acts, were, by J.F.R. and his supporters, privately and publicly discredited in the Church, to the disruption of the Society's old Board.

(1) One of these was publicly and privately represented as an insane and fanciful speculator on types, symbols and prophecy, and as insanely aspiring to leadership.

(2) Certain Directors were falsely represented as dominated by him.

(3) These and he were falsely accused of obstructing the work of the Church.

(4) These and he were falsely accused of dividing the Church.

(5) These and he were falsely accused of advocating radical Scriptural teaching.

(6) Without foundation in fact one of them was habitually accused of seeking to lord it over God's heritage.

(7) Things that one of

RUTHERFORDISM IN THE
COMMITTEE.

to countenance wrong principles and acts, have, by some of the group and some of their supporters, been publicly and privately discredited in the Church, to the disruption of the old Committee.

(1) One of these was privately and publicly represented as an insane and fanciful speculator on types, symbols and prophecy, and as insanely aspiring to leadership.

(2) Certain Committee members were falsely represented as dominated by him.

(3) These and he were falsely accused of obstructing the work of the Church.

(4) These and he were falsely accused of dividing the Church.

(5) These and he were falsely accused of advocating radical Scriptural teaching.

(6) Without foundation in fact one of the three was habitually accused of seeking to lord it over God's heritage.

(7) Things that one of

RUTHERFORDISM IN THE
SOCIETY.

the five had told in sacred confidence were scattered broadcast.

IX. J.F.R. and his supporters, July 27, 1917, tried to force through the People's Pulpit Association and the Bethel Family several matters without proper discussion, to the disruption of the old Board.

(1) He accepted the program of a spurious *first* smiting of Jordan from a brother whose key and many other views of Revelation, etc., are vagarious and contrary to those of that Servant; and he insisted that all swallow his program and labor in harmony with it.

(2) From the false viewpoint that that Servant *clearly* taught a *future first* smiting of Jordan, he sought, July 27, 1917, with almost no discussion to commit to this program the People's Pulpit Association under the new Board, which he was really organizing as the directorate of a new Society with what was in effect an altered

RUTHERFORDISM IN THE
COMMITTEE.

the three had told in sacred confidence were scattered broadcast.

IX. The Group and their supporters, July 27, 1918, sought to force through the Asbury Park Convention several matters without proper discussion, to the disruption of the old Committee.

(1) They accepted a program for a spurious *first* smiting of Jordan from a brother whose key and many other views of Revelation, etc., are vagarious and contrary to those of that Servant; and they insisted that all swallow their program and labor in harmony with it.

(2) From the false viewpoint that that Servant *clearly* taught a *future first* smiting of Jordan they sought, July 27, 1918, to commit with almost no discussion the Convention to the policy of forming a Society with an altered Charter as indispensable to a future first smiting of Jordan.

RUTHERFORDISM IN THE
SOCIETY.

Charter as indispensable for
a *future first* smiting of
Jordan.

(3) He resorted, July 27,
1917, to parliamentary
evasions and other
questionable things to
prevent discussing questions
fundamental to his whole
plan.

(4) He also resorted, July
27, 1917, to cloture methods
to prevent in the People's
Pulpit Association and
before the Bethel family
sufficient discussion of his
program.

X. Privately and
publicly J.F.R. advocated
what was in fact setting
aside some of, and adding
others to, the clauses of
that Servant's charter for
his new society, unto the
disruption of the old
Board.

(1) His advocacy of the
principle contained in the
letter of Brother Dabney that
all the Church ought to have
a vote in the election of the
Directors proves that he
preferred not to have
shareholders.

(2) His holding the "straw
vote" proves that

RUTHERFORDISM IN THE
COMMITTEE.

(3) They resorted, July
27, 1918, to parliamentary
evasions and other
questionable things to
prevent discussion of
questions fundamental to
their whole plan.

(4) They also resorted,
July 27, 1918, to cloture
methods to prevent, in the
Convention, sufficient
discussion of their program.

X. Privately and
publicly the Group
advocated setting aside
some of, and adding
others to, the clauses of
that Servant's charter in
the charter of their
proposed society, unto
the disruption of the old
Committee.

(1) They asked that there
be no shareholders in the
proposed new Society.

(2) They advocated that
the Directors be elected by

RUTHERFORDISM IN THE SOCIETY.

he wanted the Directors elected by The Tower subscribers in the Truth.

(3) By campaigning for and manipulating proxies he proved that he wanted the officers elected by the Directors of the Society.

(4) He wanted the directors to be elected annually, contrary to that Servant's arrangement.

(5) In his oration, written early in Nov., 1916, and published in the Memorial Tower, he professed the highest regard for that Servant's charter.

(6) He was repeatedly entreated not to advocate these changes, as disloyal to that Servant's charter.

(7) He was forewarned that for such advocacy thoughtful persons would be given good reason to fear that his published praise of the Charter would be open to the charge of insincerity and self-seeking.

XI. J.F.R. arranged for and conducted, in the interests of his plan for three days, Jan. 3-5,

RUTHERFORDISM IN THE COMMITTEE.

the subscribers of The Bible Standard.

(3) They advocated that the officers be elected by the Directors.

(4) They wanted the Directors to be elected annually, contrary to that Servant's arrangement.

(5) They professed in Facts for Shareholders, written early in Nov., 1917, the highest regard for that Servant's charter as divinely given.

(6) They were repeatedly entreated not to advocate these changes, as disloyal to that Servant's charter.

(7) They were forewarned that for such advocacy thoughtful persons would be given good reason to fear that their published praise of the Charter as Divinely given would be open to the charge of insincerity and self-seeking.

XI. The Group arranged for and conducted, in the interests of their plan for three days, July 26-28,

RUTHERFORDISM IN THE
SOCIETY.

1918, a thoroughly
"bossed" convention.

(1) He announced his
plan beforehand.

(2) He carried out much
of his plan; and was
prevented from carrying it
out entirely, *e.g.*, a unani-
mous re-election, by some,
previously unenlightened,
becoming enlightened as to
his purposes and methods.

(3) One of the avowed
purposes of the Convention
was to unseat the four
Directors who sought to
hold in check his
unscriptural and dangerous
plans.

(4) A widespread
"political" campaign was
waged creating much and
general sentiment, particu-
larly against Bro. Johnson,
and generally against the
Board members, inuring to
their unseating.

(5) He engineered a
movement to use for his
advantage an absent brother,
A.N. Pierson, and used his
opinions before the
Convention to the discredit
of the ousted Directors.

(6) He had at least one

RUTHERFORDISM IN THE
COMMITTEE.

1918, a thoroughly
"bossed" convention.

(1) They announced their
plan beforehand.

(2) They carried out
much of their plan; and were
prevented from carrying it
out entirely by some,
previously unenlightened,
becoming enlightened as to
their purposes and methods.

(3) One of the avowed
purposes of the Convention
was to unseat the three
Committee brothers who
held in check their
unscriptural and dangerous
plans.

(4) A widespread
"political" campaign was
waged creating much and
general sentiment, particu-
larly against Bro. Johnson,
and generally against all
three of the Committee
members marked for defeat,
inuring to their unseating.

(5) They engineered a
movement to use for their
advantage an absent brother,
Menta Sturgeon, and used
his opinions before the
Convention to the discredit
of the three rejected
Committee members.

(6) At least one brother

RUTHERFORDISM IN THE
SOCIETY.

special mouthpiece to present motions with suitable and sometimes untrue remarks to carry out his previously arranged plan.

(7) In discourses and addresses he and some of his supporters sought to undermine, in the estimation of the conventioners, the brothers who were objectionable to him.

(8) A special meeting of leaders (unannounced on the program) was called to oil the machinery to be set in motion in the Shareholders' meeting.

(9) To the advantage of his plan the false statement was made that he had legally filled four vacancies with Directors with valid powers, until the next election, when all the Directors were to surrender their

RUTHERFORDISM IN THE
COMMITTEE.

acted as their special mouthpiece in presenting motions with suitable and sometimes untrue remarks to carry out their previously arranged plan.

(7) In discourses and addresses some of them and some of their supporters sought to undermine, in the estimation of the conventioners, the brothers who were objectionable to them.

(8) A special meeting of elders and deacons (unannounced on the program) was called before the announced Convention business meeting. Judging from the atmosphere, speeches and motions, the evident object of this special meeting was to work up the elders and deacons to support the plan of the Group for the business session following.

(9) To the advantage of their plan the false statement was made that the Committee had been instructed at the Fort Pitt Convention to act until the next Convention, to which they should go and give up

RUTHERFORDISM IN THE
SOCIETY.

powers and stewardship.

(10) Bro. Johnson protested formally and solemnly against the proposed action of the Shareholders to elect directors without there being vacancies on the Board, according to the Charter.

(11) To the advantage of his plan the false statement was circulated that the seven Directors had come to the Shareholders' meeting believing their places vacant.

(12) So unfavorable to the four Directors had the atmosphere of the Shareholders' meeting become, through the "political" campaign, that they had very great difficulties put in the way of their proving that that Servant, having arranged their places on the Board, J.F.R. could not oust them, nor of right ask them to resign, nor take over the control of the stewardship that they had acquired under that Servant's arrangements.

RUTHERFORDISM IN THE
COMMITTEE.

their powers and stewardship.

(10) Bro. Johnson formally and solemnly protested against the proposed action of the conventioners, unauthorized by the Fort Pitt Convention, to elect Committee members in a body appointed by another and independent convention.

(11) To the advantage of their plan the false statement was repeatedly made that the seven Committee members had come to the Convention to resign.

(12) So unfavorable to the three marked Committee members had the atmosphere of the Convention become through the "political" campaign, that they had very great difficulties put in the way of their proving that the Fort Pitt Convention, having appointed and empowered the Committee, and not having made them subject to another Convention, the Asbury Park Convention, could neither depose them, nor of right ask their resignation,

RUTHERFORDISM IN THE
SOCIETY.

(13) By arbitrary insistence in matters in which at most the Shareholders should have gone no further than to suggest, they would not permit an Arbitration Board sitting as a separate body to deliberate on the facts as to whether the Directors of the Society should surrender the rights of that Servant in his Will and Charter to a J.F.R.-controlled-meeting.

(14) The *demand* was made by a majority vote that the Directors surrender the powers that that Servant gave them in his Will and Charter to a J.F.R.-controlled-meeting.

(15) This demand, it was insisted upon, must be granted in that meeting without permitting appropriate discussion.

(16) This demand was enforced by the J.F.R.-

RUTHERFORDISM IN THE
COMMITTEE.

nor take over the property that they had acquired under commission of the Fort Pitt Convention.

(13) By arbitrary insistence in matters in which the conventioners should have gone no further than to suggest, they would not permit the eighteen members of the Fort Pitt Convention present to withdraw in a body to deliberate on the question of surrendering the rights of the Fort Pitt Convention to a convention bossed by the Group.

(14) The demand was made by a majority vote that these eighteen brethren vote the powers of the Fort Pitt Convention over the Committee to the Asbury Park Convention.

(15) This demand, it was insisted upon, must be granted in the Convention's presence without permitting appropriate discussion or the withdrawal of the eighteen brethren for private deliberation.

(16) This demand was enforced by a Convention

RUTHERFORDISM IN THE
SOCIETY.

bossed Convention without discussion on the part of the Directors and others.

(17) This demand, so favorable to his plan, having been granted, they were, by a resolution, impliedly asked to accede to an election of their successors, *i.e.*, they were in effect asked to resign.

(18) They knew that the Shareholders would have voted them out of office, if they did not accept the situation demanded by him and his supporters; and therefore, under this stress, they ceased to object to the election proceeding; *i.e.*, they in effect resigned.

(19) The four Directors knew that they were marked for slaughter.

(20) The surrender of the powers of the four Directors, conferred by that Servant's Charter, not only put the entire directorate into the hands of the J.F.R.-controlled Convention, but also the Society's other assets.

(21) To say that the above-described course of this Shareholders' meeting

RUTHERFORDISM IN THE
COMMITTEE.

"bossed" by the Group without discussion on the part of the three and others.

(17) This demand, so favorable to the plan of the Group, having been granted, the Committee was asked to resign.

(18) They knew that the misinformed Convention would have ousted them, if they did not accept the situation demanded by the Group and their supporters; and therefore, under this stress, the three resigned.

(19) The three knew that they were marked for slaughter.

(20) The surrender of the powers of the Fort Pitt Convention to the Asbury Park Convention, not only put the Committee into the hands of a bossed Convention, but also the Committee's assets.

(21) To say that the above-described course of the Convention's business

RUTHERFORDISM IN THE SOCIETY.

was coercive is putting matters mildly.

(22) When brethren of spiritual discernment saw that in the course of his supporters the Lord's spirit was plainly lacking; and when they sought to have the proceedings stopped, just before the election of Directors was taken up; they were uncharitably accused of seeking to obstruct matters.

(23) F.H. McGee, the proposer of the motion to delay matters for investigation, was treated with contempt and silenced by "a point of order."

(24) Up to the time of balloting for new Directors, repeated efforts were made to change the purpose of the supporters of J.F.R.'s plans.

(25) All such efforts were in vain, because his "political" campaign had misled the majority of the shareholders, who seemed

RUTHERFORDISM IN THE COMMITTEE.

meetings on Saturday, July 27, 1918, was coercive is putting the matter mildly.

(22) When brethren of spiritual discernment saw that in the course of the supporters of the Group the Lord's spirit was plainly lacking; and when they sought, just before the election of a new Committee was taken up, to adjourn the meeting, they were uncharitably accused of seeking to obstruct matters.

(23) Bro. Johnson, the proposer of the motion to delay matters, until more deliberation and prayer could be given matters, was treated with contemptuous catcalls of "shame" and silenced on "a point of order."

(24) Up to the time of voting for the new Committee repeated efforts were made to change the purpose of the supporters of the Group's plans.

(25) All such efforts were in vain, because the Group's "political" campaign, by July 27, 1918, had misled the majority of

RUTHERFORDISM IN THE
SOCIETY.

impatient with the efforts to enlighten them on the real merits of the case.

(26) The shareholders, responding to motions favorable to his plans, elected six to membership on the new Board who were advocated for such membership before the election by him and his supporters.

(27) The other new member of the Board was nominated by supporters of his plans.

(28) The five Directors who had opposed his usurpations were not elected.

(29) Before the election he made special efforts to separate A.N. Pierson from the four "opponent" Directors.

(30) Without an election thereto, he assumed the chairmanship of the shareholders' meeting.

RUTHERFORDISM IN THE
COMMITTEE.

the conventioners, who seemed impatient with the efforts to enlighten them on the real merits of the case.

(26) The Conventioners, responding to motions favorable to the plans of the Group, elected six to membership on the new Committee who, with one possible exception, were advocated for such membership before the election by the Group and their supporters.

(27) The other new member of the Committee was nominated by supporters of the Group's plans.

(28) The three brothers who had opposed the questionable efforts of the other members of the Committee were not elected.

(29) Before the election the Group of four made special efforts to separate R.H. Hirsh from R.G. Jolly and P.S.L. Johnson.

(30) The Group, without an election thereto, assumed in the person of their convention chairman, the chairmanship of the business sessions.

RUTHERFORDISM IN THE
SOCIETY.

(31) Throughout the Shareholders' meeting he, as chairman, ruled in favor of his plans, to the disadvantage of the four ousted Directors.

(32) At one point he signaled A.H. MacMillan to have a motion made advantageous to his plans.

(33) Attacks were made on the four Directors and on several of their supporters, their names even being disparagingly mentioned.

(34) These attacks were made preparatory to the business centering in the election.

(35) The activity of certain interested sisters, before and during the Convention, helped to create the unhealthy atmosphere of the first business sessions of the Shareholders' meeting.

(36) The Shareholders' meeting, controlled by J.F.R., permitted no discussion of certain vital issues.

RUTHERFORDISM IN THE
COMMITTEE.

(31) Throughout the business meetings the chairman of the Group ruled in favor of their plans, to the disadvantage of the three marked committee men.

(32) At one point he signaled to Bro. Robbins to make a motion advantageous to the plans of the Group.

(33) Attacks were made on the three committeemen, their names even being disparagingly mentioned.

(34) These attacks were made preparatory to the business centering in the election.

(35) The activity of certain interested sisters, before and during the Convention, helped to create the unhealthy atmosphere of the first business sessions of the Convention.

(36) The business meetings of Saturday, July 27, 1918, controlled by the Group and their supporters permitted no discussion of certain vital issues.

RUTHERFORDISM IN THE
SOCIETY.

(37) To the last he sought to "boss" the Shareholders' meeting.

(38) His tactics turned what should have been a feast into one of the few bad Conventions held among Truth people.

(39) His general course made a division in the Church.

(40) His general course greatly distressed the Church.

(41) His general course undermined the Faithful's confidence in him.

(42) His general course wrecked the Society's real work.

(43) His general course called for the Faithful to question his leadership.

(44) His general course called for an unbossed Convention for consultation and action relative to his acts and aims and the conditions in the Church.

(45) Fearing an investigation, he refused to call an extra meeting of the

RUTHERFORDISM IN THE
COMMITTEE.

(37) To the last the Group sought to "boss" the business meetings of the Convention.

(38) Their tactics turned what should have been a feast into one of the few bad Conventions held among Truth people.

(39) Their general course made a division in the Church.

(40) Their general course greatly distressed the Church.

(41) Their general course undermined the Faithful's confidence in them.

(42) Their general course wrecked the Committee's real work.

(43) Their general course called for the Faithful to question their leadership.

(44) Their general course called for an unbossed Convention for consultation and action relative to their acts and aims and the condition of the Church.

(45) Fearing an investigation they refused to call an early Convention, which

RUTHERFORDISM IN THE
SOCIETY.

shareholders, which he was asked to do.

(46) He wrote to the Philadelphia Church that he had too much to do to arrange for a special meeting of the Society's shareholders; and that an extra meeting of the shareholders would be too inconvenient for them, and therefore *he unanimously* decided not to call them together.

RUTHERFORDISM IN THE
COMMITTEE.

they were asked to do.

(46) The new Committee wrote to the Philadelphia Church that it has too much work to arrange for a general Convention (a Convention that might uncover matters?) and that the location of Philadelphia makes it too inconvenient for a convention to assemble there; therefore, it *unanimously* decided to disfavor the request of the Philadelphia Church for a general Convention.

XII. A most impressive feature brought to light by a comparison of the wrong acts of J.F.R. and his supporters on the one hand, and of the Group and their supporters on the other hand, is the fact that in the main particulars both Groups committed the same kind of wrongs exactly to the day, one year apart. Many of the Faithful, scripturally regard the Spirit-begotten supporters of J.F.R. as of that class of antitypical Merarite Levites (Great Company, Vol. VI, page 129), typed by the Mahlite (Num. 3:20, 33), descendants of Merari. Some of these Faithful are beginning to have grave fears that the Group and their supporters may be of the antitypical Gershonite Levites (Great Company), typed by the Shimite descendants of Gershon. Does it not seem probable that the Lord allowed an exact year to elapse between the revelation (by actions) of the antitypical Mahlite and the antitypical Shimite Levites?

RUTHERFORDISM IN THE
SOCIETY.

(1) J.F.R. was voted into power, Jan. 6, 1917, by the passing of his by-laws, recommended by I.L. Margeson and two others.

(2) A little later the Board was organized by the election of the Society's officers, Jan. 6, 1917.

(3) J.F.R. defined his powers after his by-laws were spread on the Board's minutes, Jan. 20, 1917.

(4) Bro. Johnson's statement, drawn up at London, Feb. 17, 1917, setting forth the wrongs of H.J. Shearn and W. Crawford, was reported to J.F.R. as injurious, Feb. 19, 1918.

(5) His cable to the London Managers and to Bro. Johnson declared some of the latter's work to be "absolutely without

RUTHERFORDISM IN THE
COMMITTEE.

(1) The Committee was voted into power, Jan. 6, 1918, by I.L. Margeson's resolution, over which he seemed to consult two others (he succeeding a resigned member, helped largely to form the Group as separate from the other three brothers).

(2) A little later the Committee was organized by the election of its officers, Jan. 6, 1918.

(3) The Committee defined its powers after discussing its minutes and spreading upon them the powers conferred on them at the Convention, Jan. 20, 1918.

(4) Bro. Johnson's statements on the "evil servant," Feb. 17, 1918, at Philadelphia, setting forth the wrongs of J.F.R. were reported to I.F. Hoskins as injurious, Feb. 19, 1918.

(5) The Group's resolution of Feb. 23 (passed at night, therefore Feb. 24, God's time), discountenancing any teachings not

RUTHERFORDISM IN THE
SOCIETY.

authority," Feb. 24, 1917.

(6) J. Hemery, in the interests of J.F.R.'s "absolutely-without-authority" cable, suspiciously watches Bro. Johnson as "unsafe," preparatory to and during the sessions of the Investigating Commission, March 2-5, 1917.

(7) As the agent of J.F.R., J. Hemery tells members of the Investigating Commission of the "absolutely-without-authority" and "insanity" cables, with comments, March 3, 1917.

(8) J. Hemery, as J.F.R.'s representative, at a special meeting, continues to slander Bro. Johnson, March 11, 1917.

(9) J. Hemery, as J.F.R.'s representative, at another special meeting, still continues to slander Bro. Johnson, March 13, 1917.

RUTHERFORDISM IN THE
COMMITTEE.

approved by the Committee (which, of course, means the Group) declared Bro. Johnson's work on that evil servant, Elijah and Elisha, etc., "absolutely without authority," Feb. 24, 1918.

(6) I.L. Margeson, in the interests of the Group's "absolutely-without-authority" preaching resolution, at Boston suspiciously watches Bro. Johnson as "unsafe," March 2-5, 1918.

(7) Seemingly acting as the agent of M. Sturgeon (whose working program the Group has adopted), Hattie O. Henderson distributes her slanderous paper against Bro. Johnson, with comments, March 3, 1918.

(8) Hattie O. Henderson, seemingly as M. Sturgeon's representative, at a special meeting continues to slander Bro. Johnson, March 11, 1918.

(9) Hattie O. Henderson, seemingly as M. Sturgeon's representative, at another special meeting continues to slander Bro. Johnson, March 13, 1918.

RUTHERFORDISM IN THE
SOCIETY.

(10) At a Board meeting Bro. Johnson is reproved by J.F.R. and several of his supporters for having supposedly acted "absolutely without authority" in the English affairs, April 13, 1917.

(11) At this Board meeting Bro. Johnson protests against his English activity being treated as "absolutely without authority," April 13, 1917.

(12) Just after reading his paper on conscientious objection to the Bethel family, J.F.R. said to Bro. Johnson that it was necessary for the safeguarding of the brethren from military service to claim that the Society and the Church were one; *i.e.*, it was attempted to organize the Church otherwise than the Lord organized it, May 11, 1917.

(13) Bro. Johnson's Scriptural objection to this plan is treated lightly by J.F.R., May 11, 1917.

RUTHERFORDISM IN THE
COMMITTEE.

(10) At a Committee meeting Bro. Johnson is reproved by the Group as having acted "absolutely without authority" in the Elijah and Elisha discourse delivered at Jersey City and Newark, where he spoke on this subject by request of the Classes, April 13, 1918.

(11) At this Committee meeting Bro. Johnson protests against his preaching timely Truth being treated as "absolutely without authority," April 13, 1918.

(12) A representative of the Group proposed the formation of a Society as necessary for the work; *i.e.*, it was an attempt to organize the Church otherwise than the Lord organized it, May 11, 1918.

(13) Bro. Johnson's Scriptural objection to this plan is treated lightly by the Group, May 11, 1918.

RUTHERFORDISM IN THE
SOCIETY.

(14) Through the Board's compromising resolution on Bro. Johnson's English activity, J.F.R. succeeded in throwing a cloud over his English work, June 20, 1917.

(15) J.F.R. and A.H. MacMillan, June 21, 1917, try to get rid of Bro. Johnson by attempting to send him on a transient Pilgrim trip, landing him at his home.

(16) Bro. Johnson's refusal to go on a Pilgrim trip and his appeal to the Board against J.F.R.'s order for him to leave Bethel, blocked, temporarily, the effort to put him out of the Society's work, June 22, 1917.

(17) By making affidavit to four vacancies in the Board, and by appointing four new directors, J.F.R. blocked efforts to

RUTHERFORDISM IN THE
COMMITTEE.

(14) Through the compromising course of some of the Committee members and their supporters relative to Bro. Johnson's course toward the Society's leaders on trial, his Elijah and Elisha teaching is placed under a cloud, June 20, 1918.

(15) I.F. Hoskins' and H.C. Rockwell's plan (made at the conviction of the Society leaders) to form a reunion with the Society, based as it was on a denial that the division of last year was the separation of Elijah and Elisha, was logically an attempt to get rid of Bro. Johnson, June 21, 1918.

(16) Bro. Johnson's objection to, and the majority of the Committee disapproving of, the projected reunion with the Society temporarily blocks what in reality was an effort to put him out of the Committee's work, June 22, 1918.

(17) By finally preventing a meeting for July 13, 1918, several of the Group blocked efforts to interfere with their plans, July 12,

RUTHERFORDISM IN THE
SOCIETY.

interfere with his plans, July 12, 1917.

(18) The ousting of the four Directors was fully decided upon and attempted, July 17, 1917.

(19) The reaffirmation of the ousting was definitely made in a Board meeting, July 18, 1917.

(20) Part of Bro. Johnson's basis of mediation was rejected July 18, 1917.

(21) Many of the Bethel family, influenced by a "political" campaign, coldly received Bro. Johnson on his return from Cromwell, July 25-26, 1917.

(22) Bro. Johnson was fiercely and cunningly attacked by J.F.R. in the

RUTHERFORDISM IN THE
COMMITTEE.

1918.

(18) Several members of the Editorial and Pastoral Bible Institute Committees fully decided that R.H. Hirsh, R.G. Jolly and P.S.L. Johnson must be ousted, and a new Committee (whom for the most part they named) be elected; the plan for withholding the paper was a part of the attempt to put this into execution, July 17, 1918.

(19) The reaffirmation of the ousting was definitely made in the meeting of the Committee, July 18, 1918.

(20) Part of Bro. Johnson's basis of mediation of Committee's troubles; *i.e.*, by dissolving the Editorial Committee, was rejected, July 18, 1918.

(21) Many of the conventioners, influenced by a "political" campaign, coldly received Bro. Johnson, July 25-26, 1918.

(22) Bro. Johnson was fiercely and cunningly attacked by H.C. Rockwell

RUTHERFORDISM IN THE SOCIETY.

morning meeting of the People's Pulpit Association, July 27, 1917.

(23) The ousted Board members and Bro. Johnson were ordered out of Bethel, *i.e.*, out of official relation to the Society, by order of J.F.R.'s Executive Committee, July 27, 1917.

(24) Trickery and coercion were used, especially against Bro. Johnson, to put and keep him out of Bethel, July 27, 1917.

(25) Bro. Johnson was made the target of hooting by J.F.R.'s supporters, July 27, 1917.

(26) Bro. Johnson was actually, and the four ousted Board members were virtually, put out of Bethel, July 27, 1917.

(27) J.F.R., in effect, appointed an unauthorized Editorial Committee when he and others arranged to send out his "Harvest Siftings" as Society literature unsanctioned by "The Tower" Editorial Committee, and unknown to a majority of its members, July 28, 1917.

RUTHERFORDISM IN THE COMMITTEE.

in the morning meeting of the convention, July 27, 1918.

(23) R.H. Hirsh, R.G. Jolly and P.S.L. Johnson were ordered out of the Committee by the Group's supporters, July 27, 1918.

(24) Trickery and coercion were used, especially against Bro. Johnson, to put and keep him out of the Committee, July 27, 1918.

(25) Bro. Johnson was made the target of hooting by supporters of the Group, July 27, 1918.

(26) R.H. Hirsh, R.G. Jolly and P.S.L. Johnson were put out of the Committee, July 27, 1918.

(27) The Group appointed an unauthorized Editorial Committee, when they and others elected such a Committee without authorization of the Convention, July 28, 1918.

RUTHERFORDISM IN THE
SOCIETY.

(28) The publication of J.F.R.'s "Harvest Siftings," an attempt to boycott the Board's majority and Bro. Johnson was sent first of all to the Boston elders and deacons, July 29, 1917.

(29) J.F.R., directly and through W.E. Van Amburgh, at the Boston Convention, claimed that the four Directors and Bro. Johnson were misrepresenting him, Aug. 5, 1917.

RUTHERFORDISM IN THE
COMMITTEE.

(28) The making of the untrue propaganda in opposition to the three Committee members solidified into the decision of the Group and others to boycott at least two of them, which boycott has been in force since the Convention, July 29, 1918.

(29) The new Committee passed a resolution which was the next day sent to the Philadelphia Church intimating that R.G. Jolly and P.S.L. Johnson were misrepresenting them, Aug. 5, 1918.

There are additional to those given under Division XII, many more year parallels under the preceding divisions.

On Aug. 4 the Philadelphia Church requested the P.B.I. Committee to arrange for a General Convention at Philadelphia for Sept. 8-10. On Aug. 13 I.F. Hoskins, Secretary of the Committee, wrote that the Committee unanimously disfavored granting their request. As shown above, their reasons parallel those given by J.F.R. for declining the request of the Philadelphia Church last year for a special meeting of the Shareholders to regulate the situation. They feared to face an investigation, not only in the Convention of Sept. 8-10, but also at the one of Dec. 20-22. An influential brother

later asked I.F. Hoskins why the P.B.I. Committee declined to face the investigations at those two Conventions. For himself, he replied: "Every time I have a debate with Bro. Johnson he makes me look like thirty cents."

When the P.B.I. refused to call a General Convention for Sept. 8-10, 1918, at Philadelphia, one was called by the writer. Immediately after the issue of this call a discussion before the Philadelphia Ecclesia, participated in by six members of the Old Committee, three on each side, took place Aug. 25. The Philadelphia Church was not by the discussion favorably impressed with the merits of the Group's contention; rather, the unfavorable impression made on most of its delegates at the Asbury Park Convention by the course of the Group was extended to almost the entire Philadelphia Church. Further, the New Committee enwrapped itself within the folds of the mantle of its claimed power to be alone "authorized" to call General Conventions among us. After the manner of the Romish and Anglican Church, the Committee refused either to take part in, or to recognize the validity of the Philadelphia Convention. We had impartially arranged the speaking program as follows: two from each side of the controversy, and two neutrals. Four of these six declined to serve at an "unauthorized" Convention. The Committee used its influence to boycott the Convention, which was not largely attended, though more largely than the September "Bulletin" states. Had the Committee attended they would have been treated at least as well as the Golden Rule requires. The announced program was carried out; *i.e.*, mornings devoted to discourses, and afternoons, with one exception, and evenings, with one exception, to the business of investigating the Church conditions generally and the Committee conditions particularly, and of seeking a remedy for certain evils uncovered by the investigation.

We greatly regret that the Committee's course prevented its viewpoint from being fully given. The Lord's blessing rested, however, richly upon the Convention. At its last session, the great bulk of the brethren, fully convinced of the necessity of a remedy, passed as its understanding of what it believed was the Lord's will as to a remedy the following resolution (we omit its preamble and its first two clauses): "In view of many apparent evils at work throughout the Church in general, we appoint the following three brothers as an investigating committee: Bro. McGee, with Bro. Hirsh as alternate; Bro. Johnson, with Bro. Hoskins as alternate; and Bro. Newman, with Bro. Hollister, as alternate; it being understood that if any decline, their respective alternate shall have the privilege of serving in their stead, and in case any alternate shall decline to accept appointment, another shall be elected by the remainder of the Investigation Committee to fill such vacancy. The services of this Committee shall be freely offered to any ecclesia desiring the same, the general purpose being to give such assistance as shall seem necessary to help set aside evils that are wide-spread among us, as well as in the old and the new general Committees, in order that the purity of the Sanctuary and the unity of God's people be preserved."

It was sought impartially to represent every interest in the controversy. Therefore, Bro. McGee was taken for the Committee's side, Bro. Newman from the neutrals and ourself from the other side. Confidence in Bro. McGee's honesty and interest in Zion's welfare, and not in any sense the thought of putting him into an inconsistent position, was responsible for his selection as a member of the Investigating and Curative Committee. Bro. Hirsh was selected as his alternate, not to put Bro. McGee into an inconsistent position, nor to unbalance, but to balance the Committee, the thought being that the fact that he

was Bro. McGee's alternate would all the more influence the latter to accept, in order to prevent "upsetting the balance of the Committee." Bro. McGee, to our great disappointment, declined to serve; so did the two neutrals. Bro. Hirsh and the writer constituted the Committee, a third member was not elected because of the desire to have one who was both neutral in deed and at the same time influential enough to carry weight with the Church. Such an one could not be found.

The unresponsive and boycotting attitude of the P.B.I. Committee, the unfavorable impression that its three speaking representatives made in the discussion of Aug. 25, 1918, with the three ousted Committee members on the minds of the large majority of the Church, the detailed exposures of Committee conditions made through the investigation during the Convention, and the agitated changes of Committee policy from that announced in the Committee's letter of March 1, 1918, moved the Philadelphia Church to withdraw its support from, and its invitation to, the P.B.I. Committee to send it speakers, and to ask for the return of such a proportion of its total donations as existed between the Committee's expenses and total receipts up to but not including the Asbury Park Convention, the special donation for this Convention made by a certain brother not counting as a part of such total receipts. The P.B.I. Committee by its chairman and secretary, for untenable reasons, declined to make such a return. It similarly refused to refund other proportionate donations, some of them, like that of the Philadelphia Church, being quite substantial. The Philadelphia Church stood apart from the P.B.I. Committee since Sept. 17, 1918.

This Church invited the Investigating and Curative Committee to help it to recognize and to set aside in its midst any of the above-mentioned wrongs that may therein be existing. This work, delayed in part

by the quarantine due to the influenza, was completed, and the report on it was soon thereafter made. There was very good evidence that this investigation has led to more earnest searching for, and purging out of leaven, and that it will result in a better keeping of the feast (1 Cor. 5:7, 8). The object of this Committee was not to foist itself on any church; for it respects the right of each church to control under our Head in its own midst, entirely apart from dictation of any and all outsiders, whether these be individuals or committees or Boards or "present managements," etc. Nor was its object to investigate matters of doctrine and interpretation, which seem to be the province of a self-constituted doctrinal clearing house, for which we do not stand. It was simply to serve such churches only as desire and ask its service in helping them to search for the leaven which is quite wide-spread among us, and by loving counsel and entreaty encourage all to purge it out for a better Passover keeping. It did not pronounce judgment. This Committee was ready for such service, which it was glad to render to any church desiring and requesting it.

A P.B.I. Convention was held at Providence, Nov. 8-10. We were pleased to hear that the dear conventioners had a peaceful time and greatly enjoyed themselves. The more of blessings the Lord's people enjoy the happier the writer is. Nov. 15 a special delivery letter came to him that, apart from the discussion of the business matters treated of in the letter, mentioned some news items of the Providence Convention, to the effect that (1) the Convention authorized an organization, (2) authorized a periodical, and (3) appointed a Committee to seek to secure the support of the Philadelphia Church. This last item especially interested us. It gladdened us to see something of a conciliatory attitude on this matter. It moved us to decide to bring up the

matter before the Philadelphia Church and to write the first number of *The Present Truth*, on which that selfsame morning we began to work. To make the situation plain, let us say that the Philadelphia Church did not withdraw its support from the P.B.I. Committee for all time, but only until such time as it would set itself straight in the eyes of the Philadelphia Church. And if there were such a disposition on its part, it would have found that Church more than ready to go more than half way to help it so to do. Having this confidence in this Ecclesia, in addition to the labor involved in preparing the first number of *The Present Truth* as a means of helping to clear up the doctrinal aspects of the situation, we prepared and presented a pertinent resolution to the Philadelphia Ecclesia which was almost unanimously passed at a well attended meeting Dec. 1. We were invited by this church to call a Convention for Dec. 20-22, 1918 at Philadelphia, but in spite of cordial invitations to the P.B.I. Committee to participate and encourage their adherents to do likewise and the sending of a special messenger to this Committee, it refused to participate and it encouraged its followers to boycott it. Pertinent to the case we wrote an article, *In Defense Of Peace Among God's People*, for the second number of *The Present Truth* (Dec. 24, 1918) which we herewith reproduce.

In the first number of *The Present Truth*, in the article, *The Last Related Acts of Elijah and Elisha* (reproduced in Vol. III, Chap. II), evidence was given that the Little Flock and the Great Company are separated, and that the mantle of power to be God's mouthpiece to Nominal Spiritual Israel is now in the hands of the antitypical Elisha, the Great Company. Much that belongs to this mantle centers in certain powers that the Great Company has through its control by its representatives over the affairs and business of the W.T.B.&T. Society,

the I.B.S.A. and the Peoples Pulpit Association. Further in that number, in the article, Withdrawal of Priestly Fellowship, we called attention to the fact that two of the divisions of the Levites, who for the Epiphany type the Great Company, were the Merarites and the Gershonites (Num. 3:17, 20, 33). The ardent supporters of the Society and of "Rutherfordism in the Society" antitype the Mahlites Merarites. If this is true, it seems that three of the antitypes of the four chariots or wagons (which type organizations: Berean Comments on Ex. 14:9; Isaiah 31:1) given to the Merarite Levites (Num. 7:8) are in the hands of the antitypical Mahlites; *i.e.*, the Society and the two Associations named above. The Standfasts have the fourth. It would be Scriptural to conclude that the antitypical Gershonites would have the two organizations, otherwise they would be without symbolic chariots at all to assist them in their work. The Pastoral Bible Institute is one of these symbolic chariots, and the British Bible Students Committee is the other; we suggest this as a reasonable assumption because of many past happenings viewed from the standpoint of certain Scriptural teachings.

In Num. 7:2-8 the Divine approval is given to the use of the typical chariots by the Merarite and Gershonite Levites. Accordingly, the inference seems fair that the Lord will approve of the antitypical six chariots, organizations, that the Great Company and the co-operating Youthful Worthies will use for the furtherance of the work that they are Divinely commissioned to do in connection with the antitypical Sanctuary. Hence, as long as these antitypical Levites limit their activities to the work that belongs to them, every faithful antitypical Priest will not only put no hindrance in their way, but will encourage them, pray for them, and in some respects lend them some assistance in their work. But such Priests, of course, would have to resist any effort of theirs to busybody in the

work of the antitypical Priests, or, to pervert the work of the antitypical Levites. If the antitypical Levites seek to teach the Priests, and to induce them to help attempt to sacrifice on the altar, they would be busybodying, as in the type, and this would bring upon them the opposition of the Priests. (Num. 18:2, 3; Lev. 10:1). Hence, they are not to attempt to help lead forth the Scapegoat to the Gate of the Court, *i.e.*, to expose and resist the evil deeds of one another as against that altar, as this is busybodying in the work of the World's High Priest. Nor are they to seek to discover "new light" and spread it before the Church, as this would be attempting to go into the Holy, from which they have been excluded, and would result in their offering strange fire, as the Society, P.B.I. and other leaders have done in Vol. VII, "The Tower," The Herald Of The Kingdom, the Penny Parable tract, etc. Let the antitypical Levites perform Levitical work in connection with their "Chariot" services, but not hinder these Priests in their exclusive work connected with the altar. If the antitypical Levites do this, the antitypical Priests will have to resist them, and in this resistance their great Head will give them all the necessary help to drive them away from such busybodying. This will be necessarily our attitude toward the Great Company and the Youthful Worthies, if they do such busybodying. Let us hope that they will finally cease from so doing.

Let us rather hope that they will confine their ministry (1) to one another according to the Truth that they have received and will yet receive from the Priests, and (2) to the nominal people of God to whom they have been made God's mouthpiece through their possession of the antitypical mantle and with reference to whom they will get some new light from the Priests. Toward these two classes they will have an honorable and Divinely approved service, as they do it in harmony with faith, righteousness and the

Truth; and this service will tax their time, talents and strength; for it has fallen to their lot to do these things at a time when great obstacles obstruct their performance of them. It will be the endeavor of The Present Truth to help them with the Lord's truths and to encourage them with the Lord's promises, as they serve faithfully in these two respects. We would be glad, if these were the only things necessary for us to do toward the antitypical Levites. It is largely in their hands to make these our only works toward them.

Despite the shabby treatment that we have received from the Society leaders, our understanding of matters as above given has kept us in the love of God toward them. Daily do we pray for them; deeply do we sympathize with them; and gladly would we help them. In the future the Lord will open avenues for such help, and we assure the dear brethren that, as He does, we will cheerfully render it. We have long since learned how to forgive. But in this chapter we desire to offer some assistful suggestions to the dear brethren associated with the Pastoral Bible Institute. We believe that their organization is a chariot of the antitypical Gershonite Levites. We would not urge anyone to abstain from becoming a member or supporter of that Institution. We believe that each should do in this matter as he believes he will be best able to glorify the Lord. For our part we believe we can best glorify God by remaining apart from that and all other organizations, except the Body of Christ. We would, therefore, after making clear our understanding of matters as the Scriptures seem to us to set them forth, tell and encourage each to do in this matter what he thinks will best honor the Lord. The Lord lead each on to the choice best for Him!

But The Present Truth does feel deeply on some matters that it desires earnestly and lovingly to bring to the attention of the Pastoral Bible Institute and of all who become identified with it. Will the dear

brethren suffer us to set some thoughts before them for their consideration and responsiveness? The Lord, in harmony we believe with the expressed convictions of all the members of the Institute, in the charter of the W.T.B.&T. Society and will of our dear Pastor, gave the Divine arrangements for a controlling corporation that was to do the work that He intended should be done by a controlling corporation as a service of the sanctuary. It not being the Lord's intention that the other two corporations, the I.B.S.A. and the P.P.A. should control, the Lord was not so specific in setting forth arrangements with respect to them in that Servant's will. These facts move us to conclude that the charter of the W.T.B.&T.S. is the Divine sample for all other controlling corporations formed among the Lord's people; and that, therefore, the Pastoral Bible Institute will not please the Lord, if they make any alterations from the charter of the W.T.B.&T.S. other than in its name, in the draft of their own charter. We therefore earnestly bring this matter to the attention of this Institute and of all its supporters with the suggestion that they exercise all diligence to carry out this suggestion to the letter. The objections that Bro. F.H. McGee urged against adopting the W.T.B.&T.S. charter word for word except its name, we believe, are untenable for two reasons: First, there can be no mistake in following the Divine arrangements; seeming difficulties will yield to proper care in exercising the powers that the charter gives its Shareholders and Directors. Second, the dangers that he suggests are all provided against in the charter; *e.g.*, the President elected by the shareholders usurping authority over the Board. This can be obviated by the facts: First, that the charter does not give the President any powers additional to the other Directors, except three, *i.e.*, to preside at meetings, to appoint a Director, until the next annual election, in case

the Directors fail to fill a vacancy on the Board within thirty days, and to countersign the shareholders' certificates. Second, the Directors, controlling the by-laws, can make one providing for the appointment of an executive committee from which, if desirable, they could exclude the President or make him excludable as they think best. Again, his assumption that an injurious Director could be kept on the Board, whether the shareholders wished it or not, unless the Directors are annually elected, is unfounded; for the charter provides that any Director can be removed at any time by two-thirds vote of the shareholders, while an annual election of Directors is liable to introduce into the Institute and among its members "politics" of which we see too much in evidence, and which can by a "whispering campaign" or otherwise make it easy for ambitious and power-grasping Directors to rid themselves of efficient and unselfish Directors who oppose their course. Years of experience will add to the efficiency of Directors, who should not be made liable to such frequent changes, nor worried by the possibilities connected with annual elections. We believe that as that Servant arranged the charter in this respect he was wiser than are J.F.R. and F.H. McGee, who now agrees on advocating the same change that was the avenue of so great trouble last year in the Society; and the main reason that we believe that he was wiser than they in this matter is, because the Lord gave the charter through him, and certainly is not speaking through them to the brethren on this subject. We all, including F.H. McGee, thought so last year. Why the change? Was J.F.R. wrong, and were we right last year [written Dec., 1918]? And this year is he right and we—what? This change is not of the Lord!

Again, we counsel that F.H. McGee's suggested change as to who should be members of the corporation; *i.e.*, the subscribers to "The Herald," and not

voting shareholders, be not adopted. That Servant's shareholder-plan, which was the Lord's, is better; for it properly gives voting power, not in the Church, but in a business corporation, according to financial service rendered, while F.H. McGee's proposed change will prevent persons who do not want membership in the corporation from subscribing for the paper, and can bring many undesirable and unfit persons into membership in the Institute, while that Servant's arrangements makes the former evil impossible and the latter improbable. Let the Divine arrangements be followed; they are better than J.F.R.'s and F.H. McGee's. We fear that unhappy results will attend these and any other changes, as they did in the case of the Society leaders; while we believe the Divine blessing will rest upon a hearty compliance with the Lord's arrangements as to the charter.

We suggest, further, that as soon as possible there be a Board of judgment constituted, as indicated in that Servant's will in the same way, of the same number, and for the same purpose. Let worthy and suitable sisters be chosen by the Institute Committee to whom and to their successors there shall be assigned perpetually the same proportion of voting shares to the Institution's total number of voting shares, as that Servant's voting shares at the time of his death were to the total number of voting shares in the Society, the number of the Sisters' shares to increase in the same proportion, until no longer those in their hands be less than the total number of those belonging to that Servant at his death.

Another matter that we think desirable to bring to the attention of the Institute and its members: The desirability of so constituting the Committee, if possible, as to consist of brothers who were pilgrims during that Servant's life, and who live near to one another if possible, in one city, so as to be available for easy and economical consultation. While earlier

in the Harvest brothers who were not pilgrims were put on the Board of Directors, this policy was later dropped; and since 1909 pilgrims only were on the directorate, and of these such only as lived at headquarters. This being the condition at the time that the Society became vitalized, at that Servant's death, it seems to be a hint as to what the Lord's will is in this matter. It was J.F.R. who changed this policy. The change of policy smacks too much of "politics." The policy now seems to be, whenever possible, to have brothers on the Committee who belong to large churches, or churches that are desired to be kept in line with the Committee. We think this is a mistake and has resulted, in part, in four of the seven Committee members being brothers whom the Lord did not honor with the office of "secondarily prophets." Such persons have not the experience with general Church problems to warrant their rightly solving them; thus they do not seem to have the qualification for directing a general work. Novices should not be given such responsible positions.

Another thought: While that Servant suggested, and that on a secondary list, for Tower editorship but one who was not a pilgrim; *i.e.*, one among eleven and that one exceptionally able in the Truth and an auxiliary pilgrim, The Herald's Editorial Committee has two on its staff who were neither regular nor auxiliary pilgrims under that Servant, neither of whom is of exceptional clearness in the Truth. Here, again, "politics" seems to have crept in. We therefore suggest that the Committee seek a reconciliation with Menta Sturgeon, to the end that he, with his known ability, might be made available for membership on the Pastoral Bible Institute and Herald editorial committees. Perhaps A.I. Ritchie and W. Hollister may be induced to serve on one or both committees. Though not favoring an organization, they could as logically serve on the Editorial Committee as they now do serve on the

pilgrim staff of the Pastoral Bible Institute. It would be to the advantage of the work, we believe, in every way to have the members of both of these committees, especially the Institute's Committee, living in Greater New York. Local rivalries should not exist among the Lord's people. We feel that we can offer these suggestions without the suspicion of selfish motives, inasmuch as our convictions, to mention nothing else, would prevent our considering for ourself any of these positions, even if we were desired, which, of course, is not the case.

Of course, we do not mean to say that under no circumstances should others than pilgrims that the Lord appointed through that Servant ever serve on the Institute's Committee and its Editorial Committee. In some exceptional cases it may be well to have one of these, if specially qualified, on one or the other of these Committees. We have above simply indicated the ideal that it seems to us, should be striven for. That an exception to this rule is permissible is apparent from the fact that that Servant suggested on a secondary list such an one among eleven brothers for The Tower Editorial Committee. The Institute Committee, in part, has stretched this exception into the rule as respects membership in itself, and almost into the rule as respects membership on its Editorial Committee. It is against these conditions that we have made bold to offer the above suggestions.

Another suggestion, conducive to good order and peace, we opine, is: that the entire direction of the policies and the work be in the hands of the seven members of the Pastoral Bible Institute's Committee with the Editorial Committee as such restricted entirely to the work of choosing subjects for, and selecting and writing articles to appear in The Herald, otherwise having no power in its policy and work. Of course, those editors who are on the Institute's Committee would as such, but not as editors, have to do

with the direction of the policy and work of the Institute and The Herald. One of the reasons for the eruption in the Committee last summer [that of 1918] was due to the attempts of several editors to dictate the policy of the paper to the Institute's Committee, even conspiring to break up the old Committee; in part, because three of its members opposed such dictation and busybodying. One of these editors, acting by appointment of three other editors as their mouthpiece, even declared that the first issue, ordered by the Institute, to appear before the Asbury Park Convention, must not appear without an article stating that it was the policy of the Institute to smite Jordan after the war. Another thing that they advocated through him was that there must appear in the first issue of "The Bible Standard" a "good hopes" appeal and for these reasons insisted on delaying publication despite the Institute's contrary decision. This, together with the question of forming a corporation, brought the old Committee to a deadlock. Such busybodying is wrong and is a usurpation of the privileges and prerogatives of the Institute's Committee, whose office it is to initiate and to declare, in harmony with its empowerment, the policies of the Institute, and to see that they are carried out. We respectfully suggest that the editors as such be restricted to editorial, and be kept from interfering with the controlling, executive and managerial work of the Institute. While under present circumstances the following suggestions in harmony with those given above could probably not now be carried out, because of lack of available brothers, yet we feel that it would be very well, if the proper brothers are or become available, to have membership on the Institute Committee bar one from membership on the Editorial Committee and vice versa.

Another deviation from that Servant's arrangements, we have noticed, and that at conventions: Brothers who were not pilgrims are given leading

parts, discourses, and chairmanships of conventions. This is in harmony with the course of the British managers (in that Servant's absence), but not with his course: He almost never gave one, not on the pilgrim staff, a discourse or a chairmanship at a Convention. In certain rare cases this was done for exceptionally able and spiritual brothers only. Here, again, "politics" seems to be working. Less discourses, and the almost exclusive use of pilgrims for them, will be better for the conventioners, and for the large majority of those, who were not pilgrims in Bro. Russell's day, but who are now with such frequency given discourses to deliver and chairmanships to fill at conventions.

Our offering these suggestions, it is to be hoped, will not be regarded as busybodying in the Pastoral Bible Institute's business, nor as faultfinding, nor as "sour grapes." These suggestions are made in the interests of peace, prosperity and good will among the Truth people, all of whom, may our Gracious Heavenly Father richly bless according to their heart's attitude and standing before Him and His glorious Plan toward them! As far as possible, in harmony with the Word, let us "seek peace and ensue it" (1 Pet. 3:11; Rom. 12:18; Jas. 3:17, 18). This is written in defense of peace among the Lord's people. May the Lord fulfill among us His promise: "The Lord will bless His people with peace" (Ps. 29:11).

In the Aug., 1918, Committee Bulletin (this word etymologically means a little papal bull), page six, under the title, "The Object of an Organization," an article is begun wherein the purposes which the Pastoral Bible Institute Committee had in mind, as calling for transforming the P.B.I. into a legal corporation, are given. The article states these purposes clearly; and as its subject matter concerns the whole Church, it would be very proper for us to examine it. In addition to the clear statements of this article, we have some explanatory utterances, acts, publications and

letters of the Committee, and of its most influential members and supporters. All of these will assist us to come to a better understanding of the objects of the P.B.I. Our object as Bible Students is, in the Spirit of the Lord, to measure these purposes with the Lord's Word, to the end that we may be better able properly to judge of, and act toward the P.B.I. We deplore these conditions more than we can express, but feel that it is the duty of some one to stop to analyze them and lay them before the Church, that each may see and choose for himself. The Lord will to this end lend His assistance to the meek among His people (Ps. 25:7-10). After the manner of a commentary, we will quote and examine the article in question, numbering the points in each paragraph on which we will comment and giving after the quotation of each paragraph our comments as notes, their numbers and those in the paragraphs corresponding. Had the P.B.I. accepted our friendly offer to seek harmony on this and other things at the Hebron (friendship) Convention, it would not be necessary to discuss them before the whole Church. We trust by God's grace to do this "with charity to all, with malice to none," confining our remarks, as in the past, to the *official* acts of the persons involved, which of right the general Church should know, without any reference whatever to their *private* conduct.

We herewith quote the first paragraph: "Recognizing the Divine principle of order, organization, exercised in all of the arrangements of our Heavenly Father (1), our greatly beloved Pastor endeavored to arrange the various lines of activity in the service of the Truth in the most efficient and systematic ways by forming a number of business organizations (2), such as the I.B.S.A. (3), the P.P.A. (4), the United States Investment Co. (5), and the W.T.B.&T. So. (6), all of which were singularly blessed of the Lord,

and accomplished a marvelous work over the whole earth (7).

NOTE 1: God organized the Little Flock for its work (Col. 1:18; Eph. 1:22, 23; 4:3-13; Rom. 12:3-8; 1 Cor. 12:12-28; Vol. VI, Chap. II); but He did not have Jesus and the Apostles form a legal corporation under Roman laws for the furtherance of its work, and they were engaging upon the most important work in the history of the Gospel-Age—the establishment of the Church of Christ upon an enduring basis. But God did for the end of the Age arrange for six organizations for the Great Company and their co-operating Youthful Worthies to assist them in carrying out their mission (Num. 7:1-8).

NOTE 2: Our Beloved Pastor, after the manner of a single owner of a business, arranged the work systematically, not by controllership through corporations, but by his own individual controllership apart from, and usually not in harmony with the charters of his three religio-business corporations, only one of which he formed to control certain work, and that only after his death.

NOTE 3: The following is the reason why he formed the I.B.S.A.: A number of years after he bought the London Tabernacle, whose deed he had made out in the name of the W.T.B.&T.S., he learned that all British real estate held in the name of *unregistered foreign* corporations was forfeitable to the Crown. Therefore he formed the I.B.S.A. as a *holding corporation* for the Tabernacle property. The three British managers under oath in the conscription litigation in 1916 and 1917 stated that the I.B.S.A. was a holding corporation only; that it was not in control of the British Truth work, and that it was not an agency of the work of that body of Christian people who the world over were called the I.B.S.A. During that Servant's life the I.B.S.A. corporation, apart from the fees of its twenty-three members (£23 in all),

never received nor spent any money; neither did it receive nor issue a check. Will the P.B.I. kindly inform us what was its marvelous, world-wide and Jehovah blessed work during that Servant's life? The I.B.S.A. corporation was nothing more or less than "a dummy corporation" with "dummy directors," and had absolutely nothing to do, apart from holding for Bro. Russell the Tabernacle property, while he controlled it and the property held in its name.

NOTE 4: That Servant was told by J.F.R. that the W.T.B.&T.S. could not own property, nor do its business in New York State [this information, it has since been learned, is incorrect]; therefore he organized the P.P.A., whose charter expressly stipulated that as one of its officers it should have "a President who shall be elected by the Board of Directors at the *first* meeting thereof and shall hold office for life, and whose duties it shall be to preside at the meetings of the corporation, or of the Board of Directors; and have the general supervision and control and management of the business and affairs of said corporation." This clause proves that that Servant alone was meant to have the powers described therein; for of him alone could it be said that he was elected by the Board of Directors at their *first meeting*. This clause also proves that the P.P.A. was "a dummy corporation" with "dummy directors." Will the P.B.I. kindly tell us what was the world-wide, etc., work that the P.P.A. did?

NOTE 5: The United States Investment Company was a corporation absolutely controlled by that Servant, and in its work was *entirely secular*; *i.e.*, it was in business to earn money, and did no *religious* work whatever; and was not an instrument for the Harvest Work any more than any other corporation or business controlled and owned by any others of the Lord's faithful people. As a consecrated child of God he gave the Tract Fund almost all of its profits, *hiding* them in

the Annual Report among lump sums listed as donated "from other sources"; and this proves that he contributed to the work of the money that by it he earned, just as other consecrated brethren contributed of their earnings. Will the P.B.I. please tell us what its world-wide, etc., work was? Why did they not also mention others of his *business* companies and corporations organized under his control to earn money for himself and the Lord's cause? It would have been as much and as little to the point.

NOTE 6: That our readers may learn from that Servant what the powers and functions of the Watch Tower Bible and Tract Society really were, we refer them to Vol. VI, Chap. II, where will be found lengthy excerpts from a booklet that he published in 1894 entitled, "A Conspiracy Exposed" (pages 55-62). Consequently, according to this quotation and the facts mentioned in the paragraph that follows it, the Society was not during his life an instrumentality whereby the harvest work was done.

NOTE 7: That Servant used all these corporations as a means of hiding himself. The Lord's people co-operating with him, his work, not these corporations' works, were "singularly blessed of the Lord, and accomplished a marvelous work over the whole earth"; for if there ever were "dummy corporations" these were such; and if there ever were "dummy directors," those of these corporations were truly such during his life.

We now quote the next paragraph from the article under review: "The latter organization (W.T.B.&T.S.) was an especial instrumentality through which the great work was carried on during the life time of our Pastor (1), and as planned by him was to be the continued agency after his death (2). This evident purpose was interfered with by those who set aside Bro. Russell's arrangements and plans and substituted others (3). The result of these perturbations has

meant a general sifting, demonstrating those who are sincerely loyal to the Lord's arrangements as expressed through the Pastor, and those who profess to be and are not (4)."

NOTE 1: This statement we consider thoroughly false to the facts of the case. For that Servant's and our understanding of this subject we refer our readers to Vol. VI, Chap. II.

NOTE 2: It was not "to be the continued agency after his death." Rather after his death for the first time it became independent, with its directors coming "to the front."

NOTE 3: We agree that, as to controllership of the work and as to many of his arrangements, his purposes were set aside by the Society leaders; but the full truth requires us to add that had certain members of the P.B.I. and one of their most influential supporters, all four of whom were then Directors of the W.T.B.&T.S., steadfastly refused in any way to permit J.F.R. to get the authority that they knew he sought, and that they either voted or permitted without protest to be voted to him; and had they steadfastly refused to permit him to keep his usurped power, exercised for months without their protesting to him, these subversions and substitutions would not have occurred. We may have more to say about this at another time.

NOTE 4: It is true that the first and second phases of the present sifting did demonstrate that some were and some were not true to the Lord's arrangements given through that Servant; but it took a third phase of the sifting to demonstrate that some of those who seemed in its first and second phases to be loyal to the Lord's arrangements given in that Servant's charter and will, were in reality not true to them, as is demonstrated unanswerably by the fact that they and their followers have adopted for the P.B.I. a charter that changes, *i.e.*, revolutionizes, some of that Servant's

charter and will arrangements in by far more and worse ways than the Society leaders changed these. This course of the P.B.I. Board will make all nonpartisan and sober-minded brethren doubt their sincerity and honesty, when in one breath, as in the paragraph that we are examining, they extol that Servant's arrangements as the Lord's arrangements, and at the same time advocate and set into operation a charter deviating in many particulars from the one of which they have all affirmed a Divine origin and obligatoriness. Is this not revolutionism and worse yet, considering that they have done this in the teeth of protests and warnings?

We now quote the third paragraph of the article under examination: "It would seem that the time has now come, in the Divine providence, for the work to be taken up, as far as possible, where it was left at the time of the passing under the veil of Bro. Russell, and be carried on to whatever end or conclusion may please the Lord, until the last member of the Body of Christ has been glorified" (1).

NOTE 1: To understand this paragraph let us refresh our minds with the fact that our beloved Pastor's last published statement on the subject was to the effect that he expected Jordan's first smiting in the future; but this does not prove, contrary to former statements, that he had not led the work of the first smiting of Jordan, any more than his then thinking the giving of the penny was yet future proves that he had not already given it, which penny, we all agree, he did give some considerable time before he died. We pointed out above how four members of the Editorial Committee, using H.C. Rockwell as their mouthpiece, appeared July 18, 1918, before the Pastoral Bible Institute Committee and, among other things, insisted on holding up issuing the first number of "The Bible Standard" until it could appear with a statement of the Committee's policies that, among other things, should

call for "the first smiting of the Jordan after the war." At that time F.H. McGee, in and out of the Committee meeting, also said that I.L. Margeson held up "The Standard." Three of these four editors are now on the P.B.I. Board; and all of them are on its Editorial Committee. Several hundred brethren who were at the Asbury Park Convention will recall that H.C. Rockwell explained that to take up the work where Bro. Russell at death left it meant a future first smiting of the Jordan, and that "after the war," and they sought very hard without proper discussion to force this program through the Convention. The P.B.I.'s insistence on a public ministry is in line with this thought. Their denial that the first smiting of the Jordan and the separation of antitypical Elijah and Elisha have occurred implies their belief in a future first smiting of Jordan. Lawyer, not Brother, McGee makes the following comment on this matter in his "Brief Review," page 1, col. 2, par. 2, written after he and his associates learned that the brethren at Asbury Park, as well as many not there, would not endorse their program of a future first smiting of Jordan: "The Committee, and we think the [Asbury Park] Convention, had no idea of inaugurating a plan to conduct a first smiting of Jordan."

Certainly on Monday the Convention, after hearing our Sunday's exposures of Committee conditions and our Scriptural discussion on whether the Little Flock should form a corporation to carry out its work, did not favor "inaugurating a plan to conduct a first smiting of Jordan"; for on Monday, after they had more time to think over the matters, they voted down almost unanimously everything that smacked of a first smiting of the Jordan, including every feature of the P.B.I.'s program not yet voted on, holding some of these matters over for further consideration. The night before, just after the above-mentioned discussion, sixty-seven voted against and fifty-eight for the

proposition that it is unscriptural for the Little Flock to organize a corporation as the medium through which its work should be done, while fully 125 abstained from voting at all; yet despite this the August Bulletin clearly gives the impression that a majority of the conventioners favored, but longsufferingly deferred to the minority's unreadiness, the forming of a corporation to carry out the Committee's work, which H.C. Rockwell, supported by I.F. Hoskins and others, there announced was among other things "a smiting of Jordan after the war." In the above-quoted statement we regret to be compelled to say that our F.H. McGee speaks as a special pleader, hiding, misstating and evading issues and facts against his clients, as we also regret to have to say that the August Bulletin and Lawyer McGee's published defenses, because of the same kind of methods and deceptions, are at least as misleading as "Lawyer Rutherford's Harvest Siftings." We desire to state candidly to the whole Church that this course of the P.B.I. forces us against our desires to doubt the candor of various of its members on their policy of a first smiting of Jordan; therefore we suggest that those not favoring such a work will do well to abstain from all co-operation with the P.B.I.'s work; but that those heartily approving of its ways and policies will heartily co-operate with it in its work, and that those in doubt of its ways and policies will do well to settle their doubts before acting.

We herewith quote the fourth paragraph: "In order to do this the forming of a business corporation under the laws of New York State is proposed (1). This simple business corporation is to enable the different congregations (2) to co-operate along general lines (2), and be the means of preserving unity and harmony of thought and purpose (3). Without some such arrangement no concerted action on the part of the Lord's people would be possible (4). Each Ecclesia, acting locally, would develop into a faction (5), and its

efforts would necessarily have local limitations (6). In place of having one body (2), with the classes constituting the different members (2), and all working unitedly in the accomplishment of a broad and general work over the world (2), there would be innumerable bodies more or less in confusion and opposition to one another (7) with little or no work accomplished.

NOTE 1: Under the conviction that that Servant, through the charter of the W.T.B.&T.S. and his will, had given the Divine arrangements along whose lines the work of the Little Flock was to operate after his death, the Editor of The Present Truth at the Fort Pitt Convention introduced, and then made several speeches in favor of, a motion to form and operate a corporation in word-for-word conformity with the will and charter of that Servant excepting, of course, the name and address of the corporation. He advocated as title the name I.B.S.A. and as address Philadelphia, Pa., where good headquarters were offered for an Association formed strictly on such lines. This motion was made the evening of Jan. 5, 1918. On account of several prominent brothers objecting to a Society and others to insufficient time for discussion, the motion was finally tabled until the next day for further discussion, when it was voted down. The Convention Secretary, who did not for weeks prepare his minutes, forgot, as he later on stated, to record this motion. Not a few others present at that Convention recall the facts above given on this motion. And the fact that the Convention, which gave the Committee its authorization, forbade the formation of a corporation was repeatedly used by us in the Committee as a reason forbidding its forming a corporation. It was not until Mar. 31, 1918, that we became convinced (from Num. 7:1-8) that the Priests were not to use a corporation or any other organization apart from their Divinely given organism as a medium through which they were to do their work. Therefore, when in

the Committee meeting, April 29, F.H. McGee, supported by three of his colleagues, in that and in all following Fort Pitt Convention Committee meetings (*i.e.*, May 11, June 8, 22 and July 18), sought persistently against the consciences of R.H. Hirsh, R.G. Jolly and ourself to carry through the Committee his program for a corporation, the provisions of which he never made known to the Committee, we at once began to oppose his plan. In the process of our discussions we gave four reasons against it: (1) It was contrary to the expressed decision of those who constituted the Committee. (2) Many brethren would not favor and support an organization beyond a committee such as we were. (3) Without an organization we could do the work that we were commissioned to do; *i.e.*, publish a periodical and conduct a pilgrim service, ourself advocating strongly that we limit our efforts to the exercise of these, the powers that were given us. (4) Such an organization for the Little Flock was contrary to the Scriptural organization of the Church. Therefore we herein publish to the whole Church that "the forming of a business corporation" was not proposed nor supported by R.H. Hirsh, R.G. Jolly and ourself; but was persistently proposed by F.H. McGee, and warmly supported by I.F. Hoskins, I.L. Margeson and J.D. Wright against the persistent opposition of the first three named brothers, whose consciences forbade their approving it for the Little Flock.

NOTE 2: In the quotation given from "A Conspiracy Exposed," it was stated by that Servant that the Society was organized "to provide a channel or fund through which those [individuals—not congregations!] who wish can employ their money talent, whether small or great, to better advantage for the spread of the Truth than if each interested one [person—not congregation!] acted and published independently of the others." Bro. Russell understood the

Biblical organization of the Church too well to attempt to bring the Church, as the P.B.I. says, into an organization of "one body with the classes constituting the different members," "to co-operate along general lines," "and all working unitedly in the accomplishment of a broad and general work over the world!" Bro. Russell—not the P.B.I. as we see—believed in letting the Church remain organized just as the Lord originally formed it, without adding, after the manner of the Papacy, human organizational elements of any kind. But not so the P.B.I. for the paragraph under discussion, in its parts that we have marked (2), by a contrasted statement, a most emphatic way of putting it, proves that instead of holding to the Church as consisting of individual members, under Christ the Head, they are making a Church "having one body, with the classes constituting the different members, and all working unitedly in the accomplishment of a broad and general work over the world." Here we find a Church organized differently from the Body of Christ; and therefore it is a "Church which is" not "His Body," a counterfeit of "the Church which is His Body," thus an anti-Christ, instead of a Christ, body of which we should beware!

NOTE 3: This paragraph and subsequent sections of the article, while not expressly using the term, the Head, clearly by its seven-claimed missions and powers shows what is the head of this new Church, "which is" not "His Body"; *i.e.*, the P.B.I. the controlling, executive and managerial head, being its Board of Directors, and its teaching head being its Committee of Editors! For it is the function of Christ, our one Lord, to be God's "means of preserving unity and harmony of thought and purpose." He gives and preserves to the Church its one faith and baptism (Eph. 4:5). He alone is "to act as a kind of a clearing house of whatever doctrinal matters may be in circulation, or may be proposed for circulation, among the Lord's

people." He alone is "to act as a medium through which the Church collectively may execute business arrangements essential to the accomplishment of any enterprise" given her by the Lord to do. Most of the functions that the P.B.I. sets forth as theirs in the seven reasons for their corporation belong exclusively to our Lord, the Head, in His relation to the Church, His Body. Therefore the P.B.I. in its Board of Directors and in its Editorial Committee is a counterfeit of Christ, the Head of the "Church, which is His Body." Here, then, we have a counterfeit head and body—a complete anti-Christ. Here we find a transubstantiation. Their Church has been (counterfeitedly) transubstantiated and their P.B.I. Board of Directors and Committee of Editors have been (counterfeitedly) transubstantiated. Let the whole Church recognize this little Papacy, this little Babylon, this Little Antichrist! Surely a strong delusion has seized upon them! And this accounts for their "fanciful interpretations and wild speculations" on the organization of the Church. Loath as we are to speak of these things, dear brethren, are they not all true and should not attention be directed to them? Truly, "He catcheth the wise in his own craftiness!"

NOTE 4: The history of the Harvests of the Jewish and Gospel Ages is a complete refutation of this claim, so gratuitously assumed and so boldly made. Without using a corporation, as a "means of preserving unity and harmony in thought and purpose," "to act as a kind of clearing house of whatever doctrinal matters may be in circulation, or may be proposed for circulation among the Lord's people," and "to act as a medium through which the Church collectively may execute business arrangements essential to the accomplishment of any enterprise of great or lesser magnitude," etc., the Lord himself by the oversight of one individual, that Servant, through the power of the Truth, attracted individuals and individual congregations—

which he never commissioned to engage *collectively* in the harvest work—and through their *individual*, and not *collective*, co-operation brought the reaping features of the Harvest to a completion.

NOTE 5: This statement may or may not be true, the circumstances and characters of the classes and those dealing with them having much to do in the matter. We know from experience two sets of characters that can be depended upon under certain conditions to make some in a local class develop a faction. Let a class stand for Bro. Russell's ideals as against unholy grasping for power and lording it over God's heritage, as alas, the leaders of the W.T.B.&T.S. and the P.B.I. have been doing, and these will start their partisan campaigners to work on their supporters, who, responding *to advice from "headquarters,"* will, if in the majority, drive or freeze out the faithful, or if in a minority, will make a division, all the time patting themselves on the back as suffering for righteousness and charging others as division makers, while their claims and conduct show them to be under the Adversary's influence.

NOTE 6: Apart from individual congregations sending out missionaries and contributing to the support of the work of the servants of the general Church, and apart from a general deacon—*not teaching*—work, which the Church collectively may do (2 Cor. 8:16-24)—that each Church in "its efforts would necessarily have local limitations"—*is exactly the will of the Lord respecting each Church.* As at present controlled, the W.T.B.&T.S. and the P.B.I. are responsible for advocating and setting into practice an opposite, an anti-Christ, view, of a local Church's scope of activity.

NOTE 7: There will, of course, be but one "Church, which is His Body," no matter how many individual congregations there may be; and there will be as many counterfeits of "the Church, which is His

Body," as there are corporation and other heads who are able to deceive a following into believing that it is "the Church, which is His Body." Apart from what we have said in Note 5, we might add that in a sifting time such as has been, and bids fair for some time yet to be upon us, confusion and opposition are inevitable; for the Lord wants the fire to burn until all the wood, hay and stubble are burned, and the gold, silver and precious stones preserved in the fire (1 Cor. 3:11-15). Instead of a corporation preventing, it will increase the confusion, as corporations have hitherto done. The main points calling for emphasis, as taught in the paragraph on which we are commenting, are that the P.B.I. advocates (1) that the "collective" *classes* are the one Body, (2) that the individual classes (not, therefore, the faithful individuals) are the members of the one Body (their Church, not the Lord's), and (3) that certain functions that belong to Jesus alone the P.B.I. claims for itself and thus makes itself a head instead of Jesus. These three propositions are *Papistical in the extreme*. The following comparison will make this apparent. The P.B.I. Board and Editorial Committee correspond with the Pope in his two functions as controller and teacher; their collective classes, their Church, correspond with the entire Roman Catholic Church; the individual classes, with the Roman Catholic Nation Churches; their pilgrims, with the Cardinals; their leading local elders, with the national primates; the other elders, with the Bishops; the deacons, with the lower Clergy; the non-official class members, with the laity; while the advocates of the Scriptural conception of "the Church, which is His Body," and of that Servant's arrangements in his charter and will, as Divinely authorized and inviolable for controlling corporations among the Lord's people, correspond to the heretics, whose leaders correspond to the archheretics. This transubstantiation of the collective ecclesias (which at most might represent, symbolize, the

entire true Church, as the local members of the true Church are locally *represented*, symbolized, by each local Ecclesia), corresponds with the papal doctrine of the (counterfeit) transubstantiation of the *symbols of Christ's Body into His real Body*.

As though such teachings were not bad enough, the article under examination must specify *seven* reasons or purposes for the P.B.I.'s organization. That such purposes as these should be announced by the P.B.I. is not surprising, when one considers that they were not satisfied with the very limited powers given them by the Fort Pitt Convention; but sought to get and repeatedly claimed to have all the powers of the W.T.B.&T.S.'s Board. (Feb. 23, 1918, I.F. Hoskins even claimed for the Committee all of that Servant's powers, a claim that he later withdrew, we believe.) But that the publication of such purposes should have provoked so little and feeble dissent from so many who claim to be Bible Students, and to have the teachings and Spirit of the Lord as these shine out of that Servant's writings, is truly astounding.

FIRST PURPOSE: We will quote and comment on each of these seven purposes in turn. "The specified reasons for this organization are: (1) To act as a kind of a clearing house of *whatever doctrinal matters* may be in circulation or *may be proposed* for circulation among the Lord's people."

NOTE: Such a "doctrinal clearing house" is a "*medium*" by which religious instruction is *censored*. That which is approved by this "medium" is announced as "safe" and "true" and sanctioned for circulation by the P.B.I.'s "*imprimatur*," the name of the seal that the officials of "the doctrinal clearing house" of the Papacy impress on literature that they consider "safe" and "true" for circulation among Papists, who dutifully and trustfully may henceforth read it. That which is partially approved would be expurgated of features objectionable to the P.B.I. and

listed as such, even as is provided for in the kindred "Index expurgatorius" in the Catholic Church, and the faithful may read such books only after expurgated; and that which is inexpurgable is condemned entirely, as in the Catholic Church it is put on the kindred "Index Librorum Prohibitorum," the Index of Prohibited Books, which only theologians, and that only after special permission, may read. This is what the expression, "a doctrinal clearing house," suggests. Such an arrangement was before the war well adapted to Russia, Turkey and Spain, but among Truth people it could come from such only as are caught in a frenzy of delusion (2 Thes. 2:9-12, Diaglott). Its principle was well adapted to the Dark Ages, which it helped to produce. What the Scriptures inculcate as an opposite principle can be seen from 1 Thes. 5:20, 21; 1 John 4:1; 2 Tim. 2:15; Rom. 14:5; etc. What that Servant thought of it as a principle can be seen in "Studies" B, 319-322, and D, 64-66; and his avoidance of it in practice shines out by the way he directed (under the Lord) the harvest work.

In proof that the P.B.I. by their doctrinal clearing house, means what we have said we will adduce five facts:

(1) At Asbury Park, H.C. Rockwell, with the approval of I.F. Hoskins, etc., gave as a reason for a corporation having a Board of seven Directors and a Committee of five Editors, that it would provide twelve brothers capable to act as a commission to examine proposed new Scriptural interpretations to safeguard the Church from error.

(2) The majority of the P.B.I. Board and Editorial Committee favored a resolution forbidding giving forth new thoughts on types, symbols and prophecies, particularly on Elijah and Elisha, J.F.R. as "that evil servant," the Penny and the Slaughter Weapons, unless by sanction of the Committee. While two of these later voted to rescind this motion, in issuing

the article here reviewed, they show that they *rechanged* their minds. On this point we quote a letter written, largely through the influence of a sister, to another sister, who could not at the time see eye to eye on two minor points with our discourse on "That Evil Servant." I.F. Hoskins wrote this letter two days before the resolution above referred to was passed:

"MY DEAR SISTER:—Your letter just received, and it grieves me very much to learn what took place in Philadelphia last Sunday. Yours is the second report [no more] of this character, and I must say, dear Sister, that *my patience with Brother Johnson is just about exhausted*. I have heard him make those *same silly, foolish and unwise statements* repeatedly, and the brethren have often reproved him for it, and he has repeatedly promised [?] that he would desist and stop talking along those lines. Now, my dear Sister, I am so glad you wrote as you did; you *have been going up like everything in my mind*, [!] and this letter from you *just helps all the more, too!* Now no blarney about this either. [!] You sure do know how to say things nice. Now listen, *the situation is going to be remedied*. I think I can safely *promise you that there will not be a repetition of last Sunday's experience*. It grieves me unspeakably to know that those dear, blessed people there had to be subjected to that kind of thing. [!] [With but one negative vote a month later a vote of approval by this large Church was passed on that discourse, the two sisters who wrote against it to the Committee telling the Church that they believed it to be meat in due season. And seven months later, after months of the P.B.I.'s partisan activities in this Church, only eight, and they intense partisans of theirs, voted their disapproval of this discourse, while the vast majority of the Church voted its approval.] But now another thing, the Philadelphia Church are more responsible for this experience than you might think. They voted for Brother Johnson [terrible thing

for any Church to do without permission of the P.B.I.] to come and ignored the Committee here altogether. Why did they not deal with the Committee in the matter, if they wanted a Brother to come to Philadelphia? [!] Of course, I realize that it was done perhaps rather hastily, without really thinking. [!] Now, my dear Sister, if there is anything that I can help out, I will be only too glad to do it. Will go to Philadelphia next Sunday, if I could be of any service. Be sure and let me know, won't you, if there is any way in which I might offset the effect of what was done last Sunday. [!] So glad your faith is not shaken. [!] I am very confident that you and Brother are 'true blue'; yes, I fully understand your attitude on Brother Johnson and you are just right. I expect to see Brother Johnson next Saturday. Very much love to yourself and Brother. Num. 6:24-26.

Yours faithfully in Christ, ISAAC F. HOSKINS."

And this letter was written respecting a fellow Committee member, and that, one whose account of the matter had not yet been heard. (!) According to this letter "the doctrinal clearing house" and "medium for providing pilgrims" would rebuke Churches for asking pilgrims to serve them without consulting the P.B.I.

(3) Under the subtle manipulation of I.F. Hoskins and H.C. Rockwell, as well as others, a certain elder who was then about two years in the Truth, and another elder who was then four and one-half years in the Truth, last spring felt themselves qualified to present each a resolution to a certain Board of Elders and one of them to the Church, intended to put a padlock on the mouths of R.G. Jolly and ourself, as far as the use of that Church's pulpit was concerned. Fortunately that Church as a whole had a sounder mind than the two above-mentioned committee members and a number of its elders.

(4) The Boston elders (who have a P.B.I. Board and Editorial Committee member among them, who

have the Committee's spirit, and who are among its staunch supporters) and deacons *through their representative officially* warned the Boston Church against The Present Truth.

(5) Various members of the P.B.I. Board and Editorial Committee, and of their pilgrim staff, by letters, some of which are in our possession, and by discourses, have warned individuals and Churches against us as a false teacher. This charge we deny, and ask them to prove it. [Subsequent teachings show that the accusers have themselves departed from the Truth, while the accused has maintained it.] To carry out their "doctrinal clearing house" proposition would keep a large staff of eavesdroppers and heresy baiters very busy, with like helpers scattered all over the world, even as the Papacy has found it necessary, in order to operate her kindred institution. In harmony with that Servant's will the Editorial Committee should censor what appears in The Herald Of The Kingdom. And every other servant of God should most conscientiously censor his own teachings, endeavoring to speak as the oracles of God, according to the proportion of faith (1 Pet. 4:11; Rom. 12:6). And each of us individually should (Jude 3) seek to keep the Church free from error. But, alas, that such good activities are not meant by the "doctrinal clearing house" that the P.B.I. desires is evident from the five above-mentioned facts. That Servant never stood for such a "doctrinal clearing house." The kind of "a doctrinal clearing house" that the P.B.I. arrogates to itself the right to establish is an exclusive function of our Lord! And his ways of making it work are in harmony and in connection with a proper testing of the Lord's people; *i.e.*, through their coming individually in contact with and weighing error, overcome it through the Truth, which He gives the faithful, as the above passages prove; while the P.B.I.'s "doctrinal clearing house" proposition would treat God's saints

as babes and hot-house plants, exalt a hierarchy, develop priestcraft and heresy-hunting and heresy-baiting, form an inquisition, institute an *Index Librorum Prohibitorum* and *Index Librorum Expurgatorum*, enthrone a little Antichrist, palm off error, suppress the Truth, serve the Devil, hamper God's faithful servants, rob the Church of seasonal Truth, create for humans a debasing and impossible task, and set aside one of Jesus' exclusive functions. However, if any insist on having this "doctrinal clearing house," they may have it; for like likes like!

We now will quote and comment on the P.B.I.'s second reason for forming a corporation: "(2) To form a reliable (1) and responsible (2) depository of all funds contributed and required for the advancement of the work."

NOTE 1: Though we have been charged with insinuating that the P.B.I.'s Treasurer embezzled some of its funds, we desire to say that we have never done this; on the contrary, we do not believe that any member of the P.B.I. would be guilty of embezzling money; yet we are sad to have to say that its partial use of funds (which it solicited for furthering such forms of service as the bulk of the non-adherents of the Society thought to be the Lord's will to be established among them for *their* and not the *public's* help—see Committee's letter of Mar. 1, 1918, page 3, col. 1, par. 2 and page 4, par. 3), for different forms of service from what the bulk of the responses indicated, *i.e.*, pilgrim service and a periodical—proves it not to be a reliable depository of funds. Almost no one asked for other forms of service than these. Therefore the Committee, according to its own letter, was limited to these two forms of service *for the saints alone*.

It is well known that certain members of the old Committee agitated for a corporation with powers greater than the P.B.I. then had, for a public service and for a "smiting of the Jordan after the war." These

and other facts moved the Philadelphia Church to ask for the return of a certain proportion of its donations. As a Church it had contributed \$540.45 for the furthering of the above-mentioned forms of *service to the saints* in response to the Committee's appeal for support of the service generally desired. The Committee's appeal for help is found in its letter of March 1, 1918, page 3, col. 2, pars. 2, 3, and is implied in question 4: "If you favor some general service, do you desire to co-operate to further the same?" in the question blank at the bottom of page 3, col. 1, and page 4, col. 2. This Church requested the return of its proportion of unexpended money on hand up to but not including the Asbury Park Convention. The P.B.I.'s report (Aug. 3, 1918) indicates receipts as \$3,820.89; expenses as \$1,711.81 and balance as \$2,109.08. Adding to the balance the convention expenses, *i.e.*, \$416.59, we have a total of \$2,555.67, and subtracting the \$416.59 from the total receipts (for this sum was specifically donated for the convention expenses), and we have \$3,404.30. As \$540.45 are to \$3,404.30, so its proportion of the money unexpended before the convention is to \$2,555.67; *i.e.*, \$402.75. This sum the Philadelphia Church asked and still asks the Committee to return, because the Committee agitated just before and at the Asbury Park Convention, and in the article under review, using its money for purposes not specified by the bulk of the responses to its March 1, 1918, letter, *i.e.*, for public work. A recent "Herald" shows that they are engaging in public work. The Committee (Oct. 23, 1918) refused to make this refund, claiming (1) that it did not change its purposes [it certainly did by the formation of a corporation with greatly changed powers and objects and in the sense of adding to them, as the article under review clearly proves]; (2) that it had not solicited any donation from that Church [its letter, containing the solicitation, was sent by it to practically every member of that

Church, which responded to the solicitation collectively as a Church]; (3) that the Committee had placed in its treasury such gifts only as were absolutely unconditional [its letter of request for support conditioned it to use the money for such purposes only as were indicated by the bulk of the responses received, hence the gifts were not unconditional]; (4) that it was following Pastor Russell's example in refusing to refund donations [apart from the specially conditional donations made to the Tract Fund, he a number of times returned money to those who, losing sympathy with him and his work, requested such return of contributions].

Others for the same reasons, have requested a return of the same proportion of their donations. For example, a sister in Philadelphia sent \$300.00 individually to the Committee in response to its letter. They refused to grant her request; a sister in Illinois did the same thing, with the same result. For aught we know there may be other similar cases. These facts move us to say that, since the Committee solicited and received at its solicitation money for certain *specified objects*, and now insists on using this money for other objects with which some of the donors are not in harmony, and refuses their requests to return a just portion of their contributions, *it cannot honestly be said that the P.B.I. is a reliable depository for money entrusted to it for expenditure on specified work*. Human laws, whose help, however, the Philadelphia Church would not invoke, forbid a course like the P.B.I.'s. We are sure the Divine Law does the same. From the bottom of our heart we deplore the attitude of the P.B.I. and call upon it in the Lord's Name to change on this and many other matters its course, as discrediting the Lord, injuring the Church and casting doubts on its own integrity.

NOTE 2: A depository without economy and order in administration of money cannot be called responsible.

In "Another Harvest Siftings Reviewed" the thought was set forth that the Treasurer of the P.B.I. was extravagant in expenditures for hotel bills at Asbury Park. The answer of the Brief Review *characteristically* tells only some, and not vital, parts of the matter. It should additionally have said (1) that the Convention Committee considered that *six* Truth people were a sufficient number to stop at the hotel to satisfy its management, which charged \$6.00 a day; (2) that after nearly twenty Truth people had already registered at that hotel, I.F. Hoskins insisted on putting up H.C. Rockwell there; (3) that when repeated objection was made to this, I.F. Hoskins finally answered that he had a "private fund" (he did not say that he had money of his own, or money specifically donated for such a purpose, nor does the term "private fund" fit such thoughts) with which he was determined to pay H.C. Rockwell's \$6.00 a day hotel bill; (4) that as late as Friday night, when H.C. Rockwell had already been registered at that hotel, I.L. Margeson and I.F. Hoskins wanted R.G. Jolly, R.H. Hirsh and ourself to leave their \$2.00 and \$2.50 a day hotels and stop at the \$6.00 house; (5) that when I.L. Margeson suggested this plan, they refused to entertain it, stating that consecrated money should not be used so lavishly; and (6) that thereupon I.L. Margeson sought to argue the writer into stopping at the \$6.00 a day hotel. It seems to us that an economical Treasurer would have first waited to see how many of the friends at their own expense would register at the \$6.00 a day house, and then arrange for any deficiency up to six persons as per the Convention Committee's agreement. As a matter of fact one family alone, consisting of nine members, before the discussion on H.C. Rockwell, registered at the hotel, I.F. Hoskins being aware of this fact. When we made the criticism we did not have R.E. Streeter and wife and F.H. McGee's

donation for them in mind. We fail to see just why "the *Treasurer's handling the financial end of the convention*" required him to stop at that hotel; or why his "giving all of his time to the Committee's work" justified his stopping there any more than should R.H. Hirsh have done so, who at that time also was devoting all his time to the Committee's work. This fact should, it seems to us, have prompted him to the reverse course; nor should the fact that a generous brother provided for all the convention expenses have made the Treasurer less careful. Again, the fact that the Treasurer spent money without authorization of the Committee when the Committee's rule was that he should not do so, and the fact that he is whitewashed in the "Brief Review," it seems to us, makes the P.B.I. not a responsible depository. "The Brief Review's" answer on the Treasurer's renting office space is misleading. Aside from the four, R.H. Hirsh was the only member of the Committee who was consulted about renting a room. This was April 14, just one day after a Committee meeting, where the matter should have been brought up, and where three of "the four" made known their decision against establishing headquarters at Philadelphia. Contrary to his repeatedly expressed desire, I.F. Hoskins and I.L. Margeson kept him out of the evening service of the New York Church, belaboring him for over an hour to get his consent to renting a room. Their plea that there was much work "in the way of correspondence," requiring a room, and his believing that they wanted to force an entering wedge to establish headquarters at New York, led him to ask how much mail was coming to the Committee. I.F. Hoskins answered from two to four letters a day! This was "the considerable amount of work" that "had accumulated for the Secretary in the way of correspondence," while from fifteen to twenty letters a day came in during much of March. (Then Philadelphia was

yet favorably regarded for headquarters by all the members of the Committee.) I.F. Hoskins' home was not overcrowded by a "considerable amount of work" that "had accumulated for the Secretary in the way of correspondence." At none of the five remaining Port Pitt Committee meetings was a report made of the renting of the little office room. It was not orderly for the four members outside of a Committee meeting to arrange for this office space, and never report it to the Committee, nor even hint of it to two of the Committee. The other three members never did object to a reasonable expense. There being no need then for an office, it remained practically unoccupied for months.

We are unable to see that a depository is reliable and responsible which whitewashes and co-operates with a Treasurer evidencing marked extravagance, and which, asking for support for limited purposes, refuses on request of donors to refund money that the depository is using for objects which were not told the donors, and which additionally are disapproved of by the donors for the use of their money. This, the second reason for transforming the P.B.I. into a corporation, like the first, in theory as well as in practice, as evidenced by the above facts, is quite Papistical.

We now quote the third reason for transforming the P.B.I. Committee into a corporation. "(3) To act as a *medium* through which the Church collectively may execute business arrangements essential to the accomplishment of any enterprise of great or lesser magnitude (1)."

NOTE 1: On this our reply will be very brief: Will the Pastoral Bible Institute kindly give us only one Bible passage proving that the Little Flock collectively is authorized by the Lord to appoint a committee, or even permit one, to execute its business arrangements, apart from a purely deacon work

(2 Cor. 8:16-24)? I.F. Hoskins, though asked for Scriptures to prove his claims, failed to give even *one* at the Asbury Park Convention. In this proposition we have the Papal argument for the Papacy as necessary for the work of the collective Church, by the words "medium," "means," "agency," "arrangement," "organization," "representative," as they occur in the article under review, another "channel" is advocated, though the word is not used; and this accounts for the extraordinary claims made for the P.B.I. in the article under review and their consequent acts.

The fourth reason for their corporation is as follows: "(4) To be endowed with legal authority to issue a classified publication (1), as a representative of the thoughts and sentiments of the Church (2), and to publish tracts, booklets and kindred forms of printed matter for the work of the ministry" (3).

NOTE 1: Such a publication could be issued without a corporation or a company, as many publications are today and as for years that Servant did with "The Tower," which was only then put in the name of the Society, without the latter having any power over it whatever, when Mrs. Russell wanted to usurp the use of it; and as he in another case did when for good reasons he had the Sunday School Lessons published under the name of V. Noble, the B.S.M. alternately under the names of P.E. Thompson, C.W. Hek, W.H. Hudgings; and the Yiddish paper, "Die Stimme," under the name of R.H. Hirsh. Had the P.B.I. collectively or individually a fair degree of his good sense and sacrificing spirit they would have resorted, as we suggested to them July 18, 1918, to a similar thing, instead of forcing a division in the Church, rather than give up their pet idea of forming another corporation for the Church. The Committee could easily and safely, according to a plan based on Brother Russell's course on Sunday School Lessons and suggested to them July 18, 1918, have arranged

this matter without any individual getting control, had it been disposed so to do. We suggested F.H. McGee's name to appear as publisher, subject to the Committee. This proves that we did not want a place which would give us even the appearance of controlling the paper. We never attempted to control the Committee or its affairs, the "Letter of Importance," with its misrepresentations, to the contrary notwithstanding.

NOTE 2: A periodical that is the Lord's agency to give His message is a "representative of the Lord's thoughts and sentiments" to the Church, as "The Tower" was, and not "a representative of the thoughts and sentiments of the Church" in any other sense than that the Church accepts the thoughts and sentiments of a journal, truly representing Him, from conviction that they expressed the Lord's mind to them, not their mind to others. In this the P.B.I.'s fourth proposition, we find the Roman Catholic doctrine of the Church as the *Source of Truth*, speaking through its mouthpiece, the Pope.

NOTE 3: For the reason and in the manner given under Note 1 this could be and has been well done in the Little Flock without a corporation or a business company.

The fifth reason for their corporation is as follows: "(5) To serve as a *means* of unity of thought and action, without which a condition of confusion and inaction is sure to result, and just as we see slowly developing everywhere among the Lord's people (1 and 5). Would-be scribes, some of large and some of lesser mental caliber (2) are leading many off in different directions following after some pet theory or hobby, confusing the poor sheep who are unwary (3) and who no longer hear the advice and instruction of their beloved Pastor (4)."

NOTE 1: This plea for the existence of the P.B.I. *in the Church* is exactly the same as that of

Papacy, and has succeeded and will succeed just in the same way as the Papacy did (2 Thes. 2:3-8). Under (1) of the purposes of the P.B.I. we have shown how Jesus preserves, without the assistance of any organization apart from His Church, its unity of thought and action, and uses the confusion and inaction that the unfaithful may introduce as means of sifting them out and testing and proving the faithful. This method of His is *now operating*, and that with marked success.

NOTE 2: Yes, indeed, "would-be [those desiring to be] scribes!" *E.g.*, it was I.F. Hoskins who suggested to us the election of the three brothers among the Committee's supporters named in the will as editors or editorial eligibles, himself being one of these three! It was F.H. McGee who, misrepresenting us as aspiring to editorship of the P.B.I.'s paper, and putting the monitory caption over the misrepresentation, "Be not many masters," read a lecture full of misstatements and evil surmises to one of the "secondarily prophets"; whereas the Lord never honored F.H. McGee with the office of "secondarily prophets," which fact did not, however, deter him from "rushing in where angels fear to tread" and by "A Letter of Importance" usurping the office of "secondarily prophets," which office alone of those held by the living servants of the Truth gives its incumbents the authorization to address the general Church on questions of faith and practice.

NOTE 3: Of course, we among others were meant by this; but really who have been leading the unwary off? The Church is fast learning the answer to this question and it will not be long before all will know. Have not the Society leaders misled many by Studies, Vol. VII, Harvest Siftings, Penny Parable Tract, etc.? And has not the P.B.I., through the August Committee's Bulletin, F.H. McGee's Brief Review, his Letter of Importance and his one-page

printed letter to J.D. Wright, led many of the "unwary" off, to the extent that they could publish the article under review, winning approval for it, and disapproval for us? And worse yet, have they not by these publications so completely "pulled the wool" over the eyes of the majority of the Truth people who are not adherents of the Society as to gain their endorsement for the Charter of the P.B.I., which more grossly violates Brother Russell's Charter than even J.F.R.'s usurpations? Alas! "would-be scribes!"

NOTE 4: Who has violated our beloved Pastor's advice and instruction on his charter and will more than the P.B.I. in their charter? Has even J.F.R.?

NOTE 5: The course of the P.B.I., like that of the Papacy, is marked at almost every step by acts and policies that must cause division; *e.g.*, (1), they sought, and that even by resolution, to padlock the mouths of those who were giving meat in due season. Such a course must force the faithful to opposition; and persistence in such a course by the P.B.I. forced the faithful into a separation. *They* are the divisionists and not those who stood for right principles in this matter.

(2) They boycotted from preaching appointments faithful pilgrims because they gave meat in due season; such a course forced the faithful to present the Truth that was due, apart from the P.B.I.'s auspices.

(3) Some of them sought by a tricky resolution to be followed by tricky manipulation of pilgrim appointments to have faithful givers of meat in due season barred from a certain pulpit.

(4) They untruthfully warned individuals, and by such tactics made many believe against faithful servants of the Truth, that the latter indulged in "fanciful interpretation and wild speculations." In their paper they published articles that they knew some and they hoped others would believe referred to the faithful servants of the Truth to the undoing of the latters'

influence. How could this do otherwise than cause division?

(5) By a whispering campaign and wire-pulling of a most glaring kind they secured the overthrow of the Fort Pitt Convention Committee, *in order to have three of its members no longer on a Committee with them to interfere with their unscriptural policies.* This conduct of theirs turned hundreds of brethren against the P.B.I. as improper leaders of the Little Flock.

(6) By their misleading August Committee Bulletin, Brief Review, Letter of Importance and whispering and preaching campaign they have at least made proportionately as big a rent in the Church as J.F.R. and his supporters did a year before by the same methods, and all the time, like the Society leaders, they blame the others for making the division.

(7) By their forcing into existence a corporation, and that with a charter violently different from Brother Russell's, they have in a number of cases split up classes; all the time they and their supporters have blamed locally the others for the division, but in their paper *pretend* that there is practically no division. Those who are guilty of such *sectarianism* are not qualified to be the "means of preserving unity of thought and action"; rather they are at fault for a part of a "condition of confusion, ... just as we see slowly developing everywhere among the Lord's people at the present time."

(8) By their busyboding in the internal affairs of various congregations they are making divisions. As an illustration of such divisional activities, we will recite to the general Church some further facts connected with the difference between the Philadelphia Church and the P.B.I. In No. 2 we pointed out that only after mailing Present Truth, No. 1, did we *reliably* find out that the Providence Convention did not appoint a Committee to seek to secure the co-operation of the Philadelphia and other Churches for

the P.B.I. In contrast with our efforts to use for the good of the Church the situation created, as we thought, by the resolution whose report came seemingly in a reliable way to us, we feel the Church must know how H.C. Rockwell, on the official paper of the P.B.I. and as one of its officers, wrote to the Secretary *as such* of the Philadelphia Church, for which reason his letter was read to that Church. The letter, which speaks for itself, follows:

DEAR BROTHER:—Kindly permit me to address a few lines to you in response to some of the statements made in Brother Johnson's papers. Are you aware that some of the charges made by Brother J. in his first paper against a certain brother, a member of the Board of Directors, were characterized by an attorney here in this city as "criminal libel"? [!] Don't you know that if these matters were taken into court Brother J. would doubtless be branded as a criminal, or else be adjudged as being of unsound mind? [!] [Most lawyers will say anything to win a prospective client. The P.B.I. has our invitation to bring the matter into court; thereby things will be brought out on which they seem afraid to meet in discussion before conventions!] Are you not aware that the statement contained in his last paper, to the effect that a committee had been appointed by the Providence Convention to make overtures to the Philadelphia Church with a view of establishing harmony between the Church there and the Board of Directors of the Pastoral Bible Institute, is absolutely false, having no foundation in fact? Don't you know that that statement is such a palpable lie that all of the friends who were at that Convention, several hundred, are now wondering if the Philadelphia Ecclesia is still intending to endorse the lie by supporting the one who published the lie? Does the Philadelphia Church wish to be branded as false? In the eyes of the whole Church the country over the Philadelphia Class will merit the

contempt of all decent people, if it continues to endorse one who slanders, libels, and falsifies to such a degree as the present traducer of the brethren there. Are you, may I ask, to continue lending your name as secretary of the Class to such fraudulent statements as that which has appeared? If so, do you think that honest brethren in Christ would care to fellowship you, or in fact, have anything to do with you? Some of the misguided friends of the Philadelphia Ecclesia have very glibly disfellowshipped us as priests [this had not yet been done]: Well, are you not fearful of what the Lord will do to you, unless you publicly renounce the *lie* that you have been endorsing (See Rev. 22:15)? You will be conferring a favor, if you will let me know at once what action you and your associates are to take in regard to these matters, that we may know just exactly what our attitude in the future towards you will be. Trusting that you still have a spark of manhood, and at least an atom of Christian principle about you, I am as ever rejoicing in the "holy."

[Signed] H. CLAY ROCKWELL.

A wise lover of Zion, realizing that merely a mistake which harmed no one was made, would have done with the situation what we did; *i.e.*, use the occasion as an opening to seek to heal the wounds of the Church. I.F. Hoskins and H.C. Rockwell were the ones who sent the night letter of Dec. 21, declining "to take part in the Philadelphia meeting" (they would not say convention!), which sought in a just way to bring about a healing of the wounds in the Church. Is this the way to be "a means of preserving unity of thought and action" in the Church? Yes, if we want the kind of unity of thought and action that the Papacy has stood for as against *its* so-called "archheretics"; but a thousand times no, if we want the unity of thought and action for which Jesus prays in John 17:20, 21!

Had the P.B.I. been as desirous of being "a means

of preserving [Christian] unity of thought and action" as they so unctuously tell us on longsuffering paper, they would have found time between Dec. 10 (when most of them, in *The Present Truth*, No. 1, received the invitation to seek at the Hebron Convention a cure for the trouble) and Dec. 20 (when that Convention began) to arrange for a Committee meeting to consider attending that Convention. But with a punctiliousness like the Papacy's in insisting on groundless technicalities to the violation of God's commands, *i.e.*, to "seek peace and ensue it," they could not come because "we was not invited," and because "the Convention was *disorderly*" (!), not having been called by the P.B.I., which *channel-like* "RESERVES TO ITSELF the service granted to it" by the Asbury Park Convention—calling conventions!

Since our last issue we have learned more about the Committee that was supposed to have been appointed by the Providence Convention: That the Church may better understand the peace-producing qualities of the P.B.I. we will tell it. It seems that a committee of two New York brothers and one Philadelphia brother was appointed, not quite a thousand miles away from the P.B.I. Headquarters, to assist some division-making brethren of the Philadelphia Church, who support the P.B.I., and who have been and are supported by it, to complete Nov. 17, 1918, the division that they had for months been fomenting under encouragement of the P.B.I., and "*to secure the co-operation of the Philadelphia Church*" that the divisionists would form immediately after the intended, though not then, but since forthcoming, split in the Philadelphia Church. The authority for this story is Bro. Sachtleber, of Newark, a most ardent P.B.I. supporter, and secretary and elder of the Newark Church. These are some of the acts of the P.B.I., a "would-be" "means of preserving unity of thought and action" in the Church. Alas! They

remind us of certain schismatical popes who revived the Church to death and united it to pieces!

Now we cite the sixth reason for transforming the P.B.I. into a corporation: "(6) To be the agency through which General Conventions may be arranged for, and the time and place, together with the entertaining features to be decided and duly announced through its publication" (1).

NOTE 1: As to our thought on the P.B.I., *as such*, calling, etc., general conventions for the Little Flock, we refer our readers to our discussion of this matter in the next chapter. We doubt that they have exclusive right to call a convention of Gershonite Levites!

We now cite the seventh and last reason for their corporation: "(7) To arrange and develop the lecture or Pilgrim service, providing able brethren, sound in doctrine and faith, tried and true in character as well as in teaching, to serve the friends from place to place, as may be desired, and to give public ministration" (1).

NOTE 1: In the next chapter, who has and who has not, as to the Pilgrim service, the power of "providing able brethren ... to serve the friends from place to place as may be desired and to give public ministration" are Scripturally designated. Therefore, we totally and unqualifiedly deny that the P.B.I. has the power to appoint pilgrims, "the secondarily prophets," for the ministry of the Little Flock, and ask them to give us one Scripture for this claim. We doubt their right, as of Divine approval, to appoint pilgrims even for the Gershonite Levites. This claim also parallels the pope's claims of the right to appoint cardinals and their ministrations. This claim implies its groundlessness.

Where has the P.B.I. Scripture for any of these seven purposes? Apart from the *human authority* of their character, of their supporters and of themselves, we know of nothing that they can give as proof for

their exercising these powers, even in their "Church which is" *not* "His Body." Should not the fact that the P.B.I. can adduce no Scripture to prove their extraordinary and papistical claims move us to question very seriously their leadership? Do not these seven powers that these seven directors by their propaganda appropriate to themselves *unanswerably prove them to be graspers for power and lords over God's heritage?* Do not these arrogant claims become the proof of their unfitness to be leaders in the Little Flock? And unless they change their theories and conduct, have we not reason to fear that they are unfit for leadership among any of the other classes of the Lord's people?

Now the last paragraph of the article under review: "Which shall it be, ORGANIZATION, with its attendant conditions of order, harmony, efficiency, advancement and accomplishment of service to the honor of our Lord, in the interests of His Truth and the blessing of the faithful, watching saints, or DISORGANIZATION, with its concomitants of disorder, confusion, misapplied efforts and a gradual subsidence into obscurity and final disintegration (1)?"

NOTE 1: Before answering this question we desire to state that the argument of this paragraph is not new. In fact, it is quite old. It is the argument of the Papacy, the Federation of Churches and of every other denomination and sect, set forth in the same self-assertive way, to justify their own organizations. Now for our answer to their question. Organization, not Disorganization, in the form of corporations—without, however, the unscriptural, self-exalting and arrogant claims of the P.B.I. and W.T.B.&T.S., and without violations of that Servant's charter and will—for both the Merarites and Gershonites of the Great Company and the Youthful Worthies (Num. 7:1-8)!

Organization—not Disorganization—free from human organizations—in the form of THE CHRIST, consisting of the one Head and one Body, with diverse and mutually related members in the Divinely ordered unity that is one and inseparable now and forever! This is the Organization which Jesus by faithfulness unto death established over 1900 years ago, and in the interest of which the Apostles laid down their lives. This is the Organization in the interest of which all the faithful have suffered throughout the Age. This is the Organization that is complete in itself, whose Charter (the Word of God) is sufficient thoroughly to furnish and perfect the man of God. Who among us will at any and every cost stand for this, the only proper Organization in and of The Christ? Who?

Servant of Christ, stand fast amid the scorn
 Of men who little know or love thy Lord;
 Turn not aside from toil: cease not to warn,
 Comfort and teach, trust Him for thy reward;
 A few more moments' suffering, and then
 Cometh sweet rest from all thy heart's deep pain.

For grace pray much, for much thou needest grace.
 If men thy work deride—what can they more?
 Christ's weary foot thy path on earth doth trace;
 If thorns wound thee, they pierced Him before;
 Press on, look up, tho' clouds may gather round,
 Thy place of service He makes hallowed ground.

Have friends forsaken thee, and cast thy name
 Out as a worthless thing? Take courage then:
 Go tell thy Master; for they did the same
 To Him, who once in patience toiled for them;
 Yet He was perfect in all service here;
 Thou oft hast failed: this maketh Him more dear.

CHAPTER IV.

OTHER EARLIER DOINGS OF THE SHIMITE GERSHONITES.

P.B.I. REVOLUTIONISMS AGAINST GOD'S ARRANGEMENTS. SALIENT
POINTS OF P.B.I. HISTORY.

SINCE that Servant's death there have been worldwide siftings among the Truth people. These siftings, so far as they concern the separation of the Little Flock and the Great Company, have, generally speaking, been along the lines of what may be called *Clericalism*, for which a near Biblical term is *Nicolaitanism*. By this term the theory and conduct of certain leaders among the Lord's people are meant, whose peculiar activities are grasping for power and lording it over God's heritage. There would perhaps not have been such marked siftings, if the clericalists (the Nicolaitanes, Rev. 2:6, 15), had not attacked those who, standing for the Lord's arrangements as given through that Servant, resisted the former's revolutionism against these arrangements. After the Revolutionists had violated a number of these, certain brethren, taking note of it, meekly and lovingly sought to win them from their wrong course. Instead of the latter appreciating these loving efforts, and amending their ways, they with deeper schemes, sad to think and say, conspired to attain or retain their ambitious purposes, among other ways by misrepresenting first through a private, then later through a public political campaign, the former as ambitious and power-seeking persons, who must be resisted by all the brethren, it being claimed that the latter's liberty was being subverted by those whom the Revolutionists were pleased to call conspirators. In this the Clericalists acted somewhat after the manner of the fleeing thief, who, pursued down a busy street by a crowd that was crying

out to the people ahead, "Stop the thief!" also joined in their cry, pointing toward and beyond the crowd ahead who were about to intercept him, and who, thus deceived, immediately turned and started in pursuit of the imaginary culprit, while the real culprit hid himself among the deluded crowd until it was wearied and gave up the chase. Tactics somewhat similar to these were pursued by the English managers, by "the present management" in the Society, and by the Group in the P.B.I. Only after the wrong-doers by such tactics had made matters public in a misleading but plausible light, did those who were faithful to the Lord's arrangements speak of the conditions with appropriate expostulations, and then only as they actually existed.

The clericalists have been active as Revolutionists, grasping for power and lording it over God's heritage through violating the Lord's arrangements as given by that Servant in two spheres of activity: (1) in the general work as conducted from headquarters, and (2) in the local work as conducted in the local Ecclesias. In Britain all three British managers as counselors (not directors) of the I.B.S.A., which is a purely British, not an American, corporation, and in America the "present management" of the W.T.B.&T.S., and the Group of the P.B.I., we are grieved to be compelled to say, are among the clericalists who have by usurpation and trickery gotten control of the general work. It will be noticed that these three groups, as far as concerns their conflicts with one another, are divided into two groups. J. Hemery in British matters stands with "the present management" as against H.J. Shearn and W. Crawford, and in world-wide matters with "the present management" as against the so-called "opposition" among the old Board's members, whose successors are the P.B.I.

That there is a growing sympathetic oneness between the P.B.I. and H.J. Shearn and W. Crawford

and their supporters, is evidenced, among other things, from F.G. Guard's letter in the Feb. 1, 1919, "Herald," page 48. This will become manifest from the following remark: F.G. Guard, the leading elder of the Forest Gate Church, which 22 years ago was the second largest of our English Churches, and which is now in violent opposition to the Society's policies, especially as administered by J. Hemery against H.J. Shearn and W. Crawford, is the leading British Brother supporting H.J. Shearn and W. Crawford, and is the latter's father-in-law. As a step in the controversy the Forest Gate Church as such has withdrawn its support from the Society, which fact has caused a number of its members to join the London Tabernacle congregation. Thus, on the one hand, there is world-wide conflict between the two groups of corporationists among the Lord's people. These two groups, which have symbolic wagons (Num. 7:1-8), seem to antitype the Gershonite and Merarite divisions of the Levites. Therefore we need not be surprised to see a world-wide drawing together of the "opposition" corporationists, as against "the channel" corporationists. On the other hand, since Levites are more sympathetic with one another than they are with Priests, we need not be surprised to see both groups of corporationists drawn together against the author and those who see eye to eye with him, even as Herod and Pilate on a certain fateful day became friends against Jesus, though previously they had been enemies.

F.H. McGee's language is pregnant with a different thought from what he understood when in a "Brief Review," p. 1, col. 2, par. 4, he wrote the following words: "The friends are requested in considering these accusations of Brother Johnson [in 'Another Harvest Siftings Reviewed'] to bear in mind how many points are made of similarity, as to accusations against himself and his conduct. In so far as these parallels may be correct, is it not singular that these

brethren who are now accused, and who formerly sympathized with Brother Johnson and supported him, should be guilty of these same offenses? [It is singular to those only who, failing to realize that all the Great Company leaders, as graspers for power and lords over God's heritage, have the same spirit, and, like their kindred-spirited brethren, prominent in the nominal Church (Lot seated at Sodom's gate, place of prominence, Gen. 19:1) all through the Gospel Age, when their power was threatened, have found fault with the faithful shepherds of God's flock (Abraham's shepherds found fault with by Lot's shepherds, Gen. 13:5-13), and persecuted them because of their interfering with their selfish plans and works against God's Little Flock]. Is it not singular that they should have the same impression of him as others have had with whom he dealt in the past? [when he sought to keep them from violating the Lord's arrangements given through that Servant. No, not strange! it is to be expected of kindred spirits.] The brethren throughout the world will be called upon to decide these matters, not only from what has happened in the past [*e.g.*, the Committee's course at Asbury Park, their August Bulletin and connected matters], but also by what they are now experiencing and by their future experiences as time shall reveal them," *e.g.*, F.H. McGee's "Brief Review," "Letter of Importance," and his Charter, so grossly violative of that Servant's. Yea, verily! And when all the brethren have definitely taken their stand on the matters of controversy among the Lord's people since that Servant's death, until the controversy shall be over, it will no doubt have been found that all the Great Company will have been separated from the Little Flock; that the former's leaders will have been reproved by the Lord in his displeasure; and that the brother and those who see eye to eye with him whom they have persecuted and misrepresented the world over will stand vindicated by the Lord

before the brethren, and will, when the former have repented, with a loving and forgiving heart and with willing hands bless them in the name of the Lord! Amen! "The zeal of the Lord of Hosts," we believe, "shall accomplish this!"

In Vol. VI, Chap. I and Chapters I, II and III of this volume, and in *Harvest Siftings Reviewed*, we exposed some of the violations of that Servant's charter and will arrangements, as well as some violations of office and field-working arrangements committed by the three British managers, the present management and the Group in the P.B.I. In charity, until it became necessary to publish them, we held back details of the British managers' offenses, giving details on the scheme only in which all three of them co-operated to overthrow almost entirely that Servant's office and field arrangements. When the necessity arose we gave added proof that they are *revolutionists* against that Servant's other office and field arrangements from the very full evidence on these matters in our possession.

That the Board of Directors of the P.B.I. have the same spirit as the three British managers and the Present Management we stated above, giving as proof, under twelve heads, 150 particulars, every one of which is thoroughly true. The Aug. "Bulletin" and F.H. McGee's answers, *i.e.*, "A Brief Review," "A Letter of Importance," and his printed letter to J.D. Wright accompanying his "Letter of Importance," have the same spirit and use the same methods as J.F.R.'s "Harvest Siftings," *i.e.*, on matters of fact they omit essential things that, if told, would give a wholly different setting to things from what they give. They change things so as to give them a false setting and they invent things to make their theory of things seem plausible, even as they grossly misrepresent our doctrinal views, as was proven in *The Present Truth*, No. 1, etc. Sad to say, their thorough Rutherfordism

was proven in the 150 particulars above. In that paper we intimated, with a sad heart and a hesitating hand, that the guilt of the Group was even greater than that of J.F.R., because despite his *warning example against which they made a world-wide protest* in the various papers they published, they in an amazingly short time (*one year to the day*) *imitated his course*. And now the charter that they themselves have published as that of their Institute changes that Servant's charter arrangements in more and worse ways than J.F.R. did, and makes at least one of his will arrangements a dead letter, as can readily be seen. And these charter changes are not among the least of their acts of revolutionism, we are sorry to say.

[The charters of the Society and the Institute, the former in the first column, with the order of the Institute's charter changed to parallel its sections with corresponding sections of the Society's Charter, are herewith given side by side to facilitate comparison, additions to and omissions from the Society's Charter being indicated by blanks in brackets in the opposite column, and non-essential and essential changes from the Society's Charter being respectively indicated by italics and by capitals.]

<p>Be it known, That the subscribers, having associated themselves together for the purpose of dissemination of Bible Truths in various languages and being desirous of becoming incorporated agreeably to the provisions of the Act of the General Assembly of the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania entitled "An Act to Provide for the Incorporation and Regulation of certain Corporations," approved</p>	<p><i>"We, the undersigned, of full age, being desirous of associating ourselves together for the purpose hereinafter mentioned, pursuant to and in conformity with Article III of the Membership Corporation Law, do hereby certify [] and declare that we are all of full age, two-thirds of us are citizens of the United States, and three of us residents of the State of New York.</i></p>
--	---

the twenty-ninth day of April, Anno Domini, one thousand and eight hundred and seventy-four, and its supplements, do hereby declare, set forth and certify that the following are the purposes, objects, articles and conditions of their said association for and upon which they desire to be incorporated:

We do further certify and declare as follows:

1. The name of the Corporation shall be Zion's Watch Tower Tract Society. [In 1896 the name was changed to W.T.B.&T.S.]

"Second: That the name of said corporation shall be Pastoral Bible Institute, Inc.

2. The purpose for which the Corporation is formed is the dissemination of Bible Truths in various languages by means of the publication of tracts, pamphlets, papers and other religious documents, and by the use of all other lawful means which its BOARD OF DIRECTORS, duly constituted shall deem expedient for the furtherance of the purposes stated.

"First: The purpose for which the corporation is formed is the dissemination of Bible Truths in various languages by means of the publication of tracts, pamphlets, papers and other religious documents, and by the use of all other lawful means which its Board of Directors, duly constituted, shall deem expedient for the furtherance of the purposes stated.

3. The place where the business of the said Corporation is to be transacted is the City of Allegheny, in the County of Allegheny, and State of Pennsylvania.

"Fourth: That the principal office of said corporation will be located in the Borough of Brooklyn, County of Kings.

"Third: That the territory in which the operations of said corporations are to be principally conducted is New York City; but it may conduct its operations elsewhere in the United States and various countries of the world.

4. The Corporation is to exist perpetually.

5. The names and residences of the subscribers are as follows: [Names omitted here; they are the same as those under section 6].

The Corporation has no capital stock. Each donation of Ten Dollars to the funds of said Corporation shall entitle the contributor, or his assigns, to one non-forfeitable, non-assessable and non-dividend-bearing share, and to one vote for every such share in said Corporation. Certificates of membership, so acquired, shall be issued by the Secretary, countersigned by the President, to the persons entitled thereto.

"Fifth: That the corporation has no Capital Stock EACH CONTRIBUTOR to the funds of the [] corporation to *the extent of* Five Dollars (\$5.00) OR MORE WHEN SUCH CONTRIBUTION SHALL HAVE BEEN ACCEPTED BY THE BOARD OF DIRECTORS FOR THE PURPOSE OF ADMISSION TO MEMBERSHIP AS PROVIDED IN THE BY-LAWS shall entitle the *said* contributor [] to one [] non-assessable and non-dividend-bearing CERTIFICATE OF MEMBERSHIP, AND TO ONE VOTE. Certificates of membership, so acquired, will be issued by the Secretary [] to the persons entitled thereto.

6. The Corporation is to

be MANAGED BY A BOARD OF DIRECTORS consisting of seven members, and the names and residences of those already chosen Directors are as follows:

President—Charles T. Russell, Allegheny City, Penna.

Vice President—William I. Mann, Benwood, W. Va.

Secretary and Treasurer—Maria F. Russell, Allegheny City, Penna.

William C. McMillan, Latrobe, Penna.

Simon O. Blunden, New York City, N.Y.

J.B. Adamson, Allegheny City, Penna.

Joseph F. Smith, Pittsburgh, Penna.

7. The said Corporation by its Board of Directors, a majority of whom shall constitute a quorum for the transaction of business, shall have full power and authority to make and enact by-laws, rules and ordinances, which shall be deemed and taken to be the law of said Corporation, and do any and everything useful for the good government and support of the affairs of said Corporation; provided that the said by-laws, rules and ordinances, or any of them, shall not be repugnant to this charter, to the constitution

"Sixth: That the number of Directors of said corporation shall be seven (7).

"Seventh: That the names and places of residence of the persons to be the Directors of said Corporation UNTIL ITS FIRST ANNUAL MEETING ARE: J.D. Wright, 972 Broadway, Bayonne, N.J.

Ingram L. Margeson, Westwood, Mass.

P.L. Greiner, 874 Sedgwick Ave., Brooklyn, N.Y.

H. Clay Rockwell, 13 Middagh St., Brooklyn, N.Y.

I.F. Hoskins, 119 Schermerhorn St., Brooklyn, N.Y.

F.H. McGee, 107 Broad St., Freehold, N.J.

E.J. Pritchard, 29 Morton St., Andover, Mass.

"Eighth: The said corporation, by its Board of Directors, a majority of whom shall constitute a quorum for the transaction of business, shall have full power and authority to make and enact by-laws, rules and ordinances which shall be deemed and taken to be the law of said corporation, and do any and everything useful for the good government and support of the affairs of said corporation; provided,

and laws of the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania, and to the Constitution of the United States.

THAT THE SAID BY-LAWS, RULES AND ORDINANCES OR ANY OF THEM MAY BE AMENDED OR REPEALED BY A MAJORITY VOTE OF THE MEMBERS OF THE CORPORATION.

8. The said Corporation shall have as officers a President, who shall preside at the meeting of the Board of Directors, a Vice President, who shall preside in the absence of the President, and a Secretary, who shall also be Treasurer; and these officers shall be chosen from among the members of the Board of Directors annually on the first Saturday of each year, by an election by ballot to be held at the principal office of the Corporation in Allegheny City, Pennsylvania. The members of the Board of Directors shall hold their respective offices for life, unless removed by a two-thirds vote of the shareholders, and vacancies in the Board occasioned by death, resignation or removal, shall be filled by

The said corporation shall have as officers and AGENTS OF THE BOARD OF DIRECTORS, a *chairman* who shall preside at all meetings of the Board of Directors, a *Vice Chairman* who shall preside in the absence of the *Chairman*, a *Secretary* AND A *Treasurer*, and these shall be chosen from the members of the Board of Directors *by THEM*, ANNUALLY AT A DIRECTORS' MEETING TO BE CALLED AND HELD IMMEDIATELY AFTER THE ANNUAL ELECTION OF DIRECTORS AS MAY BE PROVIDED IN THE BY-LAWS. The members of the Board of Directors shall hold their respective offices FOR ONE YEAR [] and vacancies in the Board occasioned by death, resignation, or removal, shall be filled by vote of a majority of the remaining *directors*.

vote of the majority of the remaining members of the Board, who shall meet for that purpose within twenty days from the time that such vacancy, or vacancies, shall occur, and in the event of a failure to fill such vacancy or vacancies, in the manner aforesaid, within thirty days from the time when such vacancy, or vacancies, shall occur, then the said vacancy, or vacancies, shall be filled by the appointment of the President, and the person, or persons, so appointed shall hold his, or their, office, or offices, until the next annual election of officers of the Corporation, when such vacancy, or vacancies, shall be filled by election, in the same manner as the President, Vice President, and Secretary and Treasurer are elected.

"Ninth: That annually on the first Saturday of the MONTH OF JUNE, provided that should such first Saturday be a legal holiday, then on the next succeeding business day, the meeting for the purpose of the election of directors shall be held at the principal office of the Institute in the City of Brooklyn, N.Y., or at other suitable nearby building, as provided in the

by-laws. Special meetings of the members or of the directors for the purpose of transacting any necessary business may be called and held as shall be provided in the by-laws.

The persons entitled to vote at annual elections of the Corporation shall be those who hold certificates of membership acquired in the manner aforesaid.

"The persons entitled to vote at annual elections of the corporation shall be those who hold certificates of membership acquired in the manner aforesaid.

9. The said Corporation, under the name, style and title aforesaid, shall have full power and authority to make, have and use a common seal, with such device and inscription as they may deem proper, and the same to alter and renew at their pleasure; and by the name, style and title aforesaid, shall be able in law and equity to sue and be sued, plead and be impleaded in any Court or Courts, before any Judge or Justice of the Peace, in all manner of suits and complaints, pleas, causes, matters and demands whatsoever, and all and every matter or thing therein to do in as full and complete a manner, and as effectually, as any other person, or persons, bodies politic, or corporate within the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania, may or can do.

10. The said Corporation, by the name, style and title aforesaid, shall have the right, power and authority to take, receive and hold in fee simple, or any less estate, all such messages, lots, lands, buildings, tenements, rents, annuities, franchises and hereditaments as may be necessary and proper for its purposes; and sell, lease, mortgage, or otherwise dispose of the same or any part thereof; and it shall have the same right, power and authority to take, receive and hold, and to sell, lease or dispose of any and all kinds of personal property and money.

Witness our hands and seals this 12th day of November A.D. 1884:
(Above seven names follow.)

"In testimony whereof, we have made and signed this Certificate in duplicate this 20th day of November, one thousand nine hundred and eighteen."
(Above seven names follow.)

As indicated above, there are four classes of changes in the P.B.I.'s charter from that of the W.T.B.&T.S.; *i.e.*, omissions, additions, merely verbal substitutions and material alterations. We submit some remarks on these:

(1) If the provisions of the Charter of the W.T.B.&T.S., as the P.B.I. claims in various publications, *e.g.*, the August "Bulletin," page 6, were the Divine arrangement for controlling corporational work among the Truth people, then we should agree that beyond the change of the name and address of the corporation and of the law and State under which the charter would be granted, no change, even in the wording of the charter, should have been made, unless there was

a refusal by the authorities of many States to grant them a charter exactly like that of the W.T.B.&T.S., apart from the above exceptions. Such a refusal was not at all likely to be made; because, and nobody knows that better than F.H. McGee, the examination of corporation charters, especially of non-profit business corporations doing a religious work, is more or less superficial. For this reason the illegal clause of the P.P.A.'s charter giving its first President his office and the controllership of the P.P.A. for life, passed the examiner uncorrected. In some of the P.B.I. Committee discussions on this phase of the subject, this condition was pointed out by us; but it bore no fruit, because of arbitrariness and of disloyalty to that Servant on the part of the Group. Had these presented such a charter to the proper authorities, if necessary in various States, and then failed to secure its legal sanction, alterations might have been considered. But F.H. McGee's advocacy of certain changes at Asbury Park and in his "Letter of Importance" proves that *they did not want* a charter with all its provisions exactly like those of the W.T.B.&T.S. F.H. McGee's plea in his "Letter of Importance" that the clause giving the Directors office for life caused the trouble in the Society is as untrue as his charging the trouble in the Committee on us. That clause did not have any bearing whatever on the trouble in the Society; rather the *ambition* of J.F.R. found hindrance to its gratification in that clause; and therefore he declared that clause illegal, to get rid of the Board's majority for resisting his unjustified aspirations and usurpations; just as the Group succeeded in getting rid of R.H. Hirsh, R.G. Jolly and ourself for the same reason. Nor can F.H. McGee's advice in his "Letter of Importance," that another lawyer should be consulted, so that his word alone should not be followed, remove from him the responsibility of instigating and carrying through the Group's plan as to

changes in the charter. Their course in claiming that that Servant's arrangements, will and charter were the Divine will for controllership of the work, and their claims that they were seeking to carry these out, while at the same time they were conspiring to change in certain *vital* respects various provisions of the charter, arouse such distrust of their sincerity as calls on God's people to repudiate their leadership. To follow such leaders can result only in evil to the leaders and the led (Isa. 30:1-3; 31:1-3; Matt. 15:14). But those who insist on having such leaders may have them.

(2) Some of these charter changes are merely verbal, making no difference in the sense. However, proper reverence for God, and a wholesome respect for that Servant, it seems to us, would have forbidden even such changes as unbecoming.

(3) Some of these changes are unnecessary additions and omissions. A meek spirit would have refrained from such officiousness, changing what they claim were the Divine arrangements.

(4) The fact that in some clauses they adopt the exact wording of the W.T.B.&T.S. Charter and in others change the sense proves that the changes were deliberately and wilfully made.

(5) The fact that in some clauses they change the wording without changing the sense, and in others change the wording and the sense, may prove that they were practicing known trickery to hide from the unwary amid the multiplicity of changes gross violations of the provisions of that Servant's charter.

(6) Some of these changes violate the spirit and purpose of that Servant's charter, as well as a number of its necessary provisions.

(a) While the fifth clause of the Society's charter gives any contributor whomsoever of ten dollars voting membership in that corporation, the fifth clause of the P.B.I.'s Charter gives only such contributors of five dollars, or more, membership in the Institute as

the *Directors see fit to admit to membership*. The clause in which the P.B.I.'s Charter gives this power is ungrammatical; and it seems that this mistake in grammar was caused by their changing the thought and yet trying to keep the expression of the Society's charter as much as possible: They make it say that "each contributor ... shall entitle said contributor," etc. This change in this clause makes the Board of the P.B.I. sole judges as to who shall, and who shall not be members of the P.B.I. They can be depended upon to keep out all whom they do not want as members; and they will want none as members on whose support for themselves they could not depend. Logically the power to admit into, implies the power to expel from membership. This shows that they are founding an institution in which they will control, however much they have sought to give the friends the thought that they and not the P.B.I. Board would control the corporation's affairs. This also proves that *their institution is not a business corporation financing a religious work*, as that Servant formed the Society to be, but *is a religious body*, which is contrary to that Servant's purpose in forming the Society. (See the previous volume, Chap. II.) This feature of their charter evidences grasping for power and lordship on the part of the P.B.I.

(b) Whereas \$10 were the minimum contribution entitling its giver to voting powers in the Society, \$5 contributions will insure their donors of voting powers, if the P.B.I. Board should decide to accept them as members. The higher amount is little enough for such membership, though in that Servant's time all of it needed not to be given at one time; any contributions given within a year's time and totaling \$10 entitled their donor to voting powers. J.F.R. changed this (Z '17, 329, col. 1, par. 3).

(c) Whereas each additional \$10 would entitle the contributor to one additional vote in the Society, no

matter how much more than \$5 one might contribute, he could have but one vote in the P.B.I. At least three evils flow from this change: (1) This makes the P.B.I., not a business corporation, but a religious body; *i.e.*, an Antichrist. While it would be wrong for us to give voting powers, and much more so varying voting powers in a religious body such as an Ecclesia, a Convention, a Church committee, etc., for any financial consideration, in a business corporation people should be limited or enlarged in their voting powers in proportion to the amount of their financial contributions. This is a matter of such elementary justice that even worldlings recognize its propriety. The P.B.I.'s course in giving all contributors the same voting powers shows that their institution, unlike the Society, as that Servant intended it to be, is a religious body, controlled as to membership admission and dismissal by its Board of Directors. (2) This provision makes a Sister's Committee as created by that Servant's will a powerless thing; for it would give but one vote to such a committee, whereas that Servant arranged by this provision to bequeath all *his* voting powers to such as he reasonably felt sure would vote *his shares* according to his desires, and thus perpetuate *his* voting powers in the Society. The provision of a Sister's Committee should be arranged for in the P.B.I., by its Board of Directors and Editorial Committee, as provided in the will, electing such a committee as we suggested above, if they have not yet elected one. (3) Since the P.B.I. Directors have the power of admission into, and dismissal from the P.B.I., this provision is dangerous, for it gives them controllership powers beyond anything that that Servant intended the Directors of the Society to have and that also with few votes to object to their course. A few voters could be more easily manipulated than a larger number, against having which the P.B.I. could use its powers of admitting into and dismissing from

the corporation. Further, usually the larger contributors, by reason of larger business experience, can see through manipulatory methods better than the average small contributor; but having no more power than the latter, could not use their understanding of official trickery to checkmate it with more effectiveness in votes than those who were not so likely to see such trickery. The fifth clause of the P.B.I.'s Charter is a marked evidence of the spirit of grasping for power and lording it over God's heritage, with which unhappily its Board of Directors is contaminated.

(d) The fifth clause gives the Secretary too much power by giving him *alone* the power of issuing the certificates of membership without the chairman countersigning them. The present Secretary, both by his prejudices and his favoritisms, cannot in the judgment of many be trusted in every case to use this power aright. There are cases possible wherein, even if ordered by the Board to give a certificate of membership, he could and from past experiences we infer likely would evade the order, an evasion made more difficult, if the chairman, knowing of the order having been given, were expected to countersign the certificate. This possibility becomes apparent from the fact that the Secretary probably controls the incoming and the outgoing mails.

(e) Clause five, somewhat after the manner of J.F.R., omits the words "or his assigns." This is a further evidence that they do not consider the P.B.I. to be merely a business corporation doing a religious work, but a religious body. This same theory of J.F.R. moved him to do away with the voting power of the Sister's Committee, on the ground that it is illegal to bequeath voting powers in a religious body; and to introduce among his by-laws, recommended by I.L. Margeson, and passed at Pittsburgh, Jan. 6, 1917, one defining the expression "or his assigns" as meaning such persons for whom one contributed money to the

Society and asked that the voting shares be made out in their names! This omission prevents one from willing his voting powers to others. This omission is another way in which the P.B.I. Directors can keep (to them) undesirable persons from membership in the P.B.I., after the manner of J.F.R.

(f) Clause five omits the word "non-forfeitable." By this omission they secure to themselves the power to dismiss from membership in their "religious body." These Directors seem "wise in their own generation"; "but He taketh the wise in their own craftiness!" Since they in hundreds of particulars have imitated J.F.R., they would doubtless in matters of dismissal imitate him, if their necessities called for it, even as they secured the overthrow of the Fort Pitt Committee, because they wanted to rid themselves of three non-pliant Committee members. In Z '17, 329, col. 1, par. 4, J.F.R. sought to nullify the "non-forfeitable" feature of Society voting shares.

(g) Clause eight gives the members the right to amend or repeal the by-laws of the P.B.I. Directors. It leaves the right of initiating by-laws in the hands of the Directors. Therefore, what it offers with one, it can take away with the other hand; for the Directors could immediately afterward pass other by-laws for the amended or rescinded ones, slightly changed in form, and act on these for another year. And who would be the wiser, if they desired to keep it secret? Again, if they desire they can conceal the existence of their by-laws, which thus would escape the danger of being amended or rescinded. That they can be depended upon to circumvent an adverse decision of the members on by-laws, if it is to their interests so to do, is evident from the fact that the Asbury Park Convention tabled the matter of passing on the formation of a corporation *for six months*; yet *within four months* they not only had their convention (held against a former understanding, in a section of the

country where their supporters were in a majority) authorize a corporation, but also had the charter signed in duplicate! Another fact will prove the same thing: The Asbury Park Convention ordered that the "Bulletin" contain only matters of news; they made it an organ of propaganda for a corporation, of misrepresentation of what occurred in the Committee and at Asbury Park, and a cloak to send out such misleading supplements authorized by the Committee (see September "Bulletin," p. 2, col. 2) as "A Brief Review," "Letter of Importance," etc. Persons who so acted would likely take away with one hand the gift of amending and repealing their by-laws which they give with the other. That Servant's way on this subject was honest and above board. Let none think that in pointing out these defects we are surmising evil: the past course of these Directors, sad to say, betrays such attributes to be characteristic of them. Under present conditions we would not be acting circumspectly if we ignored the existence of such characteristics in them, against which it is our duty to guard the Church.

(h) Clause six omits the provision that the Board of the P.B.I. should control its affairs. In express language nothing in their charter states who shall control these. Certain it is that it is impossible for the members as such to control them, as any person of experience well knows. The various powers that the charter gives the members of its Board, as well as the absence of mention of any one else having any powers in the P.B.I., except annually to elect the Directors and to amend and to repeal by-laws, shows very clearly that the Directors are to control. And as far as through that Servant's arrangements, charter and will such control is provided for, this is exactly what should be the case. Therefore our criticism of their course is not intended to undermine their controllership limited to the things of that Servant's charter and will, but to undermine (1) their extending their

power beyond these limitations and (2) their seeking to spread the impression that they have less power than the Directors of the W.T.B.&T.S. charter, while actually giving themselves, and arranging to exercise, more powers than the latter have. In the Aug. "Bulletin," p. 4, col. 1, they say that the Group advocated forming a membership corporation in which no one except the shareholders could control, "just as Brother Russell had organized the W.T.B.&T.S. on the same basis, with the understanding that the controllership would be in the hands of the shareholders, particularly after his death," and that R.H. Hirsh, R.G. Jolly and ourself immediately announced our opposition to such a plan. Nothing in "Harvest Siftings" is more misleading than the presentation of matters throughout the entire first column of page 4 of the August "Bulletin." Never was there any objection raised by the Group to the seven brothers controlling the work given them to do by the Fort Pitt Convention, though in evil surmising they repeatedly accused us of seeking to control the Committee and its work. Never did they or anyone else in the Committee advocate that the work be controlled by all the shareholders, an impossible thing; never did R.H. Hirsh, R.G. Jolly and ourself oppose such a proposition (because it was never presented; but speaking for ourself, we are frank to say that had it been presented we would have opposed it, as contrary to that Servant's arrangements). And never did that Servant arrange for the shareholders to control the Society's work after his death, as in *Light After Darkness*, p. 22, col. 2, next from last paragraph, some of the Group, quoting from his booklet, *A Conspiracy Exposed*, prove that the *Directors* were to exercise his controllership of the business and affairs of the Society after his death. The evident purpose of the Group throughout the column in question, to represent themselves as the defenders, and the other three

brothers as the despoilers of the liberty of the Church, is totally false to the facts of the case. The reverse is the case, as the friends are more and more learning. The article on the Object of an Organization, in the August "Bulletin," pp. 6 and 7, which we reviewed above, and the charter of their Institute, which we now are reviewing, ought to satisfy any reasonable person that it is the P.B.I. that plotted to subvert the liberty of the Church; and that because R.H. Hirsh, R.G. Jolly and ourself unalterably opposed them therein, they plotted and secured the overthrow of the Fort Pitt Convention Committee, in order to rid themselves of the three opposing members, first by a "political campaign," and then by pulling the wool over the eyes of the unwary sheep on the matter. But by the time this controversy is over the whole Church will know this to be the truth of the case. The politics of the P.B.I. reduplicates that of J.F.R. of the year before, and proves, sad to say, the propagandists of the P.B.I. to be like him in character. He who treats the prospective Bride of Jesus as politicians do the public is in a most dangerous sin, personally offending Him.

(i) Their charter has put away the office of President and Vice-President, as provided in that Servant's charter, and has substituted a Chairman and a Vice-Chairman. Of course, a Chairman and a Vice-Chairman have less power than a President and a Vice President; and accordingly the other five members of the Board have more power than they would have, if they had a President and Vice-President with the proper powers of the corresponding Society officers. Two of the powers that the Society President has they have withheld from their Chairman, both of which powers would be advantageous for the work, if had by the Chairman: (1) countersigning the certificates of membership, (2) appointing a director to a vacant directorship until the next annual election, if the Board fails to elect one within thirty days after the vacancy

occurs. By depriving their Chairman of the former power they open the door to abuses on the part of an untrustworthy Secretary; and by depriving him of the second power they increase their own power.

(j) Whereas that Servant's charter makes one person both Secretary and Treasurer, the P.B.I. charter makes two persons fill these offices. It is in many ways advantageous for the one person to fill both these offices, provided that he is competent, and no other should be elected. Perhaps the exposures of I.F. Hoskins' incompetency may have caused the P.B.I. to remove him from the Treasureship. Of course, we do not expect them to acknowledge this any more than F.H. McGee would acknowledge in his Brief Review that to R.H. Hirsh and ourself he severely censured H.C. Rockwell and I.F. Hoskins for publicly attacking us, and that by name, before the Asbury Park Convention. Rather by using ambiguous terms, he gave the impression that he approved their course in that part of the Brief Review where he answered our charge that the majority of the *Old* Committee, himself and R.H. Hirsh, R.G. Jolly and ourself, disapproved of the course of H.C. Rockwell and I.F. Hoskins in foisting the committee troubles on the convention; and by representing us as charging that the *New* Committee was in disharmony, and then denied the charge!

(k) Whereas that Servant's charter arranged for the Directors to hold office for life, subject to dismissal by two-thirds votes of the shareholders, the P.B.I.'s charter arranges for their election annually. On this point please see Vol. VI, Chap. I. By this change the P.B.I. show their character kinship to J.F.R., the champion Revolutionist among God's people, and their insincerity in waging a world-wide fight against him for his revolutionism, on the ground that he was violating the Divine arrangements in the charter and will by his course in this very particular. It is our

opinion that only blind and prejudiced partisans and undiscerning innocents can believe them sincere, after what they have done in altering the charter under the circumstances.

(l) Whereas that Servant's charter made it possible at any time to remove incompetent or unfaithful Directors by two-thirds of the voting shares, the P.B.I.'s charter omits this provision. Thereby it effects two evils: (1) it takes a useful power away from the voting members and (2) it secures to the Directors more power and protection, which they may be expected in self-interest to abuse, if "past events cast their shadows before."

(m) As they have decreased the powers of their Chairman so have they increased the powers of their Secretary *as such*, making him alone the actor in signing certificates of membership, which power can easily be misused by an intriguing Secretary.

(n) Whereas that Servant's charter gives the shareholders the power to elect the officers of the corporation, the P.B.I.'s charter takes away this power from its members, and by lodging this power with the Directors gives them a power that that Servant's charter does not give the W.T.B.&T.S. Directors. This is another case of grasping for power on the part of the P.B.I. This particular change is to the disadvantage of the other members of the corporation, because it makes the officers dependent on the Board, and not on the voting members. This fact will lead men of the spirit of the P.B.I. Board to stand by the Board as against the other members of the corporation in a clash of interests, as they would know that the opposite course would cost them their official heads, and like years ago would likely result in a "political campaign," causing them to lose their place on the Board altogether. As that Servant arranged matters, "playing politics" would have been quite restrictable; the brethren in general would have been

spared much agitation; and faithful Directors would have become more and more efficient by years of experience, undisturbed by keeping one eye on the next annual election; while incompetent or unfaithful Directors could at any time on proof of incompetency or unfaithfulness be dismissed by two-thirds of the voting shares. On the other hand, by the Board's by-laws and vigilance, as that Servant arranged matters, the Directors could prevent ambitious officers elected by the corporation's members, gaining unauthorized powers, etc.

We could point out other evils in the omissions, additions and material changes of the P.B.I.'s charter, but the fourteen given above, being the most important and flagrant, are enough to prove our proposition that the P.B.I. are in truth revolutionists against that Servant's arrangements, charter and will; and that this particular form of revolutionism, in view of their published claims on the Divine origin and obligatoriness of that Servant's charter, makes them forfeit our belief in their sincerity, and our support of their leadership.

We feel that in addition to their violation of the will by their charter depriving a Sister's Committee (if they elect one at all) of the amount of power that that Servant's will arranged that it should have, we ought to mention that in announcing in the Feb. 1, 1919, P.B.I. Herald that the first article, "Perilous Times at Hand," was written by that Servant, they violated that injunction of his will that forbade indicating his authorship of any future publication of his writings with those of the editors. The Present Truth, beginning with No. 3, has generally in each issue published an article from that Servant's pen; and while that provision of his will applies to those papers only that are issued by controlling corporations, and therefore does not apply to an individually controlled paper

like The Present Truth, yet we respect the spirit of his will by not indicating his articles as such.

We ought to say that, contrary to the P.B.I. Herald announcement, that Servant did not write that article in 1910, nor as a forecast of events particularly coming after 1910, as the "Herald" affirms, for the article in question was published in the Sept., 1891, "Tower" word for word as it is published in the Dec. 15, 1910, "Tower" and quoted in the Feb. 1, 1919, "Herald," except in the last two papers a clause of four lines occurring in the 1891 "Tower" is omitted. Its publication in 1891 at the opening of the call, and just before the sifting of the sixth hour (Matt. 20:5; 1 Cor. 10:8-11), was providentially directed to warn God's children against the Second-death sifters of that hour (1891-1894), of the ninth hour (1901-1904) and of the eleventh hour (1908-1911); and its publication at the ending of the eleventh-hour sifting was providentially intended to warn against the last of the Second-death sifters and the future Great Company sifters (2 Tim. 3:8). Jannes means "he deceives," and represents the Parousia Second-death sifters who spoke, and taught, as Satan's mouthpiece, anti-ransom and anti-sin-offering, etc., doctrines against our Lord teaching the Parousia Truth through His people, just as Jannes at Pharaoh's command withstood Moses speaking through Aaron. Jambres means "he revolts." Jambres represents the Epiphany sifters who mislead as revolutionists the Great Company, speaking and acting against God's teachings and arrangements given through that Servant, and thus acting as Satan's mouthpiece to withstand Christ speaking through His people the Parousia and Epiphany Truth, and defending that Servant's arrangements for controlling corporations. While the type represents Jannes and Jambres acting on the same occasion, we are not to understand this, as we are not to understand the like cases of Nadab and Abihu, to mean that in the antitype

the two classes would work together in time. The antitypical Jannes does his anti-ransom and anti-sin-offering, etc., speaking first; and then the antitypical Jambres does his revolutionistic speaking and acting later, *i.e.*, during and since 1917, as in the cases of the antitypical Nadab and Abihu. The article, "Perilous Times at Hand," strikes the Society and the Institute leaders squarely in the eyes, and makes them see imaginary "wandering stars." A clearer description of their wrong-doings is difficult to imagine than St. Paul gives in 2 Tim. 3:1-8 and that Servant gives in "Perilous Times at Hand," and in Z 1899, pages 99-104. Of course, we are perfectly aware of the fact that they published it against us, just as the Second death sifters applied to that Servant passages that described them. We know that they meant to point us out by the article, because Dr. S.N. Wiley, one of the "Herald" editors, told the Philadelphia Church, Nov. 17, 1918, when he tried to read this article to the Church, that it applied to us, asking the brethren to read it as against us.

We ought to announce to the general Church that for gross defiance of various of its resolutions the Philadelphia Church, by a vote of 92 to 9, dismissed Dr. S.N. Wiley and two other like-acting elders from its elderate, and not because of what they misrepresent in the general letter that they are widely circulating, as a part of the underhanded, whispering and misleading campaign of the P.B.I. against us. Instead of an underhanded campaign why do they not "be manly," as their year's motto says, and come out openly against us in the "Herald"? Let them publish truth, not their misrepresentations and evil surmises about our official conduct, if they know any to our disparagement.

Hitherto we have described the revolutionism of the P.B.I. clericalists against that Servant's charter and will arrangements for conducting the general work. Additionally they have been active in attempting to

usurp and in actually usurping the rights of various local congregations and causing divisions in many churches. It was the attempt to grasp for power and to lord it over God's heritage in the London Tabernacle on the part of H.J. Shearn and W. Crawford (who deceived nine other elders into believing that that Servant wanted the Tabernacle arrangements changed, and thus secured their support) that precipitated the trouble in England. J.F.R. manipulated through the Brooklyn and New York Ecclesias (before, but in anticipation of his election to the Presidency of the Society) resolutions that he drafted and that gave him more power therein than that Servant had. The whole Church knows something of his divisional work to get the support of the various Churches for himself as the Society. We are now witnessing a similar course on the part of the P.B.I. We will give an account of its interfering with the affairs of the Philadelphia Church as an illustration of some of its activities elsewhere. We want to suggest to the Churches everywhere to stand fast in the liberty that the Lord gives each Church and not to become entangled in the web of the P.B.I.'s weaving.

Above we quoted a letter that I.F. Hoskins wrote to a sister of the Philadelphia Church. A just and capable Secretary would have followed that Servant's arrangements and defended instead of blaming the accused pilgrim. At the same time he wrote a similar letter to another sister whose husband announced some of its (to us) disparaging contents in a Berean meeting. Surely he should have waited for the Church through its Secretary to enter a complaint, if one were to be entered, before he acted. Unfortunately for himself and themselves, he had certain partisan friends in this Church, who, as spies, misinformed him on various matters, and thereby made trouble not only for the Evil Servant Sermon, but also over the Passover date of 1918. In the Spring of 1918

F.H. McGee and I.L. Margeson visited Philadelphia and learned that Dr. S.N. Wiley disfavored us; and the latter professed not to have understood at the time (though he admitted to have understood later), what the drift of their remarks against us was. In April H.C. Rockwell visited Philadelphia, and on three points so preached as to impress a number of the Philadelphia friends, some of whom knew nothing of the Committee's differences, that he was warning the Church against us. Later to the Committee he disclaimed such intentions. In June, I.F. Hoskins came to Philadelphia preaching, as elsewhere, and that in our hearing, against those who he said were giving "fanciful interpretations and wild speculations." Privately he named us among them, but he also before the Committee disclaimed meaning us, though later admitting that he did mean us. A little later he by busybodying interfered directly with an appointment that we as an elder of the Philadelphia Church had to preach to that Church, July 7. The Group's stand and propaganda in this Church had made some of its supporters, especially three elders, evident and growing opponents of us, and encouraged them as such. Repeatedly we cautioned (I.F. Hoskins in particular) against this course, but apparently to no effect. One of his sister-favorites here knew before the convention what we did not know; *i.e.*, that there was to be a rehearsal of the Committee's troubles at Asbury Park, and therefore sought to induce others to go to the convention and support her side, *i.e.*, the Group.

All this time we were silent on the trouble. Though we knew for several months of their "political campaign" against us, it was not until the Asbury Park Convention, after the Group made their "political campaign" against R.H. Hirsh, R.G. Jolly and ourself more open by public attacks, even mentioning our names, that we spoke of the situation and that in defense of ourself against the Group's attacks. A

week afterward we told a few of the evils in the Committee for the information of those of the Philadelphia congregation who had not been at Asbury Park, but who meantime heard of the Committee's differences. One of the P.B.I.'s talebearers in the Philadelphia Church quickly misinformed its Secretary as to what we said and at a P.B.I. meeting a resolution based on this misinformation was passed and sent to the Philadelphia Church, accompanied by the Secretary's request, approved by the P.B.I., that he be given an opportunity to disprove some alleged misrepresentations that R.G. Jolly and ourself were said to be spreading against the P.B.I. in the Church. The request was granted for Aug. 25. Aug. 18 the Church decided that we should answer him, having as long a time for our answers as he had for his statements, and that then any member of the Ecclesia might ask either of the two speakers two questions, the brother being asked the questions answering first, the other answering afterward. This fair arrangement the P.B.I. sharply resented; yet five of them, with supporting elders from several Churches, were present Aug. 25 to prove to the Philadelphia Church that R.G. Jolly and ourself were misrepresenters of the P.B.I. But alas for them! The facts were all against them. Repeatedly I.F. Hoskins was proven to be the misrepresenter and everyone of our statements then discussed was proven true, in several cases even by his own supporters. The P.B.I. members, in addition to I.F. Hoskins, wanted the privilege of making speeches, and even of making motions! They complained when they were not at once given the first, and throughout were denied the second liberty. Then they tried through one of their partisan Philadelphia elders to have the motion to invite us to call the Mizpah Convention rescinded, but this attempt also came to grief. The P.B.I. members in both sessions of the debate were given the same privilege as the Philadelphia

Church members, *i.e.*, to ask two questions, but not to vote or make motions as they desired. The reason why they were, apart from I.F. Hoskins, refused the privilege of making speeches in the first session of the debate on Aug. 25 was because, at their request I.F. Hoskins was their mouthpiece, while we were the mouthpiece of the other side; and it was not thought fair to let one side have more speakers than the other. Alas! that brethren trying to fasten themselves upon the Church of God as a doctrinal clearing house should so conduct themselves, officially, and at the same time attempt to violate well-established order by insisting upon making motions in a Church where they were for the day merely guests. In the second session, after one address each by I.F. Hoskins and ourself, F.H. McGee and I.L. Margeson for the P.B.I., and R.H. Hirsh and R.G. Jolly for the other side, made fifteen-minute addresses. Then I.F. Hoskins and ourself closed the discussion. We believe that the P.B.I., making as complete a failure of their case before the Philadelphia Church on that occasion as J.F.R. did on a similar occasion a year before, like him learned to avoid debates with the so-called "opposition"; for they have ever since acted out the "avoid them" policy; *e.g.*, they would have nothing to do with the Mizpah or the Hebron Conventions, which were called especially to discuss the P.B.I., nor with other meetings for the same purpose, as a letter quoted below proves.

Their talebearers and supporters were on hand at these conventions, as well as before each of them in congregational meetings, to serve the P.B.I. against the almost unanimous votes of the Philadelphia Church, seeking to block every motion and then, when passed, to make inoperative every resolution calculated to bring about an adjustment of matters. The same is true of their conduct during the four sessions of the Investigating and Curative Committee's activity in the

Philadelphia Church; and in all this they were acting in the interests of, and in co-operation with the P.B.I. Of course, the Philadelphia Church knew that these three elders with their supporters were working for the P.B.I. as against the congregation, whose elders they were. All these things were longsufferingly borne by all the rest of the elders and Church, until the Church in almost its entirety felt that these elders forfeited the trust that the Church gave them; and therefore it declared their office vacant, Jan. 5, 1919. Now they claim that they should have had a trial. Their course was so violative of repeated motions to the contrary after they were passed that their misconduct, recognized as such by almost the whole Church, made the Church feel that they were unfit to be elders any longer in its midst. The Church gave them the same kind of a trial before it dismissed them as it did before it elected them; a watching of their conduct as it saw it, and an acting in harmony with what it observed; nor can they justly claim any other kind of a trial for dismissal from eldership. Next, in co-operation with "headquarters," they formed another Church, holding a meeting for this purpose a week after they ceased to be elders.

Now some of their supporters are spreading the false report that they were put out of the Philadelphia Church; and they are seeking to work mainly on those who did not attend the meetings very regularly with this and other misrepresentations to induce them to leave the Church and join them. They, numbering about twenty, now claim that they are the original Philadelphia Church! And they then addressed the Church of 150 members from which they withdrew as separating from THEM! We wish them the Lord's blessing. We trust that they and their brethren will win all the other Great Company members of their kind that there may yet be in this city, inside and outside the Philadelphia Church, and get as great a

blessing as they can receive in their separation; for we feel that the Lord has separated them from His faithful people in the Philadelphia Church. They and the P.B.I., whom they claimed to represent, and whose spirit they have, sought in the Philadelphia Church to do with us what the P.B.I. sought to do with us before the general Church, ruin us in our reputation and usefulness. But here they failed. They will succeed eventually with their brethren of the Great Company only. They frankly acknowledge in their circular letter that they want to be under the seven brothers of the P.B.I. Board members. They may have this little pope's overlordship! The Philadelphia Church wants none of it, and none of any other lordship except that of Jesus our Lord. Throughout this conflict these divisionists acted as the acknowledged supporters and representatives of the P.B.I., from whom they received aid and comfort.

The P.B.I. sent a special delivery letter to the Philadelphia Church, Dec. 28, a week after the Hebron Convention, in response to three resolutions for a discussion of differences at that Convention, giving its idea of how peace could be made. The letter, we regret to say, is as patronizing, impudent, arrogant, insincere and misleading as a papal bull. It is as follows:

DEAR BRETHREN: At a meeting of the Board of Directors of the Pastoral Bible Institute, held Dec. 28, the two resolutions recently passed by the Philadelphia Church were considered, inviting the members of this Institution to attend the meetings [they would not call it a Convention!] held in Philadelphia, Dec. 20-22—one of the objects being to engage in a conference with that Church, looking in the direction of establishing harmonious relations between that body of people and the Pastoral Bible Institute. We would briefly explain that prior to this meeting of the Board of Directors, the resolutions could not be acted upon by the Secretary alone, nor even by certain other individual members of the Board of Directors active, without

a conference at a properly convened meeting; and there was not sufficient time and opportunity for such meeting between the time the resolutions were received and the date of the Philadelphia meeting. [They had from December 10th to December 20th, when the Convention met; sufficient time for real peace lovers.] The Pastoral Bible Institute desires to state that it sincerely appreciates the attitude of the Philadelphia Church in recognizing that there are serious difficulties in its midst, and that it realizes that the present situation in which that Church finds itself, practically separated from the Church at large [?], is an exceedingly unhappy one. We appreciate sincerely the fact, too, that the Philadelphia Church is anxiously looking for some remedy for the present unfortunate situation, and that the Pastoral Bible Institute is appealed to for assistance in this connection. We assure the friends of the Philadelphia Ecclesia that our attitude can be none other than that of an earnest desire to do all in our power to establish harmony between that Church and the Church at large. Kindly permit us to say, however, as bearing upon the subject, that so far as the Pastoral Bible Institute is concerned, there exists no unbrotherly feeling, no inharmony, no grievances toward the Philadelphia Church; nor has our Institute ever taken any action or passed any resolutions disfellowshipping the Philadelphia Church in any sense or even looking in the direction of any disturbed conditions. The whole difficulty is within the borders of that Congregation. Practically all the other Ecclesias are laboring together harmoniously with the Pastoral Bible Institute. Will the Philadelphia Church therefore permit us to touch on the heart of the difficulty, *viz.*: that for the past six months a majority of that Congregation seem to have endorsed the forced grievances, charges and resolutions which originated with the three brethren formerly members of this Committee, against the Pastoral Bible Institute. These grievances, charges and resolutions have caused the Philadelphia Church to sever its connections with the Pastoral Bible Institute, as well as with the Church at large. [?] So long as these three brethren are encouraged and upheld by the Philadelphia Church in this policy of propagating their grievances, and spreading contention and strife, the Pastoral Bible Institute believes

that nothing could be accomplished by a conference with that Church. This fact has already been demonstrated at the conference held there August 25th, when members of our Institute endeavored to enlighten that Congregation with regard to the real status of affairs, but were not permitted to do so [?], largely due to failure on the part of the Philadelphia Church to understand how to properly and effectively bring out the truth on the subjects discussed [?], whereby a great deal of matter was stated to be facts which was impossible to correct, and reply to, and thus enlighten the friends. [?] Finally, we ask the Philadelphia Church to permit us to suggest what we believe to be the only remedy, viz.: an emphatic renouncement and repudiation on the part of the Philadelphia Church of these aforesaid grievances, charges and resolutions which have caused the separation. This procedure on the part of that Congregation will solve the entire problem, and there will then exist full harmony between the Philadelphia Ecclesia and our Institute, and, in fact, with the Church at large. Until this important step is taken by that Congregation there can be no grounds for harmony, and we consider further discussion unprofitable, because until then, there is no common basis for a harmonious understanding. In the meantime, the Pastoral Bible Institute stands ready and willing to assist and minister to any of the Lord's people in Philadelphia as may be desired. [To gratify which they encouraged a division.] Assuring you of our hearty good wishes and prayers that the spirit of the Lord may guide and direct to bring about the desired end, we are

Your brethren and servants in Christ,

[Signed] PASTORAL BIBLE INSTITUTE.

The impression that this letter made on the Church, which knew the conditions very thoroughly, can better be imagined than described. The first thought of the Church was to ignore it as unworthy of further consideration; then it was thought that for the sake of principle and as a matter of record to answer the main points only of the letter. The answer, made in the form of a resolution that one of the Philadelphia

Elders was commissioned to draft and was adopted by a vote of 89 to 7, is as follows:

Whereas, The Board of the P.B.I. (after deliberating Dec. 28 on two resolutions from the Philadelphia Church and one from the Hebron Convention, inviting the P.B.I. to attend said Convention to set itself right before the entire Church as well as the Philadelphia Church, and to seek ways and means to heal the breach in the Church at large) in a properly called meeting ordered on the same date to be sent to the Philadelphia Church a letter in which the positions assumed by the P.B.I. seem to be partly out of harmony with, and partly inapplicable to, the facts of the situation; and

Whereas, The Philadelphia Church feels that, both as a matter of principle, and as a matter of record, it is necessary for it to express in the form of certain statements the main grounds and features of its dissent from the main positions of the said letter; be it herewith

Resolved, That the said Church expresses its said dissent in the following statements:

1. The Hebron Convention and the Philadelphia Church did not invite, nor does the Philadelphia Church desire the P.B.I. to assist it in adjusting any of its internal affairs, which it believes itself, by the Lord's Spirit, Word and Providence in Christ, able to solve without uninvited assistance or interference from outside persons or bodies; but the said Convention and Church by the said three resolutions did invite the P.B.I. to attend the Hebron Convention to set itself right before the entire Church, and especially the Philadelphia Church, as an indispensable step preparatory to its negotiating with the P.B.I. for the said Ecclesia's co-operation, which it understood the P.B.I.'s Providence Convention appointed a Committee to secure.

2. The Philadelphia Ecclesia denies that there are serious difficulties in its midst; but believes that the difficulties that do exist there have been largely caused by the P.B.I.'s past course, and its influence over a small minority of the Philadelphia Church, which small minority is as partisan to the P.B.I. as ardent Society supporters are to "the Channel."

3. The Philadelphia Church denies that the underlying

assumption of the P.B.I.'s position in its said letter, *i.e.*, that it speaks and acts for "the Church at large"—is true; denies that it is out of harmony with "the Church at large"; denies that it is by any means the only Church dissatisfied with the course of the P.B.I. and denies that the P.B.I. would be a proper body to heal a breach of peace between the Philadelphia Church and "the Church at large," if such a breach existed; but said Church does recognize that it is out of harmony with the P.B.I. and its staunch supporters, which disharmony the said Church on its part stands ready, and has sought, to end, in harmony with that "wisdom that cometh from above" (Jas. 3:17).

4. Neither the Philadelphia Church collectively, nor its members individually, have withdrawn either priestly or brotherly fellowship from the P.B.I. and its supporters, a thing which it and they hope may not be necessary; rather pending the P.B.I. clearing itself from the grave charges against it, for which, to put it mildly, there seem to be weighty grounds, the Philadelphia Church has withheld and still withholds its support, asked and still asks the return of a certain proportion of its donations, and declined and still declines to receive pilgrim appointments from the P.B.I.

5. While open to conviction to a contrary view, under demonstration from Scripture, Reason and the History of the case, the Philadelphia Church up to the present has not seen that the three former Committee members, who are Elders in its midst, have personal feelings in the matters at controversy between them and the P.B.I.; nor that they have presented to said Church any "FORCED grievances, charges and resolutions"; but that, so far as said Church is able to judge from the Scripture, Reason and the History of the case, these three former Committee brothers seem to have real grounds for charging four members of the Fort Pitt Convention Committee and all the members of the Asbury Park Convention Committee with what seems to be wrong-doings, some of which seem to be of a serious character. Without expressing any positive judgment on the matters at controversy, the Philadelphia Church feels that it ought to say that, if the P.B.I. has Scripture, Reason and History to disprove these seemingly well grounded charges; instead of seemingly avoiding

a frank and public discussion of these matters that affect the whole Church in general and the Philadelphia Church in particular, the P.B.I. as brothers who should "seek peace and ensue it," ought gladly to give welcome to, and not seemingly seek avoidance of, such a discussion, which seeming avoidance, recalls to mind J.F.R.'s similar course of last year (objected to by all the members of the P.B.I.), and which seeming avoidance, if persisted in by the P.B.I. will as firmly make the same impression as his course of last year made upon the mind of the Philadelphia Church. But if at any time the P.B.I. recedes from its present attitude on the said discussion, the Philadelphia Church will be ready to co-operate, as indicated by its two previous resolutions and by the additional resolution of the Hebron Convention of December 21st, all three of which resolutions were caused to be brought to the attention of the P.B.I.

6. The Philadelphia Church feels that it must express its dissent from the statements respecting matters of fact and respecting the criticism of the Philadelphia Church as contained in the P.B.I.'s letter of Dec. 28 on the discussion of Aug. 25, which was held in its presence, between the three former members of the Fort Pitt Convention Committee and three of the other four members of the said Committee, reminding the P.B.I. that it early in August charged by letter that Bros. Jolly and Johnson were misrepresenting the P.B.I. to the Philadelphia Church; that the P.B.I.'s Secretary with its approval requested of the Philadelphia Church an opportunity to correct the alleged misrepresentations, and to set forth the facts in their alleged true light; that as charges of the above-mentioned brothers as misrepresentors, the P.B.I. and its Secretary put themselves in the place of the accusers, and these brothers in the place of the accused, with the consequent propriety for the latter by their mouthpiece speaking last in answer; that the P.B.I.'s Secretary was sent a letter by the Philadelphia Church's Secretary, Aug. 20, to this effect; that the P.B.I. Secretary and two others of its members and not a few of its supporters replied to all of Bro. Johnson's addresses except his last, in which the latter confined himself exclusively to answering statements made in the addresses of

P.B.I. officials and supporters; that when Bros. Hoskins and Johnson answered questions propounded by their hearers, the former spoke last on at least as many questions as the latter, and used more time than the latter both in the addresses and in the answers to questions, and was not interrupted in his addresses to the consuming of his time so much as was the latter, that the collapse of the P.B.I.'s points and vindication of the other brother's points, so far as the issues in controversy were discussed Aug. 25, seemed to be as complete as the collapse of J.F.R.'s and his supporters' points and the vindication of the four ousted Directors' and their supporters' points were at a similar discussion held before the Philadelphia Church July 19, 1917; and that the seeming weakness of the P.B.I.'s cause, and the seeming strength of the former Committee members' cause has given the Philadelphia Church strong doubts as to the merits of the P.B.I.'s cause, which doubts the subsequent course of the P.B.I., to put it mildly, has by no means weakened.

7. The Philadelphia Church can see neither Wisdom, Justice nor Love in the remedy that the P.B.I. suggests in its letter of Dec. 28 for the present disturbed conditions. Rather, such a course as the P.B.I. suggests as a remedy would seem to misrepresent past and present, and to open the flood gates to future evils.

In conclusion, the Philadelphia Church must express its disapproval of, and regret at, the general positions of the P.B.I.'s letter of Dec. 28, with almost every sentence of which it finds itself in disagreement, its hope that wiser counsels than those contained in said letter may yet prevail, its readiness to co-operate in efforts for a peace preceded by a frank public discussion of the activities of the Fort Pitt and Asbury Park Conventions' Committees, with a righting of proven wrongs by whomsoever committed, and the assurance of its hearty good wishes and prayers that the Spirit of the Lord may guide and direct to bring about the Lord's good pleasure in this controversy.

THE PHILADELPHIA ECCLESIA.

Given at Philadelphia, Jan. 5, 1919.

Jan. 10, 1919, the P.B.I. acknowledged receipt of this resolution and accompanying letter, and promised to consider it; but to date no further communication

from it has been received by the Philadelphia Church. But H.C. Rockwell by P.B.I. appointment preached to the then organized P.B.I. Class here, that for months it had sought to separate from the Philadelphia Church. The fruit of its divisional labors has not proven large. We sincerely trust that they will get every antitypical Shimite Gershonite Levite member that may yet be in the Philadelphia Church, and that with their Mahlite brethren of the Society's Philadelphia Church get thousands of antitypical Gershonite and Merarite Levites from "Great Babylon." God bless them richly in this work! We believe that it is properly theirs. Therefore, with a sincere and loving heart we pray God's blessing upon it as such.

A third form that clericalism assumes is: Local elders individually and collectively grasping for power and lording it over God's heritage in local Ecclesias. The sifting above described worked along this line of revolutionism against the Lord's arrangements as interpreted by that Servant; *e.g.*, in the chapters of Studies, Vol. VI, on Order and Discipline, etc. The Lord, through one of the last messages of that Servant, warned the Church against these Nicolaitanes, in Z 1916, p. 327, "The Hour of Temptation." We suggest that the brethren read that article as especially illuminating the course of the revolutionistic Nicolaitanes in the local Ecclesias. In our world-wide conflict with them, we had special battles with them in the London Tabernacle, Brooklyn Tabernacle and the Philadelphia Church. At the first meeting that we had with the Philadelphia elders we had to oppose the three elders' Nicolaitanism, which increased their opposition to us, already aroused in part by the P.B.I. We stand and have stood for Ecclesiaism, *i.e.*, the right of the churches to control under Christ their own affairs, as against Clericalism. In defense of Ecclesiaism we are waging a world-wide battle as against Clericalism among the Truth people, nor will we cease from this

battle until the Clericalists surrender. Revolutionism in the form of Clericalism, local and general, is the separating practice of the Great Company sifters. In some future issue we will give details on local clericalists as distinct from general clericalists, of whom this article treats especially, rather than of the former.

In every general sifting the Second-death sifters have been active; and they are, therefore, active in this present sifting in the form of Revolutionism against the Truth and its arrangements. Some of them claim that they stand for direct Bible study apart from all human books, a practice which among Truth people is especially directed against that Servant's writings. They treat the Bible as a text book, which it is not, and not as a book of texts, which it is. A text book is an orderly, clear, systematic, progressive and complete treatise on a topic. All Bible Students know that the Bible is not constructed as a text book; on the contrary it is by Divine design, we say it reverently, more complicated, unsystematic and ambiguous than any other book in the world (Is. 28:9-13). Since it is not a text book, it should not be treated and studied as such. It should be studied topically with its texts topically arranged, *e.g.*, according to the Berean Method (Acts 17:11). It is so arranged in the Studies In The Scriptures, which God's people of the Little Flock, Great Company and Youthful Worthies will gladly study by the Berean Method. These will avoid Text Bookism, *i.e.*, the use of the Scriptures as a text book, and will use Topical Textism, *i.e.*, the topics of the Bible arranged in an orderly, systematic, clear, progressive and complete manner with proof texts taken from the Scriptures, the Book of texts. Extreme Text Bookism repudiates the Truth, and thus brings one into the Second Death class. This class is now active, and their Revolutionism against the Lord's arrangements of indoctrinating God's people as Scripturally taught by that Servant, leads them step by

step out of the Truth into total darkness with the world. Text Bookism has appeared side by side with Clericalism in the present sifting, beginning in Britain, where so-called "open Bible study," *i.e.*, study of Biblical books chapter by chapter and verse by verse as they occur, is, or at least years ago was, quite general. It has appeared here and in other countries. In its extreme form it leads to the Second Death. We will have more to say on this subject later. Let us avoid Revolutionism in both its forms, Clericalism and Text Bookism, as highly dangerous, the latter in its extreme form being more dangerous than the former.

In 1 Kings 19:18 we have a passage that applies at this time, and shows that there will be an antitypical 7,000, who will, by not worshiping or kissing Baal, be found worthy to escape the symbolic swords of Hazeal, Jehu and Elisha. Those who so escape will doubtless be the Very Elect, the ones that according to this passage (see Rom. 11:4) Jehovah *reserves to Himself*. In the 1912 Convention Reports and later in a booklet, our dear Bro. Morton Edgar has given us an able discussion of the Bible and Mythology. Among other things, he shows that Satan was worshiped as the Sun, the chief God of the ancient heathen, under varying names in various nations. In Canaan and in some other countries as the Sun he was worshiped under the name of Baal, Lord. Satan, Baal, has as his central characteristics envy of one's superiors, grasping for power and lording, Baaling, it over others (Is. 14:12-14). To worship Satan as Baal, means to be subject to Satan in envying one's superiors, in grasping for power and in tyrannizing over others. Since the kiss in ancient times, like the clasping of hands now, was a pledge of loyalty, to kiss Baal, as distinct from bowing the knee to him, seems to represent loyal support given to those who envy their superiors, who grasp for power, and who lord it over others. Hence, power-graspers are meant by those who bow the knee

to Baal, their partisan supporters are meant by those who kiss Baal. Those among God's people who do these two things, according to this passage, cannot be in the Little Flock. If tentatively justified they lose their tentative justification. If consecrated and Spirit-begotten and escaping the Second Death, they are of the Great Company. Accordingly, we see that the new-creaturely Clericalists and their loyal supporters, rebelling against the Lord's arrangements, are not members of the Little Flock. Rather they are of the Great Company. Baal, as the Sun God, "the Lord of the Day," arose in the East, progressed to the South and set in the West. Promotion does not come among God's people from worshiping and kissing Baal, the Sun God (Ps. 75:6, 7), whose course is in the East, South and West, it comes from God, who is in the North, and who "sets each one in [and in some cases out of] the Body as it hath pleased Him" (1 Cor. 12:18). The British Clericalists, the Society Clericalists and the P.B.I. Clericalists, etc., with their loyal supporters, as antitypical Baal worshipers and kissers, have forgotten this, and by their getting their supposed promotion from worshiping the Sun God, Baal, *i.e.*, Satan, they receive from God a casting out from the Body of Christ as a just recompense for evil doing. Alas! how are the mighty fallen, whom we would but could not help!

After what we have seen above to be the Antichrist character and purposes of the P.B.I., and their clericalistic revolutionism, especially against the charter of the W.T.B.&T.S., given by the Lord through that Servant, and once so recognized by them, can there be any further doubt that they are graspers for power and lords over God's heritage? If any doubt still lingers among non-partisan and faithful brethren, the Lord will, in due time, dissipate it, we are sure.

Some tasks are disagreeable; and when duty does not call for their execution, they would better be left

undone; but he who refuses to do a disagreeable duty lacks moral courage. All must admit that it is a disagreeable task to bare the errors of which the W.T.B.&T.S. and the P.B.I. leaders have been guilty. And if these brothers alone were to be considered, apart from private and personal correction, we would not have been heard from as disapproving their ways. But, unfortunately, their course involves many others, especially the dear, unwary sheep among God's flock; and no faithful shepherd can be silent, when he sees them misled. Faithfully to perform our duty as an under-shepherd in God's general flock has forced us, with a bleeding heart, to oppose before the Church some of our brethren that we have loved most fervently and above all other living brethren. There were two courses open for us, when we faced the conditions that came to the front shortly after our dear Pastor's death: (1) By letting brotherly and intimate friendship close our eyes to principle, and by supporting certain leaders, float on the crest of popularity and power among the leaders in the Society, and later in the P.B.I. Committee; or (2) suffer the keen sorrow of falling out with dearly loved ones in defending Truth, Righteousness and God's dear children. These leaders seem to place self above God, Truth, Righteousness and the Lord's people in envious grasping for power and lording it over God's people. Therefore, we hesitated not a moment as to our choice. First, we faithfully and lovingly for months sought privately to bring the wrong-doers to recognize and put aside their wrongs. Apparently, it was "love's labor lost." Then, by the principles of God's Word, the leadings of His providences and the needs of His people through the aggressive course of the wrong-doers themselves, we were forced, in open resistance to them, clearly to uncover their wrongs of teaching and practice before the whole Church. With a sad but determined heart we have taken up this disagreeable task, fully persuaded

that it is to the glory of God, the blessing of the faithful and the ultimate good of the wrong-doers and their supporters. Why, then, should we be blamed for this? And since such exposures are for the good of all concerned, all of us ought surely desire them to be made and to inform ourselves on them, to the end that all of us may act wisely and properly amid the present sifting conditions. Therefore, let all bear with us as we give some salient points of P.B.I. history. There are quite a number familiar with some of these things, but the nature of much of our widespread correspondence convinces us that the true situation has been so grossly misrepresented in the minds of many that it would be wrong to withhold the true information from them any longer than it has been.

In the background of its history lie the troubles in the Society's affairs in Britain and in America during 1916 and 1917. Out of these troubles came a number of leaders styled by the Society leaders as "usurpers" and as "the Opposition." On closer examination it will be found that these so-called "Opposition" leaders represented at least seven shades of thought and characteristics. (1) Menta Sturgeon, who for a while kept himself quite aloof from the Society and "the Opposition" leaders, though always sympathetically inclining toward and encouraging the latter as against the former. This position kept him at Bethel until about Nov. 1, 1917, three and a half months after the ousting of the four Directors. (2) A.I. Ritchie, and at first J.D. Wright, both of whom were not pronounced enough in their stand on the trouble in the Board and both of whom, weakening in the Board meeting June 20, 1917, opened the door for the defeat of the program of the Board's majority, the former balking altogether at a suit, and not being very sanguine for the publication of "Light After Darkness" and "Facts For Shareholders"; (3) A.N. Pierson who, both by heredity and training, stood so strongly for peace that he finally

gave up the "Opposition" altogether; (4) R.H. Hirsh, the only one of the four ousted Directors who had nothing to gain, but probably everything to lose from opposing J.F.R., and who did not vote on the Board's compromising resolution on our British activity; (5) I.F. Hoskins, with whom J.D. Wright is to be counted after the ousting of the Board's majority; (6) F.H. McGee, whose interest in the Board's situation was entirely unselfish, and that of a brother, a Shareholder and a lawyer; (7) ourself, whose position was that of a friend of both parties, but whose knowledge of the situation clearly recognized the evils of the Society leaders in Britain and America and whose constant effort was to have these righted, first, through personal and moral suasion and, failing in this, then through the proper body, the Board of the W.T.B.&T.S. F.H. McGee, writing for the Directors in the Fall of 1917, was right when he said that our case was apart from, though somewhat related to, that of the deposed Directors. These remarks about the seven shades of thought and characteristics in the "Opposition" leaders apply to the time previous to Jan. 1, 1918.

We begin our narrative with our experiences with Menta Sturgeon, with whom we had been on terms of most intimate brotherly friendship. One of the sad features of this present sifting is its breaking of so many tender ties! After our dear Pastor's death, next to J.F.R. and J. Hemery, we loved Menta Sturgeon above all other brethren. Before we saw that the antitypical Elisha had received antitypical Elijah's Mantle (but after we heard in Oct., 1917, that Menta Sturgeon was thinking of leaving Bethel), we counseled him against this course, (1) because the "Present Management" controlled the Truth literature, which, we knew, in every other sifting remained in the control of antitypical Elijah, and (2) because we hoped that a reconciliation in harmony with the Lord's arrangements, charter and will might yet be effected. This suggestion

we made while the large majority of the ousted Directors' sympathizers, goaded on by the course of the Society's leaders, were urging a division in the New York Church, which by the above reasons we succeeded in delaying, until after Elijah and Elisha became clear to us, when we heartily favored the division. On the point of this division, which Menta Sturgeon favored in Oct. before he left Bethel, he and we did not see eye to eye at first; on almost all other important matters we throughout were in harmony; *e.g.*, (1) that there was a separation going on between the Little Flock and what seemed to be the Great Company; (2) that J.F.R. was that Evil Servant of Matt. 24:48-51, and the foolish Shepherd of Zech. 11:15-17; (3) that Vol. VII was the seventh vial of Rev. 16:17 in a vile condition, etc.; but we could not endorse his view that Vol. VII was a part of the Penny. Such was our doctrinal agreement on current conditions before the latter part of Nov., when he left Brooklyn for a Pilgrim trip in New England, from which he did not return until about the time of the election of the Society's officers—Jan., 1918. In Oct., before "Harvest Siftings Reviewed" appeared, he remarked that he did not want to be identified with a movement in which we shared, because he thought that we believed ourself Bro. Russell's successor as teacher. When "Harvest Siftings Reviewed" appeared, showing that we did not consider ourself as that Servant's successor in any sense, he seemed to recede from his view, though subsequent events prove that he had not been able to shake himself loose from his distrust of us.

During his New England trip he developed radical views on current conditions whereon we before agreed; for at Pittsburgh early in Jan., 1918, he told others and us that "the Present Management" and all its ardent supporters were in the Second Death Class; that Vol. VII and the Big Drive were entirely of the Devil; that the first smiting of the Jordan began July 17, 1917, in

Bethel dining room, when the four deposed Directors, F.H. McGee and ourself protested at the ousting of the four Directors; and that these six were the six men with the Slaughter Weapons of Ezek. 9, who, he said, in the Bethel dining room, July 17, 1917, began the first smiting of Jordan. Since he and we parted late in Nov. we continued to make harmonious progress in his and our common views on current conditions; and thus early in Dec. we became convinced that the separation among the Truth people was the antitype of Elijah's and Elisha's separation as set forth in Vol. III, Chap. II. Before learning of his change of views, feeling sure that he would be pleased with the logical unfolding of our common views of the preceding Fall, we expounded to him, in about an hour's conversation, held in part in R.H. Hirsh's presence, our understanding of Elijah and Elisha. He sharply showed resentment, setting forth his radical change of views, adopted since we last saw him. We, of course, took exception to these. From that day forth (it was Jan. 3 or 4, 1918) we drifted further and further apart. His attitude and manner became changed. Those love lit eyes, those smiling lips, and that winning countenance with which he was wont to greet us changed into decided unfriendliness of expression. Impatience, opposition and disdain seemed to take the place of his former sweet spirit. Lovingly and meekly we sought to heal matters; but they became worse. Doubtless the weaknesses of each brother were more or less active; our too eager efforts to help him stirring up his increasing resentment, disdain and seeming envy. Him as well as other erring leaders during this sifting, our meekness and loving exhortations seemed to harden rather than to mellow. Our final break occurred Feb. 24, 1918.

It soon became known during the Pittsburgh Convention, even by some of the Society leaders, that he and we were in interpretational disagreement. This

prompted us to seek harmony on Elijah and Elisha by a discussion before the Pilgrims and elders of "the Opposition" without others being present; and therefore, we suggested holding for this purpose a meeting, which proved to be the first session of the Fort Pitt Convention—Saturday night, Jan. 5, 1918. Others being present, we suggested a special meeting the next morning for pilgrims and elders alone, when our interpretational differences might, we hoped, by discussion be overcome. He objected, saying that all should have a chance to hear, and therefore we gave way. Our reasons for wanting the discussion before the leading brothers only were: (1) Not to let the differences become more widely known than necessary; (2) not to do anything that might tend to humiliate this dear brother, whose position we knew, and who we felt satisfied would fail to make a favorable impression for his view contrasted with what we felt and knew was the Scriptural view; (3) our desire not to make it harder for him to receive the Truth than absolutely necessary; for the pride that we and others felt he was clearly manifesting we feared would, if hurt before others, make it harder for him to accept the Truth. Sunday morning each of us presented our view on Elijah and Elisha in 45-minute addresses, he speaking second. Almost everybody present, though more familiar with his than with our view, regarded ours more favorably. The resentful effect on him of the unfavorable reception of his view, that we feared and sought to avert by a more private discussion, was quite manifest; and in spite of our efforts to lift him above it we failed. In the afternoon session, after a number of consultations between him and I.L. Margeson, the latter proposed the appointment of the Fort Pitt Convention Committee, which later took the name P.B.I. Between the afternoon and evening sessions the Committee met to elect officers. We proposed Menta Sturgeon as both temporary and permanent

Chairman. He was elected. Then silence ensued, which we broke by nominating A.I. Ritchie as Secretary and Treasurer. He also was elected. Then another similar pause occurred. Seeing no one else seemingly would propose a Vice-chairman, we then proposed R.H. Hirsh for that office, who also was elected. Our proposing Menta Sturgeon for the chief place proves our appreciation of him. Our activity in proposing him and others for offices proves that we were not seeking position for ourself. It seems that our course of presenting "meat in due season" impressed him with the thought that we were assuming controllership of the Lord's work, a view that the Group afterward adopted, as their remarks indicated during the discussion of our Philadelphia Evil Servant discourse the afternoon and night of Feb. 23, 1918.

Two days after the Fort Pitt Convention we went home to Columbus, following our delivering (in the hearing, among others, of Menta Sturgeon) a lecture on the Calls, Siftings and Slaughter Weapons (Matt. 19:27–20:16; 1 Cor. 10:1-14; Ezek. 9). This discourse sets forth a different view of the six men with slaughter weapons from that of Menta Sturgeon, who after the Committee's election, in harmony with his view wanted F.H. McGee to settle at Washington, D.C.; A.I. Ritchie at Toronto, Canada; R.H. Hirsh at Pittsburgh, Pa.; I.F. Hoskins at Philadelphia, Pa.; J.D. Wright at Boston, Mass., and ourself at London, England, himself, presumably, to direct things from New York, his thought being that these, his six slaughter weapon men, do their smiting at and from these places. He went shortly afterward back to New York, and very actively sought to turn various members of the New York Class against our view of Elijah and Elisha; and succeeded in doing so with not a few who had not heard our understanding of this subject. Thus when we returned to New York, Jan. 20, to attend the first Committee meeting, after

the Convention, we found that he had created a hostile atmosphere against us among not a few members of that Church, some being forward to show it.

At this Committee meeting he, A.I. Ritchie and ourself were appointed a Committee to draft a letter that the large Committee wanted to send to the brethren throughout the world. A.I. Ritchie by Menta Sturgeon's and our request was to work out the rough draft for the smaller Committee to be presented to the larger Committee in two days; *i.e.*, Jan. 22. Jan. 21 he asked us to do this, saying he had not time. With this request Menta Sturgeon was agreed. We wrote out a rough draft, and presented it at the proper time to the large Committee, when to our surprise, A.I. Ritchie also offered one. The Committee decided that our letter be accepted, with such additions taken from A.I. Ritchie's letter as were not in ours. In our letter we suggested, Menta Sturgeon concurring, seven lines of service to submit to the general Church for their consideration and opinion. At this meeting A.I. Ritchie opposed not only the five proposals which were not especially emphasized at the Fort Pitt Convention, but also the one with reference to a periodical, which was favorably considered at that Convention. He wanted nothing but Pilgrim work to be suggested to the brethren in the letter. Two evenings later (Jan. 24, 1918) we presented our letter revised, so as to incorporate the points in A.I. Ritchie's letter, as well as some that occurred to us meantime. At this meeting A.I. Ritchie resigned from membership in the Committee, saying he was not in harmony with the effort to give a general service to the brethren, apart from Pilgrim work. His resignation was accepted. Two days later we sought to regain him by cutting out all except the two recommendations that were generally favored at the Fort Pitt Convention for a general service. He reconsidered the matter, but decided to stand apart from the Committee. Later he told others

and us that we sought to run a cut-and-dried program through the Committee, and wanted to control things, and that partly for these reasons he resigned, though he said nothing of this kind at the time of his resignation. The reason that he gave the Committee should have made him decline election to the Committee. The reasons that he later gave amount to this: He resigned, because, he claimed, that we seemed inclined to control the Committee's affairs. If we had really sought to do this we went the wrong way about it, when we moved the election of others to fill all the offices.

At the same meeting Menta Sturgeon also resigned, alleging that we had the Committee under our influence, and that he suspected anything with whose start we had anything to do. He complained to the Committee that our having made a more favorable impression on the Fort Pitt Conventioners on Elijah and Elisha than he did was due to our taking advantage of him. This claim was promptly and completely refuted. Then he tried to undermine us with the Committee on the Medad matter in the same spirit as J.F.R. did with the Steward matter at Bethel. His spirit on this occasion impressed the whole Committee as being envious of us. In substance, his charge against us was somewhat similar to A.I. Ritchie's later statement as to the cause of his resigning: Brother Johnson was trying to run things. Seemingly our giving out different interpretations from theirs impressed them with the thought that we wanted to control matters! We did not think their giving different interpretations from ours meant their trying to control the Committee. Seemingly our conduct presented to them a riddle whose solution they insisted on being given them on pain of what was in reality a threat to destroy the Committee. It seemed not to strike them that it was their course that in substance meant this: We will bring the Committee to the brink of destruction, unless we have our way about the

matter of undoing Paul S.L. Johnson in the Committee. This sad turn of events occurred within three weeks after the Fort Pitt Convention! About ten days later Menta Sturgeon's resignation was accepted. But the thought that he uttered to the effect that we had the Committee under our influence, did not end there. "Behold, how great a matter a little fire kindleth!" It remained to the great injury of the Committee, as little by little it was allowed to work like a leaven in the minds of some of the Committee members. It is a peculiarity of human nature that it resents the thought of being considered under the influence of another, and that it goes out of its way to disprove such a thing. Apart possibly from A.I. Ritchie, we feel sure that none of the Committee members believed this charge at the times that it was made; but very shortly, from a number of events, it was quite manifest that the effort was being made by certain Committee members to prove that the Committee was not under our influence, the effort becoming the stronger, the wider the two former Committee members spread their reports. The influence of this charge was spiritually corrupting in the minds of several Committee members. Alas, how little did these two brothers realize the world of evil that they would cause the Church through supporting that charge! What a lesson to God's people to guard their tongues!

Before leaving Menta Sturgeon it would be in place to point out briefly how he finally broke with the Committee and the New York Church. Contrary to our Pastor's advice he was teaching along the lines of text-bookism, *i.e.*, a study of Revelation verse by verse at one of the week night meetings of the New York Church. The elders of the Church, ourself among them, after a discussion in which we took part, though not so prominently as several others against this text-bookistic practice, Menta Sturgeon also participating, recommended to the New York Church that such a

study be not a recognized meeting of that Church. This motion was carried, but greatly resented by Menta Sturgeon and some of the members of the class that he led. Seemingly under his influence, Hattie Henderson published a more bitter attack on us than "Harvest Siftings," blaming us mainly, among other things, for the removal of the text-bookistic meeting held in her home from the schedule of the New York Church, and of enviously opposing Menta Sturgeon. Her course resulted in a Church trial, in which evil surmising of a very gross kind on her part was recognized as transforming thoroughly innocent matters into terrible evils. After two long hearings of her charges a vote was taken on a resolution of confidence in our Christian Character, loyalty to principle, and clearness of Scriptural knowledge, proposed by H.C. Rockwell, seconded by J.L. Cooke and defended by I.H. Hoskins, W. Hollister, A.I. Ritchie, etc. The resolution, in a well-attended meeting of that large Church, was passed unanimously, except for three votes; while excepting three votes a resolution of censure was unanimously passed on Hattie Henderson for her course and charges against the New York elders in general and against ourself in particular. Thereupon a few of the members of the New York Church, under the oversight of Menta Sturgeon, separated from that Church. He influenced other Churches to separate from, or not to cooperate with, the Committee. Later, on our motion, a Committee of New York elders, consisting of Pilgrims, was appointed to meet and seek a reconciliation with him; but so changed had this dear brother become that he sent this Committee word that he had nothing in common with them and the New York Church, and therefore refused to meet them. In various places, both in preaching and private conversation, he talked against us, stirring up sentiment against us on the Medad matter, a matter which in a Board meeting,

just after our return from Europe, he heard in a confidential way, just like the others present at that meeting. He began this course of public attacks on us the night of Jan. 20, 1918, before he resigned from the Committee, by a sermon which practically everyone in the New York Church understood to be aimed at us, who being in the audience, of course, knew what he was doing. We took this meekly. Indeed, there is plenty of evidence going to show that our meekness in bearing repeated attacks and our kindness to the attackers hardened their hearts, even as Jehovah's kindness toward Pharaoh hardened his heart. Later, Menta Sturgeon found that pointed attacks on us reverted against himself. Whether this caused him to change his tone in referring to us or not, we do not know; but certain it is that he changed his way of referring to us, though still telling disparagingly the Medad matter, which he must have known would prejudice people against us, unless it was properly explained, a thing that he did not do, as he gave the thought that we considered ourself Bro. Russell's successor as teacher. We are very sure that at first he did not intend the extensive pollution of the Church that his course set into operation. As against him and his supporters the Committee took our side; but the effect of his extended propaganda began and then increased doubt of our usefulness among some of the Committee. We have given details on A.I. Ritchie and Menta Sturgeon with a sad heart, not to injure them, but to show from what seed the plant of P.B.I. trouble sprang.

The Committee felt it a genuine blow to lose these two, both of whom all of us made fruitless efforts to induce to withdraw their resignations. The following Sunday (Jan. 27) R.H. Hirsh, J.D. Wright and ourself (I.F. Hoskins being absent on a Pilgrim trip) met with F.H. McGee at his home to consider the situation. J.D. Wright had to leave early on

account of his work. Already on that day we noticed the first small effect of the inoculation of some Committee members with Menta Sturgeon's charge, *i.e.*, that Bro. Johnson was exercising undue influence in and over the Committee—a thing we were not doing, nor did we even try to do. If a majority of the Committee up to this time favored some views we had, this was not our fault. J.D. Wright showed by what he advocated, as well as by his manner, that he was proving that Bro. Johnson was not influencing him. After his departure we discussed the election of a chairman, during which, using a process of elimination, we remarked as a statement of our opinion, and not, as F.H. McGee misrepresents us, as asking a question, that we would not do for the office, because of the suspicions that "Harvest Siftings" aroused against us. R.H. Hirsh, as well as F.H. McGee, heard this remark, and agrees with our version of the statement. Months later at a Committee meeting F.H. McGee, anxious now to prove that we were aspiring to controllership in the Committee, expressed to our surprise his perversion of our statement, which we immediately corrected. His referring to the matter in his "Letter of Importance" proves that he did not believe our correction of his misunderstanding, whose origin is difficult for us to explain apart from his characteristic of evil surmising, a characteristic that his legal training seems to have developed in him.

Menta Sturgeon and A.I. Ritchie made it widely known that they had resigned, the responsibility being laid at our door, which, however, all five Committee members denied. Of course, this publicity raised doubts, and letters began to be received, some of which blamed us, and asked for our resignation. I.L. Margeson, who was especially friendly with both of these brothers, wrote and advised that the Committee should dissolve, since, in his opinion, its most important members had resigned. The Committee feared that

he had been influenced by the two brothers to take this position. More and more sentiment was being stirred up against us by agitation, the Committee defending us because of a knowledge of the facts, yet feeling the weight of the criticism, and beginning, therefore, to doubt our usefulness on the Committee. Fearing that Menta Sturgeon and A.I. Ritchie and I.L. Margeson might turn the Boston Class against the Committee, it was thought wise to ask I.L. Margeson to accept one of the vacancies. R.G. Jolly was at the same time asked to fill the other. These two on Feb. 11 met with the Committee to discuss the question of their acceptance of the offer to fill the vacancies on the Committee. Three times during this meeting I.L. Margeson turned to us, and asked us whether we considered ourselves as the one who was to act as the head of the Committee; and three times we assured him that such was not our thought; and that the experience in the Society had taught all of us an unforgettable lesson on one-man power in a Board or Committee. Both of these brothers were assured by the whole Committee that it considered that it, not an individual, had under the Lord the controllership over the work given the Committee by the Fort Pitt Convention, in the same way as the Society's Board should have control over the Society's work. At this meeting, these two brothers were assured by the entire Committee that it considered membership on the Committee to be for life, just like membership on the Society's Board, subject to removal by two-thirds votes of the 31 persons that had voted on the appointment of the Committee at the Fort Pitt Convention. This understanding continued in the Committee until the Group decided to rid itself of R.H. Hirsh, R.G. Jolly and myself, claiming through F.H. McGee, June 8, that no one ought to serve on the Committee unless the Church desired him to serve thereon. To this all of us agreed, three of us, however, not knowing

at the time why the Group advanced this thought in the Committee. We understood later when we learned of this as a part of their "political campaign."

Next to Menta Sturgeon, under whose influence I.L. Margeson seemed to be at the time of his election to the Committee, nobody more than he was responsible for the Group's inoculation with the thought that we were a dead weight on the Committee, and were desirous of controlling its affairs. He began to work on this line immediately after his election to the Committee; and before the next Committee meeting had caused these thoughts to prevail to such an extent as to influence a number of its members to refuse to sign the letter that we had prepared—even making a special trip from his home near Boston to New York for this purpose—and that all seven had expressed willingness to sign at the meeting in which he was elected and to send forth to the Church. The brother even threatened to resign, if the rest insisted on sending out the letter, claiming that he feared the letter was too strong. I.F. Hoskins, influenced by him, without authority of the Committee, prepared another letter, incorporating about half of the one that we by authority of the Committee had prepared, and enlisted the support of some others for the revised letter. The revised letter, in proportion as it omitted parts of the other letter, was admittedly a weaker one than the other on the trouble in the Society and in appealing power. But the spirit of fear and compromise had gained such ground among the brothers that later formed the Group that the weaker letter was substituted for the stronger one, which had already been "set up" by the printer. After the Committee had somewhat emasculated our letter, we also preferred the weaker one in some respects.

We ought to say that I.L. Margeson was more responsible for spreading suspicion in the Committee against us, for working up manipulatory schemes to

put the Group's program through the Committee, and for spreading the spirit of fear and compromise than anyone else on the Committee. He found in I.F. Hoskins a ready ally, whose desire for controllership was repeatedly shown and exercised, as we showed in "Another Harvest Siftings Reviewed," and these so subtly worked on F.H. McGee's weakness of evil surmising as to enlist him, whose mind was brighter than theirs, as the usual mouthpiece of the developing Group. A marked difference between the four members of the Group was this: F.H. McGee, unlike the other three whom almost no argument ever could change from their purposes, was usually convincible, and at times under reasoning acknowledged and apologized for evil surmises that he expressed; as well as changed his opinions, when he saw matters more clearly after thorough discussion. Such a course on his part won our appreciation; and our longsuffering and forgiveness bore with many a remark and act of his that would have worn out the generosity of a less longsuffering and forgiving person. Especially did his attitude against I.F. Hoskins' and H.C. Rockwell's course at Asbury Park touch our heart, and our generous praise of him amid certain limitations in "Another Harvest Siftings Reviewed" was given in the spirit of that charity that covers all things that justice permits to be covered, and not because we approved of his general course in the Committee.

So far we have seen the beginning of the corrupting influence of certain qualities in the Committee, *i.e.*, the spirit of envy, evil surmising, fear, compromise, arbitrariness and craft. Other evil qualities began about this time to manifest themselves, especially in I.F. Hoskins, whom we proposed as Secretary and Treasurer when A.I. Ritchie resigned and who was unanimously elected. It became habitual with the Group to nag at and reproach us. Of course, we saw I.L. Margeson back of this, who ever since coming

into the Committee, both in and out of the meetings, was creating an atmosphere hostile to us in what became the Group. He continued to support the thought that our presence on the Committee was to its detriment, all the time doing it with sanctimonious facial and verbal expressions. Increasingly the spirit was growing "to set down on" and repress us. This we bore quietly, not even remonstrating against it until April 29, when principle forbade more longsuffering.

"That Evil Servant" Discourse, that was heard with appreciation by the bulk of the Philadelphia Church Feb. 17, gave the growing Group an eagerly seized opportunity; and the situation created by two letters from two sisters, one of whom was unduly influenced to write, the other of whom was a special friend of I.F. Hoskins, was laid hold on with alacrity by him, who discussed it with several members of the Committee between Feb. 19, when he received the first of these letters, and Feb. 23, when the Committee met, and who wrote of our address disparagingly to the sisters, but who never intimated anything of the matter to us, until he brought it up at the Committee meeting. Just as the reading of the minutes was finished he and we asked for the floor. But his determined, sharp and repeated calls for the floor won it for him. With set face, firm lips, flashing eyes and unsympathetic words he made a speech against us for what he accused us of doing at Philadelphia the Sunday before. The day before, for the first time, we learned at Philadelphia that some in the Church there did not approve of our discourse. This was from S.N. Wiley, who over the phone assured us that he agreed with the contents and spirit of the talk, but not of the time and service at which it was delivered, because about twelve outsiders were present at that meeting, which, however, was not advertised for the public. S.N. Wiley felt hurt, because the afternoon before, in response to his inquiry, we told him that

outsiders could come to the meeting with profit. We did not consider this as a promise to give a public service, but merely thought that our talk, whose subject we had not yet selected, would be on general high calling lines. That night, Feb. 16, Brother Russell's birthday, however, it was announced to the meeting that as we had just spoken on "that Wise and Faithful Servant," we would the following afternoon give a lecture on "that Evil Servant," if the brethren desired it. A unanimous vote requested us so to do. Most of the feeling against that discourse at Philadelphia was worked up by objections from Society sources, some of whose supporters were present at the meeting, or by the fear of the effect on them. Both R.G. Jolly and ourself assured the Committee, after I.F. Hoskins' speech, that Society agitation was in part back of the feeling, and most of the rest was due to fear of it. The discourse was delivered as kindly and as wisely as we knew how. March 17, both sisters as well as others, before the Church apologized for what they did, acknowledging that the discourse was edifying and meat in due season and, excepting one contrary vote, the Church unanimously passed a resolution approving of the discourse. Doubtless several, including S.N. Wiley, lacked the courage to vote against it in the face of the sentiment at that meeting. Seven months later eight members of the Philadelphia Church, under the influence of the predominate P.B.I. Committee, voted disapproval of the discourse, all the others voting approval. Seemingly these eight would in all likelihood have voted approval or disapproval of anything, accordingly as their P.B.I. partisanship dictated, as they unanimously did for months on every matter affecting the P.B.I.

To return to the Feb. 23 Committee meeting: For three hours in the Committee meeting that afternoon, with many recriminations aimed at us, the question was discussed as to whether Committee members

were to preach on any new matters not approved by the Committee. Then the meeting adjourned for supper. Supper finished, F.H. McGee presented a resolution stating that nothing—especially types, prophecies and symbols—not interpreted by that Servant should be preached by Committee members on pain of being out of harmony with the Committee. Another discussion of at least three hours then set in. During this discussion I.F. Hoskins affirmed the following propositions: that the Committee had all the power in the work that that Servant had had, and that for any member of the Committee to preach things not approved by the Committee proved that that person acted as head of the Committee! He then said that he would resign from the Committee, if anyone of its members preached things not sanctioned by the Committee. The doctrinal clearing house proposition in his mind was very apparent, therefore, Feb. 23; and the claim that the Committee had all of that Servant's powers explains why I.F. Hoskins faulted in his letter of Feb. 21 (quoted above) the Philadelphia Church for presuming to arrange for a Pilgrim to preach to it without consulting the Committee. We would, however, say that before we accepted the invitation to speak to the Philadelphia Church, we in R.H. Hirsh's presence spoke of it to I.F. Hoskins, who was then making the Committee Pilgrim appointments, and obtained his sanction, a thing that he failed to state in his letter. Our course therein was not due to our thinking that a Church could not in good order ask a Pilgrim to serve it without the consent of the P.B.I., but out of a proper courtesy to the body of whose Pilgrim staff we were a member. I.F. Hoskins, I.L. Margeson and J.D. Wright wanted F.H. McGee's resolution made so strong as to forbid answering questions on such subjects, even in private conversation or by letter! Four disapproving of this, it failed to pass. Finally

the Group, near midnight of Feb. 23, just about 16 hours less than seven full weeks from the time of the Committee's appointment Jan. 6, passed the resolution that they thought put, as far as Committee members were concerned, controllership of the Lord's Word in their hands, a papistical resolution that unanswerably proves that they were seeking headship and not ourself, as they continually charged.

A resolution fraught with greater evils, actual and potential, against the Little Flock has scarcely ever been passed! I.L. Margeson cried out immediately after its passage: "Now we are safe!" They claim that our course in the Committee on this matter and on several others, which in each case was resisting their clericalism and not foisting a policy on the Committee, proves that we wanted headship. Our answer is that their course on this and on the other matters that they claim prove that we wanted headship, unanswerably proves that they wanted a headship that set aside our Lord's headship! We desire to say that what they read (surmised) in our conduct to be headship, *i.e.*, insisting that the proclamation of God's Word must be free—was not headship, but was such a loyalty to God, His Word and His people as every faithful servant of the Truth has had to exercise against clericalists throughout the whole Gospel Age! Our attitude on this matter is one of the things which F.H. McGee, according to his "Letter of Importance," "viewed with growing concern." Let the impartial reader judge whether he had a right to feel a growing concern on this and kindred matters. Truthfully the Committee can point to nothing in our conduct that proves to a sober mind that we sought headship. They cannot point to even one act, where there was no principle involved, in which we did not accept and cooperate with the voted resolution of the majority, even though before the passing of the motion we advocated something else. While on the Committee,

and being continually reproached for wanting to control it, we asked them to point to anything that was not forbidden by the Word and that was passed by the majority of the Committee, even though we had spoken or voted against it, that we did not support after it was passed. They were unable to point out even one, whereas we pointed out a number of things in which we cooperated against our vote with the majority's decision, a thing that cannot truthfully be said of I.F. Hoskins and I.L. Margeson, and of the editorial committee, except R.H. Hirsh.

More and more the Group advocated suppressing everything that would likely stir up any opposition. They were constantly like politicians, on the lookout to see what was popular, and then cater to those that wanted that thing; while whatever was unpopular, like pointing out from the Lord's Word the meaning of the trouble in the Church, they wanted hushed. This spirit of compromise led to the resolution above discussed, though every member on the Committee believed J.F.R. to be "that Evil Servant" of Matt. 24:48-51. It is utterly untrue that we promised not to speak on this subject, or on Elijah and Elisha, either before or after the Philadelphia discourse of Feb. 17. There were some typical matters of which we spoke to the leading brethren only, and which we at their suggestion agreed to withhold for the time being from the brethren in general; but they were not among the things mentioned by us.

After Feb. 23 we had no Committee meeting until April 13. In the meantime J.F.R.'s article on Elijah and Elisha in the Feb. 15 Tower began to stir up a number of weaker brethren, and influenced some of them to return to the Society. Among other Churches feeling the effect of this article were two in which we served as Pilgrim between the above dates. At other places we did not preach on any subjects coming within the scope of the Group's resolution, because

there seemed to be no need therefore, though we did privately speak of Elijah and Elisha, etc., at Boston and elsewhere. But when at Jersey City and Newark we learned that some of the brethren were disturbed by J.F.R.'s article, and when we were requested by the first, and by the elders of the second, Class to discuss this subject, feeling that the interests of God's flock were to be put above an unscriptural resolution passed by a spirit that gave *prima facie* evidence of not being the Lord's, we hesitated not a moment to "feed the flock," as commanded by the Lord, and to disregard the traditions of men forbidding our obedience to this charge.

The Committee's Secretary and others of the Group were quickly informed of this, and at the next meeting, *i.e.*, April 13, we were severely reprimanded; and then we made a solemn protest in the name of God, our Father, and Jesus Christ our Savior against the resolution on which these strictures against us in particular were based, asking that our protest be formally entered upon the minutes, a request that J.D. Wright wanted disregarded. At this meeting the editorial committee was elected. Against no other's candidacy was anything said, though several Committee member candidates failed of election, except against our own. I.L. Margeson, speaking for the Group, urged that we be not elected an editor, because it would prove that we controlled the P.B.I. Committee! F.H. McGee objected to our election on the ground that he feared we would control the editorial committee! During the course of his speech he said that he believed that we were better equipped with ability as a Scriptural interpreter than anybody else in the Truth, yet he believed that we, with what he called our stronger mind, would over-influence the others on the Committee if elected! We know, of course, that such was the Group's policy respecting us, and therefore did not expect to be elected. We assured the Committee

that if it were the Lord's will for us to be one of the editors, He would see to our election; if not, He would prevent it; and in either case we would be content, and were; never intimating anything to the contrary. We were defeated, every one of the Group, of course, voting against us. They also sought to justify their course by our preaching on Elijah and Elisha contrary to their resolution. After the election we told the Committee that we accepted the result of the election as an indication of the Lord's will for us, and said not a word to the contrary, despite F.H. McGee's contrary statement in his "Letter of Importance," where, judging our motives, and perverting our statement of April 29, to which we will refer later, he makes it appear that we did; and where the central thought of its first few pages is to prove his evil surmises to the effect that we wanted to control the Committee, and that we became resentful, because we were not elected an editor, and because he claimed we thought that I.L. Margeson had our place as an editor! All of his propositions on this subject are false, and are evil surmises, even as he indicates in that part of his letter: "I feel certain." Evil surmisers usually "feel certain." But they feel more certain than they know.

In the meeting of April 13, after the election of the editors, I.F. Hoskins advocated what before that meeting several times he sought unsuccessfully to make us believe was proper; *i.e.*, that the Committee do not wait for word from foreign brethren in response to our letter, as to what the brethren thought to be the Lord's will on the Committee's furnishing a Pilgrim and Periodical service, etc. He brought up this matter just after the editors were elected, urging that the Committee decide that the paper be forthwith published. We and others objected on the ground that the Fort Pitt Convention instructed us to get the thought of the "Opposition" Truth people the world

over on these matters; and that to go ahead without waiting for the responses of the British and Australasian brethren was a discourtesy to them, as well as contrary to our instructions, and running ahead of, instead of waiting for, the Lord. We suggested, therefore, that the editors get the first number ready for the press, so that the copy could be given to the printer as soon as we would hear favorably from these brethren, from whom, on account of the distance and censorship, it took at least from seven to twelve weeks to hear. This thought prevailed, as all unpartisan minds will recognize it should have prevailed. We can account for F.H. McGee ambiguously using this incident as a proof that we on one occasion held up the paper from being published on no other ground than that of poverty of materials from which to construct substantial charges against us.

By this time and henceforth the Group, when unable to unite on any one proposition, could always be depended on to rally to the slogan, "Brother Johnson is seeking control!" Whenever some of them could not rally enough support for some of the measures that the fertile conspirators, I.L. Margeson and I.F. Hoskins, had concocted and were trying to work through the Committee, and that we were opposing, they would declare that if our thought prevailed, it would be sure proof to the brethren that we were "controlling the Committee!" This argument always convinced J.D. Wright and F.H. McGee; and they rallied to the formers' support. For example, a good house and lot were offered as a gift for headquarters at Philadelphia, and we were given powers of attorney over the property. Until late in March the Committee was unanimous for establishing headquarters in this city. Then certain influences began to work for New York as headquarters. Gradually all of the Group, two for unjustifiable reasons, except F.H. McGee, were won to favor New York, the others continued to

favor Philadelphia. F.H. McGee was won over to the Group as follows: The motion was about to be put establishing headquarters at Philadelphia, and four had spoken in its favor. Then I.F. Hoskins, supported by I.L. Margeson, said: "If we establish headquarters at Philadelphia everybody will say that Brother Johnson controls the Committee!" As though given an electric shock, F.H. McGee straightened up in his chair, saying, "That is so; I had not thought of that; we would better table this motion for further consideration!" Said and done! And somewhat later F.H. McGee was nicely lined up with the Group in favor of New York as against Philadelphia for headquarters! Time and again questions that should have been decided on the principles of the Lord's Word and indications of His Providences applicable to them were decided by the simple formula that became the Group's ultimate axiom: Everything must be done or left undone, as the case might require, to prove that Brother Johnson does not "control the Committee." The scarecrow thought of our "headship" sometimes became a veritable bugaboo to the Group, and at other times affected them as a red rag does a pugnacious bull; and many a time they tossed us on their horns at the cry, "Brother Johnson is seeking to control the Committee!" Seemingly I.F. Hoskins, whose conduct proves that he was seeking controllership, made use of this "stop-thief" cry to divert attention from himself to us; and he always found I.L. Margeson a ready helper, and between them they manipulated with almost undeviating success the other two members of the Group into harmony with their will. Despite the seriousness of the situation it had its comic aspects!

Is it any wonder that we who must, figuratively speaking, be knocked down before we can think brethren capable of trickery, finally through the events of the meeting of April 13 were completely disillusioned, as we began to be disillusioned by the events

of Feb. 23? In unmistakable ways the Group repeatedly showed that our room was more welcome than our presence on the Committee. Their habitual reproaches and naggings made things far from pleasant. We were faulted for practically everything that did not succeed as the Committee desired. In our relations with them we were undergoing a set of experiences that were at least as disagreeable as those that we had had with the British managers and the Society leaders. It usually took us several days to recover from the shocks experienced in the Committee meetings. Some Epiphany Scriptures were beginning to become clear to our mind, showing that it was the Group that were desirous of controllership contrary to Scriptural principles, as their acts repeatedly showed this to be the case. Not desiring to be where we were not wanted we decided to withdraw from the Committee; and noticing that R.H. Hirsh and R.G. Jolly usually, and that without any prearrangement, or even discussion, viewed matters of teaching and practice as we did, we communicated to them our thought of withdrawing from the Committee. This was between the meetings of April 13 and 29. Both of them, though appreciating our feelings and recognizing the continued injustice and unbrotherliness of the Group toward us, nevertheless advised as against this step, as that course would lead to the election of a member favored by and in sympathy with the Group, which by this time was quite a compact party, and thus leave the Church all the more to their mercy. Moreover, they reasoned that our experience with the General Church's problems, contrasted with the Group's inexperience with these, made our remaining on the Committee all the more necessary in the interests of the General Church. These arguments induced us to change our mind on the question of resigning, being willing to endure the continued and ever-increasing mistreatment of the Group in the interest of Christ's

Body. Therefore, we did not resign as we expected to do at the next Committee meeting, April 29.

At this meeting J.D. Wright objected to our protest against the resolution of Feb. 23 being continued on the minutes. We claimed it as a right that it be kept there. At this juncture F.H. McGee asked us, if we would be satisfied to have the protest taken off the minutes, provided the resolution was rescinded. We replied affirmatively. He then moved and I.L. Margeson, we believe, seconded the motion to rescind the action, all except I.F. Hoskins and J.D. Wright voting for its rescinding. Several events had conspired to change the views of the former two on the resolution. They found that something had to be done to counteract the influence of J.F.R.'s article in the Feb. 15 "Tower" on Elijah and Elisha; that not a few were falling away through it to the Society; that the only weapons available against it were our understandings of Epiphany truths; and that the latter had effectively been used against "the channel" argument, etc., at not a few places, notably the week before at Providence, where in the presence of the bulk of that Church, not yet separated by the troubles in the Society—I.L. Margeson being also in the audience—we delivered three lectures: (1) Fiery Trials, (2) Five Calls, Six Siftings and Slaughter Weapons, and (3) The Final Related Experiences of Elijah and Elisha. Before we came the Society supporters, under the influence of "Headquarters," were forcing matters to a division, which was to be voted on the night after our last lecture. R.E. Streeter and I.L. Margeson concluded that it would be most advantageous for "the Opposition," if we were to deliver several lectures giving the Scriptural view of the difficulties among the Truth people during 1917. Accordingly, our appointment for April 21 was changed, so that we could serve Providence the nights of April 21-23. On our arrival R.E. Streeter told us that if we would be especially

careful, our side might be able to reduce the Society's majority somewhat, though they would doubtless still retain a majority in the division. The majority of the extreme "Societyites" remained away from our lectures. After the last lecture R.E. Streeter, whose praise of the clearness and convincing power of our presentation was warm, unmodified and generous, assured us that nine of those who had been "on the fence" told him that they were now on our side, and that doubtless others who had not expressed themselves were for us. As an illustration of how partisanship can warp the candor of one even so mild as R.E. Streeter, we would here remark that at Asbury Park he sought to disparage the effect of the Lord's Word at our mouth at Providence by saying that only one person was convinced at that time! April 24, the night after our course of lectures closed, the division came, and we had a majority of three on our side in the test votes. And the next Sunday over 25 more came to our meeting than to the Society's meeting. After hearing these lectures I.L. Margeson, who was the main objector to our presenting such views, remarked that if they could have had these lectures at Boston, when the division was taking place, they would have gotten larger results as against the Society.

The results at Providence undoubtedly had much to do to change the attitude of F.H. McGee and I.L. Margeson on the effectiveness of "Epiphany Light" as we gave it against the Society's position. Undoubtedly this and the conviction that our presentations were Scriptural, moved them to vote to rescind the papal resolution of Feb. 23, though to a less degree their desire to have unity in the Committee was doubtless also active therein; but sad to say, in part their doctrinal clearing house proposition and partisanship caused them later to rechange their opinion. At the Committee meeting April 29 the Group sought to elect F.H. McGee chairman, having at a previous meeting

failed to elect I.L. Margeson. Convinced that their whole policy was to gain controllership in the interests of partisan ends, and not in the interests of the Truth, R.G. Jolly, R.H. Hirsh and ourself (not, however, by prearrangement, not even discussing it) voted against him, and, of course, a tie resulted, F.H. McGee not voting. Before the vote was taken for the first time we expressed to the Committee our disapproval of the (for months continued) naggings with which we were being regaled by the Group, saying that until we saw a change of conduct for the better on the part of the Group, we believed it a mistake to go ahead on further elections in the Committee; that we were convinced that the Lord would withhold blessing from the Committee, unless certain evil qualities at work in its midst were put away; and that as soon as we saw these put aside, we would gladly vote for F.H. McGee for chairman, but not before, since conditions demanded this course.

At this meeting we brought up the matter of I.F. Hoskins and H.C. Rockwell (who was present as a guest, and who had just before abused the Committee's hospitality by sharply rebuking us) preaching against us in ways that the friends understood them to mean us. Both said they did not mean us, the latter even appealing to God as his witness. During the discussion at Philadelphia, Aug. 25, the former finally admitted that he did mean us; and the latter, denying that he meant us in his sermon at Asbury Park, where those present who understood the conditions did clearly understand him to mean us, many said they did not believe that he told the truth on either occasion, but rather he seems to have perjured himself on this subject, April 29. At that time, while giving instances of such preaching against us, we forgot to mention a special particular on this point in his talk at Philadelphia in April, *i.e.*, his warning the congregation to be on their guard against anyone who

would advise them to keep the Memorial on a different date from what the Jews kept, we having done that very thing to his knowledge in that Church but a few weeks before! Whom could he have meant but us? However, we charitably accepted (April 29) his and I.F. Hoskins' statements and apologized. We herewith withdraw that apology as having been prematurely and unwarrantedly given, since falsehoods accepted as truth occasioned it.

At that meeting, April 29, before, and as the occasion of our bringing up the matter of their preaching against us, H.C. Rockwell, to the pleasement of several of the Group, made a sharp attack on us before the Committee for preaching on types, etc., not interpreted by Bro. Russell. By this time I.F. Hoskins had already begun his propaganda against us before brethren not on the Committee on what he was pleased to call our "fanciful interpretations and wild speculations." H.C. Rockwell's attack on us without naming us before the Philadelphia Church in April, and now before the Committee, was one of the fruits of this unbrotherly propaganda. But worse was to follow.

Feeling sure that the Committee's majority was hostile to us, and would oppose almost anything that we presented, we decided not to advocate any new measure, unless it was absolutely necessary, and let those who now were fairly solidified into a partisan Group direct matters with less objection from us than formerly, unless they should embark on an unscriptural course involving the Church or ourself. Hence we ceased to urge going ahead with the paper. Judging our motives, F.H. McGee in his "Letter of Importance," by evil surmising, gives his readers to understand that this was in resentment at our not being elected an editor! At the end of the April 29 meeting F.H. McGee, the usual spokesman of the Group, wanted to know whether we considered ourself as the

Committee's controller, as Bro. Russell was that of the Board. We replied, "No." Then he asked what we thought our powers were. We replied that apart from moral suasion our power on the Committee was represented by one vote, just like that of every other member. Then he said, "I do not think that it is necessary that you should be at the head, or on the Committee at all." Believing that our previous answer sufficiently covered the first part of his statement, we answered the last clause only—"or on the Committee at all"—to the effect that we did not know about that. The reason for our so answering was: the Providence of the Lord putting us there, we thought there was some necessity for it, *i.e.*, that as the Lord put us into a position where He revealed to us the evil doings of the British managers and the American Society leaders, in order to enable us for Epiphany purposes to defend the flock, so He had, we concluded from certain Scriptures, placed us on that Committee for the same reason. This conviction prompted our answer, which lawyer-like and characteristically F.H. McGee perverted into meaning that we confessed to wanting to be head! Why did he not in the connection tell our preceding remark, which disproves the impression that he aimed to make? So, too, by telling only a part of our remarks about the Group becoming sorry for their combining to keep us off the editorial staff, he misrepresented the whole import of our remarks. Several of the Group said that they voted to keep us off the editorial staff, because a number of brethren desired it. We answered that for one that thereby they would please, they in all likelihood would displease five, and that this fact would probably result in their being made sorry for their course in not electing us. We still believe our remark will ultimately prove true. But Lawyer McGee characteristically in motive reading and evil surmising twisted this statement into meaning that we in

resentment would make the Group feel sorry for not electing us to editorship! The Lord seems in this to have taken the wise in their own craftiness: their seeking to squelch us not only in this particular, but in many others, He has manipulated into making us the editor and publisher of a journal as a channel for Epiphany Truth (whose proclamation they would not permit) entirely free from the control of other human beings! This ought to be a lesson to the Group not to seek to "set" or unset anyone "in the Body as it hath pleased" them! God, not man, "sets" such.

After that meeting some of the Group, as well as R.E. Streeter and H.C. Rockwell, suggested that we furnish articles for "The Bible Standard." In harmony with the decision that we had reached before, *i.e.*, that it would be better all around if those who were aspiring and attaining to partisan controllership be permitted to learn some needed lessons, and that these could be best learned as far as we were concerned, by our leaving them largely to their own resources—we told them something to that effect, declining to submit manuscript. Immediately our evil surmising F.H. McGee exclaimed, "So, if you cannot rule, you will ruin! That is just like you." Surely our not writing for the paper would not ruin it! We replied that we would without any counter effort at all let them learn some needed lessons; and since they had only too plainly given us to understand that we were not a person acceptable to them, we would without helping directly on the paper let them do their own will! This, like other things, F.H. McGee perverted into our being resentful at not being elected an editor! Their evil surmisings only prove the more strongly their spiritual ill health. The Group's nightmare about our seeking control seems to be an example of some foibles of our fallen human nature—suspecting others of desiring what one wants for himself, and judging others by oneself.

Our suggestion of April 13, that the Committee prepare the first number of the paper, was not heeded, apart from an article that I.F. Hoskins prepared, and which was published as the first article of both "The Bible Standard" and "The Herald." The spirit of fear, instilled by I.L. Margeson, prompted the Group to hold up the paper after the Society leaders were arrested, before which sufficient responses from our foreign brethren had arrived to warrant going ahead, they claiming that the P.B.I. might become involved with the Government. We in harmony with our resolution previously stated made only a slight objection to their course. Then they blamed us for holding up the paper; we denied this, giving them the above explanation, which they knew to be the truth. The spirit of fear also prompted I.L. Margeson to seek to set aside the name Pastoral Bible Institute. It is unnecessary to give here again the particulars that were given in our Feb., 1919, issue, as to how the Group, during five Committee meetings, through F.H. McGee, tried to force a corporation on the Committee, against the Scripturally enlightened consciences of R.G. Jolly, R.H. Hirsh and ourself. Our stand against this, as against the papistical resolution of Feb. 23, was charged against us as wanting to "control the Committee." In both cases we simply resisted their wrong course, and did not try to foist a policy on them. Their papistically forcing (for the Little Flock) unscriptural policies they do not see to be the real effort at lordship. Brethren whose spiritual vision is keen will have no difficulty in recognizing who were the real aspirers for lordship.

The Group was more and more becoming filled with the idea that we must be gotten rid of. This spirit prompted them more or less in their whispering campaign against us to follow a course calculated to undermine our influence with the Church. We have sufficiently above exposed their reputation-assassinating

tactics, working up sentiment against us among credulous brethren, who ought to have been aroused against this reputation-assassination by the nature and quality of their acts. We gently remonstrated individually, and in the Committee against this wrong course, especially of I.F. Hoskins and I.L. Margeson. The former claimed early in July that the Boston and New York elders and Churches were solid against us, and others were becoming so, the Providence Church being mentioned as one. We plainly saw the nature and the logical effect of their unbrotherly and unChristian course; but apart from remonstrating with the Committee members, kept silent all the while on their deeds. For these remonstrances in the Committee meetings we were told by I.F. Hoskins, the main offender, that we were surmising evil; that the brethren were turning against us because of what we were preaching on Elijah, etc., though before the Philadelphia Church, Aug. 25, he was forced to admit that he had warned various Churches against us without naming us publicly, but doing so privately.

F.H. McGee admitted the wrong being done by himself, at Freehold, his home. Of course, I.L. Margeson would admit nothing. This unholy campaign of reputation-assassination they continued, until by the opening of the Asbury Park Convention they had convinced many brethren that R.G. Jolly, R.H. Hirsh and particularly ourself were attempting to divide the Church, while it was they by their "political campaign" who were doing this very thing. They were by talking against us among the P.B.I. supporters creating sentiment among them against us, and then they pointed to this sentiment against us as a reason why we were a dead weight on, and a hindrance to, the Committee! To what injurious evils will envious grasping for power and lording it over others lead their possessors! Now that we are exposing their wrong-doings and teachings, they quote against

us from that Servant's writings statements on evil speaking. These apply to their course, not to ours. As Jesus (Matt. 23) publicly reprov'd the Pharisees; as Paul reprov'd Peter publicly (Gal. 2:11-15); as the Prophets in innumerable places and the Apostles in many instances as God's mouthpieces spoke against the wrong acts of evil-doers, even mentioning their names (2 Tim. 3:8; 1:15; 4:14; 1 Tim. 1:20; 2 Pet. 2:15; 3 John 9, 10; Jude 11); and as all Reformers, *e.g.*, our dear Pastor, spoke against the clericalists, frequently mentioning their names, so in cases like the present, where guarding the flock against leaders who are "deceiving and being deceived" is necessary, it is not only not wrong, but our bounden duty as servants of the Truth, to expose the clericalists in our midst.

That Servant's view reproving their slanderous course against us, and justifying our exposures of their wrongs against the Church and their three colleagues on the Committee, is found in the Manna comment for July 14. If we should keep silence, God would raise up another servant to warn His people against their false teachings and wrong practices. Let no one think, as F.H. McGee surmises and then imputes as our motive, that resentment at our not being elected an editor (!) or on the Committee at Asbury Park (!) prompts our exposures. The desire (1) to guard God's Flock, (2) to preserve the Lord's arrangements given through that Servant, (3) to rescue eventually the P.B.I. and their supporters from their wrong course, a thing that private and loving admonition failed to achieve, and (4) to discharge the duties of our office, are the leading motives that prompt our course. The P.B.I. are responsible for the motive reading that assigns other motives for our actions in this matter. By this forbidden act of motive reading they have also defiled many in the Church of God.

Without at the time informing us of their motives

for desiring a General Convention, the Group, apart from J.D. Wright, through F.H. McGee, June 8, advocated holding a General Convention. Accordingly, his motion on this point was carried. After this session, I.F. Hoskins and I.L. Margeson told us that one of their objects in wanting a Convention was to have the brethren elect a new Committee, thus giving the Church the opportunity of deciding whether it favored the Group's course, which they called a conservative policy, or whether it favored our course, which they called a radical policy, the reverse, of course, was the case.

Of course, their widespread preaching, teaching and agitation against us was now, according to their plans, to yield them the fruits for which they had so long plotted, and so grossly misrepresented one of the "Secondary Prophets." R.G. Jolly, R.H. Hirsh and ourself understood now the reason for their desire for a Convention! Then before these brothers and I.L. Margeson we warned I.F. Hoskins that, if he did not change his wrong course the Lord would surely take him in hand and deal with him! An hour later we repeated this warning to him privately. The gross wrongs of this brother who, declaiming against us as a "lord," was most pronouncedly grasping for power and lording it over God's heritage, as in great detail we pointed out above, made him more than anyone else responsible for the troubles in the Committee.

While favoring the submission of the question of the election of a new Committee to the whole Church, we were not in favor of doing this to a packed and politically campaigned convention. Therefore, at our next meeting, June 22, we proposed that in the first number of our paper an announcement should be made calling for nominations, in which all of the Committee's supporters could participate; and that nominations be not closed until the foreign brethren had time to offer nominees by mail; and that then the

candidates' names should be published; and that following this the voting be done by mail. This would by Jan. 1, 1919, provide a Committee elected by the whole Church. Against this fair proposition, I.F. Hoskins and F.H. McGee, especially the former, strenuously objected. I.L. Margeson, not then present, made known his objection later. Finally, all except I.F. Hoskins agreed on the following compromise that the nominations should be made at Asbury Park and the election by mail as we proposed. Further, it was agreed in the interest of peace and good fellowship, that the Committee's troubles should not be brought up in the Convention, we telling the brethren that we would make a candid exposure of what had been done in the Committee, if they would bring up the trouble. Both of these agreements were violated by the Group, particularly by I.F. Hoskins, even as all at the Convention know that he after H.C. Rockwell's attack upon us, brought up the trouble and denounced the course of R.H. Hirsh, R.G. Jolly and ourself, even mentioning our names and that he and those on his side by "playing politics" created such a situation at the Convention as morally forced the Fort Pitt Committee to resign. Therefore, in harmony with our warning to the Group that, if they would bring up the trouble at the Convention, we would make an exposure of Committee conditions, we very mildly uncovered some of its more crying evils Sunday morning, July 28. This exposure undoubtedly began to change the predominating influence of the Group over the convention; our debate with I.F. Hoskins that night on the question of whether the Little Flock could Scripturally do its work through a corporation or Society undoubtedly added to the further undoing of the Group's control over the Convention; and on Monday morning the Group's control was not only broken but they were so completely discredited that their whole program, not yet voted on, in part was

disapproved almost unanimously, and for the rest was almost unanimously put on the table for six months. We believe that had the dismissal of the new Committee been proposed then, this would have been carried almost unanimously, even as the proposal that their unauthorized election of an editorial committee be rescinded was carried almost unanimously. The Group left that Convention sadder, if not wiser than they came. They sought to counteract their defeat by their misleading Aug. "Bulletin," which, according to A Brief Review, was delivered to them by their printer before our "Another Harvest Siftings Reviewed" came to them, Aug. 22, and by F.H. McGee's three publications; but as surely as we are in the Epiphany, so surely will they, the wrongdoers and misrepresenters, fail in this; for strong and all knowing is the Lord that is now subjecting their works of wood, hay and stubble to the fires of this apocalyptic day (1 Cor. 3:11-15). O! how earnestly did R.G. Jolly, R.H. Hirsh and ourself try to help them while yet with them; but we could not! "O Jerusalem! Jerusalem!" "How oft would I ... but ye would not"!

It is not necessary for us to describe beyond what we have done above the events of the Group's course in turning in our absence brethren, elders and even Churches against us months before we ceased being a member of the Committee, nor will we describe here the details of the proceedings in the meeting of July 18, and the course of the four editors and the Group on that day. That last Committee meeting is unforgettable. As we left the meeting room I.L. Margeson assured us that the Committee's trouble would not be mentioned to the Convention, though it might be mentioned to some of the leading brethren there in a private way—for propaganda!

It never was the policy of R.H. Hirsh, R.G. Jolly

and ourself to force matters, nor to obstruct matters, where there was no principle involved; rather we waited as far as possible on unanimity. All the forcing came from the Group! For example, we did not force establishing headquarters at Philadelphia when a clear majority favored that city. But when the majority changed and favored New York, we proposed establishing temporary headquarters there; and this was immediately carried. F.H. McGee, R.H. Hirsh, R.G. Jolly and ourself not only passed that motion (in the absence of two of the Group, however), but also passed on the same date (June 22) the motions to publish "The Bible Standard" before the Asbury Park Convention, and to put I.F. Hoskins and R.H. Hirsh on a stated salary, so that they could give their whole time to the Committee work; and to rent an office for headquarters. These things were done to carry out the purposes of the Committee's election, a course which the entire Group hindered after the Society leaders' arrest, until they were sentenced; and even then I.F. Hoskins and I.L. Margeson, later reinforced by H.C. Rockwell and R.E. Streeter, tried to block the appearing of "The Bible Standard," though I.F. Hoskins early in July agreed to the making of the plate for the first page of "The Bible Standard" and to the printing of its first number, if it would not be circulated before the next Committee meeting, which proved to be its last meeting, *i.e.*, July 18. With their plan completed, at this meeting the editors (except R.H. Hirsh), speaking through H.C. Rockwell, made a number of insistent recommendations, one being the election of a new committee at the Asbury Park Convention, in order to get rid of R.G. Jolly, R.H. Hirsh and ourself. F.H. McGee offered to oppose this proposition and to adhere to the one agreed to by all except I.F. Hoskins (I.L. Margeson being absent June 22), if R.H. Hirsh, R.G. Jolly and ourself

would agree to the formation of a corporation, which the three refused to do. Nothing was done July 18 in the way of rescinding the motion of June 22 (nor did the Committee without voting come to an understanding not) to publish "The Bible Standard" before the Asbury Park Convention. Therefore, R.H. Hirsh, who was elected Managing Editor, June 22, and whose duty it therefore was to go ahead with publishing the paper, faithfully carried out the order of the Committee of June 22 to publish the paper before the Asbury Park Convention. We, of course, favored his going ahead, because the commission from the Fort Pitt Convention and the Committee's motion of June 22 to that effect warranted it. The complaints of the majority of the Group against this only furnish corroborative evidence that they did hold up the paper, however much F.H. McGee, who before the Convention in and out of the Committee charged two of them with it, tries lawyerlike by false accusations and insinuations against us to hide this fact, which, of course, is against his client. Seemingly the majority of the Group wanted to get rid of the three before publishing a paper. Later developments favor this view.

Filled with horror at the wrongs of the Group, culminating in the Asbury Park Convention, and fully persuaded as to what the Lord wanted us to do in the situation, we published "Another Harvest Siftings Reviewed"—a paper that is throughout true—while the "August Bulletin" and F.H. McGee's three published replies contain in the neighborhood of 100 misrepresentations. How could he have lent himself to such a course, a course so contrary to all that we would have expected of him? Our answer is: Partisanship and evil surmising, combined with the lawyer's jugglery of truth, when necessary in the interests of his clients. These qualities overcame his usual honesty and candor; and then the Lord let him choose his own

way. To this day, despite his denial at Asbury Park, we cannot believe of him other than that he was a deceived agent, entrapped in the devious schemes of I.L. Margeson and in the ambitious toils of I.F. Hoskins and used by them as a catspaw to pull their chestnuts out of the fire! People of his usual kindness, fairness and candor are especially liable to be the unsuspecting instruments of others' schemes. Most deeply do we sympathize with these four for the great calamity that has come into their lives! Doubtless the prominent part that we took in the Committee's deliberations, in part by their suspicious dispositions or selfish ambitions, as the qualities of each may have been, influenced him to think that we wanted to control, as also their ambition to control matters partisanly, and their inexperience contrasted with our experience in dealing with general Church matters, blinded them to our real motives. They had not in practice learned, among other lessons, that the Lord's mind must always be decided from the standpoint of principle and not of compromise and selfishness. The low spiritual plane on which they were living left them undefended against the temptations that our Lord in the wilderness repelled by "A thus saith the Lord" faithfully obeyed. As we write this our heart aches for them! O how have the mighty fallen! We cannot forget that for awhile we had sweet fellowship with them! How unutterably sad the whole affair is! What lessons of watchfulness and prayer it contains!

But we imagine some will say how is it possible, Brother Johnson, that you can love them, and yet expose them so pointedly before the Church? Our answer is: It is our love that causes it. We would explain: Num. 8:5-20, in its Epiphany aspect, seems now to be fulfilling: We believe the Law's exposures of evils among God's people are the razor (v. 7) that their conduct "causes to go over all their flesh" for their cleansing. In due time many of their supporters

will recognize this and feel differently about our course. How glad we will be, when such will be cleansed, and then we will no more have to write of the evils of their leaders; but will be able to instruct them in the good things that the Lord wants them to learn and do. In the meantime we will, as occasion arises, have to furnish the sharp razor which their leaders' wrongs of envy, of grasping for power, of lording it over God's heritage, of the spirit of fear and compromise, of evil surmising, of bitter accusations, of assassinating slander, of contentious partisanship, of injurious arbitrariness and of legalistic worldliness "cause to go over all their flesh" for their cleansing. If the brethren would look upon our exposures as parts of this razor, and realize the ultimate good for all concerned, our course will appear in its true light, and will be recognized as being expressions of faith, hope, love and obedience. These and these only are our motives in doing as we have in this whole sad affair. Let us pray for our erring brethren that they may be rescued from the snare of the Adversary, into which they have gone with measurable wilfulness. "Alas, 'tis sad, 'tis true!"

Some may ask, Why is it that so many of the leaders have turned against Brother Johnson, and attacked him so publicly, both in Britain and America, and in their attacks question his motives, and without furnishing Biblical proof assign evil motives as the wellspring of his acts? Our answer to this question is the following: Satan knows that the Lord has given us much of the Epiphany Truth. This Truth is opposed to certain schemes that Satan is working against the Lord's people; he therefore must discredit it to prevent its general acceptance—knowing that an efficient way of discrediting a message is to discredit its mouthpiece, Satan has been discrediting us to prevent the Epiphany message from gaining a proper hearing at our mouth and pen. He finds in the ambition and

envy of certain leaders qualities that are responsive to his evil suggestions against us, and to the schemes that he is seeking to work out among God's people, and works on these qualities, and thus elicits their possessors' service to caricature us before the brethren, that the Epiphany Truth be prevented from having a proper hearing! Their ambition finds in us an obstacle to its gratification; and their envy, a supposedly dangerous rival who must be overthrown, if their plans and ambitions are to succeed: in a word, Baal worship backed by "the devil, your adversary" causes the opposition of Levite leaders to us (1 Kings 19:18; 1 Peter 5:8, 9).

This is a long chapter dealing more or less with the evils of the P.B.I., particularly of four of its leaders. This chapter shows the progressive development of the main evils which the Group has committed. In view of all of these things, many of which are in their own publications, can there be further any reasonable doubt that the Group, and the present P.B.I. Board and Editors, siding as they do with the Group, have been side-tracked by Satan, just as J.F.R. and his associates were a year before? A negative answer to this question seems to be the only one possible in the light of the Scriptures, of Reason, of the Facts and of their own publications. "Out of thine own mouth will I judge thee," saith the Lord! If other proof of this were required, the P.B.I. since shortly after 1918 going wrong on many doctrinal, chronological and prophetic matters furnishes it; for these errors prove that their leaders as sifters have by God been cast off and are by Azazel led into outer darkness. Such results, combined with our retaining the Truth and being used to give its advancing aspects, prove that we followed the Lord's will and they their own and Azazel's will in 1918.

CHAPTER V.

OTHER EARLIER ERRORS OF THE SHIMITE GERSHONITES.

SOME OTHER P.B.I. TEACHINGS EXAMINED. THE DAWN'S CALLED,
CHOSEN AND FAITHFUL EXAMINED. "ANCIENT ISRAEL'S JUBILEE
YEAR" EXAMINED.

SOME of our readers, especially the more recent ones, have asked us what we mean by the letters P.B.I. We answer: they are the title initials of a religio-business corporation called the Pastoral Bible Institute of Brooklyn, N.Y., formed by some of those whom "the Present Management" has been pleased to call "the opposition," *i.e.*, that part of "the opposition" that has ceased opposing the revolutionism of the Present Management. Doubtless one reason why the P.B.I. has ceased opposing the revolutionism of the Present Management is because by its making its charter differ from the Divine sample for such charters, it became more revolutionistic, so far as rebelling against the charter of the W.T.B.&T.S. is concerned, than the Present Management.

We have in six publications, *i.e.*, "Another Harvest Siftings Reviewed" and in the first five numbers of The Present Truth (see Chap. III), given a rather thorough examination of the History, Purposes and Charter of the P.B.I., as well as reviewed some of its teachings. At first, especially through F.H. Magee, the P.B.I. gave to some of our views published answers, which we refuted. Later, when starting the Herald, they announced as their policy the keeping of the controversy out of the Herald, which they did in the following way: they avoided mentioning our name; but from time to time put into the Herald, as well as into discourses at conventions and in local ecclesias misleading remarks of their own, and misapplied quotations

from our Pastor as if they were against our views, and slurs against "fanciful interpretations and wild speculations" and against "self-appointed leaders" seeking to control the Church; and then in conversations and letters pointed us out as the main "self-appointed leader" and purveyor of their misrepresentations of our views, and of "fanciful interpretations and wild speculations" whom they meant! Hence, their readers knew that they meant us by their misleading remarks, misapplied quotations and slurs. Some of these letters written by I.F. Hoskins and H.C. Rockwell are now in our possession and will be published, if needs be. So while ostensibly posing as peace lovers and keepers, and publishing in their supporters' letters praise of themselves for their meekness in not replying to our criticisms, which they cannot refute, they keep right on with the same remarks and misrepresentations, and the same slurs and underhanded methods which I.F. Hoskins and I.L. Margeson, through a "whispering campaign," used against us in 1918, while we were yet a member of the Fort Pitt Committee. Our Pastor treated religious differences otherwise. He would not only mention and refute teachings which he thought required his doing it; but also, if necessity required, he mentioned the names of the guilty ones, specifying their wrong official acts and teachings; but never mentioned the wrongs of their private lives; for to personalities he would not stoop. In this we have imitated his course; for we have not publicly criticized the private wrongs of our brethren, and that, not because we are ignorant of such acts, for we are not, but because such a course would be out of harmony with Justice and Love, unless such wrongs would have to be told to prevent injury to others (Manna, July 14). Our criticisms have been aimed at *official wrong-doings and teachings which have been injurious to the Lord's dear Flock*. In this we have imitated our Faithful Chief Shepherd and His Faithful Apostles and

Prophets, including our beloved Pastor. We are satisfied that our course, whose unavoidable imperfections are under the Robe, is Divinely approved, as responding to the Epiphany purposes of our Lord. Hence we have followed, and, please God, will follow it.

Our April, 1919, issue was the last one in which we especially gave attention to P.B.I. affairs [written Mar., 1920]. Since that time we have in our magazine, apart from a few brief references, been silent on their teachings and practices; but during that time we have been an interested, though quiet, observer of these; and, of course, knew when and how they were "tactfully" attacking us. Very recently, some of their letters came into our hands, in one of which, written by H.C. Rockwell, we are mentioned by name and condemned as a false teacher, etc., our understanding of the non-apostolic General Elders, *i.e.*, the "Secondarily Prophets," and our course of announcing as members of the Great Company those whom the Lord manifests as such, and of explaining the sets and groups of the Levites coming in for special condemnation. Furthermore, the Herald of late is making special efforts to justify the use of corporations as proper instruments for a general ministry for and toward the Church, which is Christ's body. Moreover, in its series of articles, "The Revelation of Jesus Christ," its course of giving many wrong interpretations, not a few of which it accepts from "foolish Virgins," as true explanations makes further silence on our part impossible, if we would be true to the Lord, the Truth and the Brethren. Hence we have decided to examine some of their main *erroneous* teachings, coming out since Mar., 1919 [up to Mar., 1920]. Like the bulk of the rest of the Levite movements, the P.B.I. attacks us on our announcing manifested Levites as such, as if we were engaged in forbidden judging. We have refuted this objection in Vol. V, Chap. II, to which we refer our readers.

The P.B.I. editors answered our objection that an external organization, corporation, managing her general work inserted into the Church is a Little Antichrist in the temple of God (2 Thes. 2:4) as follows: For the sake of good order (1 Cor. 14:40), and to prevent a "self-appointed individual" (especially *ourselves*!) from lording it over the Church, it is necessary to have a corporation in the Church to manage a general service to and for the Church through a periodical, pilgrim and convention service, and to select and publish literature for the edification of, and for distribution by the Church. Similar claims are made for and by the two Great Antichrists, the Papacy and the Federation! We quote the following passage (H '20, 348, near bottom of col. 1), which in its connection sets forth the thought that all the Lord's people, or part of them collectively, may make use of a business corporation such as theirs is to conduct a general ministry in their name, just as the Lord's people may use the corporational inventions, like railroads, etc., of our day for their convenience. "The matter of a corporation is one of those which the Lord's people may make use of *just the same* [italics ours] as they may make use of a railroad train, although St. Paul journeyed hundreds of miles by foot" and, we may add, he also used horses and ships, when convenient, and advised others to do so; but never himself used, nor advised others to use business corporations, which as such existed in his day, to manage the general work of the Church! Do these editors actually mean to insult the intelligence of the Church by telling them that there is the same principle involved in using corporationally controlled conveniences and in a few or many brethren appointing a Board to manage a general ministry to and for the Church which is Christ's Body, involving appointments for the general teaching office in pilgrim, periodical and convention work, and in managing the literature for the edification of, and for distribution

by the Church? One must be sadly deficient in reasoning power who thinks the same principle operates in these two kinds of acts. Where is there Scriptural warrant that a collection of individuals, or of churches, or of all of them has a right to make such arrangements in "the Church which is His Body"? God and Jesus never gave them such authority. Our Pastor never formed a corporation that exercised such powers during his life, nor was it the Divine intention that he should, nor did he intend it. In Vol. VI, Chap. II, we gave over a dozen facts, as well as many Scriptures that prove that in our Pastor's day, never did a Society control such a general ministry toward and for "the Church which is Christ's body"; for God did that through that Servant alone; and the reason that He never did, nor now does it through a corporation is that the Church's work is now of such a kind as does not require such agencies to manage its general work. The Lord is now doing the general work of the Church, just as He did before the office of "that Servant" was created—through the non-apostolic General Elders of the Church, who hold the second and last office in the general Church (1 Cor. 12:28; Eph. 4:11-13; 2:20, 21; 3:5; F 244, 251, 253, 273, 274).

These Editors have had much to say for over a year about "self-constituted leaders" and "a self-appointed individual" getting control of the Church, meaning especially us. We have publicly asked them to point out one act of ours that lorded it over the Church. They failed to show this, because there was no such act committed by us, while we pointed out many such acts on the part of certain members of their Board and Editorial Committee. Their "political campaign" and "wire-pulling," whereby they disrupted the Fort Pitt Committee, and got some of themselves elected on another Committee with enlarged powers, was a work of self-appointment on their part for lording it over God's heritage. Their asking, through I.F. Hoskins

at the Asbury Park Convention, for their prospective Board powers like those of the W.T.B.&T.S. Board—powers much greater than those of the Fort Pitt Committee—was an act of self-seeking lordship over the Church. Their refusing to hold a convention at Philadelphia, and holding one at Providence, in a section of the country where they knew that they could get what they feared they could not get at Philadelphia, was an act of self-seeking lordship over the Church. The self-constituting and self-appointing are all on one side—on their side! Let them sweep the accumulated dirt from before their own doors; but not throw it in front of their neighbors' doors where it is clean.

A number of times (H '19, 101, 348, etc.) the Herald editors have referred to Z '15, 359 as a warrant from our Pastor for a corporation managing a general ministry toward and for the Church which is His Body. We want to say that in our dear Pastor's answers to the questions on that page by the Society he usually means himself, even as in Z '09, 292-294 he speaks of the Society, the Volumes and the Tower as "that Servant" and "the channel," thereby modestly hiding himself behind these names. Asked why we say that in Z '15, 359 *especially*, he, by the W.T.B.&T.S., modestly means himself, we reply that not only the facts of his controllership prove this, but connected with our British trip we learned certain things that go to prove that that article was written for the benefit of a number of British brethren, especially the three British managers. So greatly had these three disregarded his arrangements for the work in Britain that *he was planning to sever himself from all responsibility for the British Branch; and told two prominent American brethren of his plans to this effect*—a fact that we learned from their lips after our return from Britain. While we were in Britain, W.C. showed us a letter that our Pastor wrote to him, and that we feel morally sure was intended in harmony with our Pastor's tactfulness

to pave the way to that end. With some feeling that Servant told us at Dallas, Oct. 21, 1916, that the three British managers would not do what he wanted them to do; and said that at Brooklyn after Nov. 5 he would talk over details with us before our departure for Britain. While in Britain certain papers came into our possession that show some things that the managers had been doing, and that made it necessary for "that Servant" to remind them more than once that the Society, *i.e.*, himself, controlled the I.B.S.A., which is a British corporation. Because a number of the British brethren wanted the I.B.S.A. to be British-controlled, it became necessary for him to remind them that the Society—himself—controlled the I.B.S.A. and the P.P.A. Hence the article Z '15, 358-360 was written, and was among his final efforts to change the conduct of certain British brethren. How appropriate to the circumstances the statements there: "Thus the *whole management* is by the W.T.B.&T.S. [himself], and these auxiliary organizations merely help in carrying on *its* [his] work." ... "In other words the P.P.A. cannot transact business except through the W.T.B.&T.S. [himself]. The W.T.B.&T.S. [himself] has the management and the P.P.A. does the work—absolutely." While the Herald has repeatedly referred to that article as proving that the Society controlled the general work toward and for the Church as an evidence that it is in harmony with that Servant's teachings for a corporation to do such work, every person who knows the facts knows that the Society neither by its Board nor by its Shareholders, nor by both combined controlled that work; but that that Servant alone controlled it. Hence in that article through the term, The W.T.B.&T.S., when connected with the idea of management, he meant no one else than himself; and the Herald's contention on this point falls to the ground. Moreover, there are certain persons among them that know that their use of Z '15, 359

misrepresents the facts of the case, as to who controlled the work nominally carried on in the name of the W.T.B.&T.S.

Hence, as we pointed out in the above-mentioned chapter, while our Pastor arranged for the Society after his death to publish the Tower, in part to contain his reprinted and posthumous articles (the Charter and Will make no arrangements for pilgrims and conventions), and supply especially *his* writings for the edification of, and for distribution by the Truth people, and more especially for work toward the Virgins in Babylon and toward the world, the Divine intention therein was that such an arrangement be for the use of the Great Company. This is proved by the fact that immediately after that Servant's death, some who are now manifested as Great Company members, one-sidedly took the direction of the work into their hands, and with and for their leader by craft against guileless ones gained chief authority, and shortly afterward by usurpation got the Society entirely in the control of the Great Company (*in them as its representatives*) *where it will remain*. By His arranging through that Servant for the Society first to operate, as a self-acting body after his death, the Lord furnished us a sample of what every controlling organization among the Truth people should be *as a vehicle for Great Company work*. And the P.B.I., having prepared and adopted—and that, against repeated expostulations to the contrary—a largely changed corporational charter, have in this respect violated the Divine will, which in print they recognized as binding on controlling corporations among the Lord's people. Therefore we know that, as a part of the washing of their robes (Rev. 7:14; Num. 8:7), they will have to undo this wrong, and in its undoing give up the Charter that they caused to be drawn up and adopted. The zeal of the Lord of Hosts will accomplish this in due time!

One may ask why is it that in matters of the Little Flock, without any organization external to itself, yea, without even an unorganized committee, but, since the Apostles fell asleep, solely by the non-apostolic General Elders, the "Secondarily Prophets," the Lord has performed the whole general ministry toward and for the Church which is Christ's body; and yet has arranged for corporations limitedly controlled by seven Directors to do certain work for those parts of the Great Company who are Transitional Merarites and Gershonites? The answer is simple: the faithful Apostles and past faithful "Secondarily Prophets," having been fully dead to self and the world and fully alive to God, ministered the meat in due season, and guided the General Flock in the paths of Truth and Righteousness; and could not by any consideration be swerved therefrom. Therefore God has trusted each to do His work independently, except during the two reaping times, when He put the work into the charge of the Apostles and that Servant. Hence, apart from brotherly counsel and co-operation with one another, they needed no external body to enable them to fulfill the general ministry for and toward the Body of Christ. So, too, He does the same thing by the present faithful "Secondarily Prophets." But with the organizational leaders of the Great Company deadness to self and the world and aliveness to God are not complete (Jas. 1:8). Their selfish propensities, especially exercised in self-will, grasping for power, lording it over God's heritage, dividing the Flock and desiring to shine before others as able teachers and executives are so uncurbed by themselves, that not one of them alone can be trusted by the Lord with an unrestricted General Ministry. Through lodging controllership in seven Directors, the Lord, as it were, plays them off against one another to check, restrain, encourage and balance one another, so that they can as seven equally empowered brothers, at least in a manner, carry out the

organizational work of the Great Company, *whenever they do not allow any one of their number—e.g., as "the Steward"—to gain control.* As concerns the unorganized Levites, the Kohathites, their leaders, being also more or less rivalrously ambitious, fall out with one another, and form various unorganized groups, so far without much of a general ministry. As a proof of this note how A.I. Ritchie and M. Sturgeon, and later M. Sturgeon and Carl Olson, fell out with one another. The fourth group of the Transitional Kohathites, the antitypical Amramites, typed by the descendants of Moses, but not of Aaron (Num. 3:16; 1 Chro. 23:13-15), are not yet manifest, nor are their two leaders yet [Mar., 1920] manifest. We rather opine that they are among the Priests, and will fall out with them, and separate from the latter, and likely from others, too, those who with them are antitypical Amramite Kohathites. Of course, all of the Great Company leaders fall out with the Priests, otherwise there could be no separation of the Little Flock and Great Company.

Such falling out began in Britain, and has continued ever since. We notice that the Herald is assuming a very liberal tone; for after claiming to be a doctrinal clearing house, the P.B.I. now grants the right to its readers to judge its utterances and accept or reject them as seems to them proper in the Lord. In contrast with their former Papistical claims, their general tone, at least on paper, is now quite subdued. It is quite different from that of the doctrinal clearing house that they proposed to establish for the Lord's people in the last meeting of the Fort Pitt Committee, and that later they gave as the *first* specific reason for the formation of the P.B.I., the later expression being in the following language: "To act as a kind of a clearing house of whatever doctrinal matters that may be in circulation, or may be proposed for circulation among the Lord's People." (Committee Bulletin—6.) Since our review of their article, "The Object of an

Organization," they have been singularly silent in advocating the main purposes of their organization as set forth in that article. They have, on the contrary, been claiming that they do not stand for certain things—things which that article undoubtedly clearly advocated. Not that they have disclaimed that article, but being thrown very badly on the defensive by our exposures of its Papistical claims, they have been trying to paint their organization with more attractive colors than with what that Papistical article daubed and smeared it. They seem to want us to think that, like the Lion whose teeth and claws were pulled out, they are a very docile and harmless body. This is well and good, so far as it goes; but until they publicly confess their errors of teaching with reference to their purposes, which are clearly set forth in "The Object of an Organization," and which they have as such not yet clearly repudiated, and until they set aside the revolutionism of their Charter, the Lord's people should withhold from them even that support which they should give to *cleansed* Levites. What will they do about that article and their Charter? Will they publicly confess their errors and wrongs along these lines, promising betterment? Or will they continue to "cover their iniquity"? Whether they will obtain mercy from the Lord, or keep on without His special blessing, will, among other things, depend on what their course on these matters will be (Prov. 28:13).

In connection with their doctrinal clearing house proposition, they advocated their inaugurating pilgrim work, their appointing pilgrims, and their arranging for General Conventions; and have since arranged a pilgrim service, appointed pilgrims, additional to those who were pilgrims at the time of that Servant's passing beyond the veil, and called a number of conventions. Since the pilgrim office is that of the non-apostolic General Elders, the only servants of the Truth now living that have the right to address the

General Church on matters of faith and practice, and since God alone has the power to appoint such teachers in the General Church, which during the Harvest of the Jewish Age He did by Jesus, especially while the Latter was in the flesh, which during the Harvest of the Gospel Age He did by that Servant, and which during the intervening time He did entirely apart from human agents; unless others can show, as an authorization for their claim, a specific command from God, we will emphatically deny their right to appoint pilgrims to minister to the General Church, that Church which is His Body. They claim that they are appointing pilgrims to minister to the Little Flock as its General Elders. We ask them before God and the Church to show us their authority from the Word of God, or from the Will or Charter for such an exercise of power? Furthermore, they have exercised this, their claimed power, to exclude three Divinely-set pilgrims from serving as pilgrims in what they claim is at least a part of the Church which is His Body. We ask them for Biblical proof for such exercise of authority on their part. Such acts are emphatically lording it over the brethren. Will they pass these vital points by in silence as they have others of their unscriptural assumptions of power? Where in the Scriptures are they *as a Board* authorized to call General Conventions? While anyone who is a "Secondarily Prophet" in "the Church which is His Body" has, as long as there is no special eye, mouth and hand of the Lord officiating, by the powers of his office as a teacher in the General Church, the power to call a General Convention, no other servants of the Truth have such power. Those who were once "Secondarily Prophets," and who are now in the Great Company have neither part nor parcel in "the Church which is His Body"; hence cannot do anything implying membership therein, let alone do pilgrim work, and appoint pilgrims and General Conventions for "the Church which is His Body." Nor

as corporational members of the Great Company have they the right to appoint pilgrims and arrange for General Conventions for the Great Company.

But we imagine we hear some one ask: Did not that Servant arrange for the Society to appoint pilgrims and General Conventions? We answer, no; for both the Will and Charter, *which are the source and rule of corporational faith and practice for controlling corporations among Truth people*, are silent on such subjects, nor do they imply these rights. The Charter by Divine intention empowers the Levites to "disseminate [sow broadcast] Bible truths in various languages by means of the publication of tracts, pamphlets, papers and other religious documents, and by the use of all other lawful means (not "agents," animate beings, but "means," inanimate things, like the Photo-Drama, the Angelophone, etc.), which its Board of Directors, duly constituted, shall deem expedient for the furtherance of the purposes stated." Of course, this implies the use of "agents" to operate these means, but no others than such. Additionally, the Will authorizes a self-perpetuating Editorial Committee and a Sisters' Committee, in which vacancies were to be filled by it, the Directors and the Editors acting jointly. It authorizes no other class of mouthpieces. Therefore it is not a religious body; it is a body to publish and distribute Bible truths by inanimate means alone, through corresponding agents only. Let not the Levites act on the principle of the Papacy; and thus add to, or subtract from the source and rule of corporational faith and practice for the controlling corporations among Truth people! Such a course is dangerous and usurpatory! We, like the rest of the brethren, took this for granted from what existed in our Pastor's day; but now recognize such arrangements to be the Lord's for the Little Flock alone; and we trust that, like ourself, all the dear ones will come to see the matter aright.

We do not want, by the remarks foregoing, to be understood as teaching that the Lord will not give the Great Company pilgrim privileges; for we believe the Word of God will yet unfold a way in which this will be done; but when it will be unfolded, we rather opine that such pilgrim service will not be authorized by nor be under the auspices of Great Company Corporations and Associations. We may here remark that some of the Kohathites are giving Pilgrim services apart from such bodies. However, we can safely wait on the Lord for the clear manifestation of His will on this point. In the meantime, let us have done with doctrinal clearing houses, especially those claiming more than proper powers. Another point on which the P.B.I. teaches error is their insistence on following the modern Jewish calendar on the Memorial date. As we have covered this point in Note IV in Studies, Vol. VI, 733-736, we will pass it by here without further comment.

The high tide of confusion on Biblical topics and of misstating the writer's Scriptural interpretations is reached in the August Bulletin and F.H. Magee's "Brief Review" and "Letter of Importance," published as supplements of the August and September "Bulletins," respectively, in what the Committee has to say on the former's views on "prophets" in the Church. A brief discussion of the matter Scripturally will, therefore, be in place here. The word *prophet*, from the Greek *prophetes*, according to its Greek etymology, signifies one who gives discourses in writing or speech before others. These prophets are of two classes: (1) inspired (2 Pet. 1:20, 21; 2 Tim. 3:15-17); and (2) uninspired (Tit. 1:12; Acts 15:22, 32). There were inspired prophets in both Old and New Testament times (Jas. 4:10, 11; 1 Cor. 14:30). Their messages could be on abstract principles, or on events, persons and things past, present or future. The inspired New Testament prophets passed out of existence with the passing away of the gifts of the Spirit, early in the

Gospel Age (1 Cor. 13:9), never again to be revived during this Age. The word *prophet* is used for Gospel-Age purposes (1) in a general sense, including all, whether inspired or uninspired, who give discourses in the Church (Acts 13:1), whether they be (a) Apostles, like St. Paul; or (b) "prophets," like Barnabas, orators for the general Church and not restricted to a local church, but not plenipotentiaries with the power to bind and loose and to bestow the gifts of the Spirit, as the Apostles had; or (c) pastors or teachers like Simeon, Lucius, and Manaen, orators, whose office powers were limited to a local church, of whom 1 Cor. 14:29-32 also treats, where the subjection of the uninspired "preaching" local elders, called prophets, is required to be rendered to the inspired "preaching" local elders, called prophets, and therefore were required to give way, even in the midst of an address, to the latter, when these received a Revelation from God. And the word *prophet* is used for Gospel-Age purposes (2) in a special sense, including only the teachers of the general Church throughout the Age, who (apart from those of them who lived when the gift of prophesy prevailed, like Mark, Luke, Timothy, etc.) without inspiration, but by extraordinary illumination are qualified and authorized by the Lord's appointment alone, to give discourses in speech or in writing before the general Church, or on request of the body before any church or collection of churches, or representatives of any number of churches, as the peculiar function of their office (1 Cor. 12:28, 29; Eph. 4:11-13; 2:20; 3:5). 1 Cor. 12:28, 29 and Eph. 4:11 certainly cannot use the word "prophets" in the sense of a local elder who delivers discourses, for these are included in the terms, "pastors and teachers." The run of thought in these passages is clearly the following: The first order of Church servants is the Apostles, the Lord's (not a church's nor the Church's nor the churches') representatives and plenipotentiaries, whose

essential function in the teaching office is inspirationally and infallibly to instruct the general Church, throughout the Age. The second order of Church servants is the "Prophets," the Lord's (not a church's, nor the Church's, nor the churches') representatives (but not plenipotentiaries) whose essential function in the teaching office is (not by inspiration nor by infallibility, but) by special illumination to instruct the general Church (not restricted to a ministry in a local church) in their times. The third order of Church servants is the evangelists, sometimes the Lord's representatives (not plenipotentiaries) alone, at other times His and a church's or churches' representatives, whose essential function in the teaching office is to instruct (not the general nor a local Church), but outsiders and beginners in their times. The fourth order of Church servants is pastors and teachers, both the Lord's and the churches' representatives (not plenipotentiaries), whose essential function in the teaching office is to instruct (not the general, but) a local Church.

The facts of the New Testament, and of Church History from the beginning to the present, prove that there have been servants of the Church who filled an office in the general Church inferior to that of the Apostles, who were not elected to their office by a local church, nor by a collection of churches; and whose office, if not covered by the term, "Secondarily Prophets," would not be mentioned as a particular office in the Church at all; and, consequently, since Eph. 4:11-14 says the teaching officers of the Church were for the complete qualification of the saints, and complete the teaching organization of the Church, these brethren would not in their work have filled an office in the Church at all; nor would their work have been necessary for the complete qualification of the Church for the work of the ministry. What would this mean? It would mean, for example, that in the times just before

the Reformation, Marsiglio, Jandun, Occam, Wyclif, Huss, etc., did not as pre-Reformers sustain an official relation to the general Church at all, separate and distinct from that of evangelists and local elders, and were thus usurpatory busybodies and graspers for power, instead of being raised up, as general teachers, "Secondarily Prophets," and deliverers of Zion from Babylonian captivity. It would mean that Luther, Melanchthon, Zwingli, Latimer, Ridley, Cranmer, Servetus, Wesley, Stone, Miller, Russell, etc., did not as Reformers sustain an official relation to the general Church at all, separate and distinct from the office of evangelists and local elders, and were thus usurpatory busybodies and graspers for power, instead of being raised up as general teachers—"Secondarily Prophets"—and deliverers of Zion from Babylonian captivity. If the "prophets" of Eph. 3:5 include local elders who deliver discourses, St. Paul would not have singled them out, and placed them in association with the Apostles as having special light on the "mystery," since, among other reasons, frequently those local elders who do not "preach" know more about the mystery than not a few other local elders who do "preach," and if the term "prophets" in 1 Cor. 12:28, 29 and Eph. 4:11 means local elders that "preach," they would not be mentioned at all; for all local elders, whether they "preach" or not, are included in the terms "pastors and teachers." Moreover, it would be putting them too close, not only to the Apostles, but to the class of Church servants above-named in usefulness to include them in the term "prophets" in Eph. 2:20, where we are told that Church is "built upon the foundation of the Apostles and *prophets*, Jesus Christ Himself being Chief Cornerstone."

Up to the time of the Eagle trial, Bro. Russell thought the terms, "Apostles and Prophets," of Eph. 2:20, meant the Apostles and Prophets in their Biblical writings as the foundation of our faith. At that time

we asked him the question, Who are the "prophets" in Eph. 2:20? He replied, the writers of the Old Testament. We then asked whether the foundation stones of God's temple were not a part of the temple; and as such whether they do not refer to certain of the saints; and as such whether they do not represent the non-apostolic teachers of the general Church like Timothy, Titus, Apollos, Silas, Luke, Mark, Arius, Marsiglio, Luther, Wyclif, Wesley, Miller, "that Servant," the pilgrims, etc.? He thought a while and then answered: "Yes, you are right." Both the Scriptures and the History of the Church, therefore, from the beginning prove that there has been an order of teachers in the Church, selected by the Lord—not by the churches, nor by a church, nor by the Church—and dismissible by the Lord alone, and not by the Church, nor a church, nor the churches, whose ministry is not a local, but a general one. This office is referred to in 1 Cor. 12:28, 29, and Eph. 4:11, under the term, "Secondarily Prophets." Expressly using the term, "Secondarily Prophets," of them, our Pastor described them, etc., under the terms General Overseers, Channels and Elders, and "Prophets" in F 244, par. 2, 245, par. 1, 2, 251, 253, 273 and 274, especially 253 on Barnabas; Tower Reprints 732, pars. 13-15. There is a distinction among the secondarily prophets. Some of them, like Arius, Claudius of Turin, Luther, Zwingli, Wesley, Miller, Russell, the Epiphany Messenger, etc., as the Lord's special eye, mouth and hand have had a special charge toward the general Church and toward those secondarily prophets who have not been the Lord's special eye, mouth and hand, *i.e.*, the ordinary pilgrims. The former, as star-members, have been higher secondarily prophets than the latter, whom God has put in the charge of the star-membered secondarily prophets.

In their ministry, however, these prophets have no "rights" to control any church, churches or the Church. Nor have they a right to speak in any church, except

by request of that church. Their office by God's appointment authorizes and qualifies them for a ministry in any church; no church, churches nor the Church should permit them to force their ministry on them. Nor are they to force their ministry on a church; rather they are to wait until they are invited to serve, even as the Apostles had no right to minister in a local ecclesia, unless invited by it so to do. Since the death of the Apostles there is no other set of Church servants whose office authorizes and qualifies them to minister to the general Church than this set of Church servants. No church or collection of churches can, or ever did elect one of these servants to the office designated by the term "Secondarily Prophets," for the simple reason that no local Church nor collection of churches can give powers that they do not possess, the office of teachers in the general Church; and for the same reason no church nor collection of churches can dismiss him from his office, though they can vote to have or not have him serve them, just as they think best; and their decision is to rule in the matter; nor has a "Secondarily Prophet" a just ground for a grievance, if any church chooses not to have him speak in its midst. Thus the offices of Apostles and Prophets are not under the control of a local church, nor of the Church at large, so far as electing persons to, and authorizing and qualifying them for, or dismissing them from such offices, though each church has the power and right to permit or refuse their service in its midst. Thus the independence of the churches with respect to the service of the "Secondarily Prophets," and the independence of the "Secondarily Prophets" with respect to the control of their office are both vindicated. Such a prophet, while serving at the invitation of a church, is certainly subject to the decision of that church as to time, place and order of his service, as well as of his entertainment. He is not a lord over God's heritage, but a helper of their faith, hope, love and obedience; nor is the Church a lord over him.

As a representative of God, and not of them, he ministers to them unselfishly, to the Lord's glory and their profit. Nor should a local church dictate on what he is to speak, since he is God's representative to them. Of course, if such an one, in addition to his general ministry, becomes a local elder, he becomes as such, but not as one of the "Secondarily Prophets," subject to the local church with respect to the office that the ecclesia gave him; and he would be obliged to confine himself as a local elder to the ecclesia's regulations even on what he should teach or preach in the ecclesia.

During the end of the Age, as throughout the Age, God selected the "Secondarily Prophets" for the general Church. As in the Harvest of the Jewish Age God selected them by Jesus, so here He selected them (the pilgrims) by "that Servant." Between the Harvests, without a human agent, God directly put these members in the Body as "Secondarily Prophets," as it pleased Him so to do. No Committees of bishops, nor other Committees, nor Boards of Directors have ever appointed a "Secondarily Prophet" in "the Church which is His Body," though without the Divine authorization the Directors of the W.T.B.&T. Society have appointed "pilgrims" for antitypical Merarite Levites; and without the Divine authorization the P.B.I. Board has appointed "pilgrims" for antitypical Gershonite Levites. That God selected the pilgrims by "that Servant" is not to be doubted, because some did not turn out well, any more than we should doubt His selecting Judas by Jesus, though the former did not turn out well; nor should the issue of the fallibility or infallibility of the Lord's procedure through Brother Russell be raised, as F.H. Magee does, since the basis of his reasoning would necessarily lead to the conclusion that God by Jesus was fallible in selecting Judas. And just as another was chosen to fill Judas' place, so if any of the pilgrims proved unfaithful, another got his place; and thus there were full seventy by the end of the reaping, 1914, the reports, of 1913

and 1914 showing more than seventy being due to some auxiliary pilgrims being counted among them.

Among the offices in the Church, therefore, held since the Apostles fell asleep, the only one whose exclusive function it is to address the whole Church is that of the "Secondarily Prophets." Calling a General Convention is inviting, exhorting, encouraging the brethren generally to assemble for worship, study and fellowship in the Lord's Word and Spirit. But such inviting, encouraging, exhorting, pertaining as they do to matters of faith and practice, are a part of the functions of the "Secondarily Prophets" office, which alone since the Apostles' death can Scripturally address the entire Church on matters of faith and practice. Because of his special power as "ruler over His household" "that Servant" called General Conventions; just as in the Apostles' times they would have been the proper ones so to do, though there is no record of General Conventions held in those times. But as before "that Servant's" time, any star-member, like Luther, Wesley, Miller, etc., with propriety called General Conventions, so now a star-member can call them. When no star-member officiates the other kind of secondarily prophets, pilgrims, if necessity makes it advisable, may call a General Convention. Their calling it obligates no one to come, even as Bro. Russell's calling Conventions did not so do. No General Convention can give anybody a right to call a General Convention; for it has not the authorization to address the General Church on matters of faith and practice, and, therefore, cannot give what it does not possess.

When did the Lord give any church or collection of churches the right to address the entire Church on a matter of faith and practice? Whoever so does busybodies in the office of the "Secondarily Prophets." Even Bro. Russell was doubtful as to the propriety of local conventions, and only reluctantly after several years of refusal would send pilgrims to "local" conventions not under his supervision, and even then

expressed to us his doubts as to the Lord's will on the propriety of such conventions. We, therefore, find that the only office now filled by living persons in the Little Flock, having the Divine authorization necessary to address the whole Church on faith and practice, is that of the "Secondarily Prophets." Therefore, we conclude that only prophets of this kind can properly so do; and therefore the star-members among them, and whenever such do not officiate, any others of these prophets, may call a General Convention, whose calling necessarily in its exhortations, encouragements, etc., implies the exercise of the office that alone can bring matters of faith and practice before the general Church. It is for this reason that the writer feels himself authorized by the Lord, because of the conditions in the Church, to call General Conventions. The friends assembled, *e.g.*, at Asbury Park had not even been authorized by their home churches to empower a Committee to call these churches, let alone all others, to a convention; therefore, in addition to the above reasons, they could not give a Committee that power. According to the writer's understanding, therefore, a Committee as such cannot properly call such Conventions.

We never claimed, nor believed ourself to be a prophet who can by inspiration declare the future, etc., as F.H. Magee repeatedly intimates. At most, we claim to be but a fallible, uninspired prophetic student. If we have missed the mark in forecasting from certain Scriptures a few events, by the Lord's grace we have struck the mark in forecasting properly fifty times as many events based on separate passages and the parallel dispensations, as many brethren know; and like "that Servant" we humbly acknowledge our fallibility in forecasting certain things.

F.H. Magee claims in "A Brief Review," page 2, par. 1, that the "Secondarily Prophets" of 1 Cor. 12:28 ceased with the gifts of the Spirit. Paul thinks otherwise. He says (Eph. 2:11-13), "*until we all*

come," etc. So did "that Servant" (see Berean Comment on 1 Cor. 12:28). The former's treatment of this passage, we are sorry to note, is somewhat similar in spirit to his casting, *e.g.*, Elijah out of 2 Chro. 21:12, and that for no other reason seemingly than that his theory is upset by the verse; and, therefore, seemingly the passage must be "wrested," so as not to stand against his view. May we not in all love suggest to him that it may be well not to wrest the Scriptures and Scriptural thoughts as the average lawyer does an opposing counsel's brief? It is a more dangerous procedure so to treat God's Word! For such procedures are more than genuine "fanciful interpretations and wild speculations." They offer strange fire!

We add to the above some questions and answers on the "Secondarily Prophets."

Question:—If the Apostles are now teaching the Church through their writings, are we not to understand the "Secondarily Prophets" to be the Old Testament writers who teach the Church by their writings?

Answer:—The Old Testament writers are not teachers of the Church as members of it; because to be such teachers of the Church, they would have had to understand their message to the Church, and how to make it understood by the Church, and they would have had to share in membership in the Church—things that they did not do (1 Pet. 1:10, 11; Matt. 11:13; Col. 1:26; Heb. 11:39, 40); while to be Apostles and Prophets to the Church necessitates an understanding of the message and the ability to explain it (Eph. 3:5; 1 Cor. 14:6, 19, 22). Furthermore, to be one of these Prophets one would have to be a member of the Church, which is God's Temple and Christ's Body (Eph. 2:20, 21; 4:7, 11; 1 Cor. 12:27, 28; Rom. 12:5, 6); for since the foundation is a part of the building, antitypical foundation stones are parts of the antitypical Temple, which is not true of the Old Testament Prophets. Hence Eph. 2:20 cannot refer to them. Above we showed how during the Eagle trial

our Pastor recognized that the "prophets" of this passage, being foundation stones, must refer to the non-apostolic general teachers of the Church as parts of the antitypical Temple; because the Old Testament Prophets were not members of the Church. By the expression, "Secondarily Prophets," persons, not writings and teachings, are meant, just as, by the expression Apostles not writings and teachings, but persons are meant, even if they do teach us now by their writings, as also do some of the Secondarily Prophets, *e.g.*, Mark, Luke, etc.

Question:—If Eph. 4:11-13 proves that the Prophets were to continue in the Church, would it not also prove that the Apostles would be with us to this time, since the same thing is said of them as is said of the Prophets? If it applies to the Apostolic writings, might it not also apply to their prophetic writings, they being prophets as well as Apostles?

Answer:—If the basis of the questioner's reasoning were correct, it would prove that the Apostles are also meant by the expression "evangelists," "pastors and teachers," since the Apostles were also (using these words in their general senses) evangelists, pastors and teachers; and consequently the only ones referred to in this passage as edifying servants of the Church would be the twelve Apostles. The questioner's mistake is due to his not rightly dividing the Word of Truth (2 Tim. 2:15), as is done in the above discussion on the distinction as to the general and particular senses of the word prophet. In the general sense all the Apostles were prophets. But Eph. 4:11 uses the word prophets with particular reference to those whom 1 Cor. 12:28 calls "Secondarily Prophets." That the "prophets" of Eph. 4:11 are not the same persons as the "Apostles," referred to in the same verse, is evident from the Greek. The A.V. makes this sufficiently clear; the R.V. and the A.R.V. make it clearer: "And He gave some to be Apostles; and some, prophets," etc. The Improved Version

is the clearest of all: "And He gave some *as* Apostles, some *as* prophets," etc. The Greek expression, "*tous men*" and "*tous de*," prove that different persons are meant; for they are used to contrast the persons mentioned as separate and distinct. The Apostles, as the teachers of every member of the Body of Christ (John 17:20), could not exercise their office in person after they were dead; they had to do this through their writings. Nor are these writings prophetic as contrasted with apostolic; for it was an essential function of the Apostolic office to teach inspirationally, not only of abstract principles, but also of persons, events and things, it making no difference whether these were past, present or future. It is not an essential function of the "Secondarily Prophets" to teach every member of the Body of Christ; nor even every member of the Body of Christ living, while they exercise their office as "Secondarily Prophets"; rather, generally speaking, their office authorizes and qualifies them to be teachers in the general Church in their own times, though exceptionally through their writings some of them have instructed brethren living after their own times; *e.g.*, Mark, Luke, Marsiglio, Wyclif, Luther, Melancthon, Zwingli, Hubmaier, Wesley, Stone, Miller, Russell, etc. "That Servant" corroborates our understanding of this in F 244, par. 2, 245, par. 1, 2, 251, 253, 273, 274; Reprints, 732, pars. 13-15.

Question:—Why does The Present Truth omit the comma after the word "secondarily" in the expression, "Secondarily Prophets"?

Answer:—In the Scripture (1 Cor. 12:28) the comma is not placed between the words secondarily and prophets. And the fact that The Present Truth omits the comma is intended to imply that a comma does not belong there. As shown above, the word prophet for New Testament purposes is used both in a general and in a particular sense. In the general sense it includes all servants of the Church who have given inspired or uninspired discourses before others,

whether these be by the spoken word or the printed page. In the special sense it includes only the non-apostolic teachers of the general Church. Such teachers alone are meant by St. Paul when he writes, "Secondarily Prophets." And when The Present Truth is treating of such Prophets *only*, the Prophets in the Church in the particular sense of that word, it uses the expression, "Secondarily Prophets," to emphasize for the purpose of clearness that it means such Prophets *only*. The word "Secondarily" in this expression is a numerical adverb, not an attributive adjective, nor do we mean by the expression "*Secondarily* Prophets" to contrast such with (supposedly) primarily prophets. We simply use this Bible term "Secondarily Prophets" to indicate that we mean, not local prophets (orators in a local ecclesia), nor inspired men like the Old Testament prophets; but only the non-apostolic general teachers, the general elders, of the general Church. In other words, we use this term to prevent our being understood as meaning local elders who preach as local *prophets*. It is because the word prophet for New Testament purposes is used in the two above-mentioned senses, general and special, that we use the word "Secondarily" in connection with the expression "Prophets" to indicate that we are using the word prophet in its special sense exclusively, which exclusive meaning is conveyed in the expression "Secondarily Prophets" in 1 Cor. 12:28; for St. Paul by that expression means the non-apostolic general elders, overseers, teachers, of the general Church, and not the elders of local ecclesias who preach. We, of course, do not use in the quotation the word "*secondarily*" as an adjective to modify the word prophets. It is an adverb in 1 Cor. 12:28.

Question:—Are not the "Secondarily Prophets" (1 Cor. 12:28; Eph. 4:11) the seven angels of the Seven Churches of Rev. 1:20, etc.—*i.e.*, Paul, John, Arius, Waldo, Wyclif, Luther and Russell?

Answer:—In answering the question we will first

have to remove a misunderstanding in which the questioner is involved; that the seven angels represent seven individuals. While Vol. VII teaches this, evidently neither Scripture, Reason nor History so teaches (Z '16, 345, par. 5). It is evident from a little reflection on generally known facts, that two of these angels did not represent individuals. Therefore it would seem that the other five did not—*e.g.*, the angel of the Church in Ephesus. It is true that St. Paul was the most able, zealous, fruitful and favored servant of the Truth in the first epoch of the Church (2 Cor. 11:23-28); yea, he even had more especially "the care of all the [Gentile Christian] Churches," as St. Peter had more especially "the care of all the [Jewish Christian] Churches" (Gal. 2:7, 8). Yet these facts did not make him the only one constituting the angel of the Church in Ephesus. We are to recall that all twelve Apostles had and exercised the power of binding and loosing (Matt. 18:18; Acts 15:7-29). Therefore, at least twelve persons were included in the angel of the Church in Ephesus (Z '16, 346, par. 5). Turning to the angel of the Church in Philadelphia, we can also readily and clearly see that Luther alone was not that angel; for other Reformers, some of them contemporaries of Luther, were used by the Lord to bring forth Truth, as it was due, Truth which Luther in some cases opposed violently, *e.g.*, Zwingli brought forth some Truth on the Lord's Supper and Christ's Person for which Luther bitterly opposed him, even refusing him fellowship, because he believed, against his teaching, that Jesus' actual flesh and blood are received in the Lord's Supper and that His humanity is now omnipresent. Luther opposed the doctrine of the Millennium and of exclusive adult baptism, which Hubmaier taught against Luther's view. Servetus brought forth Truth on the unity of God against the trinity, as against Luther's doctrine; Wesley taught Truth on Sanctification vs. some of

Luther's errors thereon. Stone taught the separation of the Church and State, abolition of the creeds and the clergy class, etc., as against Luther's doctrines. Thus we see that Luther, though doubtless one of the leading ones in the angel of the Church in Philadelphia, did not alone constitute its angel. Our understanding of each of these angels, therefore, is that he represents the Apostles and *all* "Secondarily Prophets" who were the Lord's special eye, mouth and hand. Consequently, we would have to say that it would not be proper to say that the seven brothers mentioned in the question alone constitute the seven angels, though each one (John 17:20; Rev. 12:1) is a part of one of the seven angels. No one else than the Apostles and the special mouthpiece "Secondarily Prophets" seems to be included in these seven angels. These seven angels, therefore, include more than the seven mentioned in the question, thus a great deal more than the questioner thinks they include.

Question:—Why does The Present Truth so markedly emphasize the doctrine of the "Secondarily Prophets"?

Answer:—Because of the necessity of defending the Truth on the subject against the papistical claims (1) of the Society and (2) of the P.B.I. (1) The claims of the Society to be the exclusive channel for giving the seasonal meat, and for ruling the general work of the Church teach and imply that, except through its sanction and under its auspices, no one has a right to be a channel of communicating the Lord's message to "the Church which is His Body." Hence they claim that those of the pilgrims who were appointed through that Servant, and who are not laboring under its auspices have no right to be General Elders, *i.e.*, teachers of the general Church, "Secondarily Prophets." Therefore at the Asbury Park Convention we set forth the thought that, since the vacancy of the office of that Servant, pilgrims *in office at the time of his death* until a special eye, hand and

mouth of the Lord is appointed, have the right apart from the auspices of the Society to publish a Truth paper, engage in pilgrim work and call General Conventions for the General Church, because of their office as General teachers of the Church, "Secondarily Prophets" (1 Cor. 12:28; Eph. 4:11). We explained the doctrine exactly as our Pastor explains the doctrine of General Elders in the references above given. Accordingly, we concluded that the Society had no power to unpilgrim these pilgrims, since they received their office from God through that Servant and not through the Society. (2) We also drew from the doctrine the conclusion that no one now living other than such pilgrims has the right to do these three things, and that even these could not do them, if a special eye, mouth and hand were appointed in the Church. The latter conclusion greatly displeased certain members of the P.B.I. Committee, who had not been such pilgrims, *i.e.*, F.H. Magee and I.L. Margeson. Aug. 26, 1918, four of the P.B.I. Committee members, F.H. McGee, I.F. Hoskins, I.L. Margeson and H.C. Rockwell on the one hand, and on the other hand three former members of the Fort Pitt Committee, R.H. Hirsh, R.G. Jolly and ourself, engaged in a general debate on the activities and inactivities of the Fort Pitt Committee before the Philadelphia Church. On that occasion F.H. Magee, agreed with by his three colleagues, set forth the claim that no one had a right to do pilgrim work, unless he was authorized either by the Society *or by the P.B.I.*, and that we, being authorized by neither organization, had no right to the pilgrim office. Thereupon we again defended our right to that office, as Divinely appointed thereto through our dear Pastor, and therefore were not in this office subject to appointment or dismissal by any human organization. These expressions of ours at those two assemblies were *most violently misrepresented* by the P.B.I., especially through its mouthpiece, F.H. Magee, in his "Brief Review" and

"Letter of Importance." These misrepresentations led us to write the above on Prophets and "Prophets," and to touch on other phases of the discussion raised by the P.B.I., by publishing the above questions and answers as replies to their further objections. We are satisfied that our understanding of the subject is that of the Scriptures and of that Servant.

On the subject of the advancing light the attitude of the P.B.I., as on other subjects, has been "unstable as water" (Gen. 49:4). At first they claimed that our Pastor gave all the light that was to be expected, and that the Epiphany light means nothing more than that his writings will become clearer to the brethren in those parts that they did not previously understand. Latterly they have been admitting that on some of the prophecies, especially in the Revelation, more light may be expected. We congratulate them on this change of opinion, even though we cannot agree with much of what they think is advancing Truth, and believe much of what they reject as error to be advancing Truth. We are in heartiest accord with what they quote from an address of our Pastor to the pilgrims at the Celeron Convention (H '19, 117) against "manufacturing" "new light." Nor is there any other editor among the Truth people who adheres to our Pastor's charge on this subject more closely than ourself; for we wage uncompromising war against such "manufactured" "new light," as our readers know; and avoid accepting it and incorporating it into our teachings and writings. And contrary to the misrepresentations of the P.B.I., in our use of types we confine ourself almost exclusively to those to which the Scriptures and our dear Pastor give us the clue. They have been *railing* against us as indulging in "fanciful interpretations and wild speculations." Let them prove their charge, if they can! We have defended our dear Pastor's interpretations against "fanciful interpretations and wild speculations," as all our readers know, against those whose presentations seem to be used by

the Adversary to the bewildering of the Lord's Flock, whether they have been doing this against the Parousia or Epiphany Truth, or whether they have been doing this against the Lord's Arrangements, Charter and Will given through that Servant. Nor have we had the least hesitation to do this against the opposition of almost all leaders singly or combinedly among the Lord's people; and, please God, we will continue so to do, until they cease from their false doctrines and their revolutionism!

Of course we have been the particular target at which the P.B.I. has been shooting its "arrows" on "fanciful interpretations and wild speculations." To date none of their arrows have struck the mark, we only hear them whiz by! The particular charge that they file against us is our claim that now in the Epiphany there is much Truth becoming due, and that the Lord is pleased to use The Present Truth in giving much of it to the household. We pity the chargers, (1) because they saw some of it, and now have lost it; and (2) because they are now accepting many old "fanciful interpretations and wild speculations" of "foolish virgins" as advancing light, "manufactured" "new light." Such has always been the course of Truth repudiators. There must be something spiritually wrong with such repudiators. Why should there not in the Epiphany be such advancing light given as will enable the saints to do their Epiphany work, just as in the Parousia there was such advancing light given as enabled the saints to do their Parousia work? In the Epiphany the main works of the Priesthood are to lead Azazel's Goat in its two parts, *i.e.*, both (1) among the Truth people and (2) among the nominal people of God from the door of the Tabernacle to the Gate of the Court; and to do much toward the Levites, the New Creatures of those whose humanity is represented by Azazel's Goat (Lev. 16:20, 21; Num. 8:9, 13; 4:5-15, 27, 28, 33; 7:1-8). Then the Priesthood has a work to do toward the Youthful Worthies, also shown in

some of the above references; toward the antitypical Jehoram of Judah (2 Chro. 21:12-15); toward the antitypical Herod, Herodias and Salome (Ps. 91:13; Rev. 15:2; 20:4); as well as the work of avoiding doing anything toward antitypical Jehoram of Israel, Jehu, Ben-hadad and Haziel. Hence they must learn things about these different classes that they did not know during the Parousia, in order to act toward them as Epiphany conditions require of the Priesthood. The fact that the P.B.I. Board and Editors are blind to these Truths does not make them non-existent; rather it is a proof that they are not in priestly harmony with Epiphany conditions, and hence cannot co-operate with the Priests in doing the latters' Epiphany work. Our well-meant and arduous efforts to help them to remain in priestly harmony with Epiphany conditions, while we were yet with them, were fruitless; because, unknown to us, their time to be manifested as Levites had come. We comfort ourselves with the reflection that after they have properly undergone the experiences of Num. 8:7, and in part those of Rev. 7:14, they will recognize and appreciate our efforts that now seem to them to be unkind. That the Priests recognize them as Levites is due to the fact that the latter as Levites stand before the former as Priests, *being set as Levites before the Priests by the antitypical Moses* (Num. 8:14). Presently recognizing themselves as antitypical Levites they will see the Priests as such. Then all will rejoice at God's special grace and mercy to the Priests, and His less special grace and mercy to the Levites (Rev. 19:7, 8). Just and true are Thy ways, Thou King of Saints (Rev. 15:3)!

We have been an interested reader of the Herald's series on "The Revelation of Jesus Christ." We are glad to note in it the absence of the pronouncedly papal spirit that characterized the article on The Object of An Organization, that was reviewed in Chap. III, and that characterized the P.B.I.'s course for some time. We also are glad to note that the "threatening"

and "channel" spirit of Vol. VII is likewise wanting in the Herald's series. Taken all in all we think that so far as this series has progressed, *i.e.*, into Rev. 14—the Herald's treatment of the book is somewhat better in contents, and is much better in spirit than is that of Vol. VII, covering the same chapters. Further, we should say that this series and Vol. VII are very much better in our judgment than Carl Olson's Treatise covering the same chapters. We are indeed glad to make these acknowledgments, because we find it necessary to offer some necessary criticisms, which we present to the brethren for consideration.

(1) We note that the writers of this series do not have the key to the book. Nowhere do they mention it, and they give not a few interpretations that they would not give, if they had the key. This lack makes the series as a whole unconnected in its contents and makes its interpretations fail to be self-demonstrative. Hence it leaves a student of the book in uncertainty and unclearness on many points.

(2) Not infrequently finer features of the Revelation are not expounded at all. This is probably due to the writers' not understanding these features, which they accordingly pass by without mention. Why did they not follow our Pastor's example: not publish at all until all is clearly understood?

(3) An indecisiveness of treatment characterizes not a few of their statements, which is doubtless due to their uncertainty. Had they the key, and were it due time to expound the book, this and the preceding criticism would have been unnecessary; for these blemishes would not then have occurred in the series.

(4) We feel satisfied that the presentation of many unprofitable interpretations of various conflicting, and, to most Truth people, unknown views of writers not in the Truth, after the manner of many nominal-church commentators, is quite confusing to most of the Herald's readers among Truth people. We instance

the confusion on the treatment of the seven-headed and ten-horned beast.

(5) Of not a few details and of large sections—*e.g.*, the first and second woes—they certainly give misinterpretations. The mixing of the literal and symbolic in the interpretations of these woes is sure proof of their erroneousness. If they had the key, they would not have interpreted Rev. 9:1-21 of the Saracens and Ottoman Turks. Nor would they have seen Mohammed as the star having the key to the bottomless pit. Their interpretations of these two woes are those accepted by Adventists of various Schools, and by others, "Foolish Virgins"!

(6) They sometimes, though not usually, we are glad to say, favor the interpretations of others above those of that Servant, yet after the manner of fence straddlers they shift from one side to the other. This is particularly manifest in their treatment of the two witnesses, where they try to make it appear that our Pastor favors the view that they accept from "Foolish Virgins," while our Pastor taught, as also Rev. 11:13 shows, that the three and a half days in which the witnesses were dead were during the French Revolution, which, however, the Finished Mystery does not correctly explain. Dr. Gordon's comment on Solomon (H '20, 74) is another example to the point.

(7) The greatest blemish in the Herald's exposition of Revelation is its adopting many wrong interpretations of "Foolish Virgins." Interpreters like Elliott, Barnes, Guinness, Gordon, etc., were not Wise Virgins. The first two God did not favor with a place in the cleansed sanctuary, and the last two, living in the Harvest, God did not favor with the Parousia Truth. The Herald speaks much of their godliness. Of whatever character it was it was judged by the Lord as unworthy of recognition for reward with the special favor of the meat in due season from 1829 onward; hence they were not Wise Virgins; and therefore Priests should not look to them for Scriptural

interpretations, however much these "Foolish Virgins" may strike Levites as being specially enlightened and godly. In the Herald Editors' offering with their endorsement some of the vagaries of these "Foolish Virgins" as a true interpretation, they prove both their spiritual kinship with these "Foolish Virgins," and their Levitical standing before the Lord, in that thereby they offer strange fire before the Lord. While of course we are to use the facts of history, etc., that such and other scholarly men furnish us, we are not to accept their interpretations of these facts as taught by the hidden things of the Scriptures; unless they are true; and their few true ones they were not the first to see; for not seeing the deep things clearly they could not correctly explain them.

The Herald speaks much of the Historical School of Interpreters of Revelation, and claims that our Pastor was a member of that School. This we deny, though, of course, he held that its fulfillment was largely in the past. It is true that here and there glimpses of Revelation as some aspects of its features were due to be understood before 1874 were seen by the Faithful before 1874, and that detached parts of these glimpses were seen by others from the presentations of the Faithful; yet these views were very imperfect before 1874, even as the structure of the book shows that they would be. We might compare the increasing light on Revelation shining on the Faithful before 1874 to the increasing visibility of a high mountain to persons traveling toward it, from the time of their first catching a glimpse of it, as a speck on the horizon, until they can indistinctly make out its general outlines, however, without their perceiving and distinguishing clearly its varying parts, and their relations to one another. The "Foolish Virgins" at best could, with much intermingling error, perceive but parts of what the Wise Virgins saw. From 1874 onward the details of the Revelation come out more and more to the view of the Wise Virgins, while during

that time the Foolish Virgins, including Drs. Guinness, Gordon, etc., have wandered in "nocturnal hallucinations" on the Revelation, as well as on many other Biblical subjects. Whatever light any of those brothers had our Pastor had, minus the vagaries that they cherished, and plus all the rest of the seasonal light that they did not have. Hence it is wholly unnecessary and unprofitable, yea injurious for edification for the Priesthood to study what they offer; but it is necessary and profitable for their edification to study what he offers. Nor did he get his information from the Historical School of Interpreters of Revelation. He received it from the Lord by special illumination. Great indeed is the guilt of the Herald Editors for their offering their readers the "delusive phosphorus" flashed forth by these "Foolish Virgins" as genuine light.

As that Servant (A, 12) passed by the "embalmed" and unclean doctrinal meat of the theologians and creeds, and brought forth the doctrinal meat in due season out of the Divine storehouse, so did he also do with respect to the book of Revelation. And as he declared that, apart from brief explanations and the Sunday School Lessons, he stopped during the eighties writing on the book, because in attempting to open various of its parts he found himself making mistakes, from which he learned that much in the book was not yet due; so we could not expect Drs. Guinness, Gordon, etc., at that and a later time to get the meat, not yet due, from the storehouse, which in 1879 was put into "that Servant's" charge. Therefore the Herald's suggestions to use its articles for Berean Studies on the Revelation, we fear, will lead to further darkening of its readers' minds on that book; for the series on "The Revelation of Jesus Christ" contains many "fanciful interpretations and wild speculations," and thus offers strange fire before the Lord. Strange as at first thought it might seem, it is to be expected that brethren who have represented a true teacher of

God's people to be a self-exalted and self-appointed teacher of subtle error, and of "fanciful interpretations and wild speculations" should go so far astray in these very particulars (Rom. 2:1). Our Pastor suspended Bro. Toole from the pilgrim staff for 20 months from Jan., 1915, to Sept., 1916 (while Jordan was receiving its first smiting) because he, though on a comparatively small scale, was spreading some published views of "Foolish Virgins" among the brethren. Should we be surprised that for and by a worse form of the same offense the Herald Editors now are by God being publicly manifested as cut off from the Priesthood (Lev. 10:1, 2)?

We imagine that some will say, Why do you criticize the Herald's articles on the Revelation; and at the same time offer nothing in their stead? This is a reasonable question; and to it we give three answers:

(1) We believe that it is the Lord's will that the Levites be given a rather free hand first to present, among other things, their views on Revelation; and that only afterward will He furnish through some Priest the proper interpretation of the book, and thus will give another manifestation of who are Levites and who are Priests.

(2) We believe that the Lord wants the true interpretation of the book to be deferred until all of His people will have such experiences as will make the true interpretation of that book a refreshment and blessing to all of them, and not a matter of controversy and heartaches to nearly all of them. Hence apart from a few detached references we are silent on features of that book not previously understood.

(3) Our beloved Pastor said that, until Rev. 17:9-11 would be fulfilled, he would not write Vol. VII, *i.e.*, write his long promised exposition of the book of Revelation for the Church. This answer implies that he considered it to be the Lord's will that he should not write that exposition *before the symbolic earthquake*. In answer to a question as to why he

had not yet written Vol. VII, he, in 1916 in the Bethel dining room, told the family that there were a number of things in the Revelation that were not yet clear to him, and that until they did become clear to him, he would not write that book. He then instanced the following four things especially that he did not understand: (1) The key of the book, (2) the 1600 furlongs, (3) the number of the Beast's name (though he had previously expressed himself as favorable to the interpretation offered nearly 100 years ago on the name on the Pope's crown), and (4) the seven-headed and ten-horned beast of Revelation 17, particularly verses 9-11. He further declared that he did not believe that the last point would be certainly understood until verses 9-11 had been fulfilled. Then, he added, he would write the book as an explanation of *past events*, which would demonstrate the correctness of his understanding. If the writers of the three explanations that since his death are being set forth before God's people—according to our understanding, Merarite, Kohathite and Gershonite explanations of the Revelation—had followed our dear Pastor's announced intention on this point, they would not have offered so much strange fire before the Lord; nor deceived so many of God's people; nor brought so much needless reproach and injury upon His Truth, so much sufferings upon His people, and so much properly avoidable disapproval of our Pastor's memory. What a fearful thing it is to run ahead of the Lord. Let us learn to "wait on the Lord!"

If in the providence of God it ever becomes our privilege to write an exposition of the Revelation for the Church, it will be in keeping with the spirit of the above-announced intention of that faithful and wise Servant.

In the April, 1937, issue of the Dawn, pages 9-14, is an article that, without mentioning us by name, attempts to refute our teaching on the reaping

as ending by Oct., 1914, and the gleaning in 1916, and to prove that the reaping is still going on and will continue up to very shortly—probably less than a year—before the last member of Christ's body goes beyond the veil. The question of the end of the reaping is one of such vast practical importance, that we may be sure that the God of wisdom, justice, love and power would not let it remain in uncertainty for His faithful children; for if the reaping is still going on, the priesthood should and would be engaged in it, and their ceasing from it and their working toward Azazel's Goat would be detrimental to the Truth, very reprehensible in the Lord's sight and a gross wrong against those consecrating since Oct., 1914; and on the other hand, if the reaping is finished, the attempt to continue to engage in an alleged reaping work would be detrimental to the Truth, reprehensible in the Lord's sight and a gross wrong, whose fatal consequences we will show later on, against those consecrating since Oct., 1914. The issues being so very important, we may be certain that our loving Father has spoken on this subject in no uncertain terms, that those who are walking in the light may see in this respect just what is "that good and acceptable and perfect will of God." We have often written on this subject and each time, besides the former arguments in defense of our position, we have given new ones, even as should be expected to be the case in view of the fact that "the path of the just is as a shining light that shineth more and more unto the full [not perfect] day" (Prov. 4:18). But in this chapter we will not repeat our former arguments, which number 56, and which the reader will find in Studies, Vol. III, 387-404. Rather we will give seven new ones and then answer the Dawn's contentions on the reaping still continuing. Let it not be forgotten that the Dawn is largely the P.B.I. masking under another name. Their and the P.B.I.'s pertinent view is the same. Our new reasons follow:

(57) The unfolding of the Epiphany Truth beginning in 1916 proves that previously the Parousia Truth had been completed, and hence had done its work of reaping the Church. (58) Is. 52:8 tells us that while the Lord would be gathering His Little Flock out of Babylonian captivity, which was accomplished by the reaping and gleaning work, the watchmen (pilgrims, auxiliary pilgrims, evangelists and elders) would see eye to eye, which was the case up to Passover, 1916. But since 1916 in England, since 1917 in America, and then thereafter, throughout the world, these watchmen have more and more come into disagreement. And since their agreement was to last until the reaping and gleaning were to be finished ("when the Lord shall bring again Zion"), and since now they greatly disagree, and that beginning in 1916, the reaping and gleaning must have been finished early in 1916, when their seeing eye to eye began to end. (59) Our Lord's prophecy (Luke 13:24-27) has for twenty years been fulfilling; in that many unbegotten consecrated ones (v. 24) have been seeking for admission to the high calling in vain, and that because the door is shut (v. 25); and in spite of their claims of being students of Jesus' words and that His teachings are in harmony with their ways [streets] (vs. 26, 27), He tells them that He has never recognized them as Body members (vs. 25, 27), which He is telling them through the above-given and other proofs that the reaping ended by Oct., 1914, and the gleaning by Passover, 1916. (60) The teaching that the high calling is still open to new aspirants *after the destruction of antitypical Sodom began (Sept. 21, 1914)* is the false doctrine (wine) with which antitypical Lot's two daughters (certain Youthful Worthies and tentatively justified ones) made antitypical Lot (uncleansed Great Company members) symbolically drunk (reeling with error, Gen. 19:30-38), which consideration

is another proof that the reaping ended by Oct., 1914, and the gleaning by Passover, 1916. (61) The incestuous union between Lot and his two daughters types the symbolically incestuous cooperation of pertinent error-blinded Great Company members and high-calling-claiming Youthful Worthies and high-calling-aspiring tentatively justified ones in efforts to produce others of ambitions like those of the two antitypical daughters, which symbolic incest would not be committed, if the high calling were still open to new aspirants. (62) The consequent invariable production of antitypical Moabites and Ammonites, and not antitypical Hebrews from all such cases of antitypical incest, proves that the reaping ended by Oct., 1914 [just before antitypical Sodom began to go into destruction] and the gleaning by Passover, 1916. (63) The fact that such antitypical incest-participating Youthful Worthies and tentatively justified ones and their incestuous offspring lose all standing with the Lord and can get no higher than restitution (Deut. 23:2-6), proves their theory of the high calling as still open, and as having been so even after antitypical Sodom began to go into destruction, Sept. 21, 1914, is wrong and proves that the reaping ended by Oct., 1914, and the gleaning by Passover, 1916. Please note that we hold that the Harvest in its *wide* sense, *i.e.*, as including the drying, threshing, winnowing, sifting and garnering processes, is still going on. It is the Harvest in the narrow sense of reaping and gleaning and sheaving that we claim was ended, the first by Oct., 1914, and the second and third by Passover, 1916.

To justify the view of some on the reaping beginning in 1878 and ending in 1918, certain ones continually cite our Pastor's article in the Sept. 1, 1916 Tower, entitled, "The Harvest [Reaping] Is Not Ended." But that article neither gives the date 1878 for the reaping's beginning, nor 1918 for its ending, nor does it hold to the 40 years' length of the reaping: In

two places in that article our Pastor mentions 1918 but he does it to point out *wrath parallels as to the nominal Jewish Church and as to the nominal Christian Church*, and rightly denies that these Dispensation Parallels (*not the harvest Parallels*) affected real Fleshly and Spiritual Israels, and therefore denies that they point out the reaping's end in 40 years from its start. The point that he is discussing is not the reaping of saints, but the punishments of the two nominal houses. These references are found in Z '16, 264, col. 2, pars. 2 and 6. Nowhere else in the article does he mention 1918, and anyone who will confuse a wrath feature in the Parallels with a grace feature, such as reaping is, is either ignorant, or confused, or dishonest on the subject. Our Pastor expressly states in the article that he did not know when the Gospel Harvest, reaping, would end—"We know no time limit here." On page 263, in par. 2 of the article, he gives two reasons why he changed his mind on the Harvest ending in 1914. The first of these is that too many new creatures were coming into the Truth to constitute a gleanings. The Lord for very wise reasons, withheld from him the understanding that the bulk of these new creatures were antitypical Lot, crown-losers, escaping from antitypical Sodom in America before it here would begin to go into destruction.

The second of these reasons, also given in that paragraph, is that he thought that during the smiting of Jordan, which he expressly said in the next paragraph would take at least three years, grains of wheat would be won. Hence he thought that the reaping might go on at least until the Fall of 1919, if not longer. But in the last paragraph referred to he cautions the brethren to keep in mind that he expressly refrains from giving a date for the end of Jordan's smiting and of what he expected to be its reaping work, saying that he knew of no time features for the Church beyond the date of his writing, giving Elijah's

and Elisha's going to no definite place as the proof thereof. Hence he does not in this article fix April, 1918, nor any other date, as the end of the reaping. April, 1918, as the reaping's end, is a pure guess, contrary to his express teaching. When our Pastor says (Z '16, 264, col. 2, par. 2) that "the 3½ years of Jesus' ministry were *more* [italics ours] a time of preparation of the Apostles to be instruments for the harvesting and a sharpening preparation of the sickle of Truth for the later work which *began* at Pentecost," he certainly tells the truth; but the very terms that he uses prove that while the pre-Pentecostal work was such mainly—"more"—it was not such exclusively, but was on a smaller scale another work, *i.e.*, a reaping work, as his cited Scriptures and facts prove.

Bro. Russell in the article under discussion (Z '16, 264, par. 5) expressly states that 1874 was the beginning of the harvest time and work: "*ever since then* [1874] a new song [the harvest message] has been in the mouths of the Lord's people, as they have learned of His goodness through the Divine plan of the Ages." This passage shows that the Lord's people had been doing harvest work ever since 1874. But note the sophistry that is used to evade our Pastor's plain teaching here, that the harvest message began to be proclaimed ever since the end of the 1335 days—1874! It is that 1874 was the date for the beginning of the harvest *time*, but not of the harvest *work*. The fact that "ever since then [1874], a new song was in the mouths of the Lord's people," *i.e.*, ever since 1874 they were preaching the harvest message, proves that ever since 1874 they have been doing harvest work; for what was harvest work but singing the new song (Rev. 15:2-4), preaching the harvest message? Hence that distinction applied here is sophistry, contradicting our Pastor's given date and what had also been done since that date. When the time comes for God to do a thing, God does it

promptly, as in this case it is expressly shown in Rev. 14:15: "*Thrust* in Thy sickle and *reap*; for the time TO REAP [to do harvest work] is come, for the harvest of the earth is ripe." If one stresses our Pastor's statement on Jesus' resurrection "*before the Church* harvesting began" as a proof that reaping began at Pentecost, 33 A.D., and hence that our harvesting began in 1878, we reply two things: (1) Since the article under review denies any Dispensation parallels between the work toward Israelites indeed in the Jewish Harvest and Spiritual Israelites in the Gospel Harvest after Nisan, 16, 33 and 1878, our Pastor could not have meant this remark to be taken to prove the Gospel *Harvest* to have begun at Pentecost, 1878. (2) Of course, *Church* harvesting could not have begun before Pentecost, for that very term implies the gathering of new creatures as *the Church*, of whom, except Jesus, there were none until Pentecost. But the reaping of Israelites indeed, beginning with our Lord, the first grain of wheat (John 12:24) and proceeding with the apostles, the 70 and others, until at least 500 disciples were gathered (1 Cor. 15:6), continued from Oct., 29 A.D., to Pentecost without new-creatureship, except in the case of our Lord Jesus Christ. Our Pastor rightly denied that the Dispensations' Parallels acted toward real fleshly Israel after 33 and toward real Spiritual Israel after 1878. While these did not then work, the harvest Parallels operated from 29 to 69 and from 1874 to 1914. The failure to note the difference between these two kinds of Parallels is the occasion of the above-refuted confusion on this matter.

Bro. Russell's article under discussion does not give up 1874 as the date of the reaping's beginning. It asserts it as the date of such. Nor does it deny Oct., 29 A.D., as the date for the beginning of reaping the Jewish Harvest. What the article denies is that the Jewish Harvest ended in 69 A.D., and the Gospel Harvest in 1914. It claims that in each case the reaping

went on indefinitely beyond these respective dates. In other words, the article repudiates the 40 years as the reaping's duration. In this repudiation our Pastor, when a sick, weakened and dying man, gave up a truth that when in better health and consequently in better intellectual strength he Scripturally and factually proved to be true, as did also the Edgar Brothers. The fact that this repudiation occurred after 1914, at which time the Little Flock developing Truth was completely free of error, proves it to be a mistake, since the two involved truths are Little Flock developing truths. Hence we hold to the pertinent presentations of our Pastor taught by him faithfully years before and for nearly two years after Oct., 1914.

Having pointed out and refuted the two main ways that our opponents seek to evade some of our 63 proofs (most of them they ignore; and of some of them they are ignorant), we will now take up the points that the April, 1937, Dawn offers in answer to some of our proofs and in alleged proof of its view. To the argument that new [post-1914] consecrators who have learned the Parousia Truth and its offers of the high calling [which it made *to certain only* of the consecrators] and who have applied these to themselves without having investigated the question as to whether such promises apply now to any or all consecrators or not, but who have actually assumed against the Divine Word (of whose pertinent teachings they are doubtless ignorant) that they apply to them, consider that God led them up to such views and would be slamming the door in their face, if He were to deny them the high calling, we reply: We rejoice that God opened their eyes to see the Parousia Truth and to consecrate; but even if this had taken place during the last 33 years of the Parousia time, *i.e.*, from Oct., 1881, up to Oct., 1914, it would not necessarily imply that they were offered the high calling; for, as our Pastor shows (F 156, 157), and as the

Bible proves, after the general call ceased only certain ones of the consecrators were Spirit-begotten, and the rest became Youthful Worthies, to be associated with the Ancient Worthies as princes during the Millennium (Vol. IV, Chap. V). But since the reaping ended, *i.e.*, since the Epiphany began, nobody is any more favored with the Spirit-begettal. It is the misfortune of such consecrators that, ignorantly indeed, they, against God's Word as now due, applied to themselves the Parousia promises that then applied to a limited number of the consecrators only, and that no longer, during the Epiphany, apply to anybody; but if their hearts are right, the Lord will show them that the Youthful Worthies' hope is theirs, and that He did not "*slam the door close in their face*" but closed it when due, which left many outside who wanted to come in, but could not (Luke 13:24-27).

Later in the article under review, reverting to this point, it implies that God authorized such hopes in these new consecrators' hearts, quoting as proof our Pastor's words, "The Lord is too loving and too just to *authorize* [italics ours] in the hearts of any hopes that could never be realized." To this we say heartily, Amen! and add that God never authorizes in the hearts of any *hopes that are contrary to His Word*. And since His Word in the 63 proofs above given shows that no new invitations to joint-heirship with Christ are given since Oct., 1914, He did not authorize such hopes in the hearts of consecrators since then. These have imagined or have been mistaught such an authorization without waiting to get light, proving that God did not authorize in them such a hope. To the claim that a proper understanding of the door shows that Luke 13:24, 25 does not apply now and to such consecrators, we reply that the 63 proofs given above prove that it does apply since Oct., 1914.

As to their thought that according to our Pastor the

door means opportunities to enter into suffering with our Lord in proclaiming the Gospel, which they claim is still being done, and for which they claim the high calling is still open to new consecrators, we make several replies: (1) Our Pastor taught that the door means three things: (a) the entrance into consecration and Spirit-begettal for high calling purposes; (b) the entrance into suffering with Christ for preaching the harvest message as due; and (c) the entrance into the Kingdom. The door in the first two senses is closed; but the door in the third sense is still open. It is especially to the sophistry of the article on point (b) that we desire to call attention. Rightly did our Pastor, in speaking in Studies, Vol. III of the door in sense (b), which he calls the door of opportunity, say that as long as there will be opportunities of entering into the privilege of suffering with Christ *for doing harvest work* the opportunity to enter the high calling [sense (a)] will be open. By doing such work he meant reaping the saints exclusively. How do we know this? Because when he wrote this thought in Studies, Vol. III, *i.e.*, between 1889 and 1891, he held that reaping was the final work ahead of the Church on earth and would be finished just before the Time of Trouble would begin. Hence he meant that when the reaping would be completed it would be impossible for new ones to enter into suffering with Christ.

We repeat it: When he spoke of closing the door of opportunity making it impossible for new ones to enter opportunities of suffering with Christ in preaching the Gospel, *he meant the end of opportunities for new ones to do reaping work*; for when he discussed that question in Studies, Vol. III (the witness work to the world being then only incidental to harvesting), reaping was the only way of preaching the Gospel to others not in the Truth of which he then was aware as an unfinished work for the priesthood in the flesh. Hence, according to his view, after the reaping was finished

there would be no more opportunity for new ones to enter into suffering with Christ, which implies that the door in sense (a) and means that the door in sense (b) would then be closed. But the reaping being ended in 1914 and the gleaning in 1916, no new aspirants could enter the high calling, since it was thereafter impossible for new consecrators to enter into opportunities to suffer with Christ, since this could be done only in connection with a work forever ended in 1914. By the above we, of course, do not mean that there would be no more proclaiming of the Truth after the reaping was over, nor opportunity for the Church, fully gathered, to suffer with Christ (though it could no longer be done in reaping); for certainly other than reaping work is needed in the priesthood, *e.g.*, for upbuilding one another and for dealing with the Great Company and Youthful Worthies, and in the Great Company and Youthful Worthies for service to the Church, to one another and to the world. But the sufferings associated with such work are not associated with reaping work, though, thank God, they are often instrumental in inducing consecration, *i.e.*, unto Youthful Worthship. Hence the opportunity of new consecrators entering into suffering with Christ being forever ended with the end of reaping work, new aspirants since Oct., 1914, have had no chance of entering into suffering with Christ. Thus the sections of Studies, Vol. III that they cite in favor of a present reaping work refutes their thought and corroborates our view.

The Dawn's claim, necessary for its theory, that as we get closer to the end of the Church's career new consecrators become fewer, is not in harmony with facts, for tens of thousands (Youthful Worthies) have consecrated in the last few years and are increasingly so doing, *e.g.*, in the last nine years in the Epiphany movement about 5,000 Youthful Worthies consecrated in Poland alone, and their number is

constantly increasing with greater rapidity than formerly. Hundreds of such in our Polish classes are symbolizing their consecration every year. We agree that it is through the Truth that God calls to consecration, yea, that everyone who up to 1878, when the fullness of the Gentiles came in, made a full consecration was by that Truth begotten of the Spirit, as called to the high calling. But since 1881 only certain ones were through the Truth by God, usually quite some time after the Truth induced them to consecrate, begotten unto the high calling; and the other consecrators, though induced by the Truth to consecrate, were not Spirit-begotten, and hence not initiated into the high calling; and since Oct., 1914, the Truth induces many to consecrate but begets none to the high calling. Hence the sophistry in the argument underlying the Dawn's position that since the Truth is the means of calling to consecration, all brought by the Truth to consecration enter the high calling. Yea, surely, God still controls His Truth, as the Dawn contends, and for that reason makes it work out His will in calling to consecration; and His will, according to our 63 proofs, is to beget no more of the Spirit for high calling purposes since Oct., 1914. These 63 proofs are no speculation, as the Dawn alleges of the view that it opposes, but are Bible teachings; and the facts since Oct., 1914, and Passover, 1916, are all in harmony with their teaching and against the Dawn's teaching on this subject. As a further refutation of the theory that the Truth must beget now as during the General Call it begot all consecrators, we would say: The Ancient Worthies had all the Truth due in their day and were consecrated, yet were not called to the high calling, the Truth not begetting them. Furthermore, in the Millennium the world will have all the Truth then due, even more than we now have and will be consecrated, yet they will not be called to the high calling, the Truth not begetting them. Why not? The

Truth of itself did not beget of the Spirit; it did so only when God by a direct act of His will (Jas. 1:18) empowered it so to do in each individual case. Hence, God willing it from Pentecost until 1878 in the case of all true consecrators, all such were Spirit-begotten. God not willing it for some from 1881 to 1914, the Truth did not beget such of the Spirit; and since God wills it for none since Oct., 1914, the Truth begets none of the Spirit since then. This completely refutes the Dawn's pertinent sophistry.

"There is a reason" why the Dawn, by contrast, overemphasizes the agency of the Truth in the work of calling and under-emphasizes by contrast the agents whom God used to bring the Truth to high calling prospects—it desires to disassociate the oversight of the complete reaping work from our Pastor's supervision, so that it can now have reaping apart therefrom. But the ink-horn man is in its way. Recognizing that he was dying, in the toga scene our Pastor, in his part pictured in that man, saw that the ink had been placed on the foreheads of all that sighed and cried in the city, that the elect were all sealed in their foreheads, and with this symbol made his part of the report, "I have done as Thou hast commanded me" (Ezek. 9:11). As the steward throughout the day of the Penny parable—the reaping time—he at the end of that day gave the penny to the Little Flock and the Great Company. Hence he had oversight of the reaping until it was completed. Hence there has been no reaping apart from his supervision. The Dawn stands for reaping unsupervised to an end by a supervisor.

The Dawn is forced by the facts to admit that there was an alleged curtailment of its alleged reaping after our Pastor's death until, as it thinks, recently. We may be sure that the Lord Jesus would not have allowed a curtailment of many years in the reaping work, but as from 1874 to 1914 He continually increased it, so He would have continued to increase it to the end,

if 1914 had not been the end. The alleged reaping that the Dawn stands for is in reality the symbolic incest between antitypical Lot and his two daughters. It is not reaping at all; it is an abomination to the Lord; for it makes symbolic bastards of those of them who claim to be of the Little Flock. To its question, "What arguments are there, then, if any, that God ... is not still accepting new members into the body of Christ?" we answer: At least 63 cogent arguments (more will doubtless come later) that none of the Levites, including the Dawn editors, have been able to answer, sophistrize against them as much as they will. Then the Dawn sets up a man of straw—the claim that the end of the Gentile Times proves the end of reaping in 1914—and then proceeds to kick it over. Bro. Russell repudiated such a thought in 1912, though he had previously held it. Who that now understands the subject would make such a claim? We base the true claim, not on the Gentile Times' ending the reaping, but, among other things, on the many Scriptures that limit the Parousia, the reaping period, to 40 symbolic days, and thus end it in 1914; but we do not base it on the end of the Gentile Times.

Then the Dawn sets up what is actually another man of straw, to the effect that the parallel Dispensations are claimed to teach the end of reaping in 1914, and then proceeds to kick it over. We answer this point as follows: While the *Dispensation* Parallels after April, 33, and April, 1878, affected only the nominal peoples of God, as our Pastor correctly taught, the *harvest* Parallels affected the real peoples of God from 29 to 69 and from 1874 to 1914, as our Pastor also correctly taught. We have given some details on the distinction between the Dispensation and the harvest Parallels and showed from many facts the operation of the latter to be from 29 to 69 and from 1874 to 1914 (Studies, Vol. III, 404-410). As the true view on the subject, this exposes the Dawn's claim

as actually a man of straw, though it is not such in the case of those who misuse the Dispensation Parallels as showing the end of the Harvests. The Dawn's sophistry on Rev. 7:1-3 is very manifest to one who holds our Pastor's view of that passage in mind. Against its straw-man claim, that its opponents hold the four winds to be the World War, we reply, Not so. As our Pastor from 1908 onward showed, the four winds represent the fallen angels and to their loosing he referred time and again as the loosing of the winds (not *wind*) of strife, because these fallen angels, loosed, stirred up strife. Furthermore, our Pastor rightly taught, in harmony with many Scripture uses of the word *wind* as symbolic of war, that the *wind* (not *winds*) of v. 1 symbolized the World War. The passage, therefore, teaches that the sealing of all the elect in each country would be completed before the World War would involve that country. This is the plain teaching of the passage. Against the Dawn's thought that the blowing of the four winds clearly indicates "something which would effectively block any further sealing of God's servants" and that Germany's and Russia's making it practically impossible there to preach the Gospel are examples of the effect of such blowing of the four winds, we would say that the thought is an example of reading into the text what is not there. The text teaches the reverse, *i.e.*, that conditions would to the end of the sealing of the elect be favorable to such work, not, as the Dawn teaches, that the loosing of the four winds would be "something which would effectively block any further sealing of God's servants"; for how could the loosing of the four winds "effectively block any further sealing of God's servants" if all of the sealing in each country was completed before the loosed four winds made the symbolic wind, the World War, hurt the earth, *etc.*, in each pertinent country? Thus is exposed the folly (2 Tim. 3:9) that the Dawn offers to evade

the clear force of Rev. 7:1-3, which proves that before the World War would involve a country its elect would already have been sealed, which proves our view of the question at issue. The Dawn's pertinent handling of Rev. 7:1-3 betrays the fact that it has a piece of food in its mouth, too hot to retain, too tough to chew and too large to eject or swallow.

The Dawn's confusion on the seven angels of the seven churches as being seven individuals, we will here pass by, having treated of that above, merely remarking on its use of gaps between messengers in the period between the two Harvests, that even if the seven angels were individuals the gaps could not apply to Bro. Russell, the Harvest's Eleazar, for directing and teaching purposes; for as it was necessary that Apostles, the Jewish Harvest's Eleazar, for binding and loosing purposes (Matt. 18:18), supervise the work of the entire Jewish Harvest after Pentecost, so it was necessary for their parallel, Bro. Russell, as the Gospel Harvest's Eleazar, for directing and teaching purposes, to supervise the Gospel Harvest work to a completion (Num. 4:16; Matt. 20:8; 24:45-47). Therefore, gaps between the star-members living between the two Harvests would not imply that the reaping work could go on without Bro. Russell, as the Dawn alleges. To the Dawn's claim that the apostasies among Truth people since our Pastor's death imply that the apostates have since his death forfeited their crowns, we reply, Not so; for every crown that was lost was lost by Oct., 1914, when most of our 63 proofs demonstrate the last crown was finally assigned, and hence, before the last crown was finally assigned, the last crown must have been lost. In truth, such apostasies for the most part are the Lord's Epiphany manifestations of the pertinent Parousia crown-losers as such. And as a supposed clincher to the sophism just manifested, the Dawn says, "The logic of events tells us it could not be otherwise." If

the Dawn editors were Epiphany-enlightened priests they would see that the logic of events proves what we have just said on the subject. To the Dawn's statement that "to conclude that the door to the high calling was definitely closed in 1914 or 1916, or at any other time in the past, would be equal to saying that those already accepted could not possibly fall away from their steadfastness," we reply that the two statements are not at all equal, nor does the first proposition imply the second. Anyone under the call could now fall, but they will not, not because they cannot fall, but because they are so faithful that they will not fall. God's foreknowledge, assuring Him that all faithful to Oct., 1914, Would continue so, prophesied that they would be faithful to the end, *e.g.*, by Elijah's coming to the mount at the end of the 40 days, by the sealing of all before the World War involved their countries, etc.

The testings that the Dawn instances in the last 20 years as implying the fall of many during these years from the high calling, are, according to the Bible, to manifest, not the loss of the high calling during those years, but the separation of the Great Company from the Little Flock (2 Tim. 4:1; Mal. 3:3 [second clause; the first clause refers to the Parousia testing]) and the manifestation of the latter as having lost their crowns before Oct., 1914. Hence the testings have been no farce to either class, as the Dawn claims it would be if no Little Flock member lost his crown since Oct., 1914. Were Jesus', Paul's, Bro. Russell's and all other faithful saints' testings a farce because they did not fall? The claim of the Dawn that it does not for not a few require much time to make one's calling and election sure, proved, it claims, by St. Stephen doing so quickly, and hence that there will be no appreciable length of time between the Spirit-begetting of the last called ones and their Spirit birth, is certainly a speculation. While it is true that St. Stephen

did make his calling and election sure in a short time, it must be remembered that he had been, as a pious Jew, consecrated from childhood. The vast majority of the most eminent and faithful saints were many years in making their calling and election sure. We instance all the Apostles except James, who was eleven years in so doing, practically every one of the other 37 star-members, including our Pastor, and hosts of lesser brethren in the Little Flock. The fact that since 1874 more and subtler trials than have faced any other generation of saints have confronted the Faithful, is proof that the Parousia and Epiphany trials for the individual Faithful are, generally speaking, longer drawn out than those of former generations. On this point we will say of the Dawn's statement, which it accompanies by the expression as to the nature of its pertinent teaching, "It is reasonable to suppose," that this point is an unprovable guess, or speculation, for whose proof it lacks the required knowledge, whereas the known facts given above point toward the truth of the opposing view in almost all cases. A view based on so exceptional a case as St. Stephen's, perhaps the record case of the entire Age, and that has against its frequent probability the cases mentioned above, certainly is in desperate need of support and is nothing less than a most improbable speculation. It seems to flow from the mental attitude, "My people would have it so." To its claim that our view of no Little Flock members falling since 1914, is "exceedingly detrimental to healthy Christian growth and progress in the narrow way," we reply: It is not so to the Faithful, but it would be so to unfaithful Great Company members and unfaithful Youthful Worthies; for their selfishness and willfulness move them to presume on the Lord's goodness and to avoid the cross as much as they can. God foretold to Jesus, to the twelve Apostles, except Judas, Paul taking his place in the promise (Matt. 19:28; Rev. 21:14 [to John]; Mark 10:39 [to John and James]), and to Bro. Russell (Luke 12:42—"faithful")

that they would prove faithful, and it made none of them careless, nor will any of the Faithful now be made so, should it be revealed that he was faithful up to Oct., 1914.

The Dawn states that it has "examined the various reasons offered" for the door to Spirit-begetting being closed "and found that these reasons are based entirely on human philosophy rather than upon sound Scriptural proof." In the first place, its remark that it has "examined the various reasons," etc., is unfactual. For over five years we have had in print 57 of our 63 proofs; and it has not attempted to examine the large majority of them and has utterly failed to refute any of them, as our replies to their alleged refutations prove, much less has it found any of them based "on human philosophy rather than upon sound Scriptural proof." Such assertions as the one under review are easy to make, but to prove them—"Ah, that's the rub!" Then it offers Rom. 11:25 as an alleged conclusive proof that the door to the begetting is open. "Blindness in part is happened to Israel, until the fullness of the Gentiles be come in." It reasons on this alleged proof as follows: Israel is still blind; hence the fullness of the Gentiles has not yet come in; hence the high calling is still open to new aspirants. What is wrong with this reasoning? It overlooks the fact that, when in prophecy the time of an event implying a long duration for its enactment is indicated, usually the beginning and not the end of the event is pointed out. Such is the case here. How do we know this? By the fact that this passage, compared with Is. 40:2; Jer. 16:18 and Zech. 9:12, points out the parallel Dispensations and thereby marks the exact date of the return of favor to Israel as occurring in the Spring of 1878. Two features are implied in God's intended favor on Israel: (1) Israel's return to Palestine, and (2) Israel's recovery from its partial blindness. Both of these events are long-drawn-out enactments; but both of them began

on June 11, 1878, which was God's date for Pentecost that year, though not that of the Nominal Church. These events began (1) in the decree of the Berlin Congress of Nations exacting from the Turk for the Jews greater privileges in Palestine, among others, permission of their easier access thereto than formerly, and (2) in the circulation among the Jews of Delitzsch's Revised Hebrew New Testament, which he declares began June 11, 1878 (see Delitzsch's booklet on the Hebrew New Testament, page 37). The first of these events *began* to restore favor to Israel as to the land, and the second of these events *began* to restore favor to Israel as to Truth.

St. Paul, in Rom. 11:25, as the parallel Dispensations prove, refers to the beginning of favor to Israel for its recovery from its partial blindness, even as Jer. 16:14-18 refers to the beginning of favor to Israel for its recovery of its land; for just as the withdrawal of favor from Israel was gradual in the Jewish Harvest, so is its return to them gradual here; and both of these forms of God's returning favor have been manifesting an ever-increasing fulfillment, *e.g.*, as to the second form, a very great change in Israel's view of Jesus has been going on. In 1878 the Jews almost universally would expectorate and curse at the mention of Jesus' name, as of that of the greatest sinner. Now, almost universally, the Jews regard Him as one of their greatest prophets, and some of the eulogies on Him in Jewish pulpits are hard to be surpassed by those in Christian pulpits, so far as the human side of Jesus is concerned. Had there not been this change of Jewish attitude since 1878, our Pastor, *as a Christian minister*, from 1910 to 1916, would never have gotten the sympathetic hearing from the Jews that he did get; *for a Christian minister* to have preached Zionism to Jews in 1878 would have been regarded by Jews as a defilement to themselves and as an abomination to God. As an illustration of the gradual recovery of Israel from its partial blindness, we might say that in

our library we have several eulogistic biographies of Jesus by Jews in good standing with their coreligionists, *e.g.*, one written by Dr. J. Klausner, who is, or until lately was, the president of the Jerusalem [Hebrew] University, who is probably the most intellectually influential Jew in the world, and who, in his biography of Jesus, lauds Him to the skies as the greatest of Jews and the greatest of the Hebrew prophets, though, of course, not believing Him to be the Messiah. His book is hailed by Jews everywhere as expressing their present attitude toward Jesus, who, in their former blindness, was to them the most wicked of the wicked, and hence the object of deep hatred and *misunderstanding* (blindness). The above sufficiently overthrows the Dawn's *superficial*, allegedly "conclusive" proof on the high calling being still open to new consecrators. Here we may say that, like the P.B.I., the Dawn denies our Pastor's view of the parallels.

To its claim that new consecrators are working side by side with consecrators of 40 years' standing, as implying that the door is still open, we reply that this conclusion is neither Scriptural nor reasonable; for even from 1881 to 1914 many consecrated ones not begotten of the Spirit worked side by side with new creatures, and since the door is closed all faithful new consecrators so do. We fear that most of the Dawn's new consecrators (those of them who insist that they are Little Flock members) working side by side with its consecrators of 40 years' standing and those of this latter class who, while so working, believe they are winning new ones for the high calling, are engaged in the symbolic incest of antitypical Lot and his elder daughter. Its looking for a future loosing of the four winds is not only a misunderstanding of what those winds are and a contradiction of the facts that demonstrate that the fallen angels as the winds of strife were loosed before the World War, but ought also by it to be known to be a contradiction of our Pastor's teaching

on the subject. To the implications of its exhortation to the brethren not to feel sure of their standing in the kingdom class as assured, we reply that our teachings are not to the effect that such assurance should be had; for we are not yet given any certain sign as to who are crown-retainers. All we know is that those that were faithful until Oct., 1914, will continue so. But as yet, none of those who have not revolutionized knows whether he is among such. Hence to all of the new creatures not yet manifest as crown-losers the exhortation applies now as forcibly as before Oct., 1914: Give diligence to make your calling and election sure; for just as before Oct., 1914, so now, the conditions of overcoming imply faithfulness in studying, spreading and practicing the Truth and faithfulness in enduring the incidental experiences. Since, as before, Oct., 1914, the faithful are not careless as to these points, nor will they be.

In concluding this part of our review, we feel it to be the Lord's will to point out that by its false doctrines under review the Dawn is not only guilty of holding out hopes that will never be realized by its new consecrators, and therefore will occasion them great disappointment, which will act as a boomerang on the Dawn, but is also by that false teaching guilty of a much worse evil. Its Great Company editors (proven to be such by their repeated revolutionisms against our Pastor's teachings, *e.g.*, on the chronology, on the Epiphany and Apocalypses, etc.) as parts of drunken antitypical Lot, are, in the matter reviewed in this chapter and in their other pertinent work, guilty of symbolic incest, and are thereby producing antitypical Moabites and Ammonites, symbolical bastards (Gen. 19:30-38; Deut. 23:2-6; D 576, 1), who, instead of being in the high calling, will find themselves in the restitution class, whereas had they been given the only hope now open to new consecrators, they could win out as Youthful Worthies, sharing with the Ancient Worthies in Millennial princesship. This is the

terrible guilt with which the Dawn editors and all other Great Company members drunken with the same error and guilty of the same symbolic incest, are loading themselves. We warn them in the Lord's name that it will be at their great peril, if they continue in this course of false teaching and practice. Thus it is manifest that the question of whether the high calling is open or not to new consecrators is one of commanding importance now. We have given enough evidence, both in the Biblical proof of our position and in the refutation of attacks on it and of the erroneousness of the Dawn's position.

Thus we have given 63 reasons proving that the reaping and gleaning have ended. Yet the P.B.I. Herald Editors to whom most of these proofs have been given say, "Looking for evidence that the Harvest ended six years ago, we look in vain!" [Written early in 1921.] If the reaping has not yet ended, how do they account for the great change that has taken place in the character of the work, especially since our Pastor died? What reaping or gleaning did *they* do, when for over two years they did no work at all toward the Lord's people in the Nominal Church, and since the end of those two years have done next to nothing toward them? Surely, if reaping or gleaning has since his death been in order, they proved themselves unfaithful servants during those two years, and quite slothful servants since those two years. Will these Editors kindly give us a Scriptural, reasonable and factual explanation of the events among the Lord's people, particularly their part in them, following our Pastor's death to the present, if there has been a reaping work going on since then? *Again* we ask, Will they kindly favor us with such an explanation, not failing to justify their doing no public work for two years of the time and very little since the two years ended? In view of the fact that our 63 strong proofs of the end of the reaping and of the beginning of the

work toward the Great Company have in most part been set before the P.B.I. Editors—proofs that are far more numerous than are those that show the Harvest began in 1874, and that are at least as strong—the course of the P.B.I. Editors in denying the existence of such proof reminds us of a fable, according to which five very solemn and wise looking owls are represented as perched in a row on the branch of a tree one bright Spring day listening to a lark singing its joyous lays to the golden sun. Said the five very solemn and wise looking owls to the happy lark, "Why are you singing so merrily?" The happy lark answered, "Because the Sun is so beautiful, and its clear rays are enlightening, brightening and gladdening all the world." Answered the five very solemn and wise looking owls, "We fail to see any evidence that proves the existence of the Sun and its rays!"

In the May 15, 1921, Herald the P.B.I. Editors and Directors give their promised (supposed) refutation of our dear Pastor's Jubilee views. It will be remembered that they subtracted nineteen years from the chronology of the period of the kings, and, accordingly, dated the beginning of the Times of the Gentiles nineteen years earlier than does the Scriptural chronology. This cutting off of nineteen years from the chronology, of course, makes their nominal-church chronology contradict that of our Pastor for every Jewish- and Gospel-Age prophetic period beginning at or before 607 B.C.; hence it contradicts his view of the Jubilee. They must, by hook or crook, cut off nineteen years from the typical Jubilee cycles so as to bring them to 1874, the time-beginning of the antitypical Jubilee. Seizing on the fact that there were nineteen Jubilees before the Babylonian captivity, they set up the claim that each Jubilee occurred in the same year as the seventh of the Sabbath years, *i.e.*, each Jubilee began 49 years instead of 50 years after its predecessor began. This would, of course, enable them

to cut off nineteen years from the chronology of the first nineteen Jubilees, and thus begin the last Jubilee with their nominal-church-chronology 626 B.C., which is nineteen years earlier than the true 626 B.C. We have not as yet heard how they add nineteen years for the nineteen years cut off from the Jewish Age in seeking to keep a semblance of harmony in the Parallel Dispensations; but our guess is that they do it as follows: by beginning the Jewish Age, not at the death of Jacob, but nineteen years earlier, when Jacob first sent his sons to Egypt to buy corn in the first year of the famine. If this is their view, we are ready to meet it, but will wait until they first publish their view. In this chapter we will refute their Jubilee chronology claims.

Our readers, without dissent, so far as we have heard, and many who have hitherto supported the P.B.I., believe that our answer to their changed chronology for the Times of the Gentiles, to be found in the next chapter, completely overthrows their attempt to overthrow the Bible's and our Pastor's correct chronology. This being true, that answer carries with it the refutation of their Jubilee claims; for it shows that they were mistaken in their efforts to make the Times of the Gentiles begin nineteen years earlier than they did; and hence they are for the same reason mistaken in trying to cut off nineteen years from the first nineteen Jubilee cycles. Thus we might leave their whole position as overthrown by our proof that the Times of the Gentiles began in Nebuchadnezzar's nineteenth year. However, we will additionally present some cogent reasons proving that the arguments are wrong by which they try to prove their Jubilee views, which, like their views on the Times of the Gentiles and the land's desolation, are plagiarized from nominal-church writers. We will for clearness' sake number our points.

(1) Their claim that the typical Jubilee cycles were 49 years each instead of 50 years each, if consistently applied, would make the antitypical cycle 2401 years

instead of 2500 years. Hence, instead of the great Cycle bringing us to Oct., 1874, as the beginning of the antitypical Jubilee, their view would require us to take the square of 49 years, which being 2401, would bring us to Oct., 1775, six months after the American Revolution started, as the beginning of the antitypical Jubilee! Let us remember that by squaring the lower period the next higher period is reached (see Studies, Vol. II, 401, 402, the added two pages). Thus Israel did with the first and lowest perfect time-period, that of the week, which consists, of course, of *seven* (perfect number) days. Beginning the week with Nisan 16, the day after the Passover Sabbath, Nisan 15 (Lev. 23:15), they squared the number of days in a week, and this gave them seven Sabbaths (weeks) *complete*. This cycle pointed out and led up to the next day, the Jubilee of weeks, Pentecost, a word which means fiftieth (Lev. 23:16). Thus we see that the square of the lowest period, *i.e.*, the seven days, the week, led up to and pointed out the lowest Jubilee, which was a higher festival than the seventh Sabbath of the cycle. This is one proof that the square of the lower period led up to and pointed out the next higher festival. The next higher perfect period than the cycle of weeks, in the type, is a cycle of years—of year-weeks. By squaring this period of seven years (Lev. 25:8), they had seven Sabbaths of years complete, and its last Sabbath of years led up to and pointed out the following year, the Jubilee of years (Lev. 25:9, 10). Thus, here we again see that they had to square the lower to reach the next higher period, which, in turn, led up to and pointed out the still higher festival, *i.e.*, the seventh Sabbath of years led up to and pointed out the Jubilee, which was a higher festival than the seventh Sabbath of the cycle. But the Jubilee being the highest of all the typical festivals reached by the squaring method, after the last Jubilee the lower period to be squared to get to the next higher period, which is the antitypical Cycle,

must be the typical Jubilee cycle itself; for it is always the square of the next lower that leads up to and points out the next higher period; and the longest typical period, being the one next lower than the antitypical Cycle, was that from one Jubilee to another—fifty years. Hence the antitypical Cycle would be the square of the typical Jubilee cycle, 50×50 , which equals 2500 years. And just as in every other institutional type, *fixed to a date*, the antitype had to set in on the date that the type would have occurred, had it persisted, so the last year of the 2500 years was the first year of the antitypical Jubilee.

The Herald, indeed, uses the 2500 years, *i.e.*, 50×50 years, to reach the antitypical Jubilee in 1874; but since they contend that there were but 49 years from the beginning of one Jubilee to that of another, by what right, we ask, do they square fifty? If their view of the length of time from the beginning of one typical Jubilee to the next were correct, they would have to square 49, not 50. Hence their great Cycle would be 2401 years; and their antitypical Jubilee would have had to begin Oct., 1775, if they were right. Thus their view of the time from the beginning of one Jubilee to another—*plagiarized* (not "*discovered*" by them, as they claim) from the nominal church—would have made the antitypical Jubilee begin 163 years ago! Surely, this is a great blunder, because Restitution would by now be greatly advanced, if it began 163 years ago! Thus their method makes it impossible to reach Oct., 1874, as the beginning of the antitypical Jubilee by use of the antitypical Cycle. Why do these Editors and Directors seek to rob the Lord's people of the chronological Truth? How could they have been so careless as not to see that their fixing 49 years as the Jubilee period forces them to square 49 years, not 50 years, to get the antitypical Cycle pointing out the antitypical Jubilee? For our part we cannot explain why persons as intelligent as the P.B.I. Editors and

Directors could be guilty of such blunders, except that they are in the hands of Azazel and are by him blinded. And if the brethren would remember that Satan is using these Editors and Directors to palm off errors in order to inveigle the unwary into some trap—probably a big counterfeit drive to finish the Harvest or to smite Jordan the first time—they would refuse to look to such blinded brethren for further spiritual guidance.

(2) Against their thought that the Jubilee cycles were 49 years we place the Bible statement that the seven Sabbath cycles were 49 full years (Lev. 25:8), and that the *next year*, the fiftieth, was the Jubilee year (Lev. 25:9, 10). This was undeniably true of the first Jubilee cycle; and hence all other cycles had to be made on the same pattern, or the Bible would have specifically stated that the subsequent Jubilee cycles were to be counted differently from the first. Those—and among them are the P.B.I. Editors and Directors—who claim that the subsequent Jubilee cycles were reckoned differently from that first and only one which God described will never from the Scriptures be able to prove that subsequent Jubilee cycles were of a different length from the first. They may twist and squirm all they please about "600 lunations" and "606 lunations" (and thereby mark themselves with 666 on the forehead), and quote "The Approaching End of the Age" to all eternity to prove that the Jubilee came in the 49th year, saying, "The [first] Jubilee year began in the seventh month of the forty-ninth year"; but reverent Bible Students will still insist on accepting God's statement that it came in the fiftieth year (Lev. 25:10). On this point we bring two grave charges against the P.B.I. view: (1) that it contradicts God's statement that the Jubilee came after the full end of the forty-nine years, therefore in the fiftieth year; and (2) that their view implies that subsequent Jubilees were reached by a different method of counting from that used for reaching the first Jubilee. Why did they overlook these patent facts? Azazel can

tell the reason; so can the Lord and His Epiphany-enlightened saints.

(3) Their view that the Jubilee cycles were forty-nine years in length is contradicted by the parallel method of reckoning by which the Jubilee of weeks, Pentecost, was reached. In Lev. 23:15, 16 we are expressly told that after they had counted forty-nine full days, not forty-eight or forty-eight and a half days, they should count another day, the fiftieth day, and celebrate it as a festival, *i.e.*, the feast of first fruits. Pentecost, we repeat, means the *fiftieth*, the day Jubilee, as distinct from the year Jubilee. This festival is described in vs. 15-21. This fact conclusively proves that the year Jubilee came every fifty years, not every forty-nine years. In this connection let us remember that the Day-Jubilee and the Year-Jubilee were reached by the same general method—that of squaring, and then adding a day or a year as the case required. How could the P.B.I. Editors and Directors have overlooked so obvious a fact? Azazel knows; so do the Lord and His Epiphany-enlightened saints.

(4) The Scriptures prove that the eighth year from the beginning of the seventh Sabbath cycle was the Jubilee year, which disproves the P.B.I. view that the Jubilee always came in the seventh year from the beginning of the seventh Sabbath cycle. This is evident from the following considerations: In Lev. 25:21, 22 God, to encourage Israelites not to sow for two years, and to quiet their doubts expressed in v. 20, promised that He would, in the sixth year of the seventh Sabbath cycle, give the Israelites enough increase to tide them over until they began to reap in the ninth year what they sowed in the *end* of the eighth year, *when* as the earliest crops sown they sowed pulse and barley for the ninth year's reaping. Why so? Because the seventh year was always to be a Sabbath—a rest year—for the land (Lev. 25:2-7). Hence it was also to be a rest year in the seventh Sabbath cycle. The next year—the eighth year—being the Jubilee, the land was to

rest from the sowing that would otherwise begin late in the seventh year, and continue during the sowing time of the (ordinary) eighth year (Lev. 25:21, 22). Hence we see that these facts imply that the Jubilee came always in the eighth year from the beginning of the seventh Sabbath cycle. If, as the P.B.I. Editors and Directors hold, all Jubilees came in the seventh year of the seventh Sabbath cycle, *i.e.*, in the forty-ninth year, instead of promising increase for three years, God would have told Israel that in the sixth year He would cause the earth to bring forth for two years, and that they would have enough to last them until in the eighth year they would reap what they began to sow (late) in the seventh year for the eighth's year's reaping. This fact proves that the Jubilee always came in the eighth year. Therefore, from the beginning of any Jubilee to that of its successor there were always 50 years, not 49.

(5) The Israelites first entered and began to possess the land in late Summer of the year 1576 B.C., not in early Spring, 1575 B.C., as the Herald claims. This fact overthrows the Herald's view of the Jubilees. While our Pastor, when treating on this point ignored the fraction of the year involved in this matter in reckoning the chronology, as he expressly stated (B 48, text and note), it is necessary, in order to meet the P.B.I. sophistry under consideration, that we take into account this fraction of a year, in proof of the truthfulness of the Bible statement that the Jubilee trumpet sounded in the fiftieth year on the Day of Atonement, and not on that day in the 49th year. The Herald counts the entrance into the land from the date of Joshua's crossing the Jordan, Nisan 10, 1575 B.C. This would be correct, if the land which God *gave* Israel consisted exclusively of the land west of the Jordan. But the land that God *gave* Israel included a large section east of the Jordan and north of the Arnon; and this section was entered in the late Summer of 1576 B.C. This is manifest from the Scriptures,

which give us precise chronological data for locating this event. It was exactly thirty-eight years *to a day* from the time that Israel, for their murmuring at Kadesh-barnea after the spies returned with their reports, were turned back to wander in the wilderness until the day they crossed the Zered and a few days later that they crossed (see Studies, Vol. II, 401, 402) the Arnon into, and began to possess, the land which God gave them. (Deut. 2:14, 18, 24, 25; vs. 20-23, as indicated, are to be read as a parenthesis.) Thus, according to these verses it was exactly thirty-eight years and a few days from leaving Kadesh-barnea until Israel *entered* and began to *possess* the land which God gave them (Lev. 25:2; Deut. 2:24). Comparing these verses with Num. 21:12-15 we see that it was a few days' journey, and a journey that Israel made in a few days, from the brook or valley Zered, or Zared, to Arnon, Israel's southern boundary east of the Jordan (Judg. 11:18-23).

If we can locate the time of the year when Israel turned back toward the wilderness from Kadesh-barnea, exactly thirty-eight years before crossing the Zered, we can tell exactly from what time of the year we are to begin to count the entrance of Israel into the land. The spies started to search out the land *at the time of the first ripe grapes* (Num. 13:20), and returned with *late Summer fruits* from searching the land in forty days (Num. 13:25). Palestinian grapes now first ripen in late July, and late Summer fruits now ripen about the middle of September. Probably in ancient times grapes first ripened about the middle of July and late Summer fruits about Sept. 1. The season of the first ripe grapes lasts about two or three weeks. The spies therefore returned some time from about Aug. 25 to about Sept. 15. Two days later (Num. 14:1, 25), Israel turned back to the wilderness. Hence thirty-eight years and a few days later to the day brought them to the late Summer of 1576;

and hence at that time Israel entered the land. Accordingly, exactly fifty years later, thus in the late Summer of 1526 B.C., toward the end of the Jubilee year, it was in order to sow the land for the next year's reaping (Lev. 25:22). The Scriptures explicitly state that the system of year Sabbaths was to start with Israel's entrance "into the land *which*" God would "*give*" them (Lev. 25:2), and He gave them the land east of Jordan and north of Arnon as well as that west of Jordan. Hence the entrance into the land is to be reckoned from the *late Summer* of 1576 B.C., which also marked the time to begin sowing toward the end of the six Sabbatical years and toward the end of the Jubilee years for the following years' reaping (Lev. 25:22).

It is for this reason that they were commanded to sound the Jubilee trumpet on the Day of Atonement of the fiftieth year (Lev. 25:9). The reason Israel began the Sabbath system in the Fall is because immediately after they entered the land in 1576 B.C., the civil year began, according to which the Sabbath system was reckoned, *i.e.*, in the seventh month of the ecclesiastical year. Thus the Scriptures are thoroughly consistent in starting the Jubilee with the beginning of the fiftieth year from entering the land, while the P.B.I., following nominal-church writers, especially Dr. Guinness, the writer of "The Approaching End of the Age," with his nonsense on "600 lunations" and "606 lunations," are inconsistent with the Scriptures and with themselves; for they make the first Jubilee begin in the middle of the 49th year instead of in the beginning of the 50th year. The confusion of the writer of "The Approaching End of the Age," whom they endorse, is very manifest when he speaks of 600 lunations as making fifty lunar years: *Israel never had such a year in the long run*; rather they added a month as required by the condition of the barley for first-fruit purposes; and thus their year in the long run averaged a solar year. Beloved brethren, is it not deplorable that

Bible Students should reject "that Servant's" true presentations, and accept the false ones of nominal-church writers—foolish Virgins? Does not this fact show that as Great Company members the P.B.I. Editors and Directors are more in harmony with the Great Company leaders in the nominal church—who with them and with the other Truth Levite leaders constitute antitypical Jambres—than they are in harmony with the Priests, especially with our Pastor.

(6) Their view of the Jubilee cycles as consisting of 49 years each and of the Times of the Gentiles as beginning in the first year of Nebuchadnezzar, contradicts the time symmetry of God's Plan. In constructing His Plan God used the principle of symmetry from many standpoints. Among other symmetries He wove into His Plan harmonious time features. Some of these were brought to our attention by our dear Pastor, and some by Bros. John and Morton Edgar in their time charts, approved and published by our Pastor in the Berean Bible Helps. One of these is the parallel of the 2520 years, the first part of which parallel began at the end of the First Adam's day and ended at Zedekiah's uncrowning, 607 B.C., when its second part began, ending in 1914. Many of the parallels of this time feature were fulfilled, as can be seen on the last page of the Berean Helps, just before the concordance, from the standpoint of the first member of the parallel ending at Zedekiah's uncrowning, 607 B.C.; but the entire parallel would fall to the ground, if the P.B.I.'s nineteen years' change were made. Again, their Jubilee change would destroy the time symmetry of the double 2500 years' period, from the First to the Second Adam's day, the meeting-ground of these two periods of 2500 years being the last Jubilee celebrated before the Babylonian captivity. The same disharmony would occur from the P.B.I.'s nominal-church chronology in the double 3500 years' periods from the beginning of the First Adam's day until the end of the Second Adam's day, the meeting-ground of these two periods

of 3500 years being the last Jubilee celebrated before the Babylonian captivity. So, too, would their chronological changes destroy the time symmetry of the double 2080½ years' periods from the Fall until the Gospel went to the Gentiles, 36 A.D., the meeting-ground of these two periods of 2080½ years being the date of the Covenant with Abraham, 2045 B.C. From their changes the same destruction of the chronological harmony results in the Parallel Dispensations. If, as we guess, they make its first member begin nineteen years earlier than the death of Jacob, *i.e.*, in the first year of the famine, they will spoil the parallel *event*; for the *death* of Jacob must be paralleled with the *death* of Jesus, as both were the parallel Heads of the parallel Houses of Israel, each founding his nation in twelve tribes presided over by twelve leaders. So, too, will their nominal-church chronological changes spoil the double 654+1846 years' periods from the First to the Second Adam's day, the 654 years in the periods ending respectively at the typical baptism (the flood), and the antitypical baptism (that of Jesus), these periods having their meeting-ground in the last Jubilee celebrated before the Babylonian captivity. They have stated that on the basis of a year of 360 days they endorse the nominal-church date 445 B.C. as the beginning of the seventy symbolic weeks and the 2300 symbolic days of Daniel. In this case they must, of necessity, destroy the symmetry between the counterfeit days of waiting and counterfeit (papal) Millennium on the one hand, and of the true days of waiting and of the true Millennium, on the other hand. Moreover, this last change contradicts many of the fulfilled parallels of the Parallel Dispensations occurring in the periods of the days of waiting. Finally, their changes destroy, as a seventh harmonious time feature, the symmetry of 6000 years of evil—typed by the six week-days—followed by the 1,000 years of Restitution—typed by the Sabbath—beginning in 1874. What consummate folly against the time symmetry of God's

Plan have these Editors and Directors committed! And the fact of which they boast—that they have led many to believe their errors—increases their guilt.

(7) As a final argument against their Jubilee as well as against *all* of their other chronological vagaries we present the Pyramid's testimony. Their subtraction of nineteen years from the chronology is not only refuted by the Bible, but also by its and God's Stone Witness, the Great Pyramid (Is. 19:19, 20). Here is a splendid touchstone. Will its size in its pertinent Old Testament parts shrink by nineteen pyramid inches to oblige these nominal-churchizing Editors and Directors? No; not even by one thousandth of an inch! Will it change its angles, by which many of the pertinent Old Testament dates are fixed? No, not by one second! Will it to oblige them destroy all its scientific lessons by these changes? No, not by one whit! Every one of the time harmonies referred to under the preceding point is given by the Pyramid's floor lines and by its angles in its solid masonry, as can be seen in detail in Bros. Edgar's Pyramid Passages, Vol. II; and the measurements have not shrunk even by one-thousandth of an inch, much less nineteen inches, since the P.B.I. Editors and Directors started out to "discover" (in the writings of foolish Virgins!) supposed mistakes in the Biblical chronology! Nay, that Pyramid by its measurements is an unanswerable refutation of the follies that these members of antitypical Jambres are trying to spread with sleight of hand and feigned words whereby they lie in wait to deceive the unwary. In this effort of theirs they have shown a more *battered* (Ps. 55:21) method than their kindred-spirited sifter, J.F.R. Alas, for the guileless and confiding sheep of God's flock who have fallen into their clutches!

Six times in their Jubilee article they use the expression, "we discovered," "we discover," with reference to the chronological changes that they suggest. Thereby they betray the fact of their posing as the inventors

of "new light," against which they formerly raised great outcries. These outcries we must now consider hypocritical. How valuable their chronological "new light" is can be seen from our replies in this and the following chapter. And how "new" ("we discover," "we discovered") it is can be seen from the fact that these thoughts had grown old and had been thoroughly refuted before any one of the P.B.I. Editors (including their senior, R.E. Streeter, who, at the P.B.I. Brooklyn Convention, announced himself as the originator of their chronological changes) and Directors was born. And how much of "light" they have can be seen from the darkness they introduce into all chronological subjects. They "discovered" these chronological vagaries! Yes, indeed, in the rubbish heap of Foolish Virgins' books! Alas, for such "new light," such originality! We agree that their statement is true when they say: "*Commentators in general* [*i.e.*, almost all the nominal-church writers who have commented on the chronology] who have written on the subject have adopted this (the P.B.I.'s) method of counting the *fiftieth* year as one of the cycles of seven"; *i.e.*, they have counted the fiftieth year as the forty-ninth year! Yes, "almost all the Commentators," nominal-church writers, are kindred in the spirit of confusion with them on this point! And thereby have they shown their Babylonianism.

Perhaps the most astounding of all things that have happened of late years among Truth people is the course of the P.B.I. Editors and Directors—who know that they have plagiarized these views from nominal-church writers—in palming off such stale garbage as nourishing and pure food of their invention ("we discover"), for God's Israel to eat! Knowing as we do that they are in Azazel's hands, and are as such acting as his mouthpieces to foist upon the unsuspecting brethren with these errors some counterfeit Truth work—like finishing the reaping, the

smiting of Jordan the first time, etc.—we solemnly in God's name warn the brethren everywhere to beware of these deceivers as (unwitting, of course) mouthpieces of Satan, lest they receive great spiritual injury for themselves! The only safe course for the Faithful is to repudiate these leaders, to come out of their section of little Babylon, and to stand fast in the Truth as they have received it from that Servant. So doing they may confidently expect to be abundantly fed by the Lord with seasonal Truth. As for the others—with deep sorrow we say it—they need just such smooth ("smoother than butter") deceivers as the P.B.I. Editors and Directors to mislead them, that at Azazel's hands they may receive the experiences that will destroy their flesh unto the saving of their spirits, which may the God of all grace and mercy grant!

P.S. The above discussion on the Jubilee was ready for the press when the P.B.I. Herald of June 15, 1921, came to hand. It contains an article defending its plagiarized view on the Jubilee against an attack of some brother who wrote to them. We are glad to note the loyalty of this brother to the Lord's Truth. The article hedges on the forty-ninth and fiftieth year, changing somewhat its former chart presentation to evade one of the brother's telling objections to their view as first charted. On two of its points only will we answer, because its other points have been sufficiently answered above. The Editors make a sickly attempt to evade the brother's objection that they should square 49 years to get the antitypical cycle, instead of 50, if their theory of 49 years' Jubilee cycles were correct, in the following way: they quote B 180, par. 1, where our Pastor says that the *seventh* day and the *seventh* year are to be multiplied by seven, and the *fiftieth* year is to be multiplied by fifty to get the weeks of days and the weeks of years and the great cycle of years respectively leading up to, and pointing out, the day Jubilee, the year Jubilee and the antitypical Jubilee; and then they stress the thought that the

seventh day and the *seventh* year are to be multiplied by seven and the *fiftieth* year is to be multiplied by fifty to get the various cycles. They deny that *seven days* and *seven years* are to be multiplied by seven and that *fifty years* are to be multiplied by fifty to get the necessary cycles. By this subterfuge they seek to justify their using 50×50 for the great cycle instead of 49×49 as their cycles require, barring their first which is $49\frac{1}{2}$ years. Let us see to what their view will lead. The seventh day is, of course, only one day, the last one of seven days. If one day, whether the seventh or the millionth, is multiplied by 7 we have as a result 7 days, not 49 days; and this example in multiplication would have to be stated as follows: $1 \times 7 = 7$ while our dear Pastor stated what he actually meant as follows: $7 \times 7 = 49$. Again, the seventh year is only one year, the last one of seven years; and if we multiply one year, whether the seventh or the billionth year, by 7 we have as a result 7 years, not 49 years, and the example in multiplication would have to be stated as follows: $1 \times 7 = 7$, while our Pastor stated what he actually meant as follows: $7 \times 7 = 49$. Again, the fiftieth year is only one year, the last year of fifty years; and if we multiply one year, whether the fiftieth or the trillionth year, by fifty we have as a result 50 years, while our dear Pastor stated what he actually meant as follows, $50 \times 50 = 2500$. That our Pastor meant 7 days and 7 years by the expression "seventh day" and "seventh year" and meant 50 years by the expression "the fiftieth year" is evident not only by his statement that we must *square* the time indicated in the figures, and by his actually *squaring* the time indicated in the figures that he uses in B 180, par. 1, but also by the express statement in the following paragraph: "Fifty times *fifty years* [not the fiftieth, *i.e.*, one year] gives the long period of 2500 years ($50 \times 50 = 2500$) as the length of the great cycle." His entire argument is based on a 50 years' Jubilee Cycle as the whole chapter shows. Even ordinary

school children of one year's training would not be guilty of the "folly" of making such an evasion as these Editors have made. Surely their "folly shall be made known to all men." How long will the Herald readers permit their intelligence to be insulted by such self-evident "folly"? How dare these Editors insult our Pastor's memory and reputation for intelligence by drawing him in as a witness to justify their using his figures for reaching the antitypical Jubilee based upon 50 years' Jubilee cycles in the type, when they reject his view of the 50 years' cycles and accept the view of 49 years' Jubilee cycles—a view that by his *squaring* method certainly would force them, in consistency, to square 49 years to get their great Cycle. They are clearly bound hand and foot on this matter and their evasion is like the fruitless efforts of a prisoner trying to break off his shackles whose strength is a thousandfold greater than any pressure that he can bring to bear on them.

The other point in their article on which we will comment concerns what they have to say about a [supposed] Sabbath year, coming in a way as proves the seventh Sabbatic year and the Jubilee year to be synchronous, and held, according to their view, 590 B.C., a date that is based on three errors: (1) that Zedekiah instead of being uncrowned 607 B.C., was not uncrowned until 587 B.C.; (2) that there was a freeing of slaves before the tenth day of the tenth month in Zedekiah's ninth year; (3) that Nebuchadnezzar besieged Zedekiah before the tenth day of the tenth month of his ninth year. The siege that began at this date (Jer. 52:4) was the third unsheathing of Nebuchadnezzar's sword against Jerusalem, the other two occurring, one in the days of Jehoiakim, and the other in the days of Jehoiakin, and hence none occurring in Zedekiah's time previously to the tenth day of the tenth month in his ninth year. This third siege begun at this last date, was raised for a short time through an attack threatened by the Egyptians on the Babylonians. But as soon as the latter disposed of the

former, they resumed the siege that was begun at the above-mentioned date. There was no Sabbath year kept during this siege, whether we date the siege according to the true date, 609-607 B.C., or according to the false date, 589-587 B.C. But there was, not before, but during the first part of the siege (Jer. 34:1-10), a temporary freeing of slaves in the hope that this act of mercy would win them the Lord's favor in delivering them from the siege. Then, during the short interval between the two parts of the siege (Jer. 37:5-11), the slaves were taken back again (Jer. 34:11, 21, 22). Therefore God said that the siege would be resumed (Jer. 34:22; 37:8-11); and it was done. Since the freeing of the slaves occurred during the siege, and not before, and hence from the standpoint of neither the true nor false date of the siege could it have been during a Sabbath year, it must have been that they let the Sabbath year which came before the siege pass without freeing the slaves; and then as a belated act of repentance released them in hope of inducing the Lord to free them from the siege; and then when they were freed therefrom, they immediately took back their slaves. That the freeing of the slaves was not an ordinary Sabbatic year liberation is also manifest from the fact that it was arranged for by a special, unusual and solemn covenant, on the part of the slave owners, implying a previous sin in the matter—an arrangement that the Sabbatic liberations did not require (Jer. 34:8-11, 18, 19). Nor do the passages intimate at what time the Sabbath year in question came. Hence the Editors cannot show its time relation to the last Jubilee, which must be done to prove their point. Hence this incident does not prove what The Herald claims for it, that the Jubilee year came in the seventh Sabbatical year. Such an unprovable claim, with its involved erroneous assumptions, proves anew that these Editors are in Azazel's hands. Above we refuted some earlier P.B.I. errors. They did not accept these refutations, but went on to other errors, as will be shown hereinafter.

THY thoughts are here, my God,
Expressed in words Divine,
The utterance of heavenly lips
In ev'ry sacred line.
More durable they stand
Than the eternal hills;
Far sweeter and more musical
Than music of earth's rills.

Fairer in their fair hues
Than the fresh flowers of earth,
More fragrant than the fragrant climes
Where odors have their birth
Each word of thine a gem
From the celestial mines,
A sunbeam from that holy heaven
Where holy sunlight shines.

Thine, thine, this book, though given
In man's poor human speech,
Telling of things unseen, unheard,
Beyond all human reach.
No strength it craves or needs
From this world's wisdom vain;
No filling up from human wells,
Or sublunary rain.

No light from sons of time,
Nor brilliance from its gold;
It sparkles with its own glad light,
As in the ages old.
A thousand hammers keen,
With fiery force and strain,
Brought down on it in rage and hate,
Have struck this gem in vain.

Against this sea-swept rock
Ten thousand storms their will
Of foam and rage have wildly spent;
It lifts its calm face still.
It standeth and will stand,
Without or change or age,
The word of majesty and light,
The church's heritage.

CHAPTER VI.

CHRONOLOGICAL ERRORS OF THE SHIMITE GERSHONITES.

"WATCHMAN, WHAT OF THE NIGHT" EXAMINED. FURTHER P.B.I. CHRONOLOGY EXAMINED. SOME OF CARL OLSON'S CHRONOLOGICAL ERRORS EXAMINED. SOME RECENT P.B.I. CHRONOLOGICAL CLAIMS EXAMINED. SOME MORE RECENT P.B.I. CHRONOLOGICAL CLAIMS EXAMINED. SOME MISTAKES IN PTOLEMY'S CANON. ZEH—NOT THESE, BUT THIS. SOME P.B.I. ERRORS ON JEREMIAH AND DANIEL.

IN THE April 15 Herald of Christ's Kingdom, the P.B.I. periodical, appears an article of ten pages entitled: "Watchman, What of the Night?", repudiating our Pastor's chronology. In particular it denies that the Times of the Gentiles began in the nineteenth year of Nebuchadnezzar with the desolation of the land after the overthrow of Zedekiah, claiming that the Times of the Gentiles began nineteen years earlier, in the first year of Nebuchadnezzar's reign as King of Babylon. As a result they likewise state that they repudiate the chronology of the 6,000 years from Adam's creation as ending Oct., 1872, A.D., as well as the chronology of the great cycle leading up to the antitypical Jubilee, and the chronology of Parallel Dispensations. The article assures us that not only the five Herald Editors, but the seven P.B.I. Directors agree unanimously in these chronological repudiations, as well as in what they consider the Truth on these chronological periods. Quoting from Studies, Vol. II, which our Pastor wrote between 1886 and 1889, they claim that the three things therein set forth as our expectations as to 1914 "utterly failing to materialize"—(1) the utter collapse of Christendom, (2) the end of Armageddon, [Points (1) and (2) are the same event, not two different events] (3) the full establishment of the Kingdom—we were disappointed in our expectation in 1914. This, they say, necessitates a

re-examination of the chronology to find out the [supposed] mistake.

In setting forth such a reason they overlooked the fact that ten years before 1914 our Pastor pointed out that the Time of Trouble would not begin until after the end of Gentile Times in the Fall of 1914 (Z '04, 197-199; 229, 230; the last paragraph denies that we should teach that anarchy would be over in the Fall of 1915). Hence those of us who were properly informed on the subject did not for ten years before expect the end of Armageddon by the Fall of 1914; for we for years knew that a world-wide War, to begin in 1914, would precede it (Z '04, 249; 1 Kings 19:11, Berean Comments; Amos 9:13). So, too, they overlook the fact that in 1913 the Tower cautioned us that the Church would not leave the world in 1914; and that hence the kingdom would not be fully established in 1914. Accordingly, the Herald in claiming as a ground for going back on the chronology a disappointment of our expectations in 1914 is setting forth a fictitious, a non-existent disappointment; for before that time we did not expect these things to occur in that year. Our expectations for 1914—the beginning of the great Tribulation at the end of the Times of the Gentiles, and also the end of the reaping, but not of the gleaning—were realized by the outbreak of the World War, and by the gleaning continuing in that year. The Herald Editors give as a second reason that led them to look for a mistake in our chronology—the anxiety of their readers as to the meaning of the conditions since 1914. Had the Herald Editors retained the Truth on the subject of the Epiphany, and of the separation in the Church in 1917 as the antitype of Elijah's and Elisha's separation, and had they continued to walk in the light thereafter, they would have been able to quiet the anxiety of their readers by the Lord's solution of these conditions, instead of attempting to do so by repudiating a correct chronology. Thus they have greatly erred.

The Herald Editors tell us that they have very earnestly sought the Lord in prayer, and very diligently searched the Scriptures, to enable them to find the [supposed] mistake in our chronology. But they overlooked telling their readers that they evidently paid very little heed to the Scriptures on the subject; rather they paid very much heed to the chronologies of nominal-church writers like Usher's, and Guinness' and to heathen chronologies like Ptolemy's, whose solutions they have throughout accepted as against our Pastor's solutions, which he accepted after thoroughly examining and, for good reasons, rejecting nominal-church and heathen chronologies on the date of Nebuchadnezzar's first year as king of Babylon. Our Pastor having showed these chronologies to be wrong in Studies, Vol. II, the P.B.I. Editors should have been estopped by that fact from accepting them. In this particular these Editors have followed the same spirit as they showed in not a few cases in their interpretations of Revelation. Of course, they try to make it appear that our Pastor laid down principles, *e.g.*, in Z '14, 5, justifying their procedure, forgetting to mention that later, when the War broke out, our Pastor claimed that our chronology was thoroughly vindicated by the facts, *i.e.*, the Time of Trouble beginning at the time required by the chronology. We agree to his statement (which they quote to show that we are by him told to change our views as facts require): "Our expectations must not be allowed to weigh anything as against the facts"; and we add: the facts prove that what we expected before did come in 1914; hence there is no need to suggest alterations, as these Editors and Directors do, as being necessitated by the facts. The facts forbid their alterations, and justify our Pastor's view of the chronology.

We will set forth in their order with our refutations their three supposedly Scriptural proofs that the

Times of the Gentiles began in the first instead of the nineteenth year of Nebuchadnezzar's reign. Then we will examine their attempted refutation of the 70 years' desolation of the land as being identical with the seventy years of Babylon's universal rule.

The first (supposed) proof that they give in favor of the Times of the Gentiles beginning with the first year's reign of Nebuchadnezzar instead of with its nineteenth year are two statements in Dan. 2. In v. 1 it is stated that it was in "the *second* year" of his reign that he dreamed of the metallic image; and in verses 37, 38 it is stated that he was already then a universal monarch by God's appointment. Hence they reason that this being eighteen years before Zedekiah's uncrowning, the Times of the Gentiles began, not with the uncrowning of Zedekiah in the nineteenth year of Nebuchadnezzar's reign, but in the first year of the latter's reign.

Our answer to this argument is as follows: The Scriptures date the beginning of Nebuchadnezzar's reign from two chronological standpoints: (1) from the year in which he succeeded his father *as king of Babylon*, and (2) from the year in which he became *the king of the World*, with which latter year the Times of the Gentiles began. The latter year was in the nineteenth of his reign as his father's successor as king of Babylon. We now proceed to prove that the expression "in the *second* year of the reign of Nebuchadnezzar" (Dan. 2:1) cannot refer to the second year after he succeeded his father as king of Babylon, which the Herald Editors claim.

(1) Since it was after Daniel and his three companions were by Nebuchadnezzar with Jehoiakin, the choicest Israelites, and some sacred vessels captured and sent to Babylon (Dan. 1:2), which occurred in Nebuchadnezzar's seventh year of reigning (Jer. 52:28) that these four young Hebrews were selected for a three years' student course (Dan. 1:5); and since

it was after these three years were accomplished (Dan. 1:18) that Daniel and his companions were counted among the wise men of Babylon, and were privileged to stand before the king, *i.e.*, be officers and councilors of his; and since it was still later that the dream of Daniel 2 occurred, and was interpreted by Daniel, the dream could not in any wise have occurred before the fourth year of Nebuchadnezzar *as king of Babylon*. Hence the expression "second year" (Dan. 2:1) cannot refer to the second year of His reign as his father's successor, but must refer to the second year of his *universal reign*. This we will later prove began in the nineteenth year of his reign as his father's successor over Babylon. The Herald Editors mention these three years. How could they have overlooked the fact that these three years refute their view of the "second year" of Dan. 2:1?

(2) The three years' educational course of Daniel and his three companions could not have begun before the eighth year of Nebuchadnezzar's reign in successorship to his father as king of Babylon, because it was toward the end of his *seventh* year as such a king that the first Jewish captives were by him sent to Babylon (2 Chro. 36:5-7; Jer. 52:28), where they arrived during his eighth year (2 Kings 24:12), since a very expeditious journey of that distance then required at least four months (Ezra 7:9). Hence, the three years educational course could not have been finished before the *eleventh* year of Nebuchadnezzar *as king of Babylon*. Hence also the dream coming still later, the "second year" of Dan. 2:1 could not mean his second year as king of Babylon, but must mean the second year of a different reign from that which Nebuchadnezzar began at least eleven years before, immediately after his father's death, *i.e.*, it was the second year of his Universal Empire, which began nineteen years after he became king of Babylon.

Before proceeding further we desire to make some

remarks in reconciliation of the chronology on several points which are overlooked by the Herald Editors. One of these is an apparent contradiction between Dan 1:1-4 and certain other Scriptures, and certain remarks that we made in the preceding paragraphs. If we had only Dan. 1:1-4 as data, we would likely conclude that the captivity referred to in these verses occurred in the third year of Jehoiakim; but the data of 2 Chro. 36:5-7 and Jer. 52:28 prove that it occurred in the eleventh year of Jehoiakim and in the seventh year of Nebuchadnezzar. We harmonize the accounts as follows: Dan. 1:1, 2 mentions the time of only the first of its various events, giving the others until Jehoiakim's dethronement without their chronology, as the following proves: Late in Jehoiakim's third year (Dan. 1:1) Nebuchadnezzar in his first year left Babylon for Palestine, arriving there in the fourth year of Jehoiakim's reign (Jer. 25:1). Without suffering a siege at that time Jehoiakim came to terms with Nebuchadnezzar, becoming subservient to him for three years (2 Kings 24:1); then in the fourth year of Nebuchadnezzar's reign and in the seventh year of his own reign he rebelled against the former. As a result after considerable delay the former came against Jerusalem, and for the first time laid siege to the city (Dan. 1:1), taking it in the seventh year of his own reign and in the eleventh year of Jehoiakim, dethroning him and sending some of the people and some of the sacred vessels to Babylon (2 Kings 23:36; Dan. 1:2-4; 2 Chro. 36:5-7). These events occurred toward the end of Nebuchadnezzar's seventh year *as king of Babylon* (Jer. 52:28). Thus ended the first chapter of Nebuchadnezzar's dealings with Israel in the seventh year of his reign over Babylon. This harmonizes Dan. 1:1, 2 with the other accounts. Another point becomes clear as follows: Nebuchadnezzar appointed Jehoiakin to succeed his father; but within three months and ten days (2 Kings 24:8)

he besieged and captured him in the eighth year of his own reign (2 Kings 24:10-12), leading captive the second group of Israelites to Babylon with some others of the sacred vessels (2 Kings 24:13-16; Jer. 52:29). In this latter verse a careless scribe inserted the Hebrew word for ten after the Hebrew word for eighth making the verse say the eighteenth year instead of the eighth year of Nebuchadnezzar. The difference in the number of the captives we harmonize as follows: the former passage gives the number of captives of all kinds, the latter does not include the members of the royal family, its relatives, the princes, their families, the men of war and the craftsmen. Thus ended the second chapter of Nebuchadnezzar's dealing with Israel, resulting in a second group of Israelites going into captivity in the eighth year of his reign, after a second siege of Jerusalem by Nebuchadnezzar. But the Scriptures teach that Nebuchadnezzar's sword would be unsheathed a third time against Jerusalem (Ezek. 21:14), which began in the ninth year of Zedekiah, ending during his eleventh year in his uncrowning (Ezek. 21:25-27), and in the third group of captives, and in the rest of the sacred vessels going to Babylon (2 Kings 25:1-21; 2 Chro. 36:18; Jer. 52:4-15). This occurred in the nineteenth year of Nebuchadnezzar (2 Kings 25:8). It was Nebuzar-adan, the general of his host, who led away the captives, as the accounts show, in the nineteenth year of Nebuchadnezzar (2 Kings 25:8, 11, 20; Jer. 52:12, 15, 16, 24-27, 30). We harmonize the dates of the other passages with Jer. 52:30 as follows: Nebuzar-adan returned to Jerusalem from the pursuit of the fugitives (2 Kings 25:4-6, 8) on the seventh day of the fifth month (2 Kings 25:8); on the tenth of this month he entered and then began to destroy the city and temple (Jer. 52:12; 2 Kings 25:9, 10), and on the twenty-third day of this month he led away the captives from

Jerusalem (Jer. 52:30). The Herald Editors, who use this verse to disprove our Pastor's view on the meaning and time of the land's desolation, object that this last verse says this was done in the twenty-third year of Nebuchadnezzar. Our reply is as follows: Both the account in 2 Kings 25:5-12, 18-21, 22, 25 and in Jer. 52:12, 15, 16, 24-27 show that this was done in Nebuchadnezzar's nineteenth year. Hence we understand that out of the Hebrew text the following words have been lost after the words translated "in the year," with whose corresponding words the verse in Hebrew begins: "nineteenth and in the day," etc. In other words, the verse should read as follows: "in the nineteenth year in the twenty-third day" [of the fifth month], *i.e.*, two weeks after beginning to destroy the city, Nebuzar-adan withdrew with the captives, leaving a few people and a governor in the land, who was murdered in the seventh month, whereupon all the remnant fled to Egypt, leaving the land "desolate" "without inhabitant" (Jer. 26:9; 52:16; 2 Kings 25:22-26). Thus the Scriptures teach three sieges of Jerusalem and three groups of captives led away into Babylon by Nebuchadnezzar and they speak of the third of these sieges, resulting in the third of these captivities, as the sword unsheathed the "third time," as its first unsheathing resulted in the first group of captives reaching Babylon in Nebuchadnezzar's eighth year. These remarks harmonize the chronology completely on these subjects.

(3) Reason suggests that the three years' educational course of the four Hebrew youths began later than in the eighth and ended later than in the eleventh year of Nebuchadnezzar; for these youths were prisoners of war; additionally they were of the royal family (Dan. 1:3). Against them some of the odium and distrust that Nebuchadnezzar felt toward its head who rebelled against him (2 Kings 24:1; 2 Chro. 36:6) must have been held. Hence they were persons

whom the king would not trust nor promote to the extent implied in arranging to educate them to become officers and councilors of his kingdom, until sufficient time had elapsed in which they could be observed and tested as to trustworthiness and ability for an education preparatory for such responsible careers (Dan. 1:4, 5). The *tender* love of the prince of the eunuchs implies a long time-element intervening before this education began (Dan. 1:9). Let us assume that three years, a conservative estimate for so responsible a thing, were passed in observing and testing the trustworthiness of these youths before they were admitted into the educational school for their three years' course. This would have made their entrance into and graduation from this school respectively in the eleventh and fourteenth years of Nebuchadnezzar's reign as king of Babylon. This consideration also disproves the thought of the Herald Editors that the dream of the metallic image, which occurred after the graduation of these Hebrew youths, took place in the second year of Nebuchadnezzar's reign as king of Babylon.

(4) A fourth set of considerations disproves the point of the Herald Editors, showing additionally that the dream occurred considerably later than the fourteenth year of Nebuchadnezzar's reign over Babylon: Considerable time must have elapsed and many events must have occurred to furnish the opportunities for Daniel and his three companions to prove themselves superior to all the king's other wise men in all matters on which he inquired of them as his officers and councilors (Dan. 1:19, 20). For these inquiries, be it noted, were made after they were made officers and councilors of the king, *i.e.*, after "they stood before the king." The further fact that Daniel and his three companions were singled out and were *expressly* sought by the executioner, after the king decreed the death of the wise men for failing to tell the dream, proves that they had for a considerable time been

recognized as famous among the wise men of Babylon (Dan. 2:13). Evidently also long time-intervals elapsed between the events given in each successive chapter of Daniel from the first to the fifth inclusive. Thus these lines of facts are in harmony with the date of the dream as being some years later than the fourteenth year of Nebuchadnezzar's reign over Babylon, and of course contradict the Herald's claim.

The four points given above demonstrate that the second year of Nebuchadnezzar's reign mentioned in Dan. 2:1 cannot be the second year of his reign as his father's successor as king of Babylon; for these facts prove that Dan. 2:1 refers to the second year of a reign begun many years later. Therefore, instead of Dan. 2:1, 37, 38 proving that the Times of the Gentiles began with the first year of Nebuchadnezzar as king over Babylon, as the Herald Editors with so much confidence claim, it disproves that thought, and is in line with the thought that the Times of the Gentiles began in the nineteenth year of that reign, and that the dream occurred in its twentieth year, which was his second year as universal monarch. Why did not the Herald Editors, who in their article mention the three years' schooling, see that this fact made it impossible to refer to the second year of Dan. 2:1 to the second year of Nebuchadnezzar's reign as his father's successor as king of Babylon? Why did they not try to harmonize the facts and the chronology of Dan. 1:1, 2, which mentions the chronology of its first event only, with those of 2 Kings 24:1-21; 2 Chro. 36:5-7; Jer. 25:1; 52:28? It is impossible in harmony with justice to consider interpreters who are so careless, and who make so manifest blunders in such important matters, as clear, accurate and reliable interpreters. Let our readers remember also that they committed this blunder despite their knowing that our Pastor after careful investigation rejected the event and year in Nebuchadnezzar's reign that they

are now advocating as marking the beginning of the Times of the Gentiles; for their present theory is of many years' standing among nominal-church writers, from whom they borrowed it. Let our readers also remember that in this matter the Herald Editors have rejected our Pastor's findings in favor of those of nominal-church and heathen chronologies.

The second (supposedly) Scriptural argument that the Herald Editors use to prove our Pastor to have made a mistake in taking Nebuchadnezzar's nineteenth year as the time, and Zedekiah's uncrowning and the coincident desolation of the land as the events marking the beginning of the Times of the Gentiles, and to prove themselves right in accepting against his findings the nominal-church and heathen chronologies as giving Nebuchadnezzar's first year as the time, and Jehoiakim's becoming servile to him seven years before his dethronement as the event, marking the beginning of the Times of the Gentiles, is by them claimed to be found in Jer. 27:1-11; Dan. 1:1, 2; 2 Kings 24:1; 2 Chro. 36:6. Briefly, their argument is the following: According to Jer. 27:1-11 in the beginning of the reign of *Jehoiakim*, whose reign began twenty-two years before Zedekiah's overthrow, Jehovah made a decree that all nations must be subject to Babylon for seventy years (v. 7, compare Jer. 25:11, 12; 29:10). The decree thus announced was, they say, enforced in Jehoiakim's third year when he allegedly became subservient to Nebuchadnezzar in the latter's first year. In proof they quote Dan. 1:1, 2; 2 Kings 24:1. Hence they claim that Nebuchadnezzar's first year marks the beginning of Babylon's Universal Empire and of the Times of the Gentiles, nineteen years before Zedekiah's uncrowning.

To this argument we make the following answer: This decree (Jer. 27:1-11) was made, *not in the beginning*, and then enforced in the third year of *Jehoiakim's* reign, but was made in the *fourth*, and then

enforced in the *eleventh* year of *Zedekiah's* reign, which was the nineteenth of Nebuchadnezzar's reign. In proof of the correctness of this answer we submit the following reasons:

(1) This is in part evident from the fact that this decree was made by God through Jeremiah to the ambassadors of various countries (Jer. 27:2, 3), who were at that time accredited, not to King *Jehoiakim*, but to King *Zedekiah* for delivery to their rulers. Hence the decree was made after Jehoiakim's reign of eleven years, and Jehoiakin's reign of three months and ten days were over; hence not earlier than the eighth year of Nebuchadnezzar (2 Kings 24:12).

(2) This is also in part evident from the fact that at the same time that this decree was made and delivered to the ambassadors at Zedekiah's court it was also delivered to him (Jer. 27:12-15) and to the priests and to the people (v. 16).

(3) This is further in part evident from the fact that, before this decree had been made, Nebuchadnezzar in his eighth year (2 Kings 24:12-16; 2 Chro. 36:9, 10) had already taken away the second lot of the sacred vessels—those taken in the days of Jehoiakin—while this decree threatens that if Zedekiah and the people would not be subject to it, those of the sacred vessels that yet remained would also be taken to and kept in Babylon with those formerly carried there, until Israel's return from captivity (Jer. 27:16-22).

(4) This is directly proven by the statement of Jer. 28:1 to the effect that it was in the same year as this decree was made, *i.e.*, in the fourth year of *Zedekiah*, that Jeremiah's prophecy respecting the matters treated of in Jer. 27:1-22 was contradicted by the false prophet, Hananiah (Jer. 28:1-4).

(5) This is fully evident, because the best MSS. of Jer. 27:1 read as follows: "In the beginning of the reign of *Zedekiah*," not *Jehoiakim*. In proof please

see Rotherham's note on this verse, giving the correction on the authority of Dr. Ginsburg, that very learned Hebrew scholar who has done for the Hebrew text of the Old Testament the work that Dr. Tischendorf, etc., have done for the Greek text of the New Testament—collated and published the variant readings of the original. Please also see the note of the A.R.V. on this verse. That the reading "Zedekiah" is the proper one is manifest from the entire chapter, particularly vs. 3, 12, 19, 20; and is unanswerably proven to be so by Jer. 28:1, which states that the whole message of Jer. 27 was delivered in the fourth year of Zedekiah, designating that year as "in the beginning" of his reign. Hence not only do Jer. 27:1-11; Dan. 1:1, 2; 2 Kings 24:1; 2 Chro. 36:6; Jer. 25:11, 12; 29:10 *not prove* that the Times of the Gentiles began with the third year of Jehoiakim, and in the first year of Nebuchadnezzar; but they most positively disprove it, and prove that they had not yet begun in the fourth year of Zedekiah. Since previously Nebuchadnezzar's sword had twice been unsheathed against Israel, these passages further prove that this decree, made in Nebuchadnezzar's thirteenth year with reference to a future event, did not go into effect until his sword's third unsheathing—in the end of Zedekiah's reign. Hence these passages prove that the Times of the Gentiles began in the nineteenth year of Nebuchadnezzar's reign over Babylon, which was the first year of his reign over the world, one year before he had his dream of the metallic image.

We desire to ask the Herald Editors why they quote in proof of their theories passages which positively disprove them? How could they have been so careless as to overlook the statements of Jer. 27:3, 12, 16-23 and Jer. 28:1, proving that Zedekiah was meant? The presence of those statements would have made *careful* thinkers pause and question whether there was not something wrong with the reading "Jehoiakim" in

Jer. 27:1. We opine that hurried on by Azazel, and filled with the theories of nominal-church and heathen writers, they failed attentively to consider the oracles of God, and thus plunged themselves into this great blunder, from which a proper meekness on their part toward that Servant would have saved them. Instead, while drunk with Babylon's wine, they offered strange fire before the Lord (Lev. 10:1, 9)!

Following nominal-church writers, the Herald Editors claim as a third Scriptural proof that Jehoiakim's subserviency beginning (not in his third year, as they claim, but) in his fourth year (Jer. 25:1; 2 Kings 24:1) proves that from that time onward Israel was subject to Gentile rule, and hence the Times of the Gentiles then began. Corroborations of this they think are Jehoiakin's uncrowning and Zedekiah's appointment by Nebuchadnezzar. To this we make several answers:

(1) Nebuchadnezzar's relations to Jehoiakim were not those of a super-ruler, but those of a foreign invader too powerful to resist while near.

(2) This subserviency as soon as possible was cast off and disregarded for four years (2 Kings 24:1; 2 Chro. 36:5-7).

(3) While Zedekiah (2 Chro. 36:10) was appointed by Nebuchadnezzar after the latter's besieging, capturing and deposing Jehoiakin, Jehoiakim's successor, he was independent of Nebuchadnezzar, as Jer. 27:12-17 clearly proves.

(4) If the mere subserviency of a Jewish king to a Gentile power and his dismissal or appointment by such a power prove the subjugation of Israel implied in the expression, the Times of the Gentiles, then the Jews became subject to the Gentiles, and hence the Times of the Gentiles began, four years before the fourth year of Jehoiakim, when Necho, king of Egypt, overthrew Jehoahaz, appointed Jehoiakim in his stead, and made Israel pay tribute (2 Chro. 35:20-36:4).

(5) God counted Israel His typical kingdom and thus independent of Gentile power until David's descendants lost the crown (Ezek. 21:25-27). Ezek. 21 and Jer. 27 throughout are in line with this thought, showing that Israel lost its *kingdom, independence*, by Nebuchadnezzar's sword unsheathed the third time: at the end of Zedekiah's reign.

The Herald Editors quote Ptolemy's canon and nominal-church writers in corroboration of their claims as to 606 B.C. being Nebuchadnezzar's first year as Babylon's king. In answer we say:

(1) Ptolemy's canon sets the year 604 B.C. as the first year of Nebuchadnezzar's reign over Babylon, a fact that the Herald Editors evidently know, but that they evidently conceal, proven by their giving, and that out of their proper chronological place, two years of Nebuchadnezzar's supposed coregency with his father. Why did they not place the supposed coregency at its proper chronological place at the head instead of next to the bottom of their chronological table? Was it because its position at its proper chronological place would have exposed the unreliability of Ptolemy's canon on that date—an exposure that they would not desire to be made, because fatal to their theory?

(2) It is because the Ptolemy and the nominal-church chronologies contradict the Bible chronology previous to Cyrus' decree that our Pastor rejected them as incorrect previous to that time. Shall we with our Pastor follow the Bible chronology previous to Cyrus' decree, or shall we with the P.B.I. Editors and Directors follow heathen and nominal-church chronologies contradictory to the Bible? Which? The faithful will with Joshua say, "As for me and my house, we will serve the Lord!"

Of course these Editors feel that the seventy Jubilees kept by the land during its desolation are against the acceptance of their nominal-church theory by the

Lord's people, and therefore they make the most desperate efforts to dispose of them as against their theory, and in so doing have offered some tortured explanations that have been rarely equaled for unreasonableness—explanations that they have borrowed from nominal-church writers, whose views on the 70 Jubilee years they also endorse as against our Pastor's. They claim that the 70 Jubilee years that the land kept began Dec. 25, 589 B.C., when they claim Nebuchadnezzar invaded the land in the ninth year of Zedekiah, and ended somewhat earlier in the year, 520 B.C., a period of less than 69 years, during over sixteen of which they say the Israelites were in the land after their return from Babylon! And they actually proceed at great length to expound such an absurdity to people trained in our Pastor's sober ways of thinking, even assuming that these 70 years are periods of 360 days, a method that they used to palm off a nominal-church writer's (Dr. Guinness) views as against our Pastor's thought on the 3½ days during which the two witnesses lay dead on the streets of that great City! One view of this nominal-church theory is given in McClintock and Strong's Cyclopaedia, Vol. 3, 304, pars. 2, 3.

We will give some brief refutations under two heads. We will prove (1) that the seventy years of desolation and the seventy years of Babylon's universal rule are identical; and (2) that these Editors' view of the seventy Jubilees kept by the land is grossly erroneous.

First we remark that by Babylon's seventy years' reign we do not understand that their emperors were on the throne as universal rulers that long, but that their authority as exercised by them or by their representatives among the nations would not be overthrown entirely until the end of that period, which synchronized with Israel's arrival in Palestine after leaving Babylon in harmony with Cyrus' decree. We make this

remark because, actually, Cyrus overthrew Babylon's last emperor in 538 B.C., a date less than seventy years after Babylon became a universal power.

We now proceed to give briefly the proof that the seventy years of desolation and the seventy years of Babylon's universal rule are one and the same period.

(1) The proofs already given in connection with "the second year" of Nebuchadnezzar's reign (Dan. 2:1), and the date of giving and the date of enforcing Jehovah's decree (Jer. 27:1-11) as to Babylon's universal rulership, prove this proposition and need no repetition here.

(2) Jeremiah mentions this expression, seventy years, only three times (Jer. 25:11, 12; 29:10; in the latter passage practically all versions, and that correctly, render "for Babylon," not "at Babylon") and in one of these passages—the only one where he mentions the desolation of the land as of seventy years' duration—he identifies the period of Babylon's universal rule and the period of the desolation of the land (Jer. 25:11, 12).

(3) Daniel correctly understood Jeremiah's one and only reference to the seventy years of the land's desolation to mean the period of time during which the Israelites would be away from the land (Dan. 9:2, 7, 12, 16, 18-20). Hence he prayed for Israel's return to the land as that period was closing (Dan. 9:1-29).

(4) Jeremiah's one and only one reference to the seventy years' desolation of the land (Jer. 25:11, 12), which he identifies with Babylon's seventy years' universal rule, and his references to the land being "desolate" "without inhabitant" (Jer. 26:4-7, 9) are by Jehovah Himself identified with the seventy Jubilees kept by the land *through the absence of its inhabitants* (2 Chro. 36:20-22). If these seventy Jubilees are not referred to in Jer. 25:11, 12, which verses identify the seventy years' desolation with Babylon's seventy years supremacy, where else does he foretell seventy Jubilees

to be accomplished in the desolation of the land? Nowhere! Hence the seventy Sabbaths are identical with Babylon's seventy years; for 2 Chro. 36:20, 21, 22 proves that Israel was driven and kept out of the land for seventy years in order to fulfill Jeremiah's prophecy of the land's desolation for seventy years; and the only place where Jeremiah makes such a prophecy is where he identifies the land's desolation with Babylon's seventy years' supremacy (Jer. 25:11, 12). Moses' prophecy refers to the same thing (Lev. 26:33-35). Accordingly, these two expressions refer to the same period of time.

(5) 2 Chro. 36:20-22 proves that the seventy years' desolation of the land was during Israel's *total absence* from the land, for these verses say that they were driven out, and then kept out of the land for seventy years in order that the land could keep its seventy Sabbaths. And it also says that as long as it was desolate—"without inhabitant" (Jer. 26:9)—it kept its Sabbaths for seventy years. Hence the seventy years of Sabbath keeping and Babylon's seventy years' supremacy are identical.

(6) Zech. 7:5-14 generally, and particularly verses 5 and 14, show expressly that the seventy years' desolation were a period in which nobody was in the land, and that during those seventy years of desolation no one returned to the land; while the P.B.I. theory, plagiarized from the nominal church, claims that the Israelites returned and lived there over sixteen years before the seventy years of desolation were completed!

(7) The Jubilee beginning on the tenth day of the seventh month (Lev. 25:9), and the solar year and the lunar year in Israel being in the long run equalized, which is proven by the ripening of the first-fruits pointing out the month of Nisan (Lev. 23:10-15); and the Jubilee year in the long run averaging in length the solar year, the seventy Jubilees—the seventy years of desolation—were on the average equal to

seventy solar years; and therefore we must have a period of seventy average solar years for them, which no explanation allows other than the identity of the seventy years of desolation and Babylon's seventy years of supremacy. Hence the identical period is meant by these two expressions.

The above seven reasons demonstrate the Scripturalness of our Pastor's views, and refute the nominal-church views on this subject, now offered us by the P.B.I. Editors and Directors.

Having proved the correctness of our chronology on the seventy years and thus indirectly disproved the Herald's views, we now proceed to a direct refutation of the latter's thought on the seventy years as being years of 360 days and as beginning Dec. 25, 598 B.C., and ending in Nov., 520 B.C.

(1) Whatever God's people may or may not have done before on the subject, certainly Israel never from the Exodus onward kept a year of 360 days (Ex. 12:2). Their year was a lunar year with a month added at its end whenever at that end the condition of the growing barley proved that its first-fruits would not be ripe in time for presentation in the Holy of Holies on the sixteenth of the next month (Lev. 23:10-15). Hence their years in the long run averaged a solar year of 365.242 days. Therefore the seventy years of desolation were not counted by them as consisting of 360 days each. Had they used such a year, it would have made their Passover come in the Fall 35 years after their first Passover. This consideration refutes the P.B.I.—nominal-church view on the seventy years being of 360 days each.

(2) The Jubilee years came on an average every fifty solar years, and on an average lasted a solar year. Therefore the seventy Jubilee years—the seventy years of desolation—averaged seventy solar years, and therefore would have outlasted the period from Dec., 589 B.C. to Nov., 520 B.C. by a year and a

month. Hence this consideration refutes their thought.

(3) It is an unproved and false assumption—the claim of the Herald—as we showed above—that there were seventy years of 360 days from Nebuchadnezzar's final invasion until the Israelites commenced again to rebuild their temple in the day of Darius; but it is further disproved, because the year of the Jews forbids such a method of reckoning, as was proved by the first point given above.

(4) The nations, *e.g.*, the more ancient Babylonians and the Egyptians, that used the year of twelve months of thirty days each, either at certain intervals added a month, or at the end of the 360 days added five or six days as the case required to make the years begin at their proper seasons. This is what the quotations from Sir Isaac Newton and Sir G.C. Lewis mean, as can be seen from the latter's statement (in the quotation that the Editors give they present these statements as though they favor their view, whereas they do not so do) that some of the ancients kept the year of 360 days, "*determined within certain limits of error.*" But as we have seen, the Jews did not observe a year of 360 days, because it would have made it impossible for them to keep in the proper seasons of the year their festivals, which were fixed to the seasons of the year, *e.g.*, the Passover in the Spring, the Feast of Tabernacles in the Fall, etc.; for with a year of 360 days, thirty-five years after the first Passover that festival would have come in the Fall, on about the fourteenth of the seventh month. Sixty-nine years later the same thing would have occurred again, with intervening ones coming on an average five to six days earlier in each succeeding year. This fact completely refutes the Herald's claims. True, God uses the year of 360 days and the month of 30 days in foretelling the time periods. For this there is the best of reasons; for had He, in foretelling these time periods by symbolic months and years, used the exact number of days

in the lunar or in the solar months and years, the varying number of days in their months and years and the fractional parts of days in their years would have made the statement of the prophecy bunglesome, yea, almost impossible and confusing, and the work of tracing the foretold periods practically impossible. *E.g.*, had He used lunar months, how could we be sure when to count 29 or 30 symbolic days to a symbolic month, since these do not for several reasons always alternate in the literal months, *e.g.*, on account of the added month? Or how could we be sure when to use the symbolic added month and the year of 13 months? Or how could we be sure whether to begin to count with a month of 29 or of 30 days? All of these things would have to be considered in using the lunar months and years for symbolic time prophecy. Or if the solar months were used, how would one know whether or when to use a month of 28 or 29 or 30 or 31 days? One would be at an utter loss how to manage the fraction of a day in the 354.367 days in a lunar year, and the fraction of a day in the 365.242 days in a solar year in tracing the symbolic times of prophetic years. Hence God foretold these time periods in terms of months of 30 symbolic days and of years of 360 symbolic days. However, the years so foretold were not years consisting of 360 days, but years as we now have them. The fulfillments prove this to be the case. None of the examples that the Herald gives proves that the Bible gives us in its chronology years of 360 days. The fact that the water prevailed for 150 days, and the other fact that the ark rested on Mt. Ararat exactly five months after the flood began (Gen. 8:3, 4), do not prove that these 150 days were equal to five exact months; for the ark could have drifted to a place on Mt. Ararat and then rested there in exactly five months without the date being 150 days from the beginning of the flood. Two considerations prove this: [1] These two verses do

not identify these periods. Hence this unproven, but assumed, identity cannot be treated as a proof of five months of thirty days each as being Biblical; [2] the ark drawing over fifteen cubits of water would have rested on a place fifteen cubits under the water before the water began to abate (Gen. 6:15; 7:20). Again, without any proof they assume that the 180 days of Esth. 1:4 were six months. The desperate straits to which the Herald Editors are driven in assuming a year of 360 days as Biblical, when not only is there no Biblical proof for such a year in Bible chronology, but on the contrary the Bible clearly and unanswerably proves that it used a year that in the long run averaged a year of 365.242 days, are proofs sufficient of the utter erroneousness of their position.

(5) What if the Jews did observe the tenth day of the tenth month (Jer. 52:4) as a fast allegedly for Nebuchadnezzar's invasion, which the Herald claims, and then gives its pertinent claim that this fast was in memory of the seventy years' desolation beginning with that event? This fast does not prove their point; for, during the seventy years of captivity, they additionally observed as fast days the day of the city's capture in the fourth month and its and the temple's burning in the fifth month (Jer. 52:6, 12), and in the seventh month the day of Zedekiah's dethroning at Riblah (2 Kings 25:6) and the desolation of the land, both occurring in the seventh month (Zech. 7:5; 8:19). That the P.B.I. claim that the fast of the tenth month was for the desolation of the land is untrue, is proven by the facts: (1) that not the desolation of the land, but the siege of Jerusalem set in then; (2) that the desolation of the land occurred in the seventh month, for which the fast of the seventh month was kept during the 70 years' desolation of the land (Zech. 7:5; 8:19); (3) that the date of the Babylonians' entering the land, which the P.B.I. claim as occurring in the tenth month, is nowhere given, much less given

as in the tenth month; it must have occurred before the tenth month, for it is far more than a ten days' journey from Palestine's northern boundary where the entrance was made, to Jerusalem; and (4) that the Jews considered Jerusalem's siege a great calamity, which justified a fast to mark its beginning.

(6) The land did not rest from *sowing* (as it would have had to do, if the seventy Jubilee years continued until 520, the Herald's date for their end) from the time of the return from Babylon until many years later—over sixteen years, according to the Herald—when they began again to rebuild the temple. This is evident from several considerations: (1) The Jews would have starved unless they had sown and raised at least some crops during those many years. (2) Hag. 1:6, 4-12 directly says that the people from the time they left off rebuilding the temple until they began again to rebuild it had been *sowing* the land, though reaping little. Yea, they had been sowing ever since their return; but after they ceased from the work of rebuilding the temple (Ezra 4:24), the Lord punished them for their lack of zeal for His House with crop failures (Hag. 1:6, 9-11), which, of course, proves that they sowed and sought to raise crops. This unanswerably proves that the land was sown, and therefore was not up to 520 B.C., keeping its Sabbaths to fulfill *seventy years*. On the contrary, this proves that these seventy Sabbaths ended with Israel's return to the land; for from that time onward they sowed it; and hence none of the seventy Sabbaths were enjoyed by the land during the sixteen years from the return until, according to the Herald, the rebuilding of the temple began anew. To our astonishment the Herald uses Hag. 1:1-11 as its second most important proof that the seventy Sabbaths did not end until 520 B.C.! Do these Editors have to be taught that *famine years* (mentioned in these verses as being sent in punishment for the Jews' neglecting to work on the Lord's House,

and then as being ended on their beginning again to rebuild the temple) are not what the Bible means by the land resting in its Jubilee years? Must these Editors be taught that the *Jubilee* years for the land, as well as the seven Sabbatic years intervening, were kept by the people's not *sowing* their crops, and thus letting the land rest (Lev. 25:2-4, 11)? How could they have been so careless as to overlook this point and Hag. 1:6, which they quote to prove the land's resting, but which shows the exact opposite, that sowing was done, and that therefore the land was not resting those sixteen years; and thus that sixteen of the seventy Sabbaths of the land were not kept throughout the sixteen years that they claim were parts of the seventy Sabbath years? Again, we ask, Why do they so often quote passages, *e.g.*, Hag. 1:6, to prove points positively disproven by those very passages? Is it not because they are in Azazel's hands, and are thus blinded by him, and at his direction palm off his errors on the dear unsuspecting sheep of God's flock?

(7) Their most important argument to prove their contention that the seventy Jubilee years ended in 520 B.C. and not on Israel's return from Babylon is by them declared to be Zech. 1:7, 12, 16, particularly v. 12, which speaks of the Lord's indignation lasting seventy years, and which they say refers to the period of seventy years ending in 520 B.C. To this we answer that Editors who claim to have given a proper interpretation of Rev. 6 and its symbolic horses, as referring to the Gospel Age, should have known better than to have applied to the Jewish Age a vision (Zech. 1:8-17) that refers to some of the same things as Rev. 6, and that refers exclusively to the Gospel Age. The seventy years of Zech. 1:12 refer to the period of Spiritual Israel's captivity in Symbolic Babylon, and not to the period from Dec. 25, 589 B.C., to Nov., 520 B.C. Their use of this passage, as well as that of Hag. 1:4-11 to prove their delusion, is only another evidence

of their drunken adherence to wrong theories of nominal-church teachers, and of their manifest unreliability as expounders of the Word of Truth.

When we wrote against some of their Revelation explanations we raised the warning that they were giving many interpretations of nominal-church teachers, some of which were contrary to those of our Pastor, and almost all of which pertaining to passages that he had not expounded were wrong. We are reliably informed that R. E. Streeter is the one mainly responsible for introducing such nominal-church views among the P.B.I.; but all of the Editors and Directors are responsible for giving way to these. Alas, that for such "foolish Virgins" views they are willing to repudiate our Pastor's well-proven interpretations! When we consider that these Editors promise to show in future numbers how wrong our Pastor was on the 6000 years as ending in 1872, on the Jubilees, on the Parallel Dispensations, the 2300 days, etc., suggesting to the dear unsuspecting sheep not to be alarmed at this, and that they intimate that they will do this by the use of the theory of a Scriptural (?) year of 360 days—a theory that is utterly unscriptural, unreasonable and unfactual, we are in a position to recognize the depth of delusion into which they have fallen, the proven certainty of their being in Azazel's hands, and of their being mouthpieces of him, and the dire danger to the Lord's people of permitting such persons to continue any longer as teachers in their midst. We call upon the faithful to repudiate such unreliable, erroneous and unfaithful stewards of the Truth which was committed to the custodianship of the Church by the Lord through that Servant!

They announce May 1, 1922, that they are publishing an extra edition of their April 15 issue to circulate through their supporters their views on the Times of the Gentiles broadly among Truth people. Well, be it so! Let their partisan supporters, then, do

this, if they desire so to do; but in so doing will they not hasten the making known to all men of the folly of the P.B.I. Editors and Directors as parts of antitypical Jambres (2 Tim. 3:8, 9)?

Since, according to their view, Zedekiah's overthrow was nineteen years later than the beginning of the Times of the Gentiles, they likewise state that they are convinced that the full collapse of Christendom will be over in 1933 or 1934. This was the view of some of the 1909 sifters. To make this view seem plausible they define the "Times of the Gentiles" to be, not the period of the Divine lease of power to the Gentiles, as our Pastor defined it (B 76, par. 2), but the period during which they would exercise universal power (H '21, 84, par. 3). While in Studies, Vol. II some expressions give also this latter thought, this was due to the fact that at that time he thought that the two terms were synonymous. Later, he came to see that they were not synonymous, from which time on he always defined the term to mean the period of the Divine lease of power (Z '04, 198, par. 1). For this reason he said, repeatedly, that sometime before Oct., 1914, the Lord would send the nations notice that their lease, the Times of the Gentiles, was expiring, and that they should vacate at that date, and that when they would refuse he would by the trouble evict them. All of us recall how he spoke of the war after it came as "eviction proceedings." Hence the time since Oct., 1914, is not a part of the Times of the Gentiles; it is the eviction time of those who are seeking to keep possession after their lease, the Times of the Gentiles, has expired. "There is a reason" for the P.B.I. Directors and Editors "teaching perverse things" (Acts 20:30) on the Times of the Gentiles. In their April 1 issue, they state that the reaping is not yet over. Their general position seems to indicate that shortly they are going to advocate some drive to finish the reaping. On this we shall see what we shall see. Let us, for our

part, praise our God for the certainty of the Parousia and the Epiphany Truth, and for the privileges that as Epiphany-enlightened saints we have in the Parousia and the Epiphany Truth and its service (Ps. 91:1-16).

The article that we have examined is entitled, "Watchman, What of the Night?" It is thus a question that the Editors of the Herald have asked. Having seen that their answer proves that the night is darkening about *them*, we would say in answer to their question, It is now night, and this night will darken more and more for them, until they have cleansed themselves. Then thanks be to God, it will become a day again for them!

In the P.B.I. Herald of July 15, 1921, is an article in answer to some questions that are against its Editors' views and that they say were sent to them by some of their readers respecting Jehoiakim's third and fourth years and the three years' schooling of Daniel. We are satisfied that the article is another of their veiled attempts to answer some of our points against their nominal-church view of the Times of the Gentiles beginning in the third year of Jehoiakim and in the first year of Nebuchadnezzar. Anyone reading their article can see that they are staggering as from a hard blow, but are trying to put on a brave front. Their tone, like that of the usual errorist, is very patronizing, for they speak of those who offer irrefutable Scriptural arguments against their position as being confused, and of their willingness to help these supposedly confused brethren. The fact that they themselves are the confused ones, and yet offer to enlighten those who are clear in the matter, brings to mind the offer that slaves to corruption make to free others by enslaving them (2 Pet. 2:18, 19)! In their article on "Watchman, What of the Night?" they promised that they would prove their proposition on the Times of the Gentiles by the Scriptures alone; but in the article under review they admit that from secular history only

can they answer the objections based on the fourth year of Jehoiakim and the three years of Daniel's schooling. In other words, secular history (so they claim, but we will prove later on that Ptolemy's canon disproves their claim) and not the Scriptures are to control in this matter of chronology, according to the P.B.I. Editors!

They also claim now that the expression, "the first year of Nebuchadnezzar of Babylon" (Jer. 25:1) means the first year that Nebuchadnezzar gained controllership of Judah. This is a twist worthy of uncleansed Levites and members of antitypical Jambres. We must also correct a statement that they make, to the effect that, if a Jewish king began to reign one month before Nisan, with Nisan he would enter his second year's reign. This we emphatically deny. The time of his reign before Nisan would not be counted as belonging to his own reign, but as filling up the incomplete year of his predecessor. Unless this were the case, we could not construct a chronology at all from the years of Judah's kings. And the time symmetries of God's Plan prove them to have been so treated, and this proves the P.B.I. Editors to be in error on this point. Their view would compel one to assume that each king died the day before Nisan, if one were to construct a chronology from these kings' datings—an assumption which is most unreasonable, and which, in turn, would contradict their theory on this point; for it would leave no occasion for such a theory. Our Pastor was right in ignoring the three months and ten days of Jehoiakin's reign, because they filled up the eleven years of Jehoiakim's reign, as the Scriptures show (2 Chro. 36:9, 10). The same is true in the case of Josiah and Jehoahaz, whose reign of three months ended just as the year ended (2 Chro. 36:1-4). This we know because the combined reigns of Jehoiakim and Jehoiakin ended eleven full years later, "at the year's end" (2 Chro. 36:10). Thus this point is

against them, and, of course, binds them all the tighter.

We deny their statement that secular history proves that Daniel was taken captive in the summer of 606. While a few secular historians may say some things to this effect respecting Daniel, they say it from their misunderstanding of the Scriptures. None of them claims to know anything at all of him from purely secular—heathen—sources, which make no mention of him. Some secular historians, like some nominal-church teachers, have tried to connect Biblical events in Jehoiakim's third or fourth year with Ptolemy's canon and with the first year of Nebuchadnezzar, and may, contrary to the Scriptures that we cited above, have put Daniel's captivity in Jehoiakim's third or fourth year; but as we will show most secular writers put the first and third dates later than their 606 B.C.

Again, we deny that Nebuchadnezzar was a coregent of his father. This theory is assumed by a comparatively few nominal-church writers, who, contrary to Ptolemy's canon, date Nebuchadnezzar's making Jehoiakim subservient to him at 606 B.C.; while most nominal-church writers and nearly all secular and religious encyclopedias and Bible dictionaries, following Ptolemy, but not the Bible, date this event at Jan. 604 B.C. We do not agree with this date, believing that the inspired chronological testimony of Jeremiah, Ezekiel and Daniel, who were also eye witnesses, is infinitely more to be accepted as to the first year of Nebuchadnezzar than the testimony of the heathen Berosus who lived 350 years after the events, and than that of the heathen Ptolemy who lived 750 years after the events. If the P.B.I. want to follow the heathen Ptolemy rather than the Bible let them do it, but let them not, as they do, pervert his date. *His canon makes Jehoiakim's subserviency begin at the time of the death of Nebuchadnezzar's father, i.e., allegedly Jan. 604, not in the summer of 606 B.C.* The error that these Editors offer ("the Scripture antedates, etc.") in

the attempt shows they cannot harmonize their views of the third and fourth years of Jehoiakim with Ptolemy's canon.

So far as we know, all secular historians and nominal-church writers accept Ptolemy's canon as placing the death of Nebuchadnezzar's father at 604 B.C.; and all of these, except a very few who do otherwise to defend an erroneous theory, make 604 Nebuchadnezzar's first year. A few of these, as stated above, holding to Israel's return from exile as taking place in 536, to keep harmony with their thought of a 70 years' captivity (the Bible nowhere teaches a 70 years' captivity; it teaches a 70 years' desolation of the land and a 70 year's supremacy of Babylon, *e.g.*, Jer. 25:11, 12; 29:10; 2 Chro. 36:21. The supposed 70 years' captivity is based upon a mistranslation of Jer. 29:10, where what should be rendered "for Babylon" is rendered "at Babylon" in the A.V. See other versions for the correct translation), and to maintain a semblance of harmony between their date 606 for the beginning of the captivity, the first year of Nebuchadnezzar, and Ptolemy's canon, have invented the idea of a coregency of Nebuchadnezzar with his father for two years before he became king in their year 604. Not only is there no evidence of such a coregency, but it also cannot fit in with the date of the events that are given by Ptolemy's canon and that precede Jehoiakim's becoming subservient to Nebuchadnezzar. We ask our readers to consult the article on Nebuchadnezzar in the Britannica, the International, the Americana, Schaff-Herzog, Jewish and other Encyclopedias, and in Smith's (4 vols. edition), Hasting's (5 vols. edition), Bible Dictionaries, the Century Encyclopedia Dictionary, etc., and they will find the following dates for the following events, based on Ptolemy's canon and accepted by practically all secular historians. In fact, the only authorities that we could find who do not give all these dates are the Catholic Encyclopedia, which gives

604 as the date of the battle of Carchemish, and McClintock and Strong's Encyclopedia, which copying in the main the article in Smith's Dictionary, alters its 605 date for the battle of Carchemish to 606 to fit the theory above described, *and for no other reason.*

According to these authorities, which are based on Ptolemy's canon, Nebuchadnezzar, in harmony with a frequent practice of members of reigning families, commanded his father's Babylonian armies, which, in alliance with the Medes, overthrew the Assyrian Empire, by capturing Nineveh in 606 B.C. In the Fall of 605 B.C., while acting as his father's general, not co-regent, he in one of the decisive battles of history defeated, at Carchemish on the Euphrates, Pharaoh-necho, who had previously, 608 B.C., wrested Syria from the Assyrians, and pursuing him nearly to Egypt, took from his subserviency all Syria and Palestine (2 Kings 23:29-35; 24:1; Jer. 25:1; 46:1-26) on the occasion of his first invasion of these countries. The battle of Carchemish occurred in the fourth year of Jehoiakim (Jer. 46:2). Early in 605, hence in the third year of Jehoiakim (April, 606 to April, 605) Nebuchadnezzar left Babylon (Dan. 1:1) to begin his campaign against Pharaoh-necho, Syria and Palestine. It was in the Fall of 605, hence in the fourth year of Jehoiakim (April, 605, to April, 604), that Nebuchadnezzar and Pharaoh-necho engaged in the battle of Carchemish; and it was during the former's pursuit of the latter after this battle that Nebuchadnezzar came the first time to Jerusalem, in Jehoiakim's fourth year (Jer. 25:1), in Jan., 604. The death of his father occurring at this time, he became his successor while in Palestine; hence he came to Jerusalem in the first year of his reign, 604. On hearing of his father's death, desisting from further pursuit of Pharaoh-necho, he returned at once to Babylon with a few of his troops. The fiction of a coregency contradicts the whole setting of Ptolemy's canon and its associated events. Of course, we do not accept the dates given in

this paragraph—based on Ptolemy's canon—but we give them as these authorities give them. For our part, Scripturally, we believe these events occurred in each case about 19 years earlier. But we cite them to prove that Ptolemy's canon, on which the P.B.I. Editors profess to base their faith on Nebuchadnezzar's coming to Jerusalem in the summer of 606 in the third year of Jehoiakim, contradicts their view—yea, both Ptolemy's canon, which fixes the date at 604, and the Bible, which fixes the date 19 years earlier, contradict their view. Therefore their attempt (by aid of the coregency fiction, and of the unscriptural date of Daniel's captivity, which could not have occurred before the seventh year of Nebuchadnezzar (Jer. 52:28; 2 Chro. 36:5-7), together with the unreasonable and unprovable assumptions that they make as to the time of the beginning of Daniel's schooling and of Nebuchadnezzar's dream) to harmonize the three years' schooling with Nebuchadnezzar's second year (Dan. 2:1), which according to them was 603 B.C., falls utterly to the ground. The five proofs that we gave above with reference to these three years of schooling they cannot answer.

We have faithfully followed the Scriptures in this chronological controversy. They have neither followed the Scriptures nor secular history in harmony with Ptolemy's canon. In other words, there are three general views on this subject: (1) the Scriptural view; (2) the view of Ptolemy, favored by nearly all secular and nominal-church scholars; (3) the view of a few nominal-church scholars, who attempt to hold in part to a perverted view of the beginning of the captivity and to a view of events perverted from the standpoint of Ptolemy's canon. This third view, which is more erroneous than the second, the P.B.I. Editors champion to their confusion. It is nothing but a windy hypothesis, without one fact to substantiate it, and with the crudest distortion of plain Scriptures

and facts as the only things urged in its defense. It is revelatory of these Editors' confusion, that they show themselves so lacking in correct judgment of both Scriptural and secular historical questions. In spite of their giving various authors' names as their authorities they seem to have confined themselves to the writings of but one school, and that the least exact of nominal-church writers on the subject under consideration, and in this whole matter have shown so transparent an inability to reason logically on the data that these set before them, that they would do well to resign their editorship; for they are evidently unqualified for such an office. Had they the spirit of a sound mind they *would* resign, but we do not expect them to resign.

These Editors by their erroneous chronological claims have stirred up a veritable hornets' nest among their supporters. They did not think that there were among their readers so many *thinking* Christians faithful to our Pastor's correct chronological views. A large number of these refuse to follow these error-spreading Editors in their nominal-church views. This has led the Editors to abate somewhat from their confidence in their chronological errors; and the evident fear of a division with its consequent loss of members seems to prompt them to move heaven and earth to make their readers think that the time features are not a part of "present Truth," and as such are not a matter of vital importance. Such propositions they even attempt (H '21, 227-231) to prove from our Pastor's writings, by quoting from places where he mentions the main doctrinal features of present Truth; but on the other hand, as in other cases, they fail to quote from well-known writings of his where he calls the time features "present Truth," and urges their vital importance for the end of the Age. Throughout the first chapter of Studies, Vol. II, especially pages 30-32, repeatedly our Pastor speaks of the time features as

"present Truth," which means, "meat in due season," and speaks earnestly of their great importance. As a refutation of the P.B.I. claims on this line we suggest that all re-read this chapter. This is also the Bible teaching on the matter (Luke 12:37, 42; Dan. 12:4, 9-12; Hab. 2:2, 3; 1 Thes. 5:1-5). If we remember that the expressions "present Truth" and "meat in due season" are equivalent terms, at once we will see the "folly" of their claims that the time features are not present Truth, nor of vital importance for the end of the Age. How manifest is their Jambresian "folly"—that in the harvest time harvest time features are not present Truth, and are not vitally important! How otherwise than by harvest time features could the time of beginning and ending the reaping work be recognized? How otherwise could one have known when to begin and when to stop reaping? The sign prophecies are not sufficiently clear-cut to mark them. It was the time features, not the sign features, that prompted our Pastor consciously to enter into the harvest work (Z '16, 171, pars. 10-12). It was also the time features that enabled him to see in 1914 that the reaping ended Oct., 1914, and, as he for nearly two years thereafter taught, that the gleanings, and not the reaping, from Oct., 1914, onward was in order. Evidently the P.B.I. Editors in opening the discussion on the chronology *thought* that it was meat in due season (H '21, 83-85; 115, 116). They were evidently using their chronological changes to pave the way for some (counterfeit) reaping work. In the same references they speak of the chronology as among the "vital questions of the hour." If the time features are no longer a vital question in the end of the Age, why did they, as an inquisitorial body, and as "a doctrinal clearing house," cite Bro. Cox, one of the P.B.I. pilgrims, from Boston to Brooklyn to appear before them to answer for speaking against their chronology, and for seven hours submit him to an

inquisitorial and a doctrinal-clearing-house process in an effort, which proved futile, to make him recant the Biblical chronology given through our Pastor in favor of their unbiblical and unhistorical chronology, plagiarized from the most inexact school of nominal-church writers on the subject. Their latest change of front, to the effect that the chronology is not a part of present Truth and is not a vital question, is due, we believe, not to conviction, but to "business," *i.e.*, to their desire as members of antitypical Jambres "to draw away disciples after them," because they now recognize that their chronological teachings have alienated a large number of their ablest and best followers, whom they want still to lead. Their efforts to "draw away disciples" in this respect are transparent to any one who has studied the way of those who "of your own selves shall" "arise, teaching perverse things, to draw away disciples after them" (Acts 20:30). Their contention on the chronology as not being a part of present Truth, by which they confuse the issue, as though any of us claim that chronology is one of the essential doctrines for salvation, is another error that Azazel has given them, and is another proof that they are (unwittingly, of course) among his mouthpieces. For this reason they are utterly unfit to teach any Little Flock members, but are just the kind of teachers ("smoother than butter") that Gershonite Levites need to mislead them in their wilderness experiences, while their fleshly minds are being destroyed as a result of Azazel's machinations and their afflicting results. We pity them indeed, and pray for their recovery in due time. But our love for the Little Flock impels us to suggest to all the Little Flock members among the P.B.I. to refuse further offers of service coming from the P.B.I. Editors and Directors, whose untrustworthiness as teachers and leaders ought to be as transparent as the noonday sun to all Truth people thoroughly instructed in, and loyal to, the Lord's teachings as given through that faithful and wise servant. "Wherefore, come out

from among them, and be ye separate, saith the Lord, and touch not the unclean thing; and I will receive you" (2 Cor. 6:17). By such coming out priestly fellowship will be withdrawn from them, though they may be given brotherly fellowship, as it will seem to be helpful and due for their cleansing. Separate yourselves, beloved brethren, from these Levites who have in their drunkenness dared approach God's holy vessels and altar for sacrificial purposes (Lev. 10:1-11; Num. 17:10-18:3).

As connected with our subject we would here introduce an examination of several of Carl Olson's chronological errors. In presenting these he gives them as corrections of some alleged mistakes of our Pastor on the chronology. The first alleged mistake that he claims our Pastor made was his counting the period from the death of Terah and of Abraham's entrance into the land of Canaan (as synchronous with Abraham's receiving the Covenant) to the giving of the Law as 430 years, whereas Carl Olson claims on the basis of his interpretation of Gen. 15:13 and Acts 7:6 that it was 400 years from the death of Terah and Abraham's entering the land to the giving of the Law, and that consequently the Covenant must have been given to Abraham thirty years before, *i.e.*, while he was in Ur of the Chaldees. We offer some arguments in refutation of this point: (1) It is true that while Abraham was yet in Ur of the Chaldees God offered to make a Covenant with him (Acts 7:2, 3); but He attached certain conditions that had to be fulfilled by Abraham before He would make the Covenant with him. These conditions were that (1) he leave his own country, (2) his kindred, (3) his father's house, and (4) go to the land to be shown him, which proved to be Canaan (Gen. 12:1). It was only after Abraham fulfilled these conditions that the Covenant became his. He had to prove by submitting to the four above indicated tests that he was worthy of

the Covenant, before God would give—confirm—it to him. Hence, while the Covenant was conditionally offered to him in Ur of the Chaldees, it was not given—"confirmed"—to him until he had fulfilled the conditions on which it was offered, and for, and upon the fulfilment of which it was "confirmed" (Gal. 3:17). Hence the Covenant was not given—confirmed—to him in Ur of the Chaldees, but on his entrance into Canaan. St. Stephen tells us that these conditions were by God in Ur of the Chaldees offered to Abraham for fulfilment, but he does not say one word about the Covenant being made—"confirmed"—with Abraham in Ur of the Chaldees. And the connection between Gen. 12:1 and Gen. 12:2, 3 proves that the conditions mentioned in v. 1 had to be fulfilled before the promises of vs. 2 and 3 belonged to Abraham. The conditions being fulfilled God "confirmed" the Covenant to him, and St. Paul said it was 430, not 400, years after it was "confirmed" that the Law was given (Gal. 3:17). This, then, is our first answer to Carl Olson's "wonderful unfolding" of new light (new *darkness*, in very truth, it should be called) as to the place where the Covenant became Abraham's.

(2) The "wonderful unfolding" of new light (new darkness) becomes more apparent as of Azazelian origin when we examine his claim that Gen. 15:13 and Acts 7:6 prove that it was 400 years from Abraham's entrance into the land of Canaan until the Law, and that as a result it must have been thirty years before the entrance into the land that the Covenant was made with Abraham by God. As we compare these two passages we note that Acts 7:6 is not a quotation, but a paraphrase, a brief explanation, of Gen. 15:13. The following remarks will help clarify the situation: (1) Neither of the passages gives the name of the land that Gen. 15:13 describes as not belonging to Abraham's seed, and that Acts 7:6 calls "a strange land." Carl Olson's claim is that the land is the one that Abraham entered just after Terah's death; but

both verses show that the inhabitants of the land referred to would enslave Abraham's seed, which did not in any sense occur in Canaan before the giving of the Law; therefore that land cannot be Canaan. (2) The connections of both verses show that that land was a different land from Canaan (Gen. 15:14-16; Acts 7:7). (3) Gen. 15:16 and Acts 7:7 prove that Canaan is the land to which Abraham's seed would go after God should deliver them *from* the "*strange land*" of Acts 7:6 and *from* the "*land that is not theirs*" of Gen. 15:13. These three facts prove, therefore, that the land treated of in Gen. 15:13 and Acts 7:6 is not Canaan, and therefore Abraham's entrance into Canaan cannot be referred to in these two verses, and therefore the 400 years of those verses cannot be connected with his entering Canaan. The whole connection, compared with the facts of the latter part of Genesis and the first part of Exodus, shows that the land referred to in Gen. 15:13 and Acts 7:6 is Egypt.

Another line of reasoning overthrows Carl Olson's view on Gen. 15:13 and Acts 7:6. As it was not Abraham, but *his seed*, that was to be afflicted 400 years (Gen. 15:13; Acts 7:6), and as Isaac was Abraham's seed called (Rom. 9:7), and as Isaac was not born until 25 years after Abraham entered Canaan (Gen. 12:4; 17:17), Abraham's seed could not have begun to be afflicted until some time after coming into existence, which coming into existence began 25 years after Abraham entered Canaan; but Gen. 15:13-16 and Acts 7:6, 7 speak of this seed's being afflicted 400 years up to the time of its deliverance, which occurred at the giving of the first feature of the Law—the Paschal Lamb; hence it was *more* than 425 years from Abraham's entrance into Canaan until the Law. Accordingly, the 400 years (Gen. 15:13; Acts 7:6) have no reference to the time of Abraham's entering Canaan.

A third consideration proves the faultiness of Carl Olson's reasoning on Gen. 15:13 and Acts 7:6. It

will be noticed that both of the passages contain three statements respecting the seed: (1) its dwelling in an alien land; (2) its being enslaved by the people of that alien land; (3) and its affliction for 400 years by people belonging to that alien land. Carl Olson draws the expression "400 years," which occurs in the last clause only of these verses, into their first clause, treating it as though it stated that the dwelling in the alien land would be 400 years. If this were permissible, then the expression 400 years would have to be drawn into the second clause, and this would prove that the slavery of Abraham's seed would be 400 years, *i.e.*, that from some time after Joseph's death (Ex. 1:6-11) until the Exodus were 400 years; hence there would be as many more years than 400 years from Abraham's entrance into Canaan until the giving of the Law as there were years from Abraham's entering Canaan until some time after Joseph's death! Thus his method of interpreting this verse, logically applied, destroys his own contention. And since we have proven the "land" of the first clause to be Egypt, his method of interpretation would make the verse self-contradictory from the standpoint of the length of the stay in Egypt and the length of the slavery; for the latter was shorter than the former; but his method of interpretation makes both the same length by forcing the insertion of the term "400 years" into both clauses. Surely the result of his method applied to the facts of the case is confusion. Manifestly the expression 400 years is limited to the third clause. How reasonable is our Pastor's explanation, that these 400 years' affliction of Abraham's seed began with the mistreatment that Isaac received at his weaning (Gen. 21:8, 9), at the hands of Hagar, an Egyptian, and her son Ishmael, who, though actually a son and thus a seed of Abraham, is not Scripturally counted as of Abraham's seed, but as of the Egyptian nation after his mother's nationality (Gen. 21:9, 21; Gal. 4:29, 30). In ancient as well as

in modern times, in *oriental* countries, frequently children are not weaned until from four to six years of age. As we understand matters, Isaac was five years old at his weaning; hence this episode, occurring 400 years before Israel left Egypt, and thirty years after Abraham entered Canaan marks the beginning of the affliction of Abraham's seed at the hands of the Egyptians, and is thoroughly in line with Abraham's entering the land 430 years before the Law; and this proves that the Covenant was made with Abraham when he fulfilled the conditions necessary to obtain it. His use of this passage is like a drowning man clutching at a straw! How much better it would have been, had he humbly drawn the only proper lesson that he should have drawn from the experience of teaching the terrible errors of which he has become guilty, and of which he recognizes his guilt—that he is not qualified for the office of a teacher of the General Church, and that he, therefore, should desist from further usurpation of that office.

Like the P.B.I., and from the same standpoint, he thinks that he has found another mistake in our Pastor's chronology as to the beginning of the Times of the Gentiles. His arguments are borrowed from nominal-church writers on this point, as is the case with the P.B.I. Editors, and as our answers above to the latter's views also overthrow his views on this matter, we will not repeat them here. However, two of his thoughts in this connection should receive attention. On page 2 of his June issue he states that the seventh year of Ezekiel's captivity was the last year of Jehoiakim's reign. This is a mistake. The first Babylonian captivity of Israelites occurred at the end of Jehoiakim's and in the seventh year of Nebuchadnezzar's reign (Jer. 52:28; 2 Chro. 36:5-7). Ezekiel entered into captivity with Jehoiakin, and the chronology that he gives for his different visions is dated according to the years of Jehoiakin's captivity

and Zedekiah's reign, which two events began at the same time, as the following references will prove: Ezek. 1:1, 2; Jer. 29:1; Ezek. 40:1; 33:21; 24:1, 2, etc. Hence the overturning that Carl Olson tries to put into the third or fourth year of Jehoiakim was, even in the seventh year (Ezek. 20:1; 21:25-27) of Zedekiah, yet a future thing. It occurred in the latter's eleventh year; for the prophecies of chapters 20 and 21 were given to Ezekiel on the same occasion, *i.e.*, in the seventh year, fifth month and the tenth day of his captivity and of Zedekiah's reign (Ezek. 20:1). But even if it were, as Carl Olson claims, in the last year of Jehoiakim's reign, the entire overturning is stated as a *future* thing, which proves that the overturning could not in any sense refer to a past event such as he supposes to have occurred in the third or fourth year of Jehoiakim, but must have been future to Jehoiakim's last year.

As Jehoiakin's three months' reign simply filled out his father's eleventh year, he was not counted as reigning in his own right and time; hence God said to Jehoiakim that none of his seed should sit on David's throne, Zedekiah, the last of the kings, being his brother. God's statement on this point does not mean, as Carl Olson implies, that with Jehoiakim's third year his right to reign ceased and the Times of the Gentiles commenced. However, his view of three overturnings is contradictory to Ezek. 21:25-27, and certainly is a marked example of how Azazel gives foolish thoughts to his mouthpieces. Our Pastor's explanation of the threefold repetition of the word "overturn" as being for a solemn emphasis is certainly reasonable and Scriptural. The overturning was that of Israel's royalty only; this was fulfilled in Zedekiah.

The next point in this connection respects his claim that Daniel's age was too great for his activities, toward the end of his career, which age by errors and guesses he gives as 112 years, if the 70 years began at

the end of Zedekiah's reign. This he claims favors his understanding of the Times of the Gentiles as beginning in the third or fourth year of Jehoiakim, when he claims Daniel was taken a captive. We answer as follows: The Bible shows that the first captives and the first set of sacred vessels were taken to Babylon in the end of the seventh year of Nebuchadnezzar's reign (Jer. 52:28; 2 Chro. 36:6, 7), a little over 10½ years before Zedekiah's overthrow. This would cut seven years off of Carl Olson's figures for Daniel's age. Again, Cyrus became king of Babylon in Nov., 538, and his third year would have been from Nov., 536, to Nov., 535, hence a little over 70 years after Zedekiah's overthrow. This would make Daniel's stay in Babylon until Cyrus' third year about 81 years. Carl Olson *guesses* that Daniel was 20 years old at his taking to Babylon. Even if this were true, his age would then have been, not 112, but 101 years, in the third year of Cyrus. For a person of Daniel's temperate habits, and with the Law's promise of many years for the obedient, Daniel at that age would have been able to do the work described as his in his book. Anna, the prophetess, was at least 105 years old, and was quite active (Luke 2:36, 37). In all likelihood Daniel was between 90 and 95 years old in Cyrus' third year. This point, therefore, does not favor the fourth year of Jehoiakim as the beginning of the Times of the Gentiles.

As an illustration of Carl Olson's "wild speculations and fanciful interpretations," we cite his claim that Adam was thirty years old at the time of his fall. He reasons that this must be so, because the Priests and Levites had to be thirty years old before they could serve, and because John and Jesus were thirty years old when they began their ministries! We answer as follows: These all having been *born* as undeveloped babes had to develop into manhood, which was attained at thirty years, according to the Law. But Adam was created in perfect manhood and not under the Law.

Hence what applied to them did not apply to him. No reason but Carl Olson's desire to have thirty years added to his chronology to give him a period for the operation of another set of foolish predictions and campaigns can be advanced for his theory that Adam was thirty years old at the time of his fall! The Bible nowhere intimates such a thought. It was born in Azazel's mind, and thence transplanted into the responsive mind of C. Olson. He claims that the 6,000 years since Adam's creation will end Oct., 1921, and that the 6,000 years from his fall will end 1951. He denies the truthfulness of the Parallel Dispensations. Like the Society leaders his views imply 51 Jubilee cycles of 50 years each since the last one before the captivity, despite God's saying (2 Chro. 36:21) that all the Jubilee years were fully kept—fulfilled—during the 70 years of desolation; therefore he gives 1944 as the beginning of the antitypical Jubilee. He seems to have cast off both of its arguments in Studies, Vol. II. He thus has no antitypical great Cycle pointing out the antitypical Jubilee. In his chronology it would end before the end of his 6,000 years! This may account for its absence from his scheme of things. We understand that he denies that our Lord's Second Advent and the First Resurrection have set in and that the Great Company is a spiritual class. In fact, he claims that he must cut loose entirely from our Pastor's teachings on prophecy, and work on entirely "*original*" lines. Of course, with such a standpoint, Azazel will soon take away from him every vestige of prophetic truth! What we said above about the time symmetries of God's Plan and of the Pyramid measurements applies against all his chronological vagaries, as well as against the P.B.I. errors on Chronology.

The P.B.I. Editors are going astray on a number of subjects. Their chief errors concern the organization of the Church—a doctrinal error—and the chronology—a prophetic error. Above we have

pointed out their chief errors in these respects, as well as called attention to some of their revolutionism in practice, particularly in reference to their drawing up a Charter contradictory of the sample Charter—that of the W.T.B.&T.S.—for controlling corporations among Truth Levites. In their case the proverb is surely fulfilling—"He that says *A* must also say *B*." Surely Azazel is leading them on from one error to another, *putting them under the delusion that their contradictions of our Pastor's teachings are advancing light!* This has been his course with all sifters among Truth people, as the history of all six siftings shows.

Now they are losing the Truth on the subject of our Pastor being *that Servant*. However, they are spreading this error with Satanic cunning and Judas-like treachery. In an article in their April 1, 1922, Herald, entitled, Whom and What Shall We Preach? amid protestations of affection and appreciation for our Pastor—of the same kind that Judas showed our Master while betraying Him—they deny that there is any prophetic, symbolic or typical Scripture that specifically refers to him (H '22, 101, par. 2), claiming that such personal and individual references are made to Jesus and the Apostles alone. They claim that it would be speculation to refer any such Scripture to Bro. Russell, and that they, for their part, would refrain from such speculation. They have in this seemingly come to agree with their ally, ex-pilgrim Melinder, in Sweden, whose reasons for denying that our Pastor alone was that Servant were reviewed in P '21, 148, 149. They tell us that they have not changed in their attitude toward, and opinion of, our Pastor (H '22, 101, col. 2, par. 1). This would mean either that they did not formerly believe that he alone was that Servant, when they called him such, or that they are now falsifying as to their former view of him. In the same connection they say that they believe he was "*a* [*italics ours*] very wise and

faithful servant." Why did they not say that they believe that he was *that* wise and faithful servant? Their view that there is no Scripture that refers specifically to him implies that they deny that Matt. 24:45-47 and Luke 12:42-46 specifically refer to him. In gross hypocrisy they quote passages from his writings that rebuke the course of some brethren who applied too many Scriptures to him, as though he deprecated all Scriptural applications to him by the brethren. He himself—modestly, of course—applied Matt. 24:45-47 and Luke 12:42-44 to himself (D 613, 614; Z '96, 47, note particularly the second paragraph on page 47); and he never deprecated any one's doing the same. It was only when the brethren degenerated into angel-worship of him in their efforts to apply to him multitudes of inapplicable Scriptures that he deprecated and rebuked their course (Rev. 22:8, 9).

The claim of the P.B.I. leaders that no other individuals than our Lord and the Apostles are referred to individually in the prophecies, symbols and types of the Bible not only contradicts what Bro. Russell says (C 25-59) on Dan. XI, but is also in direct contradiction of other Scriptures, *e.g.* Zech. 11:8, 15-17. See Vol. VI, Chap. III. If one studies the deep *cunning* and mock affection with which the article under review is written, he can at once see its Satanic and Iscariot-like character. It is true that they do not in express words flatly deny that our Pastor is alone meant by the expression, that Servant. This would be too dangerous to say; for this would be against their policy of drawing away disciples after themselves, since it would turn many more away from them. But what they do say certainly means this. Their fighting his chronology is in line with their denial of his being that Servant. Their fellowshipping on most intimate terms with ex-pilgrim Melinder, who they know denies that our Pastor was that Servant is in harmony with the same thing; and Bro. Frew, a pilgrim of their

own making, at Richmond, Va., some time ago, before a Class there, denied that Bro. Russell alone was that Servant. Before long we may expect them to come out openly and deny him the exclusive honor of being that Servant. Their confounding the proper application to him of certain passages with the worshiping of angels, which he condemned, will deceive only such as have not received the Truth in the love of it; and their article on the subject is a Judas betrayal of him; and this Judas-like spirit may later express itself in a final betrayal of the representatives of the entire Christ class now living in the flesh.

The Herald Editors (H '22, 27, 28) are lukewarm and unsettled on whether the various items of Elijah's experiences and related acts from the time he saw the vision on Mt. Horeb (1 Kings 19:11, 12) until Elisha's death (2 Kings 13:20) are types. They admit that our dear Pastor looked upon them as types; but they are in doubt on their being such, and confess that at least up to the present they have seen no fulfilment of Elijah's and Elisha's experiences as given in 2 Kings 2:1-19. Once some of them did see the antitypes of these things as occurring from 1874 to 1917; but through their Levitical uncleanness coming into the ascendancy in their lives and works in 1918, they have lost the Truth on the subject; and, of course, denying the only factual explanation that can fit the case—see Chapter II of Vol. III—they can find no other set of facts to fit the typical events as their antitypes. This growing unsettlement of their confidence in this phase of the Truth that they once saw, like their rejection of the thought of our Pastor as being individually referred to in any prophetic, typical and symbolic Scripture (hence according to their view he is not referred to individually in Matt. 24:45-47; Luke 12:42-44), is proof positive that they are out of the Holy and are going into outer darkness. The Lord's way of proving their gross iniquity connected

with the Fort Pitt Committee in 1918 is thus being manifested more and more as the days go by! "If the light that is in thee become darkness, how great is that darkness!" This is the reason why they do not now see any antitype to 2 Kings 2:1-19.

The P.B.I. has republished *Studies*, Vol. I and is advocating, among other ways, its use for the Pastoral work. This in itself is a good work and is appropriate for Gershonite Levites; for by such work they will lead people to repentance and faith and thus to justification, and then later on to consecration; and this is the proper work of the Gershonites (Vol. VIII, Chap. II); but their Jambresianism will teach such persons that they are candidates for joint-heirship with Christ and the Divine nature, and in this way will work genuine mischief. Thus their chronological errors will pave the way for great disappointment to their converts.

Above we refuted their nominal-churchizing and heathenizing chronology on their year 606 B.C. The brethren will be glad to learn that a goodly number of their former adherents have withdrawn their support from them, since they gave out their errors on the Times of the Gentiles beginning in the third year of Jehoiakim. In fact, the New York P.B.I. church had so many members faithful to our Pastor's chronological teachings that at the following election of its officers they voted down as Elders I.F. Hoskins and H.C. Rockwell, the only two Herald Editors who were among their Elders. From the fact that that church at the same time elected Bro. Cooke, one of the P.B.I. Directors, as one of its Elders, we infer that the Herald Editors very likely falsified when they said that the P.B.I. Editors and *Directors* were unanimous in believing that the third year of Jehoiakim was in 606 B.C., and that it was the beginning of the Times of the Gentiles. If these P.B.I. Editors were not in Azazel's hands, and if they were not

blinded by him, surely our answers above would have rescued them from their delusion.

Despite the fact that we have proven that both the Scriptural and the secular chronologies disagree with their dating the third year of Jehoiakim as 606 B.C., they continue to reiterate this thought. In their Nov. 1, 1921, issue these Editors, in the main approvingly, print an article written by a Washington, D.C., brother who wishes his name withheld, but whose initials, J.A.D. (these are the initials of J.A. Devault, of Washington, D.C.) are given at the end of the article. Only on one point do these Editors express dissent, *i.e.*, on the seventy years of desolation. J.A.D., knowing that their arguments on that point cannot be sustained, resorts to another artifice to gain the same end, *i.e.*, of cutting off 19 years from the Bible chronology. It is indeed remarkable how errorists arrive at the same results by mutually contradictory processes of reasoning. They agree in their denial of the Truth, but reach that agreement by mutually contradictory reasoning. Thus they remind us of Samson's foxes: their burning tails are tied together, while their heads are in opposite directions!

It will be recalled that our Pastor said that prior to 536 B.C. secular chronology is uncertain, and that therefore God to give us full assurance provided us with *His* chronology, covering the period in which secular chronology is uncertain, and ceased to give us *His* chronology only when secular chronology became certain, *i.e.*, from 536 B.C. onward. This is, therefore, certainly a reasonable proposition. But J.A.D. claims with much positiveness that it is reasonable that we accept secular dates prior to 536 B.C., if we do so from 536 onward. However, as he proceeds he guilelessly proves that his proposition is the unreasonable one; for he gives several secular chronological tables which differ as much as three years in what he claims are the 24 years immediately preceding 536.

It is just because of these contradictions in the secular chronologies immediately preceding 536 B.C. that our Pastor claimed that they were undependable, and therefore rejected them as correct before 536 B.C. Certainly his course was the reasonable one, and J.A.D.'s is the unreasonable one, as his own tables prove. We could not have asked him to give us better proofs for the unreasonableness of his position on this point than he has furnished us by giving us the proof from the secular chronologies that by their discrepancies and disagreements they are unreliable prior to 536 B.C. On this point we are by him reminded of the homely proverb: "Give a calf enough rope and he will hang himself." David's language certainly applies to this brother: "Tarry in Jericho until your beard be grown." "A little learning is a dangerous thing."

In the Herald (H '21, 311, col. 2, top) the claim is made that if Bro. Russell had had the arguments presented to him which the P.B.I. Editors use for their cutting off 19 years from the chronology, he would have agreed with the P.B.I.'s position on the point. But not only does our Pastor's refuting their main points in Studies, Vol. II and in later articles prove that he had studied and rejected them, but J.A.D. also proves that they were studied by our Pastor; for he claims (H '21, 325, par. 1) that he presented these very views to our Pastor, who later rejected his findings. Thus the P.B.I.'s position on this point is doubly disproven.

J.A.D. gives more folly (2 Tim. 3:9) by what he says about Mordecai's age as a proof that the Times of the Gentiles must have begun in the third year of Jehoiakim; otherwise, he alleges, Mordecai would have been too old—about 150 years old—at the time of his Scripturally described activity. He cites in proof of this point Esther 2:5-7 (H '21, 332), claiming from it that Mordecai went into captivity with Jehoiakim in Nebuchadnezzar's eighth year; whereas the passage

says that it was his great grandfather that then went into that captivity! Oh yes, his arguments are "remarkable corroborative testimony" in proof of the P.B.I. chronology! They are Jambresian folly (2 Tim. 3:9)!

His main arguments for the cutting off of 19 years from the chronology are practically the same that we have already refuted above; hence to avoid repetition we pass them by. Later on we will refer to his efforts to make another "double" than the Biblical one taught by our Pastor. This we will do when reviewing similar features of an article in the Herald of May 1, 1922, in which the Herald endorses his view in an article entitled, More Study in the Chronology. This article was occasioned by a letter that they published which attacked their chronology, especially on the 70 years' desolation—the 70 Jubilee years—and on the Parallels. They still continue to maintain their "folly" on the 70 Sabbath-keeping years—the desolation of the land—as ending about 16 years after Israel's return from Babylon and 16 years after they began to sow seed and reap what the land yielded! Persons who, in the teeth of the clear Scriptural refutation of such a view of Sabbath-keeping on the part of the land as we gave above, will still maintain such a view are just what St. Paul says of antitypical Jambres—ever seeking and never attaining the Truth.

The writer of the letter cites against their view Moses' statement (Lev. 26:31-35) that God would drive them out of their land and keep them out of their land, so that the land could enjoy the Sabbaths that they did not permit it to enjoy while they inhabited it. This passage expressly states that as long as they would be out of their land it would enjoy the Sabbaths that it did not enjoy while they were in it. The P.B.I. Editors try in a number of ways to evade this thought, among others, by half clearly, half obscurely conveying the idea that these Sabbaths were the Sabbaths that came every seven years, and not the

Jubilee Sabbaths; and then they intimate that these have been kept during the dispersion since 70 A.D. This cannot be true, because the present dispersion has lasted many more years than the number of all their Sabbatic years. The Prophet Zechariah (Zech. 7:5, 12) conclusively proves that there were no Israelites in Palestine during the 70 years of Babylon's supremacy, thus corroborating 2 Chro. 36:20, 21; Lev. 26:31-35. Nay, Lev. 26:31-35 refers to the Babylonian captivity, and its Sabbaths are the Jubilees, not the seventh year Sabbaths.

These Editors seek to evade the brother's objection by another method: they claim, despite our Pastor's rejection of that thought, that none of the captives of Israel were to be more than 70 years in Babylon; hence, they claim, this would include those who went into captivity 11 years before Zedekiah, which would make the time from his captivity until the return less than 70 years. In proof they quote Jer. 29:1-10, particularly v. 10. They stress the fact that the captives here referred to went into captivity about 10 years before Zedekiah's overthrow; yet according to their contention none was to remain there more than 70 years in all. But they base their argument on a false translation. In v. 10 the phrase "*at* Babylon" should read "*for* Babylon," (see, among others, both Revised Versions) the thought being that after the first Gentile power had exercised its full period of 70 years of exclusive Gentile royalty, and hence 70 years after the *crown* was taken away from Israel at Zedekiah's dethroning, that Empire would cease to keep Israel any longer out of their land. This passage does not say how long those Israelites would be in captivity. It teaches that the first 70 years of the Times of the Gentiles would be Babylon's period of universal dominion. Hence during this period Israel would have no crown. But at the end of the first period of exclusive Gentile royalty over the earth

Israel would return. Therefore this passage proves the length of time from the dethroning of Zedekiah until Israel's return to be 70 years; thus instead of proving, it disproves the P.B.I. position. To base arguments on false translations, as these Editors here do, is poor reasoning and worse policy.

Next they refer to Jer. 25:11, 12 to prove that all Israel was not out of the land 70 years. They claim that the expression "70 years" in the last clause of v. 11 applies only to the last clause of the verse, and not to the clause that says that the land would be a desolation and an astonishment. So far as this verse alone is concerned, it is impossible positively to assert what the P.B.I. Editors assert; for frequently for brevity's sake we omit the repetition of a phrase in a double sentence, when the phrase applies to both clauses, *e.g.*, in the sentence, "He devastated the entire land and drove out its inhabitants by his army," everybody would understand that the expression, "by his army," belongs to both clauses. So in Jer. 25:11 the expression, "70 years," belongs to both of its clauses. That this is true we assert on the authority of God Himself; for He Himself says in 2 Chro. 36:20, 21 that Jeremiah's prophecy that the land would be desolate 70 years was fulfilled by God's driving them out of their land and keeping them in other lands, thus desolating it—until it was so bereaved of its inhabitants 70 years. If the P.B.I. view of the desolation were true, there would have been no need of driving them out of their land at all. All that would have been necessary for the P.B.I.'s kind of desolation would be to make the land *unfruitful*. In other words, sending them lean years for 70 years would have been the P.B.I. desolation, as 16 of their 70 years were lean years spent by them in their own land. But God said that the land's desolation—bereavement of the land of its inhabitants—*not leanness*, would last 70 years. In no other passage than Jer. 25:11 does Jeremiah

foretell 70 years of desolation. Hence God's own explanation of Jer. 25:11 shows that the expression "70 years" in that verse belongs to the desolation of the land as well as to the universal royalty of Gentile power represented in Babylon. Therefore the expression "70 years" in the verse under consideration belongs to both of its clauses; and it proves that the desolation of the land and Babylon's supremacy were *contemporaneous*; therefore they began at Zedekiah's dethronement. Moreover, God's own explanation of how the land would enjoy its Sabbaths is conclusive on this point: *He* said that as long as Israel would be in their enemies' land—therefore out of their own land—would the land enjoy its Sabbaths (Lev. 26:31-34). Hence none of its 70 Sabbaths were kept while they were in it; and therefore the 16 years after Israel's return, claimed by these Editors as Sabbaths, were not such.

We, accordingly, conclude that the Editors' efforts to interpret Jer. 29:10; 25:11 in a way that makes them conflict with the clear teachings of Lev. 26:31-36; 2 Chro. 36:20, 21—and we might add Zech. 7:5, 12, to which the P.B.I. Editors do not refer—in order to put upon these passages an interpretation contrary to their clear teachings, has completely failed. God's statements on this subject still stand, the P.B.I. Editors and their master, Azazel, to the contrary notwithstanding.

We desire to emphasize the fact that we mentioned when we first answered their errors on the Times of the Gentiles—their lines of reasoning are not original with them; they have plagiarized these things from one of the most inexact schools of nominal-church chronologians! Not only so, but worse yet, their lines of reasoning are exactly the same as the Second Death sifters used in 1908-11, when after rejecting the Biblical chronology which our Pastor taught they sought to introduce error on that subject. This was a part of

their contradictionism—the fifth slaughter weapon. After all, it should not surprise us that the P.B.I. Editors, as parts of antitypical Jambres, should agree with the 1908-11 Second Death sifters as parts of antitypical Jannes (2 Tim. 3:1-9); for they are their soul mates and co-workers. As Jannes and Jambres before and in the interests of Pharaoh sought to overthrow the influence and works of Moses, speaking and acting through Aaron, so antitypical Jannes during the Parousia sought, before and in the interests of antitypical Pharaoh, Satan, to overthrow the influence and work of the antitypical Moses, the Christ class beyond the veil, speaking and acting through antitypical Aaron, the Christ class this side of the veil. And likewise antitypical Jambres now, during the Epiphany, is seeking before and in the interests of antitypical Pharaoh, Satan, to overthrow the influence and work of antitypical Moses, the Christ class beyond the veil, speaking and acting through the antitypical Aaron, the Christ class this side of the veil! This, dear brethren, is the rock-bottom solution of the cause of all these sifters' errors—the sixth slaughter weapon—revolutionism.

The P.B.I. Editors have finally come out with their new "double," which they seem to have borrowed from J.A.D. In his article, on which he gave a few comments above, he sets forth a double of 1864 years, whose first part, by subtracting 19 years from the Bible chronology, he makes end in 70 A.D. Beginning its second part in 70 A.D., he makes it reach 1934. In H '22, 138, col. 2, par. 2, the P.B.I. Editors endorse this view of the "double." Not only so, but they deny that our Pastor used the Parallel Dispensation to prove the time of our Lord's Second Advent (H '22, 139, col. 2, par. 4), which they say occurred *about* 1874. (How near 1874 in their opinion was it? we would fain ask.) In contradiction of this false statement that our Pastor did not use the

Parallels to prove the time of the Second Advent we refer our readers to B 247, also 234, 235. This statement of the Editors seems to prove that they are more familiar with the writings of Foolish Virgins than with those of our Pastor, whose findings they are rejecting for those of Foolish Virgins. Of course, the new parallel and other chronological errors cause them to reject the bulk of our Pastor's findings in Studies, Vols. II and III, despite their denial of this fact. In their June 1, 1922, issue they have finally "let the cat out of the bag": they show that they have gotten their chronological errors from H. Grattan Guinness (a foolish virgin, whose findings our Pastor both verbally and in the Tower rejected). Let the brethren realize this: that R.E. Streeter, who foisted these errors on the P.B.I., is more sympathetic with H. Grattan Guinness' errors than he is with our Pastor's truths. Even before our Pastor's death R.E. Streeter preached more or less of Guinness' views. It seems that he never quite gave up many views of the Second Adventists, whom he left when he came into the Truth. He has failed to heed the injunction of Is. 52:11; he has touched the unclean thing; and as a result, he is unclean. In the letter occasioning the article in their May number, which we are now reviewing, the protesting brother—Bro. Cox of Boston, who gave up their pilgrim service because of their chronological errors—calls their attention to a number of the parallels already fulfilled as proving our understanding of the Parallel to be correct. But these Editors waive these parallels aside, claiming that they do not disprove their cutting off 19 years from the chronology. These Editors have many difficulties, and they are by their teachings proving that their false chronology contradicts practically everything as far as chronological harmony is concerned. They will have to surrender the harvest Parallels or change the harvest times. They will have to surrender 1878 as the time of Babylon's rejection

and the resurrection of the saints; for only by the Parallels are these dates proven for these events. In fact, they have made a sorry mess of almost everything chronological.

First let us look at the three Old Testament passages that treat of the "double," and see how each one of them contradicts their new "double." As the first of these we will briefly consider Is. 40:1, 2. Their claim is that the "double" of these verses and "the appointed time" of the margin end in 1934. Do these verses and the facts of the case agree with such a thought? It will be noticed that these verses show that the "comfort" of which they treat was to be proclaimed to Israel *after her double was finished, and after her appointed time was completed*. But the facts prove that ever since 1878 this comfort has been preached to Israel. The decree of the Berlin Conference of nations and the circulation of Delitsch's Hebrew New Testament, were the first proclamations of this comfort. Shortly thereafter, our Pastor began to proclaim this comfort to them; and for years he and the Harvest people proclaimed it to the Jews. Yea, we know that from 1910 to 1915 he and they devoted much time to that message. In 1882 Leo Pinsker, the forerunner of Herzl, began among the Jews to preach this comfort. He was joined in this by many very prominent Israelites, such as Lilienblum, Levanda, Ruelf, etc., in a world-wide proclamation of this comfort. In 1895 Herzl wrote his Jewish State, which aroused that form of agitation that is called Zionism, in the narrow sense of that term. All Jewry is now receiving this comfort. Thus we see that the predicted comfort has been proclaimed ever since 1878; and the passage says that it would not be preached until after the "double"—the "appointed time"—was completed. Therefore the "double," the "appointed time" was completed before June 11, 1878, when the Berlin Conference began the proclamation of the comfort,

and before June 11, 1878, when Britain assumed the protectorate of Palestine for Turkey. Hence the P.B.I. view of the "double" contradicts this passage and its fulfilment. Thus their view is seen to be erroneous.

Again, their view is in violent contradiction of the second passage that treats of the "double"—Jer. 16:15-18. Jehovah says in v. 18 that He would first punish their sins and iniquities double, *before* He would fulfill to them the promises of vs. 15, 16. But we know that ever since 1881 He has been bringing to Palestine ever increasing numbers of the Jews, from Russia and other countries (v. 15). We know that ever since 1878 Jehovah has been sending the "fishers" (v. 16) to draw the Israelites to Palestine with the bait of Zionism. These fishers, in part, have been those statesmen who have politically assisted Israel to return; in part those Israelitish agitators, *e.g.*, those mentioned in the preceding paragraph, who, especially since 1881, have been arousing their persecuted brethren to go to Palestine, in hope of a home and a national government; and in part those spiritual Israelites who have been proclaiming the Biblical Zionism. Of these the harvest people and many "foolish virgins" in Babylon are examples. Thus we see that the "fishers" have been fishing them ever since 1878. But v. 18 shows that they would begin this fishing only after the "double" was over; hence the "double" was over when in the nights of June 6 and 11, 1878, the statesmen fishers as the pioneers began this figurative fishing. This consideration completely refutes the P.B.I. double ending in 1934.

Moreover, the *hunting* which was to follow the completion of the "double" began in 1881 with the Russian May laws, in consequence of which Jews were fiendishly rooted up from their homes in Russia, Poland, Romania and Galicia. A hunter offers no bait to his

game. He drives and kills them without offering them even a bait. Thus the persecutors and ravishers of Israel are meant by the hunters. The series of persecutions which began in the above countries in 1881 have been continued. The Kishenev massacre of 1903, in which over 500 of the Jews were slaughtered in cold blood, was one among many of the dark deeds of the ruthless hunters driving Israel to seek refuge in other countries, among other places, in Palestine. The terrible mistreatment of the Jews by the Russian, Polish and Romanian armies in the World War are only other examples of the havoc and ruin wrought among hunted Israel by these remorseless hunters, driving large numbers of them to Palestine. But v. 18 proves that the hunting would begin only after the "double" was over. Hence the "double" was over before the Russian May laws were enacted in May, 1881, whereby the hunters began their systematic work of scouring the countries for Israelitish game. Therefore the P.B.I. double, ending in 1934, contradicts this passage and is an error. Thus we see that the second Old Testament passage treating of the "double"—Jer. 16:15-18—with its fulfilled facts completely refutes the P.B.I. double.

So, too, does the third Old Testament passage treating of the "double" refute the P.B.I. double as being 1864 years and ending in 1934. The P.B.I. Editors make some desperate efforts to twist this passage (Zech. 9:12) into being a prophecy that makes the first part of the "double" end at the destruction of Jerusalem in 70 A.D. They claim that the word "today" refers only to the time when Jesus spoke; but that Jesus was prophesying of what would be done in the year 70. Let us see if the facts of the case will permit of this twist; for it is nothing else than a twist. All are agreed that from Zech. 9:9 to and including the words of v. 12, "Even today do I declare," refer to our Lord's experiences and words on the day

when He made His triumphal entry into Jerusalem—Nisan 10, 33 A.D. Several days later (Matt. 23:38, 39) Jesus assures us of two things: (1) that their house—the house of Israel was *Israel* (Ezek. 37:11-14; Acts 2:36), not Jerusalem, as the P.B.I. Editors teach—had already entered into its desolation process (your house *is* [has been, not *shall* be] left unto you desolate, v. 38); and (2) that they nationally were blinded and would remain blinded until some time during His Second Advent ("Ye shall see Me no more until," etc., v. 39). Let us briefly consider these two things and we shall see that the "double"—the second part of the "double," the disfavor part—was already operating on Nisan 12, 33 A.D., when Jesus used the language of Matt. 23:38, 39. That during the second part of the "double" Israel would experience God's disfavor the other two passages treating of the "double" prove (Is. 40:2; Jer. 16:13, 17, 18). But Matt. 23:38, 39 prove that they were already, on Nisan 12, 33 A.D.—two days after Jesus' entrance into Jerusalem (Zech. 9:9-12; Matt. 21:4, 5)—suffering certain very important features of Jehovah's disfavor. Therefore this disfavor—the second part of the "double"—began before Nisan 12, 33 A.D., and accordingly 37½ years before the P.B.I.'s second part of their new double began. Hence they are proven by these passages to be in error as to when the second half of the "double" began; and these facts prove that the day the Lord declared the "double" unto them it began to operate. Thus His declaration was the pronouncement of the beginning of the double's operation, and not a prophecy of its coming years later.

Let us notice how Israel was made desolate that day. In the following particulars their house—the house of Israel, we repeat it, was Israel, not Jerusalem, as the P.B.I. claims—was made desolate that day in the following particulars: (1) as a nation they lost God's favor that day (Zech. 9:12; Jer. 16:13, 17, 18;

Gal. 4:30); (2) mouthpieceship was taken away from them nationally on that day; (3) their priesthood and sacrifices were that day made inefficacious (Dan. 9:27); (4) the *promises* of the Law were no more theirs nationally, only its *wrath* was thenceforth theirs nationally (1 Thes. 2:15, 16, "*is* come," has come, not *shall* come); (5) on that day punishments began to be meted out to them: the cleansing of the temple, the public denunciation of their leaders, etc.; (6) on that day national insight into advancing Truth was taken from them (Luke 19:42, 44; Matt. 23:39); and (7) thenceforth nationally the Lord had only rebukes, rebuffs and punishments for them, and no more shielded them from wrong and evil, because of their increasing waywardness after they were bereft of His favor. These seven particulars prove that their house—Israel—not Jerusalem simply—was from Nisan 10, 33 A.D. desolate. That its desolation had other sad consequences is only in harmony with the fact that wrath was not completed at once, but was to continue throughout the Age. In view of these facts we can readily see how ineffectual are the P.B.I.'s efforts to twist Matt. 23:38 (your house *is* left unto you desolate), which is a statement of a then existing fact, into a prophecy of Jerusalem's destruction in 70 A.D.! On the "double" they are as unfortunate as they have been on their other chronological repudiations. Satan, their leader, has in this also led them into the ditch!

After saying that many have been guilty of fanciful speculations on the parallel of the 1845 years, J.A.D. tries his hand on finding from the standpoint of an 1864 years' double a parallel for Israel's rejection in 33 A.D.; and he thinks that he has found it in 1897, in which year he claims as the parallel event that Zionism was born (H '21, 335, col. 2, par. 1)! How muddled he is on the subject is manifest from several things: (1) he attempts to parallel Israel's rejection—

an act of *wrath*—with what he claims took place in 1897—which would be an act of *grace*—which proves that he does not understand the operation of the parallels; and (2) he sets forth a false date for the birth of Zionism. Zionism was begun by Leo Pinsker in 1882, in a pamphlet whose theories and applications Herzl in 1895 reproduced in his booklet on the Jewish State. That Zionism, even in the sense that Herzl was identified with the work, was not born in 1897, is evident from the fact that Herzl wrote his Jewish State in 1895 and led in 1896 a company of Zionists, and through and with them called their first international Zionist Congress into public sessions in 1897. Thus Zionism, even after Herzl's manner, was born before 1897, while Zionism in other movements flourished years before Herzl was interested in the subject of Zionism.

But the P.B.I. Editors go further, claiming with J.A.D. that the "double" belongs to fleshly Israel only, *i.e.*, they deny that the dispensations are parallel. Even if the Bible would not directly teach it, the many parallel events and dates that our Pastor and the Brothers Edgar have presented should make candid and exact thinkers say that the facts prove the dispensations to be parallel. However, the Bible also teaches the parallel dispensations. It not only teaches the two dispensations to be of equal length (Rom. 11:25-27; Matt. 23:38, 39; Is. 40:2; Jer. 16:15-18), but additionally it distinctly teaches in 1 Cor. 10:1-14 that the Harvests are parallels, that the faithful of both Harvests are parallels, and that the calls and siftings of both Harvests are parallel. Not only are the Harvests proven by 1 Cor. 10:1-14 to be parallel, but certain periods in both Ages are shown to be parallel, *i.e.*, the years 537 B.C. to 73 A.D. [Corrected: PT '39, 26] with their main events are parallel to 1309-1918 A.D. with their main events. This is shown abundantly by the facts that the Bros. Edgar present in Vol. II of the Pyramid

Passages. See, also, their chronological chart in the Bible Students Bible, noting not only the Dominion Parallels of 2520 years, but especially the parallels of the true and the counterfeit days of Daniel, the Jewish Double Parallels, and the Four Empires Parallel, all of which are annihilative of the P.B.I. chronological vagaries. In Rev. 18:6 ("*Double unto her the* [so the Greek] double") we have a reference to the parallel that applies from 1309 to 1918. As God began to work certain help for His true Israel through Zerubbabel, beginning in 537 B.C. and continued it until 73 A.D., so has He done for Spiritual Israel from 1309, when the Lord commissioned Marsiglio to begin to work deliverance for Spiritual Israel, until 1918, when antitypical Elijah as a class was separate from antitypical Elisha. The "voice from heaven" of Rev. 18:4 is that of the Lord's people giving certain messages connected with the chronology. This voice began in 1876 to give this message. One of the features of the message is connected with the "double" (v. 6). This message respecting the "double" began to open in 1876 and opened ever wider, until we saw and proclaimed many details of it as presented through our Pastor's and the Bros. Edgar's writings. As the Lord's people expounded it in its features from 537 B.C. to 73 A.D., over against 1309 to 1918, they were giving the message of v. 6. The expression "*double the double*" proves that the "DOUBLE" applies to Spiritual as well as to Fleshly Israel. And certainly these things were taught increasingly from 1876 to 1918; and this passage proves that the Lord recognizes that to be the "double" which the Lord's people, according to Rev. 18:4-6, taught as true and Biblical. Certainly, it showed grace to the faithful and wrath to God's enemies, in both dispensations, and proves that the parallels affect both Houses of Israel, and that, in both their real and nominal aspects. How do we know that the reference to "*the double*" in Rev. 18:6 applies

from 1309 to 1918? We know it because in 1309 Papacy, beginning its exile in Avignon, began to receive its torments, even as Babylon 1845 years before entered into the parallel experience. From that time on—1309 A.D.—Papacy and those of Papal spirit have been having the double that the enemies of God's people had exactly 1845 years before. Hence this proves that the *doubling* of "*the double*" began for symbolic Babylon at that time. And every time the Lord's people have interpreted the "double" aright they have been crying out, "*Double*" unto her "*the double*." Thus we see that this passage completely refutes the P.B.I. double, and proves that to be the true double which the Lord's people since 1876 have proclaimed. Why did Editors who claim to have given the meat in due season on Revelation not see the meaning of Rev. 18:6? The Lord's Epiphany-enlightened saints know the answer to this question; so does the P.B.I.'s master, Azazel.

In the June Herald the P.B.I. offer some so-called proofs for the near end (?) of the Times of the Gentiles. The Bible chronology proves that they ended in 1914. But the P.B.I., plagiarizing from Mr. Guinness, tell us that they will end in 1934. They refer to a number of his nonsensical views on lunar years of 12 *lunar months* and to his views of solar years with various beginnings and endings for various periods from both standpoints. "Confusion worse confounded" is a mild descriptive term for what they offer; and yet there is a plausibility in what they offer which, however, becomes apparent as a delusion when its counterfeit character is recognized. They introduce their Satanic counterfeit by a reference to the "four horns" that Zech. 1:19 says would scatter Judah, Israel and Jerusalem. They say that Zechariah's account of this matter is "a vision of Israel's future," yet they apply it to events in which three horns—powers—had already acted—Assyria, Babylonia and Persia, though to

fit their view to four horns they identify Assyria and Babylon! They stated the truth when they said that Zech. 1:18-21 was "a vision of the *future*," even though they explain it contradictorily as being in part in the past. We understand Judah in this passage to mean the Protestant laity, Israel the Catholic laity, and Jerusalem the true Church. The four horns that have scattered these are the rulers, clergy, aristocrats and bourgeoisie, and the four carpenters who scatter these horns are antitypical Elijah, Elisha, Jehu and Hazael.

These Editors, in harmony with their foolish virgin allies, again assert, despite the fact that they know of our Pastor's denial of the thought, that the Mohammedan power is pictured in Revelation; and they offer what we will show is Satan's attempted counterfeits as proofs of their position in certain chronological features in which the unbiblical year of 354 $\frac{1}{3}$ days figure very markedly—a proof of the Satanic origin of their theory. We are all familiar with the fact that in the Papacy Satan has given us a complete counterfeit of the organization, doctrines and practices of The Christ, and that this counterfeit also concerns the times and seasons of God's Plan (Dan. 7:25). In giving counterfeit explanations of the prophecies of Revelation Satan, through the Papacy, set forth Pagan Rome as the "Beast" of Revelation 13, and the Mohammedan power as the "Image" spoken of in that chapter, and as the "false prophet" of Rev. 16:13 and 19:20. This explains why Papists refer to Mohammedanism and Mohammed as the "false prophet." Satan used the latter power to work inimically to the Catholics, both of the East and the West in counterfeit of the Image's opposition to the true people of God; but Mohammedanism wrought practically no evil to real fleshly and real spiritual Israel. We recall that Satan worked out counterfeit days of Daniel. See Bros. Edgar's time chart on the true and counterfeit days of Daniel, in the Bible Students Bible, and their discussion of the

subject in Vol. II of the Pyramid Passages. Satan further, in a similar manner, counterfeited the 2520 years, the 1260, 1290 and 1335 years. Of course, he knew beforehand from Lev. 26:18, 21, 24, 28 that God had threatened seven times of punishment; but he did not know whether these times would be years consisting of 12 lunar or of 12 solar months; nor did he foreknow the exact time of their beginning. Hence he counterfeited various sets of beginning dates for these 2520, etc., years, *i.e.*, the heathen, not the Biblical years B.C., 747, 606, 604, 588 or 587, and then on the basis of years of 12 lunar and 12 solar months worked out through the Roman Empire and its successors and through the Mohammedan power certain events during the Gospel Age for the ends of the 1260, 1290, 1335 and 2520 years, in both years of 12 lunar and 12 solar months, from the above counterfeit dates in the Jewish Age. Through Mr. Guinness and others he presented these counterfeit periods as genuine! And the Azazel-led P.B.I. Editors in their chronological drunkenness have fallen victims to the deception, and are now [we wrote this review in June, 1922] in their June, 1922, Herald palming off these counterfeits as genuine!

Their persistence in their chronological errors despite clear, unanswerable refutations shows their wilfulness to be extreme and their service of Azazel in this matter to be determined. Satan's purpose through these errors is manifest: to set aside the Epiphany work and to prolong into the Epiphany the Parousia work. Their folly will become known to all men—yea, is becoming so now. In the Lord's name we call upon all who are faithful to the Parousia Truth to repudiate these false teachers and to withdraw all Priestly fellowship and support from them. Over and over again in their desire to "draw away disciples after them" they plead that differences on chronological questions be not made a test of fellowship. By these pleas they are throwing dust into the eyes of the brethren. The

question that their course calls upon the brethren to answer is not one of fellowship. It is one that concerns them as teachers. The question, therefore, is whether those who have once had the Truth, and then have forsaken it shall be accepted as teachers in the Church. To this question St. Paul's statement (Tit. 1:9) applies, and proves that these are disqualified for the teaching office, and therefore are accepted as teachers at the grave peril of those who receive them as such. We therefore counsel the brethren everywhere to do with these Editors what the New York Church has done with those of them who were among its Elders—to set them aside as teachers and not receive them as such through their writings; for they have not the first requisite of a teacher in the Church—meekness, *i.e.*, teachableness and leadableness that makes one quick to learn of, and to obey the Lord.

O beloved saints, who are faithful to the Parousia Truth, happy are you in being shielded from the fall of those who have fallen, and who seek to drag down others with them in their fall! Beloved Epiphany-enlightened saints, how happy is your lot, in that you see and enjoy the added safety vouchsafed you by the later "meat in due season"—the Epiphany Truth! Let us be faithful to both features of the Truth!

In the June 15 and July 1 and 15, 1922, P.B.I. Herald, its Editors try hard to buttress their chronological errors, and do so with their usual cunning, (1) in extolling foolish virgins, from whom they have learned their prophetic errors, as helpful teachers; (2) in claiming that the P.B.I.'s fighting our Pastor's chronology is not one of antagonism to him; (3) in misrepresenting what he wrote in 1913 about his re-examining his chronology as to Oct., 1914, under certain contingencies (Z '14, 4, last par.); (4) in raising the irrelevant point of the differences on the chronology as not standing in the way of fellowship; (5) in stressing the importance of the spirit of one's acts

as so superior to the nature of those acts, as to leave the impression that the latter is an almost negligible matter; and (6) in implying that exposing and warning against false teachers and against apostates and seducers from the Truth is railing and forbidden denunciation. On the first point we have sufficiently expressed ourselves in the past. Their course on the second point is the plainest hypocrisy; for they are fighting our Pastor tooth and nail on matters pertaining to the 70 years of desolation and 1914 as the end of the Times of the Gentiles. Their issuing so many articles on the subject plainly shows, despite their hypocritical compliments, their purpose to overthrow his more reliable views on the end of the Reaping time, on the Times of the Gentiles, on the Jubilees and on the Parallels. As to the third point, it is true that before our Pastor was thoroughly clear on the subject of the Church's leaving the world after 1914 he said that if the Church should be here after Oct., 1915; if the *Time of Trouble* should not then be in sight; if the nominal churches should not then have federated; and if the world should then be peaceably settling its difficulties; he would conclude that he had erred on the chronology respecting Oct., 1914, which chronology he would then have to re-examine in order to detect the error. But what are the facts on this point? Shortly afterward (in the May, 1914, Tower) he stated definitely that the Church would not leave the world by Oct., 1914, and that nothing in the chronology required it, or that the Trouble should end by Oct., 1915, as he once taught. And when Oct., 1914, had come, the Time of Trouble, which began with the World War, was here. When he spoke of the nominal church federating, he evidently meant *all* of the denominations being in the Federation; for from 1905 on he taught that the Federation of Churches was organized in that year in the Federal Council of the Churches of Christ; and he taught, in 1908, that through the appearance in Episcopal

pulpits of the Federation's ministers being sanctioned by a joint decree of the Episcopal House of Bishops and Deputies, the Image received its life. He had thought earlier that the Trouble would be over by the Fall of 1915; and this led him to make these four conditional statements. Of these conditions two alone were crucial to the chronology as to Oct., 1914: (1) the beginning of the Time of Trouble; and (2) the world in strife, far from a peaceable settlement of its difficulties. These two crucial conditions entered into fulfilment by Oct., 1914. Hence our Pastor, living for over two years afterward, did not find it necessary, nor did he encourage others, to re-examine the chronology with a view to finding in it an error respecting Oct., 1914, as the end of the Times of the Gentiles. On the contrary, he repeatedly asserted that the fulfillments proved the 1914 chronology to be correct. Let the P.B.I., therefore, cease their deceitful handling of this statement of his in Z '14, 4, last par. In this deceitful manner they have referred repeatedly to this statement. Nothing in his writings or spirit warrants their course in this matter. They are in their course following a different lord and spirit from what he followed, and that with opposite results.

We covered point 4 in a former issue. On point 5 we would state that what they say on the spirit being the necessary thing to watch, compared with their conduct strikes us as identical with what the Society friends said of their spirit and that of all of the so-called "opposition" in 1917. We further add that the spirit of those who forsake important features of the Truth and spread errors in their stead is always bad, even though with words "smoother than butter" they seek to hide from the unwary the Satanic uses to which they give themselves. What they say on the 6th point is the old "stop thief" cry of the pursued wrongdoer seeking to divert attention from himself.

In their June 15 Herald they set themselves forth as

champions of the authenticity of the book of Daniel against Higher Critics, as though our Pastor and those who hold his views on the chronology were Higher Critics! This pose of theirs is laughable! They claim that Dan. 1:1 proves that Nebuchadnezzar arrived at Jerusalem in Jehoiakim's third year and took in that year the first set of Jewish captives and the first set of sacred vessels to Babylon. It is very easy to prove both from the Bible and from profane history that such thoughts are untrue. We will give the separate proofs briefly, believing that their statement and necessary explanations will completely overthrow the P.B.I. contention on this point.

(1) The Bible teaches that three, and only three, sets of captives were taken from Palestine to Babylon, and that the first of these captivities occurred in the seventh year of Nebuchadnezzar, which was in the eleventh year of Jehoiakim (Jer. 52:28-30). Please see our statements proven in detail above on the evident addition and omission of some of the numerals in vs. 29 and 30. Hence Dan. 1:1 does not prove that the first set of sacred vessels and captives were taken in the third year of Jehoiakim to Babylon.

(2) The Bible clearly teaches that Nebuchadnezzar's sword was to be unsheathed three, and only three, times against Jerusalem (Ezek. 21:14), the third being against Zedekiah, as Ezek. 21:14 proves; and these three unsheathings were accompanied by the three captivities referred to in Jer. 52:28-30. Hence Dan. 1:1 does not prove that the first captives and the first set of sacred vessels left Jerusalem in the third year of Jehoiakim

(3) The Bible teaches that Jehoiakim in his eleventh year was taken as a captive to Babylon with the first set of sacred vessels (2 Chro. 36:6, 7). Hence Dan. 1:1 does not prove that the first set of captives and sacred vessels were taken to Babylon in Jehoiakim's third year. The proof for Jehoiakim's going as a captive

to Babylon is found in the connection that the word "*also*" in v. 7 makes between that and v. 6. In v. 6, as the event that occurred *at the end* of Jehoiakim's reign, Nebuchadnezzar's binding him to carry him *captive* to Babylon is described. Then, telling what additionally, "*also*," he carried into captivity to Babylon, v. 7 mentions some of the sacred vessels. Hence this word, "*also*," implies that some person or thing mentioned previously, *i.e.*, in v. 6, was also carried into captivity to Babylon. V. 6 mentions only Jehoiakim as being dealt with from the standpoint of captivity at Babylon. Accordingly, the word, "*also*," must refer to him; and hence by the word, "*also*," in v. 7 he is proven to have been taken to Babylon, Jer. 52:28 showing that others accompanied him; and this must have been at the end of his reign; for he remained in Jerusalem until his eleventh year. Jer. 22:18, 19 and 36:30 do not teach, as the P.B.I. claim, that he died at Jerusalem. The first passage teaches that he would have no royal mourning and burial, that from some place outside of Jerusalem he would be dishonorably cast forth and buried as an ass. The thought of his being cast forth from some place outside of Jerusalem and then buried as an ass would not forbid applying the expression to some place in Babylon. The Hebrew implies that from some place outside and beyond, literally, "from beyond" the gates of Jerusalem, he would be both cast out and buried as an ass. Hence this language implies that his funeral would not be at Jerusalem; it would therefore fit his being cast forth from some place in Babylon and there buried as an ass. Jer. 36:30 does not tell us where he was buried; but it shows that his burial was that of an ass, *i.e.*, his body was left to rot on the surface of the earth, exposed to heat and frost. This proves that his death was not in Palestine; for the Jews would not let their land be Levitically defiled by a body lying *unburied* (which was not a man's burial) in their land

for at least, as implied in the expression "heat and frost," a large part of a year. Hence we see that this passage contradicts the thought that Jehoiakim died and was buried in Palestine. The other passage shows that it was not at Jerusalem.

In view of the P.B.I. contention that our Pastor dates the first captives to be taken to Babylon 18 years before Zedekiah's uncrowning, there arises the question: When, according to our Pastor's teachings, were the first Israelites taken captive to Babylon by Nebuchadnezzar? To this question we give the following answer: Both the older Towers and editions of Studies, Vol. II, up to within several years of his death, show that he believed that Nebuchadnezzar, in the fourth year of Jehoiakim on the occasion of his first coming to Jerusalem, took the first set of Israelitish captives to Babylon. This can, among other references, be seen from the following quotation, taken from B 52, par. 1, in a copy of that book published in 1913: "Usher dates the seventy years' desolation eighteen years earlier than shown above, *i.e.*, before the dethronement of Zedekiah, Judah's last king—because the king of Babylon took many of the people captive *at that time* [italics ours]." However, our Pastor came to see later that the first set of captives was taken to Babylon *eleven, not* eighteen, years before Zedekiah's dethronement, just as Jeremiah states the matter (Jer. 52:28). This can be seen from a note that in later editions he added to the statement just quoted from B 52, par. 1, as, *e.g.*, the note in a 1915 edition of Studies, Vol. II, at the bottom of the page: "Note, however, this partial captivity occurred *eleven*, not eighteen, years before the dethronement of Zedekiah." In other words, our Pastor's mature thought on the date that Israel's first set of captives was taken by Nebuchadnezzar to Babylon, corroborates the view of that subject that we set forth above on the basis of Jer. 52:28; 2 Chro. 36:6, 7; Dan. 1:1, 2. Compare with Jer. 46:2; 25:1-11.

(4) Dan. 1:2 directly teaches the thought that Jehoiakim as a captive went to Babylon. In the clause, "which he carried away," a manifest mistranslation hides the thought. The word "which" is a relative pronoun whose Hebrew equivalent is *asher*; while the Hebrew suffix *em*, the personal pronoun for *them*, is here used suffixed to the verb as its object. The sentence should read, "He [Nebuchadnezzar] caused *them* [*i.e.*, Jehoiakim and the vessels] to go [Heb. *bow*] to the land of Shinar"—Babylon. The pronoun *them*, "em," refers as to its antecedents to both Jehoiakim and the vessels; for if the vessels alone were meant, the word for "vessels" would have been repeated, as is done in the last part of the verse when the vessels alone are meant. Hence this verse proves that Jehoiakim (and the rest of the first set of captives) and the first set of sacred vessels went to Babylon in Jehoiakim's eleventh year. Hence Dan. 1:1 does not prove that the first set of captives and the first set of sacred vessels went to Babylon in Jehoiakim's third year. The latter part of the verse shows that what Nebuchadnezzar brought to the house of his god to exhibit as trophies of victory to his god was more than the vessels which he deposited in the temple's treasures; for the disposal of the vessels is contrasted with the implied disposal of Jehoiakim (and those with him). If the vessels alone were meant as being brought to the house of his god, the pronoun *them* and not the noun "vessels" would have been used at the end of the sentence showing their deposit in the treasury in the house of his God.

(5) Jer. 25:1-9, particularly vs. 1 and 9, prove that up to that part of the fourth year of Jehoiakim's reign (v. 1) in which this prophecy was given, Nebuchadnezzar had not yet reached the land of Judah. Hence he could not have arrived at Jerusalem and have besieged and taken it in the third year of Jehoiakim, as the P.B.I. contend. The Lord sent Nebuchadnezzar

against Jerusalem three times in all (Ezek. 21:1). As his second and third sendings were at the ends of Jehoiachin's and Zedekiah's reigns, the first sending must have been a composite one, covering all his operations against Jerusalem during Jehoiakim's days as king, *i.e.*, from Jehoiakim's fourth until his eleventh year, especially from his seventh to his eleventh year (2 Kings 24:1, 2), though he first started from Babylon for this series of operations against Jerusalem late in Jehoiakim's third year (Dan. 1:1). Ezek. 21:14 and 2 Kings 24:2, 3 show that by three sword unsheathings he destroyed Judah. Jer. 25:9 shows that Nebuchadnezzar has not yet stretched out his sword against Judah and Jerusalem when it as a prophecy was uttered; but it prophesies that he would so do; while v. 1 proves that this prophecy was given in Jehoiakim's fourth year. Hence his first arrival there was *after* the battle of Carchemish, which occurred (earlier) in the fourth year of Jehoiakim (Jer. 46:2). Let us remember that Jer. 25:1-14 is a prophecy of coming events, none of which, therefore, occurred before that particular part of Jehoiakim's fourth year in which this prophecy was given. Accordingly, this verse proves that Nebuchadnezzar did not *arrive* at Jerusalem in Jehoiakim's third year, and that therefore the P.B.I. misinterpret Dan. 1:1 when they claim it teaches that the first captives and vessels left for Babylon in Jehoiakim's third year.

(6) Secular history, in harmony with the five lines of Scriptural thoughts just given, proves that it was late in the fourth year of Jehoiakim's reign when Nebuchadnezzar for the first time arrived at Jerusalem. The following are facts that are well attested by secular history: During the year *before* Jehoiakim became king, Pharaoh-Necho (2 Chro. 35:20-24; 2 Kings 23:29) made war against Assyria and took from Assyria all of the land from the upper Euphrates southward to Egypt. This included Syria and Palestine.

This land was kept in control of the Egyptians until the battle of Carchemish, in the fall of the fourth year of Jehoiakim when it was wrested from them by Nebuchadnezzar, who defeated Necho so severely, that the latter even feared to come to Jehoiakim's aid against the former, as late as from the latter's seventh to his eleventh year (2 Kings 24:1-7). In Jehoiakim's second year, as allies, the Medes and the Babylonians, the latter under Nebuchadnezzar's direct command as his father's military representative, *i.e.*, general, but not as his coregent, began a war of extermination on the Assyrian Empire; and in Jehoiakim's third year these allies overthrew Assyria by destroying Nineveh. Among other things, the Medes took as their booty Eastern Assyria, and the Babylonians took as their booty Southern and Western Assyria. However, a part of the territory that was allotted to Babylon was held by Necho, as shown above. Therefore Nebuchadnezzar, as his father's military representative, but not as his coregent, was, late in Jehoiakim's third year (Dan. 1:1), sent by his father *from Babylon* to wrest from Pharaoh-Necho that part of the Assyrian Empire which was assigned to the Babylonians, and which at that time was held by the Egyptians—all the territory from the Upper Euphrates to Egypt. Slightly more than six months later, in the fall of Jehoiakim's fourth year (Jer. 46:2), the Babylonian and Egyptian armies met and fought one of the decisive battles of the world's history—that of Carchemish—in which the Egyptian army was completely defeated and driven from the Euphrates to Egypt, Nebuchadnezzar pursuing and taking all of the territory between the Euphrates and the Nile, including Palestine (2 Kings 24:7).

The P.B.I. Editors claim that Nebuchadnezzar, in the summer of Jehoiakim's third year, was at Jerusalem and later, in the next year, fought with the Egyptians at Carchemish. This is a pure fiction, a P.B.I.

invention, for which not one reliable secular historian can be cited in corroboration; nor can it be successfully defended from the Bible; for during Jehoiakim's third year Nebuchadnezzar and the Babylonian army were warring in Assyria, a thousand miles east of Palestine; and all of Jehoiakim's reign until during the latter part of his fourth year Palestine was under Egypt's suzerainty, as it also had been from the year before Jehoiakim's reign began. A Babylonian army could not have gotten to Palestine without first defeating Necho. Immediately after Nineveh's fall, the Babylonians returned to Babylon for their triumph. In the late winter of Jehoiakim's third year (Dan. 1:1), Nebuchadnezzar started from Babylon on his campaign against Necho, which was destined to bring him for the first time to Palestine, after over a half of Jehoiakim's fourth year had passed. From this statement of proven facts it can be seen that it was a physical impossibility for Nebuchadnezzar to have been in Palestine in Jehoiakim's third year. If the Herald Editors think that they can with impunity falsify the course of history in the interests of their errors they are mistaken. Their misrepresenting the historical facts in this case is so palpable, that even a beginner in the study of the Biblical and secular history of those days can detect their brazen perversion of facts. We refer our readers to the accounts in 2 Kings and 2 Chro. and to any ancient history or to any Encyclopedia in corroboration of our statement of the case. In the facts of this case, though not in the years B.C., there is general agreement between secular and sacred history. Hence secular history corroborates the above five lines of Biblical thoughts proving that Nebuchadnezzar the first time did not reach Palestine before late in the fourth year of Jehoiakim's reign. Hence Dan. 1:1 does not teach that he reached Jerusalem in Jehoiakim's third year and in that year sent the first captives and sacred vessels to Babylon.

(7) Finally, on this point we present a strictly literal translation of Dan. 1:1, which proves that the verse does not teach that Nebuchadnezzar reached Jerusalem in the third year of Jehoiakim and that during that year he sent captives and sacred vessels to Babylon, but that in that year he entered upon the campaign that other passages tell us brought him, in Jehoiakim's fourth year, to Jerusalem. The translation is as follows: "In the third year of the reign of Jehoiakim King of Judah, Nebuchadnezzar, king [prospectively; see Luke 2:11 for a parallel case, where Jesus is prospectively called Christ, the Lord] of Babylon *set out* for Jerusalem; and [from Jehoiakim's seventh to his eleventh year] he besieged it. The verb *bow*, translated in this verse, by the A.V., "came," has a variety of meanings. Primarily it means to go, to set out. On this point Davies, in his Hebrew Lexicon (p. 80, col. 2, middle), makes the following remark on this word: "Its first and oldest sense is to *go* [not therefore to *come*], when the end to be arrived at is added and the goer is thought of as at the starting point, *e.g.*, 'Whither shall I go' (Gen. 37:30)?" The case of Jonah setting out [*"to go," bow*] and the ship about to set out [*"going," bow*] for Tarshish are very much to the point (Jonah 1:3). Among other passages, where *bow* undoubtedly has the same meaning, the following may be cited: Gen. 45:17; Num. 32:6; Is. 22:15. It is true that the word *bow* is frequently, and properly, translated "to come." But where the translation "to come" contradicts the Scriptures and also facts, as in the case before us, it should not be used as the proper translation of the word. Moreover, the primary meaning should always be preferred where it fits, as in the present case it does fit. Therefore our translation is the one based on the primary meaning of the word and fits the facts and the Scriptures above given, all three of which points are against the translation of the A.V. When the Herald Editors say that the A.V. translation is indisputably correct, they betray

the same ignorance of Hebrew as they betray of history. We very much doubt if any of the Herald Editors knows even the Hebrew alphabet, let alone can grammatically construe and translate, a Hebrew sentence! Later on, when we discuss their remarks on the Hebrew of Zech. 7:3, 5, we will find another illustration of their ignorance of that language on which they presume to speak with such a show of authority and assurance as would presuppose their Hebrew learning.

In first treating on the date of Nebuchadnezzar's first arrival in Palestine these Editors considered that Daniel meant that he arrived there in Jehoiakim's third year and that Jeremiah meant the same, but "antedated" it by calling it the fourth year! Now they claim that the two prophets refer to two different arrivals! As a chameleon changes its color as often as outside influences operate upon it, so do these Editors change their views to meet each new set of objections brought to bear on their errors.

Accordingly, we conclude that the P.B.I. Editors are in total error on Dan. 1:1, on which they base their entire chronological argument. The passage teaches what we above stated it teaches, when we first answered them and showed the chronological harmonies of the passages involved in the dates connected with Israel and Babylon.

As to their quotation from Berosus, whom they admit to be unreliable, to prove that Jewish and other captives were taken to Babylon in Jehoiakim's third year, we would say the following: Since the passage states that Egypt had already had a ruler appointed by Babylon, and that it rebelled against Babylon's rulership over Egypt, for which reason the Babylonians came against it and in the campaign took Jewish, etc., captives, Berosus cannot refer exclusively to Nebuchadnezzar's attack on Pharaoh-Necho, which was the first encounter between Egypt and Babylon; for the Babylonians did not take Egypt and appoint a ruler

over it until after Zedekiah's captivity, nor was it until in Jehoiakim's fourth year that they, for the first time, joined war against Egypt. In this passage, Berosus evidently mixes up the events of many campaigns of Babylon against the Jews, Egyptians, etc., as though they belonged to the first. Hence the passage cannot fairly be used to prove that the first set of Jewish captives were taken to Babylon a year and a half before Nebuchadnezzar's first year, *i.e.*, in the summer of Jehoiakim's third year.

The Herald Editors answer our claim that Nebuchadnezzar besieged Jerusalem in Jehoiakim's eleventh year by the statement that this was impossible, because he could not have gone from Jerusalem to Babylon and returned again, and besieged and taken it within three months and ten days, when Jehoiachin, Jehoiakim's successor, and Jerusalem were taken in the second unsheathing of the Babylonian sword against Judah. This point would not be well taken, even if it could be proven that Nebuchadnezzar went to Babylon with Jehoiakim and the first set of captives and sacred vessels; for the account is that at the end of the year—Jehoiachin, with a three months' and ten days' reign, filled out the balance of Jehoiakim's eleventh year—Nebuchadnezzar "*sent*" for him (2 Chro. 36:10) to Jerusalem and after his surrender had him sent to Babylon. Thus, through a representative, he came to Jerusalem against Jehoiachin (2 Kings 25:10-12). The Bible does not tell us where Nebuchadnezzar went after he captured Jehoiakim; much less does it say that he went to Babylon. Hence the P.B.I.'s answer on this subject is merely a straw man of their own making and overturning. Secular history, their dense ignorance of which is again manifested by what they say on this point, gives us the solution on this subject. According to secular history Nebuchadnezzar for many years—13 in all—was besieging Tyre. It was during the course of this siege that he captured Jerusalem

in Jehoiakim's eleventh year, and three months and ten days later captured it the second time through one of his generals, himself remaining at a central place where he could advantageously supervise both sieges—that of Tyre and that of Jerusalem.

Even if we should grant as proven all their unprovable assumptions with reference to it, and their unfactual claims on the expression, "It came to pass," the incident with reference to the Rechabites would avail them nothing; for there were still three months left to the fourth year of Jehoiakim after Nebuchadnezzar left Jerusalem for Babylon to secure the kingship for himself on hearing of his father's death; and during these three months Jeremiah could easily have taken the Rechabites into the temple, as described in chapter 35, and have done it in the fourth year, even as the Rechabites could, in Jehoiakim's fourth year, have fled from the invading Babylonians before these three months and still have done so after the battle of Carchemish and Nebuchadnezzar's invasion of Palestine. How unutterably weak is a cause that uses such points as that of the Rechabites—a point that is entirely in harmony with our view, but for their view is dependent on such a multitude of guesses, unprovable assumptions and untrue claims like that on the expression, "It came to pass," as necessarily meaning afterwards! Let them try to apply such a definition to Ruth 1:1 and numberless other passages! Their remarks in this connection on the present infinitive "to be" as denoting the future shows that they are as rusty on English, as they are ignorant of Hebrew grammar.

What they say of the second year of Nebuchadnezzar is beside the mark, so far as our position is concerned. The above seven reasons demonstrate that the expression, "second year of Nebuchadnezzar," cannot refer to his second year as king of Babylon, but to the second year of his universal Empire, which began in the nineteenth year of his reign as king of Babylon.

The above seven reasons forbid the thought of the three years' education of the Hebrew youths ending at any time in the second year of Nebuchadnezzar's reign as king of Babylon. Even if we should concede the taking of Daniel, etc., to Babylon in Jehoiakim's third year, which we do not do, several of the reasons that we give above prove that their educational course of three years could not have been finished until after the second year of Nebuchadnezzar's reign as king of Babylon, as distinct from his second year as universal monarch, was over. But, as we have seen, the whole P.B.I. proposition of a captivity in Jehoiakim's third year is based on unscriptural and unhistorical grounds.

It is laughable to see the pose that the P.B.I. Editors take as supposed defenders of Daniel as against Higher Critics. In our presentation of the subject there is not the slightest taint of Higher Criticism, nor is there in it the perversion of the Scriptures nor the perversion and ignorance of secular history and of Hebrew with which the P.B.I. effort on this matter is saturated. What the P.B.I. Editors need in this matter is reformation from hypocrisy and folly, and the possession of real knowledge and meekness; for had they been meek the Lord would have guided them; but, following their own wilfulness, the Lord gave them over to Azazel, who makes them, as parts of antitypical Jambres, leaders of others into error.

In the July 1 Herald the P.B.I. Editors, with much self-confidence, claim to find a positive proof in Zech. 7:1-5, more particularly in vs. 3 and 5, that it was 70 years from Zedekiah's uncrowning to 518 B.C.; for they interpret these verses and the connection as teaching that the 70 years' fasting from Zedekiah's uncrowning ended in 518 B.C., when they say the men came from Bethel to inquire whether they should weep and fast in the fifth month. These Editors hide the fact that from their usually given date for Zedekiah's overthrow, 587 (51 years before 536), to 518, were

69 and not 70 years. According to their usual view, the annual fasting not having begun until 586, a year after their usual date for the temple's destruction, this would reduce the period to 69 years. Therefore this 69 years' period to which the P.B.I.'s usual chronology reduces this time cannot be the period that Jehovah gives as the time of their having fasted 70 years. The fact that they give various dates for Zedekiah's overthrow is subversive of their "sure" proof, supposedly taught by Zech. 7:1-5—that from this overthrow until 518 B.C. were 70 years.

And these Editors refer with much assurance to what they claim is a correct translation of the Hebrew, of which they know next to nothing, as a proof of the correctness of their understanding of this section of Scripture! If they had an accurate grammatical knowledge of Hebrew and would use it honestly, Zech. 7:1-5, accurately translated and interpreted as to its teaching on the termination of the 70 years' fasting for Nebuchadnezzar's destructiveness, would, from their standpoint, be about the last passage in the Bible that they would quote to prove their chronological theories on the time of his destructiveness. The A.V. and some other translations (*because their translators held the same views as the P.B.I.*) have darkened the thought of this passage by translating the singular demonstrative pronoun *Zeh* (this) by the plural (these), as though it read *eleh* (these), and then making it limit the word for *years*, instead of making it a simple demonstrative. If it would limit the word for *years*, it would have to be plural, *eleh*, whereas it is singular, *zeh*. We offer the following, with bracketed comments, as an accurate literal rendering of Zech. 7:2-5: "For Bethel had sent Sherezer and Regem-Melech and their men to entreat Jehovah's favor, and to speak to the priests who were at the house of Jehovah, and to the prophets, saying, Shall I, separated [alone, *i.e.*, without waiting for others to join in renewing

the discontinued custom of fasting in the fifth month], weep in the fifth month, as I did [past tense, *did*, not the equivalent of the present perfect tense, *have done*. The past tense proves that the custom of fasting in the fifth month had for some years been discontinued] *this* [*zeh*, singular, *this*, not *eleh*, plural, *these*] so many years? And the word of Jehovah was to me, saying, Speak to all the people of the land and to the priests, saying, When ye fasted and mourned [the past tense used here in the Hebrew shows that the returned Israelites had some time in the past *given up* the *custom* of fasting in the fifth month; for if they had continued the custom until and including the year in which they made the inquiry, the equivalent of the present perfect tense or the present tense would have been used as denoting a custom still in vogue] in the fifth and in the seventh [month], and *this* [singular in the Hebrew; *zeh*, this, (not *eleh*, these), does not limit the Hebrew expression for "seventy years"; for if it did, it would have been plural, *eleh*, these] for seventy years, did ye fast for Me, Myself?" These verses completely refute the P.B.I. claim. They show that for some years before the inquiry was made in the fourth year of Darius, the returned Israelites had given up the custom of fasting for the destruction of the temple in the fifth month, and for the uncrowning of Zedekiah and the beginning of the desolation in the seventh month. (The P.B.I.'s claim that they mourned the obscure Gedaliah in the seventh month is a stupid evasion that will deceive no thoughtful person acquainted with the facts. What they mourned was the loss of their temple, kingdom and country). These verses, therefore, prove that already for a number of years before the fourth year of Darius the Israelites had ceased observing the annual fasts which they had kept for 70 years for the desolation of their temple, royalty and land in the fifth and seventh months. Bethel, fearing this was wrong, wished to know whether it, without waiting for the other Israelites to co-operate,

should renew the custom of fasting in the fifth month. Hence these verses prove that the 70 years began some years before 587 B.C., which the P.B.I. usually claim was the date of the destruction of Israel's temple and royalty, or some years before 588, which in the article under review they give as the date of that event. While the verses do not say just when the fasting began, in view of their showing that their 70 years' fastings had for years before 518 ceased to be kept, the only logical date for their start is 605 B.C.—on the events' first anniversaries—and for their end is 536 B.C.

Apparently the circumstances and occasion of the question were the following: Shortly after the Israelites were by their adversaries compelled to cease from building the temple after its foundation was laid, a religious decline set in (Hag. 1:2-11), accompanied, among other things, by their ceasing to fast for the four crucial events connected with Jerusalem's overthrow in the days of Zedekiah (Zech. 8:19). When the religious revival set in connected with their commencing to build the temple anew (Hag. 1:12-14), there were many things in their conduct that called for reformation; and after the more important had received reformatory attention, about two years after their commencing again the building of the temple, the question of the propriety of fasting on those four anniversaries, particularly on that of the temple's destruction, as a pious service, began to be agitated at Bethel. Hence the incident of Zech. 7:1-5. But, as stated above, the wording of these verses unanswerably proves that for years before Darius' fourth year the people had put aside the custom of observing these four annual fasts for their calamities at the hand of Nebuchadnezzar in Zedekiah's days. Hence the passage completely refutes the P.B.I.'s use of it and proves that the 70 annual fasts had been completed years in the past, and that therefore years before 588 or 587 B.C., Zedekiah has been uncrowned.

We desire to call attention to the juggling tactics of these Editors on the date for Zedekiah's overthrow. Usually, as before stated, they give this date as 587; several times they have given it as 586; in the article under review they give it as 588. All three of these dates and others also are given for this event by nominal-church and secular historians whose uncertainty and untrustworthiness on these chronological questions are by this diversity very manifest, proving our Pastor right when he affirms that secular chronology before 536 B.C. is uncertain. At ordinary times it suits the P.B.I.'s purposes to use 587 B.C. At others their purposes make it preferable to use 586. And in the case of the article under review it suits their desires to use 588. All this goes to prove their uncertainty and unreliability on the subject. In the opening paragraph of the article that we are reviewing they speak of Zedekiah's overthrow as occurring "approximately 51 years before" the return in 536 B.C. Why did they there use the word "approximately"? Because over and over again they have on the one hand stated that this period was just 51 years and on the other hand that it ended in 536; but in this article their argument makes it necessary for them to go back 70 years from Nov. 518; hence they must light on 588! Accordingly, the word "approximately," to hide the contradiction between the two dates thus given. Slippery, indeed, are these Jambresites! Like the great Serpent, Azazel, their inspirer, they are equal to wriggling around any proposition as it suits their changing necessities! We use the words "juggling" and "wriggling" advisedly. Having seen so many examples of such juggling and wriggling on their part, is it strange that we consider these Editors lacking in the honesty indispensable in servants of Jehovah!

In the July 15 Herald the P.B.I. Editors publish another letter from J.A.D., some of whose chronological views we answered above. Only briefly will we

answer the new points he brings up. To palm off the P.B.I. idea that the 70 years of desolation were not observed for the seventy Jubilees, but for *all* the Sabbatic years, he puts a new and to him entirely peculiar and original definition—"accepting as a substitute"—on the word *ratzah*, translated "enjoyed" in 2 Chro. 36:21: "the land had *enjoyed* her Sabbaths." On *his* (no other's) definition—"accept as a substitute"—we would say: Neither the quotation that he makes from the notes of the Cambridge Bible, nor any Hebrew dictionary that we have consulted, nor any Biblical reference that he gives, nor any other use of the word contains such a thought. The word always contains the thought of an activity in which there is an actual or figurative delight, pleasure, satisfaction, favorableness or graciousness. Whenever it is translated "accept" in the Bible it means "graciously or satisfactorily to receive," as is evident in the case of every passage that he cites, *e.g.*, Lev. 1:4; Lev. 26:41, 43, etc. It never means to accept as a substitute. Hence his "linguistic" proof based on his *assumed* knowledge of Hebrew, of which he is as profoundly ignorant as the P.B.I. Editors, that the 70 years of desolation of the land were by the land accepted as a substitute for all of Israel's *seventh year* and *fiftieth year* Sabbaths, is an unqualified misstatement without any foundation whatsoever in the Hebrew. We suggest that the brethren turn to the bottom of the first col. of p. 1189 (vol. 2) of the Englishman's Hebrew and Chaldee Concordance, where every passage in which *ratzah* occurs is cited in English, and our statement can be verified. Please, also, consult the following Hebrew dictionaries on the subject: Brown's, Robinson's, Tregelles' and Dietrich's Gesenius, pp. 953, col. 1; 993, col. 2; 778, col. 1; 818, col. 1, respectively; additional to these four, which are considered the best Hebrew dictionaries, please see the following Hebrew dictionaries: Davies, p. 603, col. 1, Davidson, p. 690, col. 2, and Strong, p. 110, word 7521. Please see, also, Young's Concordance, p. 10, under

"accept" No. 5. When will these Jambresites cease pretending reliable knowledge of Hebrew and Greek? Can they not see that thereby they are all the more manifesting their folly? They are surely giving all the opportunity to see their folly! The expression, "*to fulfill*" 70 years (2 Chro. 36:22) proves that all the Sabbaths that were of the kind referred to were fully kept. Therefore, there were 70 of them, and these must have been the Jubilee Sabbaths alone, and not the seventh year Sabbaths.

J.A.D., who in the article that we above briefly reviewed gave 587 B.C. as the date of Zedekiah's uncrowning, in the article on which we are now commenting gives 588 as the date! Marvelous how events occurring thousands of years ago change their dates with the changing theory-needs of Jambresites!! And he gives authorities for his 588 date! He could also give others equally "authoritative" for 589, 587, 586, and even other dates. He thus gives more evidence proving our Pastor right in rejecting the secular chronology as uncertain prior to 536 B.C.

As an example of one's having, figuratively speaking, burning lye in his mouth, and not knowing how to eject it, J.A.D.'s efforts to rid himself of the clear teaching of Lev. 26:31-35, 43, and 2 Chro. 36:20-22 as proofs that Israel was outside of Palestine during the 70 years, is the most striking illustration that we have ever seen. If it were not for the pity of it, we would be unable to restrain our laughter at his mental contortions. Any unprejudiced person reading what he says under the heading "Desolate without them" would spontaneously think of a dishonest lawyer trying to befuddle a jury on transparently damaging evidence against his client. Only a dishonest lawyer, a Jesuit, a Jannesite or a Jambresite would be guilty of such brazen, deceitful handling of facts and clear Biblical statements!

His efforts to make the 70 years' stretch over to

Darius' times, 519 B.C., by the thought that the expression, "until the reign of the kingdom of Persia," is a composite one, covering the period from Cyrus' time in 536 to Darius' time, in 519, is another piece of Jambresian folly. The Lord Himself answers this (2 Chro. 36:20-23) by telling us that the *Babylonian* monarchs held the Israelites, *who were taken in the time of Zedekiah's overthrow*, in captivity *until* the reign of the kingdom of Persia; and since the Babylonian monarchs did not rule after 537, and since the Israelites were by Cyrus, in 537, freed from the captivity in which the Babylonian monarchs held them, the beginning of the Persian reign was not a composite one, running over 17 years. The expression evidently refers to the commencement of Persia's rulership over Babylon. The passage shows that at Cyrus' returning Israel to Palestine in 537 the 70 years' desolation were finished; therefore they began in 607 B.C. The passage directly says that the Israelites led into captivity with Zedekiah, were taken to Babylon and made servants to the Babylonian monarchs, to fulfill the 70 years predicted by Jeremiah, which God Himself here calls the 70 Sabbatic years—the Jubilees—and that when these 70 years were fulfilled the Lord through Cyrus effected their return. The following is a summary of these verses: (1) The captives taken *with Zedekiah* were in Babylon, *subject to the Babylonian kings* until Persia took the kingdom from Babylon; (2) these Israelites *taken with Zedekiah* were kept *in Babylon under Babylonian kings* to fulfill Jeremiah's prophecy respecting the land being desolate 70 years (Jer. 25:11); (3) they were kept out of their land until the 70 Sabbaths were fulfilled (Lev. 26:31-35, 43; Zech. 7:5, 14); (4) and Cyrus at the end of the 70 years effected their resettlement in Palestine, in fulfilment of Jeremiah's prophecy respecting the termination of the 70 years' desolation (Jer. 25:11; 29:10 "for Babylon," not "at Babylon"). No fair use of this passage will deny these propositions as being taught by it.

In closing this line of thought we remark that we have by the Lord's grace refuted every argument that the P.B.I. has used to overthrow the Scriptural chronology which we received from the Lord through that wise and faithful Servant. Surely, throughout this controversy the Lord has fulfilled in us the promise: "No weapon that is formed against thee shall prosper; and every tongue that riseth against thee in judgment thou shalt condemn. This is the heritage of the servants of the Lord, and their righteousness is of Me" (Is. 54:17). Praise be to our God, through our Lord Jesus Christ! As long as we abide faithful to the Lord, He will protect us from the snare of the fowler and the noisome pestilence. Beautifully is our security described in Ps. 91.

From Scriptural, historical, pyramidal and reasonable standpoints, we have detailedly refuted the P.B.I.'s chronological errors on the Times of the Gentiles, the Jubilees and the Parallels. The P.B.I. Editors give as one of their reasons for repudiating our Pastor's chronology their claim that Ptolemy's Canon teaches that Nebuchadnezzar began to reign in successorship to his father as king of Babylon in 604 B.C. The truthfulness of that date for that event we have Scripturally disproved from many standpoints, showing, as our Pastor taught, that even an earlier date—607 B.C.—was the nineteenth year of Nebuchadnezzar's reign as king of Babylon and was also the first year of his universal reign, in whose second year he had the dream of the metallic image (Dan. 2:1). And now comes our dear Bro. Morton Edgar and offers a fact from Ptolemy's Canon that is in line with a point that we made above, to the effect that the Scriptures date Nebuchadnezzar's reign from two chronological standpoints: (1) as beginning with his reign in successorship of his father *as king of Babylon*—626 B.C.; and (2) as beginning with his reign as *king of the World*—607 B.C. While Bro. Edgar does not mention

this particular point, it is in line with the fact that he gives, in a letter written to a sister. We take pleasure in publishing pertinent parts of the letter, as follows:

"There is one strange point in connection with the 'Astronomical Canon of Ptolemy,' which list of kings is much venerated by the Herald. According to this list, Nabokolassar, said to be Nebuchadnezzar, began to reign in 604 B.C. (some copies say 605 B.C.). But the name of the king who comes before this is spelled practically the same: 'Nabopolassar.' There is a difference of only one letter between them, as you will see. 'Nabo-*po*-lassar' began to reign, according to Ptolemy's list, in 625 B.C., or, more probably, as some have it, in 626 B.C. Therefore the 19th year after the beginning of Nabo-*po*-lassar's reign is 606, or 607 B.C., the very date required for the beginning of the 'great seven Times of the Gentiles,' ending in Autumn, 1914 A.D. It is quite possible, and may even be probable, that Ptolemy, or some of his interpreters, has mixed up these two names, names of two men who are said to be father and son. Nabo-*po*-lassar, the father, is very likely mixed up with Nabo-*ko*-lassar, the son. It is just as likely as not that historians made a mistake here; and that *both* names are really the names of *one* king only, and not two. There is nothing improbable in this; for such mistakes are not by any means infrequent. For instance, it is through a mistake of this very kind that Ptolemy made another well-known mistake in his list of kings, namely, by mixing up the names of two kings called *Xerxes*, and *Artaxerxes*. Ptolemy's Canon makes a mistake of ten years in the reign of *Xerxes*, saying that he reigned for twenty-one years, whereas reliable history proves conclusively that *Xerxes* reigned for eleven years only. This is important to notice; for if *Xerxes* *did* reign twenty-one years, and not only eleven, then the twentieth year of his successor, that is, *Artaxerxes*, would then be ten years later than we understand it to be. And if *Artaxerxes*'

twentieth year is ten years later, then Daniel's prophecy of the seventy weeks, at the end of sixty-nine of which weeks Messiah was to come, *would not have been fulfilled!* But Ptolemy made a mistake here; and reliable history, quite apart from the Scriptural requirement, proves that Ptolemy was mistaken to the extent of ten years in the reign of Xerxes, and hence, also, of ten years in the reign of Artaxerxes.

"There are really more than one or even *two* mistakes of Ptolemy; for not only are his stated years for the reigns of two kings ten years wrong each, but the date for the death of the first, and the date for the accession of the second, are also, necessarily wrong. In other words, Ptolemy made a bad blunder in his history [rather in his chronological tables—Editor] of this period. If Ptolemy made a mistake of ten years during the fifth century B.C. (he himself lived during the second century A.D., or seven hundred years later), is it *unreasonable* to say that he made a mistake of twenty-one years in his history [chronological tables—Editor] of the seventh century B.C.? The Herald writers ask if it *is reasonable* to suppose that Ptolemy made such a mistake. Well, apparently it *is* reasonable so to suppose; for he is now abundantly proved to have made a blunder in his history [chronological tables—Editor] of the fifth century, when one would have expected that he should have been more reliable, seeing it was about two hundred years nearer to the A.D. date. But, as I say, it is not improbable that the *interpreters* of Ptolemy made this mistake, and not in this case Ptolemy himself. These later interpreters, as likely as not, have mixed up Nabo-*po*-lassar and Nabo-*ko*-lassar, just as many historians mixed up Xerxes and Artaxerxes. According to Ptolemy's astronomical list, or canon, of kings, Nabopolassar began his reign in 625, or 626, B.C.; and his nineteenth year of reign then lands in 606 or 607 B.C. 'Seven times' or 2520 years from this ended in 1914,

A.D., Autumn, which is correct. The Bible demands this, and the Bible will have *my* veneration and respect before any mere profane document, however supposedly accurate.

"Then we have the explicit declaration of Daniel, the inspired prophet of the Lord, who says: 'I Daniel understood by books the number of the years, whereof the word of the Lord came to Jeremiah the prophet, that he would accomplish seventy years in the desolation of Jerusalem.' (Dan. 9:2.) The Herald brethren, like the higher critics, say that Daniel was all wrong! It was not, they say, seventy years in the desolations of Jerusalem, but fifty-one years only! 'Daniel in the critics' den again! And Moses, the man of God, said: 'And your *cities* (Jerusalem, *the* city of the land) shall lie waste, ... *then* shall the land enjoy her Sabbaths, while ye be in your enemies' land, etc.' And Jeremiah says that when *Jerusalem* was destroyed at the dethronement of Zedekiah, Judah's last king, then the land (and Jerusalem, the great city) would lie desolate for seventy years to *fulfill her sabbaths of rest*. All these Scriptures are very plain, and all go to show that Bro. Russell's interpretation of this feature of God's plan of the Ages was correct, and that such writers as the writers of the Herald are quite misleading. It was in 1904, or ten years before 1914, that views similar to those expressed by the Herald, first came forth. So their views are by no means new, but have been seen, and refuted, long ago. And Bro. Russell himself was one of those who pointedly refuted the wrong views now so boldly brought forward by the Herald, as if they were expressing something startling, and most unexpected new facts. There is nothing new about them; and they are certainly not *facts*.

"Have you ever noticed that Nebuchadnezzar is sometimes also called Nebuchadrezzar? Just as Nabokolassar may also have been known as Nabopolassar. Note the spelling in, say, Ezekiel, and contrast

it with that in Daniel. But Jeremiah spells this name both ways. Why this peculiar change of a letter? Needless to say, the testimony of the Great Pyramid, the Lord's 'stone witness' in which Bro. Russell still declared his implicit faith in his last notice of this monument, in his new preface to Volume III just about a month before his death—is quite against the new (?) chronological views of the Herald. But of course the Herald writers have no use for the Pyramid's testimony now. They have thrown that aside, just as Brother Henninges of Australia [the chief leader of the 1908-1911 sifting—Editor] did before them, and under somewhat similar circumstances. The Great Pyramid substantiates the views held by Bro. Russell beyond all doubt."

So far the quotation from Bro. Edgar's letter. His suggestion that one and the same person is meant by the two names spelled so nearly alike in Ptolemy's Canon and that these are variant names for Nebuchadnezzar, seems reasonable. We may add to this suggestion the following: the reason that two names are given in the Canon for one person at the two different dates probably is that that one person had these two different names given him because on these two given dates he entered into widely different capacities as a ruler—on the first date he became king of Babylon, and on the second date he became king of the World. In ancient times it was a frequent custom to give a person different names at various times in his life to commemorate special events in his career. Hence we hear of persons variously named at different times like Abram and Abraham, Sarai and Sarah, Jacob and Israel, Joseph and Zaphnath-paaneah, Gideon and Zerubbaal, Jehoiachin and Coniah, Daniel and Belteshazzar, Hananiah and Shadrach, Mishael and Meshach, Azariah and Abed-nego, Jesus and Christ, Simon and Peter, Saul and Paul, etc., etc. Of the particular man under consideration, we know that he had many

variations in his name, *e.g.*, Nebuchadnezzar, Nebuchadrezzar, Nabouchodonosor, Nabouchodonosoros, Neboudrosoros, Naukookodrosoros, Nebukuduriutsur, Nabukudrachara, Nabiuvkuduurriusuur and Nabokhodrossor. Therefore it should not surprise us that he was also called Nabo-*po*-lassar and Nabo-*ko*-lassar in the Canon. His becoming king of Babylon would warrant his receiving the first name, and his changing from the king of Babylon to the king of the World would be the most natural occasion for giving him the second name; and Ptolemy could also in a most natural manner have given him double mention in the Canon at the appropriate dates to mark the two phases of his royalty. So viewed, Ptolemy's Canon would be in harmony with the Biblical Chronology which gives Nebuchadnezzar's reign as beginning at the two above-mentioned dates, thus timing two features of his royalty, one beginning in the 1st, the other in the 19th year of his reign.

Apart from the above, how can Ptolemy on the beginning of Nebuchadnezzar's and Cyrus' reign over Babylon be harmonized with the Bible's chronology for this period? We reply, they cannot as they both stand be harmonized on this subject, because Ptolemy's Canon allows only 66 years for this period, while the Bible allows 89 years for it, 19 years of Nebuchadnezzar's reign passing before the desolation began and 70 years of desolation before Israel's return in Cyrus' first year. Ptolemy's Canon for this period gives the length of the involved kings' reigns, as follows:

Nabokalassar (the Bible Nebuchadnezzar)	43
Ilvoradamus	2
Nerikassolassar	4
Nabonidus (father and for a time co-king with the Bible's and the tablets' Belshazzar)	17
	—
Total	66

Several ways have been suggested to harmonize these chronologies. One of them is advocated by Adam

Rutherford, who claims that Ptolemy's Canon omits three kings from its list, one called Belsumiskun, whom he identifies with the Bible Evil-Merodach, for whom he claims an 18 years' reign, according to Josephus' Antiquities, Book 10, Chap. 11, Section 2; but Josephus Against Apion, Book 1, Section 20, assigns only two years to his reign, which discrepancy introduces uncertainty. Moreover Evil-Merodach is usually identified with Ilvoradamus, which Josephus does in both places cited above, by showing that he was succeeded by the same person as Ptolemy's Canon gives as Ilvoradamus' successor. The fact that the latter's reign in the former citation through a corruption of the text is given as 40 years suggests that the 18 years assigned to the former's reign might also be a corruption of the text. In the latter citation the two reigns are given as 2 and 4 years and this agrees with Ptolemy's Canon. Again, Adam Rutherford assigns a reign of 9 months to one Laborosoarchod, whom Ptolemy does not list in his Canon. And, finally, he assigns a reign of 1 year and 9 months to Darius, the Mede, who according to the Bible reigned at least into a second year (Dan. 9:1; 11:1), before Cyrus took the royalty over Babylon (see Studies, Vol. II, 368-371). Again, by adding a year to Ilvoradamus' reign as given in the Canon, Adam Rutherford accounts for the 70 years of the desolation and thus puts the Canon into harmony with the Bible. But we suggest a simpler way to harmonize the Canon with the Bible. Accepting the thought that Ilvoradamus of the Canon is Evil-Merodach of the Bible, we think that originally the Canon assigned him a reign of 22 years expressed in Greek by the two numeral letters, Kappa (k) and Beta (b), *i.e.*, 20 and 2, and that as often has happened in transcription the Kappa was anciently omitted and thus is lacking in all present MSS. of the Canon. And the same thing seemingly has happened in the second citation from Josephus given above. A similar mistake in the Canon,

substituting Kappa (20) for Iota (10) gave Xerxes a reign of 21 years instead of 11 years, as required by correct history. According to 2 Kings 24:8; 25:27-30; Jer. 52:31-34, Evil-Merodach reigned many more than two years. Thus viewed, the following table will exhibit an harmonizing of the Bible and the Canon:

Nebuchadnezzar (reign after the desolation)	25
Evil-Merodach (Ilvoradamus of the Canon)	22
Nerikassolassar (not mentioned in the Bible)	4
Laborosoarchod (not mentioned in the Bible nor in the Canon)	$\frac{3}{4}$
Nabonidus of the Canon (father and for a time co-king with Belshazzar)	17
Darius' and Cyrus' reigns until Israel and Zerubbabel reach Palestine, thus ending the 70 years' desolation	$1\frac{1}{4}$
Total	70

The P.B.I. has appealed to Ptolemy's Canon in favor of its 51 years for the desolation, but it, as the figures above show, falls 3 years short of their 51 years. Our view harmonizes the Canon and secular history with the Bible and that in a thoroughly natural way, and shows that secular history does not contradict the 70 years' absence of Israel from Palestine in Babylon. The P.B.I. Editors are thus demonstrated as errorists of the first water on chronology, for there is not the slightest ground left, either Biblical or secular, upon which they can stand.

It will be recalled that above we gave the following rendering of Zech. 7:2-5: "For Bethel had sent Sherezer and Regem-melech and their men to entreat Jehovah's favor, and to speak to the priests who were at the house of Jehovah, and to the prophets, saying, Shall I, separated, weep in the fifth month, as I did *this* so many years? And the word of Jehovah was to me, saying, Speak to all the people of the land and to the priests, saying, When ye fasted and mourned in

the fifth and seventh month, and *this* for seventy years, did ye fast for Me, Myself?" It will be recalled that this translation was offered in refuting the use of this passage by the P.B.I. Editors to prove that the seventy years of this passage ended in 518 B.C., and therefore began in 588 B.C., when they claimed that Zedekiah was overthrown by Nebuchadnezzar. It seems that our translation of this passage has not pleased some of the P.B.I. supporters. These insist that the word *Zeh*, whose English equivalent, *this*, we have italicized in the translation above given, means *these* very frequently in the Hebrew. This we deny. *Zeh* is the Hebrew singular demonstrative pronoun for *this*, and *Eleh* is the Hebrew plural demonstrative pronoun for *these*. We are aware of the fact that some translators, usually where time or manner is indicated in the context by plural nouns, have rendered *Zeh* by the English plural demonstrative pronoun *these* or by the adverb *now*; but this is incorrect. The rule for singular and plural demonstratives is the same in the Hebrew as in the English and admits of no exceptions, *i.e.*, singular demonstrative pronouns are used for and with singular nouns and plural demonstrative pronouns are used for and with plural nouns, and never otherwise.

The translators who have rendered *Zeh* by the words *these* and *now*, as though it limited plural nouns, or were an adverb referring to a noun of manner or time in the context, have done so more as accommodations to secure smoother English wordings, rather than as strictly literal translations. But for every such instance in the Hebrew, the singular pronoun *this* fits as the proper translation. When in connections indicating time or manner by plural nouns *Zeh* is translated by *these* or *now*, it is not used in the Hebrew to limit the nouns expressing time or manner, but is merely placed in the sentence to emphasize the thought, and the expression is to be understood as an abbreviation of language. This is expressly stated of such cases by

Hebrew Grammarians, *e.g.*, by Mitchell's Gesenius' Hebrew Grammar, second edition, p. 416, end of note three. After citing to illustrate this use of *Zeh* in connection with nouns of time and manner Gen. 27:36; 31:38; Zech. 1:12; 7:3, 5 and Job 19:3, he cites Gen. 31:41 (where *Zeh* is in the A.V. wrongly translated *thus*) and makes the following remarks "[*Zeh* is] separated from the number [20] in Gen. 31:41; *li-zeh* [*li*, to me, stands between *zeh* and *esrim*, the word for 20] (abbreviated form for *this*, *i.e.*, the present period of time, *I have*, *i.e.*, 20 years are ended, etc.; the *other examples* [Gen. 27:36; 31:38; Zech. 1:12; 7:3, 5; Job 19:3] are *due* to a *similar abbreviation*)." This explanation, of course, shows that grammatically *Zeh* does not limit the plural nouns in these sentences; but that an abbreviation of expression, *i.e.*, an omission of words, has occurred, which, when given in full, shows that the word *Zeh* does not limit the plural noun, but is inserted into the sentence for the sake of emphasis. The connection in each case will show what must be supplied to give the full sense of the passage in question. We will quote all such passages in the A.V., adding in italics the words that the connection shows must be supplied to give the proper grammatical rendering:

He hath supplanted me—this *he did* two times.—Gen. 27:36.

This *I did*: twenty years I have been with thee, etc.—Gen. 31:38.

This *I have as the time of my stay*: I have been twenty years in thy house.—Gen. 31:41.

For this is *the case*: two years hath the famine been in the land.—Gen. 45:6.

Ye have tempted me—this *have ye done* ten times.—Num. 14:22.

Thou hast smitten me—this *thou hast done* three times.—Num. 22:28.

Wherefore hast thou smitten thine ass—this *thou hast done* three times.—Num. 22:32.

The ass ... turned from me—this *it did* three times.—Num. 22:33.

This *is the case*: forty years the Lord thy God hath been with thee.—Deut. 2:7.

God led thee—this *He did* for forty years.—Deut. 8:2.

Neither did thy foot swell—this *was the case* for forty years.—Deut. 8:4.

The Lord hath kept me alive, as He said—this *He hath done* for forty-five years—Josh. 14:10.

Thou has mocked me—this *hast thou done* three times.—Judges 16:15.

Take ... this *that I give* you—ten loaves.—1 Sam. 17:17.

Which hath been with me—this *has been the case* for days, or this *has been the case* for years.—1 Sam. 29:3.

I have not been called ... unto the king—this *has been the case* for thirty days—Esth. 4:11.

This *have ye done*: ten times have ye reproached me.—Job. 19:3.

Thou didst have indignation—this *was the case* for seventy years.—Zech. 1:12.

As I did this for so many years (Zech. 7:3). There is no abbreviation of the Hebrew in this passage; for the expression, I did, occurs in the Hebrew. This verse, by using the expression, I did, proves that there are abbreviations in the other passages quoted here.

Ye fasted and mourned ... and this *ye did* for seventy years.—Zech. 7:5.

Except in Zech. 7:3, in every one of the above cases, which include every passage where the singular demonstrative pronoun, *Zeh*, occurring in connection with plural nouns of time or manner, has been translated by *these* or *those*—plural demonstratives—it is evident that Gesenius was right when he said the expression is an abbreviated one, which when completed proves that the singular demonstrative pronoun *this* should be used

in the translation. These facts demonstrate that Zech. 7:3, 5 disproves the P.B.I. contention that the seventy years of this passage were from 588 to 518 B.C.

In Lev. 11:4, 9, 21, 29 and Deut. 14:7, 9, 12 *Zeh* is rendered *these*, but strictly speaking it should not have been so rendered. There should be substituted for each translation of the word *Zeh* as *these* in the cited passages, the word *this* with the word *flesh* supplied after it, *e.g.*, "This *flesh* shall ye not eat: *the flesh* of them, etc." and "This *flesh* shall ye eat: *the flesh* of them, etc."—Lev. 11:4, 9.

The only other passage where *Zeh* has been rendered *these* is Judges 20:17. Here again an abbreviated expression occurs which will be manifest from the following: "All this *company* were men of war." In this case, as in the cases cited in the preceding paragraph, a collective noun (hence a singular noun, implying a multiplicity of persons or things constituting the thing designated by the collective noun, like senate, army, congregation, crowd, nobility, etc.) may have been in the translators' minds; and following an English usage that permits a collective noun, when the thing thereby indicated is viewed distributively, to take a plural verb or pronoun, they may have rendered *Zeh* by the plural *these* to indicate such a thought as theirs. It would, however, have been better had they translated in every one of these cases, the word *Zeh* by *this*, supplying the collective noun needed by the context, as done above.

Some of those who have objected to our translation of *Zeh* in Zech. 7:3, 5, claim that our thought on the subject is out of harmony with Drs. Strong and Young. This we deny, and on the contrary affirm that these objectors do not understand Drs. Strong and Young, who never define *Zeh* by the word *these* but by the word *this* or *that*, though they give, not as their own definitions, but as the translation of the A.V., the words *these* and *those* as translations of *Zeh* in the citations of the pertinent passages of the A.V. in

their concordances, and in the citation of the various translations of the A.V. in their dictionaries. This can be readily seen, *e.g.*, Dr. Strong on pp. 1028-1030 gives all the occurrences of the word "these" in the A.V. Among them are 26 cases in which the word *these* is given for the Hebrew *Zeh*. Additionally, there is one case in which *Zeh* is rendered *those*. At the end of each of these quotations is found the numeral 2088, implying that the words *these* and *those* are the renderings of the Hebrew word that is numbered 2088 in his Hebrew Dictionary. Turning to No. 2088 in his Hebrew Dictionary, we find it to be *Zeh*. He defines it as the masculine demonstrative singular pronoun *this* or *that*. Then, following the colon and dash, he gives, not his definitions, but all the various translations of *Zeh* in the A.V. How do we know that all of the words following the colon and dash are not his definitions, but the translations of the A.V.? We answer that he himself tells us this on p. 5 of his Hebrew Dictionary under note 6 at the top of the third column, as on p. 5 of his Greek Dictionary under note 6 at the top of the third column he makes the identical statement with reference to the colon and dash which follow his definitions of the New Testament Greek words, and which precede their various A.V. translations. Our critics are, therefore, mistaken on the subject; and they are further proven not to understand Drs. Strong and Young on the subject. The proverb, "A little learning is a dangerous thing," is one that these critics might well consider before making their sharp criticisms, which flow in part out of the abundance of their ignorance of the Hebrew and of the proper handling of helps on the Hebrew and Greek languages.

We repeat our claim: *Zeh* never means *these*. It means *this* and does not limit the word for *years* in Zech. 7:3, 5. It was correctly and literally rendered by us in these passages, while the renderings that the P.B.I. Editors offer are incorrect, are based on ignorance

of Hebrew, violate its grammatical rules and are given to support error.

For some time the P.B.I. Herald Editors have been publishing articles on the books of Daniel and Jeremiah. Despite our complete refutation of their chronological errors they continue to repeat them, adding nothing materially to their former views on them. Like their British colaborer, Wm. Crawford, in his course toward us in Britain, they seem to proceed on the assumption that repetition is proof. They cannot answer our arguments, and the repetition of overthrown contentions avails nothing as proof against such arguments. In their recent writings we notice more and more they refer to that Servant just as they do to various nominal-church writers, *e.g.*, "a certain writer," "another writer," "a recent writer," etc., and degrade him in these connections to a par with nominal-church writers, approvingly or disapprovingly as they wish. And these Herald Editors are the very persons who in 1918 by a whispering campaign assassinated us among many supporters of the Fort Pitt Committee on the falsely alleged charge that we were teaching contrary to that Servant! In view of their and our courses toward that Servant's teaching since that time, how can they look the same people in the face before whom they made those charges?

It is not our purpose to go into details on their Jeremiah and Daniel articles. On only a few points will we offer refutations of their views. In the P.B.I. Herald '24, 12, pars. 4-7, they say that nothing occurred in 1878 indicating the return of favor to the Jews at that time, and that the fact of Israel's suffering much since then proves their contention. Was it not a most powerful evidence of the return of *secular* national favor to Israel that in 1878 at the Berlin Congress of Nations, the European Concert of Nations (*the modern phase of the fourth beast that scattered them to the four winds, taking away from them*

national existence) made it a *matter of International Law* that they be given the right of settling in Palestine with the removal of onerous handicaps from them? Was it not a most powerful evidence of the return of *religious* national favor to Israel that on June 11, 1878—exactly 1845 years to the day from the time when Jesus poured out the Holy Spirit on the believing portion of them (Acts 2:1-4, 33)—the Delitzsch Hebrew translation of the New Testament in its revised edition began to circulate among the orthodox Jews, which with other cooperating agencies has ever since then been so destroying Jewish prejudices against, and so enlightening Jewish eyes on, Jesus as years ago to have brought the majority of the Jews to believe that instead of Jesus having been an apostate and impostor, He was one of the greatest of their Prophets, and to have greatly decreased the prejudice of most of them? One of the troubles with the P.B.I. Editors is that they overlook the fact that time prophecies mark beginnings, not completions, of fulfilled events. Had they humbly heeded our Pastor's oft repeated expression on this subject, they would have continued to recognize in the two events just indicated the return of both secular and religious national favor to Israel in 1878.

But their contention that the Jews, having very greatly suffered since 1878, could not in that year have had a return to favor, shows additionally that they have overlooked the operation of punishment for another feature of Israel's guilt—their suffering to the full time the other double because of other guilt. Israel has had two doubles—one of 2520 years because of their transgressions against the Law (Lev. 26:14, 15), the other of 1845 years because of the rejection of our Lord. These two forms of guilt are indicated in Ps. 107:17, where the word "transgression" refers to their rejection of Christ and the word "iniquities" refers to their sins again the Law. But what of their

sufferings since 1914, when their 2520 years' double ended? We reply that, like the rest of mankind, and not for the two forms of guilt just mentioned, they have sinned against natural justice; and therefore in the time of wrath they must with the Gentile world suffer the wrath of the day of wrath, which began with the end of their 2520 years' double. The above observations dispose of their objection to the teaching that the double which Jesus pronounced upon the Jews began in 33 and ended in 1878 A.D. and of their claim that it continues.

But the Herald Editors in their Daniel series proceed to other repudiations of our Pastor's teachings. Among these repudiations is their denial of our Pastor's view, which they call that of "one writer," to the effect that the three plucked-up horns were the Western Empire, and the kingdoms of the Heruli and the Ostrogoths. Their reason for the supposed necessity of repudiating this thought is, they allege, that the Western Empire was a beast, not a horn. Against this claim we offer the following reasons: (1) If their view were correct, the ten-horned beast would have been destroyed before any of the ten horns came up on its head! Thus there would have been no ten-horned beast at all! (2) But the fact of the matter is that the Roman Empire consisted of two parts, the Eastern and the Western, for sometime after the death of Theodosius, for whose two sons the division was made, the Eastern Empire having the ascendancy in the organization of the Empire, even as this was the case, more markedly however, from the days of Dioclesian, 285 A.D. to 324 A.D., at which latter date Constantine consolidated the Empire, which remained so until Theodosius' death, 395 A.D. That the Empire was, after the fall of the Western Empire as such, 476, still considered as consisting of two parts with the Eastern in the ascendancy can be seen from Gibbon's statements (Vol. IV, 11, 12, 20, 21) respecting the Ostrogoths,

who with more or less loyalty, acknowledged this ascendancy of the Eastern Empire as represented in the Eastern Emperor at Constantinople. Hence the contention of the Herald Editors that the Western Empire was not a horn, but a beast—the Roman beast—falls to the ground; and their excuse for repudiating our Pastor's view of the three plucked-up horns, and for arguing for the views of nominal-church writers is groundless.

These editors, to prove this error of theirs, say that they do not know of a single historian who states that temporal power was exercised by the popes during the sixth century, but that they all agree that this was not done until the eighth century. They quote Gibbon to prove their point. But Gibbon, one of the ablest secular historians, in Vol. IV, 423-425, shows that the temporal power of the popes began before the days of Pope Gregory I, 590-604, and cites various exercises of temporal power in judicial and executive respects by this pope. Kurtz is one of the ablest Church historians, and he says, in Vol. I, 273, that Gregory exercised temporal power and states that this is admitted on all hands. It is doubtful if the P.B.I. Editors tell the truth as to their own knowledge when they say, "we do not know of a single historian that records this [that popes possessed temporal power in the early part of the sixth century], *all agreeing that it was not until the eighth century* [italics ours] ... that the Roman bishops attained temporal possessions and authority." As a matter of fact we do not know of a serious historian who treats of the temporal power of the pope who does not locate its first exercises in the sixth century. While in the eighth century, through Pepin and Charlemagne, the temporal possessions and authority of the popes were very greatly enlarged, they were exercised in Rome, etc., two centuries before, as all reliable historians agree.

At the bottom of this P.B.I. error lies the same

mistake as was pointed out above—their failure to remember that chronology points out the time of the first beginnings of predicted events, and not so much the later details. Applying this principle to the matter in hand, we would say: There were two stages of the popes' exaltation: (1) exaltation to ecclesiastical primacy, and (2) exaltation to civil authority. The claims, with pertinent acts, to his primacy in the Church were begun in the third century, were very general in the fourth century, and were acknowledged by the Eastern and Western Emperors as against all other claimants, especially against the claims of equality by the pope's only serious rival—the patriarch of Constantinople—in favor of Pope Leo I (440-461) in 454 A.D., in connection with the Eastern Emperor's annulling the 28th canon of the council of Chalcedon (451), which claimed such equality. A law of the Western Emperor (445) made it even high treason to deny the pope's ecclesiastical primacy. Thus the pope's ecclesiastical supremacy in the middle of the fifth century was a law of both the Eastern and the Western Empires. (See Kurtz, Vol. I, 269, 270.) Biblical chronology, backed by the Pyramid's corroboration, gives the third century as the date of the beginning of the first, the ecclesiastical phase of the pope's exaltation. The decree of Justinian and its accompanying correspondence (533) only emphasized the already generally accepted belief and law of the pope's primacy in the Church, and shadowed forth the events that were connected with 539—the defeat of the Ostrogoths, the capture of their capital, king and leaders, leaving them in ruin, shortly to be annihilated as a nation. This overthrow of the Ostrogothic Empire in Italy, 539, freed the pope from restraints on exercising temporal power, and thus was the first act in the setting up of the pope in temporal power. This was quickly followed by acts of temporal power which within a half century had proceeded so far that Gibbon (Vol. IV, 423-425)

could cite many of these acts of temporal power grouping them into two kinds, judicial and executive, and give many examples of each as performed by Gregory (590-604).

The ambition of the popes to gain political power made them pursue a course that contributed to the overthrow of the Western Empire, the Heruli and the Ostrogoths. Hence the little horn is prophetically represented as contributing to the plucking up of those three horns by its pushing them out of their place to make room for itself as it was growing, figuratively speaking, under the hide of the beast's head and before it broke through that hide. The powers and possessions granted by Pepin and Charlemagne in the second half of the eighth century gave the climax to the recognition of the special exaltation of the pope's *temporal* power, as the period of its adolescence was ending, just as Justinian's decree gave the climax to the recognition of the special exaltation of the pope's *ecclesiastical* power as its period of adolescence was ending. These considerations refute the P.B.I. Editors on the date of the setting up of the papacy both in ecclesiastical and civil power, and vindicate the views of our Pastor. The P.B.I. Editors' attempt to fix 539 as the date of the pope's beginning to obtain ecclesiastical as distinct from political power to oppress the saints, so as by this distinction to set aside our Pastor's thought that papacy's exaltation in temporal power began in 539, is contrary to history; for previous to 539 the popes had and exercised such ecclesiastical power, among other ways, as compelled persecution against saints through the civil power—Jezebel persecuting Elijah through Ahab. For at the behest of the clergy, especially of the papacy, these persecutions, which, among other forms, included imprisonment, exile, torture and in some cases death, began with the persecution of the Donatists (316 A.D.) by Constantine, after the Roman bishop and others had

denounced them to him, which as the dates prove was even before the Nicean Council, 325 A.D. The facts in the preceding paragraphs on the popes' exaltation to ecclesiastical supremacy, especially those connected with the dates 445, 454, and 533, completely refute the P.B.I. Editors' claim that 539 marks the setting up of the papacy in ecclesiastical power, as distinct from civil power, which they falsely claim came first in the eighth century. Facts show, therefore, that this P.B.I. distinction as applied to 539 is not true; and that our Pastor was right in the claim that 539 begins the period when the saints began to be oppressed by the pope as a *temporal* prince, *i.e.*, when the papacy was set up in civil power.

As by their chronological errors these editors rejected most of the prophetic-chronological parts of Studies, Vol. II, so by their errors on the setting up of the "man of sin" they are repudiating large parts of its last chapter and parts of Studies, Vol. III. These are followed by further repudiations on their part.

In the June 15 and July 1, 1924, Herald, the P.B.I. repudiation of our Pastor's understanding of the chronology as to the 70 weeks is set forth in detail. The year 455 B.C. for the beginning of the 70 weeks, the year 2 B.C. for our Lord's birth and the year 33 A.D. for His death are all repudiated. They follow some secular and nominal-church chronologers in giving 444 (usually 445) B.C., 4 B.C. and 29 A.D. as the years for these events; and to make the 486½ years from 444 B.C. stop at 29 A.D., they count each of these years as consisting of 12 lunar months without intercalating the 13th as needed to fix the Nisan new moon as the one nearest the vernal equinox 7 times every 19 years, and as required for the ripening of the first fruits for Nisan 16. Thus they make the time 15 such years short of the solar time. We have proven the complete unscripturalness of such a method of calculation of the Biblical years above, when answering

their first published chronological error—that on the year of Zedekiah's uncrowning; and it will not be necessary to take it up here again. In the article on Mr. Panin's Chronology we showed that Artaxerxes began to reign 474 B.C. and that his 20th year was 455 B.C. In this article we will briefly examine the reason that the P.B.I. alleges requires counting years of 12 lunar months to reach from 444 B.C. to 29 A.D. in $486\frac{1}{2}$ years. They allege that the "word" went forth (Dan. 9:25) to restore and build Jerusalem in Nisan (Neh. 2:1); hence they reason that $386\frac{1}{2}$ solar years (the $69\frac{1}{2}$ weeks until Messiah was cut off) would end Oct., while the Scriptures teach that our Lord died Nisan 14—in April. Hence they conclude that these 490 years are years of 12 lunar months.

Facts of fulfilled prophecy refute the view of Biblical chronological years being 12 lunar months uniformly. We have, as indicated above, proved that the 70 weeks began in 455 B.C. and ended in 36 A.D. and that the middle of the 70th week was Passover, 33. But apart from this there is an acid test that demonstrates that the 490 years in question were in the long run equivalent to solar years: These 490 years were cut off from the first part of 2300 years of Dan. 8:14. The 1810 years of the 2300 remaining after the "cut off" 490 years had passed by, cannot be made years of 12 lunar months and be made to reach 1846, when both the formation of the image began, and the cleansing of the sanctuary was ended. Moreover, this date is corroborated by the Pyramid measurements, 1846, Oct., being the date at the foot of the step near the Grand Gallery's South Wall. Even if the 1810 years were by the P.B.I. conceded to be solar years they would only reach from their new view of Cornelius' conversion in Oct., 32 (the right date being Oct. 36) to 1842—4 years before the Bible, the Pyramid and the fulfilled facts prove them to have ended. But if the first 490 of the 2300 years were of 12 lunar

months each, of course the remaining 1810 would be the same kind of years, and that would have made them end in June, 1790! Assuredly the Church class did not then receive the last cleansing from error previous to the Harvest! Hence the P.B.I. view that each of the 490 years consisted of 12 lunar months is wrong.

Furthermore, the fact that God has never indicated in any way that He uses lunar years of 12 months in the long run, and the further fact that all His years entering into general chronology and into the prophetic periods are in the long run equivalent to solar years, at once discredit the P.B.I. interpretation and prove that in Dan. 9:25 the expression, "the going forth of the word," does not mean the *act* of Artaxerxes in *commissioning* Nehemiah to restore and build Jerusalem, but means the *execution* of the commission. If it meant the former, it occurred in Nisan—in the Spring (Neh. 2:1-6); if the latter, it occurred five days before the first day of the seventh month—in the Fall (Neh. 6:15). The former interpretation compels our saying that Christ died in the Fall; because Scriptural years in chronology, *i.e.*, in the long run, are always, through the intercalated month required from time to time by the first fruits, the equivalent of solar years. But the fact of Christ dying in the Spring forces us to accept the second interpretation. Hence the expression, "the going forth of the word to restore and build Jerusalem," means the execution, the going into realization of the commission—the completion of the walls which made Jerusalem a city; for a walled place, regardless of whether it contains houses or not (Neh. 7:4) is a city—*ir*—according to the Hebrew. And Neh. 6:15 shows that the walls of Jerusalem were completed on the 25th of Elul—the sixth month—five days before the Fall began, and that *before* any houses were built in it apart from the temple (Neh. 7:4). Here then we are to date "the going forth [not the authorization, but the execution of the thing

authorized] of the word to restore and build Jerusalem"—the Fall of 455 B.C. It proves our understanding of the subject to be true, and refutes another P.B.I. attempt to corrupt a truth which they formerly saw.

They claim that Nisan 14 did not come on Friday in 33 A.D., and that the only Friday on which it came for many years before and after was in 29 A.D. This claim they advance as a proof that our Lord did not die in 33, but in 29 A.D. On this aspect of the question we have consulted many Bible Dictionaries, Religious and Secular Encyclopedias and other authorities, and they are quite unanimous in this that probably in both 29 and 33 A.D. Nisan 14 came on Friday. The reason why most incline to the 29 A.D. date is their assuming Jesus' birth to have been in 6 B.C. But authorities disagree on the basis of this: the date of Herod's death. Those followed by the P.B.I. assign his death to March, 4 B.C., on the supposed evidence of an eclipse, but the best authorities place Herod's death at 1 A.D., on the basis of Josephus' data as to the beginning and duration of his reign. This view does not necessitate dating Christ's birth earlier than 2 B.C.; and Cyrenius' governorship from Jan., 3 B.C. to Jan., 1 A.D. disproves the P.B.I. date 4 B.C. and certainly favors our dates, Oct., 2 B.C. for Christ's birth, Oct., 29 A.D. for the beginning, and April, 33 A.D. for the end of His ministry. The Scriptures and the clearly ascertained facts of secular chronology for the beginning of the seventy weeks, prove our viewpoint of these weeks to be correct, while the many disagreements and guesses among nominal-church writers, whose more generally accepted suppositional dates the P.B.I. largely endorses, make the latter's new views, a re-hash of unprovable nominal-church views, appear in their real character—darkness for light.

With the P.B.I.'s repudiating our Pastor's understanding

of the 70 weeks, they have nearly completed the repudiation of every time feature in Studies, Vols. II and III as there presented. The few remaining unrepudiated points are relatively unimportant and will in due time be cast overboard, to keep something like consistency in their views. Who says "A" must finally say "Z."

From the Aug. 15, 1924 issue to that of Nov. 15, 1924, the P.B.I. Herald has been publishing expositions of Dan. 11:14-45 [they continued this much longer]. In these expositions its editors have repudiated our Pastor's entire viewpoint on this part of Dan. 11, and have substituted, as they acknowledge, the views of nominal-church writers, especially those of Sir Isaac Newton, who died in 1727, and of Bishop Thomas Newton, who died in 1782, 72 and 17 years respectively before the Time of the End began—facts that, in view of the angel's statement (Dan. 12:4-12) that not until 30, and especially 75, years after the beginning of the Time of the End would clearness come as to the meaning of the prophecy in Dan. 11:14-12:3, should have deterred them from accepting the interpretation of these two Newtons, so different from our Pastor's. Not only so, but for Dan. 11:14-31 they give the Jewish view of these verses as correct. Like the usual errorist, seeking to palm off false interpretations under the screen of the plea that what is actually a true translation is a false one for which he has an alleged correct translation, they say that the expression of v. 14, "the robbers of thy people," is a false translation, and instead offer a series of translations intended to convey the idea that those who are referred to as "the robbers of thy people" are recalcitrant Jews and not the Syrians under Antiochus Epiphanes, the despoiler of the Jews, as our Pastor held (C 25, par. 2). The renderings they offer do violence to the text. Rotherham renders it in the text, oppressors, and in the margin, robbers, of thy people. Young renders it,

destroyers of thy people. The rendering that the P.B.I. offers makes an adjective of the noun in question and requires that the preposition *min* (from among) or *be* (among) govern the Hebrew words for "thy people," whereas neither of them nor any equivalent word is used. This shows their violence against the Hebrew, and proves their interpretation false.

In part they seek to work up prejudice against our Pastor's view by designating it as Adventist. Again, they ignore his application of v. 14 to Antiochus Epiphanes, alleging that their view is the only one on that verse, except that which applies it to the Romans. Thus through them Satan seeks to play one of his old tricks—getting men to combat one another on the extremes of error so that the Truth that lies between these extremes may be forgotten! They continue to apply vs. 14-31 to the squabbles between Syria and Egypt, utterly ignoring our Pastor's very reasonable and factual interpretation of vs. 16-29 as applying to the Romans. Vs. 29 and 30 do not, they say, apply to Napoleon! nor do they interpret vs. 31 and 32 as applying to the Papacy. They claim these verses apply to the Romans, who, they allege, set up the abomination that maketh desolate by erecting a temple to Jupiter on the site of the Jerusalem temple, despite the fact that this occurred over a hundred years after the latter ceased to be holy (Matt. 24:15; 23:38)—consecrated to God! What a flat interpretation!

They cut out in a most arbitrary fashion all reference to our Lord in v. 22. To them the little help of verse 34 is not the Reformation Movement, but is the cessation of persecution of Christians through the union of Church and State under Constantine in the fourth century! Vs. 36-45 do not, they say, apply to Napoleon, but partly (36-39) to heathen and papal Rome and partly (40-45) to the Saracens, their and the Adventists' later "king of the South," and to the Turks, their and the Adventists' later "king of the

North." Disregarding "the desire of women," to them means papal prohibition of marriage to the clergy, monks and nuns! The strongholds of v. 37 mean to them canonized saints as protectors! The Time of the End does not to them mean the period from 1799 until the Kingdom is established after Satan's empire is overthrown, but "the later times" of the Gospel Age, which their interpretation implies began about 650 A.D. and is yet on! They claim that our Pastor's view that Napoleon is described in these verses, forces the conclusion that he died in Palestine! This absurd objection they think is taught by the words following those that according to our understanding describe his stay in Palestine: "yet he shall come to his end and none shall help him." These words say not a word as to where he would be made helpless and come to an end! They claim that our Pastor's view makes the entire prophecy reach its fulfilment a century ago. This is true of that part of the prophecy treated in chapter 11, but certainly not of that part of it treated in chapter 12. After impliedly claiming that the expression, "the time of the end," covers a period of over 1200 years, they have the effrontery to claim that from our viewpoint the expression of Dan. 12:1, "at that time," *i.e.*, during the Time of the End, forces the conclusion that Michael stood up while Napoleon was in Palestine!

For the hodge-podge that they present, whose leading features only we have given above, they have become willing to repudiate our Pastor's sober interpretations of Dan. 11:14-45. How plainly do they show their folly in endorsing such silly interpretations and in repudiating the sober ones of our Pastor (2 Tim. 3:8, 9)! Two general considerations overthrow their whole viewpoint. First, they themselves accept the thought that the 1260 days began in 539, when the real abomination was set up (Dan. 8:11-13; 11:31; 12:11); hence the 1290 days and the 1335 days they

also admit end in 1829 and 1874 respectively. Hence they must admit that the Time of the End follows the end of the 1260 years (Dan. 12:4, 6, 7, 9), and therefore must be from 1799 onward; for at Papacy's setting up (Dan. 8:1, 3; 11:31) the scattering of God's people began (Rev. 12:6; Dan. 8:11-13, 24; 12:6, 7) and was to end at the beginning of the Time of the End (Dan. 12:7). Therefore, their entire view on Dan. 11:31-45 is wrong. But there is another, even stronger, proof of the utter error of their setting of things. It is this: The angel said that the prophecy as a whole and in most of its details could not be understood until from 1829 and 1874 onward (Dan. 12:8-12), while the details of their views as well as their general setting they have, as they acknowledge, taken from Sir Isaac Newton, who died in 1727, and from Bishop Thomas Newton, who died in 1782—years before the prophecy, according to the angel, could be understood. Therefore, their general view and most of its details are utterly erroneous. Thus is their folly made known to all (2 Tim. 3:8, 9); and their attempt in the Dec. 15, 1924 Herald to give the meaning of *guarding* to the words "closed up" and "sealed" (Dan. 12:4, 9), instead of *concealing*, is thoroughly contradicted by the whole discussion from v. 4 to v. 13, where the angel shows that the prophecy would not be understood until 30 and 75 years after the Time of the End would begin.

Truth is vitality, and if the mind
 Be fed on poison, it must lose its power.
 The vision that forever strains to err
 Soon finds its task a habit; and the taste
 That disowns something true or beautiful
 Soon finds the Truth distorted as itself;
 And the loose mind that feeds on appetite
 For the enticements of erroneous thought
 Contracts a leprosy that oversteals
 Its senses, like a palsy, chill, and fast.

CHAPTER VII.

SIN-OFFERING ERRORS OF THE SHIMITES.

THE SENSE IN WHICH THE CHURCH IS A SIN-OFFERING. THE TWO SIN-OFFERINGS IN LITERAL PASSAGES. THE TWO SIN-OFFERINGS IN SYMBOLIC PASSAGES.

THE P.B.I. in the process of years became more and more fallen into error. It did in some of its members a great deal of fellowshipping with the 1908-1919 sifters, particularly with A.E. Williamson, one of the three sifting leaders of the sifting of antitypical Korah, of 1908-1911. As a result two parties developed among them—one due to that fellowship endorsing or countenancing the three great sifting errors of the antitypical Korah sifting on the Sin-offerings, Mediator and Covenants and the other continuing to retain the Truth on these three subjects. In 1936 the former party seized control of the P.B.I. by majority vote of its shareholders and forced the other party out. Consequently a division set in, Paul Thompson being the leader of the apostate group and I.F. Hoskins the leader of the other group; but the organization as such is in control of the apostate group. Hence officially the P.B.I. as such on the part of the majority of its apostate group endorses the above-mentioned three great errors and in the minority of this apostate group while not espousing, yet tolerates as matters of indifference these three gross sifting errors. Therefore we charge the P.B.I. with guilt on these three errors. In Vol. VI, Chap. VIII we refuted their view of the Mediator and Covenants, hence need not discuss it here. But we will here rather more briefly discuss the Sin-offerings as against the Church-Sin-offering deniers. We present the argument on that subject as follows: The two Sin-offerings—one that of

Jesus and the other that of the Church—are the only means of reconciliation between God and man, and pledge an opportunity of reconciliation to all non-elect fallen men and angels, and that in the Millennium alone. When we speak of the Church as being with, under and by Jesus a sin-offering, we are not to understand to mean that the Church's sacrifice is meritoriously necessary to reconcile God and man; for all the merit used in the atonement work is that of Jesus exclusively; but He having imputed it on behalf of the Church, and thus she becoming its imputative possessor, her sacrifice is necessary to release this merit of Jesus from the embargo on it before justice by virtue of its being imputed to her, in order that, freed from all claims that embargoed it as long as it secures the Church before Justice while in the sacrificing condition, it—Christ's one merit—might be applied on behalf of the world; for the entire merit (hence it must be free from all embargoes) is necessary to release Adam and the race in him from the sentence in the Millennium. Thus there is no demand of Justice requiring us to sacrifice to satisfy Justice; it is merely a privilege, which, faithfully used, makes us share in the Christ Class' sin-offering sufferings now, and in that Class' blessing work on the basis of these sin-offering sufferings, in the Millennium. Thus the Church shares in the Sin-offering.

Before we can use this argument to disprove the theory of the 1908-1911 sifters, we must of course prove that the Church shares with Jesus in the privilege of making a sin-offering. We will do this briefly first by literal and then by figurative passages. One of the clearest proofs on this point from the literal passages is given in Rom. 6:1-11, as the passage is purged from mistranslations. The mistranslations are readily recognized as such from one of its occurrences in v. 10: "For in that He died, He died *to* sin once." Is it true that *Jesus* died *to* sin? If He did, He must have been alive to it before dying to it, *i.e.*, He must

have been a sinner, which is untrue. The blasphemous errorists that teach on this point that He was born with sinful inclinations, *i.e.*, with original sin, are most surely from Satan on this point. The Scriptures disprove it utterly (Ps. 45:7; Luke 1:35; John 8:46; 2 Cor. 5:21; Heb. 4:15; 7:26; 9:14; 1 Pet. 1:19; 1 John 3:5). The Greek dative case, in which the word translated "*to sin*" is, may be translated, especially by the prepositions: *to*, *for* and *by*. We believe that *for* is the proper rendering here; for the Scriptures everywhere teach that He died as a sin-offering, *i.e.*, *for sin*. With this correction applied to deaths associated with His, we can see daylight in this section. In this section St. Paul gives two reasons why we should not sin: our death with Jesus as a sin-offering in consecration (vs. 2-6, 8-11) and our justification (v. 7). With these preliminary statements we will quote with a few bracketed comments the entire section: "Shall we continue in sin, that grace may abound? God forbid! How shall we that are dead [literally, died, *i.e.*, at our consecration] *for* the [not, *to*, for it is the same construction as in v. 10, explained above] [Adamic] sin, live any longer therein? Or know ye not, that as many as were baptized [consecrated] into Jesus Christ [not into water; for Jesus is not water] were baptized into His death [not into water; but into His death; consequently such die the same kind of a death as He died, *i.e.*, a sin-offering death; for God made Him who knew no sin a sin-offering (2 Cor. 5:21; like the Hebrew word *chataath*, which means both sin and sin-offering, the Greek word *hamartia* means sin and sin-offering—for the latter meaning see Rom. 8:3; Heb. 9:28) for us, that we might be made the righteousness of God *in Him*]?"

"Therefore we are buried *with him* [therefore are associates with Him in death] by baptism [consecration, 1 Cor. 12:12, 13] into death [not into water, but with Him into death. Hence those associated with

Him in the death baptism must be undergoing the same kind of a death as His—a sin-offering death]; that like as Christ was raised up from the dead [human affections, put to death at His consecration, out of which He as a New Creature arose for 3½ years with a crystallized Divine character. This new creature three days later received a Divine body] by the glory [perfect blending of the Divine qualities—wisdom, justice, love and power whereby God spiritualized Christ's new-creatively character and crowned it with a Divine body] of the Father, even so [just as He did] we also [like Him] should walk in newness of life [the resurrection of heart and mind is primarily here meant, but secondarily in body later, Col. 3:1-4; 2:12]. For if we have been planted [in consecration] together [with Him] in the likeness of His death [a death like His, *i.e.*, a sin-offering death], we shall be also in the likeness of His resurrection [first in heart and mind, and secondly in body in the first resurrection]; knowing this, that our old man [humanity, formerly under the curse, but later justified from all things] is crucified [slowly and painfully sacrificed from the time of consecration onward until and unto death] with Him [as partners and associates of Him in crucifixion, consequently, for the same reason as He was crucified, *i.e.*, as a Sin-offering], that [this indicates the purpose] the body of [*the*, so the Greek] sin [this expression, the body of the sin, may have a twofold meaning, and we believe both are correct: (1) the body of the Sin-offering, *i.e.*, in this sense the purpose being to put to death the humanity of the Christ Body as the second part of the Sin-offering; for the meaning of the word *hamartia*, here translated *sin*, as sin-offering, please see above; and (2) the Adamic sin. This sin is a figurative organism—body, having many members, ramifying in all forbidden directions, all animated by the spirit of transgression, and each one performing an individual function, according to its nature and kind. In this, the second

sense, the passage would teach that the sacrifice of the Body of Christ with the Head is intended to annihilate the Adamic sin as a figurative organism, during the Millennium. We believe both senses of the word are intended by the Lord in this passage, as certainly each implies the other] might be destroyed, that [to the end that] henceforth we should not serve sin [certainly if we so hate sin as to give up our all in sacrifice that it may be destroyed in all its ramifications, the result of entering into such a sacrificial course would be that we should no more serve *the* sin—the Adamic sin in our members is particularly meant]. For he that is dead [literally, the one that died, *i.e.*, at consecration, when we die to self and the world] has been freed [literally, justified, which presupposes that one has already died to sin] from [*the*, so the Greek, Adamic] sin. [Here St. Paul introduces, and that parenthetically, his second reason why we should not sin that grace may abound—our justification, which presupposes our death, especially to the Adamic sin in us. In the following verses he resumes the argument based on our being a part of the Sin-offering, becoming such at the time of consecration and Spirit-begetting, as the great reason why we should not continue in sin, that grace may abound]."

"Now if we be dead [literally, *died*] with Christ [as associates of His from consecration onward we, of course, must die the same kind of a death as His—a sin-offering death], we believe that we shall also live [in the first resurrection] with Him [in the Millennium be associated with Him in dispensing the blessings of the second part of the Sin-offering]; knowing that Christ being raised [literally, *after being raised*—the *aorist* mood indicates simple non-continued past action] dieth no more [hence there will not be an *individual second* opportunity of standing a trial for everlasting life for anyone except Adam, and Eve, also as being directly in Adam in the first trial, and thus directly affected with him by the ransom], death [the

article *the* is here lacking, hence the Adamic death is evidently not meant, even as Jesus' death was not the Adamic death, but a sin-offering death] hath no more dominion over Him [as it did from Jordan to His resurrection]. For in that He died [literally, as respects which (thing) He died], He died for [not unto, but *for*, and literally *the*, *i.e.*, Adamic] sin once; but in that [literally, as respects which (thing)] He liveth, He liveth [not unto] for God [as the Executor of the Sin-offering blessings now and in the Millennium]. LIKEWISE [just as in His case, both as respects which thing He died and which thing He lives; hence as a part of the Sin-offering now, in dispensing Jesus' Sin-offering blessings now, and as a part of the Dispenser of Jesus' and the Church's Sin-offering blessings in the Millennium and as Jesus' co-operators in executing all of Jehovah's post-Millennial plans and purposes, Rom. 8:17; Eph. 2:7] reckon ye also [in addition to Jesus] yourselves to be dead [since your consecration, when you died] *for* [not *to*; *for*, *for* Jesus to die *for* sin and for us *to* die *to* sin would not be for us to die likewise—like Him, *i.e.*, as a Sin-offering] sin [literally, *the* sin, *i.e.*, the Adamic sin—Adam's sin and all its resultant sin in him and us], but alive for God through Jesus Christ our Lord [literally, *in* Christ Jesus, *i.e.*, as His Body]." This passage is the most detailed exposition of the Church's share with Jesus in the Sin-offering found in any literal passage in the Bible and is conclusive on the subject. When the vail of mistranslation and imperfect translation is removed, it most marvelously proves that there are two Sin-offerings—the humanity of Jesus and of the Church, or to put it from another viewpoint, one Sin-offering in two parts—the humanity of Jesus and that of the Church.

But this is only one among many literal passages on the subject. Our comments on it will make unnecessary so extended similar comments on some parallel passages, which we will now quote: "If Christ be in

you [the very words of the hidden mystery (Col. 1:26, 27)], the body [humanity of the Christ class] is dead because of sin [is therefore a sin-offering]; but the Spirit [New Creature; 2 Cor. 5:17] is life because of righteousness [which the priests minister now and will minister in the Millennium]" (Rom. 8:10; 2 Cor. 1:5). "For as the sufferings [which are thus Sin-offering sufferings] of [*the*, as in the Greek] Christ abound in us" proves the same thing. Having in 1 Cor. 15:1-28 proved that Christ's death and resurrection are a guarantee of the resurrection for the Church and the world, St. Paul in vs. 29-34 proves that the Church's death as a Sin-offering is also a guarantee of the world's resurrection, and thus is a second proof of the resurrection: "Else what shall they [the Christ Body] do which are baptized [undergoing the death and resurrection baptism (Rom. 6:3-5; Col. 2:11, 12; Eph. 4:6), not its picture, water baptism. This is the one Christian baptism of the Bible. Its symbol, *i.e.*, water immersion, is no more another baptism than a person's picture is another person than himself. The Spirit's baptism is a part of this one Christian baptism, a part connected with its resurrection feature. John's baptism is not even the symbol of the one Christian baptism. For it was for Jews only, and that for those who were living more or less openly in conflict with the Law Covenant, and was intended to symbolize their cleansing for sin as necessary for them, if they were to be transferred from Moses to Christ. Hence this baptism preceded the Jewish Christians' receiving the Holy Spirit (Acts 2:38; 9:17; 22:16), while Gentile Christians received the Holy Spirit before symbolic baptism (Acts 10:44-48), which in their case was not John's, but the symbol of the one Christian baptism, John's baptism being invalid for them, and when administered to them was set aside and the symbol of the one baptism was performed in its stead on them and by them (Acts 19:1-7). Undisputedly, Jesus' baptism by John was not John's baptism, for He was sinless, but was the symbol of the one baptism (Eph. 4:5) that He

personally made, when from Jordan to the tomb He actually fulfilled all righteousness, and which He *symbolized* at John's hands (Matt. 3:15). These remarks we make in refutation of certain attempts to make the one baptism of Eph. 4:5 exclusive for some, and different from the *baptism* into Christ's death and resurrection and its symbol, and the baptism of the Spirit for others. Rom. 6:3-5; 1 Cor. 15:29-34; Mark 10:35-39; 1 Pet. 3:21; Eph. 4:5; Col. 2:11, 12, one and all refer to the one and only baptism of the mystery class] for the dead [Adam and his race], if the dead [Adam and his race] rise not at all?"

"Why are they then baptized [with the death and resurrection baptism] for the dead [the connection of this and the preceding verse, as well as the following verses, proves that the Little Flock's one baptism, like Jesus' baptism, is causally connected with the world's resurrection; hence the Little Flock must in its humanity be a sin-offering which by Jesus' merit has causal relationship to the world's resurrection. The next two verses prove that the death and resurrection baptism is here meant; for its subjects, of whom Paul was one, undergo hourly danger and daily dying in undergoing their baptism]? And why stand we in jeopardy every hour? I protest by your rejoicing [the rejoicing which Paul had over them in winning them for the Lord, even though it came at the expense of a daily dying in him] which I have in Christ Jesus, our Lord, I die daily. [Then, citing as an example of such sin-offering sufferings his experience with the Ephesian mob, which as wild beasts struggled with him to destroy him for his sacrifice for the brethren, he says:] If after the manner of men [*i.e.*, speaking humanly, figuratively] I have fought with beasts at Ephesus, what advantageth it me, if the dead [Adam and his race] rise not? [*i.e.*, what is the advantage of my suffering as a part of the Sin-offering, if those for whom it is endured will not get the resurrection benefits for which the Sin-offering sufferings are undergone?

The thing for us as consecrated people to do would be to cease from the Sin-offering sufferings; since there will be no hereafter for the sin-offering sufferers, or for those for whom they undergo them. On the other hand, instead of undergoing sufferings useless to ourselves and others, we should in harmony with righteousness make the best of life with the realization that after it is over all will be over]. Let us eat and drink for tomorrow we die. [Having pointed out how the teaching which denies the resurrection of the dead leads to the repudiation of our sacrificial sufferings as the second Sin-offering in the interests of righteousness, St. Paul warns that the error—the denial of the resurrection of the Church and the world—would lead them to corrupt into evil the good already developed in them by the one baptism]. Be not deceived: Evil communications [sermons, literally,—those against the resurrection] corrupt good manners [ethical conduct. Then St. Paul gives a pertinent exhortation to righteousness, that from the connection we see points out that their error—no-resurrectionism—proved them deficient in the knowledge of God on their sharing in the Sin-offering, which knowledge would have made them immune to the contagion of no-resurrectionism, while the lack of such knowledge put them into a spiritual sleep as to righteousness]. Awake unto righteousness, and sin not [by going back on your consecration, which no-resurrectionism will surely effect]; for some have not the knowledge of God: I speak this to your shame."

Jesus' statement in Mark 10:35-39 teaches the same doctrine; for the cup ["the cup that I *shall* drink"] that is here spoken of and that He drank was the shame and disgrace connected with those of His sin-offering sufferings that were undergone on His last day as a supposed blasphemer and rebel excommunicated and outlawed (John 18:11), while the baptism which He was undergoing [not, *shall* be baptized with, but am being baptized with] at the time He used this language was the death and resurrection baptism while

undergoing the sin-offering sufferings from Jordan onward to the open tomb (Luke 12:50). This same cup He says James and John would drink. Hence they shared in the shame and disgrace of the death of supposed blasphemers and rebels excommunicated and outlawed in the sin-offering sufferings. This same baptism Jesus tells them they would undergo. Hence the sin-offering sufferings were theirs from the day of their Spirit-begetting at Pentecost onward. This death and resurrection baptism as being undergone with Jesus—associates with Jesus—is taught in Col. 2:11, 12, and demonstrates the falsity of the theory of No-Church-Sin-offeringism under review. The same sufferings—the sin-offering sufferings—that Jesus inflicted upon Himself unto death, St. Paul in 2 Cor. 4:10 says He and the other faithful were bearing. The connection, vs. 8-11, shows what some of these sufferings were. So does 1 Cor. 4:9-13 show some others of such sufferings. In Gal. 2:20 St. Paul tells us that he was being crucified with Christ; hence sharing in the kind of a death that Jesus underwent, the words, "Christ liveth in me," prove he was undergoing the resurrection part that Jesus underwent. Here St. Paul expresses the sin-offering thought in the form that the mystery concerned his personal participation in it, "Christ liveth in me," "Christ in you," etc. (Col. 1:26, 27). Thus he shows that the mystery class shares in the Sin-offering. Our being co-workers with Christ in the sacrificial state is another expression that implies our share in the Sin-offering (2 Cor. 6:1). Clearly our joint share with Him in the Sin-offering now ("suffering with Him") and in the distribution of its blessings ("glorified together with Him" and "reigning with Him") later, are taught in Rom. 8:17-21; 5:17 and in 2 Tim. 2:10-12. Phil. 3:10 speaks of the death and resurrection baptism impliedly, and expressly shows that St. Paul was sharing in its two parts. The preceding vs. from 6 onward show that he was participating in the Christ's suffering with others from the outstart of

his career at Damascus, and had been doing so in living out his high calling.

In 1 Pet. the same doctrine is taught, the same suffering with Christ for righteousness. 1 Pet. 2:19-24 is to the point. The whole section shows that the faithful suffer for righteousness, and only such sufferings can be sin-offering sufferings. V. 21 shows that the sufferings of Christ which were sin-offering sufferings, are the Divinely given example that we should follow. Hence our sufferings are sin-offering sufferings. V. 24 contains the same mistaken translation ("died to sin," "live unto righteousness,") as we found in Rom. 6:2, 10, 11. The pertinent words should be translated to mean that after dying *for* sins (which we do at consecration) we should live *for* righteousness. 1 Pet. 3:14, 17 and 18 treat of the Church's sharing in the sin-offering sufferings. V. 14 treats of the blessedness of suffering for righteousness, which kind of suffering alone is sin-offering suffering. The connection between vs. 17 and 18 proves that the Church, as well as Christ, is a Sin-offering: "For it is better, if the will of God may determine, to suffer doing good than doing evil, because Christ *also* [as well as ourselves; this shows that the Church's sufferings are the same kind as our Lord's—for sin, as a Sin-offering] suffered once for sin, the just for the unjust." 1 Pet. 4:12-14, 16, 19, is another evidence on the same point. That the mystery class—Head and Body—is treated of in this section is manifest from the expression, "Rejoice, inasmuch as ye are *partakers* of [sharers of, partners in] the sufferings of [*the*, so the Greek] Christ." The expression of v. 12, "the burning among you, that has happened unto you for a trial," is an allusion to the fire in the censer whereby the priest offered incense which was burned on the golden altar. This again identifies the passage with the mystery class. Hence here those sufferings are meant which are connected with the Sin-offerings as viewed from the standpoint of the antitypical Holy, *i.e.*, God and the Christ class view

such sin-offering sufferings as a sweet-smelling savor, as a thing very appreciable and precious (Ps. 116:15). The expression (v. 14), "ye are reproached *in* the name [character and office] of Christ" again emphasizes the mystery class as having the same character and office—in suffering for sin in this trial state and in blessing mankind during the Millennium by a release from sin's condemnation, to the end that it may obtain "the liberty of the sons of God." The statement of v. 14 as to the Spirit of glory and of God (wisdom, justice, love and power) resting upon them, is another allusion that implies the Sin-offering. As the anointing of the priesthood qualified it to make the sin-offerings in Aaron, so the anointing of the antitypical Priesthood qualifies it to make the antitypical Sin-offerings in Christ (2 Cor. 1:21, 22). The expression, "to suffer as a Christian" (v. 16) implies the same mystery; for only the anointed class—the Christ class—is really Christian—*anointian*. The same thought is implied in v. 19 by the expression, "them that suffer according to the will of God," whose will is that the mystery class in its first advent suffer for sin, and in its second advent appear without a Sin-offering unto salvation to whosoever will (Heb. 9:25-28; Rev. 22:17). Our denying ourselves, taking up the cross and following Christ, as indispensable to discipleship, proves that we suffer as He did, *i.e.*, as a Sin-offering (Matt. 16:24). Thus the Pauline and Petrine epistles agree that the Christ class—Head and Body—make the Sin-offerings in order to dispense their blessings afterwards—Jesus so doing with the merit of His Sin-offering now and Jesus and the Church doing it with His merit in the Sin-offering of the Church in the Millennium, the efficacious merit of this second Sin-offering being exclusively Jesus' merit, the Church's share in the Sin-offering being simply a privilege similar to that of the wife of a rich man, who as such shares in her husband's property and work as partner and joint heir. Jesus' merit, without any additions whatever, from any source, is the only

thing that satisfies Divine Justice, both for the Church now, and for the world in the Millennium (1 John 2:2). The effect of these Bible Sin-offering teachings, is of course crushing to the theory of No-Church-Sin-Offeringism.

Above we have very briefly given the main proofs from *literal* Scriptures that teach that there are two Sin-offerings, corresponding to the two parts of the mystery class' humanity—the Christ, Head and Body—or one Sin-offering of the Christ as a whole in two parts, dependent on the standpoint from which the subject is viewed. We now proceed to consider how the Lord teaches this same thought of two Sin-offerings in certain figures of the Bible. The theory under review denies the doctrine of two Sin-offerings. The proofs that we will give on the figures will show the same doctrine as we showed from the literal passages, as to the Priesthood and the Mediator of the New Covenant.

The first of these figures that we will discuss is that of the High Priest. We understand that as the antitype of Aaron there are two High Priests: (1) Jesus alone, the Church's High Priest; and (2) Jesus, the Head, and the Church, the Body, the World's High Priest. As there is no dispute among professed Christians as to Jesus being the Church's High Priest, we will here assume that thought as proven and immediately proceed to prove that the World's High Priest is Jesus, the Head, and the Church, the Body. The strongest proof on this subject is Heb. 7:26, 27; which two verses we understand to be a parenthesis thrown into the midst of a discussion of Aaron and Melchizedek in one of their respective typical capacities—that of typing Jesus as the Church's High Priest. We will begin our discussion of these two verses with an analysis of v. 27, and end it with a discussion of v. 26. To understand clearly this passage we should *first of all* note the contrast in the first and last parts of the verse. The contrast is suggested by the words "daily" (annually, *daily* standing for *yearly* here, as a day stands for a year frequently in Scripture) and

"once." The contrast is not between many sacrifices and one sacrifice, as some assume; but the contrast is between the *annual* sacrificing of a typical bullock and goat (in all about 1600 times did this occur) and the *once* sacrificing of the antitypical bullock and goat. A second thing that must be kept in mind clearly to see the thought of this passage is, the thing referred to by the expression, "this He did once." What did He do once? Our answer is, that to which the expression, "this He did once," refers. This expression "this He did once," refers to the expression, "to offer up sacrifice *first* for *His own sins*, and *then* for the *people's*." Accordingly, the High Priest here referred to "offers up sacrifice *first* for *His own sins*." Can this High Priest be the Church's High Priest alone, *i.e.*, Jesus? We answer, Certainly not; for that would make Him a sinner, which is contrary to all Scripture (Is. 53:9, 11; 2 Cor. 5:21; 1 Pet. 2:22; 1 John 3:5). Had He been a sinner, He could not have offered an acceptable sacrifice at all. Whose High Priest then is meant here? We answer, Only the World's High Priest, *i.e.*, Jesus and the Church, as Head and Body. Thus understood, the passage is clear as follows: The World's High Priest, in His *Head*, *first* offered the humanity of His Head for the sins of the World's High Priest in His Body; and *then* the World's High Priest, primarily in His Head, and secondarily in His Body, offered the humanity of His Body for the people's sins. There is no way of interpreting this verse as referring to any other than the World's High Priest without making Jesus a sinner. Interpreted of the World's High Priest, the verse is self-harmonious, harmonious with all other Scriptures, all Scripture doctrines, God's character, the Sin-offerings, the purpose of the Bible and facts. This passage, therefore, proves that the Body of the World's High Priest, under, by and with His Head, Jesus, exercises His ministry during the Gospel Age, which overthrows the P.B.I. error on this point and its claim that the underpriests minister only in the Millennium.

But some may object that the interpretation just given to v. 27 makes a too abrupt transition from the thought of v. 26, which they claim undoubtedly refers to Jesus alone. To this objection we give two answers: (1) even a ten times more abrupt transition than they think exists between the two verses could not change the fact that unless v. 27 is interpreted of the World's High Priest it implies that Jesus was a sinner, which would have completely disqualified Him from offering an acceptable sacrifice. Therefore v. 27 will have to be accepted as applicable to the World's High Priest alone, who offers two Sin-offerings, or one Sin-offering in two parts—the humanity of the Church being the second one, or the second part of the one Sin-offering. (2) But v. 26, just as well as v. 27 refers to the World's High Priest, and when this is seen it will be found that there is no abrupt transition from v. 26 to v. 27. Rather, it will then be seen that both verses constitute a parenthesis, as explained above. It is only the veil of mistranslation that makes there seem to be an abrupt transition between these two verses. When this verse is properly translated the relation between the two verses is seen to be perfectly logical and natural, as implied by the conjunction, *for*, which connects them. The mistranslation is found in the first clause of v. 26, to which we give the following translation as the proper one: "For it was proper for us also [to be] a such like High Priest, holy, etc." The verb *prepei* (*eprepe*, used here, being its imperfect tense form) is impersonal, and should have been here so rendered, even as we have given it, "*it* was proper." If one objects that our translation requires us to insert the infinitive *to be*, we reply that a similar insertion whenever the infinitive is not used is required in every New Testament use of this verb *prepei*, if the thought is to be completed. The following are all such occurrences of this verb apart from the text under consideration: Eph. 5:3; 1 Tim. 2:10; Titus 2:1; Heb. 2:10. The last is the only passage in which this verb is used with the infinitive, "to make perfect," supplied

by the Lord. Hence the objection falls to the ground. In the preceding verses and in v. 28 St. Paul is describing Jesus in certain respects, *i.e.*, during the Gospel Age, and in His capacity of acting as the Church's High Priest, antitypical of certain features of the Aaron and Melchizedek types. He pauses in the midst of this description to show in vs. 26 and 27 that the World's High Priest in certain respects is very much like the Church's High Priest. With these remarks we will now quote the verse, with bracketed comments: "For it was proper for us [Head and Body] also [in addition to the Church's High Priest] to be a such like [a very similar kind of a] High Priest, holy [the Head actually so, the Body reckonedly so and actually so to the extent of ability], harmless [the Head actually so, the Body reckonedly so and actually so to the extent of ability], undefiled [the Head actually so, the Body reckonedly so and actually so to the extent of ability], separate from sinners [the Head actually so, and the Body reckonedly so and actually so to the extent of ability], made higher than the heavens [the Head actually so and the Body reckonedly so in prospect of being beyond the veil]."

Thus these two verses constitute the strongest Scriptural proof that the World's High Priest consists of Jesus and the Church—the Head and Body. This is one of the phases of the mystery hidden from the past Ages and generations, now made plain to the saints. But this passage, based on Aaron (who in the sacrifice of the bullock stood personally for himself, as high priest for his sons, and in the sacrifice of the Lord's goat stood in his head for himself and in his body for his sons) as the type of the World's High Priest—Head and Body—proves that the Head and Body are identical with the Priesthood, which destroys the attempted non-identity assumption of these, made by the theory under examination. Furthermore, it demonstrates the share of the Church in the Sin-offering—a thing that the bulk of the P.B.I. denies, repeatedly asserting that Jesus is the sole antitype of

the bullock, the Lord's goat and Azazel's goat. And this denial is counting the blood of the (sacrificial) covenant wherewith they were sanctified an unholy thing, and is an integral part of the system of the 1908-1911 sifters, and with its refutation that system suffers a fatal blow.

Next, in proof of two Sin-offerings under the figure of the priesthood, we refer to Heb. 13:10-16. In v. 10 two priesthoods, two altars and two tabernacles are implied and the following verses show that two sets of sacrifices are also implied in this verse. V. 11 is an unmistakable allusion to the day of atonement sin-offering sacrifices of Lev. 16, and incidentally to the inaugural sin-offering sacrifices of Lev. 9. On those occasions two and only two beasts—the bullock and the Lord's goat—were treated as described in v. 11: their bodies burned without the camp, and their blood carried into the most holy for sin atonement. Based upon the fact that two and only two beasts were so treated, St. Paul draws two conclusions, applying in v. 12, the first to Jesus, as the antitype of the bullock, and in v. 13, the second to the Church, as the antitype of the Lord's goat. The reason why we say that there is an incidental allusion to Lev. 9 in this section is, on the one hand, because in Lev. 9:7 the bullock is shown to atone for Aaron as the representative of his sons (thus makes atonement for his sons and the Levites in them) and *for the people*, and the Lord's goat (v. 15) is shown to atone for the people; while in Lev. 16:6, 11 the bullock makes atonement for Aaron's sons, as represented in himself and the tribe of Levi, his house, but not for the people; for the goat alone is there said to make atonement for the people (vs. 9, 15); and, on the other hand, Jesus is set forth in v. 12 in antitype of the bullock as the one seeking to sanctify through His blood the whole people—the Church and the world. In v. 12 the suffering is spoken of on Jesus' part as outside of the city, and in v. 13 on the Church's part as outside the camp. V. 14 identifies the camp and the city in meaning. V. 13 shows that the going forth is to

Jesus without the camp, and thus also identifies the camp and the city. The variation of the expression is due to this, that whereas when Israel received the regulations for the day of atonement they were in the wilderness in a camp; but after they entered the land and built their temple they dwelt representatively in the city. Hence the temple and tabernacle correspond; the city, apart from the temple, and the camp correspond; and without the gate and without the camp correspond. Hence the symbolic significance is the same in the three sets of correspondencies just pointed out. It was the sin-offerings whose bodies were burned without the camp, and whose blood was carried into the sanctuary (v. 11). Hence in antitype Jesus and the Church suffer without the gate, without the camp. The city, Jerusalem, here stands for the nominal people of God; and for Jesus to suffer at Jerusalem just without its gates represents the fact that He was cast off as a blasphemer and a rebel, excommunicated and outlawed from among the nominal people of God, and thus died as an outcast from the nation. Luke 13:33 proves this: "It is impossible for a prophet to perish outside [apart from] Jerusalem." The literal Jerusalem cannot here be meant; for many prophets died outside of it, *e.g.*, John, the Baptist, Jesus, Sts. Paul, Peter, John, etc. But none of God's Gospel-Age prophets died apart from the nominal people of God being instrumental in their death; for these persecute or wear out God's prophets unto death. The camp signifies the same thing as the city. It was not the world in the sense of the heathen who especially persecuted Jesus and the Church, but the world or camp in the sense of God's nominal people (John 15:18-25). To undergo such persecution and wearing out by God's nominal people is what is meant by Jesus' suffering without the gate and by our going forth unto Him without the camp, as the clause, "bearing *His* reproach," proves. His reproach was the shame and disgrace heaped upon the Sin-offering. Hence our going forth to Him without the camp, bearing His

reproach, proves that we are His associates in the Sin-offering. Of course such have here no continuing city (religious government); for they are out of harmony with those among the nominal people of God, as Jesus was with the Jewish religious government. The word "therefore" of v. 15 connects it with the thought of vs. 12-14. This verse shows that it is by Jesus that we offer our sacrifice which praises God, because it is the fruit [product] of lips [the Word, "our," has no corresponding Greek word and is a wrong insertion]. The Bible is God's mouth to us and its lips are its two parts, the Old and New Testaments. The word, God's, therefore is the word to insert instead of "our." Our sacrifice of praise is a fruit or a product of the Scriptures, which enable us to make our sacrifice of praise continually by their giving our minds the necessary enlightenment and our hearts the necessary strength thereto. That this understanding is correct is evident from the clause that shows what these lips do: confessing. The Greek construction shows that the lips do the "confessing," teaching, to God's name [honor], by manifesting in their display of God's plan, His glorious wisdom, justice, love and power. Thus to hold up this glorious, praiseworthy character makes our sacrifice one of praise. The main feature of our doing good and distributing in performing sacrifices that are well pleasing to the Lord (v. 16) is truly and in the Lord's Spirit to expound to others the words of God's lips, which gloriously praise Him. This understanding is true. According to our examination of Heb. 13:10-16, it implies, in its own and in the light of Heb. 7:26, 27, that the Head and Body are the World's High Priest, for it teaches the two Sin-offerings. This refutes the denials of Church-Sin-offeringism made by the 1908-1911 sifters, now endorsed by the majority and tolerated by the rest of the P.B.I.

Heb. 10:19, "We have boldness to enter the Most Holy by the blood [merit] of Jesus," also alludes to the World's High Priest, and that in His Body. As the typical high priest entered the typical most holy twice

on the day of atonement, once for "himself" and then for the people; so must the World's High Priest do likewise on the antitypical Day of Atonement, the Gospel and Millennial Ages. The antitypical Most Holy is heaven itself, which Jesus after His resurrection entered, with the blood of the antitypical Bullock, for us—the Body of the World's High Priest (Heb. 9:24). Since again there must be an antitypical entrance into the Most Holy, in Heb. 10:19 we are told that we—the Body of the World's High Priest—after Jesus with the antitypical Bullock's blood entered the antitypical Most Holy, there to appear for *us*, (as Aaron offered in the typical most holy the first time for his sons and tribe) and by His blood to make atonement for us, by the merit of Christ, we also as the Body with the Head in the second going in are privileged to enter the antitypical Most Holy, a thing that only the antitypical World's High Priest can do on the antitypical Day of Atonement, corresponding to Aaron's unique atonement-day privilege to enter the typical most holy. This, then, shows that we are the Body of the World's High Priest and therefore share in the Sin-offering for the world, which overthrows the 1908-1911 sifters' theory, now endorsed by the majority and tolerated by the rest of the P.B.I.

Next we will briefly examine Heb. 10:1-10 as a fourth proof of two Sin-offerings, based on the priesthood figure. In vs. 1-3 the Apostle shows the inefficacy of the typical atonement day sacrifices actually to satisfy justice for sin, asserting in v. 4 that the annual bullock and Lord's goat could not actually take away sins. Why? The Justice of God requiring an eye for an eye, a hand for a hand, a foot for a foot, a life for a life, and hence a perfect life for a perfect life, *i.e.*, a corresponding price—an exact equivalent—for the debt, and the bullock and goat not being an exact equivalent to the perfect human body and life and the human right to life and its life-rights which perfect Adam had to forfeit to Justice for himself and the race in his loins for sin, they could not satisfy

Justice for Adam and the race in his loins, *i.e.*, fully pay the debt into which Adam, in forfeiting for himself and his race his right to life and its life-rights by sin, involved himself and his race. In vs. 5-10 the Apostle tells how the antitypical Bullock—Jesus' humanity—and the antitypical Goat—the Church's humanity—set aside the typical ones and are offered in their stead. These two sacrifices accomplish what the bulls and goats could not do—"take away sins." V. 5 tells of the Christ's (Head and Body) stepping forth officially among men ("entered the world"), *i.e.*, at Jordan and Pentecost, telling by His actions that God no longer desired the typical sacrifices, which He did desire until the antitypes should set in. Then the Christ sets forth the antitypes of the no longer desired bullock and goat with their accompanying offerings, in the words, "a body [in the largest sense of that word including the Head, Jesus, as well as the other members, the Church] hast Thou prepared Me," *i.e.*, Jesus' humanity and the humanity of the Church. V. 6 shows that the typical bullock and goat with their accompanying burnt offerings gave God no pleasure—did not satisfy His Justice for sin; at best they only typically, but not really, satisfied His Justice; hence the statement of v. 5 to the effect that Jehovah did not desire them further, even in their typical use, which He formerly desired—"Thou wouldest not."

The Christ by His acts says what is stated of Him in v. 7: that He has come to do the Father's will, even as was written of Him. The will of God is, by the Christ's sacrifice, the merit for this lodging in Jesus' sacrifice alone, to save all men from the Adamic sentence and lead them into an exact understanding of the Truth, to the end that they might gain the right to life with its accompanying life-rights, which Jesus' merit alone furnishes, apart from any merit that there may be in the Church's sacrifice (1 Tim. 2:4-6; Rom. 5:18, 19). Vs. 8 and 9 show that the typical set of sacrifices in their inability to be really desirable and satisfactory to Divine Justice are designedly set aside

to put in their place the second set of sacrifices, the antitypical set—the humanity of Jesus and the Church. V. 10 clinches the point that the Church shares in the second set of sacrifices: "By the which will [the will to do God's will, which both the Head and Body will—the larger Body] we have been sanctified [not justified; for we get justification by faith, and not by willing to do God's will. Willing to do God's will is consecration, and it is by the act of consecrating that we begin to be sanctified ("have been sanctified"), even as our sanctification progresses as the carrying out of our consecration progresses, and even as it is completed as our consecration is completely carried out] through the offering up of the Body [the Church which is His Body] of Jesus Christ once for all [as the Head is offered up but once, so the Body also is offered up but once.]" This passage—Heb. 10:1-10—nicely takes its place beside Heb. 7:26, 27; 10:19; and 13:10-16, as a testimony to the World's High Priest as distinct from the Church's High Priest. This destroys the theory that we are refuting, now accepted by the majority and tolerated by the rest of the P.B.I.

St. Peter gives us the Priest Body figure in 1 Pet. 2:5, 9. With the light of Heb. 7:26, 27; 13:10-16 and 10:1-10, 19, shining on 1 Pet. 2:5, 9, we see that he uses the priest figure, which from his literal statements already explained proves that he held the thought of the World's High Priest as being the Head and Body, even as in the immediate connection he shows that Jesus, the chief cornerstone, and the Church, the other stones, are the living stones of God's temple, a figure that St. Paul elaborates with more detail in Eph. 2:19-22, applying it to those whom he calls the Head and Body (Eph. 1:22, 23). "Ye are a holy Priesthood [being the Body of the World's High Priest] to offer up sacrifices acceptable unto God by Jesus Christ" (Heb. 13:16, 17). "Ye are a royal [Melchizedek] Priesthood" (Heb. 7:26, 27). St. John in Rev. 1:5; 5:10; 20:4-6 gives the testimony

to the effect that the Church consists of individual Priests, first sacrificing, later blessing—the holy and royal Priesthood of St. Peter, though considered from an individual standpoint, whereas Hebrews and St. Peter view these Priests as members of the Body. Both viewpoints are true, but bring various phases of the subject to our attention.

Do we find the Priesthood in other epistles? We answer, Yes. It is certainly implied in the temple figure of Eph. 2:20-22, as St. Peter directly connects the temple and priesthood figure in 1 Pet. 2:4-8. It is directly alluded to in Eph. 5:2, where Christ is said to be a sweet smelling savor of us. This is a reference to the incense that He, the Head, offered in His sacrifice for us, the Body. Furthermore, Phil. 4:18 shows that the Body offers incense, which proves that they are of the Priesthood. Thus Eph. 5:2 and Phil. 4:18 prove their priesthood in Head and Body. In 2 Cor. 2:14-16 St. Paul says of the elect, in their capacity of serving the Truth amid trouble, that *they* are a *sweet savor of Christ* to God. The priest, offering incense at the golden altar and causing the perfume to ascend to God, types the Christ serving the Truth amid fiery trials and manifesting to God amid such service and trial the glorious graces of the Spirit, especially faith, hope, self-control, patience, piety, brotherly love and charity. These constitute the sweet savor of Christ that, first, the Head in connection with His sacrifice offered, and that, second, the Head and Body in connection with the sacrifice of the Body offer unto God. Yea, the Father delights in this as something sweet and precious to Him. The same thing—the incense connected with the second sacrifice—is referred to in Rev. 8:3-5. The Angel here is the Christ, Head and Body. That this is the incense connected with the sacrifice of the antitypical Goat is manifest from two things: (1) The sacrifice of the Head had long before been completed; and (2) the incense was offered for the prayers of all saints, *i.e.*, our graces of the Spirit exercised amid fiery trials are so many

prayers (as they give power to our prayers) appealing to God for the supply of our and others' needs. The thought here is similar to that of the Spirit—our holy dispositions, consisting largely of these graces—making intercession for saints (Rom. 8:26) amid many troubles—fiery trials. Thus the incense allusions in the Bible prove the Church to be a Sin-offering.

Another line of figures proves the same thought—the two symbolic institutions of the Gospel Age: (1) Water Baptism, as a symbol of the death and resurrection baptism, the one real baptism, and (2) the Lord's Supper. In immersion the burial of the body in the water represents the death part of the real baptism, and the raising of the body out of the water represents the resurrection part of the real baptism. Jesus' language to John to the effect that going under the water and coming out of the water would be a fulfilment of all righteousness, proves that the water baptism was only a symbol; for it is only by the real baptism that He actually fulfilled all righteousness: His death satisfying the righteous demand of the Law for mankind's death, and His rising unto perfection of the Divine character through His 3½ years of perfect obedience to the law of duty and disinterested love, satisfying its demands as to His keeping its every command and suggestion. 1 Cor. 10:16, 17 proves that the bread also represents the humanity of the Church and the cup the death of the Church with our Lord. And this is just what Luke 22:20, when rightly translated, teaches (see Chap. VII of Vol. VI, where Luke 22:20 is detailedly explained). Thus the symbolic institutions of the Gospel Age teach the Church's participation in the Sin-offering. This has devastating effects on the theory under review.

Just one more figure that involves the Sin-offering idea—that of Jesus as the Second or Last Adam, and as such the Second or Last Father of the race, and the Church as the Second Eve, and as such the Second or Last Mother of the race (Rom. 5:14; 1 Cor. 15:45, 47; Eph. 5:31, 32; 2 Cor. 11:2, 3). Had Adam

not sinned he would have transmitted to his children the right to life and its accompanying life-rights, which were his in his sinless state. And had he and Eve not sinned she would have received this right to life with its pertinent life-rights and connected them with embryos, which she would have nourished until they were ready for birth, and thus their children would have been born with the right to life and its accompanying life-rights. Jesus, taking Adam's place, did not forfeit, but sacrificed, in loyalty to God, His human right to life and its pertinent life-rights, and thus in His resurrection acquired the right to be the last or Second Adam, the offerer of the right to life and its life-rights to the race on condition of obedience. Be it noted that these rights were those of the human Jesus. The merit that will give life is the right to life and its life-rights and is Jesus' alone—only a father gives life, a mother simply receives and nourishes it unto birth. It will be noted that we have repeatedly set forth the thought that it is Jesus' merit alone that counts in the Sin-offering imputation now and in the Sin-offering application later—in the Millennium. The Church's Sin-offering, whatever merit it may have, does not count in the merit of the Sin-offering before God. This figure of the father and mother—the Second Adam and the Second Eve—shows why this is so. Our Lord alone will give the obedient of the world life. He is the Life-giver, Savior. The Church does not give the world life. But this She will do as the Second Eve—She will receive this life from the Second Adam and will nourish into fitness for everlasting life all who obey, and thus will become the mother of all the living, as Jesus, the Second Adam, will become the Father of all the living, having given them His human right to life and its life-rights. These facts imply the two Sin-offerings, the merit of which is in our Lord alone. Here we have the Bridegroom and the Bride figure, in giving and ministering the right to life and its life-rights.

But while incidental to the discussion of the Sin-offerings,

whose Divine philosophy it is not necessary here further to explain, we have brought out various points refutative of the view of the 1908-1911 sifters as accepted or tolerated by the P.B.I.

In the Millennium the Priesthood work of blessing will be done; and none of it will be done in the Age following. Therefore there will be no sacrificial merit left over to use after the Millennium is ended; and as Divine Justice will not permit reconciliation except on the basis of an atoning—a reconciling—sacrifice (Heb. 2:17; 2 Cor. 5:18-21 [made Him sin, should be rendered, made Him a Sin-offering]; Rom. 5:6-11), there will be no atoning Priest with an atoning merit to minister reconciliation after the Millennium; for the correlative of the priest's sacrifice is reconciliation—atonement—at-one-ment. Where there is sin there must be a priestly sacrifice for sin, to reconcile God *to the sinner* (Heb. 9:22; 2:17; 2 Cor. 5:18-21; Rom. 5:6-11), and a priestly work for the sinner to reconcile him *to God*, reconciliation requiring that both sides be satisfied with one another. But the Sin-offering applying only during the Priest's ministry, and His ministry ending with the Millennium, there will be no priestly work (reconciliation of both sides at variance with one another is the very nature of the priest's work), no reconciliation, after the Millennium. During the Millennium all—the non-elect dead and the then living—will be given the one and only opportunity of gaining everlasting life from Christ's right to life and its pertinent life-rights, offered to all on condition of obedience. Those who rightly use this opportunity will be granted life by the Second Adam and will be nourished unto its complete obtaining by the Second Eve; and those who make shipwreck of that opportunity will be eternally blotted out of existence, even as those who, given now the opportunity of the elective salvation, make utter shipwreck of it, perish forever. Having exhausted their share in Christ's merit, there remaineth no more a sacrifice for sin (Heb. 10:26-31). Just so, those who do the same thing with their Millennial

opportunity exhaust their share in Christ's merit, and there remaineth for them no more a sacrifice for sin; for Christ and the Church will die no more, and thus there will be no more a Sin-offering available; after the High Priest for the world ceases to function which will be at the end of the Millennium. Hence there is to be no reconciliation in a post-Millennial Age.

It is the Mediator, Christ, the Head, and the Church, the Body, who makes the two Sin-offerings. The two Sin-offerings are thus shown in connection with the Mediator picture. This is especially taught in Heb. 9:13-23. The Mediator of the New Covenant is but one of the phases of the mystery. This Mediator is not a single individual, Jesus, as many so gratuitously assume, but a company—Jesus, the Head, and as such the dominating part of the Mediator, and the Church, the Body. Many Scriptures give us this thought, more particularly Heb. 9:13-23. Its Diaglott rendering is much better than that of the A.V., for which reason we will base our comments largely on it. In v. 13 we meet the expression, "bulls and goats," corresponding to the bullock and goat of Israel's atonement day service, and typing severally the same things—the bulls, the humanity of Jesus, the goats, that of the Church, laid down in sacrifice, as we have seen from Heb. 7:26, 27; 13:10-16; 10:1-10, 19, etc. The reason why a number of bulls and goats were used at the sealing of the Law Covenant was that all the people had to be sprinkled, and the blood of one bull and goat would not have sufficed to sprinkle about 2,000,000 people (v. 19). Had the blood of one bull and one goat been enough for the purpose at hand, only one of each would have been used. In v. 14 the antitype of Moses, who through the young men, the firstborns (Ex. 24:5-8), slew the bulls and goats, is shown to be the Christ, the slayer of the better sacrifices (*plural*, v. 23). The blood of the [emphatic] Christ does the antitypical cleansing. He is actually

spotless in the Head and reckonedly so in the Body; and by the Holy Spirit of sonship made the offering at Jordan in the Head and at Pentecost in the Body members, who represented the whole Body throughout the Age in that one act of offering. The blood of the Christ's Head cleanses our consciences from the *condemnation* of sin; and the blood of the Christ Body (since we, like our Lord, are perfected by suffering, Heb. 2:10; 1 Pet. 5:10) cleanses our consciences from the *power* of sin so that we can be meet for God's service. In v. 15 St. Paul points out what the death [blood] of the Christ, who is Head and Body, makes Him the Mediator of the New Covenant. This demonstrates that the Mediator is a multitudinous one, consisting of the mystery class, with Jesus the dominant, and therefore the representative member, of it; for which reason He, as the representative of the whole Mediator (the dominant part thus standing for the whole), is sometimes spoken of as the Mediator of the Covenant (Heb. 12:24; 1 Tim. 2:5). This Mediator—the Head and Body—is such, that His death (the merit being that of Jesus alone) canceling the sins committed under the first covenant, *i.e.*, those of the Jews, these Jews, having had the unchangeable call to the earthly favor (Rom. 11:29), might receive the promise given them—the land of Canaan as an eternal (not simply age-lasting) inheritance.

St. Paul gives some general remarks in vs. 15 and 16 on validating God's mediated covenants, on which we now comment: We have above given part of our proof that Jesus and the Church, as the Mediator of the New Covenant, during the entire Gospel Age, have been working on its seal. Jesus actually provides it by the sacrifice unto death of His right to life and its attendant life-rights, which, embargoed by imputation on behalf of the Church to fit her for sacrificing acceptably to God (1 Pet. 2:5; Heb. 13:15, 16), cannot be freed from this embargo to seal the New Covenant until the Church has completed its sacrifice, made acceptable by Christ's embargoed merit. Hence the

New Covenant cannot be in operation during the Gospel Age, since the sacrifices that constitute its seal are not yet complete. This is St. Paul's argument in Heb. 9:16, 17, which is well translated in the Diaglott as follows: "For where a covenant exists, the death of that which ratified it is necessary to be produced; because a covenant is firm over dead victims [plural, *victims*, not singular, *victim*], since it is never valid [and thus capable of proper functioning] when that which ratifies it is alive." In this passage the Apostle is laying down the general principle that prevails for the ratification and the consequent valid operation of blood-sealed covenants in God's plan. What precedes the ratification of a blood covenant is the death of the ratifier. Before the ratifier's death a blood-sealed covenant, the Apostle argues, is never valid, and becomes valid only after the ratifier's death. We have already given in part our proof that the ratifier—Mediator—of the New Covenant is the Christ, Head and Body. Therefore as long as any member of the Christ is alive the New Covenant cannot operate—for the Ratifier is thus not entirely dead. Hence, the Christ class not yet being entirely dead, the New Covenant does not yet operate. Notice that this passage speaks of blood-sealed covenants only. It does not describe a word-sealed covenant, like the one the Lord made with Noah, never again to destroy society by a flood (Gen. 9:8-17, Is. 54:9), nor a word-and-oath-sealed covenant, like the Sarah Covenant (Gen. 22:16-18; Heb. 6:16-20); but it speaks of God's blood-sealed covenants and says that they are firm, validly operative, over dead victims (plural, not *a dead victim*, singular). Hence in God's order blood-sealed covenants are ratified by a *plurality* of sacrifices. There are only two blood-sealed covenants between God and human beings: the Old Covenant between God and Israel, mediated by Moses through the blood of bulls and goats—a plurality of sacrifices, which represented Moses himself as dead in a sense, even as

the atonement day bullock and goat stood for Aaron and represented him as dead in a sense—and the New Covenant, ratified by the death of the Christ, Head and Body, its Mediator. Since God's blood-sealed covenants are ratified—made valid, firm—over dead victims, the new Covenant must be ratified—made valid, firm—over dead victims.

These victims are Jesus as a human being and the Church as human beings. The Apostle, vs. 18-22, proceeds to prove that the Old Covenant was ratified, and all its adjuncts were made valid for their purpose by the blood of a plurality of sacrifices—bulls and goats, and then in v. 23 he proves that the things in the kingdom of heaven here called heaven—its covenant, its justice, its people, its tabernacle, its vessels, are all made validly operative by the death of better sacrifices—plural, since the humanity of the Head and the humanity of the Body are these better sacrifices—for covenant purposes. Therefore Heb. 9:13-23 overwhelmingly proves that the New Covenant has not yet begun to operate; because its entire Mediator in His humanity is not yet dead.

The 1908-1911 sifters are mistaken when they teach that the New Covenant was ratified at Cavalry. Its surety was there completed (Heb. 7:22), for Jesus' death guarantees the New Covenant as coming; but it awaits the death of its entire Ratifier before it can be sealed, since it is sealed by the death of its Ratifier (Heb. 9:16, 17). The fact that Jesus is in Heb. 7:22 called the surety of the better than the Old Covenant—the New Covenant—proves that it does not yet operate; for surety is furnished and made to prevail until some future thing sets in, which is guaranteed by the surety as coming by and by. Therefore Heb. 7:22 proves that at the time of the writing of the Epistle to the Hebrews, written 64 A.D., several years after St. Paul's release from his first Roman imprisonment, the New Covenant was not yet in existence, but was at that time to be a future thing;

for incontrovertibly surety is given not for a past or present thing, but for a future thing. Hence the New Covenant did not begin to operate at Pentecost. On the contrary, the Body of the ratifying Mediator of the New Covenant began at Pentecost to be offered up, and this Body's offering up has ever since been continuing, having now progressed so far as to reach the feet of the Christ (Is. 52:7)—the last members of the Christ class, whose humanity is now on the altar being offered up spotless to God under our Head.

St. Paul proceeds to explain, type and antitype, the sealing of the blood-mediated covenants, of which there are two and only two in God's plan. The sprinkling of the book of the Law by the blood of bulls and goats (v. 19) types the satisfaction of Divine Justice by the death of the antitypical Bullock and Goat. That book is a copy, type (v. 23), of the thing in the Kingdom of Heaven which is Divine Justice. That sprinkling will be done instantly and will instantly seal the covenant Godward. The sprinkling of the people (v. 19) is a copy of the sealing of the New Covenant to the people in the earthly phase of the Kingdom of Heaven, and it will take 1,000 years to complete, *i.e.*, it will take the 1,000 years of the Millennium to give the people—Israel primarily and the Gentiles who join Israel under the New Covenant, a privilege that will be open to all the non-elect dead and living then—the right to life and its life-rights, Jesus' and the Church's legacy to Israel and the Gentiles under the New Covenant. The tabernacle in its court feature was sprinkled, typing that the Ancient and Youthful Worthies would in the kingdom be cleansed by the same Mediator's blood in the sealed New Covenant. The cleansing of the vessels types cleansing any doctrinal, corrective, refutative, and ethical teaching that may by the Ancient and Youthful Worthies be in any way contaminated by error during the kingdom. Note, please, how the Apostle, after speaking of the cleansing of the copies, the types, *i.e.*, the book, people, tabernacle and vessels, tells us that

their antitypes—God's Justice, Millennial Israel and the Gentiles joining themselves to Israel, the Ancient and Youthful Worthies and their teachings—will be cleansed by better sacrifices [plural] than the bulls and goats. Jesus' personal sacrifice was but one, and the Church's sacrifice is but one; but together they are two, and therefore their separate sacrifices are designated by the plural term, sacrifices. Therefore, Heb. 9:13-23 proves that (1) the Mediator of the New Covenant is a multitudinous one—Jesus, the Head, and the Church, His Body, and (2) there are two sacrifices, not one only, that seal the New Covenant. This fact destroys the theory under review, because the Covenant is thus shown in its Mediator to involve the Body as distinct from the Bride figure—a thing that the theory under review accepts.

Deut. 18:15-18 shows the Prophet like unto Moses—the Mediator—to be a multitudinous one. This we see taught in the words, "A prophet from the midst of thee of thy brethren," *i.e.*, a prophet consisting of brethren gathered out from among God's nominal people of Fleshly and Spiritual Israel's. St. Peter (Acts 3:19-25) was the first of the Apostles to catch even a partial understanding of this multitudinous Prophet; for it was not until St. Paul's ministry that this Prophet was fully understood as being the Christ, Head and Body, the hidden mystery now made manifest to the saints (Col. 1:26, 27). A comparison of Is. 49:7, 8 with 2 Cor. 6:1, 2 proves the same thing; for the one (Head and Body) who, in Is. 49:7, 8, it is said, will be given for (in the interests of, *i.e.*, to seal) a covenant of the people, is in 2 Cor. 6:1, 2 by Divine inspiration shown to include the Church, called, in this the time accepted, for sacrifice unto the great salvation (Heb. 2:3). The Messenger of the Covenant (Mal. 3:1) likewise is the Head and Body, who in their Second Advent will come to seal the Covenant. This passage also applies to Christ—the Head and Body—coming to mankind in His First Advent, and

that because He thus types the coming of this larger Mediator in the Second Advent, even as John the Baptist typed the Church in the flesh in the end of this Age, preparing the way for the larger Christ. 2 Cor. 3:6 calls us *servants*—those who advance or further the thing at hand—of the New Covenant. We serve, advance, the Covenant, especially in three ways now: (1) by laying down our lives for its seal; (2) by developing characters that will fit us to administer its provisions when they will operate; and (3) by helping our brethren to do the same two things. Hence this passage implies the multitudinous membership of the Mediator, as Head and Body. Our sharing with our Lord in drinking the cup of death makes it by His merit the seal of the New Covenant (Luke 22:20). Jesus is the surety of a better covenant (Heb. 7:22) than the Old Law Covenant, because His merit makes the death of His Body the seal of that Covenant. Hence His suretying it proves our participation in its Mediator. To surety something implies that it will operate later on—in the future, and not now. The allusion (Heb. 8:3) to the High Priest who offers gifts and *sacrifices*, proves that from v. 3 on the Head and Body are meant. Hence v. 6 refers to the Mediator as Head and Body, not simply to the Head. The New Covenant is legalized—not established—on better promises. What are they? The oath-bound promises to the Christ, Head and Body (Gen. 22:17, 18; Gal. 3:16, 29); for these promises arouse them to such sacrificing zeal as enables them as New Creatures to lay down their humanity unto death as the seal of the New Covenant. This seal, so wrought, legalizes the New Covenant. Thus our examination of the Mediator figure proves that the Church is a part of the World's Mediator, and as such lays down a sin-offering under Her Head. The Head and Body figure is here set forth and destroys the distinction necessary to the theory under examination, that of the 1908-1911 sifters, whose views are accepted by the majority and tolerated by the rest of the P.B.I.

We congratulate the former adherents, who, loyal to our Pastor's teachings on the Sin-offerings, Mediator and Covenants, have left the P.B.I. after it in its majority fell away from the pertinent truths; and we deplore the stand of the unfaithful P.B.I. on this matter. This stand is a proof that the New Creatures in the P.B.I. who endorse or tolerate these errors are crown-losers. "From such turn away"!

Our review of the antitypical Gershonites in both of their main branches while in their unclean Levitical condition is now completed. Theirs is a sorry story. As typed by the Gershonites, the descendants of Levi's firstborn son, Gershon, they might have become the chief of the three groups of the Levites; but as because of unfitness the typical Gershonites failed to keep the chief place among the Levites, and had to yield that place, to which, other things being equal, they had the prior right, to the Kohathites; so the antitypical Gershonites, because of the greater guilt of their revolutionisms than those of other Levites, failed to keep their place, to which, other things being equal, they had the prior right, and had to yield that place to the antitypical Kohathites. Yea, they have had to sink into a position about the Epiphany Tabernacle lower even than that of the antitypical Merarites. While the Scriptures chastise the evils of the leader of the antitypical Merarites more than those of the leaders of the antitypical Gershonites, the latter are more disapproved in the Scriptural types than the former, which accounts for their lower position about the Epiphany Tabernacle than the formers'. However, we rejoice to know that there is a silver lining to the dark cloud: These will shortly begin to cleanse themselves, and then the Lord will give them the ministry of evangelists, missionaries and preachers of the truths of Studies, Vol. I to the new Camp that will be begun when the Levites will come to their senses. We rejoice in this and hail it with eager expectation.