

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 VI

MERARIISM

20,000 EDITION

"Every One that Heareth these Sayings of mine, and Doeth
them not, shall be Likened unto a Foolish man, which Built
his House upon the Sand" (Matt. 7: 26).

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 fulness 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.

THE title of this book is based on the name given one of the three divisions of the tribe of Levi, viz., Merari, and is designed to suggest the doctrines, history and practices of the Merarite division of the Epiphany Levites. In Chapter V of Vol. IV of the Epiphany Studies we gave a few particulars on the Epiphany Levites, who consist of three general groups: antitypical Gershonites, Merarites and Kohathites. We there pointed out that the antitypical Gershonites consist of the antitypical Libnites, the B. S. C. (of Britain) and the antitypical Shimites, the P. B. I.; that the antitypical Kohathites consist of the antitypical Uzzielites (Sturgeonites), Hebronites (Ritchieites), these two being now dead as movements, but having successors in other movements, antitypical Izeharites (Olsonites) and antitypical Amramites (Hirsho-Kittingerites); and that the antitypical Merarites consist of the antitypical Mahlites (the Societyites) and the antitypical Mushites (the Standfasts). The differences between the three Levite groups are the following: The antitypical Kohathites do not have corporations or committees to control their teachings and works; the antitypical Gershonites have such corporations; for they, having failed to get control of the corporations left by our Pastor, formed such of their own; while the antitypical Mahlite Merarites got control of our Pastor's three corporations; and the antitypical Mushite Merarites sanction the uses made of these three up to the Spring of 1918, but not thereafter, and have in their Elijah Voice Society formed a corporation of their own. It is of the doctrines, history and practices of these two groups of Merarites that this book treats.

By far the larger part of this book treats of the main doctrines, history and practices of the antitypical Mahlite Merarites, because of the decidedly more prominent, influential and erroneous part that these have taken among God's people than the antitypical Mushite Merarites. And because decidedly the most prominent, influential and erroneous part therein has been taken by J.F. Rutherford, to whom for short we will refer by his initials, decidedly the larger part of this book treats of a history of his pertinent acts and a refutation of his erroneous official teachings and practices. The exposures of his main revolutionistic

official acts and practices, and the refutations of his main errors of teaching are not made from the desire to become the president of the Society, nor from the spirit of retaliation for the great wrongs that he and his main supporters have done the author, as he has taught his followers to believe, but out of love for the Lord, the Truth and the brethren. Satan is seeking more through J.F.R. than through all the other Truth-errorists combined to destroy from the earth the Truth and its arrangements given us by the Lord through that Servant. And believing that the Lord has now raised us up, as He in the past raised up faithful servants (Mic. 5: 5, 6), to defend His Truth and its arrangements against its attackers among professed Truth people (the Assyrian here is the great and the little nominal church, all professing to be Truth people), we have, among other things, devoted ourself to the Lord in the defense of His teachings and arrangements given through that Servant against their attackers. As the bishops of Rome during the Gospel Age, in the course of their introducing the apostasy, while professing loyalty to the teachings and practices of the Apostles, by craft and force, from a small beginning gradually set aside various truths and their arrangements given by God through the Apostles, and substituted counterfeit ones in their place, until they finally brought to a completion the Satanic counterfeit of God's teachings and arrangements that we find in great papacy, wherein there is scarcely a remnant of Apostolic teachings and arrangements found; so J.F.R., during the miniature Gospel Age, in the course of the apostasy that he has developed, while professing loyalty to the teachings and practices of that Servant, by craft and force, from a small beginning gradually set aside the various truths and arrangements given by God through that Servant, and substituted counterfeit ones in their place in little papacy.*

PAUL S. L. JOHNSON.

Philadelphia, Pa., March 24, 1938.

* Whenever in THE EPIPHANY STUDIES IN THE SCRIPTURES we refer to our Pastor's volumes, we call them Studies, Vol. I, II, etc.; the volumes of this series we call Vol. I, II, etc.

CONTENTS

CHAPTER I. HARVEST SIFTINGS REVIEWED.

A SYNOPSIS OF THIS CHAPTER. ARRANGEMENTS FOR THE EUROPEAN TRIP. THE BRITISH SITUATION BEFORE AND AFTER THE ABSOLUTELY WITHOUT AUTHORITY CABLE. J.F. RUTHERFORD'S AND J. HEMERY'S MULTITUDINOUS AND GROSS MISREPRESENTATIONS. J.F. RUTHERFORD'S COURSE TOWARD THE AUTHOR AFTER HIS RETURN TO AMERICA. A CHARITABLE EXPLANATION OF J.F. RUTHERFORD'S INVOLVED COURSE. A SUPPLEMENT. 7

CHAPTER II. THE CHURCH COMPLETELY ORGANIZED IN RELATION TO THE SOCIETY AS A CHANNEL.

THE CHURCH COMPLETELY ORGANIZED. ITS MISSION. ITS BIBLICAL ORGANIZATION. THE SOCIETY'S PLACE IN THE HARVEST. THE SOCIETY AS A CHANNEL. TWO WRONG VIEWS OF THE SOCIETY AS A CHANNEL EXAMINED. THE TRUE VIEW OF "THE CHANNEL." SOME HINDRANCES TO FRUITFUL SERVICE. EXAMINATION OF FURTHER SOCIETY-CHANNEL CLAIMS. 97

CHAPTER III. A REJECTED SERVANT AND SHEPHERD.

THOU SHALT NOT BEAR FALSE WITNESS. THAT EVIL SERVANT OF MATT. 24: 48-51. THE FOOLISH, UNPROFITABLE SHEPHERD OF ZECH. 11: 15-17. 165

CHAPTER IV.
RIGHT-EYE DARKENING.

COURT $\frac{3}{4}$ TYPE AND ANTITYPE. VIEWS AND REVIEWS. POUNDS AND
TALENTS. MORE RIGHT-EYE DARKENING. MORE RIGHT-EYE
DARKENING. STILL MORE RIGHT-EYE DARKENING. 189

CHAPTER V.
FIRST MISCELLANY ON DRUNKEN FOLLIES OF
RIGHT-EYE DARKENING.

FURTHER RIGHT-EYE DARKENING. RIGHT-EYE DARKENING ON
PHILADELPHIA AND LAODICEA. RIGHT-EYE DARKENING ON THE
PYRAMID. SOME FOLLIES OF RIGHT-EYE DARKENING. SOME
DRUNKEN FOLLIES OF RIGHT-EYE DARKENING. 331

CHAPTER VI.
SECOND MISCELLANY ON DRUNKEN FOLLIES OF
RIGHT-EYE DARKENING.

MORE DRUNKEN FOLLIES OF RIGHT-EYE DARKENING. STILL MORE
DRUNKEN FOLLIES OF RIGHT-EYE DARKENING. FURTHER
DRUNKEN FOLLIES OF RIGHT-EYE DARKENING. MORE FURTHER
DRUNKEN FOLLIES OF RIGHT-EYE DARKENING. 517

CHAPTER VII.
MUSHIISM.

STANDFASTISM EXAMINED. ELIJAH VOICEISM EXAMINED.
CONCLUDING REMARKS ON MERARIISM. 731

CHAPTER I.

HARVEST SIFTINGS REVIEWED.

A SYNOPSIS OF THIS CHAPTER. ARRANGEMENTS FOR THE EUROPEAN TRIP. THE BRITISH SITUATION BEFORE AND AFTER THE ABSOLUTELY-WITHOUT-AUTHORITY CABLE. J.F. RUTHERFORD'S AND J. HEMERY'S MULTITUDINOUS AND GROSS MISREPRESENTATIONS. J.F. RUTHERFORD'S COURSE TOWARD THE AUTHOR AFTER HIS RETURN TO AMERICA. A CHARITABLE EXPLANATION OF J.F. RUTHERFORD'S INVOLVED COURSE. A SUPPLEMENT.

[Written Aug., 1917.]

To The International Bible Students:

My Beloved Brethren:—Grace and peace. Your hearts have doubtless been deeply pained by J.F.R.'s Harvest Siftings—pained whether you believe it true or untrue, in its general setting of the persons and things treated of therein. It is to ease this pain, and to point to a way out that moves me to answer. It is condemnable to plunge the Lord's saints into a controversy over a matter that, as far as concerns me, should never have been published broadcast among them, much less among many outsiders. But by this uncalled-for act, I have been placed before the Church, which for 14 years I have faithfully served, and before others in such a bad light as to destroy utterly my usefulness, unless truthfully my actions can be set before the Church in a favorable light. I deplore the necessity of answering Harvest Siftings, especially as the answer must be of a personal kind, and involve others. Yet this is in harmony with Bro. Russell's article quoted in the Tower of September 15, 1917, page 283, second col. and first par. Much rather would I give my time to telling "the old, old story." But if I am ever again to tell the brethren "the old, old story" in a way fruitful to them, I must stand before them in the light of what I have been and am: a faithful servant of the Truth, as it has been expounded to us in the writings and sayings of our beloved

Bro. Russell. How to have been more faithful to the Lord, the Truth, the Brethren and Bro. Russell's policies than I was in the work that I was privileged last winter to do in Britain, I do not know. I *was faithful to these almost to death by exhaustion*. It is because my service in Britain has been so grossly caricatured in Harvest Siftings, as to be unrecognizable and injurious to the Truth and the Brethren, that I will tell the main facts, as I know them, relying upon God's grace to enable me to write with charity toward all, with malice toward none. That grace enables me to keep sweet in the love of God toward all, especially towards J.F.R. and Jesse Hemery, whom after Bro. Russell's death I loved above all other brethren. While conscious of the great wrong they have done me, from the bottom of my heart I pray for them: God bless them! May I not ask the reader not to judge my case, until after a prayerful, impartial reading of my statement?

I will first give a synopsis of this Chapter, thereafter details.

I. Additional to the letter given Nov. 3 for passports, and the letter to the British Managers, the Executive Committee on Nov. 10 gave Bro. Johnson credentials, empowering him with full authority in the Society's work and business in certain foreign countries, the Committee telling him Nov. 10 that his authorization papers described the powers they wanted him to exercise.

II. Nov. 21 at his first meeting with the three London Managers he showed them his authorization papers *as a statement of his powers*; and reported this fact to the Committee, which offered no objections in their letter of acknowledgment. From that time on he claimed and exercised full power and authority in the Society's affairs in Britain.

III. For three months he performed many executive acts, and reported them first to the Committee, and

later to J.F.R., from whom before Feb. 27 no objection came that these were unauthorized.

IV. He found two of the London Managers disregarding, changing and abrogating various of Bro. Russell's arrangements, for which on the authority of his credentials he dismissed them.

V. His course toward these two Managers was generally approved by the British brethren, particularly by the Tabernacle Congregation, the Bethel Family, especially Jesse Hemery and J.F.R.'s Investigation Commission, which Bro. Johnson neither sought unduly to influence, nor ignored.

VI. When J.F.R., despite the fact that the Board sent Bro. Johnson as the Society's, not as the President's representative, attempted to recall him and rescind his Society-sealed credentials, the latter ceased all activities for a week; then, realizing that J.F.R.'s course was unauthorized by, and usurpation of, the Board, he resumed his activities, exercising no other authority than formerly, and appealed to the Board against J.F.R.'s course. Later, without authorization from, or knowledge of, the Board, J.F.R., *in the name of the Society*, cancelled his credentials, using the Society seal.

VII. Because of his opposition to Bro. Johnson's resumption of his activities, Jesse Hemery was suspended, but never dismissed, no force, nor violence, nor seizure of anything marking Bro. Johnson's course.

VIII. Bro. Johnson secured an injunction, primarily against the bank, and secondarily against Jesse Hemery, H.J. Shearn and Wm. Crawford; because it was the only way to prevent the three making operative a financial scheme against the Society. Unable to deposit monies in the bank, by authority of the High Court and by his counsel's advice, he had the proper official place this money in a safety deposit box to safeguard it, and prevent it from being improperly diverted by the three Managers through their scheme.

IX. As soon as he could safely leave the Society's interests in Britain, he returned to America to report conditions to the Board. J.F.R. prevented his having a full and fair hearing, greatly misrepresenting his activities to the Board and others.

X. Thwarted by J.F.R. from getting a fair hearing before the Board, he laid the case before five of its members individually, all of whom took his view of the British situation. He did not direct four of these in, and he knew nearly nothing in advance of, their moves in their controversy with the President. He knows nothing of their being in a conspiracy to wreck the Society, or depose the President; nor does he believe it true of them.

XI. He learned that J.F.R., W.E. Van Amburgh and A.H. MacMillan conspired to secure for the first named, Bro. Russell's full authority, beginning this before the election. They *prearranged every detail* in the proceedings of the voting shareholders' meeting by which he was elected. *A week before the election J.F.R. placed in the hands of the Press a detailed account of these proceedings as news of past doings.*

XII. J.F.R.'s opposition to Bro. Johnson is not so much due to the British matter, as to the latter's advocating the Board's controllership in the Society's affairs, as against the president's. The latter has systematically misrepresented him, especially in his "Harvest Siftings," whose setting as a whole and in many details is false. We will refer usually to the three British Managers by initials for short.

The reader is requested to note particularly the dates in this review. They serve in many cases to clarify the situation. Last summer Bro. Russell arranged for me to take the European trip; and after his death the Board of the W.T.B.&T.S., Nov. 2, decided to carry out his wishes, appointing a committee to confer with me on the trip. This was not the Executive

Committee, which was appointed Nov. 7 and with which my final understandings on the trip were reached. Having by correspondence, not by a visit, learned from the passports department at Washington, that if I were to be granted passports, especially for Germany and France, I would have to give strong reasons in writing to the department in Washington, I reported this fact to the committee appointed Nov. 2, especially to J.F.R., and asked for a letter, *not for credentials*. Without my offering even a hint as to what the letter should contain, J.F.R., entirely alone and unassisted by me, dictated a letter which may be called a letter of appointment; because it purported to offer me an appointment as a special representative of the Society with powers of attorney, or full power and authority in the work and business of the Society in certain foreign countries. It being necessary that the letter be sent immediately with my application for passports to the department, and not to make it appear that the letter was dictated the same morning that it was presented to the passport office in New York, it was dated Nov. 1, though actually dictated the morning of Nov. 3. Its only purpose was to enable me to get passports; and it was understood on that day, that my work was to be that of a Pilgrim only. When it was presented to W.E. Van Amburgh for his signature as the Society's secretary he hesitated to sign it, thinking that it offered too great powers; but when assured that it was not bonafide, he signed it. He did not make any objections to signing the credentials the morning of Nov. 11 because then he knew the credentials were bonafide. The letter of appointment was an altogether different thing from the credentials. This letter follows:

"Prof. Paul S.L. Johnson, New York City, N.Y.

"Dear Sir: The undersigned, The Watch Tower Bible and Tract Society, as you are advised, is a religious corporation, incorporated under the laws of the State of

Pennsylvania, and maintaining an office in the City of New York; and is now, and for several years has been engaged in religious and philanthropic work throughout America and in foreign countries; that its work and business is incorporated in Great Britain under the name of the International Bible Students' Association. This corporation, or society, also maintains branches, and conducts its work in the following countries, to wit: Germany, Norway, Sweden, Denmark, Holland, Finland-Russia, Switzerland and France in its corporate name, to wit: Watch Tower Bible and Tract Society. The President of this Society having recently died, and the condition of the Society's work and business in the above and foregoing foreign countries, due to the great war, is such that an imperative necessity has arisen that we at once send a special representative to those countries to carefully examine into the condition of the work and affairs of the Society and to make report thereof. Our Society, therefore, has this day appointed you as its special representative to perform such duties, and hopes you will accept the appointment. Your duties in the premises will be: to proceed without delay to Great Britain, and thereafter to the other countries named, to there carefully examine the books and other private papers of the Association kept and maintained in the countries herein above named; to investigate the financial condition of the work and affairs of the Society in said countries; and generally *to do whatsoever is necessary, or may become immediately necessary, to protect our interests and work in said countries*, FULL POWER AND AUTHORITY BEING HEREBY GIVEN AND GRANTED UNTO YOU TO DO AND PERFORM THE SAME. In connection with your duties above outlined, you will be expected, at such time or times as may be convenient, to preach the Gospel of our Lord and Savior Jesus Christ to all who may desire to hear; to hold public religious meetings for such purposes and to do whatsoever in your judgment may be necessary to further the interests of the Society in spreading the Gospel in said countries. In witness whereof, the Society has caused this instrument to be signed with the corporate name and by its Vice-President, and attested by the Secretary and

the seal of the corporation this first day of November, A.D. 1916.

"WATCH TOWER BIBLE AND TRACT SOCIETY.

"Per A. I. RITCHIE, Vice-President.

"W.E. VAN AMBURGH, Secretary and Treasurer."

That morning, Nov. 3, this letter and my application for passports were given to the proper officials at New York to forward to Washington. In due time the passports were granted. During that afternoon I remarked to J.F. Rutherford that I ought to have credentials to facilitate my entry especially into France and Germany. I said not a word as to what they should contain. They were not dictated until Nov. 10. At the time I asked for them it was understood that my powers were to be those of a pilgrim only. *J.F.R. does not mention these credentials at all, which were addressed, not to the British Managers, but "to all whom these presents may come."* The letter to the British Managers, dictated Nov. 10, was a third thing, and was quite different from the letter of appointment and the credentials; and was undoubtedly meant in good faith. So far there is substantial agreement between J.F.R.'s view and mine, as to the understanding of my powers Nov. 3. The following are the credentials, which as before said, were dictated Nov. 10, after the passports were granted which were dated by the Passports Department Nov. 4, a clear proof that the credentials could not, as J.F.R. claims, have been given me to secure passports.

"Brooklyn, N.Y., U.S.A.

"TO ALL TO WHOM THESE PRESENTS MAY COME—

GREETINGS!

"This is to certify that Prof. Paul S.L. Johnson of New York City has been appointed by this Society—The Watch Tower Bible and Tract Society, an American corporation, as its special representative [I] *with full power and authority to do and perform whatsoever things may be necessary in connection with the work and business of this corporation in any country to which he may be sent;* [II]

to have power and authority to examine the property and stock of the various branches of this corporation outside of the United States; [III] and to call for and receive financial reports and other reports as to the general condition of the work of this Society from the person or persons in charge of the office or headquarters of any branch of this Society. [IV] He is also the fully accredited representative of the Society to lecture on and teach the Bible and to preach the Gospel in any country of the world. IN WITNESS WHEREOF WE have caused the corporate name of the Society to be signed to this instrument by its Vice-President, and to be duly attested by the signature of its Secretary and the seal of the corporation this 10th day of November, A.D. 1916.

"WATCH TOWER BIBLE AND TRACT SOCIETY.

"Per A. I. RITCHIE, Vice-President.

"Attest:

"W.E. VAN AMBURGH, Secretary."

It will be noticed that the credentials state four things as my powers. J.F.R. alone dictated these, unassisted by me, except that, he having difficulty in stating tersely my duties as a pilgrim, I suggested the following clause, which he accepted: "to lecture on and teach the Bible and to preach the Gospel." Between Nov. 8 and 10, and not before, whatever their thoughts might previously have been, at various times all of the members of the Executive Committee—Bros. Ritchie, Van Amburgh and Rutherford—asked me to do things marked [II] and [III] in the credentials. For example, Bro. Van Amburgh remarked: "Bro. Johnson, keep your eyes and ears wide open and your mouth shut, and get for us information on every line that would help us better to understand the business and work of the Society wherever you go." It was during these days that the idea grew in the Executive Committee that I was to act as *special representative* of the Society. All three members of this committee agree that I was sent as a special representative, as well as a pilgrim. Before the credentials were dictated, and after I noticed that of the four powers offered

me in the letter of appointment, the committee had asked me to exercise three, as well as spoke of me as the special representative of the Society, the title used of me in the authorization papers, the question arose in my mind, "I wonder, if, after all, the Committee does not mean the letter of appointment and the credentials that were to be dictated as genuine. I must find this out, so that I do not go beyond, nor fall short of, their desires in the matter." Accordingly, speaking of the letter of appointment and credentials, I asked them a question of the following import: Do these papers give a statement of the powers that you want me to exercise? Each member of the committee answered "Yes." The reason the Executive Committee decided to make the powers of my letter of appointment and my credentials actual is that the correspondence of the quarreling elders of the London Tabernacle was read by me Nov. 8, 9 and the night of the 9th was reported on by me to the Committee, which at once saw that I needed powers of attorney to handle the situation, as my pilgrim powers were not sufficient thereto. [For details see Vol. IV, Chapter IV, paragraph (41).] After my return from England, Bro. Ritchie was the only one of the three who remembered this question and answer. Bro. Van Amburgh, who would not sign the letter of appointment Nov. 3, until assured that it offered me fictitious powers, on my return told me that things were so hazy to his memory that he could not say whether this question was asked or not. A letter from Bro. Ritchie on this point follows:

"BROOKLYN, N. Y., Aug. 18, 1917.

"DEAR BROTHER JOHNSON:

"In reply to your inquiry, in the interests of justice I am pleased to say that I distinctly remember, and have always remembered, that before going to Great Britain last November you asked Bros. Rutherford, Van Amburgh and myself, if we wished you to exercise all the powers

outlined in the letter and the credentials written for you by Bro. Rutherford and signed by Bro. Van Amburgh and myself; and *that each of us answered 'Yes.'* From the time the first arrangements were made with you to go abroad, having in mind the disturbed condition of affairs in Europe, it was my desire that you not only preach and do regular pilgrim work; but that in a sense you also look into conditions there and advise us—and I understood this to be the thought of the other two members of the Executive Committee. I was surprised at the sweeping terms of the credentials, as drawn up by Bro. Rutherford; but thinking there might be some legal technicality requiring such phrasing, and thinking that you understood the credentials as we did I answered 'Yes' to your question. When, however, your letters showed that you considered that you had power to dismiss brethren from the office in London, I was very much surprised; and I must confess I had some misgivings. I did not, however, agree with Bro. Rutherford's handling the matter—considering that such an important affair should come before the Board of Directors. When I questioned him, he to my great surprise said it was something with which the Board had nothing whatever to do. It was then I began to see the trend of events here.

"Your Brother in the interests of the Truth,

[Signed] "A. I. RITCHIE."

Bro. Ritchie says that when he answered "Yes," he had in mind those things only of which the Committee expressly spoke, and all agree that no express mention was made of powers of attorney. As Bro. Ritchie did not grasp the full import of my question, so the other two brothers might not; and therefore their "Yes" might not have meant to them what it did to me. However, I understood their "Yes" to answer the question that I asked. Deeply do I now regret that I did not discuss in detail the first power of which the credentials speak. However, I did not invent the thought that I had powers of attorney. I got this thought from the Committee's answer to my question, which was plain and simple. If they misunderstood

the import of my question, it was not my fault; they are responsible for giving me the thought: The following facts prove that from the beginning of my visit in England, I believed that my papers meant what they said, and on the basis of such belief acted as I did. (1) As soon as possible after my arrival, I called the three Managers together, telling them that I had come, not simply as a pilgrim, but also as a special representative, whose powers were described in my letter of appointment and my credentials, which were then read. Then the Executive Committee's letter to the British Managers was read. Notice, please, that in this letter paragraph 11 shows that I was to exercise the third power mentioned in the credentials, while paragraph 12 shows that I was charged especially to visit the headquarters of the Society in the various countries, which was to perform, at least, the duties outlined in [II] and [III] in the credentials. This letter, which J.F.R. dictated, stated in paragraph 5 that the Society is controlled by its Board of Directors, a thing which he has many times since denied. Parts from a carbon copy of this letter follow:

"BROOKLYN, N. Y., November 10, 1916.

"Messrs. Hemery, Shearn & Crawford,

"Managers, Watch Tower Bible & Tract Society,

"London, England.

"Dear Brethren In Christ:—Our dear Brother Paul S.L. Johnson will bear this message to you. He comes to render such assistance as is possible to the Church in Great Britain, and we are sure that each of you will be glad to cooperate with him. ... [Paragraphs 2, 3 and 4, which to save space will be omitted, treat of Bro. Russell's last days, death, funeral and will.] [Par. 5.] The affairs of the WATCH TOWER BIBLE AND TRACT SOCIETY, and the other religious corporations organized in conjunction with it, will be managed exactly as they were in the life time of our dear Pastor. *Being a corporation, it is, of course, controlled by its Board of Directors.* Brother A.N. Pierson was elected on the Board immediately after

Brother Russell's death, and the Board of Directors now is composed of the following seven persons, to wit: Brother A. I. Ritchie, Brother A.N. Pierson, Brother J. D. Wright, Brother W.E. Van Amburgh, Brother H. C. Rockwell, Brother I. F. Hoskins, Brother J.F. Rutherford. [Paragraph 6 treats of the appointment of the Executive Committee; 7 of the coming election of the Society's officers; 8 treats of the effects and lessons of Bro. Russell's death; 9, 10 of British preparations for Brother Johnson's pilgrim tour. To save space these will be omitted.] [Par. 11.] We would be pleased to have you submit to Bro. Johnson a report of the condition of the Society's affairs in Great Britain, and of the work generally. It is not our thought that he should examine the books himself [The committee, fearing it would offend the managers, made an exception to the British books], but that you give to him such detailed information as may show the general condition of the Society's work there. [Par. 12.] It is our hope that Brother Johnson may be able to visit the Branches of our Society on the Continent. Please kindly render him such aid as is possible in this behalf. Assuring you of our love and best wishes, we remain,

"Your brethren and fellow-servants in Christ,

"EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE."

Thus it will be seen that at the first opportunity after my arrival in Britain, I showed the three Managers that I had full power and authority to act in the work and business of the Society. From that time on I acted from that standpoint. In my first batch of letters to Brooklyn, I reported the fact that I had shown the Managers my authorization papers *as an evidence of my powers. No objection came from the Committee for this act in their letter of acknowledgment.* Then and there they should have objected, if they thought that I was using the papers fraudulently.

(2) Dec. 5 I sent the Executive Committee my first batch of letters. In one of these, among other things, I stated that I had temporarily put the Pastoral Work in charge of Jesse Hemery; had appointed

the three Managers as a committee to examine the V. D. M. questions for the use of the churches at the coming annual elections; and, unlike the American procedure, was continuing Bro. Russell's sermons in the papers. To these executive acts they made no remonstrance in their letter of acknowledgment.

(3) I undertook to settle the Tabernacle difficulty, the difficulties between the Managers, and the revision of the convention program as soon as they brought these to my attention, all of which were done before Dec. 1, and I reported these things to the Executive Committee in my first letters. The Committee made no remonstrance in their letter of acknowledgment.

(4) I asked, Dec. 5, the Executive Committee to send me a copy of every letter that they sent to the London Managers, that we might not "cross" one another in our dealings with them. From that time on not only copies of the Executive Committee's, but later also of President Rutherford's letters were sent to me. As pilgrim and investigator I did not need them, but I did as special representative with powers of attorney.

(5) On Dec. 28 or 29 I wrote a letter to the Executive Committee, in which I asked them, *as I was special representative*, to deal with the Managers through me alone, as long as I was in Britain. If I did not believe that I had full power and authority in the Society's affairs, how could I have asked such a thing? No remonstrance was made to this request in the letter of acknowledgment. It was not answered. This request should have been answered, and I should have been told that I misunderstood my official powers, if they thought I did.

(6) Despite the fact that I so wrote, acted and reported these acts, which were based on the ground that I had full powers, I was never once told that I was going beyond my powers, until the "absolutely-without-authority cable" reached me Feb. 28, nearly

four weeks after I had dismissed H.J. Shearn and W. Crawford, which occurred Feb. 3. In a cablegram that reached me Feb. 19, J.F.R. showed that he was not pleased with the dismissal of these, and asked for their reinstatement. I was recalled in a cablegram sent by him Feb. 26, and that reached me Feb. 28. Though performing and reporting executive acts, I was not during those three months even once told that my duties were only those of an investigator and pilgrim, *i.e.*, the things covered by points [II], [III] and [IV] in the credentials, as should have been done, had they considered me going beyond my duties and powers. Not only did the Committee, Nov. 10, give me the thought, by their affirmative answer to my question, but by their not remonstrating against any of my executive acts, they continued me in the thought that I had powers of attorney. They, not I, are responsible for my so thinking.

The following quotation from a letter that I wrote J.F.R., Jan. 27, shows that I had from the outstart reported to the Society at Brooklyn that I was performing executive acts in Britain, which were, of course, based on the thought that I had powers of attorney:

"Just yesterday through THE LABOR TRIBUNE did I find out that you were elected President of the W.T.B.&T.S. I rejoice with you in this privilege of service with which the Lord has honored you. You were my choice, and for that reason I requested Bro. Spill to cast my 416 voting shares in your favor. ... It [my support] will be given to you without stint, as you follow the Lord's and our beloved Pastor Russell's teachings and policies, as I am sure you will. ... Never did I learn to sympathize with our beloved Bro. Russell as I have learned to do since coming to England, *and having administrative problems here, such as he had, to solve.* ... *Through other communications—to the Executive Committee—you will have found out something of what I have been having to*

unwrap. I know, my beloved brother, that you will have many, many problems of this kind to meet."

(7) My authorization papers were by my cooperation publicly and privately read to and by many as genuine.

J.F.R. knows all these facts and my understanding of the genuineness of my credentials. Why does he not mention them in his "Harvest Siftings"? Would their statement not have totally changed the impression that his "Harvest Siftings" gives?

Before I sailed I was so filled with apprehensions respecting the European Truth situation, and so weighed down by a sense of responsibility, because of the duties given me by the credentials that, when I was called on at Bethel to give the friends some farewell remarks, I could not make a satisfactory speech. Only at intervals was I able to utter a sentence. The reason was this: judging from what Bros. Russell, Pierson, Driscoll and the Executive Committee and others told me, as well as from certain Scriptures, I feared a sifting in every European country. Repeatedly I told this to the Committee, especially to J.F.R. Bro. Russell, Oct. 21, at Dallas, remarked to me that there were conditions in England of which he would give me details at Brooklyn before I sailed, and that his arrangements were being changed by responsible persons in England, who did not want to carry out his ideas, but were setting them aside for their own. At the time I did not understand his meaning, and he died before we were to talk things over at Brooklyn. After the Tabernacle trouble was laid before me, I understood. J. Hemery, on Sept. 17, had written Bro. Russell describing the "disloyalty" (J. Hemery's expression) of Wm. Crawford and H.J. Shearn in originating and engineering a movement to set aside Bro. Russell's controllership and arrangements in Tabernacle affairs, and lodge the controllership, not in the congregation, but in the Church Board. Bro. Russell

had received this letter, before he spoke to me of responsible brethren setting aside his arrangements.

While J.F.R. should have said that there was good and sufficient reason for my opposition to the dismissed managers, and while I believe the *British* churches ought to know of their offenses, to curb their present sifting activity, and although Wm. Crawford's misrepresentations, some of which are expressly endorsed in "Harvest Siftings," would justify me in self-defense in narrating the whole matter—I will, nevertheless, in charity refrain from exposing them to the whole Church. I made most loving efforts, especially with H.J. Shearn, to rescue them from their wrong course, and apart from mentioning for advice some of these matters to some of my counselors, who were unanimously recommended to me as such by all three Managers, I informed no one of their offenses, until they sought publicly to justify them. Then I spoke, not desiring the Church to be deceived. They offended on twenty-five counts in matters pertaining to the London Tabernacle; on twenty-two counts in matters pertaining to their office in the London Bethel, and on ten counts in matters pertaining to me in my official relation to them. See Vol. VII, Chapter I. J.F.R. knows of these offenses. At the voted request of the London Tabernacle congregation I appeared twice, *i.e.*, Jan. 28 and Feb. 18, against them before the Church on Tabernacle matters only. The first time I spoke against them a small minority thought I treated them more severely than the facts warranted. This was because they knew hardly any of the facts of the case, which I misunderstandingly thought had been presented to them the previous Sunday. On this point J. Hemery, in a letter to me, dated Feb. 5, tells of a conversation that he had with a deacon of the church, respecting my action before the church Jan. 28, and of his own view of it in the following quotation: "I told him the serious view that you took of this act of

disloyalty to the Society's interests on the part of those who ought to have served the interests; but I can see that there is something of the feeling that too heavy blows were struck, more than the occasion called for. *I am not of that opinion; and though I share with you the feeling that a heavy hand was laid on these brethren, I do not believe that it was more than their misdoing called for.*"

Throughout the London Tabernacle and Bethel difficulty J. Hemery worked in thorough accord with me against H.J. Shearn and W. Crawford, to whom for short we refer by their initials, J.H., H.J.S., W.C., until Feb. 26, when the "absolutely-without-authority" cable from J.F.R. arrived, when J.H. from a most ardent helper turned immediately into an opponent, who claimed not to be a partaker of the dispute, as his cable of Feb. 26 to J.F.R. shows: "Johnson claims full control everything; I *resist* as your representative. *Dispute with co-managers, his not mine.* Los Angeles cable (the "absolutely-without-authority" one, which reached London that morning) has attention. What are Johnson's powers?" J.H. gave me more evidence on their misdeeds than all others combined, and publicly and privately commended my course until Feb. 26. I took him as my confidential adviser, and did nothing of any importance without his advice and co-operation. I loved him most ardently, trusted him most fully, and treated him most kindly; but his conduct toward me after Feb. 26, is one of the greatest disappointments of my life. The whole London Tabernacle congregation and the Bethel family know that the dispute with H.J.S. and W.C. was his as well as mine, his originally; and that he supported me in everything before my recall. As for the other involved elders, I treated them leniently; and after their apology recommended them favorably to the church, though I later decided to *recommend* their dismissal. J.H. misrepresented me when he told the

congregation that I intended to dismiss their elected elders, and force my way into the pulpit.

After hearing me Feb. 18, the *congregation unanimously voted me confidence, thanks and appreciation for what I had done in their defense against H.J.S. and W.C.* Every point that I brought forth on that day was proven by many witnesses in the congregation as I made it. It might be said that even after they had made their final answer, March 4, without reply from me, and J.H. and J.F.R. had represented me as a fraud and a rebel, and the latter had put the influence of his presidential powers back of the two brothers, whitewashing them to the extent of placing them again into office as Managers; and had through J.H. on April 1, assured the congregation of his disapproval of my speaking against them before the congregation (it was done both times at the voted request of the church); *the congregation voted them down almost unanimously and would not even have them as deacons, much less as elders!* The facts that the congregation refused almost unanimously to elect them, unanimously voted me confidence, thanks and appreciation, and the reasons for my activity against them in the Tabernacle matter, J.F.R. well knows. Why did he not in his "Harvest Siftings" mention these things, which put a wholly different light on the matter?

For their offenses I concluded that the situation was unworkable and intolerable; and having in mind that H.J.S. had, Jan. 11, written me that he would on the following Monday forward his "formal resignation" to Brooklyn; that I had already, Jan. 21, informed the Executive Committee that their dismissal was in my judgment the sole solution of the situation, feeling sure it would be satisfactory to the Society, after advising over the matter with J.H., and finding our minds one on the subject, I decided, Feb. 3, to dismiss them, dictating the letter of dismissal in his

presence. After I had finished, I asked him what he thought of it; and after approval he suggested adding the following sentences which I accepted: "I desire that you leave the office at once, and the Bethel premises as soon as possible, turning over to me all the Society's and Association's monies, documents, papers." W.C. left Feb. 13, and H.J.S. not before Feb. 23. I immediately cabled the Society at Brooklyn my act, fully convinced not only that I had the power to dismiss them; but also that, on account of my detailed descriptions of their wrong-doings, my action would have the unqualified support of the Society. Indeed, about Jan. 1, fearing that the Society would prematurely order their dismissal, I advised the Committee to wait awhile, until I could prepare the friends for such action. Imagine my astonishment at the "absolutely-without-authority" cablegram.

Apart from speaking of these troubles to some of my counselors I did not mention them to anybody, until H.J.S. and W.C. began to agitate the subject among the British friends, and then apart from announcing the dismissals at Edinburgh, mentioned their activities to but four congregations. In my activity against them Bro. McCloy assured me that I had the solid support of nine of every ten of the British brethren. I was the recipient of many letters from all parts of the country, in some cases signed by many persons, assuring me of sympathy, support and cooperation. The work that I did was frequently referred to as a cleansing of the Lord's house. Especially did J.H. express his unbounded approval of what I did, until his sudden change on Feb. 26. He and many others said that I was sent in answer to prayer to comfort and deliver the brethren, and that the Lord blessed my efforts with success. A few quotations from letters from various ones follow; first some from J.H. Feb. 5, 1917, two days after the dismissal, in a letter reporting conditions to J.F.R., a

carbon copy of which he furnished me, he said in part as follows:

"It is a matter of deep regret to me that the conditions here have been such that Bro. Johnson has felt compelled to take the drastic steps, of which you have been advised by cable. *To me, all this is an answer to prayer.* ... I can truly say that in this crisis which is now upon us, that I have neither precipitated it in any way, either in the cause or in the crisis itself, *nor has Bro. Johnson.* He came quite evidently wishing to help us all. My colleagues began to pour their wishes into his ears. He made some investigation; he saw for himself that which had been hidden within my mind. He spoke, then acted, and point by point has driven him to take these extreme measures, *because they set themselves in opposition to him, instead of co-operating with him.* I feel sure, dear Brother Rutherford, that the Lord will very soon indicate His way, and that you will, while having some pain because of this matter, nevertheless soon get the assurance of heart that all is going well with the work in Britain. I believe that we shall enter upon a better work with a closer union with Headquarters, which will still more praise the Lord. ... The events of the Tabernacle are rather unusual just now. Through the introduction of this matter to Bro. Johnson he found it necessary to speak plainly to my Colleagues. Bro. Johnson made some inquiries as to how the recent letter, which was in the form of a petition to Bro. Russell, originated. He discovered for himself that it was originated in the office here. Bro. Johnson found it necessary to speak plainly to my Colleagues over this matter, and to ask them to take a certain course. They refused, practically flouting him and his authority. He gave them clear warning what he must do, but they persisted, and he found it necessary to speak very plainly to the Congregation of the action of these two Brothers, who, while professing allegiance to Bro. Russell, had nevertheless done something which was cutting at the very heart of the Church's allegiance. There was an attempt to deceive the Elders by making them believe it was Bro. Russell's wish to have a change in the Tabernacle arrangements, because he had asked them to take a share with me in the preaching services. And there was an attempt to

deceive Bro. Russell by putting before him such representation as would make him believe that all, or nearly all of the Elders, and a great part of the Congregation, wished to have such an arrangement as would do away with the Assistant Pastorate. The Elders have declared that they were deceived in this matter, and with the exception of two who have left us to set up a separate Ecclesia, they have all expressed their regret, and declared that, had Bro. Shearn told them that which he must have known, they would not have acted as they did. You will probably know how that Bro. Shearn had, by a breach of confidence as towards Bro. Russell and the Managers, taken a private letter and shown it to some of the Elders; but eleven of them persisted in their course, being deceived because the representations which these two, my Colleagues, had made to them partly in secret. Yesterday, the Church decided to defer the nominations [election] of Bros. Shearn and Crawford until a Church Meeting could be held, when further investigation might be made, and Bro. Johnson heard further."

The following occurs in a letter he sent the Executive Committee Jan. 22, 1917, less than two weeks before the dismissal: "Your sending Bro. Johnson at this time, I am sure, has been in the order of the Lord's providence. *His coming is not only a comfort to the Brethren, but a help to the work at large* [at that time he did not consider Bro. Johnson's work barren], and it will be more so as the days go past. Without my saying a word to him in the nature of a complaint, or of any detail of the letters [correspondence on the church] which you will surely have read, he began to make his own inquiry [after W.C. and H.J.S. brought the matter to his attention]. I thought as he put the questions how wise they were, and how well calculated they were to get to the root of the matter of difference, and in the general interest of the work. He showed no favor, but seemed earnestly to seek to know, and then do the Lord's will, *and I have every confidence in that which he has done as being of the Lord.*"

The following is from a letter that he wrote me dated Feb 25, a day before the "absolutely-without-authority" cablegram arrived: "The arrangement of the Committee

by Bro. Rutherford [the investigation commission of five brothers] to which one agrees as one of the safeguards of our work in the future, of necessity gives a turn to events. I cannot see that there can be any undoing of that which has been done [the dismissals and new appointments] here in the office and the home; *for the changes that have been made can be considered as nothing less than a cleansing of the sanctuary.* We have a freer atmosphere, light seems as if it were breaking upon us; the feeling of an institution is being modified and merged into that of a home; and love is beginning to assert itself; for all of which I am very grateful to the Lord. ... If the Inquisitorial Committee should by *any chance* make recommendation to Bro. Rutherford for reinstallation of our brethren it would be most awkward, if we had suggested to the Church that Bros. Kirkwood and Housden [the assistant Managers that I appointed after dismissing the two Managers] be appointed [with J.H. as the Society's representatives on the Church Executive Committee] and their election [as elders instead of H.J.S. and W.C.] had been concluded. *I do not for a moment think that such a thing* [the recommendation of reinstallation] *could happen.*" Thus it will be seen that up to Feb. 26, Bro. Hemery heartily approved of my course and felt sure it would stand because of its merits.

Bro. Fred Lardent, whose letter on the symbolic uses of colors appeared in a recent "TOWER," wrote me in part as follows: "As one of the London Tabernacle Congregation I feel I would like to convey my appreciation of the way you have in the hands of the Good Shepherd protected the flock from dangers ahead. ... I have reviewed the matter from Faith's standpoint; a crisis was approaching, and it seemed that the wrong would have become Victor; but the Lord sent His messenger exactly on time and averted the disaster; I see you are viewing the matter partly, and perhaps primarily, from the standpoint of consequences which would have gone ill with the Tabernacle arrangements as a whole; again we see you have no self-interest in the matter, but only the holy interest of the dear Lord and His Beloved Anointed."

Bro. and Sr. Morrison of Glasgow, under date of Feb. 15, wrote as follows: "We have followed your steps, dear

Bro., since coming to this country, with great interest, as we spent a few years in Bethel and can therefore fully appreciate the position there. We would like to express the heartiest approval of all you have done, and feel sure the Lord has used you as the instrument in cleansing His temple. ... Some have returned from your Edinburgh meeting [Feb. 11] and are working amongst the brethren endeavoring to raise up a feeling of resentment against your actions. [This is especially true of Bro. Mackenzie, who later became one of the five Commissioners, an ardent friend of H.J.S. However, he, like the other four Commissioners, approved of the dismissals after he heard the evidence.] Now, dear brother, in the Lord's interest, would it not be wise to write a letter ... to be read to the Church here, asking them not to form a preconceived judgment in the matter until your [second] Glasgow visit?"

Bro. H.E. Thackway, one of the leading Elders of the London Tabernacle, who was given by Bro. Russell the charge of the Photo-Drama work in whole Britain and Ireland outside of London, wrote me Feb. 10 in part as follows: "The weight of responsibility resting upon you is great, but the Lord's strength, which is yours, is very much greater. Thank you, dear Bro. Johnson, for your service. Surely the Lord sent you here to do that for which we were not strong enough! We praise and thank Him, and by His grace will press on with purified zeal and love by reason of your ministry."

The following from a letter signed by 38 brethren, not members of the Tabernacle congregation, after they had heard my addresses before the London Tabernacle, Jan. 28, and Feb. 18: "Your visit to us has thus caused the Brethren here to thank their Heavenly Father for every phase of His loving favor and to encourage one and all to a more loyal consecration to the will of Him who has called us out of darkness into His marvelous light. We feel sure you will be glad to know that your labors of love have not been in vain in the Lord; and that the brethren who have appended their signatures hereunder greatly appreciate your steadfastness, loyal devotion to the Lord, the Truth and the Brethren, and that they admire the manner in which you keep 'so faithful' to 'that

Servant' whom the Father has been pleased to take home to Himself."

Bro. John Radwell, a leading elder of the Tabernacle, who signed the resolution and whom, therefore, to his displeasement, I had publicly to oppose, wrote a letter to me April 2, after having heard Jesse Hemery denounce me the day before to the Tabernacle Congregation. Part of the letter is as follows: "I wanted to see you ere you returned to America to assure you that I believe you to be one of the Lord's true people ... As my brother, I tell you of my love. My prayers are for you that God will guide, comfort, sustain and bless you. When all may misunderstand you, our loving Lord does not, and He will comfort."

Many other letters are at hand, but these will suffice. I had letters from eight among the most sober-minded British brethren, whom—recommended to me as such unanimously by the three London Managers—I selected as my advisers on British Church affairs. Some of these letters I destroyed, not thinking they would serve me later. The others were taken, along with other things, out of my portfolio, when it was rifled by Bro. Hemery during my absence. They would make interesting reading by way of contrast with several letters from the same writers, quoted in "Harvest Siftings"; whose identical dates, with one exception, which was dated a day later than the others, prove that they were "worked up" by characteristic methods of J.F.R. and J.H.

The general opinion in Britain, until it became known that J.F.R. and J.H. were in opposition to me as a fraud and a rebel, was that my work, both toward the brethren and the public was most richly blessed. The change of sentiment that J.F.R.'s "Harvest Siftings" sets forth, I believe, is almost wholly due to my being represented as an imposter and a rebel. My last pilgrim work was done Feb. 28, the day I received the recall cable. I never had a more successful pilgrim

trip than the British one up to its last day. Both the public and private meetings were richly blessed, as J.H. sets forth above. A few examples: The Glasgow Church was ready to split on the question of Berean Lessons vs. "Open Bible Study." I offered an acceptable compromise which healed the matter. The public meeting there Jan. 14, was so successful in point of numbers, interest and cards, 243 being left, that the Church requested a return visit, for another public meeting in Glasgow's largest auditorium, which was to have been given Mar. 11. This visit was not cancelled at the request of the Glasgow brethren, but, at my suggestion, by J.H., after I was recalled, *and after all the advertising matter had been sent to Glasgow*. The colporteurs (and they were among the best) who did my follow-up work in Britain told me that they had for years been thinking they did well, if they averaged one volume for a card. The cards gathered at the meetings where I was privileged to speak in Britain the colporteurs said averaged between two and three volumes each. The last public meeting of the visit was at Liverpool, Feb. 25. Over 1700 outsiders were present, leaving 258 cards. Nothing free was offered to induce them to leave these. The British people, especially the women, who constituted $\frac{5}{6}$ of the audiences, the men being away in the war, do not leave cards so readily as the American people. Bro. Captain Smith of Liverpool told me, late in April at Brooklyn, that, as a result of this meeting, and its follow-up meetings, 50 strangers had been coming regularly to the Liverpool meetings. The brethren who have known my ministry for years will be slow to believe J.H.'s statement, that my pilgrim work in Britain was barren of results. Everywhere I went the brethren not only said, but showed that they were comforted, strengthened, encouraged and enlightened. At Manchester the Church, ready to divide on the Sin-offerings, was greatly helped by two lectures on that

subject Feb. 27, 28, my last pilgrim work in Britain. Let me repeat: J.F.R.'s and J.H.'s officially representing me as a fraud, and as a rebel against the Society, is almost wholly responsible for the seeming change of sentiment toward me and my work in Britain. Outright sympathizers of H.J.S. and W.C., a very small minority of the British brethren, of course, were opposed to me before. Some of these are largely responsible for J.F.R.'s first opposition to me.

As to the insanity charge: This thought did not originate in Britain. The first one to think this of me was J.F.R. in Los Angeles, 7000 miles away! He wrote me this in a letter dated Feb. 24. It did not come to him from my cable of Feb. 24, wherein I refer to the types and the Steward. That cable was sent to Brooklyn, not to California. Before Mar. 1, J.F.R. received no intimation of the contents of that cable, which arrived in Brooklyn, Saturday night, Feb. 24, therefore it could not have caused him to recall me on Feb. 26, nor to cable for the first time, Feb. 28, that I was insane. The cable and telegraph office records at Brooklyn show that on Feb. 28, a night letter was sent him from the Society containing the first reference to my cable of Feb. 24, and to the one I sent Feb. 27, which contains no reference to types and Steward. Doubtless A.H. McMillan's absence at Watertown, N. Y., occasioned the delay in J.F.R.'s learning of the contents of the Feb. 24 cable. J.F.R. and I have had these records carefully examined with the above results. The first intimation that in America I was considered insane came to me in J.F.R.'s letter of Feb. 24, which reached me Mar. 26 or 27. A little later the same day I found that cables from J.F.R. were introduced in the court testimony to prove me an insane usurper. Two of these will show this:

Brooklyn, N. Y., Mar. 14, 1917.

Diaglott, London.

Johnson insane. Proof forthcoming. Spending money recklessly cabling. Do not temporize further. Deprive him of all money and authority. *Arrest and incarcerate him.* Cable action.

(Signed) WATCH TOWER BIBLE AND TRACT SOCIETY.

Brooklyn, N. Y., Mar. 27, 1917.

Diaglott, London.

Greenup oppose injunction. Johnson does not represent Society *in any capacity. Sealed revocation of his credentials mailed fifteenth. Insane usurper.* Restrain him *by law.*

(Signed) RUTHERFORD.

J.F.R. omits italicized parts of these cables in his "Harvest Siftings."

Thus the discovery that I was insane (?) was made in America, not in England. While I was not well and was almost completely exhausted from heavy loss of sleep since Sept. 29, and from the hardest labors and most exacting trials of my life, I thought logically. J.H. knows this from several arguments that we had, in which he was so completely refuted, that almost the whole Bethel Family forsook him, and sided with me, in what he is pleased to call "rebellion." Their taking my side was not due to "Types" only. Seemingly, some of the British friends accepted the insanity explanation to account charitably for my alleged fraudulency. Indeed, I mingled very little with the English friends outside of Bethel after my recall, in order not to make public the difference between J.F.R. and myself: *and was thus at the mercy of those who grossly misrepresented me and whose tales were believed.* I was neither then, nor ever before, insane, though, at my breakdown in brain-fag from overwork and loss of sleep in 1910, some few brethren in the West, who heard me describe a severe internal struggle that I had had, and say that I had irrevocably lost

my brain power, believed and reported it. But Bro. Russell, whom I saw at Bethel within 10 days and with whom for a week I spent much time discussing intricate subjects (a discussion of which I brought to him in writing, prepared in the climax of the breakdown, and parts of which he later published) did not think so, nor did any of the other brethren at Bethel. J.F.R., just a few days before my return to America, warning the Bethel family against me, reported me mentally deranged at the Bethel table. Mar. 7 I drew up a protest containing 10 reasons, against J.F.R.'s course, and sent it to Bros. Ritchie, Van Amburgh and Pierson for presentation to the Board. Its reasoning could not have come from an insane person. Bro. Pierson remarked of it, "That does not sound insane!" Let me repeat: It was not my cable of Feb. 24 alluding to types that made him think me insane; for his letter of Feb. 24 to me, and his cable of Feb. 28 to J.H., both setting forth that I was insane, preceded his knowledge of the Feb. 24 cable. On that cable I might say this: Having very frequently spoken to J.F.R., with whom I was on most confidential terms of brotherly friendship, of hidden types and prophecies in the Scriptures, I thought he would not think these typical allusions, made in confidence, unusual *for me to make to him*. To others, unaccustomed to such allusions from me, they of course seemed strange. J.F.R. now acknowledges that he was mistaken on the insanity charge. However, he has greatly injured me thereby, especially in not plainly correcting his mistake but giving it a new impetus in his "Harvest Siftings," though admitting before writing that paper that he had made a mistake therein.

J.F.R. selected five able and sober-minded brothers to investigate the trouble in the London Tabernacle and Bethel. *This Commission reported in my favor, and that without getting my evidence, which was the most exhaustive that anyone had to give them. J.H.*

and Sr. H., his typist and the two brothers who transcribed the minutes, the reports and the findings, all of whom saw these, told me, after they were sent away from London, that they favored me. On leaving London after the investigation, the Chairman of the Commission, Bro. McCloy, said the same; J.F.R. and W.E. Van Amburgh admitted it shortly after I returned, the former remarking that he did not agree with the Commission's findings, had told them so, and had reversed their Bethel findings, reinstalling the two brothers. The four members of the Board of Directors of the Society who, in June, as the Board's Committee, examined this matter, and who, as a second Commission, reported favorably to me; told me that only the findings of the Tabernacle matter were given them, while the reports of both Tabernacle and Bethel matters were given them. All four said that the findings of the Tabernacle and the reports of the Tabernacle and Bethel matters favored me. I do not know what became of the findings of the Bethel matter. Bro. Housden, one of the Commission, after the report reached America, told me that, among other things, the findings in the Bethel matter, as they left London for the signature of the other four Commissioners, stated that I had acted in harmony with my powers, *and had performed in the Bethel matter a service distinctly in the interest of the British Church in dismissing the Managers*. Three of the Commission, according to the findings on Tabernacle matters given the Board's Committee of four in June, were willing to recommend them as deacons. All five thought them unworthy to be elders. J.F.R. states on the testimony of two letters (which contain 14 misrepresentations) from W.C. that I tried to influence the Commission in my favor, for this purpose visiting each one of them before they came to London to meet; and failing in this, I repudiated the Commission. Almost nothing could be further from the truth

than this statement! The following are the facts of my relation to this Commission. J.F.R.'s cable appointing this Commission is dated Feb. 22. It arrived at Bro. McCloy's home while I was there on a pilgrim visit of three days, arranged for a month before. Bro. McCloy, before my arrival in Britain, had advised J.H. to write to Bro. Russell of the "disloyalty" of H.J.S. and W.C. on the Tabernacle situation; and at his advice, and in his home, J.H., Sept. 17, wrote Bro. Russell.

Bro. McCloy and I had advised together in Jan. over the situation. Having known for a long time of the irregularities of these two brothers, he needed no convincing from me. He was one of my eight counselors in British matters. Four of these counselors were on this Commission. At his advice I decided to call all eight together in London for consultation over the general situation on the same day as the Commission was to meet; because this would save the time and money of four of the eight, who were coming to London for the investigation; accordingly, I wrote Feb. 24 to all eight brothers. A few days later at my own initiative I cancelled this meeting, *because I saw that it would have the appearance of my seeking to influence the Commission.* This conference was, therefore, never held. Except with Bro. McCloy I had no conversation whatever on the subject with the members of this Commission before they convened; nor did I speak on the case privately with them, before the findings were reached. I am sure they will all witness to this. That some of them as my counselors had heard of some of the facts of the case from me, *weeks before they had been appointed Commissioners, cannot be construed as my trying to influence the Commission.* Nor can the fact that one of the Commission (more than a week after the Commission had finished its investigation and made its findings) took my view of the impropriety of J.F.R.'s recalling me, who was

sent by the Board, without consulting the Board (which action in J.F.R.'s view made him an accomplice of mine), be construed against the Commission's finding in my favor. Before the Commission met, Bro. McKenzie, one of the Commissioners, opposed the dismissals, especially that of J.H. S. The evidence brought out at the investigation convinced him of the justice of their dismissal. By my not giving testimony the case was not made nearly so strong against them. After reaching London Bro. McCloy, whom at his request I had at his home given some assistance, sought a long time *in vain* to induce me to help the Commission and testify. None of the reasons that "Harvest Siftings" assigns for my not helping or giving testimony is true, nor is it true that I ignored and refused to appear before the Commission. I appeared before and read to them a protest against the appointment of a Commission to investigate the acts of a Special Representative clothed with powers of attorney! Such a person's acts are sanctioned before they are performed, while J.F.R. appointed a Committee to investigate them before he dismissed me, and repudiated my acts Feb. 24, and recalled me Feb. 26, after the Commission was appointed, and before it met, Mar. 3. Its sessions were Mar. 3-5. Such a procedure being contrary to good order, Divine and human, I would not become a party to it; therefore I refused to testify or otherwise help. J.F.R.'s "absolutely-without-authority" cable and recall of me, known to them when they met, certainly were not calculated to put me and my work in a favorable light before the Commission. And his and J.H.'s setting me forth as a rebel and imposter has more than anything else finally turned not only three of the Commission against me, long after their work was ended, but seems to be largely responsible for turning the sentiment of many others in Britain against me, if "Harvest Siftings" truthfully reflects the British situation;

for the sentiment there was overwhelmingly in my favor, before these misrepresentations were spread abroad. Instead of my tampering with the Commission, J.F.R.'s "absolutely-without-authority" cable and recall of me did so; for he thereby threw the influence and prestige of his office against me. But the clear evidence of gross wrongdoing held the Commission to a just report. J.F.R. does not mention in his "Harvest Siftings" that his Commission found in my favor despite his opposition to me. Why not? J.F.R. overruled the Commission's findings, reinstating the two brothers, under J.H.'s priority. And what is the result? They would not work as Managers under J.H., *but are dividing the British Church*. They have left Bethel as members of the staff, coming there occasionally as Secretary and Treasurer of the I.B.S.A. Feeling themselves martyrs at the hands of Bro. Johnson, they are going around dividing the classes: Most of the brethren in the classes have learned of their wrong-doing; others think them wronged. The result is division. The reason they have this influence is that Bro. Johnson has been publicly smitten as a fraud and rebel, while they have been largely whitewashed by J.F.R. I warned him that they would sift the British Church, and they are now doing it, according to the testimony of reliable brethren. He blames me for breaking up the British Church. On the contrary, I was being enabled, by the Lord's grace, to solve in the interests of the Truth and the Society a very difficult situation. Success was within grasp. He then interfered, overturning everything, and produced the great confusion in the British Church. Had he supported me in my work, the condition there would be decidedly more favorable to the Truth and the Society than it now is.

When I arrived in Britain the work was almost at a standstill in nearly every way. There was almost no Volunteer and Colporteur work. There was no Pilgrim

nor Photo-Drama work. The Pastoral work had not been started. The military situation greatly hampered and persecuted the dear brethren, who almost everywhere seemed discouraged. I found the managers quarreling with one another, and two of them "disloyal" in many ways, seeking personal power instead of the good of the sheep. I threw myself with all my being into the breach; I held back nothing that was for their good. The Lord blessed the work. The brethren everywhere were quickened; the Colporteurs began again; the only Pilgrim there started out again; the Drama was again exhibited; the Pastoral work was introduced. In every way I was at their service. The brethren rallied with new life and zeal. The evils were being put aside. Divided Classes were being united, Berean Lessons were displacing open Bible Study. The troubles at London Bethel and Tabernacle were solved in the interest of the Truth and the Society, while the evil-doers were being made harmless. On all hands Zion was going forward, when suddenly, under the influence of a letter and cablegram campaign, engineered by the two dividers of the British Church, J.F.R. threw everything into confusion. If it is true that the British Church is broken up, he is responsible, not I. How to have been more faithful, or fruitful in the interest of the Truth, the Brethren and the Society I do not know. I was faithful to these almost to death by weariness, under the most difficult set of conditions that I have ever faced. The Lord is my judge. He knows! Nor do I believe that my beloved British brethren for the most part will forget.

When I left for Britain, it was the opinion of the responsible brethren at Brooklyn that Bro. Russell had not given the penny, which we had expected him to do, and which at Dallas, Tex., Oct. 21, ten days before his death, he defined as "special opportunities of service in smiting Jordan," for which he was arranging.

Accordingly, while we believed that he was "that Servant" (when in a 1909 "Tower," Bro. Russell modestly said that the "Tower" might be said to be "that Servant," he hid himself behind his paper as editors generally speak of their papers as themselves; he did not mean that he was not "that Servant" or "the channel"), we concluded that he was not the Steward referred to in that parable. I had believed him so until a short time after his death. Except on this point I interpreted that Parable in England, exactly as Bro. Russell did from 1909 to the time of his death, *i.e.*, that its day was the Harvest period of 40 years from 1874 to 1914; each hour of such a working day $3 \frac{1}{3}$ years; the early morning call from October, 1874, to June, 1881; the third hour call, June, 1881, to October, 1884; the sixth hour call, June, 1891, to October, 1894; the ninth hour call, June, 1901, to October, 1904; the eleventh hour call, February, 1908, to June, 1911; that since October, 1914, we are in the evening. What clinches this interpretation is not only the fact that much larger numbers were called, and that by specially used agencies, into the Truth at those times than at all other times of the Harvest; but also that the five siftings referred to in 1 Cor. 10: 4-13 occurred in these five call periods, *the call of large numbers being necessitated by the casting off of large numbers who were later sifted out*. Bro. Russell held that the fifth sifting was from 1908-1911. It seemed to me that my experiences in Britain were pictured by those of Nehemiah, Ezra and Mordecai (J.H. believed that he antityped Eliashib and Hanani in Nehemiah); that my credentials were referred to in Ezra 7: 11-26 and Neh. 2: 7. From what is said in Ezra 7: 11-26 and symbolized in Esther 8: 2, 15, I concluded that I was privileged to become the Steward and Brother Russell's successor. Though privately I spoke of this to two brothers at Manchester, and to others at the London Bethel, apart from these two

places I mentioned it nowhere else, except at Liverpool, and that under the following circumstances: H.J.S. was by letters seeking to throw the blame upon me for his not taking a final step which might have saved the Elders from conscription. One of these letters, sent to a Liverpool Elder and now in my possession, was creating feeling against me among the brethren as an injurer of the Elders. I refuted the charge, saying among other things, that if I were unfriendly to the Elders, the Lord would not have given me a great privilege that He seemed to have given me; for there seemed to be Scriptural evidence that He had given me the privilege to be the Steward of the Parable of the Penny. This was the night of Feb. 24. J.F.R. said I "announced" this at the table of the Brooklyn Bethel. One would think from this that I set out to convince the family of this proposition. The following is what actually occurred: Late in April J.F.R. himself said that he had arranged after much thought to bring it up at the table. He had a brother ask the question, "Who is the steward of the Parable of the Penny?" Immediately he asked me to give my thought. I replied, "I have nothing to give on that point at this time." Then he said, "Brother Johnson, Brother Smith from Liverpool is here. In his presence at Liverpool, who did you say was the Steward?" I answered, "Brother Johnson." That is the way I "announced" it to the Bethel Family! Yet he says to shield me he kept back my "mental delusion," the Stewardship matter, from the family. These are but two samples of multitudes of misrepresentations in "Harvest Siftings." He seems deliberately to have chosen the policy of disparaging me before others. Several days after this episode, Menta Sturgeon convinced me that Bro. Russell gave the penny by arranging for the Smiting of the Jordan, the Pastoral Work, the V. D. M. questions and the Angelophone, by approving of a project in line with what the

Mena Film Co. is now furthering, by rearranging the workers at Bethel, and in the field, and by his death making still further arrangements for other special opportunities of service. This seems correct; for these are the *special* arrangements of Bro. Russell for enabling the saints to have the "honor" of binding the "kings" and the "nobles," "the kingdom honor" that we expect this side the veil. [The immediately foregoing was written before the author saw that the first smiting of Jordan occurred from Sept. 20, 1914, to Nov. 3 (at least), 1916, and that the foregoing arrangements of Bro. Russell were the giving of the penny at its second distribution, *i.e.*, to the Great Company who are not referred to in Ps. 149: 5-9.] I greatly prefer that our beloved Bro. Russell had the privilege of giving the penny, to my having it to give. Therefore, at my own initiative, I recalled before the family the thought that I was the Steward. J.F.R. *literally raged* at my setting forth that claim; he is now not only not making objections to others, but is encouraging their *making that claim for him* with Vol. 7 as the penny, which he shows by putting a penny cut on the dedicatory page. While the Truth in Vol. 7 will be [was] specially used in the second smiting of Jordan, Vol. 7 evidently is not the penny; for the penny was first to be given to those called in the eleventh hour, while Vol. 7 came to all in each class at the same time. Bro. Russell's interpretation is better. He was the Steward. God bless his memory! I never claimed nor expected to have all the power of Bro. Russell, nor did I ever claim to get the Truth without the "Studies," nor did I say that I heard "voices" in 1910. I greatly regret thinking and saying that I was the Steward and Bro. Russell's successor, and want the Brethren to know this.

When I read J.H.'s description of events from March 7 to April 1, all that I could say was, "Poor Brother Hemery! The Lord forgive and bless him!"

I will not attempt to deny in detail all his misrepresentations, but I will tell the story as I know it. From Feb. 28, when the recall cable reached me, to March 6, I was under the impression that J.F.R. had the right to recall me. Therefore I gave up all official activities. When J.H. asked me to take the head of the table, March 1, on my return to Bethel, I declined, saying I was no longer special representative. I meekly took my humiliation. But, alas, J.H. tried to make it worse. Without any necessity for it, he read the "absolutely-without-authority" cable to the family, before I returned to London, just as J.F.R., before my return to Brooklyn, warned the family against me as insane, etc. In various ways he snubbed me, sneered at me, and before others looked at me with contempt. He referred to me as "a discredited representative of the W.T.B.&T.S." I had for three and a half months thought him one of the finest characters I had ever met, refusing to believe reports of his insolence to inferiors, desire for power and wriggling out of responsibility for his acts. One who knows him well, and is friendly to him, said he never met one so anxious to exercise power; he might have added, nor with much better ability to hide this fact, when expedient. His strange conduct finally made me less trustful of him, and he, feeling me powerless, became careless, and acted in my presence as I had heard of him. It seems hardly believable that he would, before the majority of the Bethel family, with a face full of contempt, repeatedly snap his fingers, saying as repeatedly, "Brother Johnson, you are that!" And yet it is true. Though knowing that J.F.R. wanted H.J.S. and W.C. restored, he repeatedly asked me, from Mar. 5 to 7, while denying my powers, to send them away from the office. Later, on Mar. 7, he advised H.J.S. in the presence of Bros. Kirkwood, Housden and myself, not to act as Manager, and to leave. It was not loyalty to J.F.R. that moved him

to do this, nor to oppose me, when he felt sure that J.F.R. "threw me down." It would not at all surprise me, if my telling him that I intended to make an unfavorable report of him to the Board had much to do with his gross misrepresentation of me in "Harvest Siftings"; nor would it surprise me, if my discountenancing his ambition to become the pastor of the Tabernacle Congregation, and if his desire to have no supervision by the Society's special representative caused his first opposition to me.

Referring to my cable of Feb. 24, J.F.R. says, "This and subsequent cablegrams sent out by Brother Johnson cost the Society *hundreds of dollars* for their transmission." "This cablegram" did not cost the Society one cent, a Liverpool brother desiring and gaining the opportunity of paying for it. All my cables from Nov. 19, the day of my arrival, to Mar. 31, the day I left London, for America, cost the Society exactly \$65.22. They were with three exceptions sent at deferred rate, *i.e.*, at 8 cents a word, and not at quick rate, *i.e.*, 24 cents a word. On account of the censorship, it took about 35 to 40 days to receive speedy answer by mail between London and New York. In the crisis at London I had to resort to cables. I cabled after Mar. 6 frequently, because I received no replies and needed information. J.F.R.'s statement on the cost of my cables is another of the many misrepresentations with which his "Harvest Siftings" abound. Why did he not first investigate this item before making his statement on the cost of my cables?

Some of the grossest misrepresentations of "Harvest Siftings" are found in J.H.'s description of what he is pleased to call "rebellion." Surely he should offer prayer for forgiveness for sins of omission and commission in his presentation of my acts from Mar. 7 to 31. The facts of the situation are these: On the same day, Feb. 3, of the dismissal of H.J.S. and

W.C., I appointed with J.H.'s hearty advice, Bro. E. Housden, Assistant Manager (whom three weeks later J.F.R. appointed as one of the Investigation Commission) to do W.C.'s work, except that of Treasurer of the I.B.S.A. This put all the monies into his hands, the books, the keys of the office and safe, as well as the mails and orders. A little later I appointed, with J.H.'s hearty advice, Brother A. Kirkwood Assistant Manager to do H.J.S.'s work, except that of Secretary of the I.B.S.A. J.H. had for over a month, *i.e.*, until his suspension, Mar. 12, been acting in full co-operation with Brother Housden, in the latter's signing checks, depositing the monies in the bank, keeping the books, holding the keys of the office and safe, and handling the mails and orders. The night of Mar. 6 I came to the conclusion that *since I was sent by the Society, acting through its Board* (according to J.F.R.'s letter of Nov. 10, to the English Managers, par. 5, and according to his article in Dec. 15, 1916, "Tower," the Board being in control of the Society's affairs) *he could not recall me, except at the Board's direction*. Further, my credentials being sealed by the Society's seal, I concluded that he could not cancel my credentials without the Board's direction. These two things his "absolutely-without-authority" and his recall cables, both sent from Los Angeles, presumed to do, *without the authorization of the Board*. Therefore, I denied that he had the right to rescind my acts, cancel by credentials and recall me. That same evening I discussed this matter with J.H., *who then made no objections to my reasoning*. I, therefore, told him that I was going to resume my activity as Special Representative. I told the family then and maintained the same attitude throughout my subsequent stay, that if I were recalled by the Board, I would immediately cease my activity, just as I had done at J.F.R.'s recall, while believing he had the right to recall me. The Board knew nothing of the

situation, until Mar. 29, two days before I left London for America. No word ever came to me from the Board on the point while I was in England. What I did was not "rebellion"; it was a refusal to become a party to J.F.R.'s usurping authority over the Board, which he himself on two occasions in writing stated controlled the Society's affairs; but now denying and disregarding its control, he has caused the present trouble. People who know me know that I am thoroughly submissive to those who have the right to direct my work. Mar. 17 Justice Sargant, of the High Court, one of the ablest judges of Great Britain, ruled that my credentials could be cancelled by the *Board alone*, and that only over the Society's seal and its officers' signature; and, therefore, granted me a temporary injunction; for he ruled that my credentials could not be cancelled by cable, as J.F.R. sought to cancel them. Mar. 7, I dictated a protest to the Board, embodying my view of these matters. He never allowed that protest to come before the Board, nor the two petitions that I sent with the protest, asking the Board, first, to require that in "Towers" for the British friends, he recall repudiating my acts; and, second, to take exclusive executive and managerial power from him, and to vest it in an Executive Committee, of which I named him a member. When I found out, after my return, that this protest and these petitions, sent to Bros. Ritchie, Van Amburgh and Pierson, to be presented for me to the Board, were not permitted to come before that body, I gave them to the remaining members to read. While admitting that the thoughts of the protest and petitions may have had something to do with five members of the Board differing from him, I never admitted, rather in a meeting of the People's Pulpit Association, July 27, I denied admitting what he says I, on July 25, admitted, *i.e.*, that the trouble between him and the Board was the result of his refusal to give me another hearing before the

Board with a view to sending me back to England. It was at least a week before I asked for a hearing before the Board that I respectfully asked to return to England and finish my work. I never attempted to force my return. I regret to have to say that there is not one conversation that he reports in "Harvest Siftings," as having occurred between us, that he does not so twist as to misrepresent the things said and done as well as my spirit.

To return to the "Rebellion." Office matters worked on as usual from Mar. 7 to Mar. 12, except as between J.H. and myself. I never once, much less many times, dismissed him. Because of his opposition to me before the family, I did Mar. 12, suspend him; and during a discussion, in which he complained frequently that I kept back work from him, I as frequently told him that it was because he was suspended. This I suppose he misrepresents into my dismissing him a half-dozen times or more in one day. What he is pleased to call my "mouthing" and "rampaging" refers to a debate that he and I had before a majority of the Bethel family over the question, whether J.F.R. had a right to recall me and cancel my credentials without the Board's authorization. J.H. held that he had; I denied the right. In this discussion he was so completely refuted that only four of the Bethelites held with him—his wife, his typist and two brothers. The others, some of whom heard the points of the debate later, about eleven in number, not merely three as he says, were with me. The way each one stood was decided by the place where he took his meals. For nearly a week only four ate with J.H. The break from me began only after I had been, at his instigation, denounced as a rebel against the Society, Mar. 18, before the Tabernacle Congregation, and among the individuals of that congregation, as insane and demonized; and after a number of "guards" had been put in Bethel to overawe my supporters and circumscribe

my liberty. J.H. *knows* that it was my loyalty to the Society as represented in the Board that moved me to refuse to submit to J.F.R.'s usurpatorially setting aside the Board's act in my case.

On account of much work and the long delay in the Jan. 15 "Tower" reaching me, I did not read it until some time between Mar. 7 and 11. On reading therein the report of the Pittsburgh Convention, held Jan. 6, 7, I noticed that the article stated that the *Society's Officers were elected by the Convention*. Understanding the word convention as all Truth people use it to mean gatherings of brethren such as were held at Pittsburgh, Jan. 6, 7, and not a meeting of voting shareholders of the W.T.B.&T.S. to elect its officers, I took the article to mean just what it said, and concluded that our officers this year were not elected by the proper body. This I stated at the Bethel table, Mar. 12, a week after the Commission finished its work, not as J.F.R. says within 24 hours after it convened, Mar. 3. Three times between Feb. 27 and Mar. 6 I cabled to him without answer. Nor did I at any time after his Feb. 26 recall cable receive word from him, except on Mar. 26 or 27, when his letter of Feb. 24 reached me. After waiting until Mar. 10, I sent a cable of inquiry to Bro. Ritchie, the first time I cabled to him alone. Not hearing from J.F.R., and concluding from the *blundering statement* of the Jan. 15 "Tower" that he was not legally elected, I henceforth cabled to Bro. Ritchie, as the Society's ranking officer last legally elected. J.F.R. knows that as soon as I found out that he was elected by a meeting of the voting shareholders, and not by a convention, I gladly acknowledged him as President. Why did he not say this in his "Harvest Siftings"? I never said that I "would" or "should have become President" of the W.T.B.&T.S., had I let my name go forward, but that I might have become the President, had I permitted it. The following is the story: The morning of

Bro. Russell's funeral, H. C. Rockwell, one of the members of the Board, told me that he and other responsible brethren wanted me to become President. Tears coming into my eyes, I said that I was unworthy of being Bro. Russell's successor; that I did not have the necessary business experience for the office, and that I was going to prefer a brother in honor, J.F.R. He sought to persuade me to his view. I earnestly opposed it. That day many others spoke of it. On the part of not a few it was desired and expected. A letter from H. C. Rockwell on this point follows:

"Sept. 4, 1917.

"MR. P.S.L. JOHNSON.

"My Well Beloved Brother in Christ:

"Christian greetings to you and to all the tried and true friends at Brooklyn. Since reading Bro. Rutherford's "Harvest Siftings" and noting its many errors and false statements relating to yourself and affairs in general, I feel impelled by a sense of duty to formulate a written statement, which you are at liberty to use as may seem best, in refuting some of the wild and weird remarks now filling the air.

"To all whom it may concern, therefore, I do solemnly state in the name and in the presence of our gracious heavenly Lord, that at the time of Pastor Russell's funeral, I, H. Clay Rockwell, of my own volition and without any undue influence, approached Brother Paul Johnson and proposed to him that I would resign from being a member of the Board of Directors of the Watch Tower Bible and Tract Society on condition that he would accept the position in my place, and thus be eligible to be chosen and elected as President of the Society. Know all that Brother Johnson, through his lack of personal ambition and through his desire to await the Lord's leading in the matter, refused to accept my proposition.

"May this sincere and genuine statement, my dear brother, be of assistance in repelling some of the darts and arrows thrown at the instigation of the great Adversary. Knowing you to have 'the spirit of a sound mind,' which is the disposition of meekness and love, I have not the slightest doubt as to your full and complete

vindication before all the Lord's people, and to the shame of those who have attacked you. God bless you, dear brother!

"Yours in the patient waiting for the Kingdom,
(Signed) "H. CLAY ROCKWELL."

I wanted it known that I favored J.F.R. for President; therefore, among other things, I went to W.E. Van Amburgh, before leaving for Europe, asking him to make out my proxy, and send it to Bro. Spill to cast for J.F.R. On the Ocean, remembering that I had failed to have it stated on the proxy that I wanted my voting shares cast for J.F.R., I wrote to Bro. Spill, asking him so to cast them. J.F.R. knows this explanation. Why did he not give it?

After J.H.'s suspension Mar. 12, the work went on just as before I was recalled, and by the same persons, except that J.H. and a suspended supporter of his were not given their accustomed work, and I was consulted more than before. Shortly after my arrival the office force understood that I had powers of attorney. The monies, the mail, the orders, the books and the keys continued in Bro. Housden's charge, the keys until Mar. 21, when at J.H.'s command they were taken by one of the "guards" out of his pockets. The reason for things going on just as before was that almost the whole office force took my view. Absolutely no force or violence was used by my supporters or myself, though force was used against Bro. Housden and me, for which J.H. is responsible. His statement in "Harvest Siftings" is the first intimation that I ever had that he was not allowed the use of the phone. I am certain that this statement is untrue. I recall to have switched during that time the wire into his office for him to receive a message! However, when he was seeking to arrange for my "arrest for lunacy" and to arrange for other things against me, he went out to phone! He *knows* that I did not forcibly seize the control. Why did he say so? Why

did he say that I gradually claimed more and more authority, *well knowing* that I claimed powers of attorney from the outstart? It is absolutely untrue that I planned to usurp control of the British work; and to realize this plan brought charges against the Managers and dismissed them. *Never before publishing "Harvest Siftings,"* where he makes it the climax of my British activity, *did J.F.R. mention such a plan to me.* In making this charge both he and J.H. attempted to read my motives and misread them. Repeatedly they did this in "Harvest Siftings."

J.H. with J.F.R.'s cables had succeeded in persuading the bank no longer to honor Bro. Housden as one of the two signatories necessary for a valid check, as it had been doing for over a month with J.H. as the other signatory; on the contrary, the bank declared, Mar. 13, that it would honor the signatures of J. Hemery, H.J. Shearn and W. Crawford only. This made me apprehensive that a financial scheme, subversive of Bro. Russell's arrangements, and injurious to the W.T.B.&T.S., would be made operative by the three, who had jointly planned it. There was no other way open for me under the circumstances to thwart the "scheme" than to enjoin the bank from giving these three together control of the Society's funds. Some explanation will be helpful. Bro. Russell arranged that in the I.B.S.A. bank account there should be only that much deposited as the law required, *i.e.*, as much as the cost of the shares of the I.B.S.A. stock issued. All other monies were regularly deposited in the W.T.B.&T.S. account, also all checks issued were drawn on this account alone. In other words, Bro. Russell wanted to have, and did have, all business at the bank transacted in the name of the W.T.B.&T.S. at London, just as at Brooklyn; because he used the I.B.S.A. simply as a "dummy" corporation of the W.T.B.&T.S. for certain advantages in England for our work, just as he used the People's Pulpit Association

as a "dummy" corporation to do the W.T.B.&T.S. work in New York.

About Jan. 27, J.H. came to me saying that the Society's auditors claimed that the English Companies Act required the affairs of the I.B.S.A. to be audited and reported to the Board of Trade; and to make such an audit and report the I.B.S.A. would have to keep a separate set of books; that our auditors had drawn up a plan for a separate business organization and separate books for both corporations, and would I not sanction the plan, as it was required by the law. He is the only one of the three that sought to obtain my sanction to this "scheme." To my inquiries he gave uninforming replies. I asked to see the plan, but it was not shown me. I had him ask the Society's solicitors as to its legal necessity. He brought back word that the law required corporations to keep books, and to give audited reports to the Board of Trade. Still I hesitated, because I allowed no changes from Bro. Russell's arrangements, unless absolutely necessary, and such only as I thought he would make. Upon the occasion of another visit at Bethel I was again asked by J.H. to sanction the "scheme," which again he failed to show me, though requested so to do. After the bank decided no longer to honor Bro. Housden's signature, the latter told me that he had found among some papers a plan outlining a complete reorganization of the business and work of the Society; that when he showed it to Jesse Hemery, the latter with great eagerness said, "let me have that," snatching it out of his hands, and had not returned it. He told me that I ought to see this plan. In Bro. Housden's presence I then asked J.H. to show it to me. He refused. I then dictated a letter to the auditors asking for a copy. The next morning's mail brought it. It follows in full:

"22d January, 1917.

"The International Bible Students' Association,

"34 Craven Terrace, Lancaster Gate, W.

"Dear Sirs: As requested we confirm our suggestion as to the method on which your accounts should be kept.

"The first point which arises is to draw a definite line between the transactions of the Watch Tower Bible and Tract Society and the International Bible Students' Association. We quite appreciate that these two Societies are in effect one, and the work of these two bodies is for one end, and for this reason it is a matter of impossibility to keep the two absolutely separate and distinct.

"From the explanations you have given it appears to us to be the best method to treat the Watch Tower Bible and Tract Society in England, as a purely commercial body for the purpose of importing and printing Bible studies, pamphlets, tracts, etc., and also for the selling or distributing them; the International Bible Students' Association being the body which fosters, promotes and enlarges your teachings in this country. It must be quite understood, however, that by the name, International Bible Students' Association, we refer to the company which is registered in England and not to that Association in its world-wide work.

"The Tabernacle is the property of your Association and must therefore appear in your accounts. With the exception of the basement this is used entirely by your Association, and all the expenses incurred there should be borne by you. The receipts are in connection with the services and meetings held by you and must be treated as your income.

"The lease of 34 Craven Terrace is in the name of your Association, and the outgoings directly connected with the occupation of the house, such as rent, rates, taxes, insurance, gas, water, etc., should be borne by your Association.

"All expenses in connection with Classes, such as Lecture Bureau, Pilgrim, etc., and also in furthering your movement, for instance Photo Drama, will be paid by you.

"These payments are now made by the Watch Tower Bible and Tract Society, and when these are paid by your Association it will leave the former Society only

making payments on its own account in connection with importing, buying and printing books, etc., personal monthly office expenses, etc.

"The receipts are in connection with Sales of Books, etc., and donations; the first of these will belong to the Watch Tower Bible and Tract Society, the latter being donations to promote your doctrine, will belong to the International Bible Students' Association.

"The system we have explained to you is that all monies received from donations shall be paid into the International Bible Students' Association bank account in full, and that cheques shall be drawn on that account for the following:

"(a) All expenses in connection with the tenancy of 34 Craven Terrace.

"(b) All expenses in connection with the occupation of the Tabernacle.

"(c) All expenses in connection with Classes, Lecture Bureau, Pilgrim, Tabernacle Catering, etc.

"(d) Debenture interest.

"(e) All expenses in connection with Photo Drama; but taking previous years' figures as a guide, the receipts will not be sufficient to meet the outgoings. [When I arrived there were about \$1,500 on hand, and when I left about \$7,000 were on hand, without any coming from Brooklyn. Thus the receipts for that time greatly exceeded the expenses.—P.S.L.J.]

"When any cheques are to be drawn on this Account, which amount to more than the Donations paid in, a cheque must be obtained from the Watch Tower Bible and Tract Society for the deficit; the International Bible Students' Association will then have a balance of £23 always standing to its credit after any such deficit has been made good.

"All payments are to be entered in the Cash Book as previously and analyzed.

"The last two columns should be used for the amounts paid into Bank, but it will be found a convenience to yourselves if the donations from outside sources and those from the Watch Tower Bible and Tract Society are kept separate.

"When you wish to draw any cheques these should be

entered in the Cash Book before they are issued, and then if you deduct the total of your Payments the deficit thus shown will represent the donation you will have to receive from the Watch Tower Bible and Tract Society, before the cheque can be paid away.

"With regard to Petty Cash items, which will be paid out of the Watch Tower Bible and Tract Society's cash, a cheque should be drawn on your account for this amount, and paid back again into your account, so as to place the expenditures of these on record in your books. The payments in of this money to you will be treated as donation from the Watch Tower Bible and Tract Society.

"In the Watch Tower Society's Books all donations to the International Bible Students' Association will be analyzed in a column for that purpose and in entering the total of Petty Cash at the end of each month, these columns which relate to the work of your Society will be entered in one sum in the I.B.S.A. Column.

"The quarterly statement rendered by you to Brooklyn will be a summary of the transactions of the two bodies. The receipts will include monies received both by the Watch Tower Bible and Tract Society and the International Bible Students' Association. The payments will be a summary of the Watch Tower Bible and Tract Society's Cash Book with the one exception that the Donations to the International Bible Students' Association will not be shown as a payment, but in place of this the full expenditure of that Body will be shown.

"Should there be any point in the above which is not quite clear to you, we shall be pleased to give you any further information you may require.

"Yours faithfully,

DAVIS & WINDER."

As soon as I read this scheme I saw its gross wrong to the W.T.B.&T.S. It totally changed Bro. Russell's arrangements; increased the I.B.S.A., and decreased the W.T.B.&T.S. power; threw all the advantages on the side of the I.B.S.A., and the disadvantage on the side of the W.T.B.&T.S.; made the I.B.S.A. in effect an independent corporation, and the W.T.B.&T.S. a buying, selling (at a loss) and

guaranteeing corporation; changed the I.B.S.A. from a profitless to a profit making corporation, a thing that would have required a new charter; it would have made it almost impossible to prove that the W.T.B.&T.S. controlled the I.B.S.A., and favored the contention of all three Managers, that the I.B.S.A., according to English law, was an Independent English Corporation (J.H. explained the relation of the I.B.S.A. to the W.T.B.&T.S. as a "fraternal" one in his injunction suit affidavit, in which he failed to state that it was a subsidiary of the W.T.B.&T.S.). My solicitor said under Bro. Russell's arrangement, the I.B.S.A. performed no financial transactions, and had no income, thus could keep no books; and therefore did not have to make an audited report to the Board of Trade. Knowing H.J.S.'s and W.C.'s ways, and now seeing that J.H. was confederate with them in this scheme and seeing no other way to prevent its adoption, I sued to enjoin the bank from giving them, and them from drawing money, apart from my order, giving as my reason that I feared that monies belonging to the W.T.B.&T.S. deposits would be placed in the I.B.S.A. deposits. J.H. says that he does not to this day know why I brought the suit! Did he not read my affidavit, and in my court testimony the scheme with an explanatory letter from the auditors, who therein state that they worked out the "scheme" after conferring fully with all three Managers? At no time during the suit, while I was in England, did the work of the London Branch cease, because of the suit; for I consented to their drawing on \$1,250.00 for running expenses. I brought the suit not to injure, but to prevent the work from being injured. J.H.'s statement shows that they had an abundance for current expenses, beside the above \$1,250.00. Thus the falsity of the statement that the suit shut down the work at the London Branch is proven. Permitting them to draw on \$1,250.00 I tied up the balance, \$2,750.00, so that

they could not transfer any of it, or make other deposits in the I.B.S.A. account. I intended the injunction to tie up the surplus monies only so long as would permit me to go to America and explain the situation in person. I felt sure that J.F.R. and the Board would approve the injunction, when they would understand the "scheme" and its circumstances, which required personal explanations.

J.F.R.'s opposition to me and support of the British Managers against me, made it necessary for me to bring the suit to protect the Society against the "scheme." What he said in a letter to me written before the dismissals satisfied me that, if he would see the "scheme," he would sanction what I did against it. Mar. 21 I sought to induce H.J.S., the Secretary of the I.B.S.A., to go with me to the Registrar's office and have the I.B.S.A. registered as a foreign-controlled corporation. Needing my authorization letters for this, I borrowed them from my solicitor. Being introduced as exhibits in the evidence they were now court property. He said if I should lose them, I would come into trouble with the High Court, as well as imperil the case. *H.J.S. refused to have the I.B.S.A. registered as a foreign-controlled corporation.* Had I succeeded in securing this, it would have been to the advantage of the W.T.B.&T.S. in many ways. Now it cannot be done without a heavy fine, \$25.00 a day since Mar. 21.

The night of Mar. 21, I retired about 9: 30, the authorization papers being in my possession. The next morning, as I sought to open my door, it would not, even under pressure, yield. Noticing that it could be bent above the knob, I sought to force it open, applying such pressure that the door broke below the lower hinge. I succeeded in bending the door above the knob sufficiently first to put my hand, then my arm out, and remove a board about 6 feet by 6 inches by $\frac{7}{8}$ inch, and about four other smaller pieces of wood, all of

which had been firmly wedged against the door. How innocently J.H. writes about a bit of wood and hides the facts of the case! He had his "guards" barricade me in my room! They had previously circumscribed my liberty of access to various parts of the house. Of course, I knew that something was "doing." I went up to Bro. Housden's room; he was locked in, unable to come out, and had been searched for the keys of the office and safe, as well as for that of his room, which officially and with J.H.'s full assent he was given Feb. 3, the day of his appointment to Assistant Managership, and which he had held ever since. What a misrepresentation that I and an "accomplice" had "seized the keys of the office and safe!" They had never left Bro. Housden's official possession from Feb. 3 until J.H. had one of his "guards" take them out of his pocket the night of Mar. 21. He committed an imprisonable offense in barricading me in mine, and locking Bro. Housden in his room! As I was talking through the locked door to Bro. Housden, several of the "guards" came hastily out of their rooms partly dressed. One of them, Bro. Cronk, a Tabernacle elder, told me that a constable had been there the night before; that I had been barricaded in my room for safe keeping; that the constable was going to return that morning; that I was not allowed to leave my room, except to go to the bathroom, and then only to make use of the halls and stairs between that and my room. Immediately, I thought of my papers, as court property, which I was sure they would take from me, and of the court hearing the next day. I decided to leave Bethel at once. Returning to my room I did a few necessary things, and was about to go down stairs and leave by the front door, when one of the "guards" himself went down. This prevented my exit by the door on the ground floor! My room was on the next floor above. There was a balcony whose floor was just outside of and below my window. Below this balcony

was an iron fence. Without any jump whatever, I let myself down, my hands holding onto the balcony, until my feet rested upon the fence, then again without a jump, I let myself down on the walk. J.F.R. represents me as letting myself down from the roof; the London Bethel is a four-story building; J.H., who did not see me, represents me ludicrously in a frock coat, and with galoshes (overshoes) only. My frock coat was entirely hidden under my overcoat, which reaches nearly to my ankles. My overshoes were without heels, and, of course, were over my shoes. J.H., who one day later packed my effects, not allowing me to come to do it, knows that my shoes were not among them. How did he know that I left with a coward's heart and uneasy conscience? Why does he not tell the matter as it was, if it were to be told at all, without imaginations, suppressions, additions, and misrepresentations? Believing him without hearing my side, no wonder some of the British brethren think my conduct "undignified." If J.H.'s "guard" (one had just told me that I was not allowed out of my room) had not gone down stairs, and thus prevented my leaving by the door, I would have left by the door. As it was, to prevent myself from being kept away from the hearing of the injunction case, and my authorization papers from falling into the hands of the other side, I had to leave by the only available exit, my window. That my fears that they would search me, and take my credentials from me were well grounded, appears not only from what he did to Bro. Housden, who was not freed until about 2 P.M.; but from the fact that J.H. rifled my portfolio, took from it many of my papers, some of which he sent to J.F.R., and read my private letters. His two long statements about me in "Harvest Siftings," not to mention others of his statements there, contain 71 misrepresentations. It is utterly untrue that I wandered about Bethel between two and four o'clock of mornings,

much less to see if my possessions were safe! They were all in my room! His rifling my portfolio shows that they were in need of guarding in my absence! It is utterly untrue that I secreted myself after I had left Bethel, until I left London. Several times J.H. sent Bro. Cronk to see me at my hotel; other brethren also called on me. Mails were sent from Bethel to me. *Of course after the barricading episode I would not return to Bethel to stay.*

"Brother Johnson stole \$1,500." (?) The foregoing sentence is a quotation of language that J.F.R. used of me, in my presence before the majority of the Bethel family July 27. It is his and J.H.'s version of my having had Bro. Housden put the Society's cash on hand into a safety deposit box, after he was unable to deposit it in a bank. From Feb. 3 until and including that time, he had been officially handling all of the Society's monies, and had been doing all the Society's banking until the bank, Mar. 13, refused to deal with him any longer as the Society's representative. Until Mar. 12, J.H. had cooperated with him in this official work, and would have done so longer, had he not been suspended. It was unsafe to keep this, a daily increasing amount of money, in our safe. After Justice Sargant ruled that my credentials gave me the right to control the Society's money in Britain, and therefore gave me a temporary injunction, and after we had failed on account of certain legal technicalities governing banks in England, to open an account elsewhere; on my solicitor's advice, I asked Bro. Housden to put the money into a safety deposit box. This was done to protect the Society's money, and to prevent it from being put into the I.B.S.A. deposits. Every penny was returned except about \$200.00 that had to be put into the hands of a solicitor as a guarantee for possible court costs. To call such a transaction theft, as J.F.R. did, and threaten me with arrest for theft, as J.H., who calls this "virtually stolen

money," did through his messenger, Bro. Cronk, are two samples of the slanderous misrepresentations and the mistreatment under which I suffer. March 23, the case seemed about to be settled out of court. It was agreed that the money be put into the keeping of a neutral brother until settlement. J.H. induced him, Bro. Gentle, to turn over the money to him without our knowledge! Why did J.F.R., who knows these facts, publicly accuse me of stealing \$1,500.00? The donor of the £350 check, hearing that there was trouble in the London Bethel, requested that it be returned to him. This was done by Bro. Housden, hence it was not among the money that J.H. induced Bro. Gentle to turn over to him. Some think that 1 Cor. 6: 1-8 was violated in this suit. That passage applies to cases that can be adjusted by a church of which both sides are members. It could not be applied in this case, because the bank was the main party that was enjoined. Moreover there was no congregation that had jurisdiction over the Society's matters. Nor did I sue for past wrong-doing, nor for an offense against myself, but rather to prevent a contemplated wrong from being committed against the Society. Manifestly 1 Cor. 6 does not apply to such a case; nor does it to the case between the majority of the Board and J.F.R. and W.E. Van Amburgh.

My credentials had not been notarized, a fact that had been overlooked by my solicitors and Justice Sargant March 17. This made them quite probably not binding before an English Court. For this reason, and not because of J.H.'s affidavit, my solicitors were willing to settle the case before March 23, when it was to come up for argument. Both sides were later willing to delay matters. Accordingly, the case was postponed until March 30. At that time, doubtful about winning the case on the question of the credentials not being notarially attested, J.H.'s solicitor apprised by J.F.R.'s cable of March 21, quoted before, that

"sealed revocation of his [my] credentials were mailed fifteenth," decided to wait for this cancellation, until the next session of court, which on account of the Easter recess would be April 20. The court granted their motion to this effect. This suited me, because, in harmony with my intentions in bringing the suit, I thought it would give me time to explain matters at Brooklyn in person, where I felt sure that the "scheme" being understood, my course on the injunction would be sanctioned, and I would be able to return to London with unquestioned powers to settle the suit and finish my British work. I arrived at New York April 9, and failed in my effort. Three times I suggested a method to J.F.R. whereby I could both win the suit, and the Society be spared the costs. He was in no mood to listen to any suggestion from me.

March 13, I cabled that if the Board wanted to recall me, kindly to order it, and cancel my credentials over the Society's seal and the signature of its officers, so that I might be sure that it was the Board's work; for someone, March 9, cabled: "Both Rutherford and *the Society* have cancelled Johnson's letters of authority," the Board knowing nothing of it. The following was actually done March 15: Without the Board's knowledge my credentials were cancelled over the Society's seal and the signatures of two of its officers. To me it seems that a document having the Society's seal should never be cancelled without authorization of the Board, its controlling body. I do not know how the case was handled after I left London, March 31, nor what other points additional to insanity and the cancellation cables and papers were brought forth to convince another judge that I had no authority to bring the suit. He so decided May 7, and not as J.F.R., says, before I left London, and assessed the costs on my solicitor, who guaranteed me to the Court. Certainly the "scheme" which occasioned the suit was decidedly against the interest of

the W.T.B.&T.S., if it desired, as I believed, to continue in control of the British Branch. The suit was not brought in the interest of my solicitor, nor of myself personally, but of the Society. Therefore, neither my solicitor, nor myself ought to be responsible for the costs. I undoubtedly would have won the suit had J.F.R., not "thrown me down." This is only another case where plotters against the Society were supported by him, and I, who stood for the Society's interests and Bro. Russell's arrangements, was "smitten." Why did he take the side of those who worked against the W.T.B.&T.S.? He said that it made little difference whether the "scheme" were adopted or not, since the Managers could draw the money out of the W.T.B.&T.S. deposits anyway. Granted that they could; but that does not touch many points; for among other reasons, if the W.T.B.&T.S. wanted to be in a position to maintain its control, it could be best maintained by Bro. Russell's arrangements, which gave it charge of all the work and business. This would demonstrate its control. The "scheme" would have proven that it "fraternally assisted" the I.B.S.A., as J.H. puts it in his affidavit. With that "scheme" operating and disloyal men in charge, one could easily see the disadvantage to the W.T.B.&T.S. Certainly H.J.S. and W.C. were far from loyal. J.H.'s part in the "scheme" was not loyal. My loyalty to Bro. Russell, whom the two so greatly disregarded, had more to do with my treating them as I did than they perhaps realize. It shocked me through and through that they could have been so disloyal to him. Perhaps after all I won the object of this suit—prevented the Managers from putting that "scheme" into operation. The exposure of it, perhaps, has deterred them therefrom. Why does J.F.R. not mention this "scheme" as the cause of the suit? He knows it was. Why does he instead represent the suit as an insane attempt to wreck the British work?

It was the only way under the circumstances of preventing the Society from losing control of the I.B.S.A. and keeping it as Bro. Russell arranged it to be kept.

As to J.H.'s charge that I was carrying out a "well laid scheme to gain control of the British work and publish our English Tower," I would say the following: My credentials, I believed, gave me power of attorney, in the work in every country to which I was sent. Ignoring this, which he understood from the outstart, as some of his statements show, J.H. says that after reflecting over the situation he concluded that I was planning to settle myself in charge of the British work and as a part of the plan, to publish another "Tower." J.F.R. adds, that to realize this scheme I brought charges against and dismissed the Managers. I would say that their conclusions are evil surmising and absolutely false. These conclusions have been imagined from the few following facts: Because of the sifting that I saw setting in, and which is now in full force there, and which before leaving America, several months before, I told the Executive Committee was coming, I told J.H. I would have to stay longer than I had expected, and that I was going to ask the Board for permission to publish temporarily an English Tower to meet the sifting. I suggested the temporary publishing of an English "Tower" after I returned to America to five members of the Board, J.F.R. among them. I still think this probably the best way to meet the sifting, if "Harvest Siftings" represents the situation aright. How different my thought from their surmise! J.H. knows that I was anxious to finish the British Work as soon as possible, and that I desired to be in America by June at the latest. The reason I held on in Britain is that faithfulness to my mission under my credentials in my judgment required it. I felt sure that if I would give up at an unauthorized recall and setting aside my credentials,

and in the face of that "scheme," I would be an unfaithful servant and would be blamed as such, not only by the Lord, but also by the Board, when apprised of the situation. Why did J.F.R., who knew the above explanation in April, publish the falsehood (yea, he makes it the main feature of my British activity in his "Harvest Siftings") about my having a well-formed plan for seizing the English field? Why did he not clearly explain the matter of publishing an English "Tower"? While charging me with other things, why did he never mention this "well-thought-out plan" to me before "Harvest Siftings" appeared? How could J.H. before the same congregation before which he acknowledged me as having been used of the Lord to deliver him from the greatest trouble of his life, denounce me as a rebel to the Society, and *smile* while making "points" against me that repeatedly convulsed many in the congregation with laughter? No wonder that even an opponent of mine like Bro. Radwell should, in revulsion at the act and in sympathy with me, write me the next day the letter a part of which is quoted above! J.H. in one place in "Harvest Siftings" assures J.F.R. that I was not insane, in several other places that I was an imposter, and in another place that my work and life were not those of a hypocrite! How harmonize these statements? The Lord forgive him and bless him! My official acts, apart from the Steward matter, are perfectly clear from the standpoint from which I most conscientiously acted, *i.e.*, that my credentials were meant in good faith.

My dear brethren, will you, who for many years have known me and my ministry, believe the horrible caricature of me and my work in Britain drawn in "Harvest Siftings"? I cannot believe it of you! I leave it with the Lord; He knows.

Even granted that what "Harvest Siftings" says of my British activity were true, was it just, not to say the part of a brother, to publish it? What good can

it serve? It has only grieved, injured and thrown the brethren into the confusion against which I forewarned J.F.R. Though made the main subject of "Harvest Siftings," it is only remotely related to its object, which is to justify J.F.R.'s ousting four members of the Board. It hides the real question at issue, which is: *Is he or the Board under the Lord the controller in the Society's affairs?* The real question is not whether he is Executive and Manager in the Society's affairs, which on all hands is conceded. Before elected President, he himself set forth in the "Tower," Dec. 15, 1916, the proposition which is given in the letter of Nov. 10 to the British Managers: *"It (the W.T.B.&T.S.) being a corporation is of course controlled by its Board of Directors."* However, since he was elected President, and later was made Executive and Manager, without authority in law, in the Charter, in Bro. Russell's will, in an act of the Board, or in the Scriptures, he claims *additionally to be controller* in the Society's affairs, and acts in harmony with this claim. Indisputably his handling of the British and the Board affairs proves this to be his theory and practice. Five members of the Board dispute this. The places of four of these who resisted his efforts to control he declared vacant on the Board on a legal technicality (that they had not been elected annually) that would have equally made his place vacant on the Board, and thus disqualified his being a candidate for President; and appointed four others, and thus has a Board whose majority favors him! No matter what his motive was, these are facts. In one part of "Harvest Siftings" *he claims that the four considered me insane*, yet in other places he represents *me as having led these four brothers in a conspiracy to wreck the Society and them as submitting to an insane leader!* I deny unqualifiedly that I have any knowledge of the four ousted brothers as conspiring, much less conspiring to wreck

the Society; nor have I any faith in the statement that they so conspired. It is a creature of J.F.R.'s imagination and hides his usurpation. Though he repeatedly judges what my motives were, I do not want to judge his motives, nor have I anywhere in this reply done so. The Lord will attend to his motives. With Him I leave them. But he repeatedly asserts that a man is to be presumed as intending the natural results of his acts. I doubt the proposition of imperfect man, even if it is "legal"; but he believes it. The natural effect of his introducing and caricaturing my British Work is to hide what he knows is the real question at issue: Should he or the Board under the Lord be controller in the Society's affairs? and additionally to discredit the majority of the Board. Therefore, *according to his standards*, he by introducing and caricaturing British matter intended to hide the real issue, and to discredit the Board! I will leave to the Lord to decide, if this was his intention; but I feel justified in saying that many sober-minded brethren who know him, his methods and the situation fear that this is his motive. I will say this much: that judging from the impression that "Harvest Siftings" as a whole gives, from its stating partial facts misleadingly, from its suppression of many known facts that give a totally different impression, and from its many fabricated "facts," I should not be at all surprised, if the British matter were introduced and caricatured to hide the real question at issue and discredit the Board members. The Lord knows! He will make it known in due time!

After a restful journey I landed in New York April 9. Soon I was at Bethel, where my reception was icy, due to J.F.R.'s warning the family against me. Several days after my arrival, I had my first private talk with him. Haughtiness and contempt characterized his face and voice almost throughout this conversation. That noon he invited four members of the Board and two other brothers for what

he called a conference. I thought it was to be that for which I asked, a hearing before a full meeting of the Board. However, that meeting he calls in "Harvest Siftings" one of the "two Board meetings" where I had a "hearing." If any prosecutor treated an accused more unjustly than J.F.R. did me that day, my heart would bleed for the accused. I was supposedly having a hearing. This is what occurred: Though knowing that I was quite unwell, for over an hour he acted like a pettifogging prosecutor browbeating an accused person. Instead of letting me have a chance to tell my story, he brought forth one distorted thing after another against me—calculated without explanation to prejudice my case. Repeatedly I remonstrated, asking for an opportunity to present my case. I was answered with sneers, sarcasm and ridicule. His face expressed more contempt than that of any other face upon which I have ever looked. Despite my oft-repeated requests, he would not let me tell my story; but insisted on setting me forth to disparagement. I thought of Caiaphas' treatment of Jesus. I thought how differently Bro. Russell would have done. After about an hour of his browbeating and my repeated requests to be given an opportunity to have a hearing, and repeated statement that I was under fire and was appealing from J.F.R.'s decision to the Board, and should, therefore, first be given the chance to tell my story, and afterward let objections be urged, if they were desired to be urged, he still refusing to let me set forth my case, I solemnly protested, exclaiming, "In the name of God, our Father, and Jesus Christ, our Saviour, I solemnly protest against this gross injustice!" Even this did not quiet him. Only then did he quiet down somewhat, when he noticed that his conduct was unfavorably impressing a number of the brothers present. Amid almost constant pettifogging interruptions I finally succeeded in squeezing in a little about my credentials and the "scheme." This

travesty of justice he calls in his "Harvest Siftings" a hearing before the Board for two hours. How different he appears on the platform before an audience; but his unjust and wrongful treatment of the brethren is becoming more and more known.

The next night I was supposed to have two hours to explain the British matters before the same brothers. This also was not an official Board meeting. *He did not allow me to take up the British matter at all, claiming that it was settled.* I remarked, "I have not been heard." That seemed the last thing in the world to concern him. He then used much time, trying to inveigle me into promises to submit to his decision on passages which he had not studied, without their being discussed. Of course I would not permit myself so to be entrapped. Then I was given insufficient time to give my views on the Steward. This is what his "Harvest Siftings" calls my second "hearing before the Board" on the British situation. The British situation was not discussed at all. He had settled that without the Board, despite my *appeal to the Board from his decision.* This act proves conclusively that he considered that he, not the Board, was the final authority as he claimed. From his attitude I saw that for the present there was nothing to be accomplished. Smiling despite my disappointment, I left, as he says, in a friendly spirit. The brethren separated without a discussion, much less a statement, that I was under a mental delusion, though he says they so decided. I will not speak of his repeated mistreatment of me at the table, much of which was due to my defending some of Bro. Russell's views against his opposing doctrinal views. As his mistreating me before the six brothers in the "two hearings before the Board" aroused sympathy in my case among some of them, so his mistreating me at the table aroused sympathy in not a few of the family. Beginning early in May I was given on six

Sundays appointments to fill. Surely J.F.R. would not have arranged these services for me, if he believed me insane, and having done so wickedly in Britain as his "Harvest Siftings" sets forth! At none of these places did I say a word about the trouble, though he says I traveled from place to place at the Society's expense seeking to stir up prominent brethren against him; nor did I at any time advise the Board to gain the support of prominent brethren. I likewise withheld the matter from the Bethel family. I was waiting to tell it to the Board, where it belonged, which up to the present, despite my petition, I have not been permitted to do. Early in June I respectfully asked him for a return to Britain. For this he severely censured me, which I took meekly. I unqualifiedly deny that at that time, or any other time, I attempted to force my return; nor did I at that time, or any other time, tell him that I would appeal to the Board to go. Probably a week later I asked for a full hearing of my British activity before the Board, and did not say a word about a return to England at that time. I did not on his refusal say, "You are a usurper, and I will appeal to the Board, and see that I have a hearing"; nor did I use words to that effect. Learning that a majority of the Board could by petition secure a meeting, I asked and secured the signatures of four members to a petition that I drew up, asking for a Board meeting to hear my case. J.F.R. claims that I conspired with these four brothers. This I deny. Before I had spoken to any of them on my affair I found that they were opposed to his claim of, and acts in, controlling the Society's affairs. The following I did do: As said previously, I showed three of them, who had not before seen it, my protest and petitions of March 7. I also told the four enough about the British situation to convince them that I ought to have a fair hearing before the Board. Bro. Pierson also thought so. This certainly is not a conspiracy,

much less a conspiracy to wreck the W.T.B.&T.S. Nor was it conspiracy to ask them to petition for a Board meeting for me to have a hearing. Apart from my protest and petitions, on two subjects only do I recall having advised any of the four on their difficulty with him, before I was accepted by both sides as mediator. The one led up to mediation; the other is the following: He claims that (despite the fact that the W.T.B.&T.S. Charter says that its Board shall make its by-laws and authorizes nobody else to do this) the shareholders can legally make binding by-laws according to the Charter. One of the four asked me my opinion on this. I replied that I did not think they could; but not being a lawyer I suggested that he ask one. This he did, with the result that the lawyer, a thoroughly loyal Truth brother, Bro. McGee, who is an assistant of the Attorney General of N. J., whom Bro. Russell and J.F.R. had several times asked for legal advice, answered that according to the charter, the shareholders could not legally make by-laws for the Society. One day J.F.R. was contending for his view of this point, as being legal, when without any authority whatever to use the word "we," referring to Bro. McGee's opinion, I replied that "we" also had legal opinion, and that it said the opposite. I did not speak in a heated manner; I did not shake my finger at him; I did not say, "We are consulting lawyers and we know what we can do with you." Before the Bethel family, July 17, reporting this manufactured statement, he gave the last clause as follows: "And we'll fix you." Quite a change! Instead of my becoming angry, he became angry, crying out loud enough to be heard at least 50 feet away: "You are in a conspiracy." Then he shouted out to Bro. Eshelman, who was about 20 feet away, to come; and to me to repeat my statement in the presence of a witness. Seeing that he was intent on proving me guilty of what I was innocent, I declined

to repeat my remark to the effect that we had contrary legal opinion. Whatever the four Board members were doing they kept to themselves so far as I was concerned. Never once did I attend any of their meetings where they were planning Board procedures. I knew, of course, their view of the Board's powers, and later of their difference with him, that there had been a discussion between them and him on this matter, but I did not know their plans, nor, except that they were going to discuss their difference on controllership with the President, did I know what they were going to do in their various moves, *e.g.*, I knew nothing about the visit of the four brothers to the Tabernacle, when a policeman was called to put them out, in what J.F.R. claims was their attempt to take control by force, until I was informed of it some days later. I knew nothing about their alleged plan (which they deny) of exploding a bomb the night of July 18, before the congregation; therefore I could not have lost heart and desisted therefrom. Lately I found out that two of these four brothers were not at that meeting. These facts, of course, prove that they were not acting under my direction. He surmised this, as I believe he surmised the rest of the conspiracy. That I agreed with them that the Board, and *not he*, who over and over again claimed not to be subordinate to the Board, *should control the affairs of the Society*, according to Bro. Russell's statement on the Directors' duties after his death, in a booklet entitled "A Conspiracy Exposed" and according to the Charter, could not properly be called my being in a conspiracy. Nor should the fact that they shared my view that it would be safer for the work, instead of having him as the sole executive to have two others with him, as an executive committee, a view with which he agreed June 22, be considered an evidence of a conspiracy "to wreck the Society." That they had a letter procurable from me alone, which I showed

them to prove that it was right that the Board as controller hear my case, *i.e.*, a carbon copy of the letter that J.F.R. dictated to the English Managers Nov. 10, quoted above, far from proves that I was in a conspiracy with them "to wreck the Society." That heavy loss of sleep moved me to decline a pilgrim trip about the time that he wanted to send I. F. Hoskins on a trip to the West coast (not for only two weeks as he says) that would have kept him away from important Board meetings, for which he says he declined the trip, is poor proof of a conspiracy on the part of the four and myself. From what frail materials he seeks to construct his Conspiracy Building! Gladly have I been, and most gladly would I continue, laying down life for the work of the Society, but wreck it—NEVER!

The petition June 13, for a hearing before a full Board meeting was *denied* by J.F.R., who, W.E. Van Amburgh concurring with him in this sentiment, said he had neither the time nor the inclination to hear me. In denying the petition of the majority of the Board again he acted as the controller of the Board, whether their meeting was official or not. Instead, he appointed four brothers a Board Committee to investigate my case and report it to the full Board for their action. Though disappointed, I accepted this as the best arrangement obtainable. He furnished them the reports, which gave the evidence of the English Commission on the Tabernacle and Bethel matters, and the findings on the Tabernacle matters, *but not the findings of the Bethel matters*. He said he did not have the latter. In April he knew of their contents, for he admitted that they favored my dismissing the two brothers; but said that he did not agree with the English Commission's findings on the dismissals, a Bethel, not a Tabernacle matter. What has become of the Bethel findings I do not know. The Board Committee studied the Bethel evidence, and claimed that

the two Managers deserved dismissal. Thus they agreed with the English Commission. For five hours, occupying two sessions of one day, not for a week as he says, I went over the English situation with the Board Committee and was at no other of their meetings, while they were going over other phases of their inquiry. They, too, reported to the Board in my favor. He claims I sought unduly to influence the English Commission and conspired with the American one! Their report was so violently opposed by him that they thought it wise not then to press it further; instead a compromise was accepted, they putting off for more favorable conditions a final settlement of the case, a thing with which Bro. Pierson later came into agreement. Bro. Pierson had not yet heard my case from me. I decided after the above-mentioned compromise to seek to lay it before Bro. Pierson, which I did at Cromwell in July. While I was there so doing, I said not a word to anybody else about the trouble at Brooklyn. He gave me a full hearing, and he, too, took my view of the British situation, convinced by the facts, documents and letters that I presented to his attention. Thus five members of the Board, the only ones who have fully heard me, approved my course on the British matter, except the matter of the Steward. The other two did not have the time and inclination to hear me, but one of them later had both the time and inclination to prepare against me "Harvest Siftings" by which, next to Bro. Russell, I have been more grievously misrepresented than any other servant of the Lord in the whole harvest period. These five Board members, knowing well that I and the British matters, though the occasion, are not the cause of their difference with J.F.R., at the Boston Convention issued August 4 an open letter over their signatures in which the following occurs: "Bro. Johnson is in no sense the cause of the controversy between the President on the one side

and Bros. Pierson, Ritchie, Wright, Hoskins and Hirsh, on the other side. The President's treatment of Bro. Johnson is only one of the circumstances in which we could not approve of Bro. Rutherford's course. Our contention is that Bro. Johnson, in whom Bro. Russell reposed great confidence, and who manifested much love and zeal for the Truth, during the 14 years of his public service, during which he traveled as Pilgrim, paying his own expenses except for one year, should be given full and fair opportunity to present his case. At present he has been condemned without a trial and to our personal knowledge has been shamefully misrepresented and treated."

Shortly after the above-mentioned Board meeting I was told, June 22, there was no more work for me at the Tabernacle (where in addition to preaching on Sunday and occasionally leading a Berean Lesson week days, I worked half time, as much as my health permitted. Despite this, in one place J.F.R. says I was doing absolutely nothing in the harvest work!) Instead, I was told that he wanted to see me. He proposed a pilgrim trip. I replied that my health was not sufficiently restored for pilgrim work; that my sleep was too poor. He suggested a short one as a trial. I hesitatingly assented, asking that I be sent homeward, where I could see my wife. He did not suggest my going home that day. The next night my sleep was very poor. I concluded that a week or two in the pilgrim work would put me back where I was four months before; while, if I could wait for probably three or four weeks my sleep might warrant steady work. I respectfully told him this the next morning. Instead of his making the nice little speech that he puts into his own mouth in his "Harvest Siftings," he blurted out: "Go home then; leave Bethel, for you are the cause of all the trouble here." I replied that such was not the case; but his "grasping for power," like H.J.S., was the cause of

the trouble. To his insisting that he as the head of the home, had the right to put me out I assented, except that the Board was superior to him as the final authority, and that therefore I appealed to it against his decision that I leave. With that he dropped the matter. He brought up the matter of my leaving Bethel no more until July 27. In fact, he later arranged for a new room for me. Therefore I could not have been living in Bethel for weeks in defiance of his orders for me to leave. I did not then call him a usurper. The first time that I used this expression of him was after he ousted the four Board members, July 17. At the time of the suggestion that I go on a pilgrim trip, I was supposed to head a conspiracy. Query: If he believed me an arch conspirator and the wrecker of the British Church, why should he have arranged a pilgrim trip for me?

After Bro. Russell's death I loved J.F.R. above all other brethren. Remembering our old friendship, I sought hopefully and repeatedly to come into peace with him. This prompted me, *e.g.*, on one occasion, June 22, to put my arms around him and say, "We have been such good friends, surely we can as brothers talk over matters and adjust our difficulties. When shall we make the effort?" He agreed to 3: 00 o'clock that afternoon, but at that time sent his secretary to me, saying that he would have to see me at another time. The next morning, June 23, and not June 21, as he says, I asked when it might be, but I received reply that it could not be before a trip that he had in view. We then had a short conversation in which I briefly mentioned the following things that in my opinion in his conduct were displeasing to the Lord:

(1) Expecting to be elected President (a thing that he conceded), he should not have prepared beforehand the by-laws (of which Bro. Ritchie assured me he was in total ignorance, until they were shown him) that among other things were to give

him executive and managerial power, nor insisted on their unaltered recommendation by the resolution committee through browbeating it, nor sought to influence their passage by the shareholders, knowing that the Charter *did not give the President such powers, nor the shareholders the right to make* by-laws. I told him that in my opinion humility would have led him to accept, and faithfully do such work as the Board would offer him, and not grasp for more.

(2) After the Board made by-laws of his resolutions passed by the shareholders, instead of confining his activities to the office of Executive and Manager he was claiming and exercising *controllership in the affairs of the Society as against the Board*. Thereupon he said that he was the Controller in the affairs of the Society, and had all the authority therein that Bro. Russell had, who was not only Executive and Manager, but also Controller. About the middle of April he had told me the same thing, claiming that Bro. Russell had so arranged matters (he did for himself; but for no one else), and that the Board had almost nothing (except where legal formalities existed) to say or do in the Society's affairs. This is contrary not only to Bro. Russell's statement in the booklet "A Conspiracy Exposed" as to the Board's place in the Society's affairs after his death, but also to J.F.R.'s written and published opinions referred to above. I pleaded with him in God's name almost with tears in my eyes to desist from his course, as it was self-exaltation, like Lucifer's, and was causing the trouble that was now common property in Bethel. Had he heeded this plea the present worldwide trouble in the Church would not have occurred. It was on this occasion that I stated that we had "opposite legal opinion" and that he cried out, "you are in a conspiracy."

July 17 came. On a legal technicality that, if binding, applied to him as well as them, he ousted four

members of the Board. In "Harvest Siftings" he claims the reason was that they were conspiring to wreck the Society. In truth, as far as I know the case, they were simply resisting his usurpations by which he was claiming and exercising controllership as against the Board, and sought for the Board that it be allowed to perform its duties, duties that he has both written and published included *controllership in the affairs of the Society*. That afternoon six brothers, myself among them, protested against his arbitrariness, in ousting these brothers. *Not the remotest hint was made in these protests to anything connected with Vol. 7, which had not yet been given to the Bethel Family and whose sending to others was unknown to the protestants*. Therefore their protests against his ousting the four members of the Board, even if it be conceded that Vol. 7 is the penny, cannot be construed as the parabolic murmuring at those called as laborers in the 11th hour receiving in Vol. 7 as much as the protestants, as a brother in preaching and in print claims. Let us be above beclouding a question by such tortured and totally inapplicable interpretations. It should further be remarked on the interpretation of the whole parable given by the brother who suggested the above application, that according to his view, each hour representing three years, his parabolic day, beginning October, 1881, would not end until October, 1917; therefore his penny was given before his evening time! Thus his first hour was from October, 1881, to October, 1884; his third from October, 1887, to October, 1890; his sixth hour from October, 1896, to October, 1899; his ninth hour from October, 1905, to October, 1908; his eleventh hour from October, 1911, to October, 1914; the evening would then follow October, 1917, nearly three months after Vol. 7 was first distributed. This is fatal to his theory! Where in the Scriptures is a symbolic day of 36 years referred to? Let him search the history of the Harvest

and, except throughout his first hour (which is Bro. Russell's third less four months), he will find *throughout his call hours* no specially large numbers called *accompanied by siftings confined to his call hours*. Both of these things occur in the call hours, as Bro. Russell interpreted the parable. Why not stand by Bro. Russell's satisfactory interpretation, known as such by the brother whose interpretation has just been reviewed? Why seek, as the brother does, to convey the impression that Bro. Russell looked for a fulfilment in line with a different interpretation from his own?

Both J.F.R. and the four ousted brothers accepted my offer of mediation on July 18, on the basis agreed to by both parties, that the *legal questions involved* should be referred to the decision of a court in a friendly suit. This plan was at least just, whereas his procedure in ousting them was unjust, since it made him the accuser, prosecutor, judge, jury and executioner. I sought honestly and impartially to mediate. I never once gave as my reason for desiring privately to settle the trouble between him and the Board that it would discredit him, if it became public. I desired to keep it from the brethren at large; because I thought, to know of it would be, not to their edification, but to their injury; and so told him repeatedly. My first difficulty as mediator was caused by his refusal to keep a promise given to me several times July 18, *i.e.*, to let the four brothers have the legal opinion which was read, July 17, before the family as the legal ground for the ousting; and which they desired to have their counsel study. This refusal brought me into difficulty with the four. I tried in vain for an hour to persuade him to keep his promise. Then he refused to submit the case to a court in a friendly suit. I submitted another proposition, *i.e.*, that each side select a lawyer and that these two select a third; and before these, as an Arbitration Board, let the legal

points be argued by counsel representing each side, both sides binding themselves beforehand in writing to accept the decision of this Board on the legal points; and afterward to get together as brethren and settle matters Scripturally. The four accepted this proposition, which all will agree is fair. Apparently succeeding at first to gain, later I sought in vain to maintain his adherence to this fair plan. I worked back and forth between the two parties for a week with various offers. I had a number of brethren offer special prayer for the effort. It was made in all honesty, no attempt being made to deceive him, as he intimates, my desire among other things being to save the Church from distraction. How much better, for the Church, had he followed this course! Finally, July 25, he served me with an ultimatum to deliver to the four, to the effect that they must accept the new Board; agree to work on in peace in harmony with this arrangement, or leave Bethel; if they would not keep such a peace, he would publish the whole thing, including the British matter. This ended mediation. The following Sunday, July 29, his "Harvest Siftings" was read to the Boston Elders: *Thus while I was working as mediator he was preparing his "Harvest Siftings"!* I was the one who was deceived! July 27, at the close of a meeting of the People's Pulpit Association, when they failed to agree with his ultimatum, nor would discuss matters further with him without legal counsel, he, in *great anger*, arose, saying, "Then it will be war." So far as he is concerned, it has been assassination from then on. Verily "the wrath of man worketh not the righteousness of God." Alas! Alas!! Alas!!! How his ambition and uncontrolled temper have injured God's Church!

I will pass by many things that I suffered and saw at Bethel, including an espionage system, a "whispering" campaign wherein a "confidential statement" of distorted "facts" was spread abroad against me by

him and A.H. Macmillan, exposure of the trouble in the Board to the family in a partisan way, etc., illustrative of what one of the finest characters in Bethel almost in tears assured me, *i.e.*, that, while I was in Europe, there had been a veritable "reign of terror" in Bethel. I will describe the scene that occurred just after the noon meal of July 27, in the presence of the majority of the Bethel family. He remarked that while his controllership in the Society's affairs was disputed, it was indisputable that he was in control of the affairs of the People's Pulpit Association, in whose name the Bethel property stood. (Bro. Russell in Dec. 1915, "Tower" said that the People's Pulpit Association could act only as directed by the W.T.B.&T.S.) Therefore, he ordered me to leave Bethel that day, and the four Board members to leave the following Monday. I was denied a respectful and repeated request for the privilege to make a statement to the family. Therefore I said nothing. Then Bro. Wright asked to make a statement. He was refused; but spoke anyway. Bro. Hirsh asked to read a letter that Bro. Pierson wrote, to the effect that he disapproved of J.F.R.'s ousting the four brothers from the Board, and that he would firmly stand for and with the old Board. J.F.R. fairly shouted that he was induced by Bro. Johnson's "falsehoods" to write that letter. I denied falsifying to Bro. Pierson. This angered him. He shouted out, "You broke up the British Church." I replied: "If it is broken up, before God and this family I charge you with the responsibility." Then still more angry he shouted, "Bro. Johnson stole \$1500.00." I replied, "That is a false statement, and you know it is." Still more wrathful, he ordered me to leave Bethel on pain of legal proceedings. I replied that I had appealed to the Board from that decision; and that since I recognized the Board as in control, and, in the case of an appeal, as having the right to decide the question, I

awaited its decision; that if it ordered me to leave, I would do so at once. At this he completely lost self-control. To enforce his order he rushed at me crying out, "You leave this house." Grabbing me by the arm, he almost jerked me off my feet. So violently did he squeeze my arm that, if it were not quite muscular, I feel sure, he would have made black and blue marks on it. I called the family's attention to the fact that he exercised physical violence on my person. A.H. Macmillan, springing to his side, prevented one of his descending hands from striking me on the head and took his other hand off my arm. He continued to abuse me. R. J. Martin, who was standing nearby, repeatedly asked him whether he should not call the police. Again I called the family to witness that he had used physical violence against me. A.H. Macmillan then said, "He did not hurt you." I replied that he jerked me so violently as nearly to knock me down in plain sight of many. At this R. J. Martin started to hoot at me, and was joined in by quite a number of J.F.R.'s sympathizers. So greatly were the feelings of the majority, myself among them, outraged by this exhibition of rowdyism that they and I left the dining room.

Presently A.H. Macmillan came to my room threatening to have me removed by the police, if I did not leave. I declined to leave because of my appeal to the Board. Thinking that he would fulfill his threat, and not desiring my things put out in confusion, I packed up. Later, on my still refusing to leave, he said, "You will either leave, or by night you will be bruised or be in jail." Later, thinking that I was unobserved, I left Bethel to make a call in a house across the street. Returning as the friends were coming from the Tabernacle to Bethel for supper, I sought to enter by the Library entrance just behind a brother, but the door was slammed shut in my face, striking against me violently as it closed. The brother who did this told me to go up to the front door. As I did

so, I saw under the eyes and at the command of J.F.R., a brother put my belongings out of doors. I asked J.F.R. if this meant that I was evicted from Bethel. He replied, "Yes," then closed the door. I rang the bell. On his putting his head out the door, held slightly ajar, with a loving heart and smiling face I said, "Well, after all, Bro. Rutherford, my sentiment is 'God bless you!'" He smiled, closed the door, then opened it again, asking me if I needed any money, but said nothing else. I thanked him, saying I had some. He then, without further remark, closed the door. Many witnessed the whole scene. Some of these assured me that for a considerable time before, guards were at the doors to prevent my entrance. Alas! it is almost unbelievable that this scene could have been staged! I now pass by Bethel from time to time. I see the dear ones go in and out. My heart cries out to them, "My beloved Brethren, God bless you! Our Father bless you! I love you!" Yes, I love them all. I love J.F.R.; I love J.H. The Lord's grace has kept me in the love of God in this long experience of the greatest injustice that has come into my life. And it has come from two, whom after Bro. Russell's death I have loved above all other brethren. But the Lord's ways are best. It is best that our severest trials come from those whom we most love; for that makes them easier to bear.

After my return from Europe I learned that J.F.R., W.E. Van Amburgh and A.H. Macmillan conspired to gain for the first Bro. Russell's full power and authority in the work and business of the Society. They began this conspiracy before the election. They prearranged every detail of the voting shareholders' meeting Jan. 6. At Brooklyn J.F.R. prepared and W.E. Van Amburgh approved the resolutions that, among other things, were to secure for the President executive and managerial authority. These W.E. Van Amburgh gave I. L. Margeson (this I state on the latter's

authority), the chairman of the Resolutions Committee, for which they also arranged. A week before the election J.F.R. furnished a brother with an account of the proceedings of the voting shareholders' meeting for publication in the press of the country, telling of his election by the Secretary casting the ballot of the convention and of the unanimity of his election, and giving some of his speech of acceptance. The Editor of the New York Herald commented on the prophetic gifts of "those Bethel people" in being able to foretell just what would happen at the election! In this account J.F.R. failed to state that by his prearrangement the nominations were so closed, that there could be no other Presidential candidates for whom thousands of voting shares were instructed, and that he prepared the resolution recommending that he be made Executive and Manager. No political convention was ever more completely or more smoothly "bossed" than the voting shareholders' meeting Jan. 6. Certainly the remark that he made to me in July, when he explained how he arranged for the election of R. H. Hirsh to the Board, applies to the proceedings of the Jan. 6, meetings. "Of course, Bro. Johnson, you know all things of that character are arranged beforehand, just like matters connected with a political convention!"

As far as I know, it seems to me that his first pertinent wrong was his activity (begun before his election, which he expected, but for which I do not think he electioneered) connected with his securing for himself executive managerial authority in the Society's affairs. In this activity W.E. Van Amburgh participated, but not Bro. Ritchie, the other member of the Executive Committee. As he says, I believe that he thought it would be better for "one mind" than for a committee of three to be the Executive and Manager. His second wrong was (contrary to Bro. Russell's express statement in "A Conspiracy Exposed"

and to his own written and published view) grasping for, and usurping controllership in, the Society's affairs, instead of leaving controllership with the Board. His third wrong was his acting in many ways, particularly in the British and in the Board's affairs, in harmony with this usurpation, to the great injury of the Church. I have no doubt that he thought this course right. It seems to me that his sense of humility and justice were too weak to enable him to see aright, and to make straight paths for his feet; and thus he fell in the test. I am not judging his motive, I am simply seeking an explanation for his acts. The thought fixed in his mind that it would be in the interest of the work for his mind to be the "one mind" to control the affairs of the Society—doubtless others encouraged him in the thought, if not by word, certainly by act—he could see a conspiracy only and an attempt to wreck the Society, in the acts of those who were seeking to have Bro. Russell's ideals and charter carried out, as he wanted them after his death. Because Bro. Johnson, Mar. 7, in his protest set forth the thought of the Board's controllership versus the Executive's, and in his accompanying petitions asked for an Executive Committee instead of one Executive and Manager, and because the four brothers held the same thoughts, the first of which all of them had, before Bro. Johnson spoke with them at all on the subject, and of the expediency of the second of which, three of them were convinced before Bro. Johnson spoke to them at all on that subject; and because they sought to translate these thoughts into acts, though Bro. Johnson knew in advance almost nothing of their various moves, they must be in a conspiracy to "wreck the Society" under the leadership of Bro. Johnson! Judging from his theory set forth in his "Harvest Siftings," and the knowledge that I have of the events such seems to be his mental attitude and process.

In explanation of this mental attitude I desire to quote a remark made of him by one of his best friends in the Truth, who knows him thoroughly: "There are two Rutherfords. Bro. Rutherford whom I dearly love, and Lawyer Rutherford of whom I cannot approve." Lawyer R., not Bro. R., prepared "Harvest Siftings." And in this fact my charity finds a partial excuse for him. Almost every lawyer develops the mental habit of setting forth a theory for each case, then seeks to make everything harmonize with that theory. Whatever facts connected with the case oppose that theory are suppressed; whatever facts or partial facts interpretable in other ways, can by a twist be made to harmonize with that theory are given that twist; and whatever is lacking to make the theory plausible is invented and stated as a fact. So accustomed do most lawyers become to such practices that they become unconscious of doing such things. This is exactly what "Lawyer" Rutherford has done in "Harvest Siftings" and this accounts in part for the fact that, not only the whole setting that he gives to things is false; but also that against me alone there are in "Harvest Siftings" 220 misrepresentations, the majority of which are in his own statements! There are 32 of these in his epitome and 29 in his summary! Believing him to be a brother and a child of God, I cannot explain what he has done in "Harvest Siftings" on any other ground than that "Lawyer," not Bro., R. wrote it. Poor Lawyer Rutherford! Dear Bro. Rutherford! God bless the latter and help him overcome the former!

Why have I in a defense of myself written of some of the weaknesses of some of my brethren, whom I surely love? Not from a desire to uncover their weaknesses, but because, in harmony with Bro. Russell's article in Sep. 15, 1917, "Tower," page 283, first par., second column, I am forced so to do, under the circumstances created by "Harvest Siftings," to arouse the Church to a sense of danger! Just as H.J. Shearn

and W. Crawford in Britain have set aside some, and attempted to set aside others of Brother Russell's arrangements, so J.F.R. is doing here. Just as they kept the W.T.B.&T.S. in the background, and over-emphasized the I.B.S.A., so he is setting aside provisions of the Society's charter, and is putting controllership into the hands of the People's Pulpit Association, its subsidiary. As they there were lording it over God's heritage, so he is doing here, even though "a reign of terror" results! As they are wrecking the churches there, so he is doing here. About 35 members of the Bethel family in various ways have been driven away because they protested against his high-handedness in this matter. In his "Harvest Siftings" he advises the friends to read Brother Russell's article in Nov. 1, 1916, "Tower," on "The Hour of Temptation"; yes, by all means let the friends do so; for it warns against those leaders who grasp for power over the Church; and urges their deposition. This he is doing on a larger scale than anybody else attempted in the history of the Harvest! Did he not show his affinity to H.J. Shearn and W. Crawford by siding with them against me in a conflict brought on by their attempting to make elders lords over God's heritage, and by their setting aside Brother Russell's arrangements? No wonder therefore that my criticisms of them made little impression on him! In view of these facts, is it not time for the shareholders to consider and pray over what they should do with one who has arbitrarily set aside such provisions of the Charter and such members of the Board as were in the way of his "absolutism"? Let us stand for Bro. Russell's wise arrangements! Let us stand for Bro. Russell's Will! Let us stand for Bro. Russell's Board! Let us stand for Bro. Russell's Charter! Let us stand for Bro. Russell's W.T.B.&T.S.! *The Society's only right to the things that Bro. Russell bequeathed to it* is that the intents of his writings, will, and charter be obeyed.

No one has a right to exercise any authority in the Society, unless he submits to Bro. Russell's expressed wishes respecting those bequests. These J.F.R. has disregarded; and therefore has morally forfeited the right to exercise any authority with respect to the W.T.B.&T.S. *Will not the shareholders bring such pressure to bear by their votes as to enforce compliance with them, and set aside those who do not comply with them? Would not Bro. Walter Page, a former vice-president, make a much better President than J.F.R.?*

The above is a truthful statement of the main facts of the case. The Lord knows how my heart has bled at the necessity of giving it. He knows my unfeigned love for the brethren, as well as those of whom "Harvest Siftings" has compelled me to write. He knows my great grief at the distress of the brethren caused by J.F.R.'s "Siftings." He knows my great joy at the privilege of serving the Church, and my ardent desire to continue to serve them along the lines of that Servant's teachings. My stand for the Lord, the Truth, the Brethren and Bro. Russell's policies in Britain and here does not deserve the treatment that I have received. My mistake on the Steward was at my own initiative recalled as soon as I saw it. Any other mistake that I may have made would as soon as seen be as frankly acknowledged. The things that I did in England, in the Bethel and Tabernacle affairs, were required by the necessities of the situation, and were performed in harmony with the powers that the Executive Committee gave me to believe I had. The Lord has made them stand in spite of J.F.R.'s efforts to overthrow them.

The above review was written in August [1917]; but various considerations prevented its earlier publication. Oct. 7, "Harvest Siftings," Part II, came to hand. To only a few points therein will I make reply. Sad to say, it, too, abounds in misrepresentations; in

some places many of these are in a single sentence. Some of these relate to matters sufficiently explained above; others, except two, I will pass by in silence. It is regrettable that J.F.R. applies a railing title, "Opponent's paper" to "Light After Darkness." But I rejoice to notice that J.F.R. concedes what he before disputed, that the Board alone could make bylaws, and should control in the Society's affairs, though I fear his insistence on his headship, which implies controllership, disannuls the second concession. But I must dissent from his statements that the Board has always controlled, and that the issue was not whether it or he was controller in the Society's affairs. This was decidedly and unquestionably the issue. The issue was not whether he was executive and manager, as distinct from controller. During Bro. Russell's life he, and not the Board, was the controller as well as executive. But he usually used another as manager. In view of what he was about to turn over to the Society, before he would organize it, he stipulated with the proposed shareholders that he must control until death even though the Charter affirms the Board's controllership. This agreement was emphasized when he gave his copyrights, etc., to the Society; because these were a more valuable asset than all possible financial donations. During his lifetime the Board acted (1) in an advisory capacity, and (2) in a sanctioning capacity (for certain transactions, when required by law so to do); but it did not control. Only between Bro. Russell's death and the Board's passing the by-law making J.F.R. executive and manager did the Board control. More or less confusion exists by reason of the double use of the word "manage"; and J.F.R. takes full advantage of this confusion. To clarify the subject, let us notice the main functions of a Board as controller, of an executive and of a manager. A Board as controller *initiates all matters of policy and program, i.e.,* what is to be done, and

the ways and means of doing it; it also *makes by-laws, rules and ordinances*, unless the Charter provides otherwise; it also *passes on all acts of the officials*, approving, disapproving, rescinding, modifying, or adding to them, *as it sees fit*. An executive *carries out* the policy and program; and usually acts as the Board's intermediary with others. A manager *supervises* the office or shop, and general details. In their relation to one another a manager is subject to an executive, and an executive is subject to a Board. The word "manage" is sometimes used to designate the work of a manager, and sometimes of a controller. Our Charter and the majority of the Board in "Light After Darkness" use the word "manage" in the sense of control; and the word "management" in the sense of controllership. These four brothers differed from J.F.R. (and I share their opinion), because he insisted on interpreting the word "management," as it occurs in the by-laws that he drew up, in the sense of controllership, and acted in harmony with this interpretation. If it is asked whether the issue was one of management, as distinct from controllership, the answer is emphatically *no!* The issue was: Who is controller, the Board or J.F.R.? The majority of the Board, which includes Bro. Pierson (who by the way assured me lately that he stood for "Light After Darkness"), claimed controllership for the Board; J.F.R. both by word and act claimed controllership for himself. The following facts show that he performed distinct functions of a controller.

I. He initiated new policies and programs, and that without even consulting the Board.

1. He appointed personal representatives of the President (and so designated them, making them answerable to him alone) in various countries delegating to them the power of doing in his absence what he might do, if present. These representatives control in those countries, *e.g.*, J.H. in Britain and Ireland.

2. He changed the organization of the Pastoral work.
3. He uses his presidency of the People's Pulpit Association to control the Society's affairs.
4. Treats the People's Pulpit Association as if it were not the Society's subsidiary.
5. Accepted the donation for Vol. VII without crediting it to the funds of the Society.
6. Published Vol. VII without authorization by, or knowledge of, the Board.
7. Copyrighted Vol. VII not in the name of the Society, but of the People's Pulpit Association.
8. Appoints persons to, and dismisses some from, offices of *special* responsibility apart from the Board, *i.e.*, Pilgrims, and heads of departments, W. Bundy as the head of the Jamaica work.
9. Took the headship of Bethel family without authorization of the Board.

II. Without authorization by, and knowledge of, the Board he prepared a set of Home and Office Rules for the Society's affairs, providing for special powers for himself and fellow-conspirators; and when he had procured the sanction of the too trustful Board, expounded the Rules to exclude Board members, not working at the Tabernacle, or not on Committees, from visiting the office during working hours. The law regards members of a Corporation's Board as the partners of a firm.

III. He insisted that the habitual exercise of any function by Bro. Russell justified him in doing the same; hence claimed Bro. Russell's powers to control.

IV. He acted as if the Board were subject to him.

1. Without authorization by, or knowledge of, the Board he recalled Bro. Johnson, though sent by the Board, from Europe.
2. Without authorization by, or knowledge of, the Board he cancelled his Society-sealed credentials.
3. Refused to allow the Board to question his decision

on the British matter, claiming that it was exclusively his to settle.

4. While Bro. Johnson was before the Board on an appeal to it from his decision on the British matter, he refused to let him finish presenting his case to the Board for their decision, claiming that the Society had settled it, he, not the Board, allegedly having so done.

5. He ousted the majority of the Board, because they were seeking to take from him its usurped controllership.

V. He violated several provisions of Bro. Russell's Will, implying thereby that he is controller.

1. He suggested the publication of one, and admittedly permitted the publication of two, of his discourses as volunteer matter. The Will directs that volunteer matter consist of Bro. Russell's discourses alone. He should have refrained from such a suggestion. He should also have prevented others overriding the Will in this matter.

2. He dominates the Editorial Committee, and appoints a substitute editor, when he is long absent; not even the Board should do these things.

VI. Whoever opposes his controllership is made to feel it by a process of "smiting."

VII. He is carrying on a world-wide campaign to secure actual controllership, though ostensibly not so doing.

These facts, except the last, show that the issue was controllership, as distinct from management. Of course, he knows that the Board as controller would have to act *as such* either by *unanimity* or by *majority*; and this is the position: he ousted the majority of the Board, because, as the majority, they wanted to set aside his controllership. Later when Bro. Pierson came to see the real issue, he joined the four, and to this day disapproves of J.F.R.'s usurpatory course. Certainly he claimed controllership of the Society's *affairs, just as Bro. Russell did*, for which, however,

he does not have Bro. Russell's proprietary rights.

The reason Bro. Russell was not annually elected a Director is not because his annual election as President made him a Director; for he had first to be a Director before he could stand as a candidate for President; as the Charter expressly states that the officers shall be selected from among the Directors. The reason why Bro. Russell was never but once elected a Director is the same as that for which no other Director, including J.F.R. and W.E. Van Amburgh, was ever elected but once, *i.e., the Charter expressly states that the Directors shall hold office for life.* For a similar reason Bro. Russell was not annually elected President and biennially a Director of the Peoples Pulpit Association; for he by its Charter was to hold these offices for life. This clause of the Charter applies to the first President only, for it says that the President of the P. P. A. shall be elected President for life at the *first meeting of the Association.* This language proves that this clause with the power of controllership that the Charter lodges with its President was meant for Bro. Russell alone; as he was the only one elected President at the *first* meeting of the P. P. A. See "Harvest Siftings," page 16, under the caption "The Peoples Pulpit Association" for the wording of this clause. This clearly proves that Bro. Russell never intended that, except himself, any one individual should control even the limited affairs of the P. P. A., much less those of the Society.

Again, if the places of the four brothers were vacant by reason of their not having been annually elected, then J.F.R.'s, and W.E. Van Amburgh's places likewise were vacant; therefore, since the Charter states that the Society's officers shall be chosen from among its Directors, they could not have been candidates for the Presidency and Secretary-Treasurership; and therefore could not have been elected as such. Therefore their places on both the Board and in these offices

would also be vacant! Therefore J.F.R. would not have power bindingly to declare the places of the four vacant, and appoint successors. If, as he says, he knew for years of the vacancy of the places of those who were holding directorship for years, without an annual reelection, he knew for the same reason for years that his place, too, was vacant on the Board. Yet in the Dec. 15, 1916, "Tower," last par., page 390, and 1st and 2nd pars. 391, he enumerates, not vacancies, but seven members of the Board, himself among them; and shows that the officers must in harmony with the Charter be selected from among these seven directors, none of whom according to his mind were directors; for the six, not being elected for years and their places thus being vacant, could not elect the seventh, Bro. Pierson. Doubtless a Court would call his conduct in this matter fraudulent, especially as he thereby became a gainer. If their places were vacant, there could have been no quorum present at any Board meeting after his election as president; therefore all the acts of the Board since January 6 would be null and void, including the by-laws giving him executive and managerial authority! He would be now using fraudulent powers! Courts would doubtless rule that since he acted with the four as genuine Directors for nearly 6 months he could not call in question the legality of their Directorship. He is tied hand and foot. If it is true that directors must be elected annually, where this is not done, the directors would hold office until their successors were elected, twelve able lawyers claim. Among these are Assistants of the Attorney Generals of Penna. and N. J. Hence there was no vacancy on the Board; and J.F.R.'s action was not "simply filling four vacancies"; *it was an illegal and disorderly ousting of four legal directors and an illegal and disorderly appointing of four pseudo-directors*. When it became advisable in 1894 and in 1908 that Directors be removed, Bro. Russell did not take the law

into his own hands and oust them; but in a legal and orderly way waited, until the next annual meetings of the shareholders, when he recommended and procured their dismissal by the way laid down in the Charter. Had J.F.R. followed this appropriate example, the Society would not have been "wrecked," nor would five faithful brothers have been slandered world-wide, nor the Church be so greatly disturbed.

In the Nov. 1, "Tower," page 329, col. 1, two by-laws are given. These are the product of "J.F.R.'s Illegal Board." This makes them illegal. However, the friends can safely send in to the Secretary a modified form of the proxy on that page or any other appropriate form, filling it out, except, if they prefer not to let the Secretary know the name and address of their proxy, they can omit these, and after the form is returned with endorsement, they can fill in the name and address of their proxy. *It is neither the business of the Secretary of the Society nor of anyone else to know so long in advance of the election who holds proxies.* Nor is it under some circumstances safe that this be known. Considering what was done July 31 with Peoples Pulpit Association proxies it would be advisable to cut out of the proxy the words "adjourned or"; also the words "and attorney for me and in my name, place and stead," and to ask that immediately after the close of the annual meeting the proxy be returned to its giver. If a person holds proxies from a number of persons, he is thereby empowered to make as many nominations as there are persons for whom he is asked to cast the proxies, and to vote the instructed shares for each designated nominee; for he acts as the representative of those whose proxies he holds. This should be insisted upon, because at the last election by prearrangement nominations for President were closed as soon as but *one nominee* was presented with speeches to the meeting. A proxy holder is morally obligated to vote his proxies as instructed,

until there is no possibility of the election of the one or ones for whom he is instructed to vote. Not only should the friends refuse to fill out the blanks asking them to declare their loyalty to the Society, but should protest against their being asked to make such a declaration. Without disproof, one's loyalty is presumed.

In his comments on Section VIII of the Charter J.F.R. misinterprets the section. This section provides for the election by the shareholders at the next annual meeting, not for the places on the Board held by those directors who were *elected by the Board*; but for the places on the Board held by those directors who, not elected by the Board, *are appointed by the President*. He omits that part of section V which treats of the charter members of the Society. There were seven of these, all of whom were elected as Board members. Keeping this fact in mind enables one to see the fallacy of his claim that the titles of office added to the names of three of the Directors holding offices make them members of the Board by virtue of their election to their respective offices. The reason why these titles were added is quite a different one, *i.e.*: to prove to the court that the Society was really organized; and therefore could ask for a *legal existence* by sanction of its charter.

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 II.

THE CHURCH COMPLETELY ORGANIZED IN RELATION TO THE SOCIETY AS A CHANNEL.

THE CHURCH COMPLETELY ORGANIZED. ITS MISSION. ITS BIBLICAL ORGANIZATION. THE SOCIETY'S PLACE IN THE HARVEST. THE SOCIETY AS A CHANNEL. TWO WRONG VIEWS OF THE SOCIETY AS A CHANNEL EXAMINED. THE TRUE VIEW OF "THE CHANNEL." SOME HINDRANCES TO FRUITFUL SERVICE. EXAMINATION OF FURTHER SOCIETY-CHANNEL CLAIMS.

[The bulk of this chapter was written in 1919; the rest in 1920.]

WITHOUT organization no undertaking of a large kind can be successfully carried out. Therefore, organization marks the various forms of large human activities. Civil governments, national alliances, religious denominations and federations, capitalistic combinations, aristocratic orders, labor groups, educational and benevolent institutions, fraternal and mutual societies, civic, reformatory and culture clubs and associations and even the natural family, evidence the presence and advantage of organization. Any organization, to carry out the purposes of its existence, must have within itself the machinery by which the lines of endeavor that constitute its mission are successfully seized and realized; otherwise it is not completely organized for its mission. Whatever is present in an organization, not needed nor adapted to realize its end, is a hindrance, which wise organizers and executives will eliminate from their societies; and whatever is necessary and adaptable to their purposes they will introduce and use.

In harmony with these principles our Heavenly Father through Jesus and His Apostles made the Church in its constitution an organization; yea, so complete is this organization that it may be called an

organism whose parts constitute "*a Body, FITLY FRAMED and knit together through that which every joint supplieth, according to the working in due measure of each several part.*" (Eph. 4: 16, A.R.V.) This organization is complete in God of itself *for the purposes of its existence*, and needs nothing organizationally *outside* of itself, as it is in God, for the successful prosecution of its mission. This is in great elaboration proven in Vol. VI of the Studies, Chaps. V and VI. In this respect the Church is like other organizations; and to graft anything upon her different from or additional to her original constitution would impose upon her a dead weight, as would be in the case of any other body perfectly organized. Wise men will refrain from such graftings.

Since the founders of institutions strive to construct the organic machinery of their Societies so as to adapt them successfully to carry out the purposes of these organizations, they make a careful study of these purposes and constantly use them as standards whereby they may measure each part of the organization's machinery and agents, to the end that they may reject unsuitable and introduce and use feasible organizational elements. This principle, of course, Jehovah kept in mind when He planned the organization of the Church, rejecting from its constitution useless and harmful arrangements, and introducing only those that would be practical and beneficial. In the Bible He has revealed to His Church what these purposes are, so that, among other reasons, the Church, recognizing what they are, may cooperate with the Lord in realizing the purposes of her organization, by rejecting all foreign corporeal elements, and by using all that are germane to her mission. Hence she finds in the Bible *a complete* description of her organization and mission, to which organization and mission she faithfully limits her uses and activities, and courageously resists any attempt to corrupt this organization and mission,

even as the natural body resists the introduction of chemical elements foreign to those of which it consists, since it instinctively feels them to be poison.

What is the mission of the Church? For a proper answer to this question a number of things must be said: First, she has a mission toward God and Christ, *i.e.*, to glorify them in all things (1 Cor. 10: 31). Second, she has a threefold mission toward herself; and third, a twofold mission toward the world of mankind. The first part of her mission toward herself is to perfect herself in every good word and work (Eph. 4: 11-13: 2; Rev. 19: 7, 8). This includes three things: First, that she in her members as God's mouthpiece gather out of the world persons who are responsive to His invitation to become His own, and, as such, members of the Church (Ps. 45: 10, 11; Acts 15: 14); second, that she cleanse herself from all filthiness of the flesh and spirit (Eph. 5: 25-27; Col. 3: 5-9); third, that she become like Christ in character (Rom. 8: 29; Col. 3: 10-17; Eph. 4: 23, 24; 5: 9). The second part of her mission toward herself is to sever herself from such of her members as fall into sin and gross error, and refuse to repent. This she has done sometimes by congregational action (1 Cor. 5: 1-5, 13), sometimes by individual action (1 Cor. 5: 9-11), and sometimes by general action (2 John 7-11). Such a severance has been going on throughout the entire Age, especially during the Harvests, primarily involving Second Deaths; secondarily involving such as will be placed in the Great Company (1 Cor. 5: 5). Now, in the Epiphany, it is involving both classes as such. It has also involved some of her members who did not lose their standing before the Lord as members of Christ's Body. So, too, this severance has involved the merely justified and the hypocrites more or less associated with her. The third part of her mission toward herself is to inaugurate and transact such business matters as are necessary for her to carry out her mission.

The scope and forms of these business matters are all described in the Bible, *e.g.*, the election of the servants of the local church and the appointment of them to their services (Acts 6: 1-6; 13: 1-3; 14: 23; Titus 1: 5); maintenance of purity of doctrine and life (Acts 15: 1-31; 1 Cor. 5: 1-13); support of the servants of the Truth, and relief of needy saints (Gal. 6: 6; 1 Cor. 9: 14; Phil. 4: 15-18; 2 Cor. 8: 18-24); and making arrangements for meetings and discipline (Matt. 18: 15-17, 19, 20; Heb. 10: 25). These three things—self-development, severance from foreigners and transacting her Divinely indicated business—exhaust the mission of the Church selfward.

Then the Church has a mission toward the world. This embraces a twofold activity: First, witnessing to the world with respect to sin, righteousness and judgment to come, *i.e.*, the coming Kingdom (Matt. 5: 13-16; 24: 14); and second, reproving the world for sin, righteousness and the judgment to come (John 16: 8-11). These two things exhaust her mission toward the world. In the next Age the Church will have a mission quite different from its present one to itself and to the world. This need not be discussed here; because it does not come within the scope of this chapter. To understand clearly the Gospel-Age organization of the Church, its threefold mission, as above described, must be kept in mind. Disregard of these purposes is responsible for the Great Apostacy throughout the Age, as regard of them has resulted in the sealing of the Elect! It is disastrous to neglect, it is beneficial to observe God's arrangements with respect to the mission of the Church, as in all other respects.

Having seen what the mission of the Church is, we are in a better position to study her organization, and see whether it is adapted to her realizing her mission. In Col. 1: 18; 1 Cor. 12: 12-30; Eph. 4: 4-16; Rom. 12: 4-8 the organization of the Church is described under the figure of a human body, an organism,

and not a loosely developed Society or Club. These Scriptures assure us that there is but one Body, one Organism, of Christ, having many members, with Jesus as the Head Member. They assure us that, as in the natural body the members are diverse from one another in their functions, some having a more, others a less, important office in the body, and that, despite this diversity, they are nevertheless harmoniously related to one another in mutual dependence, helpfulness, appreciation and sympathy—so it is with the Body of Christ, in which "the whole Body [is] fitly joined together and compacted by that which every joint supplieth, according to the effectual working in the measure [function] of every part." Like the natural body, this Body, having many members, is but One; and that because it has the one spirit, one hope, one work, one Lord, one faith, one baptism and one God (Eph. 4: 4-6). Its one Head under God does its thinking, planning, feeling, willing and directing; as it has pleased God to set the various members, each one in its place, in the Body (1 Cor. 12: 18), this Head directs and uses them according to their individual functions in the Body; and as in a normal natural body, where there is but one head, no member has a head separate and distinct from the other members, so in this Body, Jesus, whose Head is God (1 Cor. 11: 3), is the Head of every member, and all members maintain their place in this Body by maintaining the condition upon which they entered it, *i.e.*, acceptance of Christ as their Head. Under this figure of one Body, having but one Head and many diversely functioning but mutually related members, is pictured *the most complete organization ever formed*, though its lack of much of what humans consider necessary to an organization makes many who do not recognize that it is a spiritual organism think that it is no organization at all. This organization manifests itself (1) in a particular

way; *i.e.*, as spiritual, invisible and internal associations of saints amid local, external and visible Ecclesias with their local servants, works, arrangements and meetings, and (2) in a general way, *i.e.*, as a spiritual invisible and internal association without any externality and visibility (a) apart from its general servants, Jesus and the Apostles, now invisible—and the "secondarily prophets," who minister to, and cooperate with the general Church in individual Ecclesias, or in collections of them in conventions by word and work, or in more or less of their individual representatives by works, conversations, mails and the printed page; and (b) apart from its local servants ministering to the saints in each Ecclesia. The whole Body is represented in each individual Ecclesia on account of its containing saints among its members. The internal bond of union between the saints at a particular locality and between them and all others is their spiritual fellowship in the one spirit, one hope, one work, one Lord, one faith, one baptism and one God. The external bond that is the point of contact between a local congregation and the members of this Body in that Ecclesia is its works, its meetings and its officers, *i.e.*, its pastors, teachers (edifying servants), helps (deacons and deaconesses), and governments (chairmen, committees of arrangements who order the course of business, etc.), and the occasional ministration and cooperation of the servants of the general Church (Rom. 12: 4-8, compare with last parts of 1 Cor. 12: 28 and Eph. 4: 11); and the external bond that is the point of contact between the saints of one Ecclesia and the saints everywhere is their conventions and works with the servants of the general Church.

Thus we see that the true Church is invisible both locally and generally, though manifesting itself through its works, arrangements, meetings and servants visibly, whether it be in one place or all places. In other words, there is *no visible general organization* of the

Church of the Living God that makes the various Ecclesias or various individuals organically parts of a general visible Body; but there is a manifestation of a local part of the invisible Church in the form of local Ecclesias externally organized, as above described, and additionally using for its purposes the ministries of the servants of the general Church, Jesus and the Apostles and the "secondarily prophets"; while the entire Church, which is invisible, finds its visible expression in the works, arrangements, meetings and servants of the general Church—Jesus, the Apostles and the "secondarily prophets," both generally and locally; in the evangelists, sometimes generally, sometimes locally; and locally alone in the pastors and teachers (elders), helps (deacons and deaconesses), and governments (chairmen, committees of arrangements, etc., who direct the course of business). This enables us to see that *no denomination* is, nor are *all the denominations combined*, the Body of Christ, the Church of the Living God; but that the Church consists *exclusively* of the Sanctified in Christ Jesus. Thus *no external, visible organization* is the Church. Hence we see the great error—like that of the Papacy, etc.—into which the leaders of the W.T.B. & T. Society fell when they stated (and that on the witness stand under oath) that one joins the Society, an external organization, a business corporation, by consecration. Thus we clearly see that they confounded a business organization with the Body of Christ; for consecration and the Spirit-begetting are the only ways whereby one joins the invisible Church, the Body of Christ (1 Cor. 12: 12, 13; Gal. 3: 26-28), and not that business corporation which is joined by contributing \$10.00 or more. Therefore, to teach that one joins the Society by consecration is to *confound the Church with the Society*; and this view would set forth the Society friends as a body, not simply the shareholders as a body, as a little Antichrist (a counterfeit Christ), a little Babylon.

Should not the brethren of the Society strenuously object to their leaders teaching a doctrine containing such implications?

The organization of the Body of Christ, as above described, is unchangeable until the entire Church passes beyond the vail, though there were temporary features added through the gifts of the Spirit, *i.e.*, miracles, gifts of healing, diversities of tongues, etc. (1 Cor. 12: 28), until these passed away (1 Cor. 13: 8-12). On the continuance of the above-described organization until the end of the Age, St. Paul gives us clear testimony in Eph. 4: 11-16, particularly in v. 13, where he says that these Church offices will remain with the Body "until we *all* come into the unity of the faith and the knowledge of the Son of God, unto a *perfect* Man [the one New Man that God is making of the twain, both Jews and Gentiles, Eph. 2: 15], unto the measure of the stature of the *fullness* of Christ." Thus we see that there is no external organization, membership in which makes one a member of the Body of Christ, neither in the form of denominations, nor of hierarchies, nor general councils, nor synods, nor conferences, nor assemblies, nor presbyteries, nor committees, nor business corporations. All these are external to her organization, inimical to her constitution, and subversive of Jesus' headship, her unity, the diversity of His members and their mutual relations in the one Body. Against every attempt to associate her organization with such forms of organization the Church should exercise unceasing opposition as being, not from the Lord, but from the adversary. And any attempt to justify their existence in the Church which is His Body, as necessary for the prosecution of her mission, should be rejected; because such necessity does not arise from her Divinely given mission, but from Satanic perversions of her mission.

Before closing the description of the Body of Christ as an organism, it would be well to point out

the various viewpoints of the four texts cited above: Col. 1: 18 is a general description showing the two parts of the Christ in their relations—Jesus as Head, the Church as Body—without pointing out expressly the official relations of other members of this Body than Jesus. Rom. 12: 4-8 treats of the unity of the Body and the diversity and harmony of its members, mentioning the diverse functions of the official Body members in a local Ecclesia without mentioning their official names, nor those of the officers of the general Church. Eph. 4: 11-13 refers to the edifying servants of the Church, both general and local, as well as to those servants whose work is of a missionary character, evangelists. 1 Cor. 12: 28, while omitting mention of evangelists, mentions all other official servants of the Church, both general and local. This passage will, therefore, be seen to be all-comprehensive with regard to the servants of the Church with but one exception, *i.e.*, the evangelists. These four passages are a splendid example of how God caused the Scriptures to be written—"here a little, and there a little," the full Truth not being found in any single passage, but in a combination of all passages dealing with any given subject.

When we say that the Divine organization of the Church is complete for *her* mission we do not mean that it is complete for all missions. She certainly is not organized for politics; for few of her members are qualified for politics; and the attempt on the part of certain ones to make her mission include politics resulted in evil to both the church and state. She is not organized for business apart from that necessary for the prosecution of her above-described work; for very few of her members have marked business capacity. She is not organized to solve labor problems; for few of her members have the time, talents and spirit that grapple with such problems. Nor is secular education a field of endeavor for the exercise of the Church's organization; for her members as a rule are not

"wise." She is not organized for ecclesiasticism; for her membership lacks the spirit, hopes, aims and qualities of ecclesiasticism. Nor is she even organized to carry on the work of the Great Company; for her members have different working ideals, require different incentives, and are qualified for a higher grade of work and treatment of themselves and of others than are called for in the Great Company's work. Thus it will be seen that the Church, which is His Body, is not completely organized for everything; but she is completely organized and qualified for the successful prosecution of her peculiar mission. Hence by the possession of the Spirit, Word and Providence of God and her form of internal organization and its local and general manifestations, she is well fitted to glorify God and Christ. In her members individually, as well as in her general and local servants, she has possessed all that she has needed to gather the predestinated number of the Elect out of the world. That she is perfectly organized to carry out this feature of her work is evident from the fact that she has succeeded in sealing all the Elect. In her individual members and in her servants, general and local, she is fitted to cleanse herself from all filthiness of the flesh and spirit and to perfect holiness in the reverence of the Lord. The fact that she has nearly completed this work (Rev. 19: 7, 8), proves that her organization is perfect for these two works. That she is completely organized to sever from her fellowship those who do not partake therein is manifest by the proper exercise of Matt. 18: 15-17 in local Ecclesias, and in the general siftings in the general Church. Through the evangelistic activities of all of her members, particularly of her teaching servants, both general and local, she has given the witness respecting sin, righteousness and judgment to come among all nations, as well as given reproof respecting these among all nations. Having already fully realized this feature of her work proves

that she has been completely organized for her mission in this particular. Thus we see that in herself, as constituted by God under Jesus' Headship, apart from any other organization, she is perfectly organized to realize her Divinely intended mission.

Of course, we do not hold that she should not use earthly instruments to assist her in her mission. She properly can and does make use of human helps in the form of mail, railroad, telegraph, telephone, printing and business systems; so, too, of buildings, inventions, literary products on history, etc., and of Levitical works like concordances, Bible dictionaries, encyclopedias, lexicons, etc. But she does not use these as organizations under her control; and thus she does not use these organizationally. Without corrupting her own organization she cannot take over for the purposes of her mission the control of any organization outside of herself as constituted by God, nor may she permit any external body to control her. Therefore she cannot form a business corporation or company for conducting her mission Godward or manward. To claim that she cannot accomplish her work without such an organization implies that God was negligent in her constitution; that He failed to instruct her by her inspired teachers, orally or in the Bible, to avail herself of the corporation or business companies' privileges sanctioned by the Roman government in the times of Jesus and the Apostles; and that He thus failed to give her a complete organization for her mission. To claim that she cannot accomplish her work without such an organization implies that all of the Antichrists were right in adding to the original constitution of the Church; that the true Church was wrong in protesting against such additions; and that men are wiser than God, when it comes to being "practical"! Surely God's faithful will not agree that the Church needs the splints, bandages, casts, braces, strait-jackets, crutches and canes of human organizers in order to carry out

her mission! Must not that work for which any other organization is of absolute necessity be a work foreign to her Divinely given mission? The Bible, Reason and History, both secular and religious, unite in answering this question affirmatively (F 326, par. 2; F 245, par. 1).

We find in the types of the Old Testament nothing to symbolize that the Little Flock would have need of an organization external to itself to realize its mission, even as we find nothing on that subject in the New Testament. In Scriptural symbology organizations are typed by chariots, which word is used to translate a number of Hebrew words. But nowhere are chariots used to type the instruments that the Little Flock would use with Divine approval for furthering its work, *e.g.*, the priests used nothing of the sort to assist them for their work, though the Merarite Levites used four and the Gershonite Levites two of these for their work (Num. 3: 18-21, 27, 33; 7: 1-9). In this last passage the word, *agalah*, is translated wagon; in Ps. 46: 9 it is translated chariot. These six chariots seem to symbolize six societies that the antitypical Merarite and Gershonite Levites do find useful for their work. Four of these organizations are for antitypical Merari: the W.T.B. & T. Society, the I. B. S. A., the P. P. A. and the Elijah Voice. The other two are for the antitypical Gershonites—the P.B.I. of America and the B.S.C. of Britain. It will be noticed also that, like the priests, the Kohathites, had no chariots given them for their ministry, significant of the fact that one of the three general classes of the Great Company will not in the Epiphany use corporations or associations for their general work, which facts prove to be the case. Accordingly, *the Old and New Testaments ignore any organization*, except the Church's own constitution, as necessary to carry out her work. Nor is this omission an oversight. It is eloquent with the fact that God, describing the organization of the

Church, purposely omitted mention of another body, or society, or company, or corporation in the Church, and wanted it understood that none of these were necessary for the Church in her carrying out the purpose of her existence. Thus seen we recognize that the Church through her general servants, assisted by the saints generally, is perfectly organized to prosecute successfully the general interests of her mission; and through these general servants, the servants of the local Ecclesias, and all other saints in and out of these Ecclesias, she is perfectly organized successfully to fulfill the local interests of her mission. She should therefore refuse to accept the service of all hierarchies, general councils, synods, general assemblies, conferences, presbyteries, boards, corporations, committees, etc., which *seek to control her work*, as additions to her Divine constitution and as unnecessary and harmful to her mission.

All Bible students will agree that, so far as Biblical passages and facts are concerned, matters are as we have just described them. The passages and facts above referred to prove this abundantly. No less decisive are the facts of Church history. The organization of the Church, as above described, began to be undermined with the bishops being made a distinct order in the Church from the elders or presbyters, and with the "clergy" becoming distinct from the "laity." Each Church, ceasing to have many bishops, *i.e., presbyters* (Acts 20: 17, 28; Phil. 1: 1; Titus 1: 4-6; [1 Tim. 3: 1-15 mentions only two kinds of servants of a local church]), began in the second century to have but one bishop, who was placed over the presbyters and deacons. These bishops, in the interest of their power, began to call synods or councils to legislate for the supposed common interests—not of the Church which is His Body, but of the churches of entire districts and provinces. The first of these synods or councils was held in Syria in 166 A. D., and these synods or councils prove that the churches were

externally organized with one another, a thing foreign to the Apostolic Age. These "provinces of the Church" were, before many decades, presided over by archbishops, whose power continued to increase; and all of these archbishops, distributed over the three territorial divisions of the Roman Empire, were in the third century made subject to the patriarchs, of whom there were then three—one at Rome, one at Antioch and one at Alexandria. These introduced other organizations into "the Church," all of them foreign and subversive to the original constitution of "the Church which is His Body." Ever since, all organizations that have been added to the original constitution of the Church have been added on the plea that they were necessary for the work of the Church. But, let us, however, never forget that these were necessary for the mission of the nominal church, which lost sight of the Divinely given mission of the real Church, and which set up a mission of its own, unauthorized for the Gospel Age, *i.e.*, the conversion of the world and the Church's reign over it for a thousand years before Christ's Second Advent.

The unity of the true Church in the one spirit, one hope, one work, one Lord, one faith, one baptism and one God was strong enough to enable individuals individually (Acts 8: 1-7), and individual churches individually (Acts 13: 1-4), through representatives, to carry out the mission of the Church; but nowhere in the Bible do we read of a collection of churches uniting organizationally through committees, boards, societies, corporations or otherwise to send forth the message of the Word, though individuals and individual churches individually *as such* contributed to the expenses of those who preached the Gospel, whether the latter were the former's representatives or not (Acts 13: 1-4; Phil. 4: 10-18). It is true that a combination of churches did organizationally, through a committee that they appointed, an earthly, deacon

work, *i.e.*, raised money for, and distributed it to the needy saints (2 Cor. 8: 16-24). But such a combination never in the New Testament through a committee, board, society, corporation or otherwise did an organizational work in furthering the spread of the Word. Therefore we conclude that the latter method of operation is not in harmony with the organization of the Church, while the former is for a deacon work in the Church. At the Asbury Park Convention, overlooking the fact that 2 Cor. 8: 16-24 refers to a deacon work alone, we thought and said that this passage warranted a committee's directing a service to the general Church in pilgrim, periodical and convention work. We desire herewith to recall this statement, as neither the Bible nor the history of the real Church nor its organization warrant it.

But the Society leaders claim that the Lord directed the work of the Harvest through the W.T.B. & T.S. This we deny. God directed the Harvest work—not through the Society, neither by its shareholders, nor by its Board—but *by one individual, i.e., that Servant*, who was placed by the Lord (a) not only as "ruler over His household" (made the director of the work of the Church as the Lord's Special Representative); but was (b) also "made ruler over all His goods" (the Bible teachings, as the Lord's special Steward), to give the meat in due season (Matt. 24: 45-47; Luke 12: 42-44). All this is evident, not only from the Bible, but also from the facts of the case, as these are recognized by all who know how the Harvest work was conducted from beginning to end. We can make this matter clear by the recital of a bit of history. Our dear Pastor formed, in 1881, a Society under the name Zion's W. T. T. S., changed later to W.T.B. & T.S., with himself in control until death, to further the work of the Truth by providing "a financial channel or fund" through which the friends could contribute to the work, but not to organize

the Harvest work. In 1884 he had this Society incorporated, having previously expressly stipulated with his fellow incorporators that he should control all its business and affairs done in or without its name until his death. This controllership stipulation was renewed, from time to time, with new directors. Further, on his giving his copyrights to the Society, he did so, as per his will, under the express condition, to which the board acceded, that he should control the interests of the "Studies," "Towers," etc., until death, and dictate by his will and charter their uses after his death, as well as the policy of the Society. In harmony with these stipulations he did control until death. This control was made an actual fact until 1908, up to which time he had owned the majority of the voting shares of the Society, by his electing all directors and officers and appointing all colaborers and initiating and directing all policies, etc., and since that time, when he ceased to own the majority of the voting shares, by the general acceptance of the thought on the part of the voting shareholders that the Lord wanted him as that Servant to control. Therefore, after 1908 also his directorship nominees alone were elected; and he required of them immediately after their election that they write out their resignations in full, except the date, over their signatures, upon the express stipulation that, if he considered it the Lord's will, he would fill in the date, and thus terminate their directorship. Such resignations were signed, *e.g.*, by Bros. Ritchie, Rockwell, Hoskins, etc. Whomsoever he desired to dismiss from any branch of the service he dismissed from that service without consulting the Board for approval. While at times he would consult with the directors individually and in meetings, and while they would sometimes vote they voted on what and how he wanted them to vote! for he alone *controlled and directed everything*, as the directors and many others know of a certainty.

He spoke of the pilgrims as first the Lord's, and second as *his* representatives. He did these things, and all coöperated with him therein, because he and they believed, and that rightly, in harmony with Matt. 24: 45-47 and Luke 12: 42-44, that the Lord willed it so. Therefore the facts prove that the Society, neither as shareholders, nor as directors, organized or in any other way controlled the Harvest operations, but that Servant alone controlled and directed that work. Unorganizedly the churches and individuals, including the shareholders, contributed to the work; as unorganizedly and individually apostolic churches and individuals contributed to the expenses of the servants of the Truth in their time. But what was to be done—how, when, where, and by whom it was to be done—*was decided, not by the shareholders, nor by the directors, BUT BY "THAT SERVANT" ALONE*, in harmony with what he considered to be the Lord's will. And when in print or orally he spoke of the Society deciding thus and so, he *modestly hid himself under that name*, as on one occasion he told one of the Lord's people, "I am the Society," and as on another, when one of The Tower proof-readers called his attention to the fact that his writing of himself and of the Society interchangeably would be used by his enemies against him, he answered to the effect that he wanted it to go that way, and he did not change the article. What, then, is the difference between the status of the Society before and since his death: We answer that it was then only an embryo society; now it is a born society, or organization. In the language of corporation lawyers it was then a "dummy corporation," having "dummy directors"; whereas, since his death it is a self-acting corporation. Like the "image of the beast," it was then without life! it is now alive. Like justification before and after the imputation of Jesus' merit, it was then tentative, it is now vitalized. In other words, its charter was in existence, but not

operative; its directors were in existence, but not directing. Its professed work was being controlled, but not through its directors, as required by the charter. The machinery was all there, and adjusted ready for use; but it had to await that Servant's death before the power came to make its machinery operate as an organization. The same remarks apply in part to the People's Pulpit Association and the I. B. S. A., though the idea connected with them was that they be perpetually controlled by the Society, *i.e.*, that they be "dummy corporations" with "dummy directors" perpetually, when it would take control, as during his life they were all controlled by him.

Hence we see as a matter of fact that the W.T.B. & T.S. did not conduct the work of the Harvest. It, therefore, is not an example in proof that it is in harmony with the Lord's Word and the practice of that Servant that a corporation or a business company, as an organization, be added to "the Church which is His Body," as an organizational necessity for the work of the ministry given the Church to perform. The Lord seems to have used that Servant, unconsciously to himself, to form the three corporations above mentioned, so that they would be ready for the Great Company's uses, when as such it would spring into being, as actually took place. Since that Servant's death attempts by the W.T.B. & T. Society, by the Pastoral Bible Institute, and by others have been made to put organizations into the Church to take in charge the general ministry of "the Church which is His Body." In all cases these attempts have proven failures; and every other attempt will similarly prove a failure, because as fire and water will not mix, neither will the organization of the Little Flock and a corporation or business company or a committee fuse in harmony for carrying out the Little Flock's work. Corporations, Societies, Business Companies and Committees (any of these organizations answering

to a symbolic chariot, Num. 7: 3-8), however, may be used in the prosecution of the work of the Great Company, as the Bible, and facts since our Pastor's death, prove.

Hence we conclude from the whole of the preceding discussion that the Church was perfectly organized in the Harvest of the Jewish Age by God for her Divinely intended mission; that her organization is that of one Body under Jesus her Head, with the Apostles as His plenipotentiaries, fully qualified infallibly and perfectly to bind upon and loose from her all necessary things as teachers of the general Church (Matt. 18: 18); with the "secondarily prophets" to act as the exclusively visible but not inspired, or infallible, or perfect teachers of the general Church, after the Apostles fell asleep, as they coöperated with the Apostles as such before these fell asleep; with the evangelists (as sharers with the Apostles and "secondarily prophets" in) serving the elementary truths of the Word to outsiders and beginners; with chosen pastors and teachers to minister the truths to local Ecclesias; with helps (deacons and deaconesses) to minister apart from applying the Word; with governments (chairmen, committees, etc.) to conduct the external business of the local ecclesias, and with every member, official or unofficial, coöperating in the mission of the Church according to his spiritual qualities, human talents and providential situation; that this Church as organized in itself by God is perfectly adapted to fulfill her mission in the world; and that any attempt to fasten upon her another organization is repugnant to her formation, and inimical to the interests of her Divine mission, but to have such organizations for the work of the Levites is not so, as plainly shown from the Bible. Therefore, The Present Truth And Herald Of Christ's Epiphany stands committed to the policy of upholding the Biblical organization of "the Church which is His Body," and of opposing any

attempt to corrupt her organization by introducing into her any other kind of an organization—opposing it as a dead weight, a hindrance, an injury and a cancer to be removed for her and others' good; for the organization of the Church is for its purposes perfect, sufficient, spiritual, sublime and effective. It is worthy of our appreciation, love and support—an appreciation, love and support that are aggressive to maintain and perpetuate this Body; and defensive to parry off all efforts to hinder, injure, pervert, limit or add to this organization in its Divinely ordained existence and ministry.

Undoubtedly the W.T.B. & T. Society is a channel of the Lord for His service. To deny this proposition is to run counter to the Bible and God's arrangements. This has been our view of it throughout the controversy that has been waging about the Society. We therefore cannot sympathize with the viewpoint of those who would set it aside, wreck it, or in any other way disparage its Divinely intended office. While we believe it to be a channel of the Lord's work we cannot endorse some of the claims that some make for it as such. Of this institution there are three views current. According to one of these the Society is an evil institution. How any one who is loyal to our Pastor could so speak of one of his arrangements we are unable to see, especially if such an one believes that he was that Servant. We cannot sympathize with such a view at all, and dismiss it as unworthy of further consideration. According to a second view, the Society has been and now is the exclusive channel through which the Lord does two things: (1) gives the meat in due season to the household, and (2) directs the work of His priesthood. This is the view of those who are now in control of the Society's operations, and their loyal supporters. Several quotations will show this view in its two parts to be held by these brethren: (1) Z. 1919, p. 105, col. 2, par. 1,

"Is not the W.T.B. & T. Society the *one and only* channel which the Lord has used in dispensing His Truth continually since the beginning of the Harvest period?" [See the entire paragraph from which this quotation is taken.] Again, Z. 1919, p. 107, last paragraph, "In view of these things [those of Ezekiel and Revelation] which have been made plain to us through the *only* channel which the Lord has been pleased to use in the end of this Age for serving Truth to His household, who can doubt that it is indeed the Lord who has placed upon His table the exposition of these two prophetic books of the Bible, which have never been previously understood by His Church?" Vol. VII, p. 145, "This [the Angel taking and filling the censer with fire of the altar] is a plain intimation of God's purpose to use the Society in further unfolding of His Truth as it becomes due." These quotations suffice to prove that it is officially taught that the Society has been and is the Lord's exclusive channel for giving the meat in due season to the priesthood.

That these brethren teach that the Society is the channel for conducting the Lord's work among His people is manifest from the following quotations: Z. 1917, p. 327, par. 1, "In the Lord's Providence a body corporate is essential to the work of the Harvest, until it is completed. We have no doubt that the Lord directed the organization of this corporation for the purpose of carrying on His Harvest work." Again, in Z. 1916, p. 390, col. 2, from next to the last paragraph to the fourth paragraph of next page, this thought is given in answer to the question, "How, then, may the Harvest work be thus conducted, since our Pastor is no longer in our midst?" In the answer, among other expressions, the following is given: "The W.T.B. & T.S. ... is ... strong, because it has been and still is used of the Lord for the carrying out of His work." Their interpretation of part of Rev. 14: 18 (Vol. VII, p. 227) contains the statement that the

Society has "*authority* over the publication and distribution of expositions of Ezekiel and John, the Revelator, symbolical coals of fire." These quotations prove, as all will grant, that officially the Society claims (1) that it is the exclusive channel of the Lord for giving meat in due season to His people and (2) that it is His channel for conducting His Truth work among and apart from His people.

There are certain results flowing from this doctrine of the channel that should be considered in order properly to estimate what the doctrine involves. While it does not involve the thought of the channel's infallibility, it does involve the thought that its adherents exercise a meekness toward it that should predispose them to receive its teachings with considerable trustfulness, that they be not suspicious of its teachings, but be inclined toward them; that they do not take toward them a critical but a believing attitude. In practice this theory manifestly results in a mental attitude like the credulity of the average Catholic. It does not put one sufficiently on one's guard against the many admittedly erroneous teachings that have flown through this channel. Hence Society adherents have been finding themselves rejecting not a few things that, shortly before, they insisted were "meat in due season." This theory, therefore, in practice works against the principle of proving all things and holding fast that which is good (1 Thes. 5: 17). This effect of the channel doctrine can make and has made its adherents subject to deceptions, and is, therefore, dangerous to their spiritual safety. Another result of this theory of the channel is that its adherents look upon its direction of affairs as of the Lord; or, as Vol. VII puts it, that *every detail* of its work is being managed by that Servant from beyond the veil. This, of course, has the effect of making its thorough adherents *unquestioningly* fall into line with its policies and activities. Indeed, so strongly does this thought prevail that many even *fear*

to examine in a rational and Scriptural manner the methods and policies of the Society, lest, as "murmurers," they lose their crowns. All sober-minded brethren will recognize that such an attitude is like that of the Catholic laity rather than that becoming to priests of God. All must admit that this attitude has caused some acts that are most regrettable.

Another effect of this theory is giving the channel the *same* official powers in the eyes of its adherents as our dear Pastor had as (1) the dispenser of the meat and (2) the ruler of the Lord's household, with the *addition* that the channel has assumed a *threatening attitude* that he never assumed, *e.g.*, it claimed that brethren would lose their crowns, if they did not engage in "the Big Drive." This effect of the channel doctrine has put J.F.R. as "the [supposed] Steward" in our Pastor's place, if not always in the theory, yet *in the practice* of those who have heartily accepted this theory. Again, this doctrine brings with it the thought that it is impious to criticize the policies and management of the Society. Even those who exercise the right of sober criticism are regarded as "murmurers" who will fail of the Little Flock, while others who go further in their criticism are regarded as in danger of the Second Death. Hence criticism of the channel is considered as coming from an evil source, just as papists think of those who criticize the papacy. This effect of the doctrine can easily be and has been used to the disadvantage of Truth and Righteousness. Another effect of the channel theory on its adherents is to cause them immoderately to suspect teachings that do not come through the Society. Another of its effects on them is to make them refuse to read religious literature that does not come through the Society, *e.g.*, we learned recently that the members of a certain Ecclesia have subscribed to a written vow not to read any religious literature except what comes from the Society. Surely this is papistical. Another

effect of it is to make the Society leaders a hierarchy, tyrannizing over the flock, as they have done. Another unhappy effect of this doctrine is the practice of the Society adherents to avoid those of their brethren who cannot conscientiously submit in these respects to a *business corporation*. And in imitating the teaching and example of the Society leaders they have "avoided" some of their brethren in drastic forms, quite out of harmony with the Lord's Spirit; yea, some of the leaders have even advised their adherents to avoid certain ones as they would "a snake," which advice, we are glad to note, they for a while recalled. How easily the effects referred to in this paragraph can result in one's shutting his mind to light and opening it to error, as these things work among Catholics!

Having considered some of the natural effects of the channel theory, we now ask ourselves the question, is this view of the Society true? A number of reasons seem to call for a negative answer to this question. We present them to our readers for consideration. Certainly sober-minded brethren, schooled in the spirit and teachings of that Servant, ought to conclude that a doctrine producing such effects as the above cannot be true, but ought to be suspected as coming from an evil source. This theory puts into the Church, as a controller of its work and as the teacher of its members, a corporation or an organization which was not a part of the original organization of the Church; and therefore is a wrong theory. We are all agreed with the teaching of Vol. VI, chapters 5 and 6, that as God originally constituted the organization of the Church it was complete, needing no organizational additions. This our Pastor showed in detail. We condensed his argument above on the Church completely organized. All will admit that Jesus and the Apostles did not arrange for a corporation to be the means of giving the meat in due season, nor of directing the work of "the Church which is His Body," though there

were corporations in their days. Therefore no organization absent from the original constitution of the Church can be inserted into it, to be its teacher or the director of its work, without violating its perfect organization and working mischief to its members. The Bible (2 Thes. 2: 1-8) shows us that another organization, the papacy, would be grafted upon the Church; it nowhere warrants, but condemns such a procedure. Hence while God arranged for the W.T.B. & T.S. to do a Divinely intended work among some of His people, He did not intend that it should do the twofold work that it claims to be its functions *in and for the Church which is Christ's Body*. And the attempt to cause it to do such a work as teacher and controller is an imitation of the papacy and rests under the same Divine disapproval, as it also has wrought like injurious works.

Again, this theory is wrong because it claims the office functions of that Servant for the Society, He had two office functions, as shown above. These functions were *his as an individual*. They were never given to him by virtue of his being connected with the Society; for he had these functions before the Society existed. In harmony with these texts *he*, under the Lord—and *not the Society*—gave "the meat in due season" and directed the Truth work until his death. All who know the situation during his life know this. These official functions, therefore, were *his exclusively*. They never before had been given to any other individual apart from Jesus, nor have they been given to any individual or corporation since. But these office functions, the Society leaders, without any authority whatever in Scripture, Reason or Fact, ascribe to the Society, even as Catholic theologians ascribe similar functions to the papacy. The will and charter never transferred our Pastor's exclusive office functions to the Society, nor could he have done so, had he wished; for these were not his to give, but

the Lord's. Nor do the Scriptures. The claim is a mere assumption. Will the channel advocates tell us where, when and how the Lord transferred these functions to the Society? If so important powers were transferred from our Pastor to the Society, surely the Bible would indicate this as *clearly* as it shows that the Lord gave him his office functions (Matt. 24: 45-47; Luke 12: 42-44). The absence of such teaching in the Bible should be a complete deterrent from making such claims for the Society among those who regard it as the *sole source and rule* of faith and practice. We ask those who make this claim for the Society to give us book, chapter and verse that clearly teaches their view. They all must admit that there is no literal passage that so teaches. Hence we say that if God stated the same official functions to be our Pastor's in literal passages, which He did not allow to be understood until the history of about 20 years proved that our Pastor exercised these functions; how much more would he have stated this in a literal passage of a Society in whose interests these claims were advanced within a month after our Pastor in death ceased to exercise them, if He granted them to the Society? Again we ask, Where is the authority for transferring that Servant's individual functions to the Society, which was not the Lord's special representative while our Pastor lived?

Their claims that the Society was throughout the Harvest the Lord's channel for giving the meat in due season and conducting the Harvest work is gratuitous assumption and brazen propaganda without basis in Scripture, Reason or Fact. He himself (D 613, especially the last paragraph; Z '96, 47) says that he was the Lord's channel for these two activities; and the facts prove his teachings on this subject. A third time we ask, Where is the authority for teaching that the Society is the Lord's channel in these two respects? The Society leaders, conceding that there is no literal

passage that so teaches, refer to Rev. 8: 3-5 as a proof, claiming that the angel who offers the incense is the Society. We reply that a mere babe in the knowledge of Tabernacle Shadows should know better; for during the Gospel Age it is the *exclusive function of the High Priest* to offer incense, while the Society is a *business corporation, created by the civil power, and therefore cannot be in the Holy*. How desperate are the straits of those propagandists in search of Scriptural proof for their position when they are forced to lay hold on a passage that refers exclusively to the World's High Priest, and use it to substantiate their unprovable claims of Society powers! Again, they refer to Rev. 14: 18 as another proof of these powers for the Society, saying that it teaches the same thing as Rev. 8: 3-5. If it does teach the same thing (which we deny) as Rev. 8: 3-5, it does not teach that the Society has these powers; for it would then explain actions and powers of the World's High Priest, and not those of a state-created business corporation. Hence neither of these passages refers to the Society. We repeat that a doctrine so important as the channel doctrine as applied to the Society must have a literal Scriptural passage to prove it; since they teach it as a matter of faith and practice; even as the Bible doctrine of the real channel for these things, our Pastor, has literal Scriptures to prove it. Hence, just as there is an *utter lack* of Bible proof, *e.g.*, that the Pope has succeeded to St. Peter's Apostolic powers, so is there an utter lack of such proof of its kindred doctrine, that the Society has succeeded to that Servant's powers and privileges. The same necessity for any one having such powers does not exist now, after the reaping is finished, as existed for such powers as resided in that Servant while the reaping was going on. Such powers were necessary for the reaping period only. Hence our dear Pastor, since John's death the sole possessor of these powers this side the vail, passed

away shortly after the reaping was finished; and these powers, with his passing away, have logically and Scripturally ceased to be.

Moreover, the blundering course of the Society, since it became an independent and self-acting corporation, which it was not during that Servant's life, proves that it is not the channel for directing the work of God's priesthood. The *ambitious course* of its leaders was a gigantic blunder, as well as a great sin. Their course with the British affair, with the board, with Vol. VII, with "Harvest Siftings," with the 1918 election "campaign," with the military question, which brought about their imprisonment, with the "avoid-them" policy, etc., etc., etc., was marked with most stupid blunders. Surely God has more wisdom than to choose such a blundering channel for directing the work of His *Priesthood!* Its blunders alone unmistakably prove that the Lord is using it to attract a class with whom blundering is the natural and usual activity—the Great Company, the Epiphany Levites. Further, its many errors of interpretation prove that it is not sufficiently qualified to be the Lord's channel to His Priests to give them meat in due season. Even according to the admissions of its own supporters very many misinterpretations are given in Vol. VII and "The Tower." There are multitudes of misinterpretations in that book that the Society brethren do not yet see. There is scarcely anything properly taught in the book where it interprets things not explained by our Pastor. Additionally, when we consider the interpretational and doctrinal mistakes made in connection with Elijah and Elisha—with the end of the reaping—with the closing of the door—with the deliverance of the Church and with the destruction of Babylon (all of which were expected in 1918)—with the death of the firstborn of Egypt—with a majority vote as being invariably the Lord's will—with the Society as the channel—with the Penny parable—with

the seven years of plenty and famine, and with literally thousands of other items, we are forced to the conclusion that the Lord would not select as the channel for giving the meat in due season to His Priestly class a body so lacking in spiritual insight, and so given to unreasonable speculations and guesses boldly advanced as "meat in due season." In justification, they claim that "that Servant" made mistakes. It is true he did make a few; but in the forty-two (42) years that he taught the Church he did not make one hundredth the mistakes of interpretation that the present alleged channel has made. Here and there he altered a small detail in the great system of Truth that he gave through that long period of time. They will have to alter almost everything new that they have given out, since they *assumed* the office of "the channel." Moreover, he was almost always the one who discovered and corrected his mistakes, while they as a rule do not see theirs until they are pointed out to them by others, or fulfilled events disprove their views. We know of but two of their many forecasts (and one many a natural man forecast) to have been fulfilled, while his usually were fulfilled. He had, while they lack, that balance of mind and clearness of vision necessary to be the channel to give the meat to the household. Hence it is self-evident God would not choose them as such a channel (Lev. 21: 20; 2 Tim. 2: 15; 1 Tim. 3: 2; Tit. 1: 9).

The channel doctrine is wrong because it makes its adherents *over-reverence a good institution*, which has been put to bad uses, and therefore fail to scrutinize its teachings and policies with sufficient care to secure themselves from great blunders, wrong policies and consequent spiritual dangers (Ps. 146: 3). In justification they allege that it is the *Lord's concern* to keep the channel pure; and thus they fail to watch properly; and leave themselves open to accept rather unquestioningly and credulously what "the channel"

offers them. Such an attitude is tempting God (Matt. 4: 7), who guarantees no such thing, but disapproves of it by exhorting us to be sober and vigilant, and to prove all things (1 Pet. 5: 8, 9; 1 Thes. 5: 21; 1 John 4: 1). This course produces in its adherents a spirit similar to that of the members of the Catholic Church, a worshipping of messengers, a failure to test their teachings and a swallowing of error and a blind obedience. The channel doctrine is wrong, because it makes God's people subject to an institution to which they should not be subject (1 Cor. 7: 23). In practice this doctrine has made the bulk of the Society adherents as subject to it as the adherents of the papacy are to it. The same line of argument is used in each case; "to be out of harmony with the channel is to be out of harmony with the Lord." This thought has spread the spirit of fear among its adherents. *They fear* to get out of harmony with the Society lest they lose their crowns and opportunities of service and fellowship. Thus they fear properly to weigh its teachings and policies, thereby encouraging priestcraft. These considerations make them *subject to a business corporation* with a spirit of servile fear unbecoming to Priests of God.

Additionally this theory is responsible for the fact that since our Pastor's death the Society leaders both in print and orally, have been teaching, like many of the denominations regarding their systems, that the Society is not simply a business but a religious organization, which one "joins by consecration," something which "that Servant" did not teach, but consistently and Scripturally avoided. Such a teaching makes the Society an Antichrist with the Society officials as head and Society members as body, as J.F.R.'s second "new view" of Elijah and Elisha proves. This doctrine has made many of the Lord's people support policies and acts in violation of principle. There is no question but the matters of principle lying at the

root of the difficulties in the Society since our Pastor's death were not decided on the basis of Truth and Righteousness by the Society adherents, but on the basis of the thought of LOYALTY TO "THE PRESENT MANAGEMENT" as the controllers in the affairs of the Society. Hence those who stood for Truth, Righteousness and the Lord's arrangements given through "that Servant" were set aside, while those who with a high hand over-rode these were supported on the plea that they were "the channel," and that the Board's majority was not. A wide correspondence and many discussions with a large number of brethren who hold this channel doctrine prove that it is not so much principle as partisan loyalty to "the channel" that determines matters of faith and practice with the average channel adherent. This is gross *sectarianism*. Yea, it is precisely the course of Roman Catholics: that the papacy is to be supported, even if principle is violated; that it is not the business of the laity to do their thinking, nor to regulate their conduct on principle; but that it is their duty to *stand by* the papacy as the channel of the Lord!

These many considerations clearly prove that this channel doctrine is dangerous, unscriptural, unreasonable and unhistorical. For power to deceive God's people and to exalt priestcraft, for power to suppress Truth and Righteousness, and to exalt usurpers, for power to make God's people servile and uncharitable, and God's faithful servants seem deceivers and injurers—for such powers "the channel" doctrine is well adapted and has been much used.

We now proceed to expound, largely in our Pastor's language, the third and true view of the Society as a channel. We give the following lengthy excerpts from a booklet that he published in 1894, entitled "A Conspiracy Exposed" (pp. 55-62):

"The Society was formed in 1881, at the time of the free distribution of 1,400,000 copies of the pamphlet,

'Food For Thinking Christians'—now out of print. It consisted of five of the Lord's children, and its affairs were *entirely in my charge*. Later, in 1884, ... the Society applied for a charter ... The object in taking out a charter is succinctly stated in 'The Watch Tower' for January, 1891, page 16, as follows: 'This is a *Business Association merely*. It was chartered as a corporation by The State of Pennsylvania, and authorized to hold or dispose of property, in its own name as though it were an individual. It has no creed or confession. It is *merely a business convenience* in disseminating the Truth. Anyone subscribing to one copy or more of the Society's quarterly, styled Old Theology Tracts (6c. a year), is considered an active member of this Society—but not a voting member. Any one subscribing for \$10 worth or more of the O.T. Tracts, or any one donating \$10 or more to the funds of the Society for the spread of the Truth, is a voting member, and is entitled to one vote for each \$10 he or she may have donated. [Therefore one does not 'join the Society by Consecration.'] The affairs of the Society are so arranged that its entire control rests in the care of Brother and Sister Russell as long as they shall live. In fact, the only objects in having the corporation are: First, to provide a *channel or fund* [not therefore the channel to give meat in due season, nor to control the work] *through which those 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 acted and published independently of the others. Secondly, the corporation was called for by reason of the uncertainty of the lives of *those at present managing the fund*. ... The Society owns nothing, has nothing, pays no salaries, no rent or other expenses. Its policy is to use in the work every dollar received, to the best advantage, and as speedily as possible. ... It will be seen from this and other mentions of the subject in 'The Watch Tower' that I have never intimated otherwise than that the management of the Tract Society would probably rest entirely in the hands of myself and Sister Russell so long as we live, as provided by the regulations of the charter—that the majority of voting shares elect the executive officers. ... Having, up to Dec. 1, '93, thirty-seven hundred and five (3,705)

voting shares, out of a total of sixty-three hundred and eighty-three (6,383) voting shares, Sister Russell and myself, of course, elect the officers, and thus control the Society; and this was fully understood by the directors from the first. *Their usefulness, it was understood, would come to the front in the event of our death.* But, he assured, we shall take pleasure in sharing the responsibilities of the place we occupy with any one [not many] whose interest in the mission of the Tract Society shall by his donations to its funds relegate our voting shares to the place of a minority. And such a one would, no doubt, be well qualified to direct in the expenditures, etc. [This proves that 'that Servant' never expected that the Society during his lifetime would be controlled by any number or combination of individuals who might own more voting shares than he, but that he would be willing to share in the responsibility of his position with a single individual who would contribute more than he.] ... In the foregoing extract from our issue of January, 1891 (which appeared in eight issues of 'The Tower' for 1891), we say, 'This Society owns nothing, has nothing, pays no salaries, etc.' Lest some should misunderstand this, we will explain. The Tower Pub. Co. (which in a financial way *represents myself*) owns the Bible House, buys the paper, pays for the printing, binding, electroplates, etc., and keeps a large stock of 'Dawns' and Tracts on hand and fills the orders of the Tract Society at any time, and at much lower prices than any worldly firm would charge for much poorer service. To do this requires that thousands of dollars lie idle continually, in electroplates, books, colporteurs' dues, tracts, etc.; and as a consequence the Tower Pub. Co. is now a borrower to the extent of over twenty thousand dollars (the interest on which is over \$1,200.00 yearly), all of which, however, is amply secured by other property which I own. The Tract Society's funds are usually spent before received, as under the 'Good Hopes' plan we know about what to expect. It runs a yearly account with the Tower Pub. Co., paying over moneys as received and balancing the account at the close of the year. Is it asked why the Tract Society does not do its own publishing? We reply, because it has neither capital nor credit. No banks would want the Tract Society's note. There are two

ways in which it could do its own publishing: (1) By doing no work for a while, it could save up the yearly donations until it had a capital with which to purchase or rent a building, buy type, make electroplates, and pay in advance for paper, printing, binding, and have capital with which to give colporteurs some starting credit, etc.; but this surely would not be so advantageous a way as the present one. (2) I could make a donation to the Tract Society of a part or all of the Tower Pub. Co.'s outfit, and take that many more voting-shares. This I no doubt would have done had it not been for the greater caution of my esteemed helpmate, Sister Russell. Her advice was: That would be no real benefit to the work, and you may be sure that, if the Society really had any assets or property, some would soon begin to interfere with its management, or at least to try to. So long as we live we had best keep matters as they are, and at our death put the Tract Society and the Lord's work in general on the best possible footing, and in most consecrated hands we can find. I followed this advice rather reluctantly; but now, in the light of the slanders herein discussed, I see it to have been the very essence of wisdom."

From this lengthy quotation we see that the W.T.B. & T.S. was simply a "*financial channel or fund*" for the gifts of the Lord's people, *i.e.*, a channel of financial co-operation whereby our Pastor, *controlling everything*, paid the bills that he made in directing the work of the general Church. Considerably after 1900 he made over to the Society all of his properties, his copyrights, etc., expressly stipulating with the directors that not only must he, during his life, control all the business and affairs of the Society, as well as the interests of all that he gave, but also by his will, charter, etc., dictate the Society's policies, etc., after his death. Consequently the Society was not during his life the instrumentality whereby the Harvest work was done. As for its place in the Lord's work since his death we would remark that *neither the charter, nor the will, nor any of the writings of "that Servant" sets forth the Society as the channel of giving the*

meat in due season to the household, nor of controlling the general work of the Church. They all unite in showing that it is intended to be an instrumentality helpful in carrying the Truth to those outside of the Truth, and additionally that "The Tower" editors, as mouthpieces of the Society, should be instruments of *edification* to Truth people—not however having "that Servant's" power of being the Lord's special mouth, eye and hand, without whose sanction and direction no new truth was to be given to the Church by others, and through whose instrumentality all new truths were first presented to the Church. Consequently the Divinely intended powers of the Society lack totally the two special functions of that Servant's office. In using that Servant to form the Society the Lord did not reveal to him exactly what the uses of this corporation in the Lord's work after his death would be, it not being then due to be understood, as its understanding would have interfered with the *trial* whereby the Lord was pleased to separate the antitypical Elijah and Elisha. (See Chap. II, Vol. III.) The Lord has since shown us this; hence we now see that the Society is the antitype of one of the wagons, chariots, used by the Merarite Levites (Num. 7: 3-8; Ps. 46: 9) to help them perform their service in connection with the tabernacle (Num. 3: 36, 37; 4: 31-33). It will be noticed that God gave the *priests no chariots* for their work. Therefore antitypical Priests should not be identified with any organization for the performance of their service apart from the Church as an organization. Nor should they accept any organization as their teacher, or executive, or manager, much less as the controller, of their work.

We are all familiar with our Pastor's teachings that in the end of the Age the Great Company as such would, as antitypical Levites, be revealed apart from the Priests (Mal. 3: 2, 3; 1 Cor. 3: 11-15; Z 1916, p. 264, par. 1). As such some of them are antitypes

of the Merarite Levites; and thus have four symbolic wagons, chariots, organizations, to assist them in their work. We understand that three of these symbolic wagons, chariots, are the following organizations (1) The W.T.B. & T.S., (2) the P.P.A. (The People's Pulpit Association) and (3) the I.B.S.A. it seems that the Mahlite Merarites (Num. 3: 20, 33) type those members of the Great Company who *partisanly* support the clericalistic leaders of the Society. These, accordingly, have three of the four symbolic chariots of the antitypical Merarite Levites, the fourth being in the possession of the Mushite branch of the antitypical Merarites, Elijah-Voicists. Hence we understand that the W.T.B. & T.S. is a Divinely arranged channel for doing the work that certain members of the Great Company have to do in connection with the antitypical Tabernacle, the true Church; that its work is not to give the meat in due season to the Priests, nor to direct their work; but it is to assist the Priests by bearing the antitypical boards, pillars, posts, etc. (Num. 3: 36, 37, etc.); to labor for their Great Company brethren, *i.e.*, to edify those of them who are in the Truth; to reach with the Truth those of them who are yet in Babylon; to help the Youthful Worthies; and to give the world a testimony of the coming Kingdom, as well as to reprove it for sin, righteousness and judgment to come. As long as the Mahlite Merarites limit themselves to these activities, their Society will be honored by the Lord as a channel for such services; but He will, as in the past He has done, oppose their organizations in their *interfering with the work of the Little Flock*. The Lord bless them in their Divinely appointed service, a Levitical service; for in such a service the Society is [was, is so no longer since 1920] a channel of the Lord!

At the annual shareholders' meeting in Pittsburgh, Jan. 3, 1920, the Lord's will on Society arrangements, as expressed in the Charter was in a number of ways

violated. We wish that the shareholders had voted the directors in, not for three years and ten months only, but for life, subject to removal at any time by two thirds vote of the shareholders, as the Charter provides. At any rate what they did as to the directors was a partial recognition of the wisdom of the Charter in providing that directors hold office for life, subject to removal by two-thirds vote of the shareholders, and the unwisdom of an annual election of directors, which has given opportunity for "politics." What was done also demonstrates the insincerity of the plea made during 1917 that there were vacancies on the board, because directors *must* be elected annually! *No honest* lawyer who *knows* the law on the subject would say that there were vacancies in the Directorate for years up to July 17, 1917.

The passing of by-laws changing the term of the Society's officers, directors and the time of annual meetings is certainly illegal; and such by-laws are null and void for the simple reason that when the state grants a corporation a charter, it empowers the corporation to act along those lines alone which are laid down in the charter. A by-law that changes a provision of a charter is in reality an amendment of that charter; and only the state granting it can amend it. Hence the by-laws passed at the shareholders' meeting, Jan. 3, 1920, are entirely null and void, even if the directors, who alone have the right to make by-laws for the Society, later passed them; even as a by-law passed by J.F.R.'s Board in Oct. 1917, making the share holders' certificates forfeitable, is null and void; because the Charter makes such certificates "non-forfeitable." If to change the title of the Society by omitting the word "Zion" from and by adding the words "Bible and" to the Society's original name required a special decree of the Court in 1896, when the change was made; much more would this be required, when the *powers* that the state grants in and by the

Charter are changed. An opinion of lawyers, who usually for filthy lucre say what their clients want, does not have the necessary authority to make such changes, which require a court decree. No *honest* lawyer who *knows* the law on the subject would say that shareholders or directors can legally pass binding bylaws that change the state-granted, state-sanctioned and state-limited provisions of the charter. The only legal way that this can be done is to appeal to the state courts to change the provisions of the Charter. But to make such an appeal would be Revolutionism, the Sixth Slaughter Weapon, as what was done Jan. 3, 1920, was also Revolutionism. This action of the Shareholders, therefore, is another example of disobedience to the Lord's arrangements as given in the Charter, and will surely prove a hindrance to success in service. When will we learn the lesson not to rebel against, but to keep the Lord's arrangements (Ps. 107: 11)?

It will be recalled that, while writing in our Dec., 1919 issue on the Golden-Age Revolutionism, we announced that fit-man experiences would surely follow such a point-blank violation of the Will. Seemingly before arousing the fit man to act the Lord waited for the next outbreak of Revolutionism, that which occurred at the shareholders' meeting, Jan. 3, 1920, against a number of the Charter's provision; for ten days thereafter the Government announced that it would reopen the case against the Society leaders, whom we pity, but who apparently have not learned the lesson that their former fit-man experience should have taught them.

For the profit of our Society brethren we take this occasion to tell them of an incident that was brought to our attention in Sep., 1917. An unconsecrated Truth friend learning early in August of the ousting of the four directors, at his own initiative and without the knowledge of any of the Truth people, wrote to an

old-time friend of his, the then Assistant Attorney-General of Pennsylvania, asking if J.F.R.'s course of ousting the directors was right. First, in a short opinion this Official replied that J.F.R.'s course was neither morally nor legally right. Later, angered at J.F.R.'s usurpation, as he continued to consider it, the same Official wrote out for his friend a lengthy opinion with numerous citations of legal authorities as proofs to the same effect. Further, he claimed that J.F.R.'s course was an offense against the State of Pennsylvania, which granted the Charter. This official then told his old-time friend that he was going to institute proceedings to annul the Society's Charter; but at the earnest entreaty of his Truth friend, who, as a condition precedent to telling us the incident, committed us to confidence as to his identity, that Official desisted from his purpose. Our object in telling this incident is not to threaten, but to apprise our Society brethren (who, deceived as greatly as they have been, are yet seeking to be loyal to the Teachings, Arrangements, Charter and Will that the Lord gave through that Servant) of the disastrous results that violations of the Charter are likely to bring. These violations are liable to lead to disannulling of the W.T.B. & T.S.! While the power-grasping course of J.F.R. and the group that under him are controlling the Society, moves us to believe that they would not regret such an event, we feel sure that the bulk of the Society brethren would feel it one of the worst imaginable calamities. Hence to safeguard these brethren against such a disaster, we have written this article, and have told this incident. The Priests, whether in or out of the Society, we earnestly exhort to resist to the end the by-laws revolutionism, and thus co-operate with our Head in leading Azazel's Goat to the door of the Tabernacle. It is His, and not our part in the High Priest's work to see that the fit man lays hold of Azazel's Goat for its repeated and unfavorable

experiences at his hand. And He will do this out of love for them, as moral suasion and previous fit-man sufferings seemingly have been insufficient to work in them that "godly sorrow that worketh repentance to salvation not to be repented of."

The April 1, 1920, Tower contains an article entitled, Let Us Dwell In Peace. This exhortation all of the Lord's people, subordinately to purity (Jas. 3: 17), should strive to practice. We have decided to discuss in a kindly spirit and plain manner the said article, and to point out the only solution for real peace and unity among the Lord's people. Nobody strove in harmony with Truth and Righteousness harder than we to prevent in 1917 the rupture of peace and unity; and we trust not to be behind others now in 1920 in seeking to restore a peace and unity in harmony with Truth and Righteousness. May the Lord give all of us as His people the necessary help through His Spirit, Word and Providence to seek a Divinely pleasing peace and unity! The article tells us of some British brethren and the Society's president corresponding on certain propositions involving the relation of the W.T.B. & T.S. and the Church. We note that the article without mentioning The Present Truth replies to its views on various subjects, some directly, others not directly involved in the propositions of the article. As in the case of the Tower's articles: Blessed are the Fearless that told of Elijah becoming Elisha, and those which are entitled, Worthies, Ancient and Modern, and Justification, so this article seems not to be aiming at any one; but from our knowledge of J.F.R.'s "tactfulness" we are satisfied that he, its writer, had our views in mind in all four articles above referred to. We are the recipient of accurate information on Society conditions, and are well aware that our views are arousing against J.F.R.'s teaching and practices many brethren in the Society. Hence the article, "Let Us Dwell In Peace,"

is another effort to meet our presentations, and quiet an increasingly troublesome situation. In view of this we will give friendly, but plain replies and seek to set forth our understanding of the Lord's mind on the subjects at issue, criticizing not the private conduct of the brethren, which we never do in print; but only their official wrong acts and false teachings, which our duty as a general elder in the Church requires us to do in the interests of the flock.

The central point in the article under review is the subject of the channel. As on other erroneous views of its writer, so on this subject the article is very vague, *e.g.*, not precisely defining the channel's supposed powers connected with its claimed successorship to "that Servant." The chief confusion in the article is its combining the Society with the Church in a real union, partly like that of state and church, and partly like that of the papacy and the Catholic Church. This thought permeates the article from beginning to end. For the present, limiting our remarks to the similarity in the relation of the papacy and the Catholic Church, we would say that as the Catholic hierarchy combines its organization with that Church, so does the article under review combine the Society with the Church, as it were, in wedlock. The argument clarified and supplemented by other Tower utterances is the following: As the hierarchy is the channel between God and the Church for its instruction and for the management of its general work; so the Society is the channel between God and the Church for its instruction, and the management of its general work. Above we pointed out that the official publications of the Society claim for it that it is "the one and only channel which the Lord has used in dispensing His Truth continually since the beginning of the Harvest period." (Z '19, 105, col. 2, par. 1; 107, last par.; G 145.) How could this be true, among other reasons, since the Society did not come into existence, until years after the

Harvest began? This proposition involves the thought, as it does in the case of the pope, that there be especially "one mind," J.F.R.'s, that God specially illuminates with the light as due, and that the Society, J.F.R., by special illumination sees and presents this special light for the friends, *e.g.*, in such articles as Blessed are the Fearless, Worthies, Ancient and Modern, Justification and the one under review, etc., all contradicting the Divinely illuminated views of him who was as "that Servant," the true channel, not as the Society's President, but as that Servant.

The channel proposition under review clarified by other authorized Society publications, is also exactly like that of the papacy in a second respect, *i.e.*, as the pope is not only the specially illuminated teacher of the Church through the hierarchy, but also the specially guided executive through the hierarchy for the Church; so J.F.R., through the Society, is not only the specially illuminated teacher of the Church, but also the specially guided executive, "the Steward," through the Society for the Church! This is the view underlying the article and is veiledly expressed (Z '20, 104, col. 1, par. 2) and is the general view of the Society's mouthpieces (Z '17, 327, par. 1; Z '16, 390, col. 2, etc.; G 227; Harvest Siftings, 10, col. 2, par. 4). All will admit that this is the official as well as the common view among Society adherents, *e.g.*, as championed in Clayton Woodworth's tract on the Penny and its Steward, which was published in the Swedish Tower, perhaps in others also. The claim that the Society is the successor of that Servant is in line with this thought, as all will grant; and as our Pastor used the term Society of himself, so J.F.R. has used the term of himself. Such a view makes the Society under the headship of its president in its relation to the Church exactly what the Roman Catholic view makes of the Catholic hierarchy through the headship of the pope in its relation to the Catholic Church.

Hence the Society is in little Babylon, the confused condition prevailing among Truth people, exactly what the Romish hierarchy is in the confused condition among the Nominal Church people. To seat such air institution with such claims in the true Church is to seat a little Antichrist in the temple of God (2 Thes. 2: 1-9). There can be no successful denial of this proposition. The new doctrine of the Society that has been made to prevail since about the time of our Pastor's death is exactly like the doctrine (of apostolic succession of bishops and the primacy of the pope as Peter's successor) that was with the falling away, in the beginning of the Age made to prevail in the nominal Church. Some day in minute detail we will, *D.v.*, trace the correspondence between the papacy's history, doctrines, practices and constitution on the one hand, and the Society's history, policy-doctrines, practices and constitution on the other hand.

But one may say, Is that not the relation that that Servant had to the Church, as the one whose mind was specially illuminated with the light as due, whose mouth and pen set this light forth, and whose hand guided the general work of the Church? We answer: by no means; for not as president of a "dummy corporation" with "dummy directors and shareholders" did he have the above-mentioned official functions; but as an individual, apart from any corporation, Divinely chosen to be for the Church the special eye, mouth and hand of the Lord for the Parousia. As the Lord's Special Representative, as an individual, and not as the president, or special representative of the Society, did he function as above. How do we know this? Because he took executive charge of the Harvest work in 1875 as the Lord's choice, when he published his tract on *The Object And Manner Of Our Lord's Return*, continued it when in 1876 he directed Mr. Barbour to edit a paper, with our Pastor as its publisher, and as one of its associate editors; and in 1879,

when the light on the Tabernacle was given him, the storehouse was put into his charge; while the Society was not formed as an association until about Sep., 1881, and as a corporation until Dec., 1884. Hence he was that Servant before the Society was formed; and received none of his powers as that Servant from, on account of, or through it. Rather he controlled it absolutely until his death, which proves that it was not "the channel" for years, but was only a "dummy corporation" with "dummy directors and shareholders," as all people who know the facts are aware. J.F.R. knows and said this, when he wrote that there was but little use for the "so-called Board" during that Servant's life (Harvest Siftings, 10, col. 2, par. 4).

The article under review claims that "the Society published all the writings of Brother Russell," and that "the Society was the channel for the beginning of these publications." We beg leave to differ. In our quotation above from his booklet, *A Conspiracy Exposed*, published in 1894, it can be seen that up to 1894, it published nothing; this remark applies also to later years; that the Tower Publishing Co. ("which," our pastor writes, "in a financial way represents myself") owned everything and published everything, and filled the Tract Society's (his) orders for Dawns and Tracts, etc. In that same booklet, as can be seen in our quotation, he called it a financial channel, absolutely under his control, a means whereby he received donations which he expended for the work, as he saw fit. His putting his copyrights, which he took out for only a part of his writings, *The Studies*, and all his other possessions, apart from most of his publications, in the name of the Society about 1903, was putting them from one of his pockets into another; for he controlled them, just the same after as before so doing, as per his express stipulation with the board. The transfer was made, not to give the Society added powers, but to protect what was his stewardship from the

unholy ambitions and covetous designs of Mrs. Russell. J.F.R.'s statement that our Pastor was an editor, not a publisher, which he says the Society was, is wholly out of harmony with the facts. It is true that from April 15, 1909, for the first time he used the name of the Society as publisher of the Tower; but even from then onward this was merely nominal, and occurred for the first time 6 years after he put his book copyrights in the Society's name. He was the real publisher, *i.e.*, controller; and when in the foreword on the inside page of each Tower he spoke of the Tower as a trust of *his* to be administered according to *his* judgment of the Lord's will, he proved that he was both publisher and editor; for an editor who is not a publisher must follow the publisher's orders, unless by definite understanding he can do otherwise. That the Watch Tower was not at all times the official organ of the Society, as J.F.R. claims, is evident, among other things, from the fact that it was published years before the Society came into existence. During our Pastor's life the Tower was his mouthpiece, though nominally for his last 7 years it was published as that of the Society, a "dummy corporation."

Again J.F.R. is mistaken when he thinks that the Society now controls all our Pastor's writings. Those writings that he for a longer or shorter duration published without copyrights anybody can reprint without the Society's permission, and this includes almost everything that he wrote. Hence the Society cannot control reprints made from copies of his writings that were issued without copyrights. The Tower was first copyrighted after his death, as can be seen from the absence of the words or initials claiming the copyright before his death. Hence the P.B.I. or anyone else is safe legally and morally in republishing literary products from our Pastor's non-copyrighted or expired copyrighted editions. Our Pastor, therefore, as the

Lord's eye, mouth and hand for His Church was, as he taught, the Lord's channel. In this sense the Society never was and never will be the channel. In its claims, actual, implied or presumed, to these functions of that Servant it is a counterfeit channel, as the papacy is. As we showed above, it is a channel, Divinely instituted for that branch of the Great Company alone typed by Mahlite Levites and Elisha.

The Society leaders and their partisan supporters seek hard in many ways to bolster up their claims on Society powers. On some of their other claims thereon we will make a few remarks. First as to their claim that our Pastor was appointed that Servant for the duration of the Laodicean Church, and hence is still acting as that Servant from beyond the vail! This claim among other things is too broad. He was appointed that Servant for the Parousia period of the Laodicean Church (Luke 12: 37, 42-47; Ezek. 9: 11), not for the Epiphany period, whose peculiar mission and trials required his vacating the office of that Servant and the non-existence of this office. There is no evidence in Scripture, Reason, Fact and his Writings that his office as that Servant persisted after his passing beyond the vail. The reason for the office precludes such an idea; being invisible, while present serving His prospective Bride with the Parousia Truth, our Lord for the best interests of the Parousia Truth and work toward His prospective Bride, had to have a special visible eye, mouth and hand through which He could see for, speak to, and work toward and through Her, until He would accomplish His Parousia mission to Her. For these purposes exclusively the office of that Servant was created; and it lasted until these purposes were realized, *i.e.*, until the end of the Parousia, during which all the watching servants were fed with the Truth, and led in the work of harvesting (Luke 12: 37, 42-44; Ezek. 9: 11). The purposes of the office having been realized, the office

ceased to exist, God ending it when the man with the writer's inkhorn began through his chief member, that Servant, in the toga scene on the Pullman Car, Oct. 30, 1916, the day before the latter's death, to report the completion of that symbolic man's work (Ezek. 9: 11). The Lord the next day gave us the unanswerable proof of the completion of the Reaping and Gleaning work ("I have done as Thou hast commanded me": "put the mark on the foreheads," etc.), and the present nonexistence of that office by making *invisible* through death the only one for whom the office was created; since his functions for the reaping and gleanings work as the *visible* eye, mouth and hand of the invisible present Lord of necessity ceased, when on that day he by his change of nature ceased to be *visible*. The Lord would never have had a that Servant, except that as an invisible Spirit He needed a that Servant as a visible special representative, through whom to see for, speak to, and act toward His prospective Bride *during and only during the Parousia for its special work*. Hence neither an individual nor a corporation is his successor, *i.e.*, has and uses his office powers as the Lord's eye, hand and mouth for His prospective Bride for the Harvest, whose end, having set in, proves our proposition with redoubled force.

The duration of that Servant's office being limited to the Parousia period of the Laodicean Church, and all the goods being put into his charge for the period of that office only, we being now in the Epiphany period of the Laodicean Church, evidently he could no longer be that Servant, nor could the storehouse be any longer in his charge; nor could he have a successor, the office which he held passing out of existence with its necessity and its period of duration; hence there is no necessity for his having a visible agency (either in the form of the Society, or in the form of J.F.R.) for giving the meat in due season. Moreover, if a channel somewhat like our Pastor were now

necessary, it would be the Lord's direct channel, and would not be our Pastor's channel. The Society's claim that our Pastor is now "from beyond the veil directing every feature of the Harvest work," is contradictory to our Lord's prerogatives as the Director of the work from beyond the veil, and is in Little Babylon the counterpart of the papal claim that St. Peter manages the Church through the pope.

As to the attempted distinction which some Society friends make between the office of "that Servant" and that of "the Steward," with our Pastor retaining the former, and giving J.F.R. the latter, we would remark that there is no difference either in nature, personnel or function, in the office designated by these terms; for Jesus, both in Greek and English (Luke 12: 42-46) uses the words interchangeably. The reason why a different word is used in the Greek of Matt. 20: 8 is due to the fact that different figures with pertinent names are used in the two passages: the figure of a household and its appurtenances is used in the former, while that of a vineyard and its appurtenances is used in the latter passage; but both words translated "steward" mean an administrator, an executive. Our Pastor now retains no part of this office indicated by these words, and this office now no longer existing, he cannot have a successor therein. Hence neither the Society nor J.F.R. is his successor in this peculiar office. In Vol. V, Chap. II, we proved our Pastor was the steward of Matt. 20: 8, and disproved J.F.R.'s being such. There are, however, strong factual reasons for believing that the latter in his work and office as the leader of the Great Company is typed by the power-grasping, money-loving, truth-denying and falsehood-telling Gehazi, the unworthy servant of Elisha (Vol. III, Chap. V).

To another of their claims, *i.e.*, that that Servant always used the Society as the channel, we would reply that being the channel (1) of controlling the work

and (2) of giving the Truth in due season, which he received by special illumination as that Servant, and not as the Society's president, he never in these two ways used the Society, which term properly means the directors with their agents in their organized capacity, or the shareholders, or both. Whenever he spoke of "the Society," or "The Tower," or "The Studies" as being "that Servant" and "the channel," as he did in some places, *e.g.*, Z '09, 292-294, he did it modestly to hide himself behind these names, as is usual with editors, authors, and corporation controllers, and thus he tactfully prevented opponents from using the matter of that Servant to the injury of the lambs in the flock, as they sought to do. All of us understood the subject and that article in this way for years, until just lately, when in the interests of themselves as power-graspers the Society leaders introduced a perverted and misleading thought thereon (Acts 20: 30). We were astounded to find that the article in Z '09, 292-294 was quoted in Z '19, 54-57 in full, and again in part in the article that we are reviewing (Z '20, 100), to prove that the Society always was during the Harvest that Servant and the channel for giving the meat and conducting the work. In that same article The Tower and The Studies are also called that Servant and the channel. This fact should be sufficient to prove even to babes in the Truth that our Pastor, an individual, not a Society, and not as its president *as such*, was modestly hiding himself behind all three of these names, and by them meant himself, as he sometimes said: "I am the Society." The fact that in Z '09, 292-294, he refers as explanatory of his understanding of that Servant and the channel to D 613, 614 and Z '96, 47, where he speaks (modestly, of course) of himself as that Servant and the channel, should have kept back the Tower Editors from such manifestly deceitful use of the article in question. What a fearful responsibility these Editors are heaping

upon themselves for using that article as Catholic writers frequently use writings of Church Fathers. We warn them in God's name to desist from such fraudulent use of that article! Further similar use of it they will make at their own peril (Gal. 6: 7, 8).

Above we proved that the Society was not that Servant during our Pastor's life, nor has it become his successor as that Servant since his death. The Tower, deceitfully handling that Servant's writings (Z '09, 292-294), has since his death set up the claim that the Society had during *his* life always been that Servant, quoting Z '09, 292-294 in full in Z '19, 54-57 and in Z '20, 100 in part, to prove this claim. This deceitful use of our Pastor's article we exposed and showed above to be false and deceitful. In the March 1, 1923, Tower in an article entitled, "Loyalty The Test," with characteristic Rutherfordian jugglery of words, The Tower Editors surrender the claim that the Society was that Servant during our Pastor's life, but set up the claim that since his death it has become his successor as that Servant; that such was our Pastor's intention when he formed the Society; that Jehovah had him organize it for that purpose; and that hence—"and this is the kernel in the nut"—to be out of harmony with that thought and the Society's work is to be out of harmony with the Lord as "murmurers" against his arrangements and to be disloyal to Him, to be loyal to whom, one must accept and work under the Society as that Servant! This theory and its outworking the Society sets up as a test of loyalty to God. Where is this test of loyalty set forth in the Scriptures—the mouth of God that contains for the child of God everything pertaining to faith and practice (2 Tim. 3: 15-17)? Above we proved that our Pastor finished the work (Ezek. 9: 11) for which the office of that Servant was created. Hence he could have no successor in that office, since, the work and need of such

an office existing no more, the office itself has ceased to be.

But let us see how The Tower Editors try to prove their proposition. As the proof they offer a quotation from Z '84, Oct. 2, which they claim proves that by Divine intention our Pastor formed the Society to become his successor as that Servant at his death. The quotation follows: "It seems tolerably certain that some of the saints will be in the flesh during a great part at least of the 'time of trouble'; and if so, there will be need of *printed matter, tracts, etc.*, [italics ours] as much then, perhaps, as now, and possibly will be more needed; for 'when the judgments of the Lord are in the earth, the inhabitants of the world will learn righteousness' (Is. 26: 9). Should *those at present prominently identified* with the work not be the last to be 'changed,' some interruption of the work might result; but this may be obviated by having a legal standing, granted by a State Charter." So far the quotation. Above we gave a much longer quotation on the reason for forming the Society, from our Pastor's booklet, published in 1894, and entitled, "A Conspiracy Exposed." It elaborates his reason for organizing the Society given above and adds, among other things, what is not stated in the paragraph quoted above—that the Society was to serve as a depository for funds to send out Truth literature. But to return to the quotation from Z '84, Oct., we remark by way of a preliminary, that Jesus (Matt. 24: 45-47; Luke 12: 42-44) states the office functions of "that Servant" to be two: (1) to expound the Parousia Truth as due to the Church; and (2) to act as executive of the Parousia work of the Church. Now we ask, Does the above quotation—or any other writing of our Pastor—state or imply that the Society, in the event of his death before the Reaping was finished, would serve in either or both of these capacities? Certainly not! Hence the quotation does not state

or imply that the Society at his death would become his successor as that Servant—the Lord's mouth, eye and hand for the Parousia. He did not *then*, in Oct., 1884, even know that he was that Servant, having first learned of it between 1894 and 1896, let alone arrange for a successor in that capacity. The quotation under consideration proves that the Society was organized to publish in the event of our Pastor's death *printed matter* like tracts and other Truth literature (which the Will says should consist exclusively of our Pastor's writings, apart from articles appearing in the Tower). The Charter agrees with this, showing that the Society was organized to furnish only *inanimate* instrumentalities for the spread of the Truth. The last clause of the quotation shows that the Society was organized so that, especially in case of our *Pastor's* death, the work—that referred to in the preceding part of the quotation: publishing printed matter—tracts and kindred literature—be not interrupted. The quotation does not refer directly or impliedly to interrupting the work of acting as the Lord's mouth in giving the Parousia Truth and as the Lord's hand in administering the Parousia Work. To what desperate straits must one be reduced when in poverty of argument he is forced to quote the above paragraph in an effort to prove that the Society, since his death, is our Pastor's successor as that Servant! All that the paragraph proves is that in the event of Bro. Russell's death, the Society might exercise a very subordinate feature of power, one not restricted in use to the office of that Servant—that of publishing printed matter—tracts, etc., which apart from the Tower must consist of his writings according to the Will. In inheriting such a power, the Society has received from the Lord a power that any Gospel-Age Merarite Levite might have performed. And in moving our Pastor to arrange for the Society to do such a work, the Lord indicated what the

antitypical fulfillment actually shows has taken place—that the Society would be an antitypical wagon (organization) of the Epiphany Merarite Levites! Hence this quotation, instead of proving that the Society would be our Pastor's successor as that Servant after his death, implies, when compared with the work of the Gospel-Age Merarites, that it would after his death become one of the antitypical Merarite Levites' symbolic wagons, which is far removed from successorship to his office!

Nor must another thing escape our memories: When our Pastor wrote the article in 1884, from which the Tower quotes, he believed that both the Harvest and the Time of Trouble would end by Oct., 1914. Indeed it was not until 1904 (Z '04, 197-199) that he came to see that the trouble could not begin until the lease of power to the Gentiles had expired—1914. Fearing that he might die before the Harvest would end in 1914, and desiring the Truth literature to be available for Harvest purposes until 1914, he arranged for the Society so that it could furnish the literature *up to that date* in the event of his death before. But he lived until not only the reaping (1914) but also the gleaning (1916) was finished. Thus he finished the work that God gave him to do—the work of giving the Harvest Truth and superintending the Harvest work unto a completion (Ezek. 9: 11). We have (in the Appendix of Studies III, 387-404) given 56 reasons from the Bible and the Pyramid proving that the reaping ended by Oct., 1914, and the gleaning by Passover, 1916. Hence the work going on since the latter date is not the Harvest—Reaping and Gleaning—work. Accordingly, the Society's work is not Harvesting—gathering the Little Flock. Hence it cannot have our Pastor's official functions as *the* channel and therefore is not his successor as that Servant.

Repeatedly and boldly the Tower (Z '23, 68, 72)

throws out the challenge to others to state what is *the* channel, if the Society is not such. We would be disloyal to the Lord, if we permitted this repeated, public and bold challenge to remain unanswered. Therefore we answer it as follows: Since our Pastor's death there has been no channel in the sense in which he was the channel. We pointed out above the fact that the Society is a channel of the Lord—for certain features of the Epiphany Merarites' work. If it were *the* channel as that Servant's successor, its mouthpiece—The Tower—would not in almost every issue bring forth some new erroneous interpretation or teaching contradictory of the interpretations and teaching of *the channel*—Bro. Russell. Its partisan supporters as antitypical Elisha are also a channel of the Lord—His mouthpiece to nominal Spiritual Israel. But there are other channels than the Society and antitypical Elisha. The Pastoral Bible Institute, the Bible Student's Committee, the Standfasts' Committee, etc., are, each in its way, channels of the Lord as Levitical organizations. The members of the World's High Priest yet in the flesh are also a channel of the Lord—to lead Azazel's Goat to the Gate and to deliver it to the fit man, and indirectly—through the latter—to Azazel (1 Cor. 5: 3-5). The Scriptures prove, and facts and the Pyramid corroborate the thought that the privilege of giving the Epiphany Truth pertinent to, and of overseeing the general Epiphany work toward—not the Priests, but—Azazel's Goat, was shortly after our Pastor's death given to us, who amid many tribulations have and will continue to exercise these functions, and will by God's grace complete the ministry toward Azazel's Goat, and shortly thereafter, through the tribulations coming on the Levitical leaders, will be recognized by God's Priests and Levites as the Lord's special representative among the Priests in giving the teachings for, and in overseeing the work toward and of—not the priests, but—the Epiphany Levites.

In answer to the claim that we violate the Will by publishing The Present Truth we would say: the Charter and Will were given *exclusively* for the regulation of controlling corporations and associations among the Truth people, and not to suppress the existence, nor to regulate the mission of an independent periodical whose publication is necessary for the defense of the Truth against its "channel" and other perverters, and for the defense of the *obligatoriness of the Charter and Will against revolutionists* (who use or set them aside as it suits their unholy ambitions) *in the affairs of controlling corporations and associations among Truth people.*

If the Tower Editors had not so greatly lost the Truth on the organization of the Church as complete, when God originally realized and described it in Apostolic times (for details see above), they would never set forth such claims as they do of the Society in its relation to the Church of the Living God, which as constituted by Him did not contain a business corporation that claimed the specific right of controlling a general ministry toward and for the Church, involving the general teaching office in pilgrim, periodical and convention work, and the control of the literature for the Church's edification and distribution. Such claims with their corresponding acts are like those of the two great Antichrists, the Papacy and the Federation of Churches.

We do not have to use our imaginations, and indulge in various unprovable, unscriptural, unreasonable and untruthful assumptions as those of the Tower Editors on Society powers on the subject under discussion. All that we need to do is to go to the *source and rule of faith and practice for controlling corporations* among Truth people: *The Charter, Will and those arrangements of our Pastor that are directly stated or implied in the Will and Charter*, but not those exclusive arrangements for the Little Flock that flowed out

of his powers toward the Little Flock as that Servant; and we will know what the Divinely intended powers and purposes of the Society are. Certain facts on their claims on Society powers for pilgrim and convention work and for authorizing *new literary products*, apart from Tower articles, deserve our study in the light of the Bible, the Charter and Will. J.F.R. has arranged a pilgrim service, appointed pilgrims, additional to those who were pilgrims at the time of that Servant's passing beyond the veil and has called conventions. Where is there Scriptural warrant that he, a board of directors, a collection of individuals, or of churches, or all of them combined has a right to make such arrangements in the Church which is His Body? God and Jesus never gave him or 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. Above we gave dozens of facts, as well as many Scriptures, that prove that in our Pastor's day, never did a Society institute or control such a general ministry toward and for the Church which is Christ's Body; for God did that through that Servant alone. Since the pilgrim office is that of the non-apostolic general elders (F 244, 251, 253, 273 and 274), 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 *usually* 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 Church which is His Body. As the respective

parallels of Zerubbabel, Ezra and Nehemiah; Marsiglio, Wyclif and Huss (Z '05, 182-185) were, as general overseers, somewhat like our Pastor, put in charge of those "secondarily prophets" who were not general overseers. We did not until recently see that such general overseers were active between the Harvests. The above references distinguish between those two classes of "secondarily prophets." These brethren 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, which the article under review also asserts, to exclude Divinely set pilgrims from serving as pilgrims in what they claim is 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 Church, and smiting the brethren. Will they pass these vital points by in silence, as they have others against their unscriptural assumptions of power? Where in the Bible is the board or Society's president authorized to call general conventions? With the above-stated limitations those who were "Secondarily Prophets" in the Church which is His Body had by the powers of their office as teachers in the general Church, the power to call general conventions (provided they lived in a time in which such power was not lodged in an individual exclusively, *i.e.*, when there were no general overseers like Marsiglio, Wyclif, Huss, etc., and that Servant especially) but no other servants of the Truth have had 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 it. Nor as corporational members of the Great Company have they the right to appoint pilgrims and arrange for general conventions for the Great Company; for God never gave them such powers to exercise.

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* [not by means of arranging for the authorship] 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 Photodrama, the Angelophone, etc.], which [not whom] its board of directors, duly constituted, shall deem expedient for the furtherance of the purposes stated." Of course this implies the use of such "agents" as are necessary to operate these means, but no others than such. Hence appointing pilgrims and conventions are not powers conferred by the Will and Charter; and it is usurpatory in the Society or its president to appoint them. 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 or agents. Therefore the Society is not a religious body; it is a body (not to provide new literary products apart from the Tower, but) to publish and distribute Bible truths by inanimate means alone, through corresponding agents only. In other words, according to the Lord's and that Servant's intention, apart from the Tower, which he

intended should consist partly of posthumous and reprinted articles of his own, the only literature that the Society may publish is what was produced by that Servant, or what was published by him, though produced by others. Hence all of the other productions that they have published have been issued in usurpation of the Will and Charter. This includes *The Finished Mystery*, *Golden Age*, *The Harp*, etc., etc. Let not, therefore, the Levites act on the principle of the papacy, as they have done; and thus add to, or subtract from the source and rule of corporational faith and practice for the controlling corporations among Truth people! In this connection we desire to recall our statement (P '19, 160, col. 2, par. 2) to the effect that the Charter and Will authorized pilgrim work *to be conducted by the Society*. We like the rest of the brethren took this for granted from what existed in our Pastor's day; but now recognize such arrangements, as far as that Servant was used to make them, to be the Lord's for the Little Flock alone.

We do not mean 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. 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 the Society's claiming more powers than God granted to it; and this means that it should put an end to its pilgrim and convention services and to its meddling in the affairs of the ecclesias. In a word, neither the Society nor any other Truth corporation has a right to engage in publishing activities outside of being a publishing agency of Bible truths in the

form of that Servant's pen products, Tower articles and pen products of others which he published being the only exceptions to this rule. Additionally it may distribute Bibles, especially the Bible Students' edition, Concordances, etc., as per that Servant's example. Therefore we appeal to all of the Society's adherents who are loyal to the Lord's Charter, Will and those arrangements of His that are directly stated and implied in the Charter and Will, as all of these were by Him given through that Servant, to work to the end that the Society restrict its mission to its Divinely authorized activities. And this means that they put an end to every activity of the Society not thus Divinely authorized, *e.g.*, busybodying in the affairs of the ecclesias, appointment of pilgrims and their service, conventions, writing or causing to be written for their publication new literature, apart from the Tower.

The three questions that the article asks, as to whether we believe (1) our Lord's presence, (2) that Servant's office, and (3) his arrangements in re the Society, in the event of his death, do not necessitate the conclusion that the Society has the powers (his powers as his successor) that the article overtly or covertly claims for it, far from prove their claims of powers. These questions like almost everything else in the article under review do not bring out specifically what should be brought out for a proper answer to their claims. We will state them as the facts require their statement: (1) Do you believe that Jesus, present in His Second Advent, did the reaping and gleaning completely from Oct., 1874, to April, 1916? Answer: Yes. (2) Do you believe that He used that Servant as His special eye, mouth and hand toward and for His Church during and for the entire reaping and gleaning period? Answer: Yes. (3) Do you believe that the Lord had him give proper directions for the Society's work, in the event of his death, through the Charter, Will and those arrangements for

its work directly stated and implied in the Charter and Will? Answer: Yes. (4) Do you believe these three answers prove that the Society is our Pastor's successor and as such is the inheritor of his office functions as the channel? Answer: No; for there is absolutely no connection between the premises in the first three questions and the Society's answer to the fourth question. Nothing in the Scriptures, Reason, Facts, our Pastor's writings, Charter and Will imply such successorship and powers. Hence the argument of the article under review is entirely without foundation from the standpoint of these three questions—it is mere assumption, as logical as papacy's claims to the successorship and powers of St. Peter—no more and no less. In only one very limited sense can we properly call the Society a successor of our Pastor, but in no other sense: its board, not its president, has inherited only that fractional part of his powers which is to see to the publication and circulation of such literature only as the Will, Charter and their pertinent arrangements prescribe. He could produce original literature; while apart from articles for the Tower, the Society has no right to prepare, or to have new literature prepared! If they insist that they have, we ask for their authority. The Charter says they may disseminate Bible truths by publishing (not by authorizing the writing) of tracts, pamphlets, etc. The Will restricts them to use as tracts that Servant's writings; nor have they a right to institute other arrangements or means than his; nor to change the Charter and Will.

The article denies that other channels have its specific work. To this we give several answers. Its specific work, as a Levitical one, is not at all toward the Priests, whom it should help, not hinder, as it has done. Nor is its specific work to direct a general ministry in literary, periodical, pilgrim and convention work, for and toward the Church which is

Christ's body. It can in harmony with the Will and Charter publish the Tower alone as containing new materials; but its proper ministry is that of Mahlite Merarites, and its main work is toward the nominal people of God, typed in Elisha's office powers. No other corporation has the right to invade its province as antitypical Elisha and antitypical Mahlite Merarites. Nor has it the right to invade the province of the Mushite Merarites, nor those of the Libnite and Shimite Gershonites, nor those of the four groups of the Kohathites, much less the province of the Priests. We hope in due time to set forth just what these limits are; but we agree with the article in the claim that the Society has a *specific* work in which no other body should busybody—the work of the Mahlite Merarites; but it has not the work of the Priests nor that of other Levites. Hence it should not busybody in their work, as it has done.

Now briefly will we answer the seven general propositions on the first page of the article, using language as nearly like theirs as the Truth will permit. (1) Our understanding is that the W.T.B. & T.S. should be a servant to the Church only as one of the wagons of the Mahlite Merarites (Num. 7: 3-8) served the typical priests; that it should not only not exercise control over the Little Flock and Great Company, but not even over Mahlite Merarites, except its officers and agents; and should keep its hands entirely off of local churches; but its course for years has been a constant effort to control both Priests and Levites in the general Church and in local ecclesias. *Its work should be almost entirely toward the public!* (2) The soul of fellowship and unity in Christ through Justification and Sanctification is the one spirit, hope, work, Lord, faith, baptism and God (Eph. 4: 4-6) enjoyed in Christ Godward, Christward and Churchward; and such fellowship and unity are wholly apart from any corporational arrangement, which cannot affect the

relation of the Priests of God. The Society in numerous cases by breaking up classes, and forcing an endorsement of "the present management," the Society's policies and Vol. VII has most violently sinned against this fellowship and unity. (3) There should be full liberty of conscience, with no attempt to coerce the views of one by another. But the Society through the spirit of fear that it has aroused by its threats of the Second Death, Judas Class, outer darkness, loss of crowns, etc., has coerced most disastrously many of the weak brethren and weak ecclesias to the dishonor of God, the persecution of the faithful and the injury of all. (4) Church government should be maintained according to the Word of the Master and the Apostles, and all should be willing to submit to the majority, unless the majority should require violation of Truth and Righteousness, in which event the minority should not submit to, but resist the majority. But this principle of majority rule applies to local ecclesias alone. The majority or minority of other ecclesias have no business in the affairs of local ecclesias other than their own, nor in the affairs of individuals not of their classes. Nowhere in the New Testament do we find the churches legislating for one another, or unitedly legislating in religious matters for the whole Church through a corporation, board, committee or individual. To do this is pure Roman Catholicism. Christ through the Apostles did all the necessary legislating for the general Church. Only respecting a deacon work may two or more congregations join through a committee in a work toward brethren in other ecclesias (2 Cor. 8: 16-24), but never in a spiritual work. The violation of this principle led to the external union of the nominal church, a union of which the Society adherents have become examples, even as the Bible sets forth the Society as a little nominal church. (5) The Society has no authority from God's word, the Will and Charter to conduct a pilgrim work. If they think

they have, let them set forth the facts and proofs. That Servant's example does not apply to the Society; for it does not have his peculiar powers. (6) The Society, while having no authority to determine the qualification of officers of the various ecclesias, has in many cases assumed the right so to do; and in not a few cases to win its point in this very respect has forced divisions on the brethren, stirred up enmity and spread sorrow broadcast where before there were none. In harmony with the limitations of the Word of God, the Will, Charter and the Divine arrangements, directly stated and implied in these, the Society has the right to determine the qualifications of those who shall constitute her officers or servants; and with the same limitations has the sole authority to elect her officers, but cannot give them powers not conferred by God's Word, the Charter and Will, which three things it has no authority to change in any respect. (7) The motives governing all actions in the Church or between the individual members should be wisdom, justice, love and power, re-enforced by such other motives as are under their control. Love, not balanced by wisdom, justice and power, is not enough. The history of the success of Society usurpations proves this. The peace and unity that the article under review asks are not a peace and unity that are Divinely pleasing. In God's time peace will come with many unities, one of the Priests and sixty of the Levites.

The greatest obstacle to such a Divinely pleasing peace and unity is (1) the Society's priestcraft, its practiced theory (a) as the channel of the seasonal meat for the Church, (b) as the channel of controlling the general work of and for the Church; and (2) the Society's kingcraft, if not the professed theory, surely the actual practice, whereby (a) through deceitful "politics" and "wire pulling" in waging and winning Society election campaigns, "the present management"

perpetuates its autocracy and forms the policies of the Society, and whereby (b) through busybodying in the affairs of the local ecclesias by the Tower, letters, pilgrims and trusted local agents, it seeks to rule all churches, and by warfare divides such as oppose its control and policies, if it can. Therefore in view of such priestcraft and kingcraft, and the multiplied evils that they have produced for years, we call upon all Society adherents who are loyal to the Lord's interpretations, Charter, Will and their properly pertinent arrangement, as these were given through that Servant, to rise as God's children and servants in His might, and by an absolute divorce put an end to the union of little papacy and the little catholic church as manifested in the Society's priestcraft; and by such a divorce put an end to the union of the little state and church in little Christendom as manifested in the Society's kingcraft—both of these evils being introduced primarily by J.F.R., and secondarily by his trusted underlings since about the time of that Servant's death. *For such priestcraft and kingcraft are the greatest foes of true Christian liberty, equality and fraternity among God's children!* Let us take a single-hearted stand for such liberty, equality and fraternity, which are guaranteed by the Bible, which are safeguarded by the Charter, Will and their pertinent arrangements, and which are the indispensables for true Christian peace and unity! And since true Christian liberty, equality and fraternity are impossible under the controllership of little Babylon's priestcraft and kingcraft, let us as God's freemen repudiate the yoke of little Babylon's bondage (Gal. 5: 1)! How may this be accomplished in the Society? By limiting its functions, apart from the Editors' work on the Tower, to *printing our Pastor's writings and publications alone* and to distributing them with Bible helps consisting of various Bible editions,

especially the Bible Students' Edition, various good Bible translations, dictionaries, concordances, etc., even as he pursued this policy. In a word, the only way that this can be done in the Society and other corporational and associational bodies among God's people is by limiting the Society's and other controlling corporations' activities to the sphere prescribed in the Charter and Will, and those arrangements of our Pastor that are directly stated and implied in the Charter and Will. Will we not stand for such Christian liberty, equality and fraternity among our corporational brethren? Many of the principles of the article, "Let Us Dwell In Peace," are fundamentally opposed to Christian liberty, equality and fraternity! And when we consider the policies and practices of J.F.R., and see them stated in part, and for the rest subtly imbedded in the article under review, and when we consider his known double-mindedness, unholy ambition, and persistent opposition to, and persecution of those who stand for the Lord's Charter, Will and their pertinent arrangements given through that Servant, even if he makes an offer of peace, it is but a wooden gift horse (corruptible doctrine). Like the discerning Trojan who, fearing the treachery of the Greeks in giving the Trojans the wooden horse, warned his countrymen: "I distrust the Greeks, though they bring a gift"; we say to one and all, We distrust J.F.R., though he offer a gift, the symbolic wooden horse set forth in his article, "Let Us Dwell In Peace." We will be like the Trojans who spurned the warning and accepted the gift horse containing hidden Greek soldiers who ruined the city after the horse was taken into Troy, if we accept J.F.R.'s gift horse filled with hidden treacherous schemes, which emerging from their hiding place, when taken into the city of God, would destroy it! We will not accept his kind of a peace offer, if, alert to the situation, we love, cherish

and defend the principles of true Christian liberty, equality and fraternity imbedded in the Lord's interpretations, Charter, Will and their pertinent arrangements, as given through that Servant. The article under review is both an overt and covert attack upon all of these; hence offers us bondage under priestcraft and kingcraft with pretended liberty, peace and unity with the certainty of future strife and division. It seems to us the final issue, in a word, is this: Shall we be J.F.R.'s bondsmen or God's freemen? Which? The Priests of God will choose freedom in Christ; the Levites more or less bondage; but thanks be to God the days of the oppressor's power are numbered, and will be cut short in Righteousness! And let all lovers of Truth and Righteousness say, Amen!

We now suggest what we think will bring real Scriptural peace and unity with their liberty, equality and fraternity among both the Priests and Levites. This is indicated for the Priests alone in Eph. 4: 3-6, which applies to them in their relations to one another, and not to them in their relations to Levites. For the Levites it is indicated in Num. 8: 7. Let the Levites (1) submit to their being sprinkled with the water of separation, the Epiphany truths on the divisions of the Lord's people in their respective groups. This means: Let them accept the Epiphany; the separating truths, in part literally and in part typically and antitypically set forth in the seasonal meat on the Little Flock, Great Company, Youthful Worthies, Second Death class, the World and the Chronology, as these lines of Truth are now going forth; (2) let them by the sharp razor of Epiphany truths and exposures shave themselves clean of their symbolic hairs, powers that do not belong to them, and that they have unjustly grasped; and (3) let them wash their robes, both in the blood of the Lamb and in the water of the Word (Rev. 7: 14; Num. 8: 7, 12). This threefold

process will cleanse them; and will greatly inure to a peace and unity that will be pleasing to God and helpful to the brethren. It will spread the Christian spirit of true liberty, equality and fraternity in real peace and unity. Will the Levites do these things? Not now, but later; for they need more experiences both at the hands of the fit-man, and of Azazel, for the destruction of their flesh. And while we know that this means sufferings for them, in which they have our sympathy and prayers; yet as the indispensables of their cleansing we pray the Lord to give them such experiences, that their spirits might be saved in the day of the Lord Jesus (1 Cor. 5: 5). Increasingly will this enable them to appreciate and spread Christian liberty, equality and fraternity in Christian peace and unity. Grant it in Thy Grace and Mercy, O Lord!

Be not men's servant: think what costly price
Was paid that thou might'st His own bondsman be,
Whose service perfect freedom is. Let this
Hold fast thy heart. His claim is great to thee.
None should thy soul enthrall to whom 'tis given
To serve on earth, with liberty of Heaven.

All His are thine to serve: Christ's brethren here
Are needing aid, in them thou servest Him.
The least of all is still His member dear,
The weakest cost His life-blood to redeem.
Yield to no "party" what He rightly claims,
Who on His heart bears all His people's names.

Be wise, be watchful, wily men surround
Thy path. Be careful, for they seek with care
To trip thee up; see that no plea be found
In thee thy Master to reproach. The snare
They set for thee will then themselves enclose
And God His righteous judgment thus disclose.

CHAPTER III. A REJECTED SERVANT AND SHEPHERD.

Thou Shalt Not Bear False Witness. That Evil Servant Of Matt. 24: 48-51. The Foolish, Unprofitable Shepherd Of Zech. 11: 15-17.

MORE than once have we noted the fact that, when J.F.R. wants to introduce a "new view," he either intimates that our Pastor had doubts on the subject, when he had none; or that he changed his opinion, or that he taught thus and so, when he did neither. According to this wrong practice, he is claiming that our Pastor changed his opinion on Tentative Justification, so that his final thought, according to J.F.R., was that there is no Tentative Justification. J.F.R. told us this same thing at Bethel in the summer of 1917. Moreover, in the March 23, 1920, issue of The New Era Enterprise, formerly the St. Paul Enterprise, he is reported, among other things, as preaching at St. Louis, Mo., the following: "Tentative Justification impossible. Tentative means probation [rather it means, temporarily to be treated as a fact for purposes of an experiment]. Pastor Russell at first thought there was a tentative Justification; but after studying into the matter more closely changed his mind." We have waited three months for The Tower to disavow this reported statement, but find instead that The Tower boldly repudiates Tentative Justification in the June 1 number, and handles our Pastor's writings on the subject deceitfully, *i.e.*, to convey the impression, which their connections contradicts, that he did not teach tentative Justification. We are satisfied from the above facts that the Enterprise statement of his St. Louis address is on this point correct. We know positively that our Pastor did not give up tentative Justification. This claim of J.F.R. that he

did give it up prompts us to publish an apposite letter, which we have received.

"In the March 23, 1920, issue of the New Era Enterprise is a report of J.F.R.'s discourse delivered March 1, at the St. Louis Convention, in which occurs the following statement: 'The moment Jehovah accepts you under these conditions you are justified, begotten. Justification is not a progressive work. It is an instantaneous matter. You are accepted instantaneously, accepted as a sacrifice. Tentative justification impossible. Tentative means probation. Pastor Russell at first thought there was a tentative justification; but after studying into the matter more closely, changed his mind.'

"In view of J.F.R.'s denying clearly established doctrines given us by the Lord through that Servant, it is not surprising to me to see him also going blind on Tentative Justification. Nor is it unusual to see him endeavoring to support his position by belying dear Bro. Russell, and trying to drag him in as a party to the same error. Alas, for many unwary sheep who are being so easily blown around by every wind of doctrine! In the interests of these, permit me to call your attention to the following statements from the pen [and mouth] of that Servant just before he left us, with the hope that they may be of use to you in arousing those of the Lord's dear sheep who are sleeping under the spell of that newly invented 'Channel' which in so many ways contradicts and repudiates the teachings of the true Channel (Luke 12: 42).

"In the Sep. 15, Tower, 1916, page 281, Bro. Russell gives his last Tower article on Justification, in which he says (col. 1, par. 5), 'We describe the person who has taken this course [represented by progress from the gate of the court to the door of the tabernacle] as being tentatively justified; that is to say, he is in the right course, doing what he is able to do to

attain [vitalized] Justification.' [This is clear and to the point.]

"Does J.F.R. refer to September 15, 1916, as the time when Pastor Russell [was still in the mental condition in which he] first thought there was a tentative justification?' If so, then at what date would he say that Bro. Russell, 'after studying into the matter more closely, changed his mind,' seeing that Sep. 15, 1916, was only a few weeks before his death? How grossly he misrepresents Bro. Russell is further evidenced by the latter's comment on this very Tower article, just a few days before he was taken from our midst, as recorded in the Question Book, What Pastor Russell Said, p. 418, in answer to the following question:

"Comparing articles on Justification in Vol. VI, Tabernacle Shadows and Sep. 15, 1916 Tower: Do these harmonize? Has Bro. Russell changed his views on Justification?' Answer: Bro. Russell *has not changed his views on Justification*. Justification is justification, has always been justification, and will always be justification, and Bro. Russell could not change justification for himself or for anybody else. [In part of the rest of the answer he shows how one must be in the Court, walk up to the door of the Tabernacle and consecrate himself before his Justification is vitalized through Christ's imputed merit.]

"Whom shall we believe, Bro. Russell, who just before his death claimed that he had not changed his views on Justification, or J.F.R., who now claims that he did? Doubtless some would prefer to believe J.F.R. While Bro. Russell walked in the light and consequently saw more and more clearly the details pertaining to Tentative and Vitalized Justification, he never ceased to believe in Tentative Justification, as J.F.R. claims.

"In Bro. Russell's last question meeting at Los Angeles, as recorded in 1916 Convention Report, p. 306,

ques. 9, he says, 'In the court is shown what we term a *Tentative Justification*.' On the next page, col. 1, par. 1, he says, 'The process of tentative justification may in some be very slow * * * All the various steps in connection with Tentative Justification are getting quite clear; for God's time has come for making things plain.' Then in par. 4, in answer to question 11, he says, 'They are approaching [vitalized] justification. These steps of Tentative Justification in the court are simply leading him to the point of vitalizing his justification.'

"These and other similar statements made during his last few days with us, should convince any open-minded Truth seeker beyond any doubt that Brother Russell never denied the doctrine of Tentative Justification, but held it steadfast unto the end. To deny this doctrine would be to deny and to become confused on many Scriptures and to repudiate important features of Tabernacle Shadows. How could anyone appreciate the Brazen Altar, wash himself at the Laver and be tied at the door of the Tabernacle in consecration, and have his Justification vitalized, without first being in the Court, the place of Tentative Justification (T 19, 20)? Surely the Brazen Altar and the Laver were not taken into the Camp in order that those not tentatively justified might use them preparatory to making a consecration! What confusion J.F.R.'s denial of the doctrine of Tentative Justification brings to those who are gullible enough to accept it! 'To the law and to the testimony; if they speak not according to this word, it is because there is no light in them.' 'And if the blind lead the blind, both shall fall into the ditch.' But what consolation that the Very Elect shall be manifested as not being deceived! May the Lord continue to use you in His blessed work of delivering His Little Flock 'from the snare of the fowler, and from the noisome pestilence.'

Your brother in Him,

R. G. Jolly."

To the above quotations from our Pastor's teachings on Tentative Justification we add one from the Foreword of Vol. VI, written Oct. 1, 1916, and finally approved by him for the press, Oct. 16, 1916, the day he left Bethel the last time, two weeks before his death, among other things, to clarify the subject of Tentative and Vitalized Justification. Before 1909 he did not clearly see Tentative in contrast with Vitalized Justification as operative during the Gospel Age. Hence when he published Vol. VI, 1903, he did not clearly see the distinction between the two forms of Gospel Age Justification. As he said, he wrote the Forewords of the Volumes, except that of Vol. I, to clarify things not clearly presented therein. It was with this purpose in mind *in re* Vol. VI that he wrote (Foreword, iii, pars. 1-3) the following as a clarification of the subject of Justification. "The subject of Justification has not changed, but it has expanded and clarified. If writing this Volume today, the author would make some slight variations of language, but without any real change as respects the meaning and application of Justification.

"We now see that a justification to life is one thing, and a justification to more or less of friendship with God is another. Abraham, for instance, and the faithful before Pentecost, were justified to friendship with God, and to have more or less communication with Him by prayer, etc.; but they could not have full justification until the Blood of Atonement had been shed, and until it had been presented to and accepted by Divine Justice—the Father. Just so the sinner today approaching God might be said to be in the way of justification, having more of God's favor than if he faced toward sin.

"We once spoke of a sinner in this condition as being justified, because he believed in Jesus as his Redeemer and was reaching forward to a full consecration of himself. Now we see that while the sinner's

attitude, like that of the Ancient Worthies, might be styled '*Tentative*' justification, it would not reach the condition of a full, complete [vitalized] justification from sin until the sinner had fully presented himself in consecration to our great High Priest, Jesus, and had been accepted of Him in the name of the Father. Then, under the covering of the imputed merit of Christ's sacrifice, the sinner would be acceptable to the Father under Christ's Robe and begotten of the Holy Spirit." So far the quotation.

The charge of false witnessing brought against J.F.R. as given above is unanswerably proven. May we be permitted a few remarks and then a suggestion *in re* the official acts above described. To give untrue testimony is under any circumstance an evil thing; but *against better knowledge* to misrepresent *Jesus* speaking to His Church through His special eye, mouth and hand for Her, which that Servant was, in order the more readily to introduce a false doctrine contrary to the express teaching of Jesus given through His special eye, mouth and hand for His Church, is a gross sin against the Holy Spirit that spoke and acted through "that Servant." Such a course cannot but merit the abhorrence of God's faithful people, and the special disapproval of God and Jesus. Such a course on J.F.R.'s part—persisted in against information to the contrary, given him, *e.g.*, by us as well as by others at Bethel in 1917, and certainly known to him from his reading the Foreword of Vol. VI, etc.—implies a very large degree of wilfulness on his part, and manifests a deplorable degree of depravity in his character. Therefore in view of his "moral laches" in false witnessing and in view of his false teaching—both being against the ministry of Jesus at the hand of that Servant on Tentative Justification—we as a Servant of the Lord, the Truth and the Brethren, protest before God, Jesus and that "Church, which is His Body," against J.F.R.'s having anything

further to do in a controlling, executive, managerial, teaching or any other official capacity in the Society; and in God's and Christ's name we ask the Society's Board to deprive him of all controlling, executive and managerial authority, pilgrim service or any other form of service in the Society; the shareholders to vote his position as a director of the Society vacant; any three members of the board to bring impeachment charges against him as an editor before the Society's board of judgment; and said board of judgment to dismiss him from the editorial committee of the Tower as provided for in that Servant's Will, assuring them that such actions are necessary in the interests of the Lord, the Truth and the Brethren; and cautioning them that neglect of zeal in carrying into effect the above suggestion, will make them, to the degree of such neglect of zeal, partakers of J.F.R.'s gross sins in the particulars above stated and proved, and will force us to take an important step to realize our suggestion. If by the time our next issue is ready for the press, about July 20, 1920, we do not hear that the board of directors and the board of judgment have done as we request above, we will start a course that in due time will realize our suggestion. J.F.R., as an *evil-doer* and *false teacher*, has gone as far as he should be permitted to go.

Having published our discussion of That Evil Servant in the Appendix of the Studies, Vol. IV, we refer our readers to it as belonging here as a part of this chapter and request them to read it before proceeding further. We omit it here to save much-needed space. The Bible in its types and prophecies frequently points out individuals who would do certain things in remote future times. We recognize this, of course, in the case of Jesus; and all of us recall how He and the Apostles applied Scriptures to Judas. So, too, Cyrus was pointed out, and that by name, 200 years before he did the things prophesied of him (Is. 44: 28; 45: 1-5).

The twelve Apostles, and the seventy secondarily prophets of both Harvests were typed respectively by the twelve wells and seventy palm trees at Elim (Ex. 15: 27); and these secondarily prophets were also typed by the seventy judges (Num. 11: 24-30). The twelve Apostles are, among others, typed by Jacob's twelve sons; and they, and St. Paul in particular, were typed by Eleazar (Num. 4: 16; 19: 4); and the Parallel shows that Num. 4: 16 and 16: 35-39 type our Pastor also. Dan. 11 refers prophetically to the following individuals: Cambyses, Smerdis, Darius Hystaspes and Xerxes (v. 2), Alexander the Great (v. 4), (his four successors, Cassander, Seleucus, Ptolemy and Lysimachus are pointed out prophetically in Dan. 8: 8), Ptolemy Philadelphos (v. 5), Antiochus Theos, Bernice and Ptolemy Philadelphos (v. 6), Ptolemy Euergetes and Seleucus Callinicus (v. 7), the latter's sons and Antiochus Magnus (v. 10), the latter and Ptolemy Philopater (v. 11), Antiochus Epiphanes (v. 12), Scopas (v. 15), Mark Anthony and Cleopatra (vs. 17-19), Augustus (v. 20), Tiberius (vs. 21-24), Aurelian and Zenobia (vs. 25, 26, 28), and Napoleon (vs. 29, 30, 36-45). John the Baptist is referred to in Is. 40: 3-5 and Mal. 3: 1. There are four individuals indicated in Zech. 11: 8, 15-17; and Bro. Russell and J.F.R. are referred to in Matt. 24: 45-47 and in Matt. 24: 48-51, respectively. Another brother is pointed out in Rev. 19: 9, 10. Accordingly, we see that the Bible frequently points out by its prophecies and types not only classes but individuals of future times.

All Truth people seem to agree to the thought that Zech. 11: 15-17 refers to an individual. While our Pastor never taught it, many Truth people have believed that Mr. Barbour, who renounced the Ransom in 1878, was that individual. Some of them have additionally used their imaginations on the subject, claiming that his literal right eye was blinded and that his literal right arm was paralyzed! In consistency they

should have gone on further in literalizing this passage and held that the sword of v. 17 was a literal one. In 1905 we visited Rochester, N.Y., Mr. Barbour's home town, and there from some of his followers learned that neither his literal right eye was blinded, nor his literal right arm was paralyzed. Vol. VII, as we know, also applies this passage to Mr. Barbour. Zech. 11: 1-7 doubtless treats of the activities and recompenses of various shepherds among God's sheep in the end of the Gospel Age; but for a number of reasons we believe that Mr. Barbour cannot be the individual to whom Zech. 11: 15-17 refers. (1) Mr. Barbour, we understand, was the first of the three shepherds of whom v. 8 treats, and therefore would not be described in vs. 15-17 as still another shepherd. The month of v. 8 is not a month of days, but of years, hence represents thirty years (Rev. 9: 5, 15; 13: 5). These thirty years, we believe, began in 1878 and ended in 1908. Mr. Barbour as the first of these three shepherds in its beginning renounced the Ransom. In 1908, at its end, Mr. Hennings entered a course of conduct that made him the leader of the 1908-1911 sifting, whose main doctrinal error was the denial of the Church's share in the Sin-offering. He was, we understand, the third shepherd of v. 8. Seemingly Mr. Paton, the leader of the 1881-1884 sifting, was the second of these three shepherds. Hence Mr. Barbour's case is disposed of in v. 8; and there is no good reason for applying to him vs. 15-17, which expressly refer to another's activity ("take thee *yet, etc.*"). (2) The activities of the foolish shepherd (vs. 15-17), according to this chapter, were to take place long after Mr. Barbour left the stage of activity among God's sheep. This is evident from a number of things set forth in this chapter: [1] The foolish shepherd's activities begin long after the servants of the Truth, Jesus' representatives, as a class, typed by Zechariah, would withdraw their ministry from the Second Deathers: "I will

not feed you; that that dieth, let it die." (V. 9.) The withdrawal of such a ministry from the Second Deathers had its beginning during the first sifting, 1878-1881, after Mr. Barbour renounced the Ransom, and continued to the end of the fifth sifting, 1908-1911. [2] The foolish shepherd's activities commence long after the Truth servants as a class ceased to feed Babylon; "that that is to be cut off, let it be cut off." This feeding ceased in 1881, when as the Parallels show the special favor of the special calls was thrown open to anybody whether in or out of Babylon, and Babylon herself was in her cut-off condition allowed by God to starve (Amos 8: 11-13). [3] The foolish shepherd's special activities were to follow the bargaining for selling the Truth servants, the representatives of Jesus, as a class, and such bargaining for the price of power began in the first and ended in the fifth harvest sifting. [4] The foolish shepherd's special activities were to begin after the staff Beauty was completely cut asunder, but just after the cutting asunder of the staff Bands began. A shepherd's staff represents his teachings, and his rod, his acts and practices (Ps. 23: 4). The staff Beauty (vs. 7, 10) represents the Parousia Truth, and its cutting asunder represents the right division of the Parousia Word of Truth (2 Tim. 2: 15). The staff Bands (vs. 7, 14) represents the Epiphany Truth, and its cutting asunder represents the right division of the Epiphany Word of Truth. The Parousia Truth had all been given before our Pastor's death, Oct. 31, 1916; and the Epiphany Truth began to open up between Oct. 31, and Nov. 9, 1916. These five things, according to Zech. 11, were to precede the foolish shepherd's activities, and since all of them followed Mr. Barbour's activities among God's sheep, he evidently was not the foolish shepherd of Zech. 11: 15-17.

At the St. Joseph Convention in 1909 one of the pilgrims, Bro. Raymond, told us that Bro. Russell held

that A. E. Williamson was the foolish shepherd of Zech. 11: 15-17. Accepting his word, for a number of years we were of the impression that A. E. Williamson was the individual of whom Zech. 11: 15-17 treats. At that time—1909—Bro. Raymond said that J.F.R. had also heard our Pastor give this thought; but when during May, 1917, we brought this thought up at the Bethel table, and defended it as our Pastor's thought, J.F.R. said he had never heard our Pastor so teach; neither did any one else at the table on that occasion recall such a thing. Shortly afterward we gave up that thought, as we came to see that it was more reasonable to apply the passage to another individual whose acts conform to the passage much more closely than those of A. E. Williamson.

While refuting above the thought that Mr. Barbour was the foolish shepherd of Zech. 11: 15-17, we gave two proofs, [3] and [4], that the special activities of the foolish shepherd belong to the Epiphany. The fact that the activities of the foolish, unprofitable shepherd belong to the Epiphany and have been very trialsome to the Lord's people proves that Zech. 11: 15-17 in its pertinent parts could not have been understood until in its pertinent parts it was fulfilled; and this fact accounts for the incorrectness of the interpretations offered on the passage before the trials connected with its fulfilment, which occurred in the Epiphany, were successfully met by the faithful. Its fulfilment taking place in the Epiphany, we are to look for some prominent leader among the Truth people at this time who will answer to the description of the foolish, unprofitable shepherd, given in Zech. 11: 15-17. There are various prominent brethren now active among the Truth people, and among them one is to be sought who answers to the Scriptural delineation of the foolish, unprofitable shepherd. Who is he? Better to answer this question let us first study the Biblical description of his sins of omission. But some might object, Would

it not be judging, and thinking and speaking evil so to do? We answer that it certainly is not the forbidden judging and thinking and speaking of evil so to do; for God in this text exhorts the servants of the Truth as one company, represented by Zechariah, to do this: "Take [lay hold on for discussion] unto thee *yet* [in addition to teaching the Parousia and the Epiphany Truth—also a proof that the foolish shepherd's activity would be in the Epiphany] the instruments [the staff, his teachings, and the rod, his official acts and practices] of a foolish shepherd [a shepherd who had left undone some very wise and profitable things, and who has done some very unwise and unprofitable things, both to the sheep and to their owner, is a foolish shepherd]." That he was to occupy a very prominent place—a position that would draw to him world-wide attention, and give him world-wide activity and influence—is evident from the opening statement of v. 16, "For lo, I will raise up [by setting other eligible ones aside, and by opening the way for the foolish shepherd to come to the fore—as God did in the case of Pharaoh] a shepherd in the land [literally *in the earth*, *i.e.*, in human society. This expression shows the worldwide prominence, activity and influence of the foolish shepherd]." Accordingly, we see that this foolish shepherd would be one of the most prominent persons among the Truth people. No one of second class prominence among them will answer to this description. Additionally, the verse implies that he must be a Truth person who is attracting very much attention among the worldly throughout the symbolic earth.

How can we tell who he is? A consideration of what the text says that he should have done, but has left undone, will help us, no doubt, to answer this question. What has he left undone that as a shepherd he should have done? V. 16 enumerates four things that a true shepherd should do, every one of which it accuses him of leaving undone: (1) "Who will not visit those

that be cut off; (2) neither will seek the young one; (3) nor heal that which is broken; (4) nor feed that which standeth still." It will be noticed from this text that toward four classes of God's sheep he fails to do what a true shepherd should do. The sheep represent, of course, God's people, who now consist of just four classes, as this verse groups them—no more and no less. In the order in which the text enumerates them these are the Little Flock, the Youthful Worthies, the Great Company and the Tentatively Justified. And the text says that he has failed to do toward each of these classes what a true shepherd should do. The Little Flock in certain of its members is described in this verse as "cut off." What does this mean? As represented by Elijah and his mantle, the Little Flock in its representatives once had under the Lord the charge of the Truth work toward the world. It was cut off from this office in the summer of 1917. And those of its representatives who resisted the usurpations whereby it was cut off from this office, together with their faithful supporters, were cut off from the fellowship of the majority of God's people, while the more passive of the Little Flock were bewildered and remained among that majority. And as the former continued to resist similar revolutionism, they continued to be cut off from other groups of brethren that as such became Levitical groups. Thus antitypical Elijah, the Little Flock, in its more active members is meant by those who were cut off. What is meant by the foolish shepherd not visiting them? Scripturally, in such a connection this would mean not to minister to them, not to comfort them, and not to seek to reestablish them in their position (Jas. 1: 27). Did anybody above all other Truth people so act? Yes, sad to say; J.F.R. was the leader in failing to do these things. As typed in 2 Kings 2: 16-18, and explained in Vol. III, Chap. III, as the leader of antitypical Elisha he even discouraged efforts on the part of others to

bring about a reconciliation; and when finally out of sheer shame he had to give way he used such tactics as would tend to keep away the faithful, and especially keep them from getting the mantle. His publication of Harvest Siftings, Part 2, his "straw vote" campaign, his other electioneering efforts, and his misrepresentations in public and private abundantly prove this. Yea, he failed to visit that part of the Little Flock in its cut-off condition—a thing that he should have done.

He likewise has failed to seek the young one, the Youthful Worthies. Denying that there can be such a class before the New Covenant is introduced, if then, he, of course, does not seek to win people for Youthful Worthship. On the contrary, deluding individuals who might be of them into believing that they are in the Little Flock, he does them a most disastrous disservice, which later on will become apparent on all hands. Nor does he heal that which is broken. The Great Company are the broken one. They have broken their symbolic feet and legs—conduct and character—and cannot as a result walk uprightly; and he should bind up their broken feet and legs, and heal them with soothing medicines from the Word. But he does not so do. Denying that there is such a Great Company now, of course he does nothing to supply their needs. Deluding many of that class also into believing that they are in the Little Flock, he thereby does them a great disservice, which later on will become apparent to all. If he would serve them aright, he would lead them to the gate and the fit man for such experience as will inure to their healing. But these things—required for their healing—he does not do. Nor does he feed—strengthen—that that standeth still—the Tentatively Justified. These evidently constitute the company "that standeth still," for they do not *progress* to consecration. He denies that there is such a class, and of course, as a result, could not feed and strengthen them. Thus he leaves undone the work that the

conditions of the four classes of God's people require should be done. In other words, the special services that the conditions of the four classes of God's sheep require at the hands of a shepherd, and that a real shepherd will render them, he refuses to give them. In acts of omission he is a most unshepherdly person. To no other very prominent leader of any group of God's people except the leader of the Society group can this passage apply. Why? Because none of these leaders except him holds views that put him out of harmony with serving at least one of these four classes of God's sheep. True, of these some are not now visiting the Little Flock, some are not now healing the Great Company, some are not now seeking the Youthful Worthies; but all among these most prominent leaders except J.F.R. are at least feeding the tentatively justified. Therefore he is the only one of the most prominent leaders of groups to whom all of these sins of omission are chargeable. He is the Shepherd of Zech. 11: 15-17.

We desire to call the attention of our dear readers to a variation in the grammatical number of the pronouns in the expression, "*those* that be cut off," and in the expressions "the young *one*," "*that* that is broken," and "*that* that standeth still." The first pronoun—"those"—is plural in number, and the other three are singular in number. Why this variation of number? We believe it is for the following reasons: the last three refer to three *entire* classes considered in each case collectively as such, and therefore each class is spoken of as one, even as J.F.R. denies totally the present existence of any of these three classes as such. But in the case of the Little Flock, it is in its majority scattered among all the Levitical groups, and also is, in some of its representatives—a minority of them—in the Epiphany Movement, which is the official Little Flock Movement; and these—not the one whole class, but only certain individuals of the

one whole class—are especially *those* that be cut off." It is more particularly these that J.F.R. does not visit. When in 1917 the division began all of those whom he called "the opposition" were in the Epiphany movement—the movement that resists openly the revolutionism of the Great Company. But as later individuals among these themselves revolutionized, they in turn dropped out of the Epiphany movement. All crown-losers will eventually drop out of the Epiphany movement. This difference in the grammatical number just noted is an illustration of Jehovah's exactness in the use of language to describe His thoughts, and is used to mark accurately J.F.R.'s course, first toward the Epiphany saints, who are *parts* and not the *whole* of the Little Flock, and hence are spoken of distributively and not collectively, and then toward the *whole* of the other three classes, each one of which is spoken of collectively as such, and not distributively in its individual members.

V. 16 notes two sins of commission of which J.F.R. has been and is yet guilty: (1) eating the flesh of the fat, (2) and tearing their hoofs. Let us look at these two particulars in their order. All of us are aware that in Scriptural symbology *fat* represents love and loving zeal. Those who are fat, therefore, represent those brethren who are filled with love and loving zeal. Hence in this text the fat ones refer to the more loving and zealous of the Little Flock members. In Scriptural symbology *flesh* represents possessions, privileges and powers. This is very manifest from the statement, "They [the ten kings] ... shall eat her flesh" (Rev. 17: 16), an expression that our Pastor properly explained as representing the ten kingdoms taking away certain claimed official possessions, privileges and powers of the Catholic Church, especially her temporal power and her powers derived from the union of church and state. Hence the expression, "He shall eat the flesh of the fat," means that J.F.R. would appropriate to and for himself the official powers, privileges

and possessions of the antitypical Elijah. How did he do this? We answer, in a variety of ways: (1) by getting for himself exclusively the Executive Committee's powers through wire-pulling of a most reprehensible and self-exalting sort; (2) by usurping power over the board; (3) by unauthorizedly and usurpingly ousting us from our position as the Society's special representative with powers of attorney in every country that we should visit outside of the United States—an act that he did as one of the series of his acts of usurping the board's powers; (4) by ousting the four board directors for seeking to stop his usurpations; (5) by dismissing from their positions of service those at Bethel who opposed his usurpations; (6) by dismissing from the pilgrim service those who opposed his usurpations; and (7) by influencing the ecclesias to cause those elders and deacons who would not approve of "The Present Management" and "the Society's policies"—J.F.R.'s usurpations—to lose their offices before time, or to become ineligible for re-election to the offices that they held. In these seven ways—carried out with deeds of grossest injustice and of unparalleled hypocrisy—he *stole* the mantle away from the representative members of, and thus from antitypical Elijah. Thus he surely ate the flesh of the fat!

The second sin of commission with which v. 16 charges him is stated in the words, "shall tear their claws in pieces," or as practically all other versions render the clause, "shall tear their *hoofs* in pieces." As the reference here is to how the foolish shepherd would abuse the sheep, and as sheep have no claws, but do have hoofs, and as the Hebrew word here used ordinarily means hoofs, doubtless the translation hoofs is the correct one here. The sheep's hoofs are their feet; and the feet in the symbols of the Bible usually represent one's conduct, acts (Prov. 5: 5; Ps. 119: 101, 105; Luke 1: 79; Heb. 12: 13). To tear the hoofs would be doing them great violence—distorting them; and certainly J.F.R. did distort the conduct and

acts of representative members of antitypical Elijah with great violence. The right things that they did against his and others' usurpations he most fearfully misrepresented—distorted. He tore their acts in their character, purpose, setting and spirit, even claiming that they were the acts of madmen, demoniacs and wreckers of the Lord's work, whom he, the preserver (?) of that work, with sad and loving (?) heart had to oppose! As evidences of his misrepresentations—his tearing of their conduct and acts—note the falsehoods and total perversion of the facts of the controversy in both of his Harvest Siftings, in his electioneering campaign, in the misrepresentations of their official and personal acts that he has had his pilgrims circulate from church to church. And as a consequence before the guileless brethren especially, altogether unsuspecting of the deep guile and hypocrisy of the foolish shepherd, the symbolic hoofs—conduct and acts—of the representative members of antitypical Elijah were all torn—distorted; and broken-hearted over it these guileless ones mourn for the supposedly straying brethren as lost! Those of the Little Flock who, seeing the real character of his acts, opposed them, he terribly misused by dishonestly taking from them their official possessions, privileges and powers, and by greatly misrepresenting their conduct and acts; and those of the Little Flock who, not seeing the real character of his acts, did not oppose him, he terribly grieved by making them think that the former have gone into the Second Death.

The unhappy results that his course would bring upon him are described in v. 17. Three woes would be his, according to this verse: "Woe to the idol [unprofitable; the word here translated idol is an adjective. It is a noun and means an idol only when in the plural; in the singular it means empty, unfruitful, vain, unprofitable, worthless. Unprofitable, or unfruitful, we believe, in harmony with most versions, to be the best translation here, and he is such because all his

efforts result in fruitlessness] shepherd that leaveth the [Little] Flock." He left the Little Flock by following his unholy ambition in grasping for power and lording it over God's heritage by revolutionism. Sorrows indeed fill the cup that the Lord has ordained for him to drink (Matt. 24: 51)—not the sorrows that come to the faithful for their loyalty to Truth and Righteousness, but the sorrows that make the way of transgressors hard (Prov. 13: 15)—punishments for wrong-doing. Three special woes of his are mentioned in v. 17: (1) the Truth would be used against him ("the sword will be upon his arm and upon his right eye"); (2) the total loss of his power and influence ("his arm shall be clean dried up"), and (3) utter error respecting his pet theories, legal, factual and religious, especially on the high calling ("his right eye shall be utterly darkened"). The instrument whereby the last two woes are being wrought upon him is the Truth based on Scripture, Reason and Facts relating to him, his pet theories and his course. "The *sword* [Truth] shall be upon his arm, and upon his right eye." It is a woe to have the Truth in these three forms against one, as it is against him. The first blow that he received from this Sword was what came to him from the revised protest and its two accompanying petitions that on Mar. 7, 1917, we drew up against his busybodying in our English work and mailed to Bros. Ritchie, Van Amburgh and Pierson to present for us to the board. Because he refused to let them come before the board, after our return from Britain we gave copies of them to the remainder of the directors. And the substance of that protest and of those two petitions, among other things, doubtless was used by the Lord to arouse the four directors to oppose J.F.R.'s usurpation of power over the board. The resultant explosion was heard everywhere among Truth people. What was the result? It was this: the second of his woes began to operate. His arm—influence—was utterly destroyed among at least 7,000 brethren

and greatly weakened among thousands of others within six months after that explosion. While in the trouble at Bethel we did not do the things that he charged us with doing—seeking to wreck the Society, etc.—we undoubtedly did do what aroused him—the power-grasper who wanted to keep the fruits of his usurpations—to decide on taking the course that made the division in the Church: setting aside those who opposed his usurpations, which eventually resulted in such a great curtailment of his influence.

The Truth attacking his course on the military question destroyed totally his influence over about 2,200 other brethren, who formed themselves into the Standfast Movement, and greatly weakened it over thousands of others, who began to recognize his unscrupulous character, as it manifested itself on the military question. As a result of the attacks that The Present Truth made during 1919 and 1920 on his errors of teaching and practice at least 1,000 brethren forsook his leadership and thousands of others became more or less skeptical of his trustworthiness, thus becoming less and less amenable to his influence. Thus his arm continued to dry up. This year [1921] very many brethren have left the Society, both in foreign countries and in America. *E.g.*, among others over 100 brethren left the London Tabernacle on account of the Golden Age work, which is now practically dead in Britain. At Jacksonville, Fla., nearly fifty brethren left the Society on account of J.F.R.'s errors on Tentative Justification, the Youthful Worthies and his Tabernacle vitiations—they are *vitiation*s, not revisions. These errors caused Bro. Page to resign from the Tower Editorial Committee. In many other churches for the same and other reasons matters are boiling and thus his influence is continually decreasing among new creatures—his arm is surely drying up. [Since the fall of 1923, from 20,000 to 30,000 Truth people the world over have left him.] When the exposures typed in Judg. 8: 13-16 shall be made, we would not be surprised,

if his influence among God's people will be utterly destroyed. If not then, it surely will be later: for this woe will surely be fulfilled in him. Who will follow him after learning of a certainty that he is "that evil servant" of Matt. 25: 48-56, and the "foolish," "unprofitable shepherd" of Zech. 11: 15-17? Gradually the whole Church will learn this, as tens of thousands have already learned it. It is only those who are asleep or partly asleep who fail to see this. To him applies the principle contained in the passage, "He that saveth his soul shall lose it." He selfishly sought to gain power and influence over God's people, and God says that as a result he will lose every vestige of it!

The third woe of which v. 17 treats is the utter blinding of J.F.R.'s right eye—choicest knowledge. One's choicest knowledge—right eye—is the theories that he emphasizes as most important, while his other knowledge—his left eye—would represent the theories that he does not so much stress. He is, accordingly, to go into utter error in his pet legal, factual and religious theories, especially those on the high calling. What will become of his other theories we cannot be sure, for the passage is silent on what will or will not happen to his left eye; but he will become utterly confused on the matters of fact, religion and of human law that he most stresses, as he has increasingly become so ever since 1917. "The sword shall be ... upon his right eye," *i.e.*, Scriptural, reasonable and factual Truth will smite his understanding of his pet theories of God's Plan and of legal and factual matters, and will make him blind thereon. In our discussion of "That Evil Servant" (Appendix of Studies, Vol. IV) we expressly mentioned at least 60 points of error in his religious teachings, and indicated many others of a factual and legal kind. [By now his errors of doctrine and interpretation mount into the thousands.] All of these show that his right eye is darkening. The Sword of Truth refuting his errors is the

accompanying cause of the darkening of his right eye. We might take as an illustrative example his error on Tentative Justification: Because the doctrine that the Youthful Worthies are now developing is based on that doctrine, and has been urged (the Sword was thrust at his right eye on this subject) against his view of Tentative Justification, he denies that there can be Youthful Worthies before the New Covenant shall operate, if then. Because as against his error on Justification the Tabernacle Shadows has been cited as proving that the Court types the condition of both the tentatively and vitalizedly justified, and that the Gospel-Age Levites are the tentatively justified, he repudiates these features of the Tabernacle that oppose his error and introduces new errors to take the place of the opposing truths—"the Sword" opposing his right eye darkens it in this respect in a sense similar to God's hardening of Pharaoh's heart. Instead of the Truth that opposes his errors being permitted by him to affect his setting aside his errors, he clings to his errors unto the repudiation of one truth after another contradictory of his errors. The same thing can be seen in his treatment of Elijah and Elisha, and in his giving wrong meanings to large sections of Scripture to bolster up his newly invented gospel of the kingdom, *i.e.*, that millions now living will never die. The faithful will ply the Sword of Truth against his right eye every time he offers some new error or new misinterpretation on his pet theories. But his headiness will be in the way of his receiving the Truth, and, bent on maintaining his error, he will, as he has done in the past, offer false teachings and interpretations to evade the Truth used against his pet theories, and thus his right eye will become darker and darker. At each darkening of his right eye the eyes of understanding of some brethren hitherto closed to his errors will become open, and they will refuse, further to follow him; and this will continue until he will be forsaken by all who remain New Creatures and Youthful Worthies.

As the most prominent leader of the Truth section of antitypical Jambres his errors will be the darkest. What a terrible woe is the third woe of v. 17! What could be much more calamitous than losing the Truth? Do we pity him? Yes, deeply. Can we help him? Not from the attacks of the Sword of Truth, from the withering of his influence among the Truth people, and from the darkening of his right eye. In these three particulars God tells us (Zech. 11: 17) that he can not be helped, because he will not permit himself to be helped.

Both Matt. 24: 48-51 and Zech. 11: 15-17 treat of J.F.R. Both of the passages cover some of the same and some of the different points of his activities. They both show that he is an evil man, an errorist, a cruel injurer and unscrupulous misrepresenter of the leaders of the Lord's people, especially of the leaders of the Little Flock, a loser of the High Calling and a sufferer of woes. The Matthew, as distinct from the Zechariah, passage shows that his root evil was a refusal to wait upon the Lord, and an insistence upon running ahead of the Lord, in self-will carrying out his own plans, and that his course would be that of a hypocrite, while indifference to the needs of the Flock and spoliation of the rights of the best of the Flock are especially emphasized in the Zechariah, as distinct from the Matthew, passage. Thus these passages have much in common—a fact that is in harmony with the thought that they treat of the same person—additionally each supplies certain features wanting in the other, and thus are complementary of one another, showing inspiration.

Sometimes brethren blame us for our opposition to J.F.R. Some even think it is due to envy and ambition on our part. Nay, brethren, we envy no man, and aspire to nothing except what the Lord has given to us as an object of aspiration. It is we who have been envied by certain ambitious leaders among the Lord's people, and this accounts in part for their

attacking us as being in the way of the attainment of their ambitions. In due time this will become as clear as the noon-day sun to the Lord's people. And until then we can and will patiently wait. If the brethren desire to know why we have been resisting J.F.R.'s course in particular, the answer is found in Zech. 11: 15, which commands the faithful shepherds as one body to lay hold on his instruments, take them up, discuss them before the Lord's people in the light of Scriptures, Reason and Facts. And, please God, we will on all proper occasions be zealous to use the Sword of Truth against the arm of this usurper and against the right eye of this errorist, until he ceases to be a shepherd in the Flock, against which he has, according to the Scriptures and Facts, so greatly sinned before God and man.

In P'20, 129, par. 1, we promised to publish three pen products on J.F.R., which, with supporting articles, would eventually result in his being bereft of all official relations with New Creatures and loyal Youthful Worthies in every group of Truth people. The discussion on that evil servant in the Appendix of Studies, Vol. IV, written in 1920 and the present discussion, written in 1921, on the foolish, unprofitable shepherd are two of the three. The third will be parts of Vol. X of this work. We are sure that the first has already convinced many, aroused fears in others, and will yet convince still many others, of the unfitness of J.F.R. to hold any office in God's Flock. We are also convinced that in the Lord's hand this discussion has contributed and will contribute its quota to the same end—an end that is necessary for the well-being of God's Flock, for which reason we pray the Lord to speed it on its mission. [By now over 40,000 Truth people believe him to be that evil servant and foolish, unprofitable shepherd. This accounts for his recent "stop thief" articles on that Servant and that evil servant, his man of sin, etc., etc.]

CHAPTER IV. RIGHT-EYE DARKENING.

COURT—TYPE AND ANTITYPE. VIEWS AND REVIEWS. POUNDS AND TALENTS. SOME RIGHT-EYE DARKENING. MORE RIGHT-EYE DARKENING. STILL MORE RIGHT-EYE DARKENING.

TRUTH is progressive; error is digressive. Our Pastor's writings are an illustration of the former, and J.F.R.'s of the latter thought. Step by step the former advanced into more light as the Day was approaching; step by step the latter turns aside as the night of his darkness deepens. Little by little and more and more the latter sees darkness for light; and alas! his adherents, forgetting the Scriptural, logical and factual presentations of our dear Pastor, in their "worship of angels," in the person of J.F.R., bow down to him in accepting without proper study that which he gives them as alleged advancing light. In Z '20, 99-104, J.F.R. made a plea for "Peace." In answering him we told the conditions on which we could have peace again. We also reminded him, in reply to his saying in that article that there was no cause for controversy, that so long as he continued writing against our Pastor's presentations there could be no peace. We will not be silent, while he is seeking to corrupt the faith once delivered to the saints. In his plea for "peace" he reminds us of a certain recent Emperor who addressed an exhortation on peace to a neighboring king, while invading the territories and killing the subjects of the latter! If he wants peace, let him make it possible for us to "dwell in peace."

His methods with the subject matter of the article entitled, The Court—Type and Antitype, in the June 1, 1920, Tower, which we will here review, are characteristically *Rutherfordian*. As he did with his "New View" on antitypical Elijah becoming Elisha so

we are reliably informed he did with his "New View" on the Court and its Gate: first in a private way (2 Pet. 2: 1) he circulated it by word of mouth and by correspondence; then he used the pilgrims further to inoculate with it the churches, himself claiming that our Pastor gave up Tentative Justification. Then finally he came out with it in the Tower. For months our correspondence has shown us what he was teaching on this subject; but we decided to wait until he would state his view in print before we would discuss this, another "New View" of his. And there will be more of his "New Views" coming out as he goes into deeper darkness. Knowing from Scripture that he would repudiate one truth after another until his understanding of his pet theories of God's Word would be utterly darkened, we knew that we would not wait in vain for him to give his "darkness" on the Tabernacle for "light"; and true enough, the June 1, 1920, Tower contains his confusion on the Tabernacle. He actually offers that which flatly contradicts our Pastor's view on the subject as a progressive development of that Servant's thought! From such progress may the dear Lord deliver us!

Another matter should be brought to our readers' attention: the narrow, shallow and contracted use of the Scriptures that he makes on this subject. He quotes some Scriptures, it is true, but not one that proves or even treats of his main point of contention: that the gate of the Court represents Consecration, and the Court, Vitalized justification only; while the Scriptures that disprove this point he ignores. He claims that the Scriptures do not teach these doctrines taught by our Pastor, against which he writes. We rejoice that as yet he has not lost the Truth on the Holy and Most Holy, though he has lost a part of the Truth on the court, and though we know Scripturally that he will become confused on the entire tabernacle. Nor do we entirely disagree with him on the court;

he is half right on the court, but only half right. What he says on the court as representing the justified condition is true enough as far as it goes. But he sees only one phase of its justification picture, *i.e.*, its vitalized phase. He is blind on its tentative aspect; hence he gives a one-sided and therefore a misleading setting to the entire subject. His claim that the Scriptures do not teach Tentative justification is an untrue and brazen assertion contrary to many Scriptures. Let him as inapplicable to the Gospel Age try to read Tentative Justification out of Rom. 4, especially verses 3-12, if he can! If he attempts it, he will find his teeth biting on granite! The fundamental error of the article under review, as in the case of his article on "Worthies—Ancient and Modern," is his denial of Tentative Justification as operative during the Gospel Age. Indeed, the only reason for his article appearing seems to be to undermine confidence in our Pastor's teaching on Tentative Justification. And to maintain his evident error, the tabernacle teachings must be twisted and distorted. It is unnecessary for us to treat further of Tentative Justification. We refer our readers to our brief discussion of that subject in Vol. IV, Chap. V. We refer to the matter here in order to emphasize the fact that J.F.R.'s error on Tentative Justification is causing him to be confused on many Scriptural subjects, among others, on some of the symbolisms of the court and its gate. If we remember the foundation error of the article under review, we will have no difficulty in seeing that his superstructure must also be false.

We call attention to the opening sentence of his article: "Question: On the typical *day of atonement* [italics ours] what did the court of the tabernacle and its furnishings represent, or picture?" Then he assumes that the day of atonement types the Gospel Age only—despite our Pastor's later and more logical thought that it types both the Gospel Age and the

Millennial Age—the Gospel Age, in the acts up to and including Aaron's taking off his sacrificial garments; the Millennial Age from then on. (What Pastor Russell Said, 26, 27.) His later thought is doubtless correct, since the At-one-ment work includes the work of both Ages. J.F.R. then treats of the services of Lev. 8 and 9, as if they were performed on the Day of Atonement. Then he ignores other types that occur at other times than on the Day of Atonement, and that give us views of the things antitypical of the atonement sacrificings and other servings of the Gospel Age. He seems to think that only those tabernacle services that occurred on the Day of Atonement type Gospel-Age matters, ignoring the fact that the transactions connected with the tabernacle in the book of Numbers, and not a few in Leviticus that did not occur on the Day of Atonement, type Gospel-Age matters, as can readily be seen from 1 Cor. 10: 1-14; Heb. 3: 2—4: 3, and from Lev. 8; 9; 10; 4: 3-12, etc. Despite his question, to prove his claim that under-priests were in the Court on the Day of Atonement he is forced to leave the chapter that gives the service of the Day of Atonement (Lev. 16), and betake himself to two that treat of the service occurring in the Spring of the year (Lev. 8 and 9) at the consecration of the priests (Lev. 8) and at the installation (Lev. 9) of the high priest. On the Day of Atonement in the type, not only was Aaron the only person in the Holy, but he was the only person in the Court. The reason for this is very apparent: On that day he represented the *World's High Priest*—(1) in sacrificing the bullock, he represented the Head of the World's High Priest, and (2) in sacrificing the Lord's goat and in the rest of the service of that day, he represented the World's High Priest, Head and Body, as the Apostle Paul clearly teaches (Heb. 7: 26, 27; 13: 11-14; 10: 4-10, 19). Hence it would have contradicted the viewpoint of the antitype, the oneness

of this High Priest, for Aaron's sons to have been in the court on the Atonement Day. The purpose of that picture is to type exclusively the work of the World's High Priest. Hence no one else than Aaron could have been in any part of the sacred enclosure on that day. How out of all reason it is for J.F.R. to conclude that, since no Levites were mentioned as being in the court that day, nobody but priests could be in the antitypical Court during the Gospel Age! Unless he views the purpose of Lev. 16 as just given, his way of reasoning logically excludes the Church from the antitypical Court during the Gospel Age. What is the difficulty with his teaching on this point? It takes only one type figuring forth limited Gospel and Millennial-Age conditions, and treats that one type as though it were all there is to the subject; yet he is forced to put the types of Lev. 8 and 9 in the typical Atonement Day picture to make his theory seem plausible, utterly ignoring other Scriptures that type antitypical Levites as being in the antitypical Court during the Gospel Age (Num. 8: 22; 4: 15, 25-28, 31-33; 1: 51; 10: 17, 21; Lev. 10: 4, 5; Heb. 3: 7-4: 3).

While professedly answering a question that pertains to the Atonement Day alone, as his opening sentence implies, to prove that Aaron's sons were in the court on the Day of Atonement he has recourse to the service of Lev. 8 and 9, which occurred in the Spring, and not on the Day of Atonement, which was in the Fall. While it is true that these chapters type certain phases of the Gospel, as well as certain phases of the Millennial-Age work, they do not refer to the typical atonement day service. He uses them, however, as though they did. Why? Because, impliedly, he wishes to seem to prove the point necessary to his proposition, that all the priests, but no Levites, were in the court on the atonement day; and that hence none but priests could be in the Antitypical Court during the Gospel Age! The very fact that he is

forced to leave the day of atonement chapter to find a supposed argument for his point shows that he cannot prove it from the atonement day service. Had he in addition to his first step taken a second step away from the day of atonement service, and entered Lev. 10: 4, 5, he would have been faced with a type that disproves his *implied contention and claim* that in the Gospel Age Priests only are in the Court.

Having pointed out the two main defects of the article under review, *i.e.*, its basal error—the denial of Tentative Justification and its one-sided and universal emphasis on one limited picture, while ignoring other pertinent pictures which contradict his proposition, we will now discuss other features of the subject which will help us to see through others of his sophistries. He is fairly clear on the meaning of the term "outside the camp," and "the camp." We will, however, give on these a few explanations that he fails to give, and that will help us better to see the subjects, from which vantage point we will then be able better to see through his fallacies on the court and its gate. Hebrews 13: 11-14 is very illuminating on what is meant by the expression "without the camp." It shows that the expression means a condition in which one is as an outcast from among, and in disfavor with God's *rebellious nominal* people. There are two figures in this text: the camp of the wilderness and the city of Jerusalem. These pictures correspond as follows: The temple and the tabernacle correspond; the camp about the tabernacle and the houses of the city about the temple correspond; the wall of the city and the last circuit of the camp's tents correspond; and the expressions "without the gate" and "without the camp" correspond. V. 13 shows that for the faithful to be, "without the camp" implies that they to a completion undergo from the *rebellious nominal* people of God the reproaches that the Christ class receives. Just as Jesus' death outside the gate

symbolized that He was in disfavor with, and an outcast from the *rebellious nominal* Jewish commonwealth, so St. Paul exhorted the Lord's saints to such faithfulness as would give them the same experience at the hands of the same class of people, explaining that we have here no religious commonwealth (city) with which we are in harmony. (V. 14.) Jesus shows the same thought in John 15: 18–19: 42. Hence we conclude that as "outside the Camp" means a condition of disfavor with, and rejection from among the *rebellious nominal* people of God, the camp means, as the above passages imply, the *rebellious nominal* people of God who, while desiring some relation to God, do not desire it sufficiently to be approved by Him, even for fellowship with Him. In the Harvest of the Jewish Age they were the about-to-be-rejected or the rejected house of Israel. During the Gospel Age they have been those professed Christians that have not heartily repented toward God and heartily exercised faith toward Jesus, or those who have not remained in these conditions of heart and mind, though desiring some fellowship with God, *i.e.*; those who have not even been tentatively justified, or those who did not retain Tentative Justification, though loud in their professions. The fact that all Israelites of the camp who left Egypt at the age of 20 years and upwards, except Joshua and Caleb, died in the wilderness under God's disapproval (Heb. 3: 7–4: 2) demonstrates that the camp represents, for the Gospel Age, those rebellious nominal people of God who, though desiring some harmony with God, either never attain or else cease to retain even Tentative Justification, *i.e.*, in the finished picture, those who are less than tentatively justified. In the Millennium the antitypical Camp will be the world of mankind, more or less desiring harmony with God, but not yet by works justified. We suggest that the brethren read our Pastor's article on the subject in Z '10, 150. We likewise suggest that the dear ones read "that Servant's"

articles treating of Tentative and Vitalized Justification, as follows: Z '10, 93, col. 2, pars. 3-6; 246, col. 2, pars. 1-4; Z '11, 394; Z '12, 152, col. 2, par. 4; Z '13, 92-94; Z '14, 67; Z '15, 103, 104; 292, 293; Z.'16, 281; Foreword of Vol. VI, iii, iv. In these we will see his continued progress in the light, and a complete refutation of another "new view" of J.F.R.

Having seen what is represented by the conditions implied in the expression, "without the camp" and "the camp," we are better prepared to see what the court represents. In seeking a definition of its antitype during the Gospel Age, we must have one that embraces every class that according to the Bible is in the antitypical Court during the Gospel Age. To define and explain what the court types in such a way as to exclude therefrom a class which the Bible teaches has been during the Gospel Age in the antitypical Court is manifestly incorrect. In harmony with our Pastor's definition, to define the court as representing the justified condition, in contrast with the unjustified condition of the Camp, and the sanctified condition of the Holy, is correct. But if we then proceed to explain, as J.F.R. does, that the justified condition means exclusively what our Pastor called the vitalizedly justified condition, and exclude what he meant by the tentatively justified condition, we err; for the Bible teaches that the tentatively justified condition as well as the vitalizedly justified condition is represented in the antitypical Court during the Gospel Age. We will give three proofs for this: (1) Rev. 11: 2 is a passage to the point: "The Court which is without the Sanctuary ... is given to *the* [emphatic in the Greek, *i.e.*, the special class among the Symbolic] Gentiles" (I. V.). According to the Bible a symbolic Jew is a consecrated person (Rom. 2: 28, 29; John 1: 47); and a symbolic Gentile, a symbolic non-Jew, therefore, is one that is unconsecrated (Rev. 2: 9; 3: 9). Hence by *the* Gentiles of Rev. 11: 2 certain, but not all,

unconsecrated persons are meant. Therefore *they* must be meant who are the tentatively justified; for they, though unconsecrated, have been in the antitypical Court during the Gospel Age, according to this verse as certainly unbelieving Gentiles cannot here be meant to be in the Court. This is very manifest, too when we realize that circumcision types consecration, and uncircumcision types the unconsecrated condition, whether tentatively justified, or not even tentatively justified (Col. 2: 11, 12; Gen. 17: 10, 11, 14; Rom. 4: 11, 12). Rev. 11: 2 assures us that *the* symbolic Gentiles would be in the antitypical Court. The verse therefore means that while no unconsecrated person would come into the antitypical sanctuary, the antitypical Holy, the place of sanctified ones—*the* special class among the unconsecrated, the Justified, would be in the enclosure outside of the antitypical Holy, *i.e.*, in the antitypical Court. J.F.R.'s theory denying this fact must be wrong. His view is too narrow, contracted and shallow to take in all the pertinent facts and verses of the Bible; therefore he is in error on the point. (2) In Ezek. 9: 7 we are shown that those who are in the Court are wholly different persons from those in the Holy; hence the tentatively justified are meant by them. For details on this point, please see Vol. V, Chap. II, in those parts that treat of the slaughter weapons. (3) The thought that our Pastor repeatedly proved, and that we proved in very many articles, is also to the point, *i.e.*, that as there was no Great Company as such until the end of the Age, the Levites in the Court before the end of the Age must be the Tentatively Justified (Num. 8: 22; 4: 15, 25-28, 31-33; 1: 51; 10: 17, 21; Lev. 10: 4, 5; comp. Heb. 3: 7-4: 3). These three considerations prove our Pastor's view that the court represents the justified condition, either tentative or vitalized. Hence J.F.R.'s view of the antitype of the court is only half true; and because of his one-sided denial that it types a tentatively

justified condition, his article is defending an error by a one-sided and antithetical emphasis placed upon a half-truth, a most sophistical procedure.

Something ought to be said of his oft repeated remark that one is either justified or he is not justified. This statement as it stands is true enough; yet he uses it to teach an error; for he uses it to deny Tentative Justification. To make his statement teach the full Truth we correct it as follows. One is either vitalizedly justified or he is not vitalizedly justified. One is either tentatively justified or he is not tentatively justified. It would be wrong, however, to say, as he implies by his use of the statement, that if one is not vitalizedly justified, he is in no sense justified; for many people have been tentatively justified that have not had their tentative justification vitalized (2 Cor. 6: 1). Of course we do not claim that the tentatively justified are fully, *i.e.*, vitalizedly, justified; for the very term tentative implies that they are not. Nevertheless for the purpose of a temporary experiment for the advancement and help of the persons concerned to consecration, God temporarily reckons the faith of truly repentant and believing sinners as righteousness (Rom. 4: 3-8, etc.), and treats them temporarily as though Christ's righteousness were imputed to them (Rom. 10: 4). The same thing applies to the symbolisms of the court-posts, hooks and curtains. On the one hand, temporarily, the posts truly represent the tentatively justified, who are truly (silver hooks) holding tentatively to the righteousness of Christ; on the other hand, they truly represent the vitalizedly justified, who truly (silver hooks) are holding vitalizedly to the righteousness of Christ. "It is not a camouflage, not a subterfuge," in either case; but in each case the exact thought symbolized must be kept in mind. It is because J.F.R. fails to see both facts that he can see only "a camouflage;" "a subterfuge," in what the Lord tells us as a verity (Rom. 4: 3-8 and Rom. 10: 4) of

the tentatively justified by faith, truly, though tentatively, holding to Christ's righteousness. We appeal to the experience of all the brethren, before their consecration and after acceptance of Christ as their Savior, as a proof that they truly held to Christ as their Righteousness, even though they did not understand it thoroughly. It is a fact of experience of which we can all testify, except those who like our Pastor consecrated at a time immemorial.

This, another "New View" of J.F.R., is defective in a further respect: It does not allow for any symbolization of that condition in which unconsecrated believers are—a condition by far more important than that typed by the Camp. His view of the Camp gives the condition of those who are not even tentatively justified—among the tents, that of the impenitent; between the tents and the gate, that of the penitent; both conditions being outside the Court; his Court, the vitalizedly justified condition; his Holy, the spirit-begotten condition; and his Most Holy, the spirit-born condition. But he has no place for the tentatively justified condition. One's journey from the Camp to the Gate cannot at any stage represent a real faith in Christ as Savior, inasmuch as the Court curtain represents things connected with faith—the outside of it a "wall as unbelief" in Christ's righteousness to those outside, the inside of it a "wall of faith" in Christ's righteousness to those inside. Where is the faith that is both counted for righteousness, and that is tentatively holding to Christ's righteousness referred to in Rom. 4: 3-25 and Rom. 10: 4, represented in the tabernacle, if not in the act of the Levites' passing through the gate? At the antitypical Gate there is a consecration to righteousness on the part of the repentant and believing sinner (Num. 8: 13-15): but not to sacrifice, which is symbolized at the first veil (Matt. 7: 14; 2 Cor. 3: 13-18). The twofold application of Num. 8: 6-22 is very manifest. The tentatively justified

are tentatively the firstborn, though of course they are not the firstborn in the finished picture in the end of the Age. Throughout the Gospel Age, in the tentatively justified, this passage has been antityping in a tentative manner; and now in the Great Company it is also antityping in a vitalized manner, even as in various descriptions from Num. 1: 47 onward we find the twofold picture. Of course the service of Num. 8: 6-22 cannot represent the consecration unto death that every individual who will find himself in the Great Company made when he came into Christ; for such a consecration is pictured in Lev. 8. As in the case of the tentatively justified, so it represents for the Great Company their consecration to the *righteous* service of the Sanctuary. Hence everything is clear, if we view matters as did our dear Pastor, but not so, if we view matters as J.F.R. does. The fact that his "new view" allows for no symbolization for the tentatively justified condition is one of its fatal defects.

Another consideration that refutes J.F.R.'s "New View" on the court and the gate: his view leaves out of consideration the fact that one must *progress* from the Gate of the Court to the Door of the Tabernacle. He concedes that antitypically there is progress necessary in going from the Camp to the Gate of the Court. He will doubtless admit that antitypically there is progress necessary in going from the First Veil to the Second Veil. He will also doubtless admit that antitypically there is progress in honor and service necessary in arising from under the Second Veil, advancing to the Mercy Seat and sprinkling the blood; for these steps imply the first resurrection, ascension, glorification and ministration. Hence we should expect that there is, as our Pastor repeatedly showed, progress in going from the Gate of the antitypical Court to the antitypical First Veil. But J.F.R.'s "new view" makes one arrive at both stations at one step! This is even a more wonderful feat than that supposedly performed by the

fabled man who is said to have worn boots enabling him to take steps of seven leagues each! Since his proposition involves the denial of progress from the antitypical Gate to the antitypical First Veil, we ask him why this should be, since it contradicts the idea of progress implied in every other stage of Tabernacle symbolisms? Let him give us Scriptural, reasonable and factual proof, for so extraordinary a claim. Surely we could not accept his error, *i.e.*, the denial of Tentative Justification, as a proof for his more than seven-league-boots proposition! Yet he offers nothing else than this.

This leads us to criticize his partially blundering explanation of the steps from the Camp to the Most Holy. He gives them as follows: "(1) Seeking harmony with God; (2) being drawn to Christ; (3) consecration; (4) imputation of the merit of Christ and the *presentation by the High Priest to Jehovah pictured at the door of the Tabernacle*; (5) *acceptance and Justification* by Jehovah (6) *Spirit-begetting to Sonship*; [italics ours] (7) Spirit-birth." We have italicized the main words that are in confusion and disorder. By the words, being drawn to Christ, he uses an ambiguous expression. Did he mean by it "faith toward our Lord Jesus Christ"? Then why not state it clearly? Would it not suggest the real Gate scene? Justification by Jehovah follows immediately on the imputation of Jesus' merit, *before Jesus presents us to the Father*, otherwise we would be unacceptable as gifts and sacrifices (Heb. 5: 1). Again, Jehovah's acceptance and the Spirit-begetting are one and the same thing: He accepts us by the begetting of the Spirit. In contrast with the above faulty, and in part ambiguous, enumeration of the steps taken in starting from the Camp until one's ministry in the Most Holy we offer the following: (1) "Repentance toward God," *i.e.*, progress from one's place in the antitypical Camp to a place just outside the antitypical Gate; (2) "Faith

toward our Lord Jesus Christ," *i.e.*, passing through the antitypical Gate, which puts one into Tentative Justification; (3) knowledge and appreciation of, and growth in harmony with the righteousness of Christ—the antitypical Brazen Altar; (4) cleansing from filthiness of flesh and spirit, represented at the antitypical Layer; (5) consecration by the individual and presentation by the High Priest at the antitypical First Veil; (imputation by Christ and full (vitalized) Justification by the Father occur in the Most Holy; and in time occur between one's consecration and Jesus' presentation of him to the Father as a gift). (6) Spirit-begotten condition, beginning with the begettal, progressing through enlightenment at the antitypical Candlestick, through strengthening in every good word and work at the antitypical Table, through sacrificing at the antitypical Golden Altar, and through perfecting by suffering, unto the antitypical Second Veil; (7) Spirit-born condition, progressing in the First Resurrection, Ascension, Glorification and Ministration.

J.F.R. (Z '20, 167, par. 7) makes some quotations from T and A that *he well knows* our Pastor did not mean as he seeks to wrest them. Worse still, at the end of his article he quotes Z '16, 281, par. 2, which treats of Vitalized Justification, as a corroboration of his "new view" stated in a way to contain a denial of Tentative Justification, ignoring the fact that the preceding paragraph approves of Tentative—incomplete—Justification, as well as Vitalized—complete—Justification, and further, ignoring the fact that the following four paragraphs discuss and approve of Tentative Justification. What does this *Lawyer* mean by such brazen jugglery? We think that the Society adherents must face their individual responsibility toward God as to him. If they continue to allow him to misteach and mismanage as they have done, the Lord will hold them answerable to the extent that they might have changed, but did not change these conditions. We trust, however,

that they will see their privilege and duty to handle him as an unruly person should be handled (1 Thes. 5: 14). The Lord will withhold marked blessing from the Society, until he is removed from his position as teacher and executive. Our dear Pastor wrote (Z '16, 174, par. 1), just four years before J.F.R.'s, attempted refutation, that nobody has been able to refute the setting that he has given to "the Plan" as set forth in Tabernacle Shadows (Is. 54: 17). J.F.R. and his co-editors may think they have, but they have not; for among the conspicuous failures that they have made in attempting to refute various of our dear Pastor's teachings, we have above proven that a position in the forefront of such failures belongs to his article in the June 1, 1920, Tower, entitled, "The Court—Type and Antitype," just reviewed.

It is now some months [written Sep., 1923] since we have written anything on Society conditions. During this time a number of things have marked Society activities and teachings that call for attention. Some of these things are quite praiseworthy, and for them we rejoice and offer our praise—we wish that in every particular matters were praiseworthy. It is surely a praiseworthy matter that the Society has issued all of our Pastor's Towers, in the Tower Reprints. All true lovers and admirers of his must appreciate and feel thankful for having all his Towers brought within their reach; and certainly they have been provided at a very reasonable rate. We, of course, cannot bestow such unstinted praise upon a part of the Reprints—about 2½ years' numbers—that have been written since our Pastor's death. It would be expecting too much of a work published under J.F.R.'s control to think that he would not see to it that the Index of Topics was juggled to favor his errors. This can be seen from the way the Topical Index treats Tentative justification, the Levites, and the Modern (Youthful) Worthies. Under Justification, Tentative,

references are given to it as treated by our Pastor up to 1913, and from then on no references to it are given. This, of course, would be in line with J.F.R.'s false statement that our Pastor gave up belief in that doctrine some time before his death. We wrote into the index the Tower references to it up to and including that in the September 15, 1916, Tower as these are given above. Under the topic Levites, in the interests of J.F.R.'s pertinent error, no references at all are given to the Gospel-Age Levites—the tentatively justified! Under Modern Worthies, only one reference is given, and that to a 1918 Tower, published two years after our Pastor's death, and quoting from him on the subject without the Index indicating that fact. We added two references as follows: 4836: 2-5 [Z '11, 181, pars. 2-10]; 5761: 7, 8 [Z '15, 269, pars. 11, 12]. These examples, among others, are given to caution the brethren that the Topical Index is juggled in the interests of J.F.R.'s errors. Of course, the Index is given a Society bias on events, persons, works, etc., since 1917. We desire to express pleasure, also, that the Tower is defending our Pastor's chronology on the Times of the Gentiles (though deviating from it on the dates of the beginning and end of the Harvest and on 1925), as against the Pastoral Bible Institute, which is teaching error on almost every line of our Pastor's chronology. The case of F. H. Robison, one of The Tower editors, calls here for a brief remark. From his published letter and type-written articles, we learned that his errors were on the Parables of the Kingdom and on Revelation, on which things he is accepting and spreading errors that he learned from a Nominal Church theologian, a Foolish Virgin, named Dr. Bullinger. The far-fetched points that F. H. Robison adduces to prove that the Revelation refers to Fleshly and not to a Spiritual Israel and applies exclusively to the end of the Age—the Apocalypse or Epiphany—and not to the entire Age, are characteristic

of the confusion of Nominal-Church views, into which unfortunately he has allowed himself to fall His course as one of the chief Tower editors (the three who live at Bethel are doubtless the most influential editors) is, however, one of the best refutations of the newly developed doctrine of the Society as "the channel"; for he shows that for years he neither believed Brother Russell nor the Society to be "that Servant"—the channel. Query: How could he agree to articles claiming those thoughts and appearing in the Tower? His letter proves him to have been acting the hypocrite for years as to the Society's views on the subject. If a part of the so-called "channel" thought and acted hypocritically, this is likely true of the rest (Matt. 24: 51), and how could such a so-called "channel" be the real "channel," *i.e.*, "that Servant"?

In F. H. Robison's published letter he makes the extraordinary statement, as a matter of general acceptance and self-evidence in Society quarters, that the Bethel Home is J.F.R.'s private property, as president of the People's Pulpit Association, basing the thought on the clause which says that the President of the Association who shall be elected at its first meeting would hold office for life and control all the business and affairs of that Society. J. F. R told us that the charter of the People's Pulpit Association was made so to read for the express purpose of preventing the control of the work from being gotten and exercised by some one else than Brother Russell. This fact as well as the wording of the clause itself proves that the controllership was intended for but one person, and not for his successor in that office after his death; for it; expressly stipulates that the President of whom it treated must be elected at the first meeting of the Board. Hence that clause on the President refers and was intended to refer to but one person—Brother Russell, who was elected President at the first meeting of the Board. Only one person could be and was

elected President at the first meeting of the Board; hence the clause referring to the powers of the President as controller applies and was intended to apply to the first President only. This matter is so clear as to be self-evident to those who know of Brother Russell's unique place in the Lord's work at the end of the Age. But it was in harmony with J.F.R.'s course of usurpation to take to himself the powers intended for the People's Pulpit Association's first President alone. However, conceding merely for argument's sake that subsequent presidents should according to the charter have such controllership, it by no means would follow that the properties held under the name of that Association were its President's private property, as is held at Bethel; for in such a case he could sell it at pleasure without the consent of the Board, or could by Will bequeath it to others without the consent of the Board. Hence the sophistry of the whole position. For our part we have good reason for believing that it is illegal in New York for a Corporation's president to hold office *for life*, and just because he is president to *control* all the business affairs and property of a New York Corporation. Such controllership the laws of New York do not permit to be vested in a corporation's president *as such*. The People's Pulpit Association's charter is in this clause illegal.

This fact suggests another matter on which we offer some interesting information to the brethren: the law of Pennsylvania to which J.F.R. appealed as requiring the annual election of Directors (which construction of that law he threw to the winds in 1920, as to both Society Directors and Officers) expressly states that it is not retroactive, and hence does not apply to such corporations as were previously chartered with the privileges of electing Directors for longer terms. Therefore the Charter of the Society, having been granted before that law was enacted, did not in the point just referred to become illegal by the passage of

that law. Hence the ousted Directors were legal directors and were ousted in gross violation of the law of Pennsylvania. Both Divine and human law forbade J.F.R.'s course toward the four Directors.

In Z '21, 286, in answer to a question as to what merit atones for our wilful and partially wilful sins committed before our consecration, the Tower teaches that Jesus' merit atones for such sins. Such an answer is a gross doctrinal error. Jesus' merit atones for Adam's sin, which was totally wilful, and all sins that result from Adam's sin, *i.e.*, all sins of weakness and ignorance. It does not atone for any wilful or partially wilful sins whatsoever in Adam's descendants. None of us before consecration can commit a totally wilful sin as distinct from a partially wilful sin; for a totally wilful sin can be committed by those only who are on trial for life. Each individual of the Church must by stripes expiate the partial wilfulness of his sins committed before consecration. In the very nature of the case he must rid his character of the partial wilfulness in the sin before he can consecrate; for consecration implies the surrender of every measure of wilfulness and the acceptance of the Lord's will. We would therefore say that expiation for the part that is wilful in any sin is made by stripes before the person consecrates, and thus he has a clean slate when he receives the imputation of Jesus' merit for his Adamic sins.

Considerable excitement was raised among the Society brethren by the statement in the Tower that there were more Apostles than The Twelve, and that St. Paul did not take Judas' place as one of The Twelve. The root of the difficulty is due to the Tower Editors failing to recognize that the Greek word *apostolos* has different meanings, *i.e.*, a general meaning and a special, or technical, meaning. Its general meaning is messenger, and as such it can apply to any one and every one who is used as a messenger—one sent forth

with any order or on any mission. The New Testament uses this word in both the above senses. Clear examples of the general sense can be seen—among other passages, in 2 Cor. 8: 23; Phil. 2: 25. In these passages the persons mentioned were messengers—apostles—of certain churches—not of God or of Christ; for they were sent forth by the vote of these churches on certain missions. Sts. Paul and *Barnabas* are in Acts 14: 4, 14 called apostles in this same general sense, because they were sent out on their missionary journey by the *church* at Antioch as its missionaries—messengers. The word *apostles* is not used in 2 Cor. 8: 23; Phil. 2: 25; Acts 14: 4, 14 in its special, or technical, but in its general sense—that of a messenger—one sent out on a mission. In the special, or technical sense, the Greek word *apostolos* is applicable to a special class of twelve, and *only twelve*, distinct men, who as messengers of God and Christ acted as their *plenipotentiaries* in the founding, teaching and upbuilding of the entire Church. As such they had to be eyewitnesses of Christ's resurrection, and had to be endowed with inspiration and infallibility in all their teachings, and with the power of working miracles and bestowing the gifts of the Spirit. None others than these Twelve were given all these powers. Therefore, since St. Paul had all these powers, and that in a higher measure than any others of "The Twelve," he must have been one of them, as repeatedly he compares himself with the remainder of "The Twelve," showing that in no way was he inferior to any of them.

That Matthias was counted one of "The Twelve" was due to the fact that fallible and mistaken men regarded him as such. Christ alone had the right to choose "The Twelve" (John 15: 16), even as only Jacob, as His type, had the right to beget his children, as their types. Hence the Apostles and the Church, even after Pentecost, would have had no more right to choose an Apostle, as one of "The Twelve," than certain

of Jacob's sons, the Apostles' types, and their descendants, types of the Church, would have had the right to beget a son for Jacob. Therefore the choosing of Matthias by the Spirit-lacking, uninspired and unauthorized eleven Apostles and 109 other brethren (Acts 1: 15-26) was entirely null and void. St. Luke's not expressly correcting in the Acts their busybodying was likely due to the fact that writing largely as St. Paul's amanuensis, St. Paul himself in Galatians and 2 Corinthians having already sufficiently proved that he was one of "The Twelve," it would seem too much like "rubbing it in" on St. Luke's superiors and the Church for the correction to have been made in the book of Acts. The use of the expression, "The Twelve," in Acts 6: 2 no more proves that Matthias was by St. Luke regarded as being one of the Twelve Apostles than St. Paul's telling us (1 Cor. 15: 5, compare John 20: 24-26) that Jesus (eight days after His resurrection), when there were but eleven Apostles, appeared to "The Twelve," means that there were then twelve Apostles. In both cases we are to consider that the whole of the Apostolic band then existing is called by the *name*—"The Twelve"—that designated them as a class, or a body. If, *e.g.*, four of the Apostles had died, it would have been right from this standpoint to speak of a meeting of the remaining eight as a meeting of "The Twelve"; for in such a case the whole of the class, the whole of the body that was called "The Twelve," then living, would be meeting, even as a similar use is made of the term "seventy" (Num. 11: 24, 25), though applying to but 68 of the 70 (Num. 11: 26-30). From the same standpoint the expression, "Peter standing up with the eleven," is to be understood; for that expression is equivalent to the expression, "The Twelve," and as in the other cases just mentioned applies to the whole body of the Apostles *as such*, even if one or more of them were absent by reason of death or cutting off from the Apostolate.

The Tower claims that 1 Cor. 4: 4-9 proves that Apollos is called an Apostle. This statement is certainly not true. The expression in verse 9, "us, *the* Apostles, last," proves that "The Twelve" are meant, and also proves that St. Paul was one of them. If St. Paul and Apollos were meant by that expression in verse 9, it would read, us Apostles, two of the last. Especially the article "*the*" before the word Apostles, and less especially the adjective "last," after the word "Apostles," prove grammatically that "The Twelve" are meant. Nor do 1 Thes. 1: 1 and 2: 6 call Silvanus and Timothy Apostles. Rather, St. Paul says that he and they might have been of weight among the Thessalonians, just as "The Twelve" could be, the reason being that St. Paul was one of "The Twelve" and the other two acted as his representatives. In other words, the expression, "as the Apostles of Christ," is not in verse 6 definitive of and restrictive to Sts. Paul, Timothy and Silvanus, *i.e.*, as meaning these three, but is comparative of them with "The Twelve," of whom St. Paul was one, and as such used the other two as his representatives. The thought would be clear as such if stated as follows: We might have been burdensome (of dignity or weight) as the Apostles of Christ *are burdensome*—of dignity or weight. The Tower's question as to whether the spirit of discernment that enabled St. Peter to detect the fraud of Ananias and Sapphira could not have detected a spurious Apostle is beside the mark. Of course it could, had it been the Lord's will to reveal such a thing to St. Peter; but the Lord willed otherwise. Hence St. Peter, though able to detect the one, was not able to detect the other. Doubtless, among other reasons, the Lord withheld knowledge on this matter as a test on the whole Church, including the Apostles, as subsequent events abundantly prove. When The Tower says that St. Paul never claimed to be one of "The Twelve," it speaks unadvisedly. 1 Cor. 4: 9 certainly proves that he

did. The Epistle to the Galatians and the second to the Corinthians were written, among other things, to refute the Judaizing error that denied that St. Paul was one of "The Twelve," and hence denied the obligatoriness of his teachings on the Church, though it conceded that the teachings of "The Twelve" were binding on the Church (Matt. 18: 18). Lack of knowledge of the Greek, inaccurate knowledge of the Scriptures and illogical thinking are responsible for the Tower editors' errors on the Apostles, as taught in Z '21, 350, 351.

The Tower published a letter which sets forth the statement that J.F.R. told its writer and others that Brother Russell just before his death said that *Tabernacle Shadows* needed revision; and that it was in fulfillment of this (supposed) expression of his that the Society published its revisions of that booklet. Judging from similar claims of J.F.R. on our Pastor's supposed changes of thought, and from our knowledge of what our Pastor actually held up to his death, we are satisfied that J.F.R.'s statement on this subject is as untrue as his statement that our Pastor gave up *Tentative Justification* (See Chap. III). The letter seems to have been inserted into the Tower, as some other things have been, to feel the pulse of the Church as to the safety of inserting the so-called revisions—devisions, views away from the Truth, is a proper designation for them—into the text of the *Tabernacle Shadows*.

Seemingly as a pretext intended to spread the thought among the Society friends that *Tabernacle Shadows* needed revisions, among others the question on whether the Altar of Incense was not in the Most Holy has been agitated in Society quarters, with the answer generally given that it was there located. We have already shown the erroneousness of this view by pointing out that the correct translation of Lev. 16: 2, 12 (P '21, 126, pars. 5, 6) proves that it was in the Holy.

This is also implied in every reference to it in the accounts of the command to build the Tabernacle and in the accounts of its actual building as given in Exodus, and in the account of the Levites' service with reference to it as given in Numbers. Heb. 9: 4, as rendered by some translators, is also appealed to by the Society leaders to prove their position. On this point we may say several things: (1) The Vatican MS, and the Egyptian and Ethiopian Versions (both very ancient) place the words in question, rendered by some as "the golden altar," in v. 2. (See Diaglott.) We know that the Vatican MS. as far as it extends is considered by the best text critics, as the most reliable of all the ancient MSS. of the Greek New Testament. If we should accept this reading, it, of course, would deprive those who seek to place the Incense Altar in the Most Holy of their only argument. (2) However, to those who insist that the other MSS. prove that the words in controversy should be placed in verse 4, we offer another answer: The word translated by some as altar, in Heb. 9: 2 or 4 is *thymiaterion*, and occurs but once in the New Testament, *i.e.*, in the passage under consideration; while every place in the New Testament where the Golden Altar is undoubtedly meant the word *thysiasterion* is used in the Greek Rev. 6: 9; 8: 3, 5; 9: 13; 14: 18; 16: 7). This implies that the word in the New Testament should be translated "censer" as is done in the A.V., in the text of the E.R.V. and in the margin of the A.R.V. Moreover, in the Septuagint—the Greek translation of the Old Testament made by Hebrews and begun 283 B.C.—*thymiaterion* is never used to translate the Hebrew word for the Golden Altar, but is frequently used to translate the Hebrew word for censer. This fact is helpful to settle the question at issue, because the Apostles generally—almost without exception—use in the Greek those expressions for Old Testament things that occur in the Septuagint. The use of the word

thymiaterion for altar occurs only in heathen and other unbiblical books, never in Biblical books of the Old (the Septuagint) and New Testaments. Hence we see that the weight of evidence favors the A.V. and E.R.V. translation of *thymiaterion* as *censer*, in Heb. 9, whether we place the word in verse 2 or 4. The evidence, typical and antitypical, is overwhelming that our Pastor was right as to the situation of the Golden Altar. The Tower Editors' use of this matter is a proof, among many others, of their unfitness to revise Tabernacle Shadows.

The Society under J.F.R.'s direction is introducing Sunday Schools into the Classes. It is true that it avoids the use of the expression, Sunday Schools, as a name for them; but this is merely juggling words. They have the thing itself, whether they call it a Sunday School or Juvenile Class! By introducing such Classes they are perverting the Church, both in its organization and its mission, and are grossly revolutionizing against the Lord's Word as explained by our Pastor, F 545-547. We must call the attention of the brethren to another interpretational deviation in the Tower from our Pastor's teachings: that the image of Daniel 2 is not yet smitten on its feet by the Stone taken without hands out of the mountain. Our Pastor's thought was that the stone began with secular and religious Truth to smite the image from 1874 and 1878 onward, and from 1914 onward continued to smite the image, with the war implements that the Lord's scientific—secular—truth gave the nations. This is only another of the countless, thoroughly useless and unfactual deviations from our Pastor's teachings by the Tower editors.

It is self-evident that in a review of this kind we should give some attention to J.F.R.'s book, *The Harp of God*. The publication of the book is a violation of Brother Russell's Will, which denies the right of the Society to publish anything apart from the

Tower and our Pastor's writings, and which denies the editors of the Tower the right to have part in any other publication than the Tower. A book begotten, conceived and born in revolutionism against God's arrangements cannot have God's approval, and must be designed by Satan for a fell purpose. And that purpose is manifest from the discussions of Society brethren on, and the use they make of the book. It is intended to save people now coming into the Truth the trouble and labor of "wading through the Six Volumes"! Thus by this amateur book Satan is setting aside the Divinely approved and masterly Six Volumes of our beloved Pastor. The stress placed by the Society on *The Golden Age*, *The Finished Mystery*, *Talking with the Dead*, *Millions Now Living*, and *The Harp* distribution, and the consequent lack of emphasis placed on our Pastor's books by its Colporteurs, prove that our Pastor's books and booklets are being displaced and shelved. This is Satan's purpose in this entire affair, and he is accomplishing it through the unholy ambition of revolutionism of the Society leaders, especially J.F.R. It is only the blind who do not see this trend in the Society.

The Harp is replete with misinterpretations and farfetched imaginations. It is a mild description to call its claim (p. 16), that Job 38: 35 refers to radio and Is. 60: 8 to air-ships, far-fetched imaginations; for they are more than far-fetched imaginations—they are errors. While visible, discharging electricity is lightning; radio, and we might add telegraphy and telephony, are not lightning. Is. 60: 8 refers to Israel fleeing from persecution to Palestine, as the connection shows. J.F.R. (p. 41) applies Nadab and Abihu as types of our first parents. How could this be, since the Law, its Tabernacle and its services in their right and wrong uses were shadows of future things (Heb. 9: 9, 10; 10: 1; Col. 2: 16, 17)? Perhaps he seeks by this perversion of our Pastor's interpretation

to turn away attention from himself as being a part of antitypical Abihu—a supposition that is in line with the misinterpretation that he offers on the subject. His statement (p. 90) that Mary bore Jesus "without pain and without suffering" is an unprovable assertion contrary to all reasonable and analogical experience, and is a theory worthy of a Mary-worshipping Jesuit, but not of a Truth teacher. What he says (pp. 91-96) about Satan's plot to destroy the infant Jesus is a striking example of a confusion of Truth and error. It is an unprovable guess that Satan made the star of Bethlehem to appear in the east, and with fell purpose started the wise men out on their quest for the babe Jesus. The first Scriptural evidence that we have of Satan's activity toward the wise men is in connection with Herod's appearing on the scene. Our Pastor's explanation on the subject is of greater depth, sobriety and credibility. It is certainly as reasonable to think that God revealed Himself to the wise men in the East, sending them on their errand, as that He did in the dream after they found the child, and then sent them on another errand. Had they been Satan's agents and Divinely displeasing, as J.F.R. contends, God would not have favored them with the dream, at all, but would have saved the infant Jesus in another way by approved agents. The word Magi does not necessarily mean one who dealt with the occult; it was frequently used as a title for the learned, the scholarly, as the word Doctor is now frequently used. We suggest that the brethren read our Pastor's comments, Z '06, 14, 15.

J.F.R.'s remarks (p. 117) on the life-rights prove that he does not understand the life-rights nor their relation to the right to life. We understand the right to life to mean the Divinely sanctioned privilege to exist perfectly, and the life-rights to mean the privileges connected with, and necessary for the perfect enjoyment of the right to life. Thus Adam and the

angels, created perfect, were given by God the privilege to exist perfectly, and could retain that privilege by obedience to His Law. In the life-rights, God gave them everything they needed for the perfect enjoyment of their perfect existence, so long as it was theirs by right. Thus the life-rights of Adam included perfect food, light, air, home surroundings, dominion, etc. By sin Adam forfeited both his right to life and his life-rights, for himself and his race. Hence none of the race in Adam now has the right to life nor the life-rights that go with that right, though they have a temporary *use* of a little life to which they have no right (before Divine justice), and a *moiety* of light, warmth, food, home, surroundings, dominion, etc., to which they have no right (before Divine justice), and which are not life-rights; for the sentence deprived Adam and his race of the right to life and the accompanying life-rights, the latter of which are inseparably connected with perfect conditions, either in Eden or the perfect earth. Accordingly, when J.F.R. says (p. 117), "Any human being that is living possesses the right (?) to food, air, light, ... and these (?) are called life-rights," he teaches two errors; for life-rights imply perfect things as their constituent parts, and the fallen race has no Divinely sanctioned right to them. But some may object to this that Jesus did not have perfect air, food, etc., and yet had life-rights. To this we reply, Jesus until thirty years old was not a perfect *man*. Hence from His birth until He was thirty He is to be considered as being in God's sight as Adam was during the process of creation, i.e., from the time when God began to form his body until he actually was a living soul—a perfect *man*. This being the case, the right to life with its accompanying life-rights did not belong to Jesus as a human being until He was just about to consecrate Himself. Immediately on receiving them as His by right He sacrificed His right to use them for Himself; and thus God was

not obligated to give Him the use of Edenic perfections so far as the life-rights were concerned, because the Son gave up the personal use of these life-rights at His consecration, just as He became a perfect *man*.

In numerous cases J.F.R. gives a twist to passages whereby he claims for them, and wrongly so, senses different from those given by our Pastor, many of which twists are given to prove his "millions" proposition, e.g., he explains in 2 Tim. 4: 1 and 1 Pet. 4: 5 (p. 329) "the living" to be those under the curse who have not yet departed this life, and the dead to be those of that class who have departed this life. Our Pastor explained the living as the New Creatures and fallen angels who are not under the death sentence, and the dead as Adam's entire race under the curse, whether in or out of this life (Matt. 8: 22; Rom. 14: 9; 2 Cor. 5: 14, 15). He also formerly explained the dead in 1 Pet. 4: 6 as the Church as human beings in the death of consecration, though later he applied the expression to the race under the curse. To bolster his "millions" errors, J.F.R., perverts these passages. So also as a proof of his "millions" gospel he applies John 11: 26 (p. 334) ambiguously. While admitting that it belongs to the next Age, he claims that it is proper to give it as the message now—"millions now living," etc. To prove such a thought the passage will have to apply now and not to the next Age. Is. 35: 4-6 (p. 330) he also grossly twists to prove his "millions" proposition. Vs. 3 and 4 are an address to the Church living before the Second Advent (not to the world now living), bidding her, for a number of reasons, not to fear, because of (1) the hope of the Second Advent, (2) her vindication as against her institutional enemies in the Time of Trouble, and (3) her deliverance. Then vs. 5 and 6, indeed the rest of the chapter, show what will then take place, after these three things occur—restitution to the world, which is described as symbolically blind, lame, deaf,

and dumb, etc., in vs. 5 and 6. So our Pastor very properly explained these verses. But J.F.R., on account of his darkening right eye, explains the deafness, blindness, etc., as physical and belonging to this generation, and thus thinks he proves his "millions" proposition! In a similar manner, for the same purpose, Rom. 8: 19, 22 (p. 330) is twisted. Our Pastor showed that the entire race in the dying process is meant. J.F.R. puts the proposition as though one must understand the passage as applying either to people in the tomb or to those living at the inauguration of the Kingdom. Denying the former part of the alternative (in which denial we agree) he claims as a self-evident consequence that it applies to the generation now living, and hence it teaches that "millions now living will never die!" What logic and discernment! Noah's family saved in the Ark now types, according to J.F.R. (p. 333), his millions who will pass through the Trouble. St. Peter tells us that those in the Ark type the consecrated, including the Little Flock, and we will not hesitate to accept his interpretation as against J.F.R.'s (1 Pet. 3: 20, 21). He also cites (p. 330) Matt. 24: 21, 22 to prove his millions proposition. While the passage, as well as others, certainly does prove that some will live through the Trouble, it does not in the remotest way hint how many they will be, much less teach that they will number millions.

Zech. 13: 8, 9 (p. 330) is his classic passage on the "millions" subject. We all know our Pastor's logical explanation—"the two parts"—classes—representing the Little Flock and the Great Company, and the "third part"—class—the Restitution class, passing through the refining fires—the resurrection by judgment (John 5: 21)—of the Millennium, and thus at its end made *God's people* through entering into direct relationship with Him as such in the New Covenant, when its Mediator ceases to function as such (1 Cor. 15: 24).

It is self-evident that the refining fires cannot be the Time of Trouble; for that has not and will not refine—help retribute the race. At best it will punish, abase and beat into subjection, and thus will prepare people to accept the Kingdom; but it will not even partially retribute the race, as the expression *refine* means to rid the world of depravity and to restore them to God's image, even as it has a similar meaning for the Little Flock and Great Company (Mal. 3: 2, 3; 1 Cor. 3: 12-15). In other words, Zech. 13: 8, 9 refers to the three salvations and how they will be brought about: the Little Flock and Great Company gaining their salvations by being cut off—separated in consecration from the world—and by dying—carrying out their consecration unto death; while the world gets its salvation by being brought through the resurrection of *judgment*, spoken of in this passage as being brought through refining fires. Such an exposition is logical, factual, reasonable and Scriptural—just as is characteristic of our Pastor's expositions. J.F.R. muddles the passage, especially as according to a later Tower he has given up our Pastor's thought on verse 8 (*forced thereto by holding error* on who are meant by those who pass through the refining fires), and now claims that its "two parts" are the clergy and the Second Death class! But even if we should concede that Zech. 13: 9 refers to the Time of Trouble and to those who will pass through it, it does not teach how many will do so, much less that there will be millions who will so do.

There is not a Scripture that teaches his millions proposition. It is purely a guess, which will probably prove true, but is nowhere taught in the Scriptures, either expressly or impliedly; and therefore should not be taught to the public, much less as the message of the hour and the Gospel of the Kingdom, though it would not be out of order among Truth people to discuss it as a probably true guess, but nothing more.

The writer of The Harp did not show the wisdom of the writer of The Studies, who avoided explanations on subjects that could not, in the space available for them, be clearly and convincingly given, and who therefore left these undiscussed, until they could be given adequate and convincing treatment. Lacking this wisdom, J.F.R. gives so brief statements on immortality (p. 41), the soul (p. 28), the Great Company (p. 80), immersion (p. 188), etc., that no thinking person holding opposite views could be adequately instructed unto real conviction. The Harp by what it says and leaves unsaid carries on the propaganda of many of J.F.R.'s errors, on which we have already in this treatise given full explanation. In teaching so many wrong things in The Harp, J.F.R. has given additional proof that he as "that evil servant" (Matt. 24: 48-51) is eating and drinking with the drunken, and has been cut off from the Little Flock, and as "the foolish and unprofitable shepherd" (Zech 11: 15-17) his right eye is continuing to darken. Some of our dear readers may ask, as has been told us they do, "Why does Brother Johnson devote so much space to criticism?" "Necessity is laid on" us. Our criticisms though plain are never of a *personal* or bitter kind; and are always with reference to official teachings and acts. We would ask our questioners, How could we as an under-shepherd in God's flock be faithful to the Lord, the Truth and the Brethren, if we remained silent while Satan through various leaders among the Truth people is seeking to undermine the Truth and the Divinely given methods for its service, to the injury of God's sheep? If we should cease to guard the flock from Satan's subtle attacks and fell purposes, would not the Lord raise up another to do what we failed to do?

Our writing on the parables of the pounds and the talents is not due to a belief on our part that our dear Pastor did not truthfully, sufficiently and clearly explain

them; for a calm study of his articles on these parables, especially as they are found in Z '06, 315-319; Z '10, 251; 313, 314; Z '14, 202-204, will convince the meek child of God that these presentations are true, sufficient and clear. Rather, our writing on the subject is due to the fact that some of the brethren are being troubled by two Tower articles (Z '23, 35-40; 67-73) that have denied our Pastor's interpretations of these parables, doing so with confidence-men-like protestations of not antagonizing any other's interpretation. The style and confused reasoning of the two articles convince us that they were written by the Society's president. It is not our design here to discuss in detail the parables of the pounds and the talents; rather, we wish to show the errors and wrong methods of reasoning that characterize the Tower articles under review. Particularly will we expose the false definitions that they give to various features of the parables and their misrepresentation of our Pastor's view on the meaning of the pound.

To make it appear that the light on the parable was not due until after 1918 and just before the Church would pass beyond the veil, presumably by 1925, and to make it appear that the parable's reckoning began since 1918, the article on the pounds (Z '23, 35, par. 9) interprets as teaching a type of the Church's present nearness to the kingdom the statement that introduces the parable of the pounds, "He spake a parable because he was *nigh to Jerusalem* and because they thought that *the kingdom of God should immediately appear*." That introductory statement in connection with the parable was intended to convey the reverse of the thought of the nearness of the kingdom, and hence cannot type the nearness of the kingdom. (Z '14, 202, par. 4.) It was given to show that those who thought that at their reaching Jerusalem which occurred Nisan 10, 33 A.D., the kingdom would be established, were wholly mistaken; for the kingdom was far in the

future, which thought, among other things, Jesus shows by the parable. Nor is it true that Jerusalem even usually types the kingdom in its rule over the earth. Usually it types Christendom. In connection with Jesus' approach to and entering into Jerusalem at the time connected with this parable, Jerusalem did not type the kingdom at all; but it stood representatively for Jewry (Matt. 23: 37-39; Luke 19: 41-44), and as such typed Christendom. We know this from the parallel dispensations, which show that as Jesus entered Jerusalem, A.D. 33, typically as King and exercised kingly authority in judgment against Jewry, so He typed how in the parallel He as King came in 1878 to *Christendom* and exercised kingly authority in judgment against Christendom, otherwise called Babylon (Matt. 16: 28; 21: 1-16; 23: 37-39). Hence the statement of their approaching Jerusalem has no reference whatever to the Lord's people after 1918, much less as being very near the kingdom. The event cannot apply to the Lord's *supposed* coming (a vagarious Rutherfordian coming) to His temple in 1918. He has been spiritually in His temple throughout the Gospel Age, as is seen from His walking amid the seven golden candlesticks (Matt. 28: 20; Rev. 1; 2; 3). He came in a personal way to the real temple in 1874 and to the nominal temple in 1878. What the article under review says about our Lord's (supposed) coming to His temple in 1918, has no other foundation than the Azazelian theories of the Society's president. Then the article under review speaks of the Church in the flesh coming to the temple condition in 1918. How absurd! From the beginning, the Church has been the temple of God (1 Cor. 3: 16, 17; 2 Cor. 6: 16; Eph. 2: 21; 2 Thes. 2: 4, etc.); and thus has from the beginning been in the temple condition. Additionally we may speak of the glorified Church—typed by Solomon's temple—as being in the temple condition when contrasting her with her condition in the flesh as in the

tabernacle condition typed by the tabernacle. But we may not contrast two of her periods in the flesh in that way.

Again, the first article (Z '23, 36, par. 1) speaks of our Lord's return in 1874, taking unto Himself His kingdom in 1914, and beginning to reckon with His servants in 1918, after His return (1874) and taking the kingdom (1914), and quotes to prove these thoughts the words, "when He was returned, having received the kingdom" (Luke 19: 15). Against such an application of these words especially two things may be said: (1) Greek grammar forbids such an application: for the participle "having received" is in the aorist (past) tense, and therefore proves that the action indicated in the participle "having received" occurred before the action indicated in the verb "was returned." Hence the kingdom—kingdom-authority, as our Pastor explains the use of the word here (see Berean comments on the verse)—was received before our Lord returned in 1874; and (2) the parable elsewhere shows (v. 12) that the purpose of our Lord's going away was to receive kingdom-authority and then afterward to return. These two reasons therefore forbid the application of the expression, "having received the kingdom," as referring to what He supposedly received in 1914. Furthermore we deny that our Lord first took unto Himself His great power and first reigned in 1914. When He returned in 1874 He already had the authority to reign as king (Ps. 45: 3, 4), which is also symbolized by the crown on the Reaper (Rev. 14: 14), who began to act as Reaper in 1874, as well as is taught in this parable (Luke 19: 12, 15). The first exercise of His kingly power—His beginning to take unto Himself His great power and beginning to reign—occurred in 1878 paralleling His typically taking this power and typically reigning the day of His entrance into Jerusalem (Rev. 11: 15-17). The especial acts by which this exercise of power and this reigning were

begun, were the casting off of Babylon and the raising of the sleeping saints. Not only do the parallels and subsequent world events prove this proposition; but it is also proved by the fact that the kingdom beyond the veil had to be existing and exercising power as a kingdom (Dan. 2: 44) before it could in 1914 stand up in the World War to overthrow Satan's empire (Dan. 12: 1).

The article under review fails to distinguish properly and therefore confuses what it should clarify on this subject. While the Lord's beginning to exercise His great power and His beginning to reign occurred in 1878, from that time forward He continually increased the exercise of His power and the sphere of His reign. A very important stage of such increase of exercise of power and rulership occurred in 1881 when He withdrew all exclusive favor from Babylon; another extension of these occurred in 1914. Such activities will increase when the symbolic earthquake sets in, and still further will they increase when the symbolic fire starts. In Jacob's Trouble it will take on a further increase, as will also be the case when the kingdom beyond the veil awakens the Ancient Worthies, establishes the earthly phase of the kingdom, and inaugurates the New Covenant. In a partial sense we may speak of each one of these steps as our Lord's taking His power unto Himself and reigning; but to single out 1914 as the date for the whole action or the beginning of the action, as the article under review does and attempts to prove, is a demonstrable error, as we have shown above. But this error is taught to support another error of the article, *i.e.*, that our Lord began in 1918 to fulfill the parabolic reckoning with His servants. The harvest gatherings and privileges of service prove that He has been reckoning with the Faithful from 1874 until the present time; and the harvest siftings prove that He began to reckon with the partially faithful and the utterly unfaithful in 1878

and has been continuing so to do ever since, even as our Pastor taught. Scriptures, Reason and Facts utterly overthrow the errors of the article under review on the point as to the time of our Lord's beginning to reckon with His servants after His return.

In Z '23, 36, pars. 3, 4, the first article under review, as the connection shows, applies the kingdom that was appointed to the disciples (Luke 22: 29) to their stewardship of the Lord's affairs while in the flesh. The next verse thoroughly refutes such an idea; for it shows that when they get the kingdom that was appointed them, they would sit on thrones and reign over the twelve tribes of the Millennial Israel, as well as share with the Lord in His glory (eating at His table), which of course will not happen until the Millennium.

While the first article under review professes not to antagonize any other's interpretation (Z '23, 35, par. 8), it attempts to refute our Pastor's explanation of it (page 36, par. 6). But in the attempt it grossly misrepresents what our Pastor meant when he spoke of "our justification" as the pound given to each of the ten servants. In other words, either because its writer and the other Tower, editors are grossly ignorant of our Pastor's understanding of the pound, or are wilfully perverting it, the article attempts to refute his thought by using the words "our justification" as the pound in a different sense from our Pastor's use of them as the thing meant by the pound, and then the article proceeds to give three reasons against this misrepresentation of our Pastor's thought as a proof that his thought is untrue, and as a consequent reason for seeking another definition of the pound, *i.e.*, it sets up a man of straw and then kicks it over. This straw-man performance will become apparent from the following explanations: As the word, sanctification, means first an action—a setting apart, and second the product of that action—a holy condition of heart and mind, so the words "our justification" mean first an

action—God's freeing us from the Adamic condemnation and reckoning us perfect, and second the product of that action—our human all reckoned perfect and made acceptable for sacrificial purposes. Our Pastor's uses of the words "our justification" as his understanding of the pounds of the parable, prove that he uses the words "our justification" as the definition of the pound, not to mean God's action in freeing us from the Adamic condemnation and in reckoning us as perfect, but in the sense of the product of that action—our human all reckonedly perfect and made acceptable for sacrificial purposes. How often he shows this to be a sense in which he used that term, when explaining the words of Rom. 12: 1, "present your bodies ... holy, acceptable ... your reasonable service!" In proof of the fact that this is his thought we suggest that our readers compare Z '06, 316, par. 1 with Z '14, 203, par. 2. If the words "our justification," as the pound, meant God's *judicial* act of forgiveness through Christ's merit, we could give not only three, but at least a dozen reasons to prove that it could not be the pound of the parable. But our dear Pastor was too deep and clear a thinker to set forth such a foolish definition of the pound—a definition which for many reasons breaks down under the requirements of the parabolic pound. What he meant is clear from what he wrote on the subject of what God's justifying us does with our human all, and on the subject of the pounds in the above-cited paragraphs and in other articles—that the pound represents our human all reckoned perfect and made acceptable for sacrificial purposes. Without naming our Pastor, the article under review seeks to disparage his misrepresented definition (and on this point goes back on the definition that it misrepresents as his) by the claim that our justification is *ours*, not God's, and therefore cannot be the pound, because the pounds according to the parable belong to the Lord. This argument we deny—

our human all reckoned perfect and made acceptable for sacrificial purposes belongs to God, because before (Heb. 10: 14) He really—vitalizedly—justified us—actually reckoned us perfect and thus made us acceptable for sacrificial purposes—we gave Him our human all in consecration, and immediately after vitalizing our justification He accepted our human all as reckoned: perfect and acceptable for sacrificial purposes.

This, then, is the pound—our justification understood as our human all reckoned perfect and made acceptable for sacrifice. This definition stands every requirement of the parable. The pound is the same in all—thereby all God's servants are given an absolutely equal thing. The sacrificial uses of this pound in proportion to the different degrees of faithfulness in the servants have produced different results, causing some to have tenfold fruitfulness—the ten gained pounds represent, not ten acquired human alls reckoned perfect and acceptable for sacrificial purposes, but greatest increased fruitfulness—some to have average fruitfulness, etc. For such varying fruitfulness resulting from varying degrees of faithfulness we would naturally expect, even as the parable teaches, the Lord to render appropriate different degrees of rewards—ten cities, five cities, etc. Before showing how the pound of the unfaithful servant could be given to another we desire to make some further explanations.

The second article under review (Z '23, 67-73) in its definitions, makes no distinction between the pounds and the talents, defining them both as being all the Lord's kingdom interests committed to His servants. The fact that each was given the same amount from the standpoint of the pounds and the fact that the amounts of the talents differed in proportion to the differing abilities of the servants, prove that the pounds and the talents are not the same things. The fact that the talents are apportioned according to each; recipient's ability, proves unanswerably that they

represent opportunities of service. Why? Because the reason that God has for making His servants have different positions—functions or opportunities for service—in the body, is based solely on their different abilities. These abilities consist of three classes of things: (1) the measure of the Holy Spirit in each one; (2) the measure of human capacities, attainments, possessions, etc., in each one; and (3) the measure of the providential situation of each one. Each of these three things is of different value in Jehovah's estimation. He values the first more highly than the second and the second more highly than the third; but figures in each servant their respective values for service in the body in such a way as to make their total value for His purposes in the body determine the place or function that He gives each one in the body of Christ. That place in the body constitutes that person's opportunities of service, just as the nature of each of our bodily organs constitutes its function—its opportunity of service. Consequently we see that the talents varying with the varying abilities of each one, must represent opportunities of service and not all the Lord's kingdom interests on earth. Z '23, 70, par. 7 gives as the definition of the abilities of the servants only what comes under the first of the three lines of abilities as given above—in other words, with usual Rutherfordian superficiality it gives an incomplete definition, one that covers only one-third of what the true definition covers. This is one among many illustrations of the poor analytical powers of the Society's president.

The ten entrusted pounds of the one parable correspond quite closely to the second and third classes of the abilities of the other parable—the measure of human capacities, etc., and the measure of the providential situation—plus their being reckoned perfect and made acceptable for sacrifice, which makes their possessors all have an equally valuable entrustment in God's sight. This point is necessary to keep in

mind for a variety of reasons: (1) it is a fact, and (2) it enables us to see how the parable can say that the pound of the unfaithful servant was given to the most faithful servant. Remembering that the *entrusted* ten pounds—not the gained pounds—represent each servant's human all reckoned perfect and made acceptable for sacrifice, and that this human all consists first of the human capacities, attainments, possessions, etc., of each servant, and second of the providential situation of each servant, and remembering that the slothful and wicked servant represents the Great Company, we can see how, from the standpoint of speaking of a part of a thing for its whole, the pound can be taken from the one and given to the other. In the first place, that part of the pound that consists of acceptableness of the human all for sacrificial purposes is taken entirely away from the Great Company; for its humanity ceases to be a part of the Lord's antitypical Goat. In the second place, God changes their providential situations so that they are not in a sacrificial environment. In the third place, through chastisements He takes away more or less of their human all. Henceforth lacking *essential* features of the pound, they may properly be spoken of as having had their pound taken from them! The activities and environments of such persons since 1878, both in the nominal church and in the harvest siftings among the Truth People, prove that they have from the above-mentioned standpoints lost their pound—that the Lord has taken it away from them. However as long as they retain their place in the Great Company, they still retain the robe of Christ's righteousness; but they have spotted it badly. The Lord gives the pound taken from the slothful, to the faithful servants, by giving them the others' human capacities, attainments, providential situations made acceptable for sacrifice.

For example, doubtless Mr. Barbour lost his crown sometime before April 16, 1878, when, as the parallel of

Judas, he betrayed the Lord. One of his attainments was proficiency in editing, and one of his providential situations was freedom from pre-occupation for controlling, a Truth paper. As the Lord was taking these away from him, by giving him several associate editors and by giving our Pastor executive charge of the paper, He was giving our Pastor the attainments and providential situation not previously had by him whereby he could edit and control such a paper. In this way, as well as in others, He took away Mr. Barbour's pound and gave it to our Pastor. It is easy to point out in various ways as touching the talents as distinct from the pounds, how when certain persons forfeited their opportunities of service, these fell to his lot to have. More than once certain ones at the Bible House being displaced during siftings, their work temporarily at least fell to his lot to perform; and this is also true respecting the larger opportunities of service that other persons forfeited, *e.g.*, when certain associated editors, notably his helpmeet, forfeited their editorial work, it fell to his lot to perform it all; also some of their pertinent human capacities—the pound—he was enabled by the Lord to cultivate, thus gaining their pound. A notable and overshadowing instance in which the Lord took away both the pounds and the talents from the Great Company in the Truth as a class, and gave them to the Little Flock as a class, occurred in connection with His removing from the former certain human attainments, possessions, providential situations and opportunities for service—thus both pounds and talents—and giving these to the Little Flock for Jordan's first smiting from 1914 to 1916.

From the above considerations we can readily see how our Pastor's interpretations of the pounds and the talents stand all the tests of Scripture Truth: they are in harmony with (1) themselves, (2) all Scripture passages, (3) all Scripture doctrines, (4) God's character, (5) the Ransom, (6) the purposes of the

Bible and (7) facts; while the contrary interpretations of the Society's president were occasioned either by a deplorable misunderstanding or a wilful perversion of our Pastor's thought on the pounds, are based on incomplete and insufficient definitions, are presented in hypocrisy as not antagonistic to another's interpretation, are set forth in revolutionism, were engendered by a lack of meekness and humility toward that Servant, are given as a part of a program for the spread of errors in teaching and practice invented by Azazel.

In the May 15, 1923, Tower appears an article entitled *The New Creature*, which we will here briefly review. Any use that its writer may make of a truth that he has not yet lost may properly be looked upon as used in the same general way as Papists use Scriptural teachings—directly or indirectly to palm off, wittingly or unwittingly, Satanic perversions of the Truth. Those who do not recognize this as the use that Satan is making of "that evil servant" and "foolish, unprofitable shepherd," are either babes in the Truth or are under the influence of spiritual opiates. The inability to see the erroneousness of the article in question is first-class evidence of the possession of undeveloped, or of stunted and blunted spiritual perceptive powers on the part of a New Creature.

The fundamental error of the article is the pet error of "that evil servant" his denial of Tentative Justification. It is because the Truth on Tentative Justification implies the truthfulness of our Pastor's teachings on the nature, office and place of repentance, conversion and faith in relation to justification, and on the nature of the things sacrificed in consecration, and because "that evil servant" denies the Truth on Tentative Justification, that he must perforce advance false or insufficient definitions on the office, relation and working of repentance, conversion, faith and the things sacrificed in consecration. Whoever logically holds the Scripture Truth on Tentative and Vitalized Justification

will, generally speaking, be free from the spiritual contagion that holds "that evil servant" in its grasp as a fevered victim (Ps. 91: 6). We have from various standpoints in Vol. IV, Chapter V, refuted his views on that subject, and will not here repeat these refutations.

We should always watch the definitions that are offered us on Scriptural subjects; for therein lurk the seeds of error in the teachings of a false prophet. The article under review offers some one-sided, and therefore misleading definitions of *mind* and *heart*. According to this article, the mind means only the knowing "faculty" and its contents—knowledge, and the heart means only the feeling "faculty" and its contents—the affections. Accordingly, the article uses the word *repentance* to mean a change of mind in the sense of a change of one's knowledge! Mere novices in Biblical knowledge are aware of the fact that, in addition to meaning the knowing faculty and its contents, the word *mind* frequently in the Bible means the disposition (Rom. 7: 25; 12: 2; Col. 2: 18; Phil. 2: 5, etc.). No wonder such an incomplete definition of the word *mind* moves J.F.R. to define repentance, as he does in the example that he gives, as a change of mind in the sense of a change from the wrong knowledge endorsing evolution to the true knowledge that one is a sinner and needs a Savior. The word *repentance* means much more than a change from wrong to right knowledge as to one's moral state. It means not only a change from a wrong to a correct knowledge as to sin and righteousness, but also a change of disposition from a love of, and pleasure in sin to a sorrow for, and a hatred and abandonment of sin, and also from a hatred and avoidance of righteousness to a love and practice of righteousness. Anything short of this is not a Biblical repentance. It implies a "godly sorrow" that "worketh repentance to salvation not to be repented of" (Matt. 3: 8; Luke 10: 13; Luke 15: 7; Acts 8: 22; Rev. 3: 2, 3, 19; 2 Cor. 7: 9-11). Every case of a

genuine repentance mentioned in the Bible implies a change of disposition, as can be seen in the case of Joseph's brethren, various national repentances of Israel, David, Manasseh, Nineveh, the woman who washed Jesus' feet with her tears, the prodigal son, Peter, etc. Our experiences corroborate this.

Again, he defines conversion as changing one's course from a life of self-righteousness. He does not say to what the change is made, except that it is to a different course; but he assures us that even after one's conversion he does not yet know what he must do [presumably, to come into harmony with the Lord]; that it is only *later* on that he learns that he is alienated from God, and what are the terms of his coming into harmony with God. According to this thought, the conversion that this article teaches is that part of the Biblical repentance that decides to give up sin and to do right, before one has learned to believe that God will forgive him his sins [tentatively], if he accepts Jesus as his Savior. Such a conversion is poorer in contents than even the conversion of revivalists who make it consist of "repentance toward God and faith in our Lord Jesus." Conversion, as the Bible teaches it, is the entire process of turning from depravity into the image of God, and is a lifelong work. J.F.R. has not only forsaken the Truth definition of conversion (Berean Comments, Acts 3: 19), but has fallen into deeper error on the subject than has the Nominal Church. To supplement the one-sided and incomplete definition of the heart offered by the article—the faculty of the feelings and its contents—the affections and motives [presumably, not the motives that come from the intellect]—we add that the word *heart* is also frequently used in the Bible to mean the *will*, as the following passages prove: Matt. 15: 18, 19; Mark 3: 5; Luke 8: 15; 21: 14; Acts 7: 51; 11: 23; Rom. 2: 29; 10: 9, 10; 1 Cor. 4: 5; 7: 37; 2 Cor. 9: 7; 1 Thes. 2: 4; Heb. 4: 12; Rev. 2: 14.

Again the article under review teaches that one at consecration comes to exercise faith in Jesus' blood as the merit which works forgiveness of his sins. This is a palpable error contradictory of the Bible, which sets forth faith in Christ's blood for [tentative] forgiveness as the immediate antecedent of Tentative Justification (Rom. 3: 25, 26; 4: 1-10, 22, 23; 10: 4; Acts 16: 30, 31; Gal. 2: 16); contradictory of the experience of at least a billion of believers throughout the Gospel Age, who believed on Jesus' death for the forgiveness of their sins, and who were thereby introduced into a measure of peace with God, though they never consecrated; and also contradictory of the experience of all consecrated persons, except those few who like our Pastor cannot remember a time when they were not consecrated. This error, that one at consecration comes to believe that he is forgiven for Jesus' sake, J.F.R. has been driven to accept, because of his false doctrine that it is at the gate of the antitypical Court that one consecrates. The sword-thrust on this line has blinded his right eye on this subject as well as on other subjects. How true that his defense of his errors against attacks from the standpoint of various truths drives him to give up those opposing truths! It is in this way that each sword-thrust increasingly blinds him.

Most palpable is his confusion on the Sarah covenant and on the covenant of sacrifice. He makes them the two parts of *one* covenant and that in the sense of a contract! He, therefore, says that Jehovah and we enter into the contract relations of this covenant. In refutation of this error, we would say: Biblical covenants are of two kinds: (1) promises binding but one party to another, and that unconditionally, and (2) contracts binding both parties to them to certain conditions. The covenant with Noah (Gen. 9: 15; Is. 54: 9) is an example of the former, the Mosaic covenant of the latter kind (Gal. 3: 18-21). Our covenant of

sacrifice is not a part of a contract. It is an unconditional promise on our part, binding us alone, and is produced by such appreciation of God's *past*, not future, favors as worked in us a consecrating faith in, and love for God, obligating us unconditionally to do anything that God desires of us, even unto death (Ps. 50: 5; Rom. 12: 1). The covenant of sacrifice was made by us to God as an unconditional promise, and not by God to us. On the other hand, as a totally different covenant, God made the Sarah covenant (Gen. 22: 17, 18) as an unconditional promise—not a contract—to the Seed—those who are of the Christ (Gal. 3: 16, 28), as they before becoming the Seed—parts of the Christ—made the covenant, or promise of sacrifice to God, *i.e.*, their consecration vows.

To claim that the covenants operating between God and us are the two parts of one contract binding each side to certain conditions, on the fulfillment of which certain advantages flow to God and to us, shows an utter misunderstanding of the covenant of sacrifice—our consecration vows—and of the Sarah covenant, which are two separate covenants,—both of them being unilateral and unconditional promises (Gal. 3: 20). Such a view as the article under review presents destroys the unilateral character of each of these covenants and necessitates a mediator to make the contract operative; because God would not enter into a *contractual* covenant with imperfect beings without a mediator (Gal. 3: 20). As we unconditionally promised God out of appreciation of His *past* favors—(Rom. 12: 1)—*and not as a condition of obtaining the High Calling*—to do anything that He may desire, so God greatly appreciated this spirit of devotion to Him, and out of this appreciation begat of His own Spirit us who had this spirit of devotion to Him, and gave us who have and keep that spirit of devotion to Him (Heb. 3: 14) certain features of the unconditional promises of Gen. 22: 17, 18. These promises insofar

as they apply to the Christ class are the Sarah covenant, which is made only to those who have and keep the spirit that prompted their consecration, and it is absolutely unconditional to them. And it belongs to no others; for it belongs to those only who are in *Christ*. Consequently there are now two covenants operating: one of sacrifice—our consecration vows—that we made to God unconditionally (Ps. 50: 5; Rom. 12: 1), and one—the Sarah covenant or promise—that God made to the Faithful; for the Faithful alone are the Seed, the Christ (Gal. 3: 15-18, 29). Thus there are unconditional promises binding God to the Seed, and unconditional promises binding the Seed to God; but these two sets of promises are not two parts of a contract; for each is bound to the other by an unconditional promissory covenant—not by a contractual covenant.

Finally, the article offers some confusion as to what we give to the Lord in consecration. It denies that we give Him our will, our mind, our heart or anything else except our imputed human right to life. If this were true, we would give Him no actual present possession, only a prospective possession. Biblically, we presented to Him our heart in the sense of our will (Prov. 23: 26); we presented to Him our human all—all that we are and have and all that we hope to be and have as human beings, implied in the term "bodies" (Rom. 12: 1); and we presented to Him ourselves, and renew the presentation every day (2 Cor. 8: 5). Thus we not only presented to Him our tentatively imputed right to life with the [tentatively] imputed life rights that go with that right to life—things that we did not actually have—but we also presented to Him what we actually had and were, not simply what we were [tentatively] imputed to be and have and are actually now imputed to be and have. It is self-evident from experience, as well as from Scripture, that we offered to give Him what we were and had, and

not simply what we might hope as human beings actually to be and have, but which we will never get; for let it be remembered that the right to life and the life-rights are not actually given to us, but only imputed to us; for if they had been given to us, we would actually have become perfect. Experience teaches us that we *presented* for sacrifice actualities, as well as [tentatively] imputed things and hopes, which under the terms of our consecration will never be ours except as we now have them imputatively. What we were and had, having been presented to God and then made acceptable by the imputation of Christ's merit, God after accepting our sacrifice at Christ's hand by the Spirit begettal, contrary to the teaching of the article under review, gave us back our human all, in the sense of a *stewardship*, for use according to His will for His cause. This is shown in the parable of the pounds. Each one has committed to him as a stewardship that which in consecration he offered to give to God, plus that which Jesus' imputation made it in God's sight—a reckonedly perfect humanity acceptable for sacrifice—the pound. J.F.R. denies this in the article under review. His denial explains the reason for his rejecting our Pastor's definition of the pound and his substituting "kingdom interests" as the definition of the pound—all of which is due to his denial of Tentative Justification. In the Tower for Sept. 1, 1923, he published an article entitled "Methods of Deceit." Generally speaking, up to its last page he described the studied deceitfulness of perverters of the Truth so accurately that he, as the guiltiest of them, must have made an exhaustive study of his own "methods of deceit," and then described them as though they were those that he desires his readers to believe are practiced not by himself, but by those who teach contrary to him, the special mouthpiece and controller of the Society, God's supposed channel for the Priests' faith and work; for who among Truth people have

been tossed to and fro by various winds of doctrine more than those who have accepted his increasingly perverse teachings? Who has more deceitfully contradicted our Pastor's teachings than he? Who has sought to make our Pastor appear as an advocate of perversions of his own teachings more than "that evil Servant"? Who has attempted to palm off "original" teachings (original with Satan) as meat in due season, in an attempt to set aside the real meat prepared by our Lord through our Pastor, than he? Who among Truth people has presented "darkness in advance" more than he? Who, making capital of our Pastor, has given him the Judas kiss while betraying, him in many of his teachings, in his charter, will and in many of his arrangements, more than the foolish, unprofitable shepherd? What teacher among Truth people has been more guilty than he of the charge implied in the following sentence of his, "The logical deduction they draw from their findings is that the Lord deluded Bro. Russell in permitting him to believe a lie"? Who "instead of dispelling doubt by a re-examination of Bro. Russell's writings" has made an endeavor "to prove the *new* [italics his] views and ideas to be Scripturally correct" more than he? Who has shown more of "a growing disregard or neglect of what that Servant has written" than he? If "a denial or reversal of formerly held truths is naturally suggested to those having a morbid desire for novelty," what teacher among the Lord's people on the basis of such a principle has a larger "morbid desire for novelty" than he? Who by "reputation of channel" has "rushed off their feet" more brethren than he? Whose official conduct, onward from the time he drew up by-laws intended to give him all our Pastor's powers in the Society, betrayed "desire, ambition, grudge or other item of selfishness" greater than his? If "disruptive doctrines smack of slight of men" and devils, whose disruptive doctrines have smacked thereof more than his? We

know of no one among the teachers of the Lord's people, appointed through our Pastor, who has done worse in anyone of these particulars than "that evil Servant." The items and passages with respect to which he has rejected our Pastor's teachings and interpretations and on which he has substituted "new views" mount into the *thousands*, and according to the Bible will continue to increase unto complete darkness.

In this article we will point out with pertinent refutations the increasing darkening of his right eye on the New Creature and death, and on the parables of the ten virgins and the sheep and goats. On the matter of the New Creature and death he raises the question (Z '23, 247, 248) as to a faithful Christian who dies "Does the New Creature die?" He answers, Yes. The question itself should have been stated otherwise to bring out the two answers rightly belonging to it. The answer given is misleading, because it conveys a partly mistaken and a largely misleading thought. The "method of deceit" in the treatment of the question lies in the fact that the writer uses the term, New Creature, as though it had only one meaning—the person who is Spirit-begotten; whereas the Bible uses the term to mean two things: (1) the *person* who is begotten of the Spirit (2 Cor. 5: 17), and (2) the *holy powers* begotten and the *holy qualities* produced in the person who is begotten of the Spirit (Gal. 6: 15; compare with Gal. 5: 6, which proves that the term *New Creature* in Gal. 6: 15 means the holy powers begotten, and the holy qualities developed in the person who is begotten of the Spirit). Of course the New Creature in the first sense, *i.e.*, the person who has been begotten of the Spirit, dies when a faithful Christian dies. Every passage that is quoted in the article under review, and that proves that the New Creature dies, refers to the New Creature in the sense of the first definition above given to the word But not one of those passages refer

to the New Creature in the second sense of the word as given above.

What answer should be given to the question as to whether the New Creature dies, if the word *New Creature* is used in the second sense of the word? In harmony with our Pastor's constant teaching, we reply: Yes and No. If the person falls into the second death class, his New Creature dies before his natural man dies; but a person's New Creature never dies, if he is faithful unto death. The person who sins the sin unto death by that very sin annihilates the New Creature in the second sense of the word, both as to the holy qualities developed, and as to the holy powers begotten in him. But when a faithful Christian dies, the New Creature in the second sense of the word does not die—these holy powers and qualities do not pass out of existence. They exist; but are not active or conscious, since their activity would require an organism, which the New Creature, in the second sense of the word does not have between death and the resurrection. Just as our new-creaturely powers and qualities continue to exist, but are inactive and unconscious while we are asleep, so have they continued to exist, though inactive and unconscious, while the faithful were in death throughout the Age. These new-creaturely powers and qualities of the faithful continue to exist in death for two reasons: (1) they are realities, actually *created* things—real "*New Creatures*"—not mere abstractions; and (2) these powers and qualities, which constitute the character of the faithful, have maintained the right to live on the Divine plane with the life-rights that go with that right to live. But that which has the right to live never in Jehovah's order of affairs dies except sacrificially, like our Lord's and the Church's humanity, or constrainedly, as in the case of the Great Company's humanity, or ministerially, as in the case of the Ancient and Youthful Worthies after the next Age. But the new-creaturely right to life and

its life-rights are not sacrificially given up unto death; only the human right to life and its life-rights are. Consequently the New Creature, in the second sense of the word, from and on account of the two viewpoints just given, does not die, either when the faithful Christian dies, or when a Great Company member dies, or when during the Little Season the Ancient and Youthful Worthies die. Such a thought really militates against the Ransom; for if Jesus' New Creature, His holy powers and qualities, died, one might ask whether His New Creature died the Adamic, the Sacrificial, the Constrained, the Ministerial or the Second death—all the deaths we know of. Not the Adamic, for the New Creature was begotten of God; not the Second Death; for that would make Jesus a sinner. Would the Tower teach that Jesus as a New Creature died sacrificially? This would be to deny the Ransom, and would be similar to the Nominal Church view that Jesus died as, a "God-man" and that He gave more than just a human life as the ransom-price and if it should teach that He died the constrained death of the Great Company, or the post-Millennial ministerial death of the Ancient and Youthful Worthies, it would also deny the Ransom, which requires the sacrificial death of a perfect human being as the corresponding price for Adam.

In Studies, Vol. III (190-197), etc., our Pastor presents a Scriptural, reasonable and factual interpretation of the parable of the ten virgins. Being familiar to our readers, it needs no repetition here. Professing, as in his treatment of the pounds and talents, not to be antagonistic to our Pastor's interpretation, J.F.R. sets forth in Z '23, 291-297 an interpretation of the parable of the ten virgins that, for the reasons that he claims require it, is utterly subversive of our Pastor's interpretation and cannot for the chronological reason given as requiring it, be held in common with our Pastor's. He sets forth the following claims: That the parable

could not begin to have a fulfillment until between 1914 and 1918; that all the consecrated slumbered and slept when Christ delayed to deliver the Church in 1914; that the cry, "Behold the Bridegroom," was fulfilled at the Cedar Point Convention in 1919; that the wise virgins went forth with joy [oil in their vessels] to meet the Bridegroom from then on in the various drives of the Society; that the foolish virgins do not go into these services with joy [oil in their vessels] hence do not go into the marriage with Him; that those faithfully doing "the Channel's" work will as wise virgins go in with the Bridegroom; that then the Kingdom door is closed; that the others repent, but too late—all because they did not joyfully enter into the Society's drives! The chief thought that, as a characterization of this interpretation, wells up in the mind of one familiar with our Pastor's interpretation, is that such an explanation is childish, flat and vagarious.

To make this "new view" seem plausible, the following are some of the perversions that the article presents: that the disciples asked the questions, "When shall these things be?" and "What is the sign of thy presence, and of the end of the world?" (Matt. 24: 3), because they desired to know when Jesus would deliver them and the rest of the Church *as His bride*—a phase of the mystery of which they then understood nothing, it being first revealed to St. Paul; that the goods committed to that wise and faithful servant were kingdom interests, whereas it was the storehouse of Truth; that the word "then" in Matt. 25: 1 means after 1914 instead of the Time of the End; that the evil servant is a class instead of an individual (a view that logically makes the wise and faithful servant a class as the Society now teaches to be the case); that all the virgins were anointed (a thing true of the wise only; for the Great Company, though receiving the begetting, does not have the anointing); that oil symbolizes joy, whereas it symbolizes (1) the Holy Spirit

as a whole (Ps. 23: 5; compare with Acts 10: 38; Ex. 29: 2), and then severally in its various powers and qualities, and therefore joy only as one of these (Lev. 8: 12; Is. 11: 2, 3; Ps. 45: 7; Is. 61: 3; Ps. 133: 1, 2); and (2) the Word of God (Jas. 5: 14; Ex. 25: 6; Zech. 4: 12); that virgins are *wise* because of joyfully doing the Lord's will (which means the Society's work), instead of having the Truth and the ability tactfully to apply it; that virgins are *foolish* because of not joyfully doing the Lord's will (which means the Society's work), instead of having error and acting in harmony with it; that the lamps "represent the will of God as expressed toward His children," whereas they represent the Bible; that *all* of the virgins have as their lamps "a knowledge of the expressed will of God concerning them, as set forth in the details of the Divine plan," whereas this is true of the wise only; that the Bridegroom tarried in respect to delivering the Church, whereas the tarrying was with respect to His second coming; that an especial trial on the Church began Oct., 1917—"the beginning of 1918"—instead of June, 1917, which is not referred to in the parable; that the expression, all slumbered and slept, means that some slumbered and the others slept; and that the virgins trimming their lamps means the Society's adherents studying the Scriptures to find out that Elijah was transubstantiated into Elisha in 1918 and 1919!

The reason why he is forced to abandon our Pastor's interpretation is that in the interests of his own original patented gospel of the kingdom—"Millions now living, etc."—he abandoned our Pastor's interpretation of Matt. 24: 4-14 as giving a summary of the events of the Gospel Age, and applies these verses to the present period. Keeping this thought in mind, we see that as a matter of course he cannot, as our Pastor did, apply the parable to the Second Advent movement beginning in 1829 and culminating with the sending away of the Great Company from the closed door.

He has failed to see that a comparison of Matt. 24: 3; Mark 13: 4 and Luke 21: 7 proves that the disciples asked *four*, not three questions: (1) when would the temple be destroyed—"When shall these things be?" (2) what special sign-propheesied event—would follow the destruction of the temple and precede the sign of the *parousia*—"What sign [prophetically fulfilled event, is one of the meanings of this word] will there be when these things [the events connected with the destruction of the temple] shall [have] come to pass?" (3) what would prove His second presence—"What shall be the sign of Thy presence?" and (4) what would prove the harvest time of the Age—"and of the end [synteleia, summing up, consummation] of the world [age]?"

In Luke 21: 8-24, Jesus gives the answer to the first question; in Matt. 24: 4-14; Mark 13: 5-14 with its special feature in Matt. 24: 14 and in Mark 13: 10, Jesus gives the answer to the second question; and in the rest of the discourse of Matt. 24, Mark 13 and Luke 21, Jesus answers the third and fourth questions, Matt. 25, as well as portions of Matt. 24, Mark 13 and Luke 21, being added as a generous feast not asked for by the disciples but required to clarify the subject matter. In the Greek by the word *telos*, end (Matt. 24: 14; Mark 13: 7, 10; Luke 21: 9), Jesus points out the period Biblically called the Parousia from 1874 until what we recognize to be 1914; and in the Greek by the word *synteleia*, consummation, summing up (see A.R.V.), mistranslated *end* in Matt. 13: 39 and 24: 3, He points out the Harvest in its widest sense as including the Parousia and the Epiphany, 1874-1954, a part of which is the *telos*, end, or time or reaping, in the widest sense of that word. Repeatedly in this discourse Jesus refers to the *telos*—end—in distinction from the *synteleia*—Harvest as the summing up or consummation of the Age—thereby indicating in answer to the disciples' second question its connection with the special

sign asked for in the second question. The *telos* in its widest sense is a shorter period of time than the *synteleia*, because it is included in the *synteleia*, as its earlier part; but as distinct from the *synteleia*, the *telos* was the first part of the *synteleia*. In Mark 13: 10 (compare with Matt. 24: 14), Jesus shows that before the *synteleia* the Gospel would be preached among all nations; and in Matt. 24: 14 He shows us that the *telos* would be the time after the Gospel would be preached among all nations. Consequently our Pastor was right when he said that in the Bible, translated into all national languages, and sent to all the nations, was this testimony given to all nations. This was fulfilled by 1861 (A 91, par. 2) which was before the *synteleia*—the Harvest. The Modern Foreign Missionary Movement, which dates from Carey's organizing the first Foreign Missionary Society in 1792, and the Bible Societies, which date from 1804, were the agencies that did the main work of such Bible translation and spreading. Thus before the *telos* as the first part of the *synteleia* was this final proclamation made, just as Matt. 24: 14 says: "This gospel of the kingdom shall be preached in all the world [when the testimony would go forth for and unto a world-wide proclamation] ... then [after the time of such activities, which began in 1792 and culminated in 1861] shall the end come," which we know came in 1874.

Thus these passages give *the sign*—the world-wide Gospel proclamation made by the Bible, translated into the languages of all nations and sent to them—that was according to the second question to follow the temple's destruction; and according to Jesus' explanation many other events were to precede *this sign*, as well as the sign of His *Parousia* and the sign of the *Synteleia*. Doubtless the Lord told of the many events following those connected with the destruction of the temple and preceding *this sign* itself, in order to impress upon the disciples the thought that *this sign* would be in the

distant future, and in order to encourage amid those many events the brethren who would live after the temple's destruction and before *this sign* itself. *This sign* preceding the Harvest, that evil servant's whole setting of Matt. 24 and 25, which is to the effect that they refer to things after 1914, is upset thereby and does not have one leg upon which it and his own original patented gospel of the kingdom—"Millions, etc."—built upon it can stand.

But this time setting of this sign proves more. It proves that the "then" of Matt. 25: 1 may refer to the *telos* as distinct from the *synteleia*, *i.e.*, 1874-1914; or to the *synteleia*, 1874-1954, as distinct from the *telos* of 1874-1914; or to the Time of the End, *i.e.*, from 1799 to 1954. To determine which of these three time periods is covered by the "then" of Matt. 25: 1, we need the light of fulfilled prophecy as a reliable helper. And what do these fulfilled facts prove? They prove that the world-wide Second Advent movement, begun in 1829, reached the climax of its first stage by 1844 in the Bridegroom's beginning what seemed to the watchers to be a delay. Thereafter came the slumbering and sleeping until 1874; then the cry, "Behold [see] the Bridegroom!"—He is here; then the study of the Scriptures on the subject of the Second Advent—trimming the lamps; then the possession of the Truth—the lighted lamps—by some, and of error—the darkness of unlighted lamps—by others; then the wise virgins entered the open door of Harvesting opportunities with the Bridegroom, and continued so to do until the last ones entered it, 1914-1916; in the meantime the others have been and still are seeking the light, but obtain it too late to find an open door to entering into harvesting, because the reaping is ended. Evidently, therefore, the foolish virgins represent Great Company members who will get the Truth, obtaining it as they will after the Little Flock in its entirety had entered the open door. What do these

fulfilled facts prove with respect to the "then" of Matt. 25: 1? That it refers to the day of Jehovah's preparation; for it refers to events that began 45 years before the *telos* and *syntelesia* began. These are the actual "physical facts" of the case, while the events that the article under review calls the "physical facts" of the case are not only not referred to in the parable, but even for them to be given that plausibility which Satan always gives his errors, the symbols and statements of the parable must be wildly perverted in the manner that we have shown above. What a glaring and transparent illustration of such perversions is the teaching of the article in review, that the Bridegroom's coming occurred at the 1919 Cedar Point Convention in the revival of the Society's adherents' courage and in the inauguration of the Golden Age, *i.e.*, agitation and securing of subscriptions to start it, which were the things done there.

The refutation of his "new view" on the parable of the ten virgins is given in Matt. 25: 13, where Jesus interprets the scope and purpose of the parable immediately after giving it, in the following language: "Watch *therefore*, for ye know [beforehand] neither the day nor the hour wherein the Son of man cometh." This verse undeniably proves, by its connection, that it refers to our Lord's Second Coming, which occurred in 1874, *i.e.*, by the word "therefore" immediately following the parable and drawing the lesson that the parable was given to inculcate, it proves that the lesson that the parable was intended to convey is that Christ's followers were throughout the Gospel Age to be on the alert to expect Christ's Second Coming, whereas the "new view" makes the exhortation, which shows the parable's scope as teaching the necessity of expecting Christ's Second Advent, apply entirely *after* His Coming! The parable illustrates such watching and waiting for the setting in of His Second Coming by the oriental custom of virgins watching and waiting

for the coming of a bridegroom for and with his bride whom he had gotten from some distant place. See in the Diaglott a note on Matt. 25: 1 which illustrates this custom. This demonstrates that at least a part of this parable refers to events preceding the setting in of our Lord's Second Coming in 1874; while the "new view" allows no application of the exhortation to "Watch, therefore, etc." to anyone living before 1874 or even before 1914.

We will now discuss briefly his "new view" on the parable of the sheep and goats—gotten from Azazel, from whom he has gotten his thousands of other "new views." This new view is given in Z '23, 307-314, and Z '24, 381, 382. He claims that the parable refers to a passing of a decision on persons of Christendom in the end of the Age, hence before the Millennial reign of restitution is inaugurated; that the goats are the clergy—the shepherds—and their chief supporters—the politicians and commercial men as the principal of the flock; that the sheep are the unconsecrated of Christendom who are inclined to humility and righteousness; that the brethren of the parable are the Church. The decision, according to the parable, should be to life or to annihilation, as the characters of the persons concerned would require; but on this he wobbles and hedges, because he knows that such as he says are the sheep and the goats have not, in the vast majority of cases, progressed in character development or undoing far enough to fit them for everlasting life or everlasting destruction as the case would require, having never yet been on trial for life, which must precede a decision like that of the parable. This very fact should have unanswerably demonstrated to him that his "new view" of the parable is wrong; for it does not permit all his sheep to get the reward or all his goats to get the punishment from the Lord set forth in the parable.

We will now point out the crooked road of perversions

over which he had to travel, even to give such plausibility to his "new view" as to embolden him to believe that he could *fool* his readers into believing it. He pervertingly assumes as one of the things making necessary a "new view" that, as should be expected, the clergy and the principal of the flock have not been dealt with in either of the preceding parables; whereas these, as well as their partisan supporters and such others of the Second Death class as were not of the clergy, of the principal of the flock, or of their partisan supporters, were sufficiently dealt with a few days before when Jesus, in the pounds parable largely like that one which immediately precedes that of the Sheep and Goats, told of the slaying—some with the first, others with the second death—of his enemies who would not have Him reign over them (Luke 19: 27). He also pervertingly assumes, in the first and the second reasons that he gives for making a "new view" necessary, that the judging of the parable is the pronouncing of a decision only; whereas according to many Scriptures, including this parable, judging implies four processes connected with a trial for life: (1) instruction; (2) testing after opportunities for character-growth are given; (3) reformatory chastisement for measurably wilful failures under the trial; and (4) decision, favorable or unfavorable, as the case may require. He pervertingly assumes as his third reason for making a "new view" necessary that, the Church is meant by the brethren of this parable; whereas they are His *greatest* brethren being the greatest children of His Father, while the brethren of the parable are His *least* brethren. He pervertingly assumes as the fourth reason for making a "new view" necessary that, since the restitution class will derive life from Christ, they are not His brethren, despite the fact that God, as in Adam's case (Luke 3: 38), and as in the case of Adam's children, had he and they remained sinless, being the Source and Giver of perfect

life to all perfect creatures, is thereby their Father, regardless of His using agents to confer that life, and also despite the fact that the brethren of this parable are called His *least* brethren, which the faithful of the next Age will be. See Rotherham and both Revised Versions on this corrected translation. He pervertingly assumes as the fifth reason for making a "new view" necessary, that the perfection of the restitution class implies that they could not think that Jesus meant Himself personally when He spoke of their benefiting Him or not; whereas the fact of their trial at the end of that Age implies that they will be liable to mis-impressions or incomplete impressions. He pervertingly assumes as the basis of his sixth reason that all of the teachings and facts connected with a prophesied event are entirely given in one passage referring to such an event; whereas the Scripture states such things "here a little, there a little," and therefore the parable shows, not everything connected with the next Age and the Little Season following it, but as its main thought various kinds of conduct which, practiced during the Millennium, will determine the class in which one will find himself in the Little Season, while Rev. 20: 7-9 shows how the bad characters formed by the loveless ones during the Millennium, but not mentioned in this passage as having then been formed, will lead them to rebellion after the Millennium. He pervertingly assumes as the basis for his un-numbered seventh reason for making a "new view" necessary, that one cannot be spoken of from the standpoint of a former condition out of which he has forever passed, and therefore claims that those who become brethren in the Millennium cannot be meant, for the reason that these after becoming brethren will not be in prison; whereas the Scriptures do call persons what they no longer are on account of their once having been such, as, for instance, Jesus is called Michael (Dan. 12: 1) in an act entered into nearly 2,000 years after He had ceased

to be Michael, and Satan is called Lucifer —(Is. 14: 12-14) over 3,000 years after he ceased to be Lucifer. He pervertingly assumes that time considerations require his "new view"; whereas there is between this parable and the two preceding ones, or in this one nothing suggesting a *time connection* or suggesting that the decision of this parable is before the Millennial reign. He pervertingly assumes that the *coming* of our Lord with the Church to *reign* (Matt. 25: 31; compare with Matt. 19: 28) means the same as His coming with the Church to *punish* the wicked (Jude 14), the same as His being in His temple and giving the charge to *declare troublous times* (Is. 6: 1-11), which St. John's comment shows began early in both Harvests (John 12: 39-41), the same as His being seen with the saints on this and the other side of the veil *warring* (not *coming*, as he pervertingly assumes) with the Truth as a weapon against error (Rev. 19: 11-16), and the same as the saints executing vengeance, as described in Ps. 149: 5-9 (which they actually did while he in a long and unjustifiable absence from the service abstained from the work of smiting Jordan the first time, from 1914 to 1916). He pervertingly assumes definitions for the sheep and the goats that will not hold true of all of either of his classes when used in connection with the rewards and punishments given, *e.g.*, the majority of his goats—the clergy and the principal of the flock, not being begotten of the Spirit,, cannot go into the second death. He pervertingly assumes that the thoughts given in the three parables of this chapter are given by our Lord as the sign of His presence and the *synteleia*, Harvest (Matt. 13: 39; 24: 3), in answer to the questions asked by the disciples; whereas the sign of His presence is the Truth (Matt. 24: 27, 30) and the sign of the *synteleia* is the Harvest work; and whereas these two things come out only incidentally and subordinately to other lines of thought in the first two parables, and are not

referred to at all in the third parable. He pervertingly assumes as a basis for one of his arguments that a teacher's answer to a number of questions can contain only such thoughts as are asked for; whereas, like other good teachers when circumstances and necessity call for it, our Lord as a generous giver and painstaking helper gave His disciples more than they asked for, because circumstances and necessity called for it as helpful in a general way. He pervertingly assumes that the final decision is given at the end of this Age, yet hedges in such a way that he leaves as a final impression with his readers that it is not given until the end of the next Age, which wobbling overthrows his view. An interpretation based upon such and so many perversions as its necessary foundation must be false.

Briefly we will give seven lines of thought that demonstrate our Pastor's interpretation to be correct: (1) His interpretation makes this passage harmonious with itself, with all other Scriptures and Scriptural teachings, with God's character, Christ's ransom, and with facts and the Bible's designs, while the one we are refuting more or less contradicts every one of these seven axioms of Biblical interpretation. (2) The opening verse shows that Christ will not be seated on the throne therein referred to until the entire Little Flock is with Him—"all His holy angels with Him" (Col. 3: 4; Rom. 8: 17; 2 Tim. 2: 11, 12). (3) The gathering of all nations before Him is an individual and not a class affair; while class gatherings are assumed by the interpretation under view. (4) Their separation is also an individual and not a class affair, though this individual separation results in the individuals forming two classes; whereas the interpretation under review makes the separation begin with already formed classes, but makes it produce no other classes. (5) Christ's "*least* brethren" (the literal translation; see Rotherham, and the two Revised Versions, Young, etc.) are the restitution brethren, as His *greater* brethren in

an ascending scale are the angels, Spirit-born Youthful Worthies, Great Company, Ancient Worthies and Little Flock; while the interpretation under review cannot be made plausible without having as its basis the false translation of the A.V., "one *of the least* of these, my brethren." (6) All the faithful restitution class will, as the real sheep, inherit the earth at the end of the next Age; while not all of the sheep of the article under review are real sheep, and thus all of such sheep will not get the everlasting life on earth. (7) All of the goats are the incorrigible of the next Age and go with Satan and his angels into annihilation; whereas not all of the goats of the interpretation under review prove to be real goats, and thus all of its goats do not go into the same fate as the devil.

The first article of the Feb. 15 Tower, entitled "The Destiny Of The Goats," attempts to defend the "new view" of the Sheep and Goats, and, like every other new view that its writer presents, manifests the increasing darkening of his right eye, even as the Lord has foretold of him (Zech. 11: 15-17). By some half-truths he seeks to hide the real issues, and by multiplicity of sophistical words he succeeds in darkening counsel. He tries to evade the logical conclusion of his claim, *i.e.*, that his parabolic goats, being the clergy and the principal of the flock, must all go into the second death, by saying that the class as "*goats*," not the individuals constituting the goat class, will be destroyed. But how does this agree with the Lord's statements in the parable, "Then shall He say unto *them* [individuals of a class, not simply a class as such, distinct from the individuals constituting it]," "*ye* gave Me no meat," "*ye* gave Me no drink," "*ye* took Me not in," "*ye* clothed Me not," "*ye* visited Me not," "then shall *they* also [individuals, just like the righteous, a similarity to whose words is by the word 'also' expressly indicated] answer Him, when saw *we* Thee?" "Then shall He answer *them*, Verily I say to

you, Inasmuch as *ye* did it not unto one of these, My least brethren, *ye* did it not unto Me." "*These* shall go away into an everlasting cutting off; but the righteous into life eternal." The contrast in this last verse is annihilative of his sophistry. Here the righteous [all the individuals of the special class referred to] are contrasted with the wicked [all the individuals of the special class referred to]. The exact opposite classes [in all their individual members] are not only contrasted, but their eternal states are shown to be the exact opposites—all the individuals of the one class enter eternal life; therefore its opposite, eternal death, is entered by all the individuals of the opposite class. The distinction that he makes utterly breaks down in the presence of the personal and demonstrative pronouns that Jesus uses in describing the acts and words of those persons symbolized by the goats in contrast with the acts and words of those pictured by the sheep in view of their contrasted eternal states.

If he were consistent in the application of his distinction, he could not at all use the parable to teach the second death of the wicked and persecuting clergy and the principal of the flock; for there could be no reference at all to the second death in the parable from the standpoint of his distinction, *i.e.*, that they are destroyed as *goats*, but not as individuals, just as from the standpoint of a similar distinction the casting of the tares into the furnace of fire for their destruction *as tares* does not refer to the second death at all. Thus his attempted distinction applied to the goats destroys the use of the parable to prove his contention, *i.e.*, that the wicked and persecuting clergy and the principal of the flock go into the second death; for he makes the distinction to evade the conclusion that all his goats must go into the second death.

Again, in this article and in Z '24, 382 he tries to evade the force of the ransom argument 'as used against his position by his correspondents to the effect

that the ransom guarantees an *individual* trial for life for every human being, after releasing him from the Adamic sentence, his claim being that very many go into the second death without having the ransom merit imputed or applied for them, if they know of the ransom and persecute the Christ. One of the passages quoted against this new view by his correspondents is Rom. 5: 18. To evade the force of the objection, he confounds "the free gift" of this passage with the process of bringing people unto the Millennial justification of life and then at great length proceeds to argue that "a gift is a contract" and that receiving the free gift always requires a consenting acceptance from the receiver, and therefore he argues that the free gift is not given to everybody, despite the fact that the verse says "it shall come to *all men*." Even a superficial reading of the verse should manifest his sophistry in identifying the "free gift" with the process of being brought up to "justification of life." "The free gift [the forgiveness of sins; Rom. 5: 16: 'the free gift is from many offences'—Diaglott] came [shall come, as is evident from the words, '*shall* be made righteous' in the next verse] to all men *unto* [for the purpose of enabling them to use the opportunities its reception gives them to gain] justification of life." The next verse proves that the free gift means the cancellation of the Adamic sin and condemnation, for it gives the reason why this free gift shall come to *all men*: "for as by one man's disobedience *the* many were made sinners [partake of the Adamic sin], even so by the obedience of one *the* many shall be made righteous [of that sin, be forgiven the Adamic sin]." While many gifts do require a consenting recipient before their giving is consummated, his underlying assumption that every gift presupposes not only a giver, but a consenting recipient before the giving is consummated, is a superficial fallacy, as the following examples prove: God gave Adam, his race and every

other created thing the gift of existence without their consent. Sunshine, rain, cold, heat, day, night, seasons, etc., are also gifts not requiring the recipients' consent. So, too, in the case of the free gift referred to in Rom. 5: 18. It is the cancellation of the Adamic sin and condemnation which Jehovah will give the world when Christ applies the ransom merit for the world, and all in Adam will receive that gift without knowing it, and therefore without consenting to its reception *at the time*. It will be impossible for the majority to know of its bestowal until years afterward; for they will be dead long after the gift's bestowal.

He is similarly confused on 1 Tim. 2: 4-6. To defend his view that justification to life is not essential to a trial for life now and that the ransom doctrine does not guarantee its use for a Millennial trial of life with an accurate knowledge of the Truth for all not having had it in this life, he gives the expression, "God will [literally, willeth to] have all men to be saved," the same meaning that we as a Lutheran gave it before we came into the Truth, and when we thought that all men were on trial for life now, *i.e.*, that God *desires* the *eternal* salvation of all! These words have no reference whatever to *eternal* salvation; they refer, like Rom. 5: 18, 19, to *universal* salvation from the Adamic sentence, which, together with universal enlightenment, the passage says God is determined shall take place. Why do we say this? Because the passage says so, and then gives three guarantees as proving it: (1) the perfect character of God implied in His unity, "there is one God"; (2) the ransom, "the man Christ Jesus ... a ransom for all"; (3) the Gospel Age and the Millennial Age for its testimony to the Church and the world respectively, "the testimony in its own *seasons*."—Diaglott. The writer of the article under review in order to justify his error that people now go into the second death without having been justified to life (the antecedent to a trial for life now),

is detracting from the ransom. And to call, as he does, the mixture (supplemented by faintly understood and mostly misunderstood Truth witnesses from Truth people) that the Nominal Church gives sufficient knowledge to put unbegotten people into a position of responsibility for life or death eternal, so that many of them will have no trial after this life, is another proof of the darkening of his right eye. Not only Rom. 5: 18, 19 and 1 Tim. 2: 4-6, but numerous other Scriptures and the entire plan of God contradict, from the standpoint of the ransom and the exclusive trial of the Church now (the firstborns alone being now, in the night of antitypical Nisan 14, in danger of the second death), his new doctrine that many people before and since Pentecost without justification to life go into the second death.

He offers two examples as proofs that wilful sinners go into the second death without justification to life—Judas and the scribes and Pharisees. He thinks that Matt. 23: 33 proves it of the scribes and Pharisees. This passage, as our Pastor held (as can be seen from both quotations from him, given in the article under review but quoted as though they taught the "new view"), teaches no more than that they had so greatly undermined their characters that Jesus almost despaired of their recovery when brought to a trial for life in the Millennium. The passage does not say that they would not escape a sentence to Gehenna. It goes no further than to intimate that the Lord warns that they were in grave danger of not finding an escape from it. On the contrary these very Pharisees were foretold by the Lord as *seeing* (hence they will be alive again in the Millennium, and are therefore not now in the second death) Abraham, Isaac and Jacob, etc., as of the earthly phase of the kingdom and themselves debarred from such princeship, despite their delusion that they would be the foremost ones among

those princes (Luke 13: 28). Hence they are not now in the second death.

With Judas the case is different; for he had what God for the time being considered and treated as exactly equal to justification to life and the Spirit-begetting, *i.e.*, God in accepting the twelve and the seventy as Apostles and Prophets in the Church by the *pre-anointing* which He gave them (Matt. 10: 1; Luke 10: 19), shows that He had anticipatorily granted them justification to life; and by giving them these highest offices in the Church had set them in the Body. Thus He shows that He had put them on trial for life. He therefore, before Pentecost, caused their names to be written in the Lamb's Book of Life (Luke 10: 20; Heb. 12: 23). As a part of the Lord's Goat they were before Pentecost tied to the door of the Tabernacle. Therefore they could pray, "Our Father," and therefore on numerous occasions Jesus called God their Father. The ransom having already been put on the Altar (see comment in Berean Bible on Matt. 9: 2, etc.), and they being participants with the Lord in His office and sufferings, God must, under the conditions above mentioned, have anticipatorily given them justification to life. Hence any one of them by fully wilful sin before Spirit-begetting could have gone into the second death. But this danger of going into the second death before Spirit-begetting, was limited to these special 82 persons, a prerequisite for which was justification to life, the pre-anointing, the sharing in the two highest offices in the Church, as Jesus' special helpers and the writing of their names in the Lamb's Book of Life. Since no others had these privileges, they could not have had the dangers attending these privileges—the Gospel-Age dangers involved in being on final trial for life without Spirit-begetting. Hence Judas, believing and knowing that he was betraying the Messiah, made utter shipwreck of his privileges and went into the second death. But with the scribes

and Pharisees it was entirely different, even as our Pastor indicates in one of the article's quotations from his writings, when he says that not they, but Judas was the real crucifier and was more guilty than Pilate, the Roman soldiers, the Jewish rabble and the Sanhedrin; for they did not believe and hence did not know that Jesus was the Messiah (Acts 3: 17; 1 Cor. 2: 8); nor were they given the anticipatory justification to life; the pre-anointing, the offices of Apostles and secondarily prophets in the Body and enrollment in the Lamb's Book of Life. Hence their course toward the Lord, Truth and Righteousness, was not a final one. They yet have awaiting them through the ransom merit an opportunity for life, which will be undergone by them amid expiatory stripes and with little hope of reformation on the part of the more wicked among them. Exactly so will it be with those of the clergy and the principal of the flock who have not been justified to life and consequently have not been Spirit-begotten and hence are not now on trial for life, but who against more or less light have sinned against the Christ class. The scribes, Pharisees, clergy, principal of the flock and all other persecutors and mistreaters of the Christ class, who did not believe, and hence did not know the Messiahship of the Christ class, are all represented as salvable. This is evidenced by the man who carried out the bodies of the bullock and goat without the camp washing himself and becoming clean at the end of the atonement day (Lev. 16: 27, 28). Nor will the unbegotten wicked clergy, principal of the flock and others, who as the fit man persecuted the Great Company in 1918, for this persecution go into the second death (Lev. 16: 26), as the writer of the article under review claims, alleging such Great Company members to be the Little Flock, though doubtless some Little Flock members, mingling with the Great Company, did suffer persecution from the same persecuting persons. By the foregoing we are not to be understood

to mean that none of the clergy and the principal of the flock will during the Gospel Age go into the second death. On the contrary, those of them who have been Spirit-begotten and have for example become *sifting leaders* in any of the six siftings, will go into the second death, as is evident from the type (250 Levites) of those engaged in the fifth—the contradictionism—sifting (Num. 16: 35, 38; 1 Cor. 10: 10). Doubtless these as of antitypical Judas have persecuted and will persecute the true Church. For such Spirit-begotten ones we have no hope whatever. They will surely go into the second death; but they are not pictured forth by the parabolic goats, which represent those of the second death class who die at the end of the Millennium, but not those of that class who at 100 years are Millennial second deathers.

As his final and supposedly conclusive proof, the writer of the article under review cites 2 Thes. 1: 6-10, which he thinks applies only to the Time of Trouble; and which he claims teaches the punishment of the non-Spirit-begotten persecuting clergy, etc., with the second death in the Time of Trouble. But this text forbids such an application, which presupposes that the expression, "*shall come*" (v. 10), when applied to the Lord's Second Advent, and the expression, at the revelation of the Lord Jesus" (literal translation, v. 7) as used in these verses, are limited to our pre-Millennial time. As our Pastor frequently pointed out, the entire Millennium is frequently referred to as the period when He comes and of His revelation. The words "shall come" may also apply to the setting in of the Parousia, and the words, "shall come" and His "revelation" may also apply to the entire Parousia and Epiphany. Passages showing that the words "shall come," used of our Lord's Second Advent, apply to the entire Parousia, or Epiphany, or both, are, among others, the following: 1 Cor. 11: 26; Luke 12: 37; 21: 34; 1 Thes. 5: 2; 2 Pet. 3: 10; Jude 14. Passages

showing that the words, "shall come," used of our Lord's Second Advent, apply to the entire Millennium, are, among others, the following: Matt. 16: 27; 23: 39; 25: 31; Mark 8: 38-9: 10; Luke 17: 20. Passages which teach that the revelation of our Lord will be pre-Millennial, among others, are the following: Luke 17: 30; Col. 3: 4. Passages that refer to our Lord's revelation as both pre-Millennial and Millennial, are, among others, the following, the italics indicating those purely Millennial: Rom. 2: 5; 8: 18, 19; 1 Cor. 1: 7; 1 Pet. 1: 7, 13; 4: 13.

In view of these facts we must investigate the meaning of the words, "shall come" and "revelation," as used in 2 Thes. 1: 6-10, and from the passage itself find out whether they apply to pre-Millennial or to Millennial things, in so far as its teachings on punishing all of the Church's persecutors are concerned. Vs. 6, 7 and 10 contain such statements as prove that the passage covers the entire Millennium, and not simply the Parousia and the Epiphany. Notice first of all the time statement in v. 7, "*at the revelation* of the Lord Jesus." What do the foregoing words say will take place "at the revelation of our Lord Jesus"? (1) Not only that the entire Church will have rest from all persecutions as a reward from the Lord; but (2) that all unconsecrated persecutors of the Church from St. Paul's day on will be punished retributively by the Lord. What does this imply? That all such persecutors will be alive again. When will this be? After the day of vengeance is over, during the times of restitution. Hence the expression, "at the revelation of the Lord Jesus," used in v. 7 does not apply, in so far as punishment on such persecutors is concerned, to the Parousia or to the Epiphany, but to the Basileia or restitution time alone; for not until then will such dead persecutors of the Church return from the tomb: Therefore the writer of the article under review has totally misapplied this passage when he uses it to

prove the second death of the non-Spirit-begotten persecuting clergy, etc., at the end of this Age. Secondly, let us look at v. 10, where another time indication is given, explaining the meaning of the words, "shall come." That time indication is the expression, "in that day." What day is this? The Millennial day, the restitution day. How do we know this? (1) Not merely because this is the usual meaning of that expression; but (2) especially because the expression, "*all* that believe in that day," is in contrast with the *Church*, thus proving that the day is the Millennium, in contrast with the Gospel Age—the day of the great salvation. Therefore the expression, "He shall come," in v. 10, is not limited to our Lord's arrival, nor to the Parousia, nor to the Epiphany, but to the entire thousand years—the restitution times, when indeed He will be glorified in His saints and admired by *all* other believers. Accordingly, the classes referred to as (1) not knowing God and (2) not obeying the Gospel are (A) not only those (a) who will die at 100 years (those who know not God) and (b) those who will die at the end of the Millennium as symbolic goats (those who do not obey the Gospel); but (B) also (a) those Parousiac and Epiphaniac Spirit-begotten ones in the nominal church who sinning the sin unto death never came into the Truth, and thus never really came to know God (those that know not God); and (b) those Spirit-begotten ones in the Truth who sin the sin unto death (those that obey not the Gospel—the Truth, which enabled them really to know God). What does our investigation prove with reference to this passage? We answer, The passage as such cannot be applied exclusively to a period previous to the kingdom, but applies to the whole Millennium, especially to the second and third phases of our Lord's Second Advent—the Epiphany and the Basileia. What follows from this? The complete disproof of the claim of the article under review that it

applies to the second death of the supposed goats of that article, supposedly including the non-Spirit-begotten persecutors (clerical and lay) of the Christ class.

At times J.F.R. slurringly alleges that some brethren use their knowledge of Greek and Hebrew to pervert the Truth. His readers understand him to mean especially us. Our readers know that we make use of our knowledge of these languages, but they know that we do so in order to defend and explain the Truth, and frequently to refute his and others' errors. But we would on this point remark that if he thoroughly knew English, Greek and Hebrew grammar, and were not drunken in his use of such knowledge, he would be saved from many a mistake, *e.g.*, his interpreting (Z '24, 58, par. 2) the *noun* "rest" in 2 Thes. 1: 7, which he explains as though it were an *imperative verb*, but which the Greek most clearly, and the English less clearly, show is a noun and the object of the verb "recompense." This mistake is the means of his completely misunderstanding the Apostle's thought in vs. 6 and 7, and makes him think the Lord's people are exhorted to "rest" during the Gospel Age, whereas the Apostle shows that the Lord will "*at the revelation of the Lord Jesus*" (Diaglott) recompense (1) *tribulation* to the Church's unconsecrated persecutors of the entire Age, and (2) *rest* to the Church of the entire Age, which proves that the recompense for the persecutors is after restitution sets in and the dead return.

A by far much more drastic evidence of this right eye darkening than the last-mentioned item is seen in his new thought (Z '24, 4, 5) that the reaping period of the Harvest is one of 50 years. Without humbly confessing that he was in error when contrary to our Pastor he for years taught that the reaping began in 1878 and ended in 1918, he tells his readers that the reaping period is from 1874 to 1924. He alleges as proof that the Jews reaped their harvest fifty days, by beginning their reaping on Nisan 16 (as the Bible

teaches they did, Deut. 19: 9), and ending it on Pentecost (which the Bible nowhere teaches). He claims that as Pentecost was the feast of the *firstfruits*, the reaping was finished on that day; and he argues that this types a 50 years' reaping at the end of the Jewish and Gospel Ages. There is absolutely no connection between his reasons in what he gives as type and antitype, and his conclusions. Pentecost, as set forth in the Old Testament, in so far as it is the feast of *firstfruits*, types the whole Gospel Age, and from the standpoint of the after-fruits, types the Millennial Age (Joel 2: 28, 29), as our Pastor taught and wrote, and not the end of the reaping. (Note the practical identity of the expressions in Lev. 23: 17 and Rev. 14: 4, "they [these] are the firstfruits unto the Lord [God]," as expressing the fruitage—the 144,000—of the entire Gospel Age; additionally see Ex. 23: 16; 34: 22; Num. 28: 26). What are typed in the New Testament by the fifty days from Jesus' resurrection and Pentecost, we have shown in Vol. V, Chap. I, which please see.

We now will refute this view of a 50 years' reaping.

(1) The Bible teaches that the Gospel-Age reaping lasted 40 years. Please see the fifty-six proofs on this point in Note 3 of the Appendix of Studies, Vol. III. Among these proofs we note the following: The first 40 days that Moses stayed in the mount, the 40 days that Goliath defied Israel, the 40 days of Ezekiel's siege of Jerusalem, Jonah's 40 days of denunciation against Nineveh, the 40 days of Jesus' temptation in the wilderness and the 40 days of His resurrection experiences before His ascension. Therefore the reaping was not 50, but 40 years.

(2) The literal reaping was finished before Pentecost each year in Israel: because the gleaning was finished at least a day after the reaping, and because the male gleaners as well as the male reapers had to appear at the tabernacle, and later at the temple at

Jerusalem, on Pentecost with all other male Israelites (Ex. 23: 14-17; 34: 18-23). Therefore the reaping was over at least two days before Pentecost in Israel.

(3) The reaping was finished considerably earlier before Pentecost than these two days, because the reaping and gleaning had to be finished long enough before Pentecost to permit all male Israelites to arrive at the latest a day before Pentecost in Jerusalem for the temple service on Pentecost—"before the Lord"—traveling being unlawful on a holy convocation day, such as was Pentecost. But some parts of Palestine were an eight days' journey from Jerusalem, *e.g.*, those places in north and north-eastern Palestine. Hence this and the former reason prove that the reaping ended before ten days preceding Pentecost.

(4) The reaping was finished *before* such journeys ten days prior to Pentecost were begun; because from each habitation (Lev. 23: 17) two loaves baked from the firstfruits' flour, ground from the reaped grain and made into leavened dough, had to be brought by each head of a family to the temple. But, as a rule, such dough was kneaded the day before baking so that the dough would have time to rise; and the bread would be baked the day before the journey, which was usually begun at dawn. This consideration makes the reaping end two days earlier than the preceding reason, hence earlier than 12 days before Pentecost.

(5) The reaping was finished long before this grinding, kneading and baking occurred; because there preceded such acts, and there followed the reaping process six other harvest processes, which required at least ten days' time to complete: (1) sheaving, (2) drying, (3) treading by the oxen, (4) winnowing, (5) sifting and (6) garnering. This consideration combined with the preceding ones requires the reaping to be completed at least 22 days before Pentecost. In all of these points as we have given them we made no allowance for any delays whatever between the ending

of one of these processes and the beginning of the next one, while in practice there were, doubtless, often days intervening between the end of the one and the beginning of the next.

(6) Since only reaping the *firstfruit grain* (typical of the consecrated) could be used to type the reaping of the Jewish and Gospel Harvests, if the standpoint of the article under review were correct, *i.e.*, that a day of the literal reaping types a year of the antitypical reaping and that the Jewish reaping was from Nisan 16 to Pentecost, then the reaping of the firstfruits would precede the reaping of the after-fruits, and therefore would have been completed much earlier than 22 days before Pentecost.

(7) Since the Bible nowhere states the number of days that any Jewish reaping, much less any Jewish reaping of firstfruits, lasted, it cannot have intended the number of days of any Jewish reaping period to type the number of years in the Jewish- and Gospel-Age reaping times; for there being no Biblical statement giving the numbers of days in any Biblical Jewish reaping period, there can be no type on which to base an antitype in this matter of days typing years. These reasons overthrow J.F.R.'s pertinent "new view."

Further, he claims that the fulfilled facts—his definition of his oft used expression, "physical facts"—prove a fifty-year reaping period. This we emphatically deny on the basis of the above-mentioned fifty-six reasons and the following fulfilled facts:

(1) The reaping began in 1874 and ended in 1914.

(2) From the Fall of 1914 to that of 1916, the Faithful, following "that Servant's example" (which "that evil servant" did not follow), ceased the reaping work as such and antitypically confessed the sins over Azazel's Goat, smote Jordan, fought Gideon's first battle, bound the kings and princes and pronounced the judgments written, which things were not a part of the reaping work.

(3) During most of the time of such activity on the part of the Faithful, the antitypical poor—the Great Company—and the antitypical stranger—the Youthful Worthies—(Lev. 23: 22) did the gleaning world completing it by April 18, 1916.

(4) The Faithful, being thus reaped and gleaned, have since Sept. 16, 1914, and April 18, 1916, as a class (varyingly in its individual members according to each one's case), been undergoing, and will continue to undergo, to a completion the six harvest processes that follow the reaping or gleaning: sheaving; drying, treading, winnowing, sifting and garnering.

(5) As parts of the World's High Priest these under their Head, have since Nov. 25, 1916, been leading Azazel's Goat to the gate, delivering it to the fit man and letting it fall into Azazel's hands.

(6) The Great Company has since Sept. 20, 1914, been undergoing the seven parts of its experiences as Azazel's Goat: (1) hearing the High Priest confess the sins over it, (2) being loosed from the door of the tabernacle, (3) led to the gate, (4) delivered to the fit man, (5) led to the wilderness, (6) let go in the wilderness, and (7) falling into Azazel's hands through abandonment by the priests.

(7) The Lord since April 18, 1916, has continued the work previously begun of calling some Great Company members into the Truth from the Nominal Church and other persons from the Nominal Church and the world into the Truth as Youthful Worthies—partly by the Great Company in the Truth, which work they mistake for reaping the Little Flock,

These fulfilled facts, therefore, prove the forty years' reaping period and disprove the "new view" of a fifty years' reaping period.

Shortly after finishing the preceding part of this chapter, our attention was called to the first article of the March 1 Tower entitled, "A Ransom For All." It makes in six pages a most confused attempt to defend

his "new view" to the effect that the scribes, Pharisees, the unbegotten clergy and principal of the flock are amenable to the second death. *E.g.*, when he says that the Jews had their responsibility increased by increased light; we agree; but we deny that this responsibility was increased to the ultimate degree; because when the Lord meted out by the law death or other punishments for special wrongs, as in the cases that he cites (Nadab, Abihu, Korah, Dathan, Abiram, Miriam, Uzzah, Moses and David), St. Paul expressly states of the worst of these punishments—death—that it was not the "sorer punishment" the Second Death (Heb. 10: 28, 29). Heb. 10: 26-30 expressly teaches that only members of Christ's body can during the Gospel Age by wilful sin go into the Second Death: "If *we* sin wilfully after receiving the knowledge of the Truth there remaineth no more sacrifice for sin"; but "the sorer punishment" remains. If the "new view" were correct, St. Paul would have said, "If *any one* sins wilfully after receiving some knowledge of the ransom, etc."

Then (P. 70, par. 2) he quotes John 15: 22-24 to prove that the Jewish leaders sinned unto death. He inserts brackets into the last verse as follows: "They had not had [the] sin [the Greek is emphatic here]." It is often painful to one who knows Greek to see one, like J.F.R. who does not know it, tell what is emphatic in Greek! But when he tells us that a thing that is not at all used in the Greek of this passage "is emphatic here," he gives proof of his ignorance and recklessness. The Greek article for "the" is not in the original at all. To make the verse teach that the Jewish leaders went into the second death, he inserts the article "the" before the word "sin," remarking "the Greek is emphatic here," the design being to make the expression "[the] sin", mean the sin unto death. Emphatic indeed?! The pressure of the emphasis of the Greek here must have been so heavy that it forced

the supposedly emphatic Greek word for "the," to remain out of the text altogether! And this comment is made by the one who charges those who do know Greek with using it to pervert the Truth! While the presence of the article here would not necessarily prove that the second death is meant, Greek abstract nouns, like German and French abstract nouns, being usually accompanied by the article, in ways not permissible in English (as can be seen from the following texts, in every one of which the Greek article for "the" precedes the word for "sin," though none of them refer to the sin unto death nor to another special sin: 1 Cor. 15: 3, 17, 56; Heb. 2: 14; 1 John 1: 9; 3: 4, 5, etc., etc., etc.), its absence, however in this text certainly proves that the sin unto death is not meant. Our Lord's language implies that there was more or less wilfulness against some light on the part of the Jewish leaders from which they would not be excused; but this does not mean that their responsibility was unto the second death.

He quotes (p. 71, par. 1) our Lord's words, "If ye were blind, ye should have no [flagrant] sin; but now ye say, We see; therefore your [responsibility for your flagrant] sin remaineth." (Brackets ours.) This is true. Certainly whoever sins against any measure of light is to that extent responsible for, and will have to expiate his sin by stripes. But that does not, except for those who are on final trial for life, and who make complete shipwreck of their trial, imply that the responsibility is to the extent of the second death, as the writer implies. In discussing this subject J.F.R. seems to have forgotten entirely that mixed sins exist.

The article under review further claims (71, par. 3) that the fact that Spirit-begetting will not take place in the Millennium, and that people will nevertheless go into the second death proves that it is not necessary to become Spirit-begotten to commit the sin unto death. How could one who has known the difference

in God's dispensational dealings, now spiritual, later human, make such a statement to prove his proposition as applicable before the Millennium, unless he is drunken or his right eye is darkening? The thing that he must prove to substantiate his "new view" is that people can be put on final trial for life or death eternal without the imputation or application of the ransom, a thing that he has most dismally failed to do, and that cannot be done, his failure illustrating this.

We will now set forth the Lord's Word that destroys his entire "new view" as to the liability of unbegotten persons (apart from the 82 above mentioned) to the second death before the restitution Covenant begins to operate. *God never gives a person an opportunity to stand final trial or life apart from a covenant that makes an offer of such a final trial with the possible issue of the Second Death.* The only covenants that offer such a final trial are two: (1) the Abrahamic Covenant *in the spiritual* features that now apply to the *Great Company* (Judas latterly being treated as of this class), and that in the end of the Millennium will apply to the *Ancient* and *Youthful Worthies*; and (2) the New Covenant which will be for human beings in the Millennium. The Law Covenant, while setting before the people life and death, did not do it as a final trial; but the Sarah features of the Abrahamic Covenant offer the Divine Nature and joint heirship with Christ to the Faithful unconditionally, and do not apply to any but the Faithful. It therefore does not offer a trial with life or death eternal as the issues. It puts the measurably unfaithful under those spiritual provisions of the Abrahamic Covenant that offer life unconditionally to the overcoming Great Company members. There being no other present provision in the Abrahamic Covenant, those who fail to overcome as Great Company members of necessity sink into the second death. God passes no final judgment on anybody *except in*

harmony with the provisions that mark the covenant operating in the case. The scribes and Pharisees were on trial under the Law Covenant and no other; hence only such a sentence as the Law Covenant could pronounce on its violators could be pronounced upon the scribes and Pharisees, who in blaspheming the Holy Spirit, sinned quite wilfully against the first table of the Law, and in murdering Jesus sinned quite wilfully against the second table of the Law. Therefore the condemnation of the Law Covenant was the only one which fell upon them. Therefore their death was not the second death; for the Law Covenant did not inflict the "sorer punishment," which is the second death.

In Z '24, 245 it is taught that Enoch died. In defense of this plain contradiction of Heb. 11: 5, which teaches that Enoch did not experience death, Heb. 11: 13, "These all died in faith," is quoted. The words of Jude 14, 15 are alleged to teach that Enoch was given a vision of the reign of Christ which vision is alleged to be his translation, and that immediately on seeing it God granted him an instantaneous death. Others, but not the Tower article under review, claim the curse compelled Enoch's death.

Against the last point—that the curse necessitated Enoch's death—we would say that the curse does not forbid in every case the slowing up of the dying process until the ransom merit applied in the Millennium will cancel the death sentence; and therefore without violating justice the Lord could for typical reasons have slowed up the dying process in Enoch's case, inasmuch as the ransom would in due time make up this penalty for Enoch, as we know it will similarly do for those who pass into the Millennium without death. This, as will later appear, God actually did for Enoch. Further, Heb. 11: 5 directly teaches that Enoch did not see, *i.e.*, experience, death. To see death means to experience death (Luke 2: 26). Therefore Enoch's not seeing death means his not experiencing

death. That the expression "and he was not" (Gen. 5: 24) does not mean that he died is evident; for St. Paul explains it (Heb. 11: 5) to mean that Enoch was not found, though not dead, because, alive, he was transplanted somewhere away from men's abode. Again, the view that we are examining misapplies Heb. 11: 13, "These all died in faith," when it includes Enoch among the "these all." The "these all" refer to Abraham, Isaac, Jacob and Sarah—those who were promised the covenant blessings, but who did not while alive receive them, "not having received the promises." Vs. 13-15 prove unanswerably that the "these all" refer to those only of the ones discussed in Heb. 11: 2-13, who were offered the Abrahamic promises. Hence Abel, Enoch and Noah (Heb. 11: 4-7) are not included among the "these all." Therefore Heb. 11: 13 does not teach that Enoch died; for it refers to others.

Furthermore, Jude 14, 15 does not say that Enoch saw a vision of the kingdom, as the article under review teaches; but it says he prophesied of Christ's coming with the saints to punish wicked persons. Jude says not a word of Enoch's prophesying that Christ would come to bless, as the article claims. This prophecy is limited to the Parousia and the Epiphany, during which Jesus and the saints will punish the wicked sifers (v. 14).

Moreover, the article under review contradicts the teaching that Melchizedek did not die; because the Scriptures teach that Enoch and Melchizedek are the same person. The following is the proof: St. Paul says that of Melchizedek "it is *witnessed* that he liveth" (Heb. 7: 8). In so many words it is no where *witnessed* in the Old Testament that *Melchizedek* lived on without dying. Enoch, according to St. Paul's explanation, is the only human being of whom the Old Testament "witnessed that he liveth" (Gen. 5: 24; compare Heb. 11: 5). Therefore these passages and Heb. 7: 8 prove that Enoch and Melchizedek

are one and the same person. They being the same person, we have a record from which Jude testified of Enoch's prophecy that the Lord and the saints would come to punish the sifters of the Parousia and Epiphany. Enoch did not express this prophecy in words; but in the symbols of the Pyramid, which he as Melchizedek built. The prophecy was expressed symbolically in the following way: The place at the upper end of the Grand Gallery's South Wall that symbolizes our Lord's Second Advent and its date is north of the North Wall of the bottomless pit, *i.e.*, His Second Advent would set in before the bottomless pit condition would be reached, which was reached in 1914. Into the second death—the antitypical bottomless pit—the wicked sifters of Jude 4-16 and 2 Pet. 2: 1-22 will be cast after our Lord's return, according to Jude 14, 15, as prophesied by Enoch, who did not deliver this prophecy in words, but in the symbols of the Pyramid, as just described.

Finally, Enoch did not die, because God desired that he should not "sleep" in the death condition in order that by his not sleeping in the death state he could be used by God to represent—type—those of the saints who would die after 1878, but would not sleep—they would be translated into the spirit condition without having to remain asleep in the death state. And it was to type this favor of the Lord to those who as the antitypical Enoch would walk with God during the Parousia and Epiphany that God kept Enoch alive.

In Z '24, 295, 296, the Society's president gives a new view of Ps. 82. We are familiar with our dear Pastor's view of this Psalm, according to which in vs. 1-5 prophetically our Lord in His Second Advent is represented as judging the political, financial, ecclesiastical, industrial, social and labor kings, and in which in vs. 6 and 7 prophetically He is represented as declaring that the Little Flock are mighty ones and sons of God and are privileged to share in the Sin-offering with Him

as one of the princes, Adam being the other prince. This excellent interpretation the "new view" corrupts, narrowing it into an arraignment of the clergy alone, who according to this new view will die like Satan, supposedly one of the princes of v. 7! This interpretation is intended to prove that the clergy as the parabolic goats go into the second death. On this perversion, Luther's statement with reference to the pope well applies: "One little word overthrows him." That one little word is: "all of you are children of the Most High" (v. 6). If any one thing is certain, it is that all of the clergy are not "children of the Most High." Therefore as a class they cannot be meant here, though some of them are New Creatures, and thus sons of God; and though others of them, while not New Creatures, are, nevertheless, by Tentative Justification tentative human sons of God in the sense of Rom. 12: 1 and Prov. 23: 26—a sense of sonship which J.F.R. denies, as he denies Tentative Justification; but very many of them never were even tentatively justified, *e.g.*, many of them were higher critics and disbelieved in blood-atonement at an early age, even before entering college before their becoming ministers. According to his view none are sons of God except New Creatures. Hence, the expression, "ALL of you are children of the Most High," even according to his view proves that the clergy are not as such referred to in vs. 6 and 7. Such language as Ps. 82: 6, 7 can apply to the Little Flock alone. These verses, in harmony with the Scriptural principle of hiding God's thoughts—"here a little, there a little" (Is. 28: 10)—are, by their sense as applying to New Creatures only, proven to be thrown into the midst of an entirely different line of thought. Moreover, the discussion in John 10: 33-36, *e.g.*, "If [Jehovah] called them gods unto whom [literally, with reference to whom] the Word of God came," conclusively proves that the Little Flock is meant in Ps. 82: 6, 7. J.F.R.'s perversion of this Psalm is only another

example of how his efforts to defend an error, *i.e.*, that the clergy are the parabolic goats, and are going into the second death, lead him to continually increasing error.

In Z '24, 307-313, he attempts, contrary to our Pastor's teaching, to prove another "new view," *i.e.*, that Satan has as yet in no sense been bound. He darkens the entire subject by covertly assuming that Satan's binding is not a progressive thing, and that it will make him inactive. Hence, from his present activity, he concludes that Satan is not yet in any sense bound from the standpoint of Rev. 20: 1-3. Satan's binding is not only progressive, but also is of distinct stages: From 1874 to 1914 he was undergoing binding with reference to the three foundation errors of his kingdom: the Divine right (1) of kings, (2) of aristocrats and (3) of clerics; and its three supporting errors: (1) the consciousness of the dead, (2) their change into spirits at death and (3) their bliss or torment. This stage of his binding was so complete by 1914 that by these six errors he no more could control his empire. Hence, the World War was possible as the weakener of his empire. His binding is now proceeding along the lines of his deception that now in state, church and society, God's kingdom is and should be in power as a dictatorship, and that all of these should operate together. He will be shortly so fully bound in these respects as to be unable to control Christendom thereby. Thereupon will follow the revolution. Hence he will be gradually bound on lines of the deception that the brotherhood of man as expressed in Socialism will bring in the Millennium. That stage of his binding becoming complete and he being no longer able to control his empire by this, its pertinent deception, anarchy will set in, completely overthrowing every vestige of his empire; then follows his final binding's stage, just before Jacob's Trouble; and thereafter in every respect his binding will be complete. So, too, will his loosing be a

gradual one, and that by stages. Only from the standpoint of a gradual binding and that by stages can we interpret in harmony with Truth the teaching that he is to be bound 1,000 years—an insuperable obstacle to the "new view" of the ever darkening right eye, which obstacle he seeks to set aside by teaching a direct contradiction of Rev. 20: 3, *i.e.*, that Satan will not be bound 1,000 years; but considerably less. The fact that it is the Truth (Rev. 20: 1-3) which binds Satan proves unanswerably that his binding is gradual; and the fact that the overthrow of his empire is by three stages—war, revolution, anarchy—proves that his pertinent binding (necessary to bring about each of these three stages) must be one of at least three stages. These facts dispose of his entire position.

We will briefly answer his perversions on Matt. 12: 26-29. He claims boastingly, "without the hope or expectation of successful contradiction," to prove that Matt. 12: 27, which treats of binding the strong man, does not refer to the Second Advent. Rather, he claims that Jesus in vs. 25-29 suggests that either (1) the devil (v. 25), or (2) God's Spirit (v. 28), or (3) a human being (v. 29) must be credited with casting out the devils, and that hence Jesus reasons that he must be doing it by God's Spirit, as the other two suppositions are untenable. Our Pastor taught that v. 26 by its contents alludes to the Second Advent, and is introduced in this connection, only because its thought relation to the point under discussion disproves the claim of the Pharisees that Jesus cast out devils by Satan. From this standpoint he correctly held that Jesus' thought was that Satan could not be casting out devils; because that would imply that the Second Advent had set in, at which time Satan's kingdom was for the first time to be divided against itself (Dan. 5: 28; see also Rev. 16: 19, where a later stage of its division is indicated). Thus the basis of our Lord's first refutation of the Pharisaic accusation is that the

divided condition of Satan's empire peculiar to the Second Advent could not at His First Advent be prevailing, and that therefore He could not be casting out Satan by Satan. J.F.R. tacitly assumes that v. 29 sets forth a human being as a third possible agent for casting out the devils on this occasion. This is a pure importation into the text. For if such had been the thought, the Greek word for MAN—*anthropos*—would have been used in v. 29 as required by the thought-contrast with Satan (v. 26) and with God's Spirit (v. 28), but instead the indefinite pronoun *anyone—tis*—is used, which may apply to God, Christ, good and bad angels, or men. Hence we say that he tacitly assumes, without the least proof, that a third possible agent—man—for casting out devils is here introduced. That the casting out of devils cannot mean the spoiling of the strong man's house is evident from the fact that Satan's house was not then and thereby spoiled, and is also evident from the further fact that his house according to the Bible is not spoiled—literally, thoroughly wasted—until at Christ's Second Advent. That this verse cannot refer to a First Advent work is further evident from the fact that Satan's binding is exclusively a Second Advent work (Rev. 20: 1-3). Therefore, his third point—a baseless assumption—is utterly destroyed. His claim that his view as he gives it is required by the context is a mere sophism; because as we saw above from the case of Ps. 82: 6, 7, and from the direct statement of Is. 28: 10, the Scriptures frequently put into a connection things that are on an entirely different subject or are only in a general way and by remote allusion related to the subject of the context. When, as in the present case, the facts stated in the verse disprove a contextual line of sequential arguments, such a mode of presenting arguments must not be assumed. Hence, our Pastor's thought that our Lord in v. 29 introduces a parable of

the Second Advent only remotely suggested by the line of thought in the context is correct.

Some of the Society friends think that our candid and plain discussions of the new views of the Society's president are proof of bitterness on our part toward him—a thought that he has spread. We desire to assure such brethren that we have bitterness toward no man. Our plainness is due to the Divine purpose for the Epiphany. The Lord declares His Epiphany purpose to be to bring to light the hidden things of darkness, and to make manifest the counsels of hearts (1 Cor. 4: 5; 3: 12-15; Mal. 3: 1-3). Such manifestation cannot be done by ambiguous words. It requires an exact and clear refutation of the revolutionism as to error and arrangement. Inasmuch as revolutionism on the part of the Great Company is involved, we know from their Scripturally described double-mindedness (Jas. 1: 8) that their motives in such revolutionism are *impure*, being on the part of the leaders—antitypical Jambres—unholy ambition, power-grasping, lording it over others, pride, etc. (2 Tim. 3: 1-8). Such knowledge, combined with the knowledge that they are exploiting God's people, causes us to expose them, as Jesus exposed the Pharisees, as Savonarola, Luther, Zwingli, etc., during the Reformation time exposed the doctrinal and practical errors of the Papists, and as our Pastor exposed the doctrinal and practical errors of the clergy and of the sifters of his day. But in the *Epiphany* it must be done with greater plainness to accomplish the Lord's purpose of bringing to clearer light the hidden things of darkness and in making manifest the *counsels of hearts*.

But, one may ask, why make the Society's president the chief object of such refutations and exposures? We answer: He is the most guilty of all the members of antitypical Jambres in misleading God's guileless sheep; and he does it with more subtle hypocrisy, cunning and cruelty than is to be found elsewhere in all

Church history. So pronounced is he as a revolutionist against the Lord's ways that God has pointed him out individually in Zech. 11: 15-17 and in Matt. 24: 48-51. Let the brethren who blame us consider the Scriptural, reasonable and factual evidences of God's pointing him out in these passages; and convinced by these evidences, as they are presented in the Appendix of Studies, Vol. IV and in the preceding chapter, they will recognize that we are acting in this matter simply as a mouthpiece of the Lord to rescue the sheep from this wolf in sheep's clothing.

We have been accused of persecuting him. On the contrary, he has persecuted us, as his Harvest Siftings and many others of his activities prove; and he has done so, because we sought lovingly and righteously to keep him back from a course that Scripture, reason and facts prove unanswerably has been a very wrong one for him, a dangerous one for the Church, a perverting one for the Truth and a dishonoring one for the Lord. Never have we attacked him on personal lines, as he with gross misrepresentations has us. Always have our refutations been against his official errors of doctrine, and our exposures, against his official wrongs of practice. We challenge the production of one sentence from our writings against him as being attacks on his personal conduct as distinct from his official acts and teachings. He has through gross official falsehoods and dishonesty influenced tens of thousands to withdraw fellowship from us. He has pilloried us before the whole Church as of the Judas class; yea, he has symbolically crucified us "without the gate" of his symbolic city. This was accomplished when his propaganda—printed and oral—on the subject was so thoroughly believed as to convince thousands that as rebels and blasphemers against God's channel we and our faithful supporters in the Lord were in the second death class—a thing openly preached in the Rochester Convention in 1923. This

fact moved us for a year and a half to cease sending among his adherents any refutations of concurrent new views until Jan., 1925, since when more heed is being paid to our refutations of his errors.

But we are not in despair, nor are we cast down, through our having been cast out as a supposed blasphemer and rebel against God's arrangements. Those who thus accuse us are in most cases such themselves, some of them wilfully, others blindly so. Our experience in this respect is the experience of God's Priesthood, especially its leaders, and more particularly its Head, from the days of Jesus until now, as we see in the case of Jesus, the Apostles, the angels of the five churches between the Harvests, our Pastor and now ourself. We comfort our heart with the reflection that we are privileged to go the same way as they. Pertinent is the saying of Is. 65: 5: "Hear ye the Word of the Lord, ye that tremble [that reverentially stand in awe] at His Word: Your brethren that hated you, that cast you out for My name's sake, said, Let the Lord be glorified [we hate and cast them out for God's glory]; but He shall appear to your joy; and they shall be ashamed!" The Bible teaches that the mouthpiece Priests are special targets, and are crucified "without the gate," both in great and in little Babylon (Matt. 5: 10-12; Luke 13: 33; Heb. 13: 12-16; 2 Cor. 1: 12, 13; 4: 1-18).

What do all the facts of the case prove? Do they not prove that we have been faithful throughout the years of the division—from 1917 to the present? Have we not throughout these years stood for the obligatoriness of our Pastor's will and charter in controlling corporational matters among the Truth people, whereas our crucifiers have been unfaithful therein? Have we not throughout these years stood faithful in our advocacy and practice of the Lord's arrangements given through "that Servant" for the conduct of the work, whereas our crucifiers have rebelled

against every one of those that stood in the way of their gratifying their rebellious ambitions? Have we not stood firm as an ocean rock against the waves of error raised by the windy delusions that our crucifiers have set in motion? Tell us whether we tell the truth or not, when we say that those who amid a sifting maintain complete hold on the Truth previously given, who see clearly the advancing Truth, and who hold it in full harmony with the previously given Truth, are the ones who are given the Divine approval as faithful before and amid the sifting? Tell us whether we tell the truth or not when we say that those who amid a sifting lose large parts of the Truth previously given, and who in their places present opposing errors, are the ones who are given the Divine disapproval as unfaithful before and amid the sifting? These are the real tests in the case. Therefore, let us not allow ourselves to be deceived, if erroneous teachers and wrong practicers are clearly manifested as such by us, when they point to its plain, unvarnished manifestations as a sure proof that we are bitter, are in the Judas class, and as a blasphemer and rebel are a Second Deather. Such accusations are only the "stop thief" cry of the pursued wrong-doer. As for ourself, we have the full assurance of faith that the Lord is now appearing to our joy, that they will be ashamed, and that in due time He will bring forth our righteousness as the light and our judgment as the noonday (Ps. 37: 6). With this assurance we rest; and we wish nothing less for our readers than that they may have at least as much of God's joy and peace as we.

Hence let none take offense at our plain refutations of delusive Azazelian errors and clear exposures of wrong Azazelian practices. They are appropriate for the Divinely ordained Epiphany purposes. They are figured forth, among other things, by Christ's severe and unvarnished exposure of the scribes and Pharisees in Matt. 23. They are spoken and written in the

same kind of love as that in which our Lord spoke the rebukes of Matt. 23; and to blame us who are under and by the Lord making their small antitypical rebukes, is in reality blaming Him.

We desire to set forth the viewpoint from which the gross errors that have been appearing in the Tower from the pen of the Society's president since the Jan. 15, 1925 issue are to be viewed: They are the efforts of a proven fraud to divert attention from the complete collapse of his fraudulent claims—his teachings as respects the antitypical jubilee coming 1925, the Ancient Worthies' resurrection, and the cessation of entrance into the Adamic death state this year [written in 1925]. Events had progressed sufficiently to make apparent even to the simple that his program for this year is impossible of realization. Buttressed by the Parousia Truth, we saw, soon after he stressed this error, wherein it impinged against the Truth: We refuted it by time and sign prophecies. Especially two time prophecies we used against him: (1) the 70 Jubilee years being fully kept—"fulfilled"—during the desolation of the land (2 Chro. 36: 20, 21), the cycles this side of the last jubilee before the desolation are jubileeless, and therefore are of 49, not 50, years duration, and therefore reached their culmination in 1874, and did not so do in 1925; (2) the squaring method, which gives the antitypical cycle, leads up to 1874 and cannot in any manner be made to lead up to 1925, The sign prophecies that we cited as against this view required for their fulfillment a very much longer time than the few years from when he first (1918) brought out this view until 1925. The most, and most important, of these sign prophecies have not yet been fulfilled: Antitypical John's beheading, the cleansing of the Truth Levites, the symbolic earthquake, the total destruction of Babylon, the foretold reign again of the beast, the full development of the Youthful Worthies, the Church and the Great Company leaving the world,

anarchy, Jacob's Trouble, etc. These refutations should have "staid the madness of" this modern Balaam. But he has made it impossible to accomplish this (Zech. 11: 17; Matt. 24: 51).

Mr. Barbour prior to the date insisted that without fail Nisan 16, 1878 would witness the deliverance of the entire Church; but when the forecast failed he tried to divert attention from his failure in order to retain his following. In doing this he caused an explosion of figurative dynamite—he renounced the ransom! The Society's president, in spirit allied to him, and guilty of a more apparent fraud, is imitating him in seeking to divert his victims in order to retain them as his followers. This is the viewpoint from which his gross perversions in the Tower since the Jan. 15, 1925, issue are to be regarded. When in 1920 we refuted his perversions on 1925, we told the brethren to be on the lookout for some new delusion with which he would seek to divert attention from his failure in order to retain his following. (P '21, 128, top of col. 2.) Knowing his kinship to Mr. Barbour, his character and his Bible portrait, we felt sure he would so do, and now we see our forecast fulfilling.

Lawyer-like he sets forth the thought that his 1925 teachings are correct, but would fulfill differently from what was expected! On this point he begins with the Ancient Worthies, in Questions 1 and 2 of Z '25, 23, in which he cautiously seeks to pave the way for the acceptance of the perversion that the Ancient Worthies might return from the dead before the Little Flock and the Great Company leave the earth! However, he sets it forth in a way that he can repudiate the possibility, if driven to it by events. The evident purpose of these two questions is to unsettle faith in the Scripturalness of our Pastor's views on the Ancient Worthies as to the time, order and nature of their resurrection. Of course one acquainted with the former's "methods of deceit" sees just what he sought to dodge.

In harmony with our Pastor's view he formerly taught that the Church and Great Company will leave the world before the Ancient Worthies return from the tomb; he also has taught that these two classes will remain in the earth until at least anarchy starts; further, he knows that the revolution, which is to precede anarchy, has not yet come. Hence the cautious setting forth of the possibility of the return of the Ancient Worthies before the Little Flock and Great Company leave the earth; because he knew that the Little Flock and Great Company, as the time drew near, would not leave the earth in 1925.

Let us see what God says as to the order of the resurrection classes: "But every man in his own order, Christ [the Little Flock; see Berean Comments] the *first fruits*; afterward they that are [will become] Christ's during his [thousand years'] presence [those who will by the New Covenant become his children, *i.e.*, the Ancient and Youthful Worthies and the obedient of mankind]" (1 Cor. 15: 23). "When this corruptible *shall have put* on incorruption, and this mortal *shall have put* on immortality, *then* shall be brought to pass the saying that is written, Death [the Adamic death, in which are the Ancient Worthies as well as the rest of mankind] is swallowed up in victory" (1 Cor. 15: 54). "The dead in Christ shall rise *first*. Then we which are alive and remain shall be caught up *together* [before others are thus dealt with] with them in the clouds, to meet the Lord in the air" (1 Thes. 4: 16, 17). "Blessed and holy is he that hath part in the *first* resurrection ... They shall be priests of God and of Christ and shall reign with Him a thousand years (Rev. 20: 6). These passages clearly prove that the Little Flock precedes all other classes of God's plan in the resurrection of the dead.

The same is manifest from the picture of the marriage of the Lamb and His Bride and the marriage supper of the Lamb. The order of events is as follows:

First the marriage—the first resurrection—takes place, then the marriage supper comes, to which the bridesmaids—the Great Company—are as guests brought after their resurrection. After the marriage supper is over, the children are begotten and born. The first class of these children are the Ancient Worthies, whose begetting is their awakening from the dead perfect in faculty. The Sin-offering picture proves the same thing: for the Little Flock and Great Company must first be brought back from the dead before the blood of the antitypical Goat is available for the rest of the race, first and chief among which will be the Ancient Worthies. The Mediator figure proves the same thing. Thus we see that both Bible passages and Bible doctrines prove that the Little Flock and Great Company precede the Ancient Worthies in arising from the death state. And when the Society's president says that the Scriptures do not teach such precedence, but that we reach such a conclusion by a process of analysis only, he shows, to say the least, his unpreparedness and untrustworthiness as a Biblical interpreter. When he says that Heb. 11: 40 refers only to the perfection of the Ancient Worthies' character, he greatly errs. It refers to perfection, physical, mental, moral and religious, therefore includes their awakening from the dead perfect in all their faculties; after which they will be quickly perfected in character.

Of course they will be awakened before the New Covenant is made manward, for they are the first ones with whom it will be so made; but they will not be awakened until after it is made [sealed by Christ's blood] Godward. Thus by ambiguous language—his "methods of deceit"—he seeks to hide the Truth. His claim that Ps. 45 does not present the classes in the order of their resurrection, in the light of the above, is seen to be another delusion; for the order of the class resurrections there is as we found them above to be Biblically taught. Moreover, while it is true that

there is a distinction between awakening and resurrection in the case of the world; in the case of the Little Flock, the Great Company and the Ancient and Youthful Worthies, however, their awakening and resurrection are synonymous. His claim that the better resurrection of the Ancient Worthies consists of their change to spirit nature at the end of the Millennium is a palpable error. How do we know this? Because while alive they knew nothing whatever of God's purpose to make them spiritual at the end of the Millennium. They, therefore, could not have hoped for it, their hopes being earthly altogether. Therefore, their being "tortured, not accepting deliverance, *that they might obtain* a better resurrection," as an expression of their hope, cannot mean their resurrection as spirits but as humans at the beginning of the Millennium!

In Z '25, 35-41, the darkening of his right eye on the meaning of the robe of Christ's righteousness is set forth. In this article he denies that the robe of Christ's righteousness is that righteousness of Christ which is actually imputed to us at the vitalization of our justification—his human righteousness, or, in fact, any other kind of righteousness. On this point we answer as follows: Christ has only one other kind of righteousness—His righteousness as a Divine being, which He could not give us; for that would divest Him of righteousness altogether. This simple answer destroys his contention. He quotes a large number of Scriptures, none of which in the remotest degree proves his contention; for by not one passage has he connected the expression "robe of righteousness" with his definition of it—God's approval since 1918 of the faithful course in cooperating in Society, drives on the part of New Creatures, and their coming under the robe of protection and blessing and joy. According to this the robe of righteousness was not worn previous to 1918. He has given us a definition, we repeat it,

which no Scripture connects with the expression, "robe of righteousness."

The following is a brief discussion of the robe of Christ's righteousness: Christ's righteousness may be understood in two ways: (1) the perfect harmony of His human character with the Divine law, and (2) the perfect harmony of His Divine character with the Divine law. To exist forever as a human being He must have the former, and to exist at all as a Divine being He must have the latter. He now exists as a Divine being, and therefore has not given or imputed to us His righteousness as a Divine being. He does not now exist as a human being, and therefore can use its righteousness—His only righteousness other than His Divine righteousness—to impute to us. His human righteousness He is Scripturally taught to have bestowed by imputation upon us. The Bible teaches that He has imputed His human righteousness to us to *cover the imperfections of our flesh*, so that the New Creature receive no prejudice or condemnation through this fallen flesh. The following Scriptures teach this thought expressly: Rom. 3: 24-26; 4: 5-8; 10: 4; 1 Cor. 1: 30; 2 Cor. 5: 21; Phil. 3: 9. The expression, "faith [faithfulness, one of the three Scriptural meanings of the word faith] of Jesus," also means the human righteousness of Christ, as the following passages show: Rom. 3: 22; Phil. 3: 9; Gal. 2: 16; 3: 22. This is the only righteousness of Christ that the Scriptures teach is imputed to us. Its covering us is seen in the expression, robe of Christ's righteousness.

The expression, the *robe* of righteousness, is a figurative one. In this expression, the word *righteousness* is not figurative; but the word *robe* is figurative, the word *righteousness* here being explanatory: It tells just what the robe is—it is the righteousness which *covers* our human imperfections. This is just what St. Paul says Christ's righteousness does as the righteousness of faith (Rom. 4: 5-8). This figurative usage

will become clearer from some explanations. In Scripture symbols nakedness is used figuratively to represent sin and manifest sinfulness (Rev. 16: 15; 3: 17, 18; Is. 47: 3; Ezek. 16: 37; Hos. 2: 3). This figurative nakedness in the believer is *covered*, as by a robe, by the imputation of Christ's righteousness (Rom. 4: 5-8), and righteousness is represented as a robed or clothed condition as opposed to a naked one (Job 29: 14; Rev. 19: 8; Ps. 45: 8, 13, 14). Three times, and only three times, is righteousness Scripturally referred to as a robe. This is said (1) of Job's righteousness (Job 29: 14), and (2) and (3) of Christ's righteousness (Luke 15: 22; Is. 61: 10). There can be no doubt that the robe in Luke 15: 22 is Christ's righteousness as a human being; and we can demonstrate the same to be the case in Is. 61: 10, to which the article under review gives the false definition which we above briefly refuted.

In Is. 61: 10 the term is self-definitive: it tells just what the covering is—it is righteousness. The article under review says that Is. 61: 10 teaches that Christ is the giver of the garments of salvation and the robe of righteousness. But the verse says that Jehovah is the Giver of these: "I will greatly rejoice in *Jehovah*. My soul shall be joyful in *my God*; for *He* hath clothed me with the garments of salvation; *He* hath *covered* me with the robe of righteousness, as a bridegroom *priesteth* [literal translation; he arrays himself as a priest] it with ornaments [literally, head dress], and as a bride adorneth herself with her jewels." The speaker here is the Christ, Head and Body. This is not only apparent from vs. 1-3, but also from the allusion to the Bridegroom and the Bride (2 Cor. 11: 2; Rev. 19: 6-8; 21: 2, 9). Since this Bridegroom needs not another to give Him a robe of righteousness, the robe of righteousness here referred to must cover the Church, the Body of the Speaker. Therefore the head dress must be that of the Bridegroom, the Head

of the Speaker. We further note that since the robe of righteousness belongs to the Bride, or Body, the garments of salvation must belong to the Head, or Bridegroom. We, therefore, understand that in this verse the garments of salvation represent our Lord's official powers whereby He is able to save unto the uttermost them that come unto God by Him, and that the robe represents the righteousness that now covers the Church—Christ's righteousness. What is there in this text to justify the definition of the article under review for the garments of salvation, as being "joyful obedience, etc."? Their wearer is Jesus beyond the veil now; and, of course, not joyful obedience, but His official powers as the deliverer of the Church are meant. So viewed, the passage teaches us certain Gospel-Age privileges and powers of Christ and the Church. The definition that the article under review gives the robe of Christ's righteousness—the Lord's approval upon those who since 1918 do joyfully and obediently the Society's work, and the Lord's protection and blessing and joy—is neither Christ's righteousness nor righteousness of any kind. Therefore it is a misnomer to call it righteousness of any kind. Hence it is evidently neither a correct definition nor explanation, of the term. It is an eisegesis.

We will now answer individual points in the article: It says that the robe of righteousness cannot be justification because both justification and consecration precede Spirit-begetting, and the robe is worn by the New Creature. We reply: The robe is justification and is ours by imputation of Christ's merit at the vitalization of our justification just prior to Spirit-begetting. The flesh, which is sinful, not the New Creature, which is sinless, is covered by it, and it protects the New Creature from the faults of the flesh until the flesh is completely laid down in death by the New Creature; hence it is justification, and is received before Spirit-begetting. It is tentatively worn

in many cases years before consecration, and for an instant by the humanity before Spirit-begettal, after vitalizing of justification.

The writer of the article under review has finally given us a definition of what he means by Christ coming to His temple—our Lord's entering into the work of testing or reckoning with the Church from 1918 onward. He quotes in corroboration, "Judgment must begin at the house of God." We agree with the teaching of this Scripture, and assert that it began to apply at Passover, 1878, when the first great Harvest sifting—that on no-ransomism—began to test the Church. Furthermore, it applied in the other four harvest siftings of the Reaping period, and also applies to the sixth sifting from 1917 onward, in which sixth sifting the writer of the article under the review is the chief sifter. The troubles that involved the Society leaders and their partisan supporters in 1918 were *fit-man* experiences given them for the purpose of cleansing them. His definition of the Lord's coming to the temple ignores the five great Harvest siftings of the Parousia; and the Scriptures are vocal with the fact that our Lord came to the temple in 1874, parallel to His coming to the typical people in 29 A.D., and that He began the testing work in 1878, as our Pastor clearly taught, and as facts cited in Vol. V, Chap. II, demonstrably show, which prove him wrong.

His claim that the robe of righteousness was given since 1918 is a baseless and unfactual supposition in defense of which, therefore, no Scripture or fact has been, nor can be given. Let him give us but one time or sign prophecy to that effect, if he can! His statement that the work of the Parousia through "that Servant" was a preparation for, and, therefore, subordinate in importance to, what the Society has been doing and suffering since 1918, is an illustration of his utter lack of perspective and sense of the fitness of things. The Little Flock gatherings, preparatory for,

and subordinate to, what has been proven to be the Azazelian work of the Great Company!

The wedding garment is not Christ's righteousness, according to this article, but a joyful conformity to the Lord's arrangement in preparing for the wedding—doing the Society's work! In conformity with this definition the parable of the wedding garment is tortured into a flatness that is characteristic of the writer's vagaries; while the sublimely beautiful, true and factual interpretation of that parable given through "that Servant" goes by the board! This parable now applies since 1918, and that to brethren in relation to the Society's work! He who casts off the garment is he who since 1918 refuses joyfully to do the Society's work! How do we know such a setting of the parable to be false? It implies that crowns are lost and re-assigned in every country since the tribulation began to involve it, while the Bible shows that the wind did not blow in any country until all the elect in that country were sealed. We have given 63 proofs to the effect that Spirit-begetting ceased by Oct., 1914, and that the sealing of the Elect in their foreheads ended Passover, 1916. See 56 of these in Note III of the Appendix of Studies, Vol. III. Hence such a setting as the article gives to this parable is false.

And what is the sum-total—the meat in the kernel—of the whole article? O! joyfully and obediently (to "the present management") enter into the Society's various drives, and you will be ushered into glory, otherwise you will be put into the Great Company or the Second Death class! Do we not see the cloven hoof? What is the purpose of the article? Ah, its writer knows that, as to 1925 expectations, he is increasingly looked upon as a misleader of the brethren by thousands of brethren in the Society; and to keep them from doing what their sad experience through his deception should lead them to do—repudiate him as a teacher and executive—he is trying alternately to

draw them on by new erroneous hopes and to hold them back from leaving him and his erroneous doctrines and practices by implied threats of loss of crowns, Judas class and the rest of the stock-in-trade terrors that Little Babylon uses to bully the weak, unsuspecting sheep, as her counterpart to Great Babylon's threats of purgatory and eternal torture to the supposed heretics and disobedient.

Boastingly he claims that the Society is the only agency that is doing anything for the Lord's Truth. We, of course, recognize that they are doing "great works." But we humbly say that the Epiphany-enlightened saints are doing a more effective and important, if not so large, noisy and sensational a work. Our annual report for the last ten years show that on an average over \$15,000.00 a year have been expended in this work through the Epiphany Bible House alone. About 10,000,000 Herald Extras—four-page tracts, 9 x 12 in., and tens of thousands of books and booklets have been circulated in this time. Public lectures and pilgrim visits have been and are being given. The Present Truth is being published in five languages. Our tracts of Bro. Russell's authorship are being printed in seven different languages. A yearly average of about 50,000 Present Truths and 20,000 Heralds of the Epiphany are being circulated. 1297 newspapers carried our eight weeks' service against the Eternal Torment and Consciousness of the Dead theories, and 65 others carried John's Rebuke, to millions of readers. Our interview against Sir Arthur Conan Doyle's Spiritism propaganda was brought before 20,000,000 readers. In view of these facts, let the Tower cease boasting that the Society alone among Truth people is doing anything for the Lord, and thus claiming that it is the only agency that the Lord is using—another of its "methods of deceit" whereby uninformed brethren are kept in line by

the implied threat, to leave the Society is to be cut off from service, which the brethren dread.

In Z '25, 51-59, there is an article by the Society's president on The Year of Jubilee. He still persisted in setting forth the proven error that the antitypical jubilee begins in Oct. of 1925, instead of having begun in Oct., 1874, as was clearly proven by "that Servant." Above we summarized the evidence that disproves such an idea, hence will not repeat it here. Rather in this review we will take up certain other errors of the article in question. It cites Jer. 25: 11, 12; 29: 10 and Dan. 9: 2, which speak of the desolation of the land as lasting 70 years, as proofs that there were to be 70 jubilees. These passages do not mention the word *jubilee* at all, let alone say that there would be 70 of them; and only by indirect inference, and that by light gotten from other passages, notably Lev. 26: 33-35 and 2 Chro. 36: 20, 21, can they be brought into connection with the thought of 70 jubilees. Why did not the writer while attempting to demonstrate 70 jubilees, cite in this their most appropriate connection 2 Chro. 36: 20, 21, and Lev. 26: 33-35; which former passage is the only one in the Bible to mention the exact number of jubilees as 70? Was it because this passage teaches exactly when the 70 jubilee were fulfilled—fully kept—during the 70 years' desolation of the land? Was it because he desired to keep from his readers' minds the thought that if the 70 jubilees were fully kept at that time, they would not be kept again—repeated—in the cycles following the last jubilee before that desolation set in, and that, hence, his counting 51 of them twice to get to 1925 is a gross violation of the teaching of this passage? Why else would he cite on this point indefinite passages to prove what 2 Chro. 36: 20, 21 clearly proves, if not to hide from his readers' eyes its refuting his view. Nor can he plead ignorance of Lev. 26: 33-35 and 2 Chro. 36: 20, 21; for in other connections he

refers to them. "Methods of deceit" are these indeed.

Again, he sets forth the thought that Israel's entrance into "the land which I [Jehovah] give you" (Lev. 25: 2), was in April, 1575 B.C. Of course, Israel then crossed the Jordan and first entered the part of the land given them by God west of the Jordan; but six months before they had entered the part of the land which God gave them east of the Jordan; and since God gave them the land on both sides of Jordan and the passage (Lev. 25: 2) states that they were to begin to count the year for the jubilee from the entrance into "the land which I [Jehovah] give you"; the counting must begin in the Fall of 1576 B.C. See Appendix of Studies, Vol. II, page 401, 402. Here we will but briefly summarize the proof; it was exactly 38 years to a day from the time that Israel, for their murmuring at Kadesh-barnea after the spies returned, were turned back to wander in the wilderness, until the day that they crossed the river Arnon into, about 12 days before they began to possess, "the land which I [Jehovah] give you" (Deut. 2: 14, 18, 24, 25, vs. 20-23 being parenthetical, as indicated). A comparison of Lev. 25: 2; Deut. 2: 24 and Num. 21: 12-15, proves that it was a four- or five-day journey from the brook or valley of Zered, or Zared, to the river Arnon, Israel's southern boundary east of the Jordan (Judg. 11: 18-23). The time the messenger spent going to, remaining with, and returning from Sihon, king of the Amorites, was about six to seven days, The spies started out at the time of the *ripening of the first grapes* (Num. 13: 20) and returned after 40 days with *late summer fruits* (Num. 13: 25). Palestinian grapes now first ripen in late July, and late summer fruits 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 from two to three weeks. The spies, therefore, returned sometime from

about Aug. 25 to Sept. 15. Two days later (Num. 14: 1, 25) Israel turned back to the wilderness. Hence, 38 years later to a day brought them to the late summer of 1576 to the Zered; and about 12 days later, the day after the day of atonement, Israel first entered "the land which I give unto you."

The article under review makes the Times of the Gentiles begin about Aug. 1, 607 B.C., when Jerusalem was taken by Nebuchadnezzar, and the return of the Israelites seventy years later, supposedly about Aug. 1, 536 B.C. But God, Himself, says that the seven times, as well as the seventy jubilees, would begin with the *desolation* of the land and Israel's first absence from the land, which occurred the first day of the seventh month, about Oct. 1 (Lev. 26: 28, 32-35, 43; Jer. 41: 1, 4, 16-18). The official uncrowning of Zedekiah (Ezek. 21: 25, 27) occurred at Riblah about the first day of the seventh month; for Riblah was a five weeks' journey from Jerusalem, which was left by the Babylonians on the 23rd of the fifth month, 607 B.C. (Jer. 52: 9-11, 30, corrected reading). With this uncrowning the Times of the Gentiles began. Jer. 25: 11, 12 identifies the period of the desolation with the seventy years of Babylon's supremacy, the translation "*at* Babylon" being properly set aside for the translation, "*for* Babylon" in almost all versions of Jer. 29: 10. For details on these points please see Vol. VII. These facts prove that the Times of the Gentiles and the desolation of the land began at the same time, *i.e.*, about the first day of the seventh month. The data given in Ezra 2: 70; 3: 1 are as to the first passage indefinite as to date. Therefore it cannot be used to prove that Israel reached Palestine from Babylon about Aug. 1, 536 B.C. The statement that they dwelt in their cities evidently meant that they pitched their tents in the places where they desired to live; for a camp of tents is also Scripturally called a city (Num. 13: 19). The thought of Ezra 2: 70; 3: 1 is that they

made tent cities for their temporary abodes that they might at once repair to Jerusalem and begin to build the temple as Cyrus decreed. This they did the first day of the seventh month; consequently they erected their tents the day before and dwelt that day and night in them, hastening the next day to Jerusalem. Thus viewed these passages perfectly agree with the right thought on the period of the desolation of the land—seventy years, its desolation beginning the first day of the seventh month, the date of Zedekiah's official uncrowning. Therefore, in making the Times of the Gentiles end about Aug. 1, the Society's president is in error. Our Pastor was right in starting this period about Oct. 1. Pages 394-401 of *Studies*, Vol. II, we give a number of striking parallels with which the reign of David's house gradually came to an end; and they prove the above claim of our Pastor.

The article says that July 17, 1917 (the day of the Divinely and humanly illegal ousting of the four directors by the Society's president) was a marked date. In a sense totally different from its writer's claim, it was indeed a marked date—a date that marked his beginning the counterfeit small miniature Millennium as the little pope in the little Catholic Church in Little Babylon, corresponding to 799 A.D., when Great Papacy began its counterfeit Millennial reign in Great Babylon. Some day we will present to the Church detailed proofs that the period of the manifestation of the Levites under the bad leaders was exactly as many days long as the Gospel Age up to 1920 was years long, and that on the corresponding days and years of these respective periods exactly the same things in principle were done by the faithful and by the measurably unfaithful. And in what we will call the small miniature Gospel Age—a period, the days of which correspond to respective years in the Gospel Age—the Society's president in principle did the many evils that the popes during the Gospel Age did in the corresponding

years. This fact will help to make clear why we have in these columns frequently referred to him as the little pope, and his organization as the little Catholic Church in Little Babylon. By these terms we were not hurling opprobrious epithets at him and his organization, but were declaring a sober and demonstrable truth, arranged for and given by the Lord. From this fact it need not surprise us that when Satan learned of the real small miniature Gospel Age, he set about to create counterfeitedly dated events, in which the Society, its leaders, conventions, etc., figured, and used these counterfeitedly in counterfeit periods to bolster up the 1925 delusion of the Society mouthpieces, as we note in his article on the birth of a nation as to the 1260 days, now to be reviewed.

So blind is the article's writer becoming, that he thinks that the rain of Zech. 14: 17-19 may be literal rain. It refers to restitution blessings, which will be obtained only by coming into harmony with the kingdom—Jerusalem, as shown by our Pastor in Z '11, 152. While, as he says, no Scripture teaches that dying will cease everywhere in the earth as soon as the earthly phase of the Kingdom is setup at Jerusalem, he has in his "Millions" booklet, etc., publicly taught that the earthly phase of the Kingdom will be set up at the hands of the Ancient Worthies in 1925, and that thereafter no one need any more die! As to whether 1925 is a prophetic date or not, it is certain that it is not such from the standpoint of the jubilee, which he claims it is. His warnings against special trials that year are intended to intimidate his followers, lest they repudiate him because of his false teachings as to that year's jubilee expectations—the return of the Ancient Worthies, the establishment of the Kingdom and the cessation of the Adamic death.

In Z '25, 67-74, the same writer borrows from the theatrical world a title—The Birth Of A Nation—for an article that repudiates as much of our Pastor's

teachings as any single article of his with which we were at that time acquainted. Knowing that it would so strike his readers, he began the article with the plea—a lawyer's trick—for tolerance of the "new view." His next statement, that prophecy is not understood until fulfilled, is only half true. Some of it is, and some of it is not. It never is when connected with a trial on the Church. His statement that the devil's privilege to rule the world without interference ceased in 1914 is an error. God always interfered with Satan's rulership when it sought to transgress the Divinely fixed hindrances to its free course beyond certain limits. The history of the wane of the papacy since the days of Boniface VIII, 1294-1303, is full of marked illustrations of God's hindering Satan's world-rule ambitions. The Lord, according to the parallel dispensations, took unto Himself His great power and reigned in 1878, not in 1914; though in this latter year His wrath more markedly came upon the angry nations. He claims to have offered Scriptural proof that the Lord came to His temple—which he defines as beginning to give it its crucial tests—in 1918. He has not offered even one verse that proves this. The parallel dispensations, the antitypical jubilee cycle and Daniel's 1335 days, with their Pyramid corroborations, prove that He came to His temple in 1874, and the parallel dispensations, and the Pyramid as well as the siftings prove that He began the testing work in 1878. The flashes of Truth that he says were to have been expected since 1918—at the Lord's supposed coming to His temple—have been shining with increasing brightness since 1874; while what he claims is the advancing Truth since 1918 is proven error.

He says that Rev. 11: 17-19 belongs to chapter 12—a gross mistake—and applies to events from 1914 onward. Had he not lost the Truth on the seventh trumpet as sounding from 1874 onward, he would never have thought of teaching that the verses apply

only from 1914 onward. It is, however, on chapter, 12 that his "folly" reaches its height of absurdity and stupidity. He repudiates our Pastor's marvelous and fulfilled explanation of Rev. 12 (see notes in the Berean Bible) and applies the woman in part to glorified fled saints in heaven and in part to the Society's officers as representatives of the Church on earth. This organization, he claims, gives birth to the new nation the Millennial government of the earth—the birth of a nation. If the article is studied carefully, it will be seen that he uses the term *nation*—the one that he says is born—in the sense of the Christ's *governmental machinery* whereby Satan's empire is to be overthrown and the world is to be ruled Millennially. His use of the term shows, therefore, that the idea of a nation in the sense of God's Kingdom—the Christ, Head and Body—is not meant, but that the machinery that they use and will use to accomplish their purposes is meant. This definition is utterly false. The man-child that Is. 66: 7 says is to be born is the Christ class, not their governmental machinery. Moreover, the birth referred to in this and the following verse is a figurative one. It is the Little Flock and Great Company being delivered from Babylon—Nominal Zion—the former class *before* "the wind," etc.—the part of the tribulation which began Nominal Zion's travail would strike the countries where they were, and the latter class *after* such tribulation, even as our Pastor has explained. The real birth of the Christ class in the Body—the Kingdom—began by the resurrection in 1878, is yet progressing, and will be completed when the last member of the Christ goes beyond the vail.

His claim that stars cannot symbolize nominal leaders contradicts Jude 13, Matt. 24: 29, etc. His claim that Satan was not before 1914 debarred from, but appeared in, heaven, God's abode as distinct from the symbolic heavens, which he seeks to prove from Satan presenting him self before God in Job 1 and 2,

shows the superficiality of his views. Jesus contradicts this, speaking of a pre-human experience of His, "I saw Satan like lightning fall from heaven." To be, or to present oneself, before the Lord, means to enter into some religious activity relating to God in some way, like Israel, the Levites and the Priests presenting themselves before the Lord—it does not mean their having gone to heaven in the sense of God's abode, as the article under review would make that expression mean. He does this in order to set aside the Biblical teachings that Satan and the other fallen angels are confined within the atmosphere about this earth, and to make room for his vagary that Satan and his angels were battled with in God's abode from 1914 onward, and were then cast out of heaven. Such is his war in heaven in Rev. 12! His claim that Satan had the right to rule until 1914 is a double error. Satan never had the right to rule; he *usurped* the *power* to rule, which fact proves that he had no right to rule. The Gentile nations had a lease to rule until 1914; but Satan never! His further claim that Jesus did not have the right to rule until 1914 is also a double error. He had the right to rule throughout the universe on His resurrection (Matt. 28: 18), and began in 1878 to exercise His Millennial right to rule, and in 1914 in the further exercise of it began to overthrow Satan's empire.

His claim that March 27, 1919, to Sept. 8, 1922, are the 1260 days of Rev. 12 needs only to be stated to show its folly, and betrays an utter lack of an insight into the fitness of things. Bail was made admissible for the imprisoned brethren March 21, 1919. On March 25 they were released from prison, not on March 26, as he says (Z '19; 118). They gave the bail March 26, during the day, the court not being in Session at night. This fact disproves the 1260 days' proposition, making it 1261. But conceding him right in starting with March 27, 1919, the following answers are conclusive: Our remark above on Satan's

making counterfeit periods is the key to the refutation of his 1260 days' claim. Things do not fit a wilderness condition in his 1260 days; for some of the greatest and most widespread Society drives occurred during those times. Against his taking the days as literal, we would say that while all the numerals of Revelation are literal, the nouns that they modify are symbolic; Hence the 1260 days are symbolic—1260 years being meant, as taught by our Pastor. The flat interpretation that they left the wilderness condition September 8, 1922, when another of the Society's numerous drives was started, needs only to be stated to show its absurdity. If the earth, as he says, swallowed false teaching—the supposed water out of the serpent's mouth—persecution, not freedom therefrom, would have resulted; because the people would have acted out the errors thus swallowed. And the banner incident at the Convention is presented as a starter out from the wilderness experience! Nay, it was only part of their Azazelian wilderness experiences.

But what does the 1914 birth of the nation—the inauguration of the governmental machinery to overthrow Satan's empire and to administer the Millennial Kingdom, as he defines it, afford, that was not had by the Christ class beyond the veil before 1914, *i.e.*, from 1878 onward? Absolutely nothing. Therefore, it is merely a later start of what had existed nearly forty years before; and is their presentation as some new wonderful thing! But what is back of this application of a many years' long existing set of machinery to a date nearly forty years later? This is one of the gestures to hold wavering Society adherents in line, as though they were endowed under the Society's rulership with special powers which were not theirs during "that Servant's" day! In other words, it is one of the things now being used to bewitch and enchant, in order to divert attention from the dismal failure of all the Society's 1925 claims. This and

nothing less is its meaning and purpose. Therefore, it should be acted toward accordingly. Let us watch and see what other diversions will be brought forth. We may expect more; for the condition is desperate for the Society's president, since thousands of his followers are beginning to see through his religious frauds.

In Z '25, 91, the following question is asked: "If the offer of life to Israel was bona fide, and any one who measured up to God's requirements would have been given life, would it not be true to say that God is at liberty to grant life on compliance with any conditions He chooses to impose?" The answer states that any one who would have kept the Law would have gotten everlasting life without a ransom, because nobody but Adam was under sentence, though all were under condemnation. In the first place, to be under the condemnation of God is to be under sentence; and in the second place the statement that Adam alone was under sentence is false (Rom. 5: 12-19). We give our answer by a question and answer:

Question: Was Israel under a death sentence inherited from Adam before coming under the Law Covenant, and did their failure to fulfill the Law Covenant also bring upon them a sentence of death?

Answer: Yes, we give as our answer to both questions. They were of the race of whom it is written, We "were by nature [heredity] the children of wrath [the death sentence, Rom. 1: 18, 32], even as *others*" (Eph. 2: 3). The Apostle most clearly shows (Rom. 5: 12-19) that the whole race not only shares death, but also shares the death sentence with Adam. This becomes clear from the whole section, especially as we notice the run of thought between vs. 16 and 18. V. 16 shows that the Adamic judgment was a condemnatory sentence; and v. 18 elaborates this by showing that this condemnatory sentence came upon all men through Adam: the result of the one man's offense was a

condemnation upon all men. Hence the whole race inherited not only death, but the death sentence, from Adam. This is also apparent from 1 Cor. 15: 22: "As all in Adam die." This passage does not mean that all in Adam will actually enter the death state, but that all in Adam actually come under the death sentence. The whole Plan of God, more particularly its central feature, the Ransom, is pivoted upon the thought that the whole race is under the sentence of death in Adam, and that it is dying, not only because of having inherited an imperfect life from him, and must spend its existence amid imperfect surroundings conducive to death, but also because there is resting upon it the sentence of Divine justice unto death (John 3: 36), which it has inherited from Adam. While this sentence came upon all in Adam, indirectly, *i.e.*, through him, its involving them, even if indirectly, is nevertheless an actual involving of them in that sentence. To deny this proposition is logically to deny the Ransom. We therefore consider the denial of the actual condemnation of the race in Adam in the Aug., 1920, Tower to be a clear denial of the Ransom, and as such to be in most violent opposition to the Holy Scriptures and to our Pastor's masterly expositions on this subject. There was no injustice, which that article claims there would have been, in God's conditionally offering Israel life when He knew it was impossible for Him to give them life on the proffered condition. This is apparent from several reasons: (1) because He knew they could not fulfill the condition, and therefore knew that He would never be called upon by the eventuality of such fulfillment to give them what His justice forbade; (2) because He knew that their efforts to gain life by the Law would benefit them by uplifting them above the rest of mankind—symbolized by the Pyramid's First Ascending Passage—and thus He knew His offer would benefit, not injure them; (3) because no injustice ever befell any of them by reason

of being under that Covenant; (4) because He knew that their failure to keep the Law would make them feel the need of a Savior; (5) because He knew that their failure, with conjoined teachings and experiences, would prepare the faithful to receive the Savior when He should come, and would benefit the rest in the Millennium; (6) because He knew that their experiences would be helpful in influencing Gentiles toward the Savior; and (7) because He knew that the Law Covenant would become the means of Jesus' maintaining His life-rights under the Law, and that this would sanction these life-rights becoming available for delivering them from the Law's condemnation, and that this would put Him into a position to give them life under conditions that He would enable them to fulfill. Most fallacious, therefore, in the reasoning of the above-mentioned article in ascribing injustice to God, if He had offered to give the Jews life on condition of keeping the Law, though He could not in justice have given it because of their being under the Adamic sentence. The condition in which Israel was, and the purposes that the Lord had in mind did justify Him in making them an offer that was impossible for Him to realize for them, if they could have fulfilled the conditions, which He knew they could not do.

In Z '25, 131-137 is an article from his pen on the subject, For The Elect's Sake. This article repudiates our Pastor's explanation of Matt. 24: 21, 22, which teaches that the shortening of the period of tribulation is at its end, and that the expression translated, "for the Elect's sake," should be rendered, on account of the Elect," *i.e.*, that the Elect beyond the vail will interfere and prevent anarchy and Jacob's trouble—the last parts of the tribulation—from running their full and natural course, and thus prevent the annihilation of the human family. Certainly the Bible teaches this with respect to Israel, whose deliverance from destruction at the hands of the anarchistic remnants is

expressly credited to miraculous Divine interposition (Ezek. 39). Matt. 24: 21, 22 teaches the shortening of the length of the trouble, not as the article under review teaches, the shortening of the war feature of the trouble. The article under review claims that in all the countries involved in the World War there were, long after the war began, people who were of the Elect, or who could be made of the Elect, but who were not yet reaped—sealed in their foreheads; that the war conditions prevented their being reaped; and that the Lord brought the war to an abrupt end for the sake of reaping these elect or electable ones. Thus the war was, according to this new view, shortened in order to win these brethren. This, the article teaches, is meant by our Lord's statement that on account of the Elect the Time of Trouble would be shortened. Against this new view, which we all recognize repudiates our Pastor's view, we offer the following objections:

(1) The text says that the duration of the trouble—"those days," the Time of Trouble—and not the first features of the trouble (as was the war), is the thing that is to be shortened. The shortening of the war would not necessarily shorten the duration of the trouble; nor has it actually shortened it, else it would now be over; for the Time of Trouble has been going right on since the war ended, though up to the present time with less intensity than during the war. Had the war been the last feature of the trouble, then to have shortened it would have shortened the duration of the trouble. Therefore the explanation that the article under review gives does not show a shortening of the Time of Trouble.

(2) According to the Bible (Rev. 7: 1-3), the Elect of each country must all be sealed before the war would strike that country. Therefore there could be no unsealed Elect in any war-involved country after the war involved that country. This refutes the assumed, but unfactual, view that the Lord abruptly

ended the war, and that in order to seal the war-involved countries' supposedly unsealed Elect whose sealing could ostensibly not be done during the war; and thus it refutes the new view that the shortening of those days means shortening the war in order to seal the remainder of the Elect in the war-involved countries. To escape this conclusion the article under review, contradicting our Pastor's known definitions of the winds and the wind of verse 1 (see Berean Comments), confuses a number of things: (a) the winds of v. 1, which are the fallen angels, with its wind, which is the World War (1 Kings 19: 11; Ps. 48: 7; 107: 25); (b) the winds, which are the fallen angels, but which are in the article falsely defined as destructive power, with the whirlwind, which is the revolution and anarchy of the Time of Trouble (Jer. 25: 30-38); and (c) the four winds of Jer. 49: 32-36; Ezek. 5: 10-12; 17: 21; Dan. 11: 4, which stand for the four points of the compass with its falsely defined symbolic winds, wind and whirlwind.

(3) The Bible also teaches that the reaping would end shortly before the war would reach the reaper (Studies, Vol. III, 387-404).

(4) The war did not come to an abrupt end as claimed in the article under review; for every informed person knows that it tapered off gradually. It certainly began suddenly: Austria's 48 hours' ultimatum and Germany's 12 hours' ultimatum made it begin suddenly, as the Scriptures teach it would (1 Thes. 5: 3); but the Bible and the parallels nowhere teach that it would end suddenly. The figure here used disproves it; for birth pangs during the delivery taper off gradually. That the war tapered off gradually is evident from the following facts: (1) Bulgaria on Sept. 27, 1918, appealed for terms and, receiving them, surrendered Sept. 30, 1918; (2) Turkey on Oct. 14, 1918, asked for terms of surrender and accepted those granted by the Allies Oct. 30, 1918; (3) Austria asked for terms of surrender on Oct. 31, 1918, and accepted

the Allied terms Nov. 1, 1918; and (4) Germany on Nov. 7, 1918, sued for an armistice, which was granted Nov. 11, 1918. (See the Encyclopedia Americana, Vol. 28, 459-452.) Thus the war was about a month and a half in closing—from the first appeal for terms of surrender until the last terms were accepted, which proves clearly that it did not end abruptly. For several months the defeats and famines of the Central Powers presaged their collapse. The article under review stresses its fictitious claim of an abrupt ending to the war in order to inculcate the thought that God supernaturally interfered Nov. 11, 1918, in order to free the Society people from restraints so that they might allegedly finish the sealing of the Elect. Again, the article under review, with very ambiguous language, juggles the dates for the Jewish-Roman war so as to make them parallel with 1914-1918, in order to instill its thought of a Divine interposition ending the war Nov. 11, 1918, in order to reap and glean the rest of the Elect. Of course any informed person will at once recognize this jugglery. Cestius Gallus came up against Jerusalem in 66 A.D. (paralleling 1912, not 1914), by which the Jewish-Roman war began. April 18, 70 A.D., the siege of Jerusalem under Titus began. The last part of the city was taken Sept. 11, 70 A.D. Only three fortresses in all Palestine remained untaken after the capture of Jerusalem. Of these Masada fell as the last after a siege of ten days, April 1, 73 A.D. Moreover there is no parallel between April 1, 73 A.D. and Nov. 11, 1918; for this period is more than 7 months longer than the parallel time—1845 years. J.F.R., again, parallels wrath with grace acts! Nor was there any conversion work done *in Palestine* after the war, for the Jews were driven out. Thus the parallel in its dates and events does not fit the setting that the new view requires for its proof from the parallel. Accordingly, this new view, like his other new views, collapses.

The article introduces many false assertions germane and not germane to its central thought—the stopping of the war in order to reap and glean the rest of the Elect. Contrary to our Pastor's thought, J.F.R. understands the dragon of Rev. 16: 13 to be Satan, and the beast to be the civil, ecclesiastical and business powers. He fails to state his thought on the false prophet of this verse. He is expecting a war greater than the World War, in proof of which he quotes approvingly from various secular writers. The Scripture, under the symbol of the wind, refers to the World War as the greatest of all wars (1 Kings 19: 11). Doubtless the great earthquake will be greater than the World War, but it will be a revolution and not a war. While doubtless small wars will continue to occur, no great war like the World War will come. He applies Is. 24: 22, which refers to the prisoners of the tomb, who will in the great day be recovered therefrom, to the imprisonment of Satan (Rev. 20: 3).

In Z '25, 163-168, J.F.R. has an article entitled, Light in Darkness. It contains considerable darkness amid some light. It correctly designates a number of things that will lead one out of the Truth into darkness. But the main thing that has caused him and other leaders in the Truth to go into darkness he fails to mention, *i.e.*, grasping for power and lording it over their brethren. The Lord charges him in Matt. 24: 48-51 with three great offenses: (1) sinning against the Lord—"my Lord delayeth"; "therefore I will run ahead of Him in self-will"; (2) sinning against the brethren—"smite his fellowservants"; and (3) sinning against the Truth—"eat and drink with the drunken." In Zech. 11: 16 the Lord charges him with gross sins of omission and commission, and for these sins pronounces upon him as punishments the utter loss of influence among New Creatures and Youthful Worthies and complete blindness in his theories. It is for this reason that every new view

that he brings forth is erroneous and every attempt to extend his power makes him lose it as respects New Creatures and Youthful Worthies. He is right when he says, "Only saints will continue to walk in the light until the perfect day." And by this token he is proven to be no saint; for he has for years increasingly been going further and further away from the light that he once enjoyed into contrasted darkness, unto which he is Divinely sentenced. When he who is walking in darkness writes on the conditions necessary to walking in the light, we are forcibly reminded of the words of the Lord (Ps. 50: 16-21): "But to the wicked [Matt. 24: 48] God saith, What has thou to do to declare My statutes, or that thou shouldst take My covenant in thy mouth? seeing thou hatest instruction [richly given him by "that Servant"] and castest My words behind thee [by inventing new views whereby he casts away formerly held truths]. When thou sawest a thief [the not unusual corporation plutocrat of our day who through tricky lawyers defrauds fellow directors] then thou consentedst with him [by stealing the controllership in the Society from its directors and ousting the majority for opposing his power-grasping] and hast been partaker with adulterers [practicing in Little Babylon the principle of the union of church and state in the union of a corporation and the Church]. Thou, givest thy mouth to evil [teachings], and thy tongue frameth deceit [against the Truth]. Thou sittest [in the office of president] and speakest against thy brother [who protested against your wrong teachings and practices]; thou [falsely] slanderest [in Harvest Siftings] thy own mother's [Rachel's] son! These things thou hast done, and I kept silence [so far as putting you out of power is concerned]; thou thoughtest that I was altogether such an one as thyself (that I was using you for my special representative as the head of the "channel");

but I will reprove thee, and set him in order before thine eyes [vindicate him in your presence]."

In this same article he refers to the wedding garment as the preparation for the Kingdom, instead of Christ's righteousness, a thing that we have refuted above. In this article, as well as in numerous others, he sets forth a doctrine as to God's organization that makes it consist of the working machinery of the Church beyond the veil and the Society this side of the veil, while God's organization is the Church—provisional while in the flesh, permanent when in the spirit. See Chap. II.

In Z '25, 179-185 is an article on, The Way To Life. In par. 7 J.F.R. falsely defines as meaning *morning star* the word, Lucifer, which means *light bearer*. In pars. 14 and 15 he denies that Lucifer usurped authority over man, because, he alleges, God gave him authority over man. We deny both his claim and the reason he gives for it. Satan never was given authority over man by God—never was by God made man's ruler. He was as the covering cherub commissioned by God to protect man in Eden (Ezek. 28: 14); but this did not make him man's ruler, any more than the commission of the good angels to protect the saints makes them the rulers of the latter (Matt. 18: 10; Heb. 1: 14). While functioning as man's protector and not as his ruler, Lucifer "meditated a usurpation," a fact that is not only impliedly stated in Phil. 2: 6 in contrast with our Lord's course, but is directly stated in Is. 14: 15, 16: "I will sit upon the mount of the congregation [the kingdom of the people] ... I will be like the Most High [found a kingdom like God's]." Accordingly, Lucifer was not only untrue to his trust in Eden, but as the two passages just quoted prove, he became untrue to his trust by attempting a usurpation of authority over man. He was not content to act merely as man's protector—"covering cherub"—but as others since have done,

a notable example of them being J.F.R., he usurpatorily grasped for power and lordship over man, even to the extent of sinning and plunging man into sin and death in order to accomplish it. Satan never had the right to rule over man. Every whit of power that he has exercised and still exercises over man is usurped. When Satan told our Lord that the kingdoms of this world were given to him he falsified. He usurped them; and as his usurped kingdom he was *permitted*, not authorized, by the Lord under certain restraints to rule. The article under review errs when it limits the expression "morning stars" in Job 38: 7 to the Logos and Lucifer; for the parallelism of this verse shows that by that expression all the angels are meant; for the expression, "the morning stars sang together," is paralleled by the expression, "all the sons of God shouted for joy."

In paragraphs 23 and 24 the writer contrasts iniquity with error. What is said of iniquity is good enough; but error is defined in such a way as to include departure from both truth and *duty*. This is too wide. Error contrasted with wickedness is false belief and teaching. Wrongs against duty are matters of wickedness, not of error. This false definition of error is given, because the writer desires to make the expression, "the error of the wicked," cover the refusal to do the work of the Society, or to do a work not done, but disapproved by the Society, calling it selfishness in paragraph 61. In following parts of the article this false definition of error is made to serve just this office. On the contrary, the expression, "the error of the wicked," is the false teaching of apostates from the Truth, like J.F.R. Against his error, as well as against that of other sifters—antitypical Jannes and Jambres—the Lord warns us in 2 Pet. 3: 17.

The article under review quotes Is. 14: 12 as a proof that Satan's casting out of heaven means his supposed final defeat, *i.e.*, from 1914 on. It denies

that it refers to him from the time of his introducing sin in Eden onward, on the ground that there were no nations then. This reason is shallow; for it overlooks the way in which Satan then weakened the unborn nations. A mere beginner in the Truth knows that by bringing sin and through it death upon man in Eden, Satan weakened the unborn nations. How do, we know that in v. 12 Satan's casting out from heaven is meant by the words, "How art thou fallen from heaven [Luke 10: 18], O Lucifer, son of the morning! How art thou cut down to the ground [confined to the earth as his sphere of existence], which didst weaken the nations!" We answer, the following verses give as the reason for his being cast out of heaven and being confined to this earth the unholy ambition that prompted him to grasp for power over men and angels, which had its beginning in Eden: "*for* thou hast said in *thy heart*." Here Satan's unholy ambition in grasping for power, which he began in Eden, is given as the reason for his being cast out of heaven into the earth—a thing that Jesus said He saw occurring in His prehuman condition (Luke 10: 18). Thus Is. 14: 12-14 undoubtedly proves that Satan was cast out of heaven just after his sinning in Eden.

In the article under review (pars. 50-57) a new view of the antitype of the murderer fleeing to the city of refuge and of the avenger of blood is given. Our Pastor taught (see Berean Comments) that the murderer is the Adamic sinner, the one murdered is the principle of righteousness set aside by this sin, the avenger of blood is justice and the city of refuge is Christ. The lesson is that the sinner's only escape from death at the hands of justice in his flight by faith and consecration to Christ, and his remaining in Him until His high-priestly work on his behalf has come to an end, when he will be forever safe. This beautiful, fitting and true antitype is set aside by the preposterous interpretation that the murderer is the New Creature,

that Satan is the avenger of blood and that the humanity of the New Creature is the one murdered—*murdered* forsooth at consecration! In elaborating this preposterous view the article says that Jehovah has appointed Satan to the office of ruling over the race, and that this makes him the nearest kinsman of all men! While permitting the usurper to execute the race, God would appoint him to nothing except destruction. If Satan were God's appointed ruler of the race, God would be responsible for Satan's sinful rule. Jesus says that Satan is the murderer of the race, its worst enemy, not its next kinsman—vindicator against injury (John 8: 44).

He warns (par. 61); on the basis of 2 Tim. 3: 1, of our perilous times. He (2 Tim. 3: 1-9) more than any other living person has made them perilous. When he says that some brethren having selfishly sought to shine above others is the cause of the strife that makes our times perilous, he tells the truth; but truth forces us to say that he is the most guilty of all such; for more than all others has he grasped for power and lordship over the brethren and ruthlessly trampled upon all other prominent brethren who stood in the way of his gaining and retaining such usurped power. Moreover, his desire to shine as the inventor of "new views" continually leads him to propound errors against which the faithful are duty bound to contend in the interests of the Lord, the Truth and the brethren (Jude 3); and thus he is the cause of the most strife among God's people. Blessed are they who contend against him earnestly for the faith once delivered to the saints and now being corrupted by him.

In an article entitled, *The Remnant*, in Z '25, 211-218, there are several further repudiations of our Pastor's teachings on the part of J.F.R. and the substitution of "new views" in their stead. We will note several of these: One is found in pars. 31-33. There he sets forth the thought that the separation of the

tares from the wheat, and the bad fish from the good, as set forth in Matt. 13: 41, 49, is something that occurs now as distinct from the time before the war, and means the separation of some of the Truth people from what he and his supporters consider the Lord's true people—the Society supporters. That his application cannot be true is evident from the fact that the wheat and the tares are first separated, then the tares are bundled and thereafter cast into the fiery furnace. The casting into the fiery furnace, which is the tribulation, began with the World War in 1914. Therefore the bundling of the tares must have preceded that time. As a matter of fact the bundling of the tares nationally began in the formation of the Triple Alliance, from 1879 to 1881, and received its completion in the formation of the Triple Entente, brought into being from 1891 to 1904. That this explanation is true is evident from the fact that Jesus uses verses 41 to 43 to explain verse 30. With his usual superficial, slipshod and Greek-ignorant thinking, J.F.R. seizes on the expression, "They [the tare gatherers who began this gathering before 1879 when the bundling began] shall gather [together] out of [away from] His kingdom all things that offend and them which do iniquity," as a proof of his new view. The proper translation is "they shall gather *together away from* [for the Greek *ex* in the sense of *away from* please see Rev. 14: 13; 2 Tim. 2: 26; 2 Pet. 2: 21; John 8: 42; 12: 32; 17: 15; Acts 12: 7; 15: 29] His kingdom, etc." As our Pastor explained, there is a twofold viewpoint of the separation of the wheat and the tares, dependent on whether the tare gatherers or the wheat gatherers are regarded as the actors. If the wheat gatherers are regarded as the actors, then the wheat was regarded as being separated from the tares "Come out of her My people"; but if the tare gatherers are regarded as active, and this is the viewpoint of verse 41, then the tares are regarded as being separated from the wheat—the

"kingdom." This explanation makes all clear on this part of the parable and of Jesus' explanation of it, while the interpretation under review confuses everything, making the separation follow the bundling and burning of the tares.

We desire to say something on his perversion of Zech. 14: 1-3, set forth in known opposition to the proper interpretation of our Pastor. The article explains the Jerusalem there treated as "God's organization"—the Society, of course; and the battle there referred to is explained as their conflict with the civil powers, especially during the war. It will be recalled that our Pastor treats this section as referring to Jacob's Trouble. The article denies our Pastor's views on the flimsy and alleged reason that it is not reasonable to apply it to regathered Israel, whose unbelief and whose small numbers are alleged as making the application to them unreasonable. Why should it be unreasonable that the remnants of anarchists left in all nations after anarchy, will go up to plunder Israel in Palestine? Why should Israel's final punishment be considered as unreasonable in coming to them in their unbelief? It is their very unbelief that makes such an experience reasonable, yea necessary, to humble them out of their unbelief. And it is their comparatively small numbers combined with their great wealth that will lure the anarchistic remnants from all nations to their own final punishment in devastating regathered Israel, even as Ezekiel 38 and 39 teach.

In Z '25, 243-248 is an article entitled, Protection And Deliverance. Like other articles of J.F.R., it contains erroneous "new views." One of these (pars. 16-20) is given to bolster up his false view of the robe of righteousness refuted above. It gives a false application to Zech. 3: 1-3, where Joshua, in type of the Christ, Head and Body, is presented as clothed in body, not in head, in filthy garments, and is given a change of garments. Our Pastor explains this vision properly

in Z '93, 13. As Aaron was robed in beauty and glory at consecration *prospectively* to show the future glory of the Christ, so this vision represents the Christ *in its Body*, not in the Head, but *retrospectively before* the imputation of Christ's merit, when all our righteousness was as filthy rags, and then, dropping the retrospective view, it shows the same class *after* that imputation, represented as the change of garments in the picture. That these filthy garments cannot refer to this class *after* the imputation of Christ's merit, as the article under review claims, is evident: (1) because then they are in clean garments—the robe of righteousness, represented by the white, clean garments of Aaron's sons at the consecration service; and (2) because filthy or spotted garments cause one to forfeit his place in the Christ class (Jude 23; Rev. 7: 14; Num. 8: 21). We agree with his application of Ps. 32: 9, 10 as referring to stubborn, heady brethren who misuse the Truth (par. 23), and would add that he is the foremost of such stubborn, heady ones who misuse the Truth, as practically every article that he writes shows; and the many sorrows that this passage pronounces against such misusers of the Truth, the Lord says will come upon him individually (Matt. 24: 51).

In par. 33, and frequently in later articles, he uses the words, "time is no more," in false paraphrase of Rev. 10: 6, "that there should be time [delay] no longer," to mean that "no longer are we to deeply concern ourselves about time." The connection of Rev. 10: 6 shows that the expression applies before 1874; for it shows that the beginning of sounding the seventh trumpet was still future. Hence the words cannot mean what he uses them to mean; for God's people are commended for earnestly studying (Rev. 1: 3), among other things, certain time features subsequent to the angel's oath, of which these words are a part. But why this anxiety to discourage the diligent study

of time features? "Ah, there is the rub!" In his delusion on the Seventy Jubilee Cycles, against which we gave him very early warning, he insisted on five things that were to occur by Oct., 1925, and that have failed to occur: (1) the deliverance of the Church and Great Company; (2) the end of the tribulation; (3) the return of the Ancient Worthies; (4) the establishment of the earthly phase of the kingdom; and (5) people no more needing to die—"Millions, etc." His positiveness on this date ought to have aroused distrust of his views, and did in many sober minds. Of course he now agitates that they are not to be deeply concerned about time features! Indeed, he would like them to forget all about his having deceived them on the subject! But they should not forget his deception of them. They should hold it against him as a sure proof that he is an unreliable teacher. Now he, pope like, decries criticism of his proven errors as quarrelsomeness! And, true to Little Babylon's counterpart to hell-fear, he threatens such alleged quarrelsomeness with loss of the crown! And he bids his misled followers to busy themselves in the "great works" of the Society as help against falling from steadfastness!

Some other repudiations of "that Servant's" teachings and substitution of erroneous views in their stead are made in an article entitled, *Diligence and Fervency*, in Z '25, 259-263. In this article (par. 5), he faults those who were misled by the false expectations that he himself gave them on 1925. He charges their expectation as originating in their selfishness and rebukes them for it. But undeniably he was himself the one that raised such expectations; still he utters not one word of sorrow or confession as to his sin in this respect. In par. 6 he reiterates the claim, for which he has not offered one scintilla of pertinent proof, that in 1918 the Lord first came to His temple, which He has explained as meaning His entering into the testing of His people. Our Pastor clearly proved by

the parallel dispensations, etc., that the Lord came to His temple in 1874, and began to test His people in 1878, in the first harvest sifting; and the Lord has been continuing it in the five subsequent siftings, the last beginning in 1917 and still continuing.

Just as the papacy, while pretending great reverence for the Apostles, has gradually set aside their teachings and arrangements, so he, while pretending great reverence for "that Servant," has been setting aside his Divinely sanctioned teachings and arrangements. Beloved brethren of the Society, for you longer to follow this great errorist, whom God Himself calls "that evil servant" and "the foolish and unprofitable shepherd," is at the great peril of your New Creatures! He can only lead you into further darkness, disappointment and loss. And his berating you as manifesting unfaithfulness with consequent loss of your crowns, if you do not do what he calls in par. 10 "the work that is yet to be done," is a Satanic effort to keep you in line as victims of further delusions and as frantic workers in his further drives. Your overcoming depends indeed upon your faithfulness to the Lord unto the end in harmony with the *Truth*, which will lead you to repudiate him—the most dangerous and deceitful enemy of the Truth on earth. And his plea in par. 26, coupled with "time is no more," that this requires you to persevere in what he desires you to do as God's work finds its parallel in similar pleas of the papacy to deceived Catholics, and will lead to the same general consequences, if followed as many Catholics follow the papacy's pleas—to disappointment and chagrin, in comparison with which the disappointment and chagrin as to the 1925 error are small.

The King In Action, is the subject of an article in Z '25, 275-278, which calls for some comment. In par. 8, J.F.R. quotes Heb. 10: 12, 13, "sat down on the right hand of God; from henceforth expecting till His enemies be made His footstool," as a proof that

"Jesus must remain inactive as against the devil up to a time certain, which time was fixed by His Father." Elsewhere he tells us that this time was not before 1914, when He supposedly battled with Satan and drove him out of heaven—God's Court. In harmony with St. Paul (1 Cor. 15: 24-26), we understand the expression, to make His enemies His footstool, *i.e.*, to put them under His feet, to mean *to destroy them*; and since the Adamic death is the last of His enemies to be destroyed (1 Cor. 15: 25), and since Satan and the post-Millennial wicked will be destroyed after the Adamic death is destroyed, he, the fallen angels and wicked men, are not included in the expression, to make His enemies His footstool. Therefore this passage cannot mean that "Jesus is to remain inactive as against the devil up to a time certain"; for it does not refer to the devil at all. The passage, as that Servant interpreted it, means that while exercising [sitting] Jehovah's power and enjoying His chief favor [right hand], Christ, during the Gospel Age, must wait until the Millennium, when gradually He will destroy His enemies—"all rule and all authority and power," *i.e.*, every *effect* of Satan on mankind (1 John 3: 8).

This passage does not teach that Christ during the Gospel Age must remain inactive as against Satan. Compatibly with God's purpose in permitting evil to the Church and the world, Jesus often during the Gospel Age hindered and thwarted Satan, e.g., the Reformation was a mighty hindrance put upon Satan by Christ—"whom [papacy is Satan's special representative] the Lord [Jesus] will consume by the spirit of His mouth [in the Reformation]" (2 Thes. 2: 8). It is true that before 1874 Jesus did not begin to bind Satan preparatory to overthrowing his empire; but ever since that time He has been binding him and in 1914 had so far bound him in national respects as to *begin* to overthrow his empire by the World War; and the pre-revolution phase of the binding is now

going on. The new view that Satan was not cast out of God's heaven until 1914, and was not acted against by our Lord until 1914, has no foundation in Heb. 10: 12, 13, nor in any other Scripture.

To his question in par. 14, "Did the world end in 1914?" we answer, No, not specially. In a sense it ended in 1874, in another in 1878, in a third in 1881, in a fourth sense in 1914, in a fifth it will end in 1954, and in a sixth in 1956; for this world ends and the next begins lappingly into one another, as that Servant taught. It is true that 1914 ended the Times of the Gentiles; but the present evil world is not yet finally ended. The fight between Christ and Satan for the overthrow of Satan's empire began very soon after our Lord's return, and not in 1914, though at that date a very important stage in the fight for the overthrow of that empire was entered. None of these facts are in the remotest degree related to Satan's being cast out of heaven, which the Scriptures teach occurred just after the sin in Eden.

In par. 15 he states that the first work of Christ [in 1914] was to cast the devil out of heaven, which in the March 1 Tower he defined as God's Court. Then he attempts a proof of this from 2 Pet. 3: 12, where the symbolic heavens—the powers of spiritual control—are referred to as being dissolved. According to his application, God's abode in the Pleiades will burn up! He evidently does not understand the heavens of 2 Pet. 3: 12 to mean the powers of spiritual control; for he includes the latter as the "ecclesiastical elements" "in the earthly part," in contrast with the heavens from which, according to him, Satan was cast out in 1914. Here is a proof that he considers the heavens of 2 Pet. 3: 12 not to be the symbolic heavens, but God's own abode, and according to this worse than the nominal church view, God's abode is to be dissolved.

In Z '25, 323-327 is an article on, A Call To Action,

that in parts calls for a reply. Its writer, J.F.R., in pars. 6-9, perverts Is. 62: 10, which we will quote and briefly explain: "Go through [the gate of consecration; Matt. 7: 13]; go through [the gate of death, by carrying out consecration] the gates; prepare ye the way of the people [by sacrificing, that there may be a highway of holiness]; cast up, cast up the highway [by teaching restitution truths]; gather out the stones [of error]; lift up a standard (of truth and righteousness) for the people." The bracketed comments give that Servant's thought on this text. Thus understood, it is an exhortation especially applicable to the Lord's people during the Harvest, even as he so applied it; and without any doubt the Lord's people then fulfilled it. But the pars. under review seek to apply it to the time since 1918 to "the nation," whose "birth" we examined above. Par. 26, considered in connection with his hundreds of repudiations, casts reflection on "that Servant" by saying: "Some would now dishonor the Lord by saying that He committed every detail [This is a cunning and mischievous misrepresentation of the teaching that the entire storehouse was placed in "that Servant's" charge] of His Truth to [a] man ["that Servant"] and that the light of Truth, instead of shining more and more according to promise; ceased to shine in 1916 [the year of "that Servant's" death]; and that since then there is nothing more to do." This quotation sets up a man of straw and kicks it over. Its purpose is to convey the thought that the light has been shining right on through J.F.R. It is only the shallow and the ill informed who would teach that "that Servant" gave the full light unto the perfect day. The light has been shining on since his death; and because what he gave was light and not darkness, the succeeding light has been in harmony with and has flowed out of that which he gave us. It has not, like J.F.R.'s teaching, given darkness on hundreds of subjects made bright and clear by "that Servant's"

writings. He has presented instead of the formerly given light ever increasing darkness, claiming it to be advancing light. This has been the claim every sifter from Mr. Barbour, the first harvest sifter, to J.F.R., the leading sifter of the last harvest sifting. Let none of God's people be deceived: The Society's president as Satan's chief servant among Truth people is, like his master, putting light for darkness and darkness for light. If what he is teaching is light, then what "that Servant" gave was very largely darkness. To accept his "new views" as light inevitably implies the rejection as darkness of an ever increasing amount of light given by "that Servant." But which of the two—for they are in direct contradiction on hundreds of subjects—has given the light? God says that "that Servant" gave it (Luke 12: 42-44; Matt. 24: 45-47; Num. 4: 16). And God says that J.F.R. is drunk with error and increasingly blinded with darkness (Matt. 24: 48-51; Zech. 11: 15-17).

In par. 38 the article grossly misinterprets Is. 30: 26, which we will quote with bracketed comments: "Moreover the light [teachings] of the moon [the Old Testament] shall be [as clear] as the light [teachings] of the sun [New Testament], and the light [teachings] of the sun [New Testament] shall be sevenfold [perfectly clear] in the [finished Harvest] day that the Lord bindeth up [heals] the breach [made by error] of His people, and healeth the stroke of their wound [made by Great and Little Babylon]." The article under review pervertingly defines the moon as representing the expressed will of God and claims that the passage teaches that God's expressed will is as clear as the sun to His people now. It is not true that the Lord's will is now as clear as the sun. On the contrary, the Word is now "a lamp to our feet and a light to our path" amid much uncertainty and darkness—"a light shining in a dark place," until by the end of the Epiphany everything in the Bible will be clear.

The article under review defines the sun as the light of the kingdom of the Lord.

One of J.F.R.'s champion articles for putting darkness for light, and for rejecting that Servant's teaching in the interests of his own "new views," is the article on, The Holy Spirit Poured Out, in Z '25, 339-344. In this article he grossly perverts the clear interpretation of Joel 2: 28, 29 given us by that faithful and wise Servant. Beautifully clear is the latter's setting given to this passage, *i.e.*, that verse 29 describes the outpouring of the Spirit for the Church in the Gospel Age, and that verse 28 describes the pouring out of the Spirit for the world in the Millennial Age. But the article under review denies this twofold application, and applies both verses to the Gospel Age. According to it the servants and handmaids are such literally of the Jewish brethren in the beginning of this Age, and the *all flesh* are the rest of the Jewish brethren; additionally also they are the Gentile brethren gathered out of all nations during the Gospel Age, especially since 1918! His main argument is that St. Peter quotes this passage in Acts 2 and applies it to the Gospel Age. To this argument we reply that St. Peter's quotation of the passage was not for the purpose of interpreting it, nor to show to what Age or Ages it applied, but to refute the accusation of drunkenness made by the Jews against him and his fellow Apostles (Acts 2: 13). St. Peter denies that the phenomenon that the Jews witnessed was drunkenness (v. 15), and asserts that the phenomenon was the outpouring of the Holy Spirit, not a sinful but a Divinely approved thing, prophesied by Joel (v. 16). He then proceeds to quote the entire section of Joel treating of the outpouring of the Spirit; but makes no interpretation or application of the passage further than to use it to prove that the Jews were not witnesses of drunkenness, but of the outpouring of the Spirit. If St. Peter's purpose in making the quotation and his

use of it are kept in mind, we will at once recognize that there is nothing in St. Peter's use of the passage to limit its application to the Gospel Age, as the article under review contends, and that after the manner of certain nominal church interpreters—post-Millennialists. Similarly, if in the next Age the outpouring of the Spirit would be represented as drunkenness, the passage could with equal propriety be quoted to disprove the charge; but such a use of the passage would not limit its application to the Millennium. St. Peter did with this passage what in perfect propriety has been done with other passages—use them to refute an error or to prove a truth, without giving the full application of the passage. *E.g.*, St. Paul in Heb. 10: 15-17, to prove the forgiveness of our sins, quotes from Jer. 31: 33, 34, which gives many details on the New Covenant, among which details is one with reference to the forgiveness of sins—which is the thing to be proven. St. Paul's argument was that our faith justification reckoning us as living after the Millennium, and therefore as having all the New Covenant blessings reckoned to us, we must have forgiveness of sins, for it is one of the New Covenant blessings. But the section on the New Covenant establishment is quoted, not to prove that the New Covenant applies now or later, but to show that we enjoy forgiveness of sins, which is only one of the New Covenant blessings mentioned in Jer. 31: 33, 34. But how foolish it would be for us to use this quotation as proving that the New Covenant applies to the Gospel Age! In a similar manner St. Peter quotes Joel 2: 28-32, not to apply the whole passage to the present time or to any other time, but to prove that the phenomenon that the Jews witnessed was not drunkenness, but the outpouring of the Spirit. Hence he does not limit it to the Gospel Age. Having thus disposed of his main argument, we next take up his second chief argument, that the expression all flesh cannot apply to the Millennium.

It does apply to the whole race, but its work of blessing must be limited to certain ones, because the whole human family will not receive the Holy Spirit in the Millennium; for then as now only those who obey will receive it (Acts 5: 32). We agree that all flesh will not receive the Holy Spirit in the next Age. Then as now, only the obedient will receive it, Those who then refuse obedience, *e, g.,* those who die at 100 years, will not receive the Holy Spirit. But this does not prove his claim that the passage applies only to the Gospel Age; for the reasoning used by him in making it inapplicable to the Millennial Age makes it inapplicable to either Age; for it is true that in neither Age will all receive the Holy Spirit. The purpose of his point is shattered completely when the passage is properly translated. It should be rendered: "After this I will pour out My Spirit *for* all flesh,"—not *on* all flesh. The Hebrew word *al*, among other things, means for in the sense of *on behalf of* (Gen. 19: 17; Judges 9: 17; 2 Kings 10: 3; 1 Kings 2: 18; Esth. 4: 8, 16; 7: 7; 8: 11; 9: 16; Dan. 12: 1; Job 42: 8; Neh. 1: 16; 2 Chro. 30: 18; 29: 21; Ezra 8: 35, etc.). It is very frequently used in connection with the Hebrew word *kepher*, *to make atonement*, to point out in whose interest the atonement is made. With this translation we see that no limitation is required to be put on the expression, *all flesh*. On the contrary, it should be taken unlimitedly, unless the passage or some other Scripture should limit it; but the passage itself does not limit it; and the Scriptures are vocal with the teaching that an opportunity to get Millennial blessings, one of which is the gift of the Spirit, will be available for everybody, in contrast with the limited number for whom the elective salvation is available. Therefore, we conclude that, like his chief argument, his second argument collapses; and with the collapse of his foundation arguments, his whole superstructure

falls down. We call attention to J.F.R.'s superficial thinking as exposed in the above refutation.

But let us look at the verses preceding Joel 2: 28, 29 and from them we will see the time setting enabling us to construe properly the time indicated by the word "afterwards" in v. 28. V. 23 points out a twofold time of the coming of the former rain—the high calling truth. Its coming the first time "moderately" was in the Harvest of the Jewish Age. This refers to a giving that occurred before Zion was bidden to rejoice: "for He *hath* given, etc." Zion's rejoicing time was from 1874 onward. The next sentence of v. 23 tells of a giving of the *former* rain future to its first giving, which future rain (note the strange expression, if it applied to the natural rain, which it of course does not) would occur at the same time as the giving of the latter rain—restitution truth: "He *will* cause to come down for you the rain, the former rain and the latter rain in the *first month*." When were both of these rains due to come at the same time? and when did they actually come together? We reply, In the reaping time, 1874-1914. V. 24 then shows the harvest gathering following the former and the latter rain coming together: "the floors shall be full of wheat," as it also shows the accompanying presence of much refreshing Truth (wine) and the Holy Spirit (oil). V. 25 shows that, then the havoc wrought by the symbolic locust, cankerworm, caterpillar and palmerworm, will be undone, set aside, and compensating blessings of grace and Truth will take their place. ("I will restore to you the years, etc.") What is pictured by these four devastators? Turning back to Joel 1: 4, we see that in the order named they would do a devastating work. Undoubtedly Joel 1 refers to the Gospel Age between the two Harvests. The things represented by these four devastators have in succession as named destroyed the growing products of the Gospel Age. What four things have done this to the growing Truth,

Spirit of the Truth and the Lord's people? We reply: (1) episcopism (the palmerworm), (2) papalism (the locust), (3) Antichristism (the cankerworm) and (4) Protestant sectarianism (the caterpillar). Truth people will not dispute that these four institutions have devastated the Truth, the Spirit of the Truth and the Lord's people, and have brought about the havoc wrought in the Gospel Age between the Harvests, as described in Joel 1. Accordingly, v. 25 proves that during the reaping time, 1874-1914, the undoing of the pertinent evils and the bestowment of their opposite goods would take place so far as God's faithful people are concerned. This we know did take place in the reaping period. Vs. 26 and 27 continue to describe the blessings, the condition, the activities of the Faithful, and their consciousness of the Lord's favor during the Harvest. This we also know to have been true of the period of 1874-1914. Therefore vs. 23-27 refer to the reaping time, 1874-1914, as also do verses 21 and 22. Consequently the word "afterward" of v. 28 refers to a period after the Harvest is over, *i.e.*, to the Millennium. The connection, therefore, demonstrates that v. 28 refers to the Millennium, and therefore proves that Servant's view of v. 28 to be correct, and therefore proves J.F.R.'s view to be false.

One of the straw men that the article under review sets up and kicks over ostensibly in refutation of the Truth on this subject may now engage our attention. It gives as a reason (par. 11) that v. 28 cannot apply to the Millennium the fact that then none will be begotten of the Spirit. This straw man we set aside as follows: No qualified teacher among us has ever claimed it would; for the pouring out of God's Spirit and the begetting of God's Spirit are not coequal terms. The Spirit poured out for us (Is. 11: 2-5) is one of begettall and anointing, but the Spirit poured out for the world is one of sanctification and righteousness (Ezek. 35: 25-27). The former gives

the image of God on the Divine plane, the latter on the human plane; but in both cases it is God's Holy Spirit given or poured out. The next argument of the article (par. 14) is the statement that "the text plainly says that it is before the great and terrible day of the Lord that the Spirit will be poured out on all flesh." This argument is a misstatement of facts. V. 31 says that the sun [New Testament] will be turned into darkness [will give the Nominal people no light], and the moon [Old Testament] into blood [its sacrifices and history will appear bloody to the Nominal people] before the great and terrible day of the Lord come. Through infidelity from 1835 up to 1874 and through the five slaughter-weapon men this did occur before 1914. But v. 31 is a sentence by itself, and several sentences intervene between it and v. 28. Therefore, the passage does *not* plainly nor in any sense whatever say that the pouring out of the Spirit for all flesh precedes the great and terrible day of the Lord. His third and fourth arguments—that St. Peter interprets Joel 2: 28, 29 as the article under review does—are his main arguments, and are refuted above.

His fifth argument is that the facts require that vs. 28 and 29 be not reversed chronologically. Not actual facts, but some butcheries that he has committed against various parts of the text are alleged as facts requiring his view: (1) that "all flesh" does not mean all flesh, but means certain saints, first from Israel and later from Gentile nations, *i.e.*, all flesh means some flesh; (2) that brethren long in the Truth and not engaged in his drives are indulging in day dreams and air castles (!)—the old men that dream dreams; and (3) his claim that St. Peter interpreted the passage when he only quoted it (without further explanation) to refute a false charge—to show that the phenomenon that was misunderstood as drunkenness was not such at all, but was the outpouring of the Holy Spirit. These three things are not facts at all; they are gross

untruths—misinterpretations of facts—given as facts. There is every reason in fact and in God's plan to make v. 28 follow v. 29 chronologically; for above we have shown that the harvest period is described in vs. 21-27. Nor is the Spirit poured out for all flesh until the Millennium. Hence the "afterward" of v. 28, which is correctly translated by the A.V., must apply to a period subsequent to the period described in vs. 29-31, or there would be no reference to the Gospel Age in the entire section, vs. 28-32, in which case St. Peter could not have truthfully said that the phenomenon that the Jews misunderstood as drunkenness was the outpouring of the Spirit, an outpouring that Joel prophesied would take place. (Incidentally we mention that the article interprets the "times of refreshing" (Acts 3: 19) as applying to the Harvests, not to the Millennium—another repudiation of "that Servant's" teachings, and in plain contradiction of Acts 3: 19-21!) The silly applications that he makes in paragraphs 30-34 of the sons, whom we understand to be the Millennial believing Jews, the daughters, whom we understand to be the Millennial believing Gentiles, the old men, whom we understand to be the Ancient Worthies, and the young men, whom we understand to be the Millennial Youthful Worthies, we will pass by without further comment than that complimentary things are said of all four of these classes as operations of the Holy Spirit in them; but the article interprets so as to make the Spirit cause one of them to indulge in evil things—"day dreams" and "air castles"! In paragraph 40, smoke is defined as confusion, whereas it means teachings—memories (Rev. 15: 11; 15: 8).

We caution the Society adherents against believing the glowing reports that J.F.R. issues from time to time. E.g., in the Annual Report, Z '25, 366, the following statement is made about the work in Poland: "It is the pleasure of the Society to report that the Polish work is now in better shape than at any other time in Poland. There are now 9 pilgrims on the list rendering service."

This statement is a most glaring misrepresentation of facts. The Present Truth is published in Polish; and we have a large correspondence with leading Polish brethren. They assure us that fully 85 per cent of the Society adherents have left the Society in the last year. In the Warsaw class 287 left the Society and considerably less than 50 remained. The country over like proportions have left the Society. That the Society has 9 pilgrims on its list in Poland may be true, but full truth requires it to be said that the ablest Polish pilgrims have left the Society, and that it is rushing elders into the pilgrim service in a frantic effort to save the storm-tossed, battered and foundering ship from sinking! Nor from the wording of the report on Sweden are the Tower readers given the slightest hint that over half of the Swedish brethren have left the Society this last year. The revolt against the Society's president is rapidly increasing (his arm in drying up) and will be world-wide in due time; for, not only is he to go utterly blind in his right eye, but his influence is to dry up entirely among all New Creatures and good Youthful Worthies, those perseveringly remaining with him either losing their New Creatureship or their Youthful Worthship, as their standing is.

The "new view" on Satan's remaining in heaven as a member of Jehovah's Court until 1914 has provoked much resentment in Society circles. Among other arguments that J.F.R. has had brought to his attention is the following: the complete disharmony of such a view with the third petition of the Lord's prayer—Thy will be done on earth *as it is in heaven* [God's abode]. This argument proved a staggering blow that made J.F.R. groggy as a figurative boxer, as can be seen from Z '26, 25, pars. 45 and 46. These two paragraphs are like the wild and ineffectual pawings that a groggy and staggering pugilist feebly opposes to a winning fighter who has given him a blow that prepares for the next, the knock-out blow.

CHAPTER V.

FIRST MISCELLANY ON DRUNKEN FOLLIES OF RIGHT-EYE DARKENING.

FURTHER RIGHT-EYE DARKENING. RIGHT-EYE DARKENING ON PHILADELPHIA AND LAODICEA. RIGHT-EYE DARKENING ON THE PYRAMID. SOME FOLLIES OF RIGHT-EYE DARKENING. SOME DRUNKEN FOLLIES OF RIGHT-EYE DARKENING.

THE Society's President continues to run true to form. He continues to set forth new errors and repudiate old truths. He will go further and further into error and lose thereby more and more influence over new creatures and faithful Youthful Worthies (Zech. 11: 15-17). There has been a veritable stampede away from him since the collapse of his prognostications for 1925. The announcement of each new error and the repudiation of each old truth on his part become occasions for more new creatures to leave him. Some of his errors are so transparently evident as such, that it requires no special ability to reason or acute knowledge of the Bible to see through them. If one tests his views with Scriptures, reason and facts, he can hear his theories figuratively rattle.

More and more is he making manifest his fundamental position, *i.e.*, that since 1918 the Lord has entered into a new and more favoring method of dealing with his supposed Little Flock and Great Company, favoring such far above His people previously. Since Elijah was supposedly transubstantiated into Elisha, the latter has been supposedly doing greater exploits than the former ever did, and has allegedly been obtaining much more favor from the Lord than the former ever did. To give Scriptural plausibility to this view he is applying to 1918 onward many Scriptures that our Pastor rightly applied to 1874 onward. Of course such applications introduce confusion where perfect

harmony prevailed before. This wrong viewpoint as to the condition of the supposed Little Flock and Great Company is responsible for many of his errors. From the fact that his viewpoint of the dispensational dealings since 1918 requires for its plausibility so much perversion of Scripture we conclude that it is false. These remarks will give us a vantage point from which to estimate the new errors that have come out since the Feb. 1, 1926, Tower, the last one that we reviewed up to March, 1926. We will proceed to review the issues requiring attention from then onward to Aug., 1926.

In Z '26, 52, pars. 9, 10, J.F.R. teaches in an article entitled, "Obedience Leads To Life," that Satan was anointed to rule over the perfect Adam and to put him to death, if he disobeyed. This he claims is taught in Ezek. 28: 14. That passage teaches that Lucifer was the anointed [qualified] cherub that was to cover [protect] man in Eden; but it says not one word of his being made man's ruler. Lucifer was qualified by the Lord to protect man, just as the good angels have by the Lord been qualified to protect the just (Ps. 34: 7; Heb. 1: 14). But who could rightly say that these passages prove that the angels, who are commissioned to protect [cover] us are thereby authorized to rule over us? Just so little can we rightly infer from Ezek. 28: 14 that Lucifer was authorized to rule over Adam. Much less can it be rightly inferred from it or from Heb. 2: 14, which is cited to prove it, that he was by his anointing [qualification] authorized to put Adam to death, if he disobeyed. Satan has the power of death (Heb. 2: 14) in the sense that his dominion is one of death, not life—he is ruling over a dying, not a living race. He gained it as the prince of this world by usurpation since the flood, but never got it by Divine sanction or authorization, though in Eden he attempted to gain it. This claim for Lucifer is an erroneous imagination of J.F.R., without any Scriptural, reasonable or factual

evidence. The Bible proves that Satan sought to gain power over the race by his course of usurpation in endeavoring to become God's equal (Is. 14: 13, 14). In this passage the expression, "I will sit also [in addition to exalting his throne over angels] upon the mount [kingdom] of the congregation [the human family] in the sides of the north [as a spiritual ruler]," proves that Satan's attempted rulership over man was a usurped one, and as such has never been sanctioned by God. Therefore J.F.R.'s view on Satan's empire and its authority before God is totally false; and this refutes his whole position as to Satan's rights to the kingdom over man until 1914. Moreover Satan gained his rulership by becoming prince of this present evil world. Before it he had influence but not rulership over man.

In par. 16 he sets forth the thought that God had given His word that the tree of knowledge [experience] of good and evil would produce a fruit increasing the knowledge of its eaters. Here again we meet with an imagination. Where does the Bible give or imply such a thought? By eating of its fruit in disobedience man gained a terrible experience with evil; even as, if he had abstained from eating of it, he would have continued to have a blessed experience with good. The fruit of that tree could not give knowledge, as knowledge comes not through stomach nutrition, but by brain exercise. The tree was called the tree of the knowledge [experience] of good, because, if the command of Jehovah with respect to it had been obeyed, man would have been continued in his experience with good; and it was called the tree of the knowledge [experience] of evil, because, by disobeying Jehovah's injunction as to it, man became exposed to an experience with evil, even as Satan's sin and previous righteousness made him the "one of us" knowing [experiencing] good and evil (Gen. 3: 22).

In pars. 17-23 we have some more Jambresian

"folly" offered us, and that with reference to the trees of life, which the article claims were a single tree distinct from the trees "good for food," and that it was a tree of whose existence Adam was ignorant and of which he never ate, or he would have been death-proof—immortal! It is true that there are three distinct sets of trees referred to in Gen. 2: 9; but they are differently grouped from the way the article under review groups them. The Hebrew shows that they are grouped as follows: (1) every tree that is pleasant to the sight [ornamental trees, including flower trees and bushes]; (2) every tree good for food, *even* [the Hebrew word *ve* means *even* as well as *and*] the trees of lives in the midst of [within] the garden [there is no word in the Hebrew text for the word *also*, given in the A. V. in this clause]; and (3) the tree of the knowledge of good and evil. Against J.F.R.'s opinion we assert that God did inform Adam to eat of the trees of life; for He told Adam to eat of every fruit-bearing tree in the garden, except that of the knowledge of good and evil (Gen. 2: 16). This refutes the article's contention that Adam knew nothing of the tree[s] of life before he sinned. He claims that Gen. 3: 22, by the words "lest he put forth his hand and take also of the tree of life and eat and live forever," proves that Adam knew nothing of the existence of the tree of life. Even to an English reader such a thought is not suggested by these words. To a Hebrew scholar the original completely refutes the thought under review. In the Hebrew language the imperfect tense is used to represent incompleted, continued action. The word translated "put forth" is in the imperfect tense. Hence it implies continued action. The words for *eat* and *live forever*, while in the perfect tense, are grammatically given the force of the imperfect by the Hebrew word *gam*, meaning *also*; thus they imply continued action, a thing that the very nature of one of them implies—*live forever*. Hence

the verse means: lest the man *continue to put forth* his hand and continue to eat and continue to live forever. Therefore the tree[s] of life were not an immortality conferrer. They were a life preserver, if continually eaten of. Adam had been eating of them ever since his creation.

The following passages prove that the Hebrew word *etz*, tree or trees, though singular in form, is frequently plural in meaning, especially when a descriptive noun is used after it: as trees of lives (Gen. 2: 9); trees of fruit (Gen. 1: 11; Ps. 148: 9; Eccl. 2: 5); fruit trees (Ex. 10: 15; Ezek. 36: 30; Lev. 23: 40); trees of food (Deut. 20: 20; Lev. 19: 23; Ezek. 47: 12; Neh. 9: 25); olive trees (Hag. 2: 19; Neh. 8: 15; Is. 41: 19); trees of the field (Ex. 9: 25; Ezek. 15: 6; Is. 10: 19; 44: 23). Thus the Dictionary and the Grammar prove our Pastor right on the tree[s] of life, and J.F.R. wrong on this subject. Adam's being driven out of the garden and the placing of the cherubim to keep him away from the trees of life prove several things: (1) that they were not a single tree in the middle of the garden (the translation should be *within*, not *in the midst of* the garden); for if they were such a tree, the cherubim, surrounding it, could have kept him from it while he, remaining in the garden, could eat of the supposedly other fruit trees; (2) that if he had remained in the garden he would have continued to eat thereof; (3) that his being driven and kept out were necessary to prevent his eating of them; [All of these thoughts disprove the theory under review]; and (4) that the theory that his *once* eating of the tree[s] of life would make it impossible for even God to destroy him, *i.e.*, make him death-proof, immortal, contradicts the Bible, which teaches that corruption—the natural body—cannot inherit incorruption (1 Cor. 15: 50). The thought implied in the last sentence of the article, that the opportunity of consecration for the Divine nature is still

open, we have abundantly refuted in the Appendix of Studies, Vol. II. The fact that the writer of the article under review taught that the door would be closed in 1918, then in 1921, and then by 1925, and now [1926] teaches that it is still open, as he so taught after each of these dates, proves his untrustworthiness as a teacher.

In Z '26, page 72, par. 44, he tells us that joy *began* in heaven in 1914, after Satan's then supposed casting out of heaven. Was there no joy in heaven when our Lord ascended, and was acclaimed by the heavenly host as Victor and Lord? Was there no joy in heaven at the millions of repentant sinners during the Gospel Age (Luke 15: 7, 10)? Was there no joy in heaven when the sleeping saints were awakened in 1878? According to his teaching in this instance Jehovah Himself in heaven since man's fall, experienced no joy, until in 1914, when Satan was finally cast out, when, the article says, "Joy then began in heaven."

In Z '26, 83-88, is an article on, "Manifestation Of His Goodness." Following certain far-fetched views of higher critics, J.F.R. in pars. 6 and 21 claims that Ps. 65 was first in Hezekiah's day after Sennacherib's defeat introduced into the temple service. This is nowhere taught in the Scriptures, and the flimsy basis for its teaching is founded partly on the higher critics' denial of the Davidic authorship of Ps. 65, and partly on a most unreliable guess. They claim that the agricultural and pastoral allusions of this psalm prove that it arose in connection with the third year harvest mentioned in Is. 37: 30. This claim is a splendid illustration of the flimsiness of their guessage. There are no special shepherd allusions in Is. 37: 30, which disproves the guess, and there were hundreds of other harvests in Israel besides that of Is. 37: 30, from which the agricultural allusions could have been gathered. It is not unlike J.F.R. to reject Truth and

accept higher criticism. Our readers will recall how he said that "there are mistakes ... misunderstandings or misapplications ... in the Bible" (Z '20, 103, par. 3).

He further sets forth the thought that as this psalm was prepared for the temple service its understanding could come only after the Lord (supposedly first) came to His temple in 1918. Against such a view the following holds: Since Ps. 65 was understood and properly interpreted in our Pastor's day (see Berean Comments), and since J.F.R. has added nothing new to the understanding of its contents, his view of the Lord's not coming to His temple until 1918 is wrong from the standpoint of his own logic. Again, many other psalms were prepared for the temple service, yea all of them, and the vast bulk of these were understood in our Pastor's day. Therefore, from J.F.R.'s own logic it follows that the Lord came to His temple before 1918.

He sets forth a new view on Sennacherib. He is claimed to type Satan; his army, Satan's organization (par. 20); and his fall, the overthrow of Satan's empire. This, like many other of the types of the Society's president, is supposed to stress as especially important the activities of the Society since 1918, which are supposedly greater by far than those of the faithful previously. But this view contradicts the parallel dispensations, according to which the struggle between Sennacherib and Hezekiah types the struggles of the Radicals and Conservatives in the French Revolution. The true view was first brought out by Bro. John Edgar and endorsed by our Pastor (Z '05, 179). Everything in the story of Is. 36-39 harmonizes with this view, while the one under review lacks such harmony. In par. 41, in the interests of the same error, he makes another misapplication of a clearly understood type. He claims that the overthrow of Pharaoh's army (Ex. 14: 13-25) foreshadows the Time of Trouble. All of us recall that in Vol.

VI, 457-459, our Pastor shows that the destruction of Pharaoh and his host at the Red sea types the eternal destruction of Satan and his followers at the end of the Millennium, while the rescue of the Israelites represents the deliverance of the faithful restitutionists at that time. There can be no doubt that all of the facts are in harmony with our Pastor's thought. How demonstrative J.F.R.'s accumulating errors are of the proposition that an erroneous position leads to repudiations of opposing truths.

In Z '26, 99-104, is an article entitled, "Hypocrisy And The True." One would think that hypocrisy would be about the last subject that J.F.R. would select for discussion, lest people's attention might be attracted to his own colossal hypocrisy. Yet he may have taken up its discussion on the principle of "stop thief" cry, in the hope of diverting attention from his own hypocrisy to that of others. Of all the hypocrites that have ever lived he is the only one who is individually pointed out as such prophetically in the Bible (Matt. 24: 50). While classes of hypocrites have been prophetically pointed out, he is the only individual so pointed out. This leads us to believe that he is the greatest hypocrite that ever lived, Satan and the fallen angels excepted. When we remember that he is the little pope in little Babylon, who enacted day after day the hypocrisy that the popes of Great Babylon committed year after year, it is of course additionally evident that he is the greatest hypocrite that ever lived. Our own experience with, and observation of him, coupled with our knowledge of history, confirm us in the thought of his pre-eminence in hypocrisy.

He rightly points his finger to the chief domain and exemplars of hypocrisy—religion and religious leaders. Herein his personal experience has doubtless come to his enlightenment; for the chief hypocrites have doubtless been the cunning, selfish, designing, power-grasping

religious leaders, who have pulled the wool over the eyes of the people by their specious pleas of being the channels of heaven's special favors to man, *e.g.*, the popes of Great Babylon and the pope of little Babylon. But we think he did not begin early enough with the start of hypocrisy. It began with Cain in his sacrifice as related to God and Abel's sacrifice, not in the days of Enos, the son of Seth, as he claims (Gen. 4: 26). He teaches that this verse as translated in the margin, "Then began men to call themselves by the name of the Lord," means that hypocritically men began to use religion. Aside entirely from the question as to whether this translation is correct, how can his thought be found in this translation? It is a pure importation into the translation. But the margin gives too free a rendering. It renders a passive by the reflexive voice, for which there is a form in Hebrew distinct from the passive. The literal translation (there is no word for *men* here in the Hebrew) is "to call by the name of the Lord was then begun," *i.e.*, in the days of Enos the custom was formed of using the name of God, or the word for *God*, in the names given to people. Thus this is seen in the name *Mahalaleel*, Enos' grandson, who was born when Enos was 160 years old (Gen. 5: 9-13). *Mahalaleel* means *praise of God*, *Mahalale* meaning *praise* and *el* meaning *God*. Thus the name *God* entered first into the name of a human being in connection with the naming of Enos' grandson. The translation, "to call on the name of God [in the sense, either to pray, or to make oath] was then begun," could also be correct; but the thought of prayer thus being first begun would be incorrect, as it contradicts the fact that Cain and Abel had previously prayed, *i.e.*, at the time of their sacrifices. Understood as teaching that in Enos' day a beginning of making oaths by God, the second translation may be the right one. The reason that we suggest both of these translations as possibly correct is

because the Hebrew word *be* may mean either *by* or *on*. And since both translations give good senses either may be correct, if we understand the second one to refer to taking oaths by God. But we are more inclined to the former than to the latter translation. However, no correct translation would give the idea that during Enos' day men began to use religion hypocritically; for Cain had already done this years before Seth, Enos' father, was born. J.F.R.'s course on this matter is a good example of his methods of *eisegesis*—introducing his own notions *into* the Bible in contrast with our Pastor's methods of *exegesis*—bringing God's thoughts *out* of the Bible.

In par. 17 the article under review still teaches, despite our Pastor's and our refutations, that Enoch died. In this par. it also teaches that for Enoch to see death (Heb. 11: 5) meant for him to *observe* someone die! Why not let the words, *to see death*, in connection with one's own death, mean what the Bible clearly shows them to mean (Ps. 89: 48; Luke 2: 26; John 8: 51, compare with v. 52; Luke 9: 27; Matt. 16: 28; and Heb. 2: 9)? A comparison of these passages not only shows what is meant by *seeing* death, but shows that for one to see death means the same as to taste death, *i.e.*, to experience death.

In par. 44 the false prophet is set forth as Churchianity, and not as the Federation, as our Pastor taught; and its frog is represented to be hypocrisy. His remarks on big business and big politicians seem to imply that their hypocrisies are the other two frogs. All this is in repudiation of our Pastor's teaching. His speaking of the frog coming out of the mouth of the beast occasions us to remark that he, as the pope of little Babylon, is the mouth [spokesman] of the little beast, in little Babylon, and as such by his Divine-right channel claims, is speaking forth its little frog. Just like the frog, he does look solemn, wise and great, as he swells up with pride and opens wide his mouth, but all

he can do is to croak, lacking real wisdom and greatness, which is self-abasement—instead he is full of self-exaltation, power-grasping and lording it over others in his little frog pond. The pity of it is that so many of the Lord's people have been terrified by his croaking into re-echoing it; but we are glad to know that thousands upon thousands are getting deliverance from him. This accounts for his reporting about 10,000 less partaking of the Memorial in 1926 than in 1925—and this in spite of his claim that he has gained many new adherents during the past year.

In pars. 23-25, it is said that the temple is the living members of the Church, *i.e.*, the Society from 1918 onward. The Bible differs: The temple is the Church throughout the Age, and has been represented in each generation in its living members. Against the thought that the Lord came to His temple first in 1918 to judge them by fiery trials first and the nominal church afterwards, the Scriptures and the facts are eloquent and complete. The Scriptures prove that He first came to His Church in 1874 and with them began to reap, and then started to test the Church more severely, *i.e.*, in a general sifting, with fiery trials in 1878. During the harvest periods, the ends of the Ages, these things were done as parallel acts in point of time, 1845 years apart (1 Cor. 10: 1-14). The five harvest siftings, all complete by 1911, and hence before 1918, were very severe and fiery trials, as St. Paul assures us in 1 Cor. 10: 1-14, and they certainly most severely tested the Church. The first of these began in 1878. Here is where judgment began "*with us*," after the Lord's return in its larger aspect, though as Jesus in the Spring of 30 A.D. (John 2) made His first cleansing of the temple, so in the Spring of 1875 not a few who were in the 1873-1874 Advent movement began to undergo a preliminary casting out, because unable to stand the trial of an invisible return when expecting a visible one. The Lord, as proved by the parallel in 1878, began

to exercise the kingly authority with which He was invested at His return in 1874, by casting off Babylon, Nisan 10, 1878, paralleling the Lord's casting off fleshly Israel, Nisan 10, 33 A.D., not as J.F.R. claims, in 1918 and 33 A.D. as parallel dates, thus paralleling things not parallel; for the parallel affects two similar things or events 1845 years apart. Jesus' purging the Jewish temple in 33 A.D. types something in the parallel 1845 years ahead, *i.e.*, in 1878. His coming there in 33 A.D. cannot parallel something supposed to have taken place in 1918; for these dates are more than the parallel time—1845 years—apart. In harmony with the Scriptures which put the fiery trials especially in the sifting periods, 1878-1911, though the sixth sifting beginning in 1917 has been a fiery trial, in harmony with the facts of these trials in the five siftings within those years, in harmony with the parallel dispensation dates and in harmony with prophetic chronology, we know that Christ came in 1874, did some easier testing in 1875 and began crucially, *i.e.*, with fiery trials, to test the real Church in 1878 and shortly thereafter the nominal church, continuing this throughout the five harvest siftings. This, then, proves that Jesus began the crucial testing of the temple class in 1878—40 years before the counterfeit date. (The little Antichrist, like the great Antichrist, counterfeits every thing.) These are the Scriptural and factual evidences on the subject as we were taught them by "that Servant" and they stand, while the Jambresian folly of the Society's president in trying to parallel 33 A.D. with 1918 as the time of the beginning of the temple's testing, whereas the 1845 years lead to 1878, will soon be made known to all! Does this symbolic sorcerer think that he can with his wizard wand so enchant his readers as to make them think that $33 + 1845 = 1918$? This he seeks to do when he argues that the parallel of Jesus' casting off of Israel and cleansing

the temple was in 1918! How can brethren, trained in our Pastor's strictly logical, factual and Biblical methods of reasoning, tolerate such a pervert as J.F.R. shows himself to be in this teaching? This might do to tell his recent converts for whom he found the "Six Volumes too much to wade through" and therefore gave them "a short-cut through the Truth in the form of the Harp," but how can those trained in our Pastor's teachings endure so erratic a teacher as he is proven to be by the Jambresian "folly" just exposed?

It is true that a great trial came in 1918 upon the Society, especially upon its leaders. But that trial was fit-man experience. One of the Little Flock's crucial trials began in 1917, the separation of antitypical Elijah and Elisha. But the 1918 Society experience, so far as the Society leaders and their partisan followers were concerned, was largely a punishment for their gross wickedness in connection with the separation of antitypical Elijah and Elisha in 1917. And the gross cowardliness of J.F.R., who, when in danger, and hoping for deliverance, faced about and advised the brethren to buy liberty bonds, and bought them himself, is very manifest. He became more guilty than the clergy whom he so roundly denounced for their war activities; for they were apparently patriotic in their activity, while he was, against better knowledge, grossly disloyal to God and stained his hands in war blood by supporting the war financially through buying war bonds and advising consecrated brethren to do likewise! His cowardliness and that of his associates he now claims was the fear of the Elijah class fleeing from Jezebel, a flight that occurred 100 years before! He blasphemes our Lord's coming to the temple and crucially testing His faithful, by degrading His activities therein to the activities of the fit man in punishing the Society section of Azazel's Goat! The Lord saw to it that they got fit-man experiences; but

He did it to beat them into their senses, away from their double-mindedness, and not as an experience to fit them for a supposedly greater service than the faithful Little Flock had ever had; because as members of the Great Company they are incapable of serving more effectively than the Little Flock; and the Lord loves the Little Flock so much more than He loves them that He would not give them a more honorable service than He would give and has given to His Little Flock.

Please let us keep in mind the remark made above that the theory of J.F.R. is that since 1918, when the Lord supposedly came *first* to His temple to purge it with crucial cleansings, He has been honoring the partisan Society adherents with privileges and blessings above all His other people from Pentecost on, and that at that time a change of dealings from Him set in toward His supposedly faithful people. To give a seemingly Scriptural setting to this error, a large number of Scriptures have been violently wrested and tortured (2 Pet. 3: 16) by J.F.R. into a totally different sense from that which they suggest and that given them by that faithful and wise Servant; and these wrested and tortured misunderstandings are by him claimed to be advancing light. There was a change in the work after the real separation of antitypical Elijah and Elisha in 1917. Then the same drunken class—antitypical Elisha, the Great Company of the Society—frenzied by the first Jambresian errors, frantically performed the second smiting of Jordan, and ever since it renewed its activities in 1919 (Rev. 19: 3), has largely been beating the air with its "Millions" propaganda for 1925—an illuminating example of what the supposedly greater than Elijah work really is! His other claimed new light is of exactly the same character and came from the same counterfeit sun—Satan—as his 1925 proposition; for be it noted that his drives from 1919 to 1925 had that error as their

keynote. Yea, verily, such is his advancing light, and such is the supposedly greater honor and work than antitypical Elijah ever had! How can false propaganda be the greatest work?

In par. 35, J.F.R. disclaims credit for originating this supposed marvelous and advancing light. He blasphemously ascribes to God the authorship of Azazel-invented theories! He is right in not ascribing the authorship of his errors of doctrine and wrongs of practice to himself; for they were made by his master, Azazel; for him does he serve, his thoughts does he spread, his wrong methods does he use, and a part of his evil organization—the little Roman Catholic Church—has he been developing among Truth people, while he has been casting aside one Divinely originated truth, practice and organizational feature after another. Therefore this supposed light that he claims will be sevenfold—perfect—by about the time his followers leave the earth, *i.e.*, before the earthly phase of the kingdom is established, will then be recognized by all New Creatures and faithful Youthful Worthies as Egyptian darkness; for long before then will his right eye be utterly darkened (Zech. 11: 17).

In Z '26, 131-136, is published an article entitled, "Character Or Covenant—Which?" This is another article that betrays the erraticism of J.F.R. The ignorance of Greek, English and the nature of character development, the self-contradictions, the sophistries, the contrastless contrasts and the "methods of deceit" with which the article abounds, ought to convince any Truth-instructed person of the confused mind of its writer. Above all his articles that we have ever read this one proves his unfitness to teach. In pars. 5 and 6 are found some sophisms on perfection of character, which he vociferates against as though it meant sinlessness, whereas it means a disposition crystallized in Christlikeness, which is certainly a Scriptural thought (1 Pet. 5: 10; Heb. 13: 21; John 17: 23;

Jas. 1: 4; 1 John 4: 17, 18). He cries out in his drunkenness that the Greek word *charakter*, which occurs but once in the Bible (Heb. 1: 3), not meaning in the Bible what the English word *character* does; there is no such thing as character development! Fastening on one of the meanings of the word *character*, *person*, in English, and ignoring the one used in the term *character development*, he tells us that we do not develop characters, but that we are characters! Here is a splendid illustration of the sophist that he is: emphasizing a meaning of the word not pertinent to the subject and ignoring that one of its meanings which is pertinent to the subject, he denies the propriety of the use of the pertinent one and insists on the application of the impertinent one to the subject! His sophistry on this subject would be a good example for a text-book on logic, to illustrate the sophism of using a word having different senses in one of its senses only, as a proof that it has not another of its senses!

To clarify the subject we will make some explanations: In neither profane, nor in New Testament Greek, has the word *charakter* the meaning that we attach to the English word *character* in the expression *character development*. Our English word *character* has about twelve different meanings. See Century Dictionary. It has all of the senses of the Greek word *charakter*, plus some that the Greek word does not have, and that have been added to the word since it was taken into the English language. This fact shows the sophistry of the writer, who claims that since *charakter* in the Greek New Testament (where it occurs but once) does not mean what is meant by the English word *character* in the term "character development," there is no such a thing as character development taught in the Bible! Hence he *hoots* at developing a Christlike character, and derides the whole idea of character development in the article under review!

By the word *character*, as used in an ethical sense, we mean the sum total of one's inherited and cultivated qualities of heart and mind, one's inherited or developed disposition. And one who denies that in this sense of the word the Bible teaches character development is either ignorant, or blinded, or wilfully dishonest.

Let us cite some Scriptures, all of which exhort to, or treat of character development, *i.e.*, the cultivation of Christlike qualities, whose aggregate constitutes a Christlike character: Matt. 5: 3-12; 7: 18, 19, 24, 25, 13: 23; Rom. 6: 4, 13, 19; 12: 9-21; Gal. 5: 22-24; 6: 1, 2, 6, 8; Eph. 5: 9, 10, 18-21; Col. 3: 1-17; 1 Thes. 5: 11-18; 1 Tim. 6: 11, 12; Heb. 13: 1-21; 1 Pet. 3: 3-13; 5: 5-10; 2 Pet. 1: 3-10; 3: 18; 1 John 4: 7-21. Remembering what the developing of a Christlike character means—the cultivation of the graces whose aggregate constituted our Lord's perfected spiritual disposition—we at once, if we have the knowledge of God's will toward us, know that we must develop a Christlike character. If we do not develop character, why does Christ describe us as bringing forth fruit (Matt. 13: 23)? If we do not develop character, why does St. Paul tell us to put on the graces of the Spirit (Col. 3: 10-12)? If we do not develop character, why does he describe the qualities that we must develop as fruits of the Spirit (Gal. 5: 22-24)? If we do not develop character, why do the Lord and the Apostle describe our cultivating the graces as our work of building (Matt. 7: 24, 25; 1 Cor. 3: 12, 14)? If we do not develop character, why does the Apostle say that our spiritual senses [graces] are exercised [developed] by use unto enabling us to discern God's will (Rom. 12: 2; Heb. 5: 14)? If we do not develop character, why does the Apostle exhort us to add [cultivate beside previous developments] the graces and to grow in grace and knowledge (2 Pet. 1: 5-7, 3: 18)? Nobody but an ignorant or a deliberately dishonest

or blinded person, would deny that the Bible teaches the thought contained in the terms, "character development" and "development of a Christ-like character."

J.F.R. finds many Scriptures contrary to his "new view," and this becomes the occasion of his wresting them. He rails at the idea of character development. Rom. 8: 29 was one of the passages most frequently used by our Pastor to teach that we must cultivate a Christlike character. The connection proves that the image here referred to is not the bodily image of our Lord to be gotten in the resurrection, as claimed by J.F.R., but Christ's character image. For, as our Pastor shows in Studies, Vol. VI, 181-185, Paul logically explains in vs. 28-30, in the reverse chronological order, our development by God for the kingdom: (1) after our entrance into the high calling God works (v. 28) all our experiences and privileges, etc., for our spiritual good—character development as new creatures—which God predestinated (v. 29) must be like Christ's if we are to be of the many brethren (Rom. 8: 9, 14) of whom Christ is the firstborn; (2) to put us into the position to develop Christ's likeness, He previously favored us with the call to glory, honor and immortality (v. 30); (3) and to fit us for this call he previously justified us tentatively (v. 30); and (4) to fit us for such tentative justification He previously honored us with the gospel knowledge (v. 30), arousing us to repentance toward God and to faith in our Lord Jesus. Thus the connection proves that the expression, "conformed to the image of His Son," means to be developed like Christ in character; hence a character image is here meant and not the image of His body that we will receive in the resurrection. Let our readers watch for some further perversions from the Society's president on v. 30; for as it was interpreted by our Pastor, it teaches tentative justification as preceding the call to consecration and the high calling. While it is true that the Greek word *eikon*

does not necessarily mean *character*, but means *image*, it does mean a character likeness, if the connection shows such to be the kind of image that is meant; as it can also mean an intellectual or even a physical likeness. The connection must determine what kind of a likeness is intended by the word *eikon*. Rom. 8: 28-30 proves by its run of thought that character likeness to Christ is meant by the words, conformed unto the *image* of His Son.

Repeatedly the article under review says of persons that they are characters, *e.g.*, "Jehovah is the character," "Christ is a character," "you are characters." This is true enough when the word character is used in the sense of a person. But the use the article makes of this expression to deny that God, Christ, etc., have characters, but that they are characters—persons—is a sophism worthy of an ever darkening eye. It is as stupid to claim that it is wrong to say that Jehovah, Jesus and New Creatures have characters as it would be to claim that it is wrong to say that Jehovah, Jesus and New Creatures have hearts, minds and the Holy Spirit, *i.e.*, the holy character.

When he says that the expressions, "Jacob's character," "Esau's character," are not properly Biblical *terms*, saying this to bolster up his claim as against the idea of character development, he is again guilty of sophistry. The word *character*, not occurring in the Bible, is of course not a Scriptural *term*; but it is a Scriptural *thought*, even as the words, substitute and substitution, with reference to the ransom doctrine, are not Scriptural terms, but they certainly are Scriptural ideas. Even so character is a Scriptural idea, though not a Scriptural term. When we say, Character is what a man really is, we do not use the term *character* to mean a person, as the connection shows J.F.R. makes it mean; but we mean that his ethical condition is his real identity, not some external thing. In par. 24 he denies that Jesus was required to

develop character while on earth. In refutation we would say that Jesus as the prehuman Logos had a perfect spiritual character adapted to His spiritual plane of being, but not one adapted to the Divine plane of being; that as a human infant He had a perfect character in the sense of an undeveloped perfect disposition, that as He grew in knowledge and *favor* with God His perfect and undeveloped disposition was undergoing development and that by the time his testing under the Law was consummated He had crystallized a perfect human character. As a New Creature at Jordan His disposition as a New Creature was not yet developed. It became developed unto crystallization—perfection—gradually, as He faithfully practiced self-denial and world-denial, meditated on God's Word, spread God's Word, practiced its spiritual parts and suffered faithfully in loyalty to God's Word. Thus His New Creature was developed in character unto fitness for the Divine nature and His future office (Heb. 2: 17, 18; 5: 8, 9). To deny that He developed a Divine character from Jordan to Calvary implies that the denier does not understand the necessity of development from human dispositions to Divine dispositions to attain the Divine nature, from having human characters to gaining Divine characters—the change of character necessary for human beings to become Divine beings. J.F.R.'s contradiction of Heb. 5: 8, 9, which teaches that Jesus developed *obedience* under suffering conditions, and thus was made perfect in character and body, is refuted by the very wording of the text itself; for the text says that *He* was made perfect, not that He perfected, or "completed His covenant," as the Society's president falsely alleges, perverting the passive into the active voice and then interpolating an object to the active verb. In par. 31 he confuses the Sarah Covenant with the covenant of sacrifice, treating them as one covenant.

In discussing 2 Pet. 1: 5-10, he (pars. 32-40) contradicts

his position. It is true that he carefully avoids using the words "develop the graces," and "develop character," but he describes the thing itself: for no one can explain this problem in addition (2 Pet. 1: 5-7), then making the graces so developed active after they are added, and then finally making them abound, without describing character development; for this is the cultivating of the higher primary graces, making them active and causing them to abound—develop and control all our other qualities of heart and mind. This is what St. Peter explains, and he uses the word *add* in the sense of development beyond what was previously had or cultivated. How can one add one grace to another unless he cultivates it? This proves that the word *add* is here used in the sense of *develop, cultivate*; and as it is the graces—qualities of heart—that are cultivated, of course character is developed; for it is cultivating ("add") the graces, making them active ("if these things be in you") and causing them to abound ("and abound") in their higher primary kinds.

Then he affects groundlessly a contrast between developing a Christlike character and keeping our covenant. The following proves this: Our consecration is our promise to God to be dead to self and the world and to be alive to God. The carrying out of this promise develops a Christlike character; for Jesus' qualities of heart and mind as a New Creature—His spiritual as distinct from His human qualities—were developed by His remaining dead to self and the world and alive to God amid His varied experiences. For what did His carrying out of His vows move Him to do? To cultivate self-denial and world-denial, meditate on God's Word, spread God's Word, practice God's Word and suffer for loyalty to God's Word. These things developed Divine-mindedness in Him instead of His former human-mindedness, *i.e.*, they cultivated a Divine character in Him. And when we fulfill the same covenant we develop a character like

His. Thus the very carrying out of our covenant produces a Divine character. Therefore the jugglery of the article, whereby the development of a Christlike character is set forth as a thing contrary to the keeping of our covenant ("Character Or Covenant—Which?") is clearly exposed.

This teaching of a supposed opposition between character development and covenant keeping, which is treated by J.F.R. as though it meant only serving the Truth, witnessing, is doubtless the basis of his extreme emphasis on service and his comparative neglect of emphasis on the other six features of covenant keeping: (1) deadness to self and the world, (2) study of the Word, (3) watchfulness and (4) prayer according to the Word, (5) practicing the Word and (6) suffering for loyalty to all six previous parts of our covenant keeping. This extreme emphasis injures many. We certainly believe in service. It is surely one of the seven features of our covenant obligations; but to stress it one-sidedly and extremely to the comparative neglect of the other six features of our covenant obligations results in a one-sided and consequently narrow and insufficient development. A well rounded development, embracing all features of our covenant obligations, is needed if we would be conformed unto the image of God's Son.

In Z '26, 143, last question, J.F.R. renounces another teaching of our Pastor, *i.e.*, that the earth is purchased in the ransom. By this renunciation he makes according to our observation, a ninth impingement against the ransom, as the following will show. By his sin Adam forfeited to Divine justice (1) his right to life and (2) his life-rights. Jesus for his ransom substituted (1) His human right to life and (2) His human life-rights. One of the human life-rights is ownership of a perfect earth. This Adam by sin forfeited to Divine Justice; hence Jesus' ransom purchases it back from Divine Justice for Adam

and his race. Therefore to deny Jesus' purchase of the earth in the ransom impinges against it; for it denies one of its features. The extreme emphasis on witnessing and the comparative neglect of emphasis on the other six features of our covenant obligations appear markedly in two articles that we will now review: Z '26, 163-168, "Sacrifice And Service"; and Z '26, 179-184, "Sacrifice And Obedience."

The first paragraph of the article on "Sacrifices And Service" is devoted to the exposition of a half-truth. It claims that Rom. 12: 1 is addressed to *brethren in Christ*; whereas it is directly addressed to those who have not yet presented their humanity to God, as our Pastor explained it. Hence the passage applies to the tentatively justified, inviting them to consecrate. But indirectly we may apply it, as our Pastor did, to the consecrated, as an exhortation to them to keep their bodies presented to God in their efforts to carry out their consecration. It is a favorite method of deceit in J. F. R, to state half-truths, with intent to hide the other halves, as *e.g.*, in the matter of emphasizing vitalized justification to the ignoring of tentative justification. In par. 5 we have another illustration of a half-truth given as the full truth on faith, in the way of a definition: "Faith is an understanding and appreciation of God's Word as the truth, and a confident reliance upon that Word." The full definition of faith is: a mental appreciation of, and a heart's reliance upon, God and Christ, in respect to their beings, characters, words and works. Another half-truth is given in par. 8, where he says that "Sacrifice is the offering of anything to God by way of expiation or propitiation." While such a definition fits the sacrifice of Jesus and the Church, it cannot fit the sacrifices—consecration works—of the Ancient Worthies, Great Company, Youthful Worthies and the Restitution class. The expression that he adds as explanatory to his definition, "the destruction or surrender of anything

for the sake of something else that is higher or more desirable," is false as applicable to the Christ's sacrifice. This class did not consecrate with the hope of a reward, but as an expression of supreme faith in, and love for, God, to whom out of delight, and not for a reward, they took pleasure to yield themselves. It is important to watch the definitions of a half-truth teacher, because half-truths frequently, yea usually, hide the truth and give entrance to error.

While on this point of half-truths, we ought to mention how in Z '26, 147-152, in an article on "Holiness," he is guilty of the same method of deceit. He explains that holiness is such a devotion of self to the Lord as faithfully serves and keeps devotedly in the serving activity. Holiness not only implies devotion of self to God's service—witnessing—but the other six steps of the Christian life already mentioned, and the state of heart and mind that results from these seven activities. This error of omission on holiness is only another result of the one-sided emphasis that J.F.R. places on service.

In pars. 14, 15 we have some more half-truths on what one sacrifices. We are there told that all the Lord's people sacrifice the same amount of things: their right to live as perfect human beings in the perfect world. This is true; but it is not the full truth. The right to live with its accompanying life-rights are not really ours. They are only imputedly ours. They could not become ours actually until restitution time comes; so actually these are now sacrificed, not as a possession, but as a hope, while we now additionally sacrifice some actual possessions: what we actually are and have as human beings. It is true that from the standpoint of what we are imputedly we all sacrifice the same amount in quantity and quality, represented by the pound, a reckonedly perfect humanity—which alike all the servants received and are to use in sacrifice. But to claim, as J.F.R. does, that there is

no difference in the quantity and quality of what is consecrated to the Lord is, from the standpoint of what each one as an actual possession offers to God, a palpable untruth. To say, *e.g.*, that Bro. Russell offered the Lord no more of actual possession than the least talented consecrator is a self-evident error.

The chief error of the article under review is its half-truths on the relation of the under-priests to their sacrifice. Like the Levites, J.F.R. contends that we are not now members of the World's High Priest, and as a consequence do not share in the sacrifice, *i.e.*, we now do no sacrificing; but that our Lord does it all. The following sentence gives J.F.R.'s view: "His [Jesus'] body members, when complete and glorified, will then become a part of the High Priest; and then, and not until then, will such body members participate in the sin-offering." (Par. 26.) This actually means that *they will never participate in the sin-offering, because it is finished before they are glorified!* To such nonsense does the Levitical position on the subject lead!

Perhaps an explanation of what is meant by our High Priest offering the antitypical Lord's Goat, and of our coöperation with Him in sacrificial work may help clarify the situation. It was the ministry of Jesus that enabled us to consecrate (1 Cor. 1: 30; 2 Cor. 3: 5); *i.e.*, He by the Word and providences wrought a consecrating faith and love in our hearts, enabling us to consecrate; but we had to do the consecrating (Rom. 12: 1). Thus we offered ourselves as presents to God; but the presents being imperfect, God could not accept them. Jesus, then, as our High Priest, by the imputation of His merit, made the present reckonedly perfect, and then He alone, without our co-operation, offered us as gifts to God (Heb. 5: 1); for as yet we were not New Creatures, and were therefore not yet parts of His Body; and thus could not from any standpoint be said to have offered ourselves

as parts of the Lord's Goat to God, though we as individuals presented ourselves to be sacrificed. This work of offering our humanity to God as acceptable gifts is solely the work of our High Priest. This being done by our High Priest, God accepted the gifts by the bestowal of the Holy Spirit upon us; and this acceptance of the gifts made them parts of the second part of the one great sin-offering, *i.e.*, the antitypical Lord's Goat (Heb. 13: 13); and henceforth we are represented as New Creatures in the Body of the High Priest, and in and under Him coöperate with Him in the sacrificial acts whereby our humanity is put to death (Heb. 13: 13, 15, 16; 1 Pet. 2: 5; 2 Cor. 2: 14-17; Phil. 4: 18; Rom. 8: 10). Thus while our High Priest alone offers us to God, after we are offered to the Father, in Christ and under His direction we coöperate with Him in the sacrificial acts whereby our humanity is little by little and more and more used up unto death. Not only the Scriptures above quoted prove this; but the facts of our experience prove it, our preaching, teaching, witnessing, colporteuring, volunteering, sharp shooting, contributing, etc. While our humanity is passive in the hands of our High Priest, certainly our New Creatures are not passive in sacrificial service, but are very active under our High Priest's direction and power to energize our bodies in the Lord's service (Rom. 8: 10, 11); for we are servants of the New Covenant (2 Cor. 3: 6), and are co-workers with Christ (2 Cor. 6: 1). J.F.R. thinks that we as New Creatures do not coöperate with our Lord in sacrificing acts; and he uses this mistaken thought as a basis for concluding that we, therefore, do not coöperate with our High Priest in leading Azazel's Goat from the Door of the Tabernacle to the Gate of the Court. As the basis of his conclusion is contrary to facts as well as to the Scriptures, so is his conclusion; for Aaron after killing the Lord's goat types

the World's High Priest, the Head and Body, and not simply the Head (Heb. 7: 26, 27).

While there was no Great Company class as such in the days of the Apostles, yet there were individuals who, having lost their crowns, as such were given experiences similar to the leading of the Azazel's Goat from the Door of the Tabernacle to the Gate of the Court, and to sending him away by the fit man; and in these acts certain of the under-priests coöperated (1 Cor. 5: 4, 5; 1 Tim. 1: 20). J.F.R. evidently has confused what our dear Pastor has said on our High Priest alone offering us to God, and the separate works whereby the thing offered is sacrificially used up in the Lord's service. The former is Jesus' work alone; the latter is primarily His work, and secondarily our New Creaturely coöperation with Him. So it is in the work of leading Azazel's Goat from the Door of the Tabernacle to the Gate of the Court. This is the work of our Head primarily, who is pleased in harmony with the Father's plan, to use his under-priesthood in the flesh under His direction and by His power as His co-laborers in this work. Let us be faithful in such coöperation. This is our especial Epiphany work. Our understanding therefore of the Scriptures and that Servant's writings on the subject is the following: The World's High Priest has a two-fold ministry: (1) In Head and Body He first sacrifices for the world's sins (Heb. 7: 27; 10: 5-10; 13: 10-16; 1 Pet. 2: 5, 9); then (2) in Head and Body He delivers, by the At-one-ment work, the world from the sentence, power and effects of sin (Heb. 9: 28; 1 John 2: 2; Col. 3: 3, 4; Rom. 8: 18-21; Rev. 1: 6; 5: 10; 20: 6; 21: 3-5; 22: 1-3).

In T 51, par. 1, our dear Pastor, speaking of the Day of Atonement picture (Lev. 16), says: "In this type we find Aaron *alone* representing the *entire Anointed One (Head and Body)*, and two different *sacrifices*, a bullock and a goat, are here used to represent

the *separateness*, yet similarity in suffering, of the *Body* and its Head, as the Sin-offering" (all italics ours). According to our Pastor, in sacrificing the bullock, Aaron types our Lord alone, and in sacrificing the goat he represents primarily our Lord and secondarily "the Church which is His Body," as chapter 4 of Tabernacle Shadows clearly teaches. Especially should we note par. 2 on page 49. Consequently the entire World's High Priest is active while in the flesh; and His second and third activities consist in sacrificing the Lord's Goat class, and in dealing with the Azazel's Goat class before his change of Garments. The picture of Lev. 16: 19-22 shows this as to Azazel's Goat; and the same is manifest from 1 Cor. 5: 3-13; 1 Tim. 1: 19, 20; Jude 22, 23, as literal passages treating of individuals who were given Great Company experiences and dealings at the hands of the Head and *Body* of the World's High Priest.

Heb. 7: 26, 27 is very strong as proving the activity—the ministry—of the Body, as well as the Head, while yet in the flesh. To understand clearly v. 27 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 over 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 the Bible (Is. 53: 9, 11; 2 Cor. 5: 21; 1 Pet. 2: 22; 1 John 3: 5). 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 Bible's purposes and Facts. This passage, therefore, proves that the Body of the World's High Priest under and with His Head, Jesus, exercises His ministry during the Gospel Age. The I. V. translates v. 26 as follows: For it behooved us [to be] such an High Priest, holy, etc. Here, as in v. 27, the High Priest is the World's, not the Church's High Priest, *i.e.*, the Head and Body. St. Paul's exhortation to the Body of the World's High Priest, "Let *us go forth* therefore unto Him without the camp *bearing His reproach*," proves the same thing. So does St. Peter's statement, "Ye are a Holy Priesthood, *to offer up sacrifices*." Numerous other Scriptures prove the same thought. Additional to the passages cited we offer the following: Matt. 16: 24; Mark 10: 35-39; John 17: 18; Rom. 6: 3-11; 8: 10, 17; 1 Cor. 15: 29-34; 2 Cor. 1: 5; 4: 10; Gal. 2: 20; Phil. 3: 10; Col. 1: 24; 2 Tim. 2: 10-12; 1 Pet. 2: 19-24; 3: 14, 17; 4: 12-14, 16, 19. All of these passages show that we are ministering

sacrificially *now* as parts of the World's High Priest. Therefore in harmony with the Scriptures and that Servant's writings we teach that the World's High Priest, The Christ, Head and Body, ministers from 29 and 33 A.D. until 2874 A.D. During the Gospel Age He ministers the sacrifices as the basis of the Atonement, and for Azazel's Goat, and during the Millennial Age He will minister the At-one-ment between God and the people.

It is, of course, our Head who sacrifices us, and that because He is both our High Priest and our Head. However, in certain stages of the sacrificial acts we coöperate, after our High Priest has sacrificed us, *i.e.*, has made the offering of us to the Father—a work in which we in no sense coöperate, though before that occurred we had to present (Rom. 12: 1) ourselves to God for sacrifice and be submissive in His hands. The steps are the following: Heeding the Lord's invitation, "Present your bodies a living sacrifice," we offered ourselves as gifts to God. It was Jesus' ministry that worked a consecrating faith and love in our hearts by the Word of God whereby we, who apart from Him can do nothing (John 15: 5), were enabled to offer ourselves as gifts, or presents. But these presents being imperfect, God could not accept them, since anything short of actual or reckoned perfection is not pleasing to Him. It is the office of a high priest to make the persons and works of those for whom he acts as high priest acceptable to God (Heb. 2: 17; 1 Pet. 2: 5), and to offer their gifts and sacrifices (Heb. 5: 1). Therefore, our High Priest undertakes to make our imperfect gifts, our humanity, and our sacrifices, works, acceptable to God (Heb. 13: 15, 16). The first of these He does by imputing a sufficiency of His merit on our behalf to bring up our gifts, our bodies, to perfection. This He does exclusively. Then He alone without our aid or coöperation offers us, individually,

to God as gifts, and thus fulfils a high-priestly function.

But this is not all; for the Lord's Goat is a Sin-offering, not a gift. The gift was offered to God. He accepted it by the impartation of the Holy Spirit, at the hands of our High Priest, not at our hands. It will be remembered that the gift that we presented, but that was not acceptable until covered by Jesus' merit, was unconditional: The Father was offered the gift for any purpose that He might desire. Hence its entire disposal and use were left unconditionally to His good pleasure. He has been pleased to accept the gift and convert it into a sin-offering—not that He must so do, but that as an act of grace He was pleased so to do. The thing that was an accepted gift was then offered by our High Priest to the Lord as a part of the second Sin-offering, each individual gift being now a part of the Lord's Goat. It was the exclusive work of our High Priest to offer the accepted gift as a part of the second sin-offering, because Jehovah was pleased to have it changed into a part of that offering for sin. The Head alone offers the sin-offering. Our part in these acts was merely a passive one—we remained inactive, though we were willing that any disposal pleasing to God might be made of us. At the time we did not know that Jesus offered us to the Father in these two ways. We simply lay, as it were, dead in His hands. Thus the offering of the gift and of the sin-offering was Jesus' exclusive work. Not before, but instantly after His offering of us as parts of the sin-offering, we became members of the High Priest's Body by being begotten as New Creatures; and only from then on do we coöperate with and under our Head in the various *sacrificial acts whereby our human all is consumed* for the Lord, even as the members of the natural body coöperate with the natural head. This does not mean that there is an equal partnership on the part of our Head and

ourselves as His Body members in the subsequent acts of sacrificial work, even as the members of the natural body do not have an equal partnership with the natural head in the acts of the human body. This Scriptural illustration of the natural head and body in their coöperation gives us a very accurate view of the coöperation of the Head and Body of the World's High Priest. The natural head does all the planning, willing, directing and empowering for the members of the natural body, and for each one according to its function. The natural members do not coöperate in any of the planning, willing, directing and empowering, but they coöperate in the execution of the acts planned, willed and directed, for which power is given by the natural head.

Thus our Head in the sacrificial works whereby the sacrifice is consumed does all the planning, willing, directing and empowering for each member of the Body of the World's High Priest. He plans and wills which one to use and which one not to use, how, when, where and for what to use or not use each member. He directs the whole operation by making such providential arrangements as are necessary for the execution of the specific work that is to be done or left undone. He likewise teaches each member what, how, when and where he is to do in the execution of the sacrificial acts. He also empowers each member to do the sacrificial acts by the promises, encouragements, restraints, corrections and instructions of the Truth, which He gives to each member of His Body. He further empowers them by strengthening their New Creatures for the sacrificial work and making the providences of each one of such a kind as will enable him to do the will of the Head in each sacrificial act. This, then, is the work of the Head of the World's High Priest in every one of the sacrificial acts following the offering of the sacrifice. Of course this is the overshadowing, the all-important, part of the sacrificial

acts following the offering which He exclusively makes. And what are our parts in the sacrificial acts subsequent to His offering of us to the Father as parts of the sin-offering? Exactly that which a natural member of the natural body does to the plans, volitions, directions of the natural head, according to its empowerments. Thus we must respond to what He plans, wills, directs, in that for which He empowers us, by executing in and under Him His plans, volitions and directions, by His empowerment. We must therefore by the qualities that He has already wrought in us learn for every separate sacrificial act what His plan, will and direction for us are. This we do by a study of His Word, Spirit and Providence; and we must accept and use the strength that He gives us by His Spirit and Word, and use the supports that He offers us by His Providence for empowerment to execute the sacrificial acts that He as our Head plans, wills and directs for us. *And we must execute the acts themselves.* Thus there is a continual coöperation of the Head and of the individual members of the World's High Priest in executing each separate sacrificial act. Thus, for example, in our mission toward the brethren each one of us and under our Head lays down his life for the brethren in a vast number of sacrificial acts, all of which our Head plans, wills and directs, and for all of which we accept and use the empowerment that our Head gives. This matter is so apparent from the many Scriptures already quoted, from our Pastor's numerous explanations and exhortations on the subject, and from the experiences of every one of the members of the Body of the World's High Priest, that unless we understood that the Levites are in Azazel's hands, and as a result express his thoughts, we would be at a loss to explain how some of them could be so thoughtless as to teach that the World's High Priest will not be active until after glorification!

A caution is here necessary: While the Head of the World's High Priest sacrifices each member of His Body and does the primary part in the subsequent sacrificial acts in which each one of His Body members as a secondary part coöperates, each individual member of the World's High Priest, after the Head has done His primary part in the subsequent acts of sacrifice, in and under His Head sacrifices himself alone—he does not sacrifice, use up the rights of, his fellow-members. Our privilege toward one another is in and under our Head to assist as we can by teaching, encouraging, supporting and helping our fellow-members to perform the sacrificial acts that our Head has planned, willed and directed for them to do, and to do which He empowers them, when He indicates that we are to give them our assistance in their sacrifice. In so doing the Body-members coöperate with their fellow Body-members in their sacrificial acts, but do not sacrifice one another. Each individual member, though helped by other members, is to carry out his own consecration. All of this coöperation is beautifully illustrated in the mutual care of the members of the natural body.

Some of the Levites raise the objection that we can no more deal with Azazel's Goat than we can sacrifice the Lord's Goat. We answer that there is no parallel whatever in the character of the two works. Even if we should be sacrificing other members of the Lord's Goat as such, which we do not do, there would be no parallel between the two acts; for sacrificing the Lord's Goat is a totally different thing from leading forth Azazel's Goat to the gate and to the fit man and delivering him to Azazel. How do we lead it to the gate? By resisting its revolutionism. How do we deliver it to the fit man? By withdrawing Priestly fellowship. How do we deliver it to Azazel? By withdrawing all brotherly help and favor. Why can we not do these things as well, for example, as we do the

opposite acts: (1) Support the fellow-members in their sacrifices; (2) give them Priestly fellowship; and (3) give them our brotherly help and favor? The two sets of acts just instanced are a contrasted parallel; and at once a sound mind will admit that the two sets of acts can be and are done. Moreover, the fact that St. Paul and the Corinthian Church (1 Cor. 5: 1-13) gave the incestuous brother in their midst the treatment that is a strict parallel to that which the Priesthood now gives Azazel's Goat proves conclusively that we, as an Under-priesthood, can and should coöperate with our Head, while in the flesh, in leading Azazel's Goat to the Gate and to the fit-man, and in delivering him to Azazel for the destruction of the flesh, that the Spirit may be saved—a result that proves that our work toward Azazel's Goat is a Priestly work—a work well pleasing to the Lord. It would be just as logical to deny that as a part of the Priesthood we can assist the Priesthood (Rev. 19: 7), and can give testimony to the world of the coming Kingdom (Matt. 24: 14), as to deny that as a part of the Priesthood we can act toward Azazel's Goat. But let us not forget that the Levites are denying our coöperation with our Head in sacrifice, just to overcome the thought that we can under our Head deal with them as a part of Azazel's Goat, which we can do as typed.

If we do not now coöperate with our Head in the sacrificial acts whereby our humanity is consumed as a part of the sacrifice of the antitypical Lord's Goat, why does St. Paul exhort us as that Goat to "go forth unto Him without the camp, bearing His reproach" (Heb. 13: 13)? Why does he exhort us by Him to offer *the sacrifices of praise to God* [preach things reflecting credit on God], as *sacrifices pleasing to God*, if we do not now share in the sin-offering (Heb. 13: 15, 16)? Why does St. Peter assure us that we are a holy Priesthood *to offer sacrifices*, if we do not now

share in the sin-offering (1 Pet. 2: 5)? Why does St. Paul call us in the incense of our sacrifices a sweet savor of Christ unto God, if we do not now share in the sin-offering (2 Cor. 2: 14-17; Phil. 4: 18)? If we do not now share in the sin-offering, why does St. Paul say, If Christ be in you, the body is dead because of sin [as a sin-offering] (Rom. 8: 10)? If we do not now share in the sin-offering, how could we as parts of the Mediator serve the New Covenant in the work on its seal (2 Cor. 3: 6)? If we are co-workers with Christ, why do we not share with Him in that which His Work in the flesh was—a sin-offering (2 Cor. 6: 1)? If we do not share now with Him in the sin-offering, how can we now be suffering and dying *with* Him (Rom. 6: 3-11; 8: 17; 2 Cor. 1: 5; 1 Cor. 15: 29-34; 4: 10; Gal. 2: 20; Phil. 3: 10; 2 Tim. 2: 10-12; 1 Pet. 2: 19-24; 3: 14, 17; 4: 12-14, 16, 19)? If we are not now sharing in the sin-offering, how could we be taking up the cross and following Christ (Matt. 16: 24)? If we are not now sharing in the sin-offering, how could we be now drinking of His cup and be in process of being baptized with His baptism (Mark 10: 35-39)? If in this life it is not possible for us to share in the sin-offering, how can we share in it at all, seeing the sufferings for sin are limited to the fleshly life (1 Pet. 4: 1)? Surely the Levitical position on this subject is in the most direct contradiction to the Scriptures, our Pastor's writings, the facts of our experience and the conclusions of reason. By claiming that the Body members of Christ cannot on this side of the veil have any part in the sin-offering, J.F.R. has in fact, though perhaps not intentionally, repudiated the Church's participation with her Lord in His sacrificial cup, and has actually, though perhaps not intentionally, joined the 1909 sifters in denying our sharing in the sin-offering, so far as the Church's participation in its sacrifice is concerned.

Having shown and disproved the foundation error

in the article under review, we will now briefly refute its incidental errors. In par. 29, like *Studies*, Vol. VII, on Rev. 8: 1-3, it says that "the altar represents the place of sacrifice." The golden altar represents the Christ as New Creatures, and the brazen altar represents the Christ as human beings. Pars. 28, 30 falsely define the word *present* as *standing ready*, as used in Rom. 12: 1, where it means *yield* or *surrender*—make a present of yourself. The writer says (par. 30) that it is manifest from the Scriptures that the New Creatures do not do any sacrificing. Heb. 7: 27; 9: 14; 1 Pet. 2: 5 and numerous other Scriptures, some of which have already been quoted, or cited, show that they do; and in the very nature of the case New Creatures are the only ones that can; for the New Creature is the priest who does the sacrificing. In par. 31 he denies that the New Creature sacrifices, affirming that instead he fulfils his covenant. There is no real contrast here, because the New Creature fulfils a covenant of sacrifice, *i.e.*, a covenant which requires him to sacrifice (Ps. 50: 5). The very terms of this passage prove that to fulfill his covenant he must sacrifice, and thus the attempted contrast disproves his position. In pars. 32-34, he alludes to, quotes and perverts T 45, par. 2, which tells of the under-priests' also waving the offering, to prove his position. The reverse is proved by the paragraph. It shows that the under-priests share in sacrificial acts, and that continually until death. Hence this section proves that we as new creatures of Christ's Body in this present life "may not lay down or cease *to offer* all our powers [our human all] in God's service." To quote such a paragraph to prove that we do not share in sacrificial acts proves his increasing right-eye darkening, if it does not prove his dishonesty; for, lawyer-like, he may be quoting it with perverting remarks to explain away its damaging effects on his error. If his remarks in par. 38 on children caring for their parents mean that

consecrated children are not duty-bound to care for parents in need, especially in the needs of old age, his remarks are unscriptural (1 Tim. 5: 4, 8). However, he may be writing against the spirit of overdoing for parents beyond their needs, exemplified in the man who wanted to wait until his father died before becoming a disciple (Matt. 8: 21, 22). If the latter is his thought, it is correct; but if it is, he has not clearly expressed himself. The twists and perversions in pars. 43 and 44, whereby he seeks to explain away our sacrificial acts as explained in Heb. 13: 15, 16, are only more proofs of further right-eye darkening, as the entire article also proves this fact.

In Z '26, 179-184, is published an article on "Sacrifice And Obedience," which requires some attention. Par. 19 states that Esau types Satan. God himself tells us that he types those rejected from attaining the election, from attaining the Little Flock: (1) Nominal Fleshly Israel (Rom. 9: 1-13); consequently by the parallel dispensation (2) Nominal Spiritual Israel (Is. 63: 1-6); and (3) the Great Company (Heb. 12: 16, 17). This article sets forth Saul as the type of all the [supposed] anointed in 1918, in and out of the Truth, and finally winds up with his typing those [supposed] anointed ones who fail to smite clericalism so thoroughly as "that evil servant" has been exhorting them to do. This, of course, is another feature of his pet theory of the special favors for his followers, the supposed temple since 1918. Saul types a variety of characters. For the Gospel Age he types the crown-losing leaders of the various denominations, who in each denomination took the place of leadership held by the faithful leaders [antitypical Samuel] who announced the stewardship truths, *i.e.*, Saul types the Gospel-Age princes. These, like Saul, were at first humble, loyal and serviceable to the Truth. But, like their type, Saul, they shortly failed to put obedience above service. The faithful Little Flock leaders rebuked

them, even as Samuel rebuked Saul. They have run ahead of the Lord ["my Lord delayeth"], even as Saul failed to wait for the sacrifice until Samuel came to make it. They failed to make a complete job of killing their love of sin as the Little Flock does, even as Saul failed to extirpate all Amalekites, while Samuel saw to it that they were extirpated. They smote their fellow servants—the Little Flock leaders—even as Saul persecuted David. They became teachers of error ["eating and drinking with the drunken"—symbolic sorcery], even as Saul took to witchcraft. Thus the facts show that Saul typed the crown-losing leaders of Christendom throughout a large part of the Age. This is the large type—that of the Gospel Age. But there has been a smaller type, which is confined to the Epiphany, and which has been fulfilling and has yet some time to run. This we hope later to give in detail. The remark of par. 24, that shortly after 1918 the Lord completely rejected the ecclesiastical systems, is totally out of harmony with the Bible, reason and facts. The Bible and facts prove that He did this in 1878, and reason re-enforces this view.

In Z '26, 227-235, under the title "The Temple Of God," is another article that requires attention. In par. 2 J.F.R. confounds the two messengers of Mal. 3: 1. The first of these messengers is (1) John the Baptist, the preparer of Jesus' First Advent, and (2) the Church in the flesh, the preparer of Jesus' Second Advent; and the second of these messengers is Jesus in His First Advent and in the Second Advent (Mark 1: 1-4; Is. 40: 3). Our Pastor on the basis of the Bible and the parallel dispensations very properly applied Mal. 3: 1 to both Harvests, and the time of them to 29 A.D. and onward and 1874 and onward. In par. 6 the parable of the virgins, and in par. 7 that of the talents, are used to prove the fact of our Lord's coming to His temple. They teach it. But the Scriptures, reason and facts teach that this was in 1874, not

in 1918 as he claims. To prove that the Lord came to His temple lately, the Society's president quotes Ezek. 21: 27—"I will overturn, overturn, overturn it, ... until He *come* whose right it is, and I will give it to Him." The sophistry in the use of this passage lies in the use of the word *come*. In the Bible, in connection with the Second Advent, the word *to come* sometimes means the act of His arrival in 1874 (Acts 1: 11), sometimes applies to the entire Parousia (Matt. 24: 42-44; Luke 18: 8; Rev. 1: 7), sometimes applies to the entire Epiphany (Matt. 23: 39; 24: 30; 26: 64; Luke 18: 8; 1 Cor. 4: 5; 11: 26; Col. 3: 4; Rev. 1: 7; Jude 14), sometimes applies to both the Parousia and the Epiphany, as several of the foregoing passages prove, and sometimes applies to the whole Millennium (Matt. 25: 31; Luke 9: 26; 2 Thes. 1: 10). This word that can cover so many periods cannot be used from Ezek. 21: 27 to prove that the Lord came to His temple in 1918. This passage does not refer to the temple at all, but has reference to the end of the Times of the Gentiles in 1914. Therefore it cannot be used to prove Christ's coming to His temple at all, let alone in 1918. In this passage it refers to the fact that in 1914 He would arise to a work that would result in Israel's deliverance from the Gentile's dominion. This was His starting ouster proceedings against the Gentile nations in 1914. Hence the passage has no reference to our Lord's coming to His temple, to which He came in 1874. He began in 1874 to assail Satan's kingdom by a wordy conflict, and continued it until 1914, when from a wordy war He proceeded to a dispossession of the nations, and additionally to the physical overthrow of Satan's empire.

We have in the first part of this chapter shown that the troubles on the Society in 1918 were fit-man experiences, and as such were intended to burn out some of the dross of the Levites—the symbolic silver—and to burn their wood, hay and stubble (Mal. 3: 2, 3; 1 Cor. 3: 13-15).

But those troubles, being such experiences, could not be special evidences of God's special favor to the Society partisans as the [supposed] Little Flock, as J.F.R. repeatedly affirms. Hence the whole setting that is given to matters in pars. 24-27 is a delusion quite in harmony with his hallucinations. To claim that the clean offering of Mal. 3: 4 began after 1918, and that in the work of the Society partisans, is to discredit the pure work of the reaping and gleanings time, 1874-1916. Imagine, beloved brethren, the erroneous drives on *Millions now living will never die after 1925* being the pure offering, and the true harvest work from 1874 to 1916 being in comparison unclean! No wonder the Bible for such effusions calls the Society's president evil, drunk, foolish and unprofitable! His applying Matt. 24: 10 to the 1918 troubles, as a proof that the so-called "opposition" betrayed the Society's leaders, is not only a perversion of a passage that applies to the persecutions of the faithful, usually by the crown-losers, and mainly during Papacy's reign, but is a gross and untruthful slander. The reason the government prosecuted the Society leaders was partly because they witnessed against the war spirit, which was a proper thing to do, though they were wrong in decrying patriotism in the natural man; and partly because they interfered with the draft, which was partly proven against them by intercepted letters that they wrote into camps, advising brethren not even to wash dishes, pare potatoes, clean barracks, wait on tables, etc. They, by such letters and witnessing, betrayed themselves. The so-called opposition knew nothing of what was brewing until the Society leaders were arrested on evidence that their own speeches, letters and articles gave the government. Hence we see the double error of applying Matt. 24: 10 to their 1918 troubles with the government.

Par. 34-51 claims that King Uzziah types Nominal Spiritual Israel, especially just before 1918. This

is a groundless claim. The parallel dispensation proves that he in the large picture types a phase of things in Christendom considerably before the French Revolution, while in the smaller picture he types a certain person who arrogantly busy-bodied in a certain Epiphany priestly work, and for that reason was stricken by the Lord with symbolic leprosy. A proof of the delusion under which the Society's president labors is his making Little Flock types of what are actually Great Company types on various matters since 1918 of almost everything in the Scriptures. Does he think that on the mere say-so of "that wicked servant" and "foolish, unprofitable shepherd" properly informed Truth people will accept such baseless claims? Increasingly they are driving from him thousands of New Creatures and good Youthful Worthies; and this is a factual proof of the error of such claims. In par. 42 it is said that in the autumn season of 1919 the Cedar Point Convention was held. This dating is wrong; for it was held Aug. 24-Sept. 1. This wrong date is probably, like many others of the Society's president, to lay, lawyer-like, the foundation for some time delusion that he may be wishing to palm off. In par. 45 the purging of Isaiah's lips (Is. 6) is explained as typing the Society adherents awakening to the fact that as the Lord's representatives they were to be more active. This is in utter disharmony with the pertinent Scriptural symbols, in which lips represent teaching, unclean lips represent unclean teaching, the altar represents the sacrificed humanity of the Christ, a coal therefrom represents a truth—in this case the ransom, and the purging of the lips represents the cleansing of the teachings from error. Isaiah here types God's people who, while dwelling in Babylon were proclaimers of unclean teachings, but who coming into the Truth from 1874 on were cleansed from their errors, especially by the ransom truth, and

given the work of proclaiming the Word until the Time of Trouble would bring destruction.

Let us note some of his supposed clarifications, all of them in striking contradiction to the light received through "that Servant": (1) no tentative justification; (2) consecration at the Gate; (3) Christ's merit not deposited at Calvary, but after the ascension; (4) Christ's death on a tree not necessary to satisfy Justice; (5) the Church a part of the High Priest only after her glorification; (6) a Biblical mediator a reconciler (which is a priest), not a guarantor of a covenant (which is a Biblical mediator); (7) the Christ becomes Mediator only at the sealing of the Covenant; (8) the Egyptian firstborn type of clergy as such; (9) Christ's merit is the value He gained; (10) no Youthful Worthies; (11) antitypical Elijah transubstantiated into antitypical Elisha; (12) Jeremiah types the Society adherents; (13) misapplication of the Joseph type and its seven years of plenty and famine; (14) misapplication of the John the Baptist type; (15) on the slaughter weapons; (16) on the parable of the penny; (17) on smiting Jordan; (18) on the Seventy jubilee cycles; (19) on antitypical Judas; (20) on the Great Jubilee in 1925; (21) the deliverance of the Church and the Great Company by 1925; (22) the end of the trouble by 1925; (23) the return of the Ancient Worthies in 1925; (24) the establishment of the Kingdom in 1925; (25) the end of the infliction of the Adamic death in 1925; (26) confusion on the wise and foolish virgins; (27) confusion on the pounds and talents; (28) confusion on the sheep and goats; (29) confusion on the wedding garment; (30) confusion on the separation of tares from wheat; (31) confusion on the robe of righteousness; (32) confusion on Rev. 12; (33) Satan's usurpation and being given the right to rule over the human family; (34) confusion on the slayer and the avenger of blood; (35) errors on Matt. 24: 1-14;

(36) the star of Bethlehem and the three wise men as Satan's servants; (37) the point of the sword; (38) the three parts and the refining fires of Zech. 13: 8, 9; (39) the bound ones and prisoners of Is. 61: 1; (40) the gospel of the Kingdom; (41) the end of the Age; (42) the time and character of the message of Is. 52: 7; (43) confounding the slaughter weapons with the sword of Elisha; (44) all faithful *new creatures* die; (45) the Society is "that Servant"; (46) the evil servant is a class; (47) the incense offered in the most holy; (48) the court not typing tentative justification; (49) confusion on repentance; (50) on faith; (51) on conversion; (52) on consecration; (53) on the Sarah Covenant and Covenant of Sacrifice; (54) the thing given in consecration; (55) time and nature of the world-wide witness; (56) our Pastor still directs the Society's work; (57) on the essentials for a trial for life; (58) 50 years' Harvest; (59) Enoch experienced death; (60) the clergy as such doomed to the Second Death; (61) The Ancient Worthies can be resurrected before the Church and the Great Company leave the earth; (62) misinterpreting thousands of verses properly interpreted by "that Servant"; (63) antitypical Elijah began his ministry in 1874; (64) errors on the Channel; (65) errors as to the nature of the beast, image of the beast, etc.; (66) Elijah restored all things from 1874 to 1918; (67) Satan not cast out from heaven until 1914; (68) those not Spirit-begotten can be now on trial for life or death without the merit of Christ's blood imputed to them or applied on their behalf, and can go into the Second Death; (69) Jesus' New Creature died on Calvary's cross; (70) there are 19 instead of 12 Apostles; (71) time features are no longer to be given much attention; (72) Jesus was inactive toward Satan until 1914; (73) the heavens of 2 Pet. 3: 12 are not the ecclesiastical powers of control; (74) applies Is. 62: 10 since 1918; (75) Is. 30: 26 is not Millennial;

(76) Joel 2: 28 applies to the Gospel Age, perverting the sons, daughters, old men and young men; (77) the times of refreshing are the Harvest; (78) a new dispensational work began for the Little Flock in 1919; (79) Satan was empowered to put Adam to death, if he disobeyed; (80) the tree of knowledge yielded fruit giving knowledge; (81) there was but one tree of life; (82) Adam knew not nor ate of the trees of life; (83) the tree[s] of life made one death-proof, *i.e.*, immortal; (84) joy began in heaven in 1914; (85) mistakes—misunderstandings, misapplications—in the Bible; (86) Sennacherib types Satan; (87) his overthrow types the overthrow of Satan's empire; (88) the overthrow of Pharaoh's army types the overthrow of Satan's empire; (89) denies that Christ developed character; (90) denies that the Church develops character; (91) opposes character development to covenant keeping; (92) applies Rom. 12: 1 to new creatures only; (93) incompletely defines holiness; and (94) faith; (95) teaches confusion on separation of the good and bad fish; (96) claims one sacrifices only his imputed rights; (97) claims all actually sacrifice the same quantity and quality; (98) claims that Jesus does all the sacrificing; (99) denies that the under-priesthood coöperates under the Head in sacrificial acts; (100) teaches that the under-priests are not part of the High Priest until their glorification; (101) teaches that only then will they share in the sin-offering; (102) wrongly defines the antitype of the altar; (103) opposes sacrificing to covenant keeping in the new creature; (104) errs as to the Amalekites' ancestor; and (105) on their typical significance; (106) teaches that Esau types Satan; (107) that saints first began in 1874 to journey to the Kingdom; (108) teaches that Saul types all anointed ones in and out of the Truth in 1918 and later; (109) that Saul later types those who cease thoroughly to smite the ecclesiastics; (110) that the Nominal Church was completely

rejected after 1918; (111) misapplies Mal. 3: 1-4 to 1918 onward; (112) misapplies Ezek. 21: 27 as pointing indirectly to Jesus' coming to the temple in 1918; (113) makes the 3½ years—29-33 A.D.—parallel to the 3½ years—1914-1918; (114) perverts fit-man experiences into Little Flock experiences; (115) claims that the offerings of Mal. 3: 4 began in 1918; (116) applies the persecutions and betrayals of Matt. 24: 10 to 1918; (117) teaches that Elijah and Elisha type two works; (118) their separation, the separation of two works; (119) Uzziah types Nominal Spiritual Israel, especially just before and immediately after 1918; (120) perversion of numerous typical Scriptures for his 1918 delusion; (121) perverts the symbolic teachings of Is. 6: 1-10 in the interests of the 1919 and subsequent drives; (122) teaches that the earth was not redeemed; (123) on at least nine points impinges against the ransom; (124) hypocrisy first began in Enos' days; (125) Enoch's not seeing death means that he observed no one die; (126) Enoch's not seeing death means he died without feeling its pains; (127) Enoch prophesied deliverance; (128) was the first so to do; (129) teaches a counterfeit dragon, beast and false prophet; (130) counterfeit frogs coming out of their mouths; (131) the nature of the advancing light; (132) paralleling 33 A D. and 1918; (133) the fiery trials on the Church; (134) the Society's work since 1919 (the 1925 Millions propaganda) greater and more honorable and purer and better done than antitypical Elijah ever did; (135) Society adherents since 1918 more favored than God's Faithful ever were before; (136) his light will be sevenfold (perfect) before the earthly phase of the Kingdom comes; (137) perverts the meaning of character; (138) perverts the meaning of *image* in Rom. 8: 29; (139) teaches that God, Jesus and the saints have no character; (140) wrests and tortures numerous Scriptures in the interests of his errors on character.

If we would point out the details of errors coming under point (62) above—"misinterpreting thousands of verses properly interpreted by 'that Servant'"—our list would swell into thousands of details; for almost never does he allude to or quote a passage in an article on his pet views but he corrupts its sense. Yet he says he has not changed our Pastor's teachings, has only clarified them!

J.F.R. has in the October 15 and November 1, 1928 Towers repudiated a former view that he received from our Pastor, and that he widely circulated in *The Finished Mystery*, namely, that the Philadelphia Church was the Reformation Church and that the Laodicean Church is the Harvest Church, claiming that the Philadelphia Church was from 1874 to 1918 and that since 1918 or 1919 we have been in the Laodicean period. We will not in this chapter examine his hallucinations on the subject; rather we will present some positive evidence proving that The Philadelphia period was the Reformation Period and that the Laodicean period was the harvest period from 1874-1954—the first 40 years of which—the Parousia—being for the reaping and the second 40 years of which—the Epiphany—being for the rest of the other harvest processes. As will be shown later in this chapter, and as is required by the logic of his position, J.F.R. holds that the reaping did not begin until his Laodicea began 1918-1919, though in his Oct. 15 and Nov. 1 articles, which we are herewith refuting, he claims to believe that the reaping began in 1874. He is holding back his real thought until his pilgrims have sufficiently inculcated his adherents with it to make it "safe" for him to come out in the Tower with it. For the proof of this as his course we refer to the facts given a little later. That the Bible teaches that the reaping is an exclusively Laodicean matter is evident from the following consideration: The seven angels of the seven churches are identical with the

seven angels that stand before God with the seven trumpets; and it is under the sounding of the seventh angel—the Laodicean angel—that the reaping of both the wheat and tares takes place (Rev. 11: 15; 14: 14-20). Hence Philadelphia precedes the reaping time. With this introductory paragraph we are ready to present three general lines of proof showing that Philadelphia ended and Laodicea began in 1874. The conclusive proof of this proposition will, without examining the detailed vagaries of the two articles that are mentioned above, abundantly refute them.

I. We offer first a set of comparative and contrasting proofs for our Pastor's view of the two churches as true, based on a comparison of, and contrast between Rev. 3: 7-13 and 14-21: (1) The names fit the characters of the two periods as he gives them (vs. 7, 14), and are contrary to J.F.R.'s perversions. The Reformation period was pre-eminently the period of brotherly love, *e.g.*, as can be seen from the Protestant brethren accepting and supporting until the need was passed, the over 1,000,000 Huguenots exiled for their faith from France, the 30,000 Saltzburger driven out of Austria and other very numerous brethren driven in masses out of various other Catholic countries, their serving and defending, frequently at great risk, much self-denial, suffering, loss of life and in other ways, their persecuted brethren, their great self denials in spreading reformation truths, translating, publishing and circulating the Bible to help their brethren to the Truth, the foreign missionary work as a witness of the kingdom in all nations and to win brethren for the Lord, the Methodist brethren giving all to the poor brethren, except what their bare needs required them to keep, the brethren in the Miller movement piling up their money on the church altars or tables for any of the brethren to take for the supply of their need, etc. Of all periods of Church history the Reformation period was pre-eminently the time of

brotherly love. But from 1874 and particularly from 1878 onward except among the Truth people the love of many—those of the nominal church—waxed cold. On the other hand from 1874 and especially from 1878 till 1914 began the Parousia features of Laodicea—the agitations for justice for the people—Laodicea means justice, vindication for the people—in the cries of relief from wrong and exposure of wrong-doers in church, state, aristocracy and capital, the rendering of recompense to the errorists for teaching error in the exposures of their errors, the taking of mouthpièceship from the nominal church, the giving over of the nominal church to loss of all her Divine privileges, possessions, uses, etc., with the consequent giving her over wholly to Satanic influences; then with 1914 began the Epiphaniac features of Laodicea—physical punishments for the wrong-doers with the World War as the first great physical punishment of Christendom for vindication of the people, to be followed by the other features of wrath, which will not end until the Epiphaniac part of Laodicea is ended. Thus the facts prove the names apply as our Pastor taught them.

Our Lord's office works as implied in the descriptions of Him from the standpoint of His pertinent works (vs. 7, 14) for these two periods fit our Pastor's setting of things and contradict that of J.F.R. V. 7 calls him holy and true, because in the Reformation time He severely reproved Rome for its unholy practices and errors and warmly advocated Protestants' holy living and true teaching. Then did He use His power (key of David) as the Church's Beloved—David—to unlock the Bible that Rome held under lock and key (symbolized by Luther finding the Bible in the monastery locked and secured by a chain) and "opened"—explained it as true (Luke 24: 32, 27)—as then He so "shut"—refuted Papacy's teachings—as none could open—vindicatingly explain—them.

On the other hand, the description (v. 14) of His

Laodicean works tallies well with His office occupations from 1874 to the present and will continue so until the Epiphany's end. He is the Amen who in His Second Advent came forth to amen—realize—the hopes of the Church and the world and thus fulfill God's eternal purpose. He has from 1874 onward most faithfully witnessed for the Truth—the faithful and true Witness—and against all error among His nominal and real people, a thing that was in the Philadelphia period done only on a small scale, *i.e.*, for certain truths and against certain errors. One of the truths specially emphasized during this period is His being not coeternal, coequal and consubstantial with the Father, but, "the beginning of the creation of God." See *e.g.*, Studies, Vol. V and numerous Tower articles, also Studies, Vol. I, Chap. VII. Thus we find that the office descriptions of Christ fit the two periods as our Pastor taught them and contradict the setting under review.

Again, the commendation given the Philadelphia Church (vs. 8, 10) and severe reproofs administered to the Laodicean Church (vs. 15, 17) prove our Pastor's setting and disproves the one under review. During the Reformation period the Protestant denominations were honorable women (Ps. 45: 9). Of their works of teaching truth and refuting error on doctrine and life, of their stand for righteousness, of their Bible translation and spread, of their missionary and evangelistic work and of their labors of mercy, our Lord could say, "I know thy works," "thou hast kept My Word," "thou hast not denied My name." And of their devotion and the horrible persecutions and other unexampled sufferings that they underwent—greater even than those of the Smyrna Church—our Lord could well say, "thou hast kept the words of My patience." But none of such praise could be given them since 1874 and more particularly since 1878 when they were "spewed—vomited—out." Hence Philadelphia could not have begun in 1874 and continued to

1918. On the other hand, the rebukes for their lukewarmness (v. 15), for their boastfulness (v. 17), for their ignorance of their real condition (v. 17) and for their wretchedness, misery, poverty, blindness and nakedness (v. 17) most thoroughly fit them ever since 1874 and 1878. Let us remember that the Lord sometimes addresses His real, sometimes His nominal, and sometimes both of these peoples in the Churches.

Again, the Roman hierarchy and its partisans—the professed symbolic Jews, but actually a synagogue of Satan, an assembly that Satan gathered—that began in the Smyrna period (Rev. 2: 9) were the special enemies of the Philadelphia Church (v. 9), which is true of the Reformation Protestant Churches; but is not true of them since 1874, since when they and Rome have begun to "roll together as a scroll" in more or less friendship. Hence Philadelphia was over by 1874. Again, the Philadelphia Church was kept *from*, not *in* the hour of temptation as the articles under review claim and its setting requires. The hour of temptation (v. 10) begun in 1878, in the first of the six harvest siftings, while Laodicea was not (v. 18) kept from it, but went into it. Hence the Philadelphia Church was not in existence from 1878 onward, and Laodicea was, to go into it, in existence before 1878, hence did not begin in 1918 or 1919. Furthermore, the Lord's Second Advent which set in in 1874 (not a fictitious coming to the temple in 1918, which none ever forecast before 1918 as then due to come, that idea never even being thought of until years after 1918, while the forecasting of our Lord's Second Advent did occur in Philadelphia, before 1874, as v. 11 teaches it would be) was declared during the Philadelphia period to be in the near future (v. 11), but was declared as present in the Laodicean period (v. 20). Hence Philadelphia was over and Laodicea began in 1874. No special Truth feast was promised the faithful in Philadelphia; but great feasts were promised

the Laodicean faithful (v. 20), which Jesus said would set in at His return (Luke 12: 37) in 1874. There was no knock by the prophetic word in Philadelphia indicating our Lord's presence to have set in; but there was one from 1875 on, as the Laodicean period progressed (v. 20). There was no special cry to the Philadelphia Church to repent, as the Reformation Church was faithful to her commission to the end, but the fallen condition of Laodicea since 1878 drew forth in the six siftings many cries to repent (v. 9).

The door opened to the Reformation Church was to all in it (vs. 7, 8); but the one to Laodicea was to individuals only (v. 20), which again places Philadelphia and Laodicea where our Pastor placed them, and therefore, disproves the new view, because the general call ceased early in the true Laodicea, 1878-1881. No special eye-salve was needed for Philadelphia to gain the Reformation truths, which were embraced by millions who were not consecrated, but there was for Laodicea from 1874 onward, to gain the harvest Truth, which was gotten by but a comparatively few (v. 18). Philadelphia was not wretched, miserable, poor, blind and naked like Laodicea, the condition since 1878, but had the riches of the crown (v. 11). Philadelphia was the mouthpiece of the Lord to the end of her career, while in 1878 the nominal church was spewed—vomited—out, hence in 1878 Philadelphia did not exist and Laodicea was then cast off as mouthpiece (v. 16). Philadelphia's overcomers had offered to them the hope of going to heaven and there becoming part of the glorified temple, and as part of the Bride of Christ and of the Daughter of Jehovah, had the privilege of receiving the family name, the crown (v. 12), being the special reward conditionally offered *to all in it* (v. 11) throughout the Reformation period for overcoming. This was certainly the hope offered to the whole Reformation Church, while to the consecrated of Laodicea, *not to all in it* (note

the distinction between the general and special calls here implied in this contrast), the kingdom and joint-heirship with Christ (v. 21) and the Divine nature (gold tried in the fire; v. 18) were the special promises. Hence we conclude that the comparisons and contrasts between Philadelphia and Laodicea as given in Rev. 3: 7-13 and 14-21 prove that Philadelphia was the Reformation Church ending its career in 1874, while Laodicea was the harvest Church beginning in 1874 and not ending for many years yet—in 1954, we believe, the Bible to teach.

II. The prophetic chronology proves that Laodicea began in 1874; hence not in 1918 or 1919, and hence Philadelphia was over by 1874. We will give our chronological points briefly; and believe they are conclusive on the time of those two churches.

(1) If Philadelphia lasted only from 1874 to 1918 its duration was 43½ years. But since each of the trumpets of Revelation corresponds in time with the time of its pertinent church, the messenger of each church being the messenger with the pertinent trumpet, the Philadelphia messenger must have blown for at least 391 years and 15 days (Rev. 9: 13-15); hence he started to blow hundreds of years before 1874. Therefore Philadelphia must have begun hundreds of years before 1874. When after the symbolic earthquake we write our promised exposition of the Revelation, we will submit conclusive proof that the Philadelphia Church began about twenty-five years before Luther's 95 theses were published October 31, 1517. Our proof will show that the second woe, the one under the sixth trumpet, lasted to within a few years of 1874. However, for the purpose of the matters at hand the above is conclusive, that the Philadelphia Church began hundreds of years before 1874, and that by 1874 Laodicea was due.

(2) The 390 days of bearing Israel's sin (Catholicism's sins borne 390 years by the faithful, as distinct

from the contextual Jerusalem's, Protestantism's sins borne 40 years—1874-1914—by the faithful; Ezek. 4: 4-6) represents the full period of the second woe of Rev. 10: 12, etc., except its last year and 15 days, and was therefore wholly within the period of Philadelphia and was over before the 40 years' siege of Protestantism began in 1874. Hence Philadelphia was over by 1874 and Laodicea began then.

(3) The 6,000 years from the fall, ending in 1874 and introducing the Millennium as the end or Harvest of the Gospel Age, must then have set in as that which brought in the lapping of the Millennium and the Gospel Age (Matt. 13: 40), since the Harvest is confined to Laodicea (Rev. 11: 15; 14: 14-20). Hence Laodicea must have begun in 1874 and therefore, by that time Philadelphia was over.

(4) The 1335 days of Daniel (12: 12) ended in 1874, and prove the Lord's Second Advent set in then, while Jesus declares that *at that time* He would come forth with the harvest message and work, which are Laodicean as shown above (Luke 12: 37; Matt. 13: 40-43; 24: 30, 31; Rev. 14: 14-20; Ps. 50: 3-5).

(5) The Parallel Dispensations show that as the reaping of the Jewish Age was in the end of the Jewish Age, *i.e.*, the first period of the Church—Ephesus—so the reaping of the Gospel Age must be in the parallel time and stage of the Gospel Age—1874-1914 and is thus in the end (Matt. 13: 40), the *last* or Laodicean period of the Church.

(6) The antitypical Jubilee cycle fixing 1874 as the introduction of the Millennial Age in its beginning of the lapping of the Gospel and Millennial Ages, must have introduced Laodicea, the last stage of the Church; for in such a lapping as the end of the Age, there could not be two stages of the Church, which would make two stages of the Church for the Harvest, a thing contrary to the type of the Jewish Harvest. Hence Philadelphia was over by 1874, when Laodicea

began, the great cycle from the last Jubilee before the desolation of the land leading up to and introducing 1874 as the beginning of the Millennium.

(7) The 51 jubileeless cycles (hence cycles of 49 years), because all 70 Jubilees, being held during the desolation, none of them was repeated at the end of each 49 years of the remaining 51 cycles (2 Chro. 36: 21) ended in 1874 and their end implies the presence of the great Restorer, whose first work after His Return was the reaping as shown under (4); hence then Laodicea began and Philadelphia ended.

III. Briefly will we set forth some of the sign prophecies—signs of the times—as proofs that, the reaping being the Laodicean period, Laodicea must have begun before 1914, and hence Philadelphia could not have stretched into 1918. That Laodicea is the reaping period is, we repeat, evident from the fact that, its angel, the seventh, being the angel with the seventh trumpet, it was under his trumpet that the reaping came (Rev. 11: 15; 14: 14-20).

(1) Since the tares began to be burned in 1914, the reaping must have preceded their burning and must have been doing so for 40 years according to the parallel dispensations (Matt. 13: 40-43; Rev. 14: 14-20). Hence Laodicea began in 1874.

(2) The Time of Trouble which began with the World War in 1914 was to overtake the reaper, and thus to end his activity (Amos 9: 13); but this reaper began before he was overtaken, hence years before 1914; and new ones being won for Christ during Laodicea (Rev. 3: 18, 20, 21), Laodicea must have been during the reaping; hence it began years before 1914.

(3) The Elect were all to be consecrated—"killed"—(Rev. 6: 11) before the time of exacting wrath—the Time of Trouble—and the wrath beginning in 1914, the reaping was all over by then, and hence the reaping stage of Laodicea began years before.

(4) The Elect were all to be sealed on their foreheads

in each country in which they were before the wrath would strike that country. Hence the last of the reaping was ended in Europe by 1914 and the last one gleaned in America by 1916 when America began to drift into war with Germany. Hence Laodicea began years—40 years—before 1914 (Rev. 7: 1-3).

(5) The twelve daylight hours of the Penny Parable corresponding to the 40 years reaping time—the Parousia—and its twelve night hours corresponding to the rest of the harvest period—the 40 years of the Epiphany—the five harvest call periods were finished by June, 1911, the first beginning in 1874; hence Laodicea began in 1874, and therefore Philadelphia was then over; for the reaping comes under the seventh trumpet, which the Laodicean messenger sounds (Rev. 11: 15; 14: 14-16).

(6) The midnight of the Ten Virgins' parable, being April, 1877, when the general proclamation of Christ's second presence began, and its night beginning October, 1799, not only must it end in 1954 with the end of the Epiphany; but this also proves that when the call, "Behold the bridegroom," began in April, 1877, the reaping was already under way; hence Laodicea was then present, and Philadelphia had already ended; for the reaping comes under the seventh trumpet, which the Laodicean messenger sounds (Rev. 11: 15; 14: 14-20).

(7) In 1 Cor. 10: 5-14 the five siftings, as represented by five of Israel's evil experiences in the wilderness, are shown to have taken place in the Jewish and Christian reaping periods, which by the following considerations are proven to be the first and last stages of the Church—Ephesus and Laodicea; Heb. 3: 7-4: 11 additionally shows that these evil wilderness experiences of Israel type Gospel-Age experiences. Facts show that these five siftings were during the Gospel Age enacted on a larger scale than the siftings of the two Harvests, one of them occurring in each of the five

Church epochs between the Ephesian and Laodicean Churches. (1) During the Smyrna Church through the sifting work incidental to the introduction of the doctrines of trinity, immortality and eternal torment, the larger no-ransomism sifting was enacted, since these doctrines denied the ransom. This corresponds to the first harvest sifting, 1878-1881. (2) Through the giving up of the real object of the Gospel Age—the selecting of the Church for the Millennial conversion of the world—for a false one—the Church's conversion of the world and reigning over it 1,000 years before Christ's return, an unbelieving plan was set forth as God's plan—the larger infidelism sifting was consequently set into activity during the Pergamos period, since such a teaching is unbelief in God's plan for the Church and the world. This corresponds to the second harvest sifting, 1881-1884. (3) In the Thyatira Church the chief stumbling block—sifting feature—was antitypical Jezebel's unholy fornication with the kings of Christendom (Rev. 2: 20-23). This was the larger combinationism sifting, antitypical of the illicit union of Israel with the Moabitish and Midianitish women at Baal-Peor. This corresponds with the third harvest sifting, 1891-1894. (4) Reformism of the Catholic Church in head and members was the chief sifting evil of the Sardis period as evidenced by the strenuous and evil efforts of individuals, rulers, universities and three general councils to reform Christendom at that time—centuries 14 and 15 (P '24, 24). Hence it is the fourth Gospel-Age sifting, and corresponds to the fourth harvest sifting, 1901-1904. (5) The gross contradiction of the Protestant Reformers by Catholic and other enemies with the consequent sifting running throughout the next period until after the Miller movement, as the Gospel-Age antitype of the Korah, Dathan, Abiram and 250 Levites contradicting Moses and Aaron, and as the correspondence of the fifth harvest sifting 1908-1911, proves that during that antitype the

only other than the first and last church stages—the Philadelphia Church—must have been present; hence Philadelphia must have ended before the first of the Gospel harvest siftings began in 1878. Hence Laodicea had begun to operate before 1878. All of us recall how the giving of the vow (Num. 16: 37-41) with its four pledges, antitypical of the fringes—tassels—in the corners of the Israelites' garments, occasioned the contradictionism sifting in 1908. The Gospel-Age correspondence thereto is the Lord's giving through John Wessel, the principal man in the Philadelphia star (Mic. 5: 5), the four cardinal principles of the Reformation by which the Protestants were enabled to stand and the Papists aroused to contradictionism: (1) The Bible is the sole source and rule of faith and practice; (2) Jesus is the sole Head of the Church; (3) Justification is by faith alone; and (4) only the consecrated are priests. When Luther, years after Wessel's death and early in his reformation work, first read Wessel's writings, he remarked, "had I read Wessel before I began the reformation work, my enemies would certainly say that I got my doctrines from Wessel, so well do we agree." The above seven proofs from the sign prophecies, to which many more could be added, if necessary, prove that Philadelphia preceded 1874 and that Laodicea began in 1874. J.F.R.'s articles on these periods in the Oct. 15 and Nov. 1 Towers are so unutterably weak that we decided to answer them only indirectly, *i.e.*, by proving Philadelphia to have ended and Laodicea to have begun in 1874, without wasting time, space and printer's ink in going over their puerilities.

When we first heard of J.F.R.'s changes on the Philadelphia and Laodicean periods, we made the remark that he will shortly be teaching that the reaping did not begin in 1874 but in 1918 or 1919. But there stands in the way of such a thought not only the Bible chronology and prophecy with their fulfillments, but

also the corroboration of these—the Pyramid. He recognizes this; and therefore he must needs deny the Pyramid as of Divine origin, claiming that Satan is its builder. He has not given one pertinent proof for his assumption that the Lord came to His temple in 1918. He came to it at His Second Advent, in 1874; and in 1875, parallel to the first cleansing of the typical temple (John 2: 13-17), He began the cleansing of the antitypical temple by driving away certain of the disgruntled, disappointed Adventists from among the Faithful; and, as the parallel of the second cleansing of the typical temple, He began in 1878 the more thorough cleansing of the antitypical temple (Mal. 3: 1-3) by the first of the six harvest siftings, the sixth being the one now especially active. Hence the Lord did not come to His temple in 1918, for which the propounder of such a thought has offered no real proofs, though he has presented some of his eisegetical imaginations as [alleged] proofs of it. So now, according to him, we have most of the Philadelphia time as the period of that Servant's activity, and the Pyramid as a Satan-built "pile of stones." To mark the grave of that Servant and the graves of other members of the Bethel family J.F.R. caused a *Pyramid* to be erected, on which are inscribed the names of Bro. Russell and others, with a vacant space opposite that of that Servant's name for his own name when he will have been buried. Furthermore, on our Pastor's headstone he caused the inscription to be put: "The Laodicean Messenger." Thus he has furnished monumental evidence of his apostacy. Query: Will he now have the said Pyramid and headstone removed?

There is a kind of logic to error as there is a true logic to truth. It is because error holds together with something like consistency, and requires the denial of opposing truths, that we made the above-given remark, *viz.*, that J.F.R. will be denying that the harvest work was done during and under Bro. Russell's ministry,

when, last May [1928], we heard that he taught that the Philadelphia period was from 1874 to 1918 and that since then the Laodicean period obtains. This we also thought was the logic of the later Pyramid repudiation, when we heard of it, and later we also got corroborative evidence that "that evil servant" is "working up" by "methods of deceit" the Society's adherents to a preparedness to receive the announcement that the Harvest did not begin in 1874, but in 1918 or 1919. One of the "methods of deceit" that he uses "privily" to "bring in damnable heresies" (2 Pet. 2: 1) before he publicly states them in the Tower, is to spread them among his adherents through his pilgrims. This he is doing as to the time of the Harvest not beginning until after 1918. Bro. Wise, the Society's Vice-President, on a pilgrim visit with "a mission," at Indianapolis, Nov. 29, 1928, preached there this new error.

According to Bro. Wise's statement, we can see that the alleged harvest work, as beginning about 1918, is now being privately introduced among Societyites. But the admission that their work on the Millions proposition—a work that engrossed all their public efforts from 1919 to 1925—was a delusion, implies that it must have been of Satanic origin, and hence they admittedly have spent almost the entire first six years of *their* Harvest in Satan's service, which would mean only this: that they gathered a Harvest for Satan. We submit the proposition that the leaders who directed them into such a service must have a Satanic, not a Divine channel in such work, hence that work—their work toward the public—was not reaping work, nor was any other reaping then done, which disproves their new harvest theory. Is it reasonable to suppose that such leaders would be used as the Lord's channel for the Lord's work subsequent to such a "big" Satanic "drive"? The Bible teaches that the crown-lost Societyites are in Azazel's (Satan's) hands for the

destruction of their fleshly minds, and this proves their gross errors and their "big drives" to be "frenzies of delusion" (2 Thes. 2: 9-12). Did the real harvest work proceed along lines of delusion? Verily not! They now admit that their millions proposition was without Scriptural warrant and resulted from their misunderstanding the jubilee type. As early as 1920, as soon as we heard of this millions proposition for 1925, we warned them that they were misinterpreting the jubilee cycles since the desolation of the land, reminding them that these were of 49, not 50 years, since the jubilee years were all kept during the 70 years' desolation, and hence were not repeated at the end of the subsequent cycles. The proper understanding of the jubilee, as our Pastor gave it, proves that the reaping began in 1874. Why should we think then that those who fearfully misunderstood it and worked up such a frenzy of delusion are likely to be right on claiming 1918 or 1919 as the beginning of the Harvest? Our warning that J.F.R. would after 1925 offer some other delusion to keep disciples following after him is now fulfilling. This delusion is that the Harvest began in 1918 or 1919! And this error will lead to other right-eye darkenings for him, as time goes on, and fruitless "drives."

Let us pause before discussing his Pyramid delusions and see what he has done with our Pastor's literature, the stewardship of which he and the rest of the Board and Tower editors received on condition of faithfully administering it, through which he and they received the special powers, prerogatives and privileges of leadership in the Society, in which he and they have been most unfaithful, and from which they should resign as unfaithful stewards, unworthy of the further benefits coming from a grossly misused stewardship. They have ceased reprinting (1) Bro. Russell's Book of Sermons, (2) Scenario, (3) Poems of Dawn, (4) B. S. Ms., (5) Manna, (6) Hymnal, (7) Comments as he

left them, (8) Six Volumes (the decision no longer to reprint these was made after the Detroit Convention, 1928, allegedly due to their not then getting enough contributions to publish them and the books of the Society's president at the same time. The hypocrisy of this claim is apparent when we keep in mind that the reprinting of the volumes from plates already on hand is much more economical than printing new books, which require new type and new plates. The local brethren in the ecclesias are, on orders from headquarters, seeking "to dump," at 5 cents each (!), all the Volumes on hand, especially on "the opposition," so that they may be kept from spreading "*error*" among the public and thus can handle the new books alone!), (9) the booklets on the Tabernacle ("an old man's fancy"), Spiritism, Hell and Our Lord's Return, and (10) the Tower Reprints (which they decided not to print any more, because of their also being allegedly so full of errors and also out of date). Accordingly, they have ceased reprinting all of Bro. Russell's literature, retaining only a name—The Tower, which is continually repudiating one after another of his teachings. For several years did one of the elders of the New York Temple in vain seek to get J.F.R. to allow a Tabernacle study to be conducted in that Church. Another of these elders showed by act exactly what J.F.R. has for years been working for, according to the following: The elder first mentioned above visited the one later mentioned. Pointing to the bottom drawer of his chiffonier, the latter spoke to the former words to the following effect: "In that drawer I keep Bro. Russell's writings locked up as out of date and full of error, while I keep the recent Towers and Society's recent books in the open as meat in due season. I keep Tabernacle Shadows, the Six Volumes and the Berean Bible in the back part of the drawer as the most out of date and erroneous, and the Tower reprints in front of them as not quite

so out of date and erroneous, but all of them so out of date and erroneous as to be unfit for use any longer, while I feed on the truth now due and coming through the channel." No comment necessary!

For years we have warned the brethren that J.F.R. has purposed to supersede our Pastor in everything and to substitute for the latter's literature writings of his own. He denied this so long as he feared the consequences of such knowledge becoming a means of opening the eyes of any considerable number of his followers. But he thinks he no longer needs to be so careful; for he believes that the bulk of his followers believe him to be that Servant's successor and even the angel of the Laodicean Church (in the Oct. 15 and Nov. 1, 1928, Towers he claimed that the so-called "faithful remnant," he and his co-laborers, are that angel) and consequently the former's superior. His contradictions of our Pastor's views are now so glaring that he can no longer pretend to be in harmony with him. Hence the mask so long worn is thrown off. Over a half of the people who were in the Truth in our Pastor's day have come to recognize our nearly twelve years' [written in 1928] Scriptural descriptions of him, based on Matt. 24: 48-51 and Zech. 11: 15-17, as correct.

Matt. 24: 49 speaks of his being symbolically drunk. According to his own admissions he must have been symbolically drunk from 1919 to 1925 on the millions proposition—his one and all engrossing public activity during those years. Symbolic drunkards, like literal drunkards, vomit more or less (Is. 28: 1, 7, 8), and in the Nov. 15 and Dec. 1 Towers he had another spell of nausea, emptying his symbolic stomach of some good food formerly eaten, but not digested, by throwing up the entire Pyramid; for there he repudiated his former belief that the Great Pyramid at Gizeh is God's stone witness and altar, as set forth in Is. 19: 19, 20. The real reason for his repudiation is that the

Pyramid contradicts his as yet not published new views on the Harvest beginning in 1918 or 1919; for it shows that its reaping ended in 1914, and that the reaped brethren had begun to be separated into two classes in 1917. We will first prove that the Great Pyramid is God's stone witness and altar and then refute the considerations that he gives in a specious attempt to prove it to be a work of Satan and not referred to in Is. 19: 19, 20.

The arguments which prove the Great Pyramid to be God's stone witness and altar are these: (1) The Pyramid sets forth by its arrangements and construction every salient feature of God's plan, especially the Christ and His course as the center of that plan; (2) by its measurements the Pyramid gives the time features of God's plan; and (3) it was built centuries before any part of the Bible was written, and that at a time when nobody in heaven or earth, except Jehovah Himself, understood this plan and its time features. Hence it must have been built under God's direction.

Our Pastor in the Pyramid Chapter of Vol. III pointed out the main symbols of the Pyramid as illustrative of God's plan, particularly of the Christ, and its leading measurements as illustrative of its time features. The Edgar brothers did both of these things in much greater detail in their two-volumed work entitled, *The Great Pyramid Passages*, which our Pastor endorsed. We will now refer to the things proving these three points:

I. The Pyramid by its construction and arrangements sets forth God's plan, especially the Christ, as the center of that plan. God's plan is His arrangement made to meet and overcome sin and evil in their nature and effects among His free moral agents. Man's fallen condition, increasing depravity, experience with evil, especially in the second—the present evil—world, and the end of this second world in destruction, are symbolized in the Descending Passage between the old

entrance and the Pit, the latter showing its destruction. The period before the flood is represented by the part of this passage's floor above its intersection with the vertical of its roof-commencement to the old opening and then down the old side to the base of the Pyramid. The First Ascending Passage represents the Law period and the Grand Gallery represents the period of Spirit-begetting—the Gospel Age. The entrance into the Ante-Chamber in its first part, represents the death of the human will and in its second part, under the Granite Leaf, represents the taking of the Lord's will as our own. The Ante-Chamber represents our course as New Creatures in Christ's school. The passage between the Ante-Chamber and the King's Chamber represents the death of the sacrificed body, while the King's Chamber represents the Spirit-born condition in the Divine nature. The granite in the Pyramid represents the Divine and the limestone the human. The passage to the Queen's Chamber, which symbolizes the restitution condition, represents the highway of holiness leading to restitution. The Well represents the ransom, the Grotto, hades and the Pit, the lake of fire. The four sockets, one at each of the four ground corners, as the foundation of the Pyramid, represent Jehovah's four great attributes as sustaining the great lines of the plan and squaring with one another. His name, Jehovah, as its builder is worked into its symbols in several ways, with Tabernacle corroborations, as shown in P '26, 75, 76. The Pyramid as a whole represents the Christ, the *head stone of the corner* (Ps. 118: 22; Zech. 4: 7; Matt. 21: 42; Acts 4: 11; 1 Pet. 2: 7) representing Jesus, and the other outer—casing—stones representing the Church. All ancient Egyptian, Greek, Syriac and Arabic writers on the subject agree that from the top stone to the base the Pyramid had as its surface smooth lime stones, white like marble. These have either all fallen away or have been taken away, except the lowest layer at

certain places, from which we get the inclination angle of the original surface. It is because the Pyramid as a whole represents the Christ, who is the embodiment of God's plan and who is God's altar and witness in the world, that the Scriptures refer to it as the symbolic altar and witness of God (Is. 19: 19, 20). The Granite Plug stopping the entrance to the First Ascending Passage symbolizes that the Law shuts off from life all who are fallen—all going down the Descending Passage. The Well being the only way left by the builders of gaining access to the Ascending Passages, symbolizes that the way of life comes to fallen man through the ransom only. The above indicated matters are undoubtedly the salient features of God's plan and they are thus shown to be symbolized in the Pyramid. Many others could be set forth here, but these are sufficient to prove our first proposition. Those desiring the others can get them in Vol. III, in Vols. I and II of *The Great Pyramid Passages*, and in the three Vols. of *The Great Pyramid*.

II. By its measurements the Pyramid gives the time features of God's plan. The time features are given as a rule in a way to show the time or duration of the various features of God's plan. On this point we will give a very brief summary of the various time features brought out in Vol. II of *The Great Pyramid Passages*, supplemented by several others that the Epiphany has brought to light. The time of the birth and death and the age of our Lord Jesus at death are symbolized by the hypotenuse of the right-angle triangle formed by the intersected space between the north end of the First Ascending Passage and the point of intersection of the projected floor line of the Queen's Chamber and the First Ascending Passage, which is found to be 33½ Pyramid inches from the north end of the First Ascending Passage. This is the exact period of our Lord's life, while His age at consecration is shown by the intersection point of the projected north Grand

Gallery wall line with the projected floor line of the Queen's Chamber, 30 inches from the latter's intersection with the First Ascending Passage (62 [this number and all the following similarly parenthesized numbers are the page references to the first edition of Vol. II of *The Great Pyramid Passages*]). The length of the First Ascending Passage and of the Granite Plug gives in Pyramid inches the exact number of years from the giving of the Law until our Lord's death—1647 years (66, 67). The duration in years of the call to Spirit-begetting as the general period of the Gospel Age is symbolized by the floor line of the Grand Gallery from its north to its south wall—1881½ years—April 33 A.D. to October, 1914 (70). Measuring from the north wall of the Grand Gallery along the floor line to the bottom of the large step near the south wall, we find the Pyramid inches to be 1813½, which is exactly to a day the years from Calvary to September, 24, 1846, the date when antitypical Elijah and Elisha became the two parts of the cleansed sanctuary. Measuring thence to the intersection of the projected south wall of the Grand Gallery and the top of this large Step gives in Pyramid inches the exact time of the appearance of antitypical Elisha as separate and distinct from antitypical Elijah—June 27, 1917—the day that J.F.R. and the writer came to a final official break, as respective representatives of the two classes in the order last mentioned. (Chap. VII of Vol. III.) Measuring along the floor line from the bottom of the Step to the point of its intersection with the vertical line of the south wall and then up that line to its intersection with the top of the Step gives as many Pyramid inches and a fraction as there are years and a fraction from September 24, 1846, to July 18, 1920—the date that antitypical Elijah appeared openly separate from antitypical Elisha. (Chap. VII of Vol. III.)

The time from Jacob's death, April, 1813 B.C., to our Lord's Second Advent, October, 1874 A.D., is

symbolized by the measurement from the point of intersection of the Descending and Ascending Passages to the north wall of the King's Chamber, omitting the front of the large Step as not a part of the floor of the Grand Gallery (91). The double as the parallel dispensations' duration— $2 \times 1,845 = 3,690$ —is symbolized by the length of the Granite Plug, the two Ascending Passages to the front of the large Step and the distance from the north end of the Step to the south wall of the Ante-Chamber (97). The length of the Times of the Gentiles is indicated by the sum of the horizontal length and vertical height of the Grand Gallery (113). The time from the flood—Oct., 2473 B.C.—to our Lord's manhood—30 years of age, when occurred His baptism, Spirit-begetting and the beginning of His ministry—is symbolized by the distance—2,501 inches—from the intersection of the roof-commencement's vertical line and the Descending Passage (which marked the flood) down the Descending Passage to its point of intersection with the First Ascending Passage, then thereup to the level of the Queen's Chamber and then along that level until its intersection with the vertical line of the Grand Gallery's north wall—Oct., 29 A.D.—while the intersection of the First Ascending Passage and the level of the Queen's Chamber, reached 30 inches before, symbolizes the date of His birth (163).

Adam's day of 1,000 years, in contrast with our Lord's day of 1,000 years, the larger double, $2 \times 2,520 = 5,040$ years, being the period bounded by these two days, is symbolized by the 1,000 inches in the distance from the leveled rock base of the Pyramid up the face of the casing to the ancient entrance and down to the north edge of the basement sheet (166). The time from the end of Adam's day, Oct., 3127 B.C., to the beginning of the first resurrection, April, 1878, is symbolized by the distance from the north end of the basement sheet vertically down to the level of the Well

opening, then horizontally to the center of the Well opening—5,003½ Pyramid inches (173). The date that the last one of the Little Flock would be put on the altar and would begin in the Truth to be sacrificed as covered by Christ's merit, as being 1883 years after April, 33 A.D., *i.e.*, April, 1916, is shown from the distance from the floor of the Descending Passage at the north edge of the Well opening to the level of the Queen's Chamber (176). The duration of the "world that was" as, 1,654 years, is represented by the 1,654 Pyramid inches gotten by the following measurements: the horizontal distance of the platform level from the front edge of the casing stones to its intersection with the vertical line of the roof—beginning in the Descending Passage, up this vertical to the Descending Passage, then northward along the latter's floor line until the old entrance point is reached and then down to the platform level at the bottom of the casing stone—1,654 inches (178).

The time of our Lord's Second Advent is symbolized by the distance from the point of intersection between the Ascending and Descending Passages, which marks 1512 B.C., to the Pit along the built floor line—3,385 Pyramid inches, representing the years from Oct., 1512 B.C., to Oct., 1874 A.D., while if the line of the Descending Passage is prolonged at the same angle until it reaches the Pit, 40 Pyramid inches are added to this distance, symbolizing 1914, when the trouble—destruction of this world—was to begin (190, 191). The end of the second world—1914—in addition to the end of Spirit-begetting is also represented by the vertical line of the south wall of the Grand Gallery being practically in line with the north wall of the Pit, showing that the end of the begettall and the beginning of the trouble were to be about synchronous (193). From the two preceding considerations the Epiphany is shown to be a period of 40 years—1914 to 1954—as follows: Since the north wall of the Pit at the entrance

of the Descending Passage's floor line by different measurements represents both 1874 and 1914, with the latter date as the starting point measuring back to where the slanting and horizontal floors of the Descending Passage meet, then projecting at the same angle as the Descending Passage its floor line until it reaches the north wall of the Pit, the length of the latter line will be found to be 40 Pyramid inches longer than that of the former, *i.e.*, this symbolizes that it represents a reaching of the pit 40 years later than 1914, from which we infer that Anarchy will reach a crisis in 1954, whether in its beginning, progress or end we are as yet unable to say, as marking the end of the Epiphany. The end of the Little Season as 1,000 years later than 1914 is symbolized by the 1,000 Pyramid inches from the bottom of the north wall of the Bottomless Pit to the end of the Blind Passage (198).

The dates of 1295 as the ascension to the papal throne of Boniface VIII, the pope under whose reign papacy reached its climax and began to wane, of 1309 as marking the beginning of Marsiglio's reformation work and of 1324 as marking its climax, are gotten by measuring variously back from the north wall of the Pit along the roof and floor of the Descending Passage to various parts of the Well (210, 211). Oct., 1378, as marking the beginning of Wyclif's reformation work, is gotten by measuring back from the north wall of the Queen's Chamber (perfection coming under the first test at the end of the Millennium, April, 2878) to the north edge of the Well's mouth—a distance of 1,499½ inches; for in Oct., 1378, Wyclif attacked papacy's practices, especially transubstantiation, as contrary to the ransom, symbolized by the Well (216). The date of the division of Christendom during Luther's trial at Worms (1521) is given by the distance from the point of intersection in the Descending Passage (1512 B.C.) to the beginning of the floor

line of the Horizontal Passage—3,031½ Pyramid inches (222). The distance from the north wall of the Pit to the north wall of the Recess—126 inches—represents the time back from 1914 to 1788, when the French king signed a decree to assemble the States General, which from certain standpoints was the beginning of the French Revolution (225). The time from the begetting of Isaac (July, 2021 B.C.) to our Lord's resurrection—2052¾ years—is given by the sum of the following measurements: from the intersection of the Descending and Ascending Passages vertically to the projected floor line of the Queen's Chamber—669¼ inches—then along this line to its intersection with the north wall of the Grand Gallery—1,383½ inches (252). The time from the Exodus (April, 1615 B.C.) to the end of the Jewish Harvest (Oct., 69 A.D.)—1,683½ years—is symbolized by the length of the First Ascending Passage from the point of intersection—1,545 inches—and the distance from the north wall of the Grand Gallery to the edge of the Well's shaft—140¼—whose sum equals 1,683½ Pyramid inches.

We will now briefly mention some other time features symbolized in the Great Pyramid: The birth and Spirit-begetting of Jesus (244, 245), the date of the Abrahamic Covenant (249), the time from the entrance into the land until the Babylonian captivity (256), the Times of the Gentiles and the preceding seven times, *i.e.*, from the end of Adam's day (263, 264), the time from the completion of Solomon's temple to the finding of the last of the living stones of the antitypical Temple (268), the time from the last typical jubilee until the antitypical jubilee (271), the seventy weeks (274), the 2,300 days (276), the 1,335 days (279), the 1,260 days (283), the 1,290 days (288) and the period from the fall to the complete restoration of the faithful restitutionists (314). In other words, every prophetic period, time and important

event of the Lord's plan and that in harmony with the Bible chronology as a whole and in detail are symbolized in the Pyramid. Thus we have proved that the Pyramid symbolizes every important feature of God's plan and its chronology, the first two propositions of the three proving that God built the Pyramid.

III. The third proposition necessary to prove that God is the Builder of the Great Pyramid is this: It was built centuries before any part of the Bible was written, and when nobody in heaven or on earth, except Jehovah, knew His plan and its chronology. If this proposition can be proven, it follows that Jehovah was the Pyramid's Builder. J.F.R. concedes that the Great Pyramid was built before the Exodus. The ancient Egyptian historians place its building hundreds of years before the Exodus, some of these writers having themselves lived before the Exodus. No one who has ever investigated the subject questions its pre-Exodus building. The Pentateuch is the first part of the Bible to have been written and its first part put into writing was written after the Exodus.

But when the Pyramid was built nobody in heaven or on earth, except Jehovah, knew His plan and its time features. Rom. 16: 25, 26 teaches that the mystery, the center of God's plan, which is symbolized, as well as fixed chronologically in the Pyramid, was a complete secret from the beginning of creation and began to be made manifest only from Jordan on. But the Planner of the Pyramid knew the mystery and its time features; for these are symbolized exactly in the Pyramid. Hence no creature of God originated the Pyramid. None of the earthly or heavenly princes of *this* world, which includes Satan (John 12: 31; 16: 11; 2 Cor. 4: 4; Eph. 2: 2; 6: 12), knew the mystery before Calvary (1 Cor. 2: 7, 8). Hence neither the fallen angels nor fallen men understood it before Calvary. Eph. 3: 9 proves that from the beginning of the universe until the Gospel Age God had kept secret this

mystery. Hence not even the Logos knew it before becoming flesh, though very likely (the Bible is silent on this subject) just before He became flesh God told Him enough of the purpose of His carnation to secure His consent thereto; but it was only at His begettal that heavenly things—the things of the high calling—were begun to be made clear to Him (Matt. 3: 16). This mystery was hidden from all in the Ages and generations preceding the Gospel Age (Col. 1: 26, 27). Hence, none but Jehovah understood it at the time the Pyramid was built. None of the angels—either good or bad—and no human could see the high calling before Jordan (1 Pet. 1: 10-12). The Divine Plan was first made known to the fallen angels by the preaching of the Christ, *i.e.*, after Jordan (Eph. 3: 10). Jesus expressly tells us that Satan did not know the time of our Lord's return (Matt. 24: 43; Luke 12: 39), the date of which, with that of its accompanying trouble, the Pyramid repeatedly symbolizes, as shown above. Not even Jesus understood these dates before His ascension (Mark 13: 32; Acts 1: 7). Hence the absurdity of saying that to Lucifer at creation God revealed the plan and its times and seasons. These time features Jesus learned only after His ascension (Rev. 1: 1). Before the ascension God kept the times and seasons in his power solely (Acts 1: 7). These considerations prove our third proposition, that nobody in heaven or on earth, except Jehovah, knew His Plan, let alone its chronological features, when the Pyramid was built. But since the Pyramid gives the Divine Plan and its chronological features at a time when only Jehovah understood these (Acts 1: 7), He must have built it.

J.F.R. claims that Satan built the Pyramid, and claims that Job 38: 7—"When the morning stars sang together, and [even] all the sons of God shouted for joy"—teaches that God revealed all the details of His plan with its time features to the Logos and

Lucifer, and that as a result they sang together an anthem of praise to God, which, he alleges, is meant by the morning stars singing together, and that with the knowledge allegedly so gotten Satan built the Pyramid. Against this view we offer the following objections: (1) Such an interpretation contradicts the Scriptures above given, proving that nobody before Jordan in heaven or on earth, except Jehovah, knew the mystery and that none before Jesus' ascension knew the plan's future time features, which God up to that time had "*put* [securely kept] *in His own power*" (Acts 1: 7). (2) Such an interpretation contradicts the poetic parallelism of Job 38: 7, where the parallel identifies the morning stars with *all* the sons of God—all the angels—who are expressly mentioned in some of the above-cited passages as not understanding the plan and its time features before Pentecost. (3) Such an interpretation reads into the passages thoughts of which neither it nor any other Scripture gives any intimation whatever—*eisegesis*. (4) Such an interpretation is contrary to God's character for it implies that God committed the folly of giving one who He knew would become His worst enemy information that God wanted withheld from him so that He could properly limit his power for mischief (Matt. 24: 43; Luke 12: 39). (5) Such an interpretation is contrary to facts; for (a) all of Satan's pre-Gospel-Age religions were counterfeits of his misunderstandings of some of the Old Testament's dark sayings on the plan so far revealed, and (b) only after he heard Christ and the Church explain the real mystery was he able to invent a real counterfeit of it—Antichrist, the papacy, which judging from his usual course he would have invented in Old Testament times, had he had the necessary knowledge. (6) Such an interpretation undermines appreciation of God for allegedly giving such unwise information, and hence is against our cultivating godliness and is therefore wrong.

(7) Such an interpretation is blasphemy, for it is the foundation of the theory under review that ascribes an exclusive work of God to the Devil. (8) Such an interpretation ascribes an equality of confidence on God's part in the Logos and Lucifer nowhere taught in the Scriptures. (9) Such an interpretation is degrading to the Logos and implies a course unworthy of God. (10) Such an interpretation is based upon an exaltation of the cherub—Lucifer—above his fellow cherubim, nowhere hinted at in the Bible. (11) This interpretation is self-contradictory; for it would make God's arch-enemy, who tries in every way to falsify God's plan and its time features, *truthfully* set forth that plan and its time features in symbols, whereas he would have misrepresented it symbolically, if he built the Pyramid, even as he has always misrepresented it symbolically and literally (2 Cor. 4: 4; 11: 14). (12) Finally, this interpretation is contrary to Satan's character, who has no truth in him, whereas the Pyramid is, next to the Bible, the greatest exhibition of truth in existence (John 8: 44). These twelve reasons abundantly refute the thought that Satan built the Pyramid and that he got the knowledge for it before the events described in Job 38: 7.

We will now discuss the two articles on The Altar In Egypt, in the Nov. 15 and Dec. 1, 1928 Towers, giving briefly their main points with terse refutations. To J.F.R.'s charge that the Pyramid is cherished by those that do not accept his alleged new light, we answer that their not accepting such so-called light is to their credit; for the Bible disproves it, as our replies show, and describes it as coming from one whose spiritual understanding is increasingly darkening and who is symbolically drunk (Zech. 11: 15-17; Matt. 24: 49). To his statement that those who appreciate the Pyramid think that Truth has not advanced since 1917, and that since that time the Church has nothing to do, we reply that this statement is false in

both of its parts, so far as the Epiphany brethren are concerned; for they are engaged in the service of leading the Truth, the Protestant and the Catholic parts of Azazel's Goat to the Gate and fit man, and have been feasting on the advancing Epiphany Truth, which is grounded on, grows out of, and is in harmony with the Truth given before 1917; while J.F.R.'s alleged advancing light is so much out of harmony with it that he is setting aside all its literature as "full of error"—a proof that what he is giving as Truth is error. Instead of holding to the light he had and advancing in harmony with it; he has precipitated himself and others into a disorderly retreat from it into increasing darkness.

To his claim that to look for corroborations for the Lord's Word and its time features in the Pyramid implies rejection of the Bible as sufficient for the sole source and rule of faith, we reply: (1) We do not use the Pyramid, but the Bible alone, as the source and rule of faith. (2) Accordingly, we do not use the Pyramid as a source and rule of our faith, but simply as a symbolic corroboration of that Truth previously derived solely from the Bible. (3) If to use it for a symbolic corroboration of the Truth derived solely from the Bible were repudiating the Bible as the sufficient and only source and rule of faith, then God repudiated it as the sufficient and only source and rule of faith for us, when He appealed in Rom. 1: 19, 20 and Job 38-41 to the universe, to its creatures and to its laws as proving His existence and great attributes, in contrast with man's insignificant attributes, when He declares that the order of nature, both in heaven and earth, bear witness to Him (Ps. 19: 1-6), when He uses them as symbols of the heavens, earth and other features of His plan (Dan. 12: 3; Gen. 1: 14; Rev. 12: 1; Matt. 13: 43; Rev. 21: 1, etc.), when He had the tabernacle and the temple with their furnishings, etc., used as symbols of various features

of His plan, when by Paul He appeals to man's nature and conscience as proofs of God's existence and of their moral responsibility to Him and of the existence of His moral law (Rom. 2: 14, 15), when He had the Jews practice circumcision and Christians immersion, as signs of consecration, when He had the Hebrews have the annual lamb as a symbol of the lamb slain in Egypt, and Christians have the Lord's Supper as a symbol of the Lamb of God, when He uses the terrain and cities of Palestine to symbolize various parts of His plan, when He used the twelve stones taken out of the Jordan and many other physical objects as memorials, and when He stored up in hiding various historical and archaeological objects in Palestine, Egypt, Babylon, Syria, Persia, Asia Minor, Greece and Rome, and has of late been bringing them to light as a refutation of higher criticism by corroborating the Bible's historical and archaeological claims.

None of the foregoing things are a part of the Bible, but exist as material things separate from the Bible; but they lend corroboration to its teachings; and what clear thinker would say that to use their corroboration of the Bible is contrary to holding to the Bible as our sufficient sole source and rule of faith? The sophistry that we are exposing is worthy of a *lawyer* who seeks, not to enlighten, but to befuddle a jury, to whose intelligence he offers insults by presenting for their persuasion such sophisms. God never intended corroborative things to supply supposed lacks in the Bible as a sufficient source and rule of faith, as the article under review contends they would imply, but as crutches for weak believers and as weapons for strong believers useful for refuting enemies of the Bible by extra-Biblical things. And this is just what the Pyramid's, nature's, archaeology's and history's witness has triumphantly done. The dilemma, therefore, that he presents, either to accept the Bible as the sole source

of faith and reject the Pyramid, or *vice versa*, saying that he who proves that the Pyramid corroborates the Bible thereby proves that the Bible is not the sufficient and sole source and rule of faith, or that they who prove the Bible to be such disprove the Pyramid to corroborate it, is thus proven to be a sophism.

To the article's claim that the Pyramid, as an image of something in heaven and earth, could not have been built by God and could not be accepted as such by us without His and our violating the second commandment, we reply that the second commandment does not forbid images, *i.e.*, representations, but the worship of them, as can be seen from God's commanding various ones to make the images and representations of the tabernacle and the temple, in themselves and in their cherubim, furniture, vessels, etc., the picture of the cherubim in Ezekiel's temple and the recorded visions of the Bible as representations, *e.g.*, the vision of the sheet with its clean and unclean beasts shown to Peter at Joppa, the transfiguration representations, the vision of the new heaven and new earth shown to St. Paul, the entire series of images shown to St. John on Patmos, the bodies that Jesus after His resurrection made as representations of Himself, etc., etc.

When J.F.R. says that the Apostles' having a clearer teaching word (2 Pet. 1: 19) than the vision of the transfiguration implies that they did not rely on that vision, it contradicts St. Peter's use of that vision; for in the connection (vs. 16-18) he uses the vision as a proof that they had not been following cunningly devised fables, but reliable Truth. V. 19 does not show that the vision was not trusted by the Apostles, but shows that some parts of the Word are clearer than visions as guides and proofs as to Truth. All teachers will endorse the pedagogical principle here inculcated, that the clearer is to be preferred to the less clear exposition and proof. So the bringing in of

this vision on the mountain, which St. Peter presents as less clear than some other teachings, does not prove that the Pyramid testimony has not probative force, though, of course, it is very much inferior in its Truth uses than the Bible.

The article's effort to prove that the Pyramid is not in the midst and at the same time on the border of the land of Egypt, by calling attention to the fact that Egypt is 600 miles long and 250 miles wide and that the Pyramid is not 300 miles from the northern and southern borders and 125 miles from its eastern and western borders, and that, if it were, it could not be on the border of the land, is sophistical for several reasons: (1) There are two Egypts, Lower and Upper Egypt. When only one of these is meant, in Hebrew the word *Mazor* is used (Is. 19: 6; 37: 25; 2 Kings 10: 24; Mic. 7: 12); and when both are meant, in Hebrew the word *Mizraim* (whose dual form *aim* expressly makes the word mean two Egypts) is used. See Gesenius' Thesaurus, 815, bottom of first, and whole of second column. In Is. 19: 19 the dual form, *mizraim*, two Egypts, is used. The Great Pyramid is on the boundary between these two Egypts and thus is on the border of the two Egypts and is also in their midst, *i.e.*, between them, the word *betoch* being very frequently translated by the words *between*, *in* and *within* (Gen. 9: 21; 18: 24, 26; 37: 7; Ex. 23: 33; 39: 3; Lev. 11: 33; Num. 13: 32; 35: 34; Jos. 19: 1, 9; Judges 7: 16; 1 Sam. 9: 18; 1 Kings 6: 19, 27; 1 Chro. 11: 22; Job 20: 13; Ps. 143: 4; Ezek. 3: 24; 14: 16, 18, 20; 24: 5; Zech. 2: 4). Thus it is *in*, *within*, both of the Egypts and on their border. The method of showing that it is in the center of lower Egypt, which the article under review calls "ingenious," is also correct. And the invidious reference to swallowing bait, hook, sinker, line and pole, made to those who accept it as being credulous only proves the ignorance of J.F.R. as to geometry and trigonometry. Geometricians and

trigonometricians from mathematical demonstration know that the center of a triangular arc sector is at the angle formed by its two straight lines, the sneers of J.F.R. against those who accept this thought to the contrary notwithstanding, since they avail merely to reveal his ignorance on the subject.

To the article's claim that the Pyramid never was, nor will be, a place of sacrifice and therefore cannot be called an altar, we reply that it is not Scripturally referred to as a literal altar, but a symbolic altar; hence only symbolic, not literal sacrifices, belong to it, which were performed by its earthly builders in their acts of building it. The Christ are the literal altar of God, *typed* by the Aaronic brazen and golden altars and *symbolized* by the Pyramid. It, therefore, is very properly called an altar in Is. 19: 19; and it is referred to as such in Rev. 16: 7; for out of the symbols of the Pyramid—especially those related to the Pit—as treated in Vol. III, the third vial, came the message announced in Rev. 16: 7: "I heard the altar say, 'Even so, Lord God Almighty, true and righteous are Thy judgments.'" To its statement that as a pillar it never gave, nor is it giving, testimony to the name of Jehovah, we reply that we have proven that it did so in the Parousia and is doing so, as shown above, in the Epiphany. Even God's name, Jehovah, is by its structural lines, base and angles, inscribed therein, as that of its Builder (P '26, 75). It once gave that witness to J.F.R., which proves that now he does not see what he once saw in it, *i.e.*, that his right eye is darkening increasingly. Of course, we do not expect such an eye to see what it formerly saw; but that does not justify his dogmatism which declares that it never did, nor will witness to Jehovah's name. If the blind now deny the sun's light, once, but now no more seen by them, that does not prove their dogmatic denial of its existence to be true.

To his denial that the Scriptures allude to the Pyramid,

we reply that in every passage where the expression, head stone of the corner, head of the corner, or head stone, occurs with reference to our Lord, the allusion is to the Pyramid and not to the temple; for only in such a building is there a head stone of the corner. The word translated *chief corner* stone is totally different from the one translated "head," etc., in the following citations (Ps. 118: 22; Matt. 21: 42; Luke 20: 17; Acts 4: 11; Zech. 4: 7). While we concede that in Eph. 2: 19, 20 the antitypical stones of the temple are referred to, yet properly they may be referred to as indirect proof, *i.e.*, of stones being used symbolically, as in the Pyramid, which is the way our Pastor used this passage in this connection. To his statement that our Lord was laid as a head corner stone of the temple "*in miniature*" when He presented Himself as King to Israel and in completion when He came to His temple (allegedly in 1918); we reply: nothing in the Bible gives such thoughts. Rather He was in process of shaping as the head stone of the corner from Jordan to Calvary; and at His resurrection and ascension He was by God (1 Pet. 2: 4-8) laid in the full and only sense of that word; for when St. Peter spoke to the Sanhedrin, Jesus had already been made the head stone of the corner (Acts 4: 11; see also 1 Pet. 2: 7; Eph. 2: 20 as showing this as done already in the past from the standpoint of the temple). Bro. Russell did not use Job 38: 4-6 as more than an illustration of the Pyramid and did not use it as a direct reference to it, as the article under review charges. To his statement that God charged Job with talking foolishness, we reply that such is tantamount to saying that God was foolish, who inspired his speeches (Jas. 5: 10, 11) and who expressly said twice that Job spoke aright of His matters (Job 42: 7, 8). To his statement that the use of impressed Egyptian labor in building the Pyramid is proof conclusive that God had nothing to do with its building, since, he

alleges, God would not cruelly use slaves to work so hard as its stones required them to work (though he offers, and can offer no proof that slaves were therein used or cruelly treated), we reply that God did undoubtedly arrange for building Solomon's temple, and it was built by impressed labor, provided by Hiram and Solomon (1 Kings 5: 6, 13-18), and some of its stones were larger than any of those put into the Pyramid, as they can to this day be seen.

J.F.R. alleges as a further proof that Satan built the Pyramid the facts that the Descending Passage in corresponding to an astronomer's pointer and that the Ascending Passage in corresponding to his telescope, at midnight of the autumnal equinox of 2170 B.C., with the Dragon star (Satan) looking directly down this pointer and the Pleiades directly in angular line with the Ascending Passages, *which*, it stresses *ended in a stone*, and which made the Pleiades invisible through them, symbolize the fact that Satan has always sought to shut God out of sight. To this we reply that since there then was no opening for the Ascending Passage, it being closed by the stones that in the Descending Passage covered the lower end of the Granite Plug, the true symbolism would prove that all that Satan could see of God's plan at that midnight was that the race was descending more and more in degradation, without knowing the end of the way, since the horizontal floor of the Descending Passage's southern end shut out the view of the Pit from the top of that Passage. This symbolism would, therefore, prove that Satan lacked the knowledge necessary to construct the main symbolic features of the interior of the Pyramid—its horizontal passages, its ascending passages, its chambers, well, etc., as well as their dimensions, and therefore proves that he did not build the Pyramid.

To his charge that the study of the Pyramid tends to turn its students away from God's Word and Work,

we answer that facts prove that its study properly conducted has made them abler students and servants of God's Word, while it is the sifters who have rejected its testimony, *e.g.*, the sin-offerings' deniers of 1908-1911 and the main revolutionists—the Society and P.B.I. leaders—in the present sifting, respectively members of antitypical Jannes and Jambres, and who have been turned away from God's Word and Work unto the character, word and service of Satan (2 Tim. 3: 1-9). To his charge that students of the Pyramid use it mainly to fix dates for the Church's leaving the earth we reply that this never was the main use that our Pastor, the Edgar Bros. or ourself have made of it, and that in 1908 our Pastor announced that the Pyramid did not give such data and advised against such a use of the Pyramid.

His claim that the passage (Is. 31: 1), "Woe unto them that go down to Egypt for help," forbids the use of the Pyramid for corroborative purposes, is silly; for New Creatures are here warned, as the connection shows, against seeking help from the errors, organizations and methods of Satan's empire, as fleshly Israelites were thereby prohibited from seeking deliverance from the resources of literal Egypt. It has no reference to a prohibition of spiritual Israel as to things in literal Egypt. To his claim that the expression, "in that day," in Is. 19: 19, the time from 1914 onward is meant, and that the prophecy could not be understood before 1918, we reply, Not so; for the connection shows that the expression, "that day," includes the time of Jehovah's sending our Lord in His Second Advent—1874 (v. 20); moreover, the cries of the oppressed have been especially going up since 1874, "the cries of the reapers," etc. Hence this day goes back to 1874, the beginning of the seventh one-thousand-year day from Adam's fall—thereby the Millennial day is meant, it being usually meant by the expression, "that day" in the Bible (vs. 20-25). Hence

the point of the article, that Is. 19: 19, 20 could not be understood before 1918, falls to the ground. It was understood before 1891, when Vol. III was published. To his claim that, not the Pyramid's top stone, but Christ, is meant by the stone of stumbling, and that, not the stubbing of a literal toe on the Pyramid, but stumbling over Christ, is mean in the reference to the stone of stumbling, we reply: Whoever denied this? Such a point could only be urged, if one would confuse the symbol with the reality, as by implication he charges against those who believe that the Pyramid symbolizes Christ.

To the article's claim that Is. 19 refers only to symbolic Egypt because, it alleges, the chapter treats of the relation of the anointed ones to the Egypt under discussion, of whom, it says, none were in Egypt when the Pyramid was built, we reply that there is no reference whatever to any of God's anointed in the entire chapter, except to our Lord in His Return. Hence the attempt to limit its Egypt to symbolic Egypt falls to the ground. The "swift cloud" of v. 1, even as the same thing is symbolized by the cloud of Ezek. 1: 4, 5, etc., does not refer to God's organization—supposedly the Society and the glorified Christ—in any sense, as he claims, but to the swiftly coming great tribulation, which proves that the chapter treats also of matters prior to 1914. This chapter, like other chapters treating prophetically of various nations, has a double application, first to literal Egypt and, second, to symbolic Egypt. And, like some of such chapters, *e.g.*, Jer. 50 and 51, sometimes it stresses the literal more than the symbolic and sometimes the symbolic more than the literal. The reference to the Pyramid we take both literally and symbolically, the symbolic Pyramid being the Christ, and each being as such an Altar and Pillar in its respective Egypt. The five symbolic cities (a city symbolizes a religious government, *e.g.*, Babylon, New Jerusalem, etc.) we understand

to be the five religious governments that are united with the state in Europe—the Greek Catholic, the Roman Catholic, the Lutheran, the Calvinistic and the Episcopal churches, which are the only churches of Christendom united with the state. They speak the language of Canaan in the sense of professing to teach the Bible, which they quote for their creeds, and every one of them has consecrated (sworn to the name of) the Lord; one of these—the Roman Catholic—shall by way of pre-eminence be called, the city of destruction. The Septuagint translation, *Azedek*, for *destruction*, does not, as he says, mean Melchizedek (*king of righteousness*), but means *unrighteousness*, being compounded by the Greek negative, *a*, and the Hebrew noun, *zedek*, *righteousness*. Five is not, as he claims, a specially sacred number; for seven is the sacred number. Five, as a half of ten, the number of human [among others] completeness, would seem here to be the number of human incompleteness, and as such properly designates the five religious governments above mentioned. Many of J.F.R.'s numerous errors of interpretation on various features of Is. 19 we will pass by as not germane to our purpose. He closes his article with the remark: "We now wonder why we ever believed in, or devoted any time to the study of the Pyramid of Gezeh. Not only will we abandon such a study now, but we will ask God to forgive us for wasting the time that we put in on it and redeem the time by hurrying on to obey His commandments." The sentiments just quoted are very similar to those used by another sifting leader—Mr. Henningses—when he renounced his belief in the Church's and his share in the Sin-offering in 1908.

We are not so sure that J.F.R. deeply studied the Parousia Truth in its deeper features. He was certainly able in the surface things—such as were required for public meetings; but our dealings with him convince us that he did not study deeply into its

deeper truths. He told the New York Church, when he repudiated the Pyramid before it, that he had not studied the Pyramid much, rather that he had taken it for granted. It would seem that he did this with other deeper things of the Truth. We will now relate an incident that is a partial key to the unlocking of his strange course since 1916: While he and we in 1915 were walking to our hotel after the last session of the Oakland, Calif., Convention, he, holding our arm, began to weep. We asked him the reason, which he declared was his dearth of spirituality, telling us that his spirituality was dried up. He then asked what we would recommend as a cure for his condition. Knowing that the Truth is the power of God, working in us to will and to do, we asked him whether he was daily studying the Volumes, as our Pastor recommended. He answered that there were so many diverting things at Bethel that he seldom got opportunity to study them. We replied that though we had gone over them carefully about fifteen times, we still kept up the practice recommended by our Pastor of reading ten pages daily, and found that this helped us to grow stronger in grace, knowledge and fruitfulness in service. Then we suggested that he "redeem the time" so as to study his ten pages daily, assuring him that, like ourself, he would find it very stimulating for growth in spirituality, if it were done in a meek and appreciative spirit. He said that he would do it. We never heard whether he did it or not, but in thinking over his course toward the Truth since 1916, we fear that he did not "build up the waste places of former years."

Speaking of the Pyramid (Vol. III, 319, par. 1) our Pastor remarked: "The inspiration of its testimony will doubtless be as much disputed as that of the Scriptures by the prince of darkness, the god of this world, *and those whom he blinds to the Truth*" [italics ours]. Doubtless the Lord, foreseeing the course of the sifters of the Parousia and the Epiphany in denying

the Pyramid as God's stone witness worked on our Pastor's mind, moving him to make the above remark. Doubtless of all such deniers J.F.R. will have the unenviable pre-eminence of working the greatest amount of mischief through his repudiation of the Pyramid. He claims to be our Pastor's successor. Actually he is his detractor, as his repudiations of his teachings prove; and our Pastor is his true portrayer when he describes this Pyramid-denier as of "those whom Satan blinds to the Truth." How may we rightly view all repudiations of our Pastor's findings on the Little Flock matters as he left them with the Church? We answer, the Lord has furnished us with a stamp of his approval on such teachings of our Pastor. We refer to Lev. 12, which we explained in detail in Chapter II of Vol. IV. Hence we know that when 1914 was here, our Pastor in his mature views had given us the full and pure Truth for the development of the Little Flock. Hence we know that repudiations of Little Flock matters as he left them with us are repudiations of Truth. This teaching, from Lev. 12, was doubtless given by the Lord to His people to safeguard and give them an invincible weapon against the fearful repudiations of Little Flock matters by the teachers of the various Levite groups, and that from the wrong premises held by J.F.R. will follow in yet more vital matters. "From such turn away," as you value your own spiritual interests (2 Tim. 3: 5); for their repudiations are errors, the more of which you will accept, the longer and harder will it be to retrace your steps, as the Lord will require of each who accepts them to do.

By three successive major delusions, not to mention minor ones, has J.F.R. sought to draw away disciples after him (Acts 20: 29, 30). The first was the following: In 1917 he promised the brethren that if they would "get into the chariot," endorse and support his policies, they would by March 27, 1918—the

Passover—"mount to the skies." When this failed, he asserted that at that date the door of entrance into the high calling closed; but alas for him, later newcomers into the Truth wanted to be in the high calling; so he managed to make that door become "a swinging door," which supposedly admitted as many newcomers as clamored for entrance. (2) The second major delusion—begun in 1918—by which he sought to draw disciples after him was his slogan, "Millions now living will never die" after 1925—when the deliverance of the Church and the Great Company was to take place, and the forecast return of the Ancient Worthies was expected to seal the millions proposition. But again, alas for him, after 1920 the millions kept on dying, the Church and Great Company still remained in the flesh, and the Ancient Worthies did not return, despite his challenge to objectors to prove that they had not returned and were not in hiding in some secret Palestinian place!

Years before 1925 we wrote that, when 1925 would prove his millions proposition a frenzy of delusion, he would present another delusion to divert attention from his second great fiasco and to keep his disciples. This delusion—the third major one—as we forecast, has come in the proposition that the Harvest began in 1918 and is now on, and is the most gigantic and evil of the three. If this delusion were true, our Pastor was the greatest individual deceiver on religious subjects that ever arose during the Gospel Age; for it implies the rejection of almost all of Pastor Russell's prophetic writings, of many of his doctrines and of almost all of his works, as delusions. We call special attention to a principle that J.F.R. announces in his Dec. [1928] articles on the Time of the End and the days of Daniel, and that opens the flood gates of error, giving Satan, through him, the vantage ground to reject anything he wishes in Pastor Russell's writings: his claim that the Time of the End is the same as the end of the Gentile

Times and that, therefore, before 1914 the Lord's special truths for His people in His Second Advent could not be clearly seen! This principle accounts for the flood of error in the more recent Towers, each succeeding one becoming more erroneous than the former, as it also promises worse yet to come.

In 2 Tim. 3: 1-9 St. Paul speaks of Jannes and Jambres as typing the apostate teachers *of the last days*—the Parousia day and the Epiphany day. The facts prove that Jannes—*oppressor*—types the sifters who in the Parousia day misled the second death class by antitypical sorceries—delusions; and that—Jambres—*rebellious*—types the sifters who in the Epiphany are misleading the Great Company by antitypical sorceries—delusions (2 Thes. 2: 9-11). After describing their unholy characters and works St. Paul says (v. 9) that their "folly" will in due time be made known to all consecrated brethren. J.F.R. is the chief member of the Truth section of antitypical Jambres, there being also a nominal-church section of antitypical Jambres, even as there were in the Parousia these two sections of antitypical Jannes. In this review of some of his more recent delusions we will not only prove them to be erroneous, but will also stress their "folly." Hence we have made part of the title of this and the next chapter read "Drunken Follies of Right-Eye Darkening," the allusion being both to 2 Tim. 3: 9 and to Zech. 11: 15-17, both passages referring to him, the former pointing out the class whose chief he is among Truth people, and the latter pointing him out as an individual. The errors to be reviewed are so numerous that our refutations and exposures of them must necessarily be more or less brief, with the omission of the minor ones. His present view is that a new dispensational line of dealing began in 1918. He now calls it the Elisha work, Elijah supposedly typing, not a class, but a work up to 1918, and Elisha supposedly typing, not a class, but a work since then. For

details please see Vol. III, Chap. III. It will be recalled that after we proved that, since the faithful and wise servant was an individual (our Pastor), that wicked servant must be another individual (J.F.R.), he changed his view so as to claim that the faithful and wise servant was a class, his "remnant," and that the wicked servant is, therefore, a class—those of the Lord's consecrated people whom he calls "the opposition." Again, when we proved that since 1914 we are in the Epiphany and that, therefore, the priestly work was with Azazel's Goat, to evade the proofs that demonstrated that his partisans are a part of that Goat, he found it necessary to teach that a new dispensational work began in 1918 and that this work is the reaping of the Gospel Age. The above proves how each demonstration of his association and identification with evil things has driven him into giving up a formerly held truth and to bring out an error instead, in order to evade the proof of his real position and work among the Lord's people.

His present view is that since 1918 especially, and more especially since 1922, and most especially since 1926, great advancement in the Truth's unfolding has been going on, through the Society as God's alleged organization. He claims that this is due to our Lord's alleged coming to His temple in 1918 to test His people. He alleges for this thought Mal. 3: 1-3. This passage does indeed teach that our Lord in His Second Advent would come to His temple (the true Church) and test it. But the passage shows that this testing began early in the Parousia (Who shall abide *the day of His coming?*—the Parousia was the day of His coming) and that it reaches far into the Epiphany (And who shall stand *when He shall appear*—literally, *make manifest, epiphanize, i.e.,* who will maintain his standing in the high calling during the Epiphany?). The tests of the Parousia were to separate the second death class from those that retained the Holy Spirit,

as the question implies: Who shall *abide* [continue to endure and thus to persevere as New Creatures]? This testing was done mainly through the five harvest siftings, the first beginning in 1878 (1 Cor. 10: 1-14). The tests of the Epiphany decide who shall maintain his stand (Rom. 5: 2) in the high calling and who shall fall therefrom into the Great Company, as is implied in the question, Who shall *stand*? This testing is being done through the sixth sifting, that of the Epiphany (2 Tim. 4: 1). Mal. 3: 2 proves that the Lord's coming to His temple to test it occurred in 1874, the beginning of the day of His coming, and therefore pointedly disproves the view that this occurred in 1918. It was, therefore, from 1874 onward that the glorious Truth would especially unfold, not since 1918, 1922 and 1926. And the things that J.F.R. is bringing out, contradicting more and more the real truths of the Parousia and the Epiphany, must be error, not Truth—mud splashes, not lightning flashes. They are even worse than symbolic muddy water; for in the latter Truth predominates above error, while in his new views error greatly predominates over Truth. Hence he offers symbolic mud with which he splashes the transparently clear and heart-satisfying Truth.

He speaks very much of lightning flashes coming from the temple—his teachings as alleged enlightenments from the Lord. The Bible nowhere says that lightning flashes come out of the temple. Such a figure would be untrue to the basis of the figure; for lightning comes out of the sky, not out of a building. Nor does the Bible ever use symbolic lightning as that which gives light to the Church. Lightning flashes are spoken of as coming from God's throne and attributes—heavenly things—(Rev. 4: 5; Ezek. 1: 13, 14), but never from the temple; and their mission is in the Bible given as bringing to light matters of the symbolic heavens and earth—false religions and society (Ps. 77: 18; 99: 4)—and never matters of the

true Church. The following are all the Scriptures that use the word *lightning* symbolically or typically, and they are in harmony with our assertions on their source and mission, and in no case refer to J.F.R.'s views of their source and mission: Ex. 19: 16; 20: 18; 2 Sam. 22: 15; Job 28: 26; 37: 3; 38: 25, 35; Ps. 18: 14; 77: 18; 97: 4; 135: 7; 144: 6; Jer. 10: 13; 51: 16; Ezek. 1: 13, 14; Zech. 9: 14; Rev. 4: 5; 8: 5; 11: 19; 16: 18. The only other occurrences of this word are Dan. 10: 6; Nah. 2: 4; Matt. 24: 27; 28: 3; Luke 10: 18; 17: 24, where it is doubtless literal. We ask our readers to look up these passages and in them they will find a complete absence of the thought that lightning flashes come out of the true Church and enlighten it. Literal lightning in a house would set it on fire and blind and kill its occupants. Folly is thus implied in the thought under review. Hence J.F.R.'s alleged lightning flashes are nothing more or less than plainly discerned mud splashes.

Another of his errors is the thought that our Lord in His Second Advent did not come back to earth, but remains in heaven. According to him the Second Advent is no advent, but a work, which our Lord allegedly does while remaining where He ascended 40 days after His resurrection. With our Pastor we admit that He could do His Second Advent work without leaving heaven; but with him we also hold that this is not the way that the Scriptures say He would do it. The contrast of His going away and coming again, of John 14: 2, 3, proves His Second Advent to be a real and personal one. His coming again in like manner as He went away proves the same thought (Acts 1: 11). Our meeting Him in the air proves His personal return to the earth in His Second Advent (1 Thes. 4: 17). His being *kept in heaven until* the times of restitution of all things implies His leaving heaven for earth at that time (Acts 3: 19-21). The parable of the nobleman, by its

contrasting his going to a far country to receive a kingdom and his returning thereafter, demonstrates that our Lord's return is as personal and real as His leaving the earth for heaven. His descending from heaven (1 Thes. 4: 16) proves the same thing. And the saints looking for Him to come from heaven for their deliverance implies His personal return (Phil. 3: 20, 21). The clear-cut contrasts of these seven passages, to which others might be added, plainly prove our Pastor to be right in teaching a personal and real return of our Lord in His Second Advent; and the folly of the "new" view is thereby manifested, as well as by its giving nominal-church men a club with which to strike hard blows at his error, as being the alleged teaching of Bro. Russell. No number of passages that speak of the Father's coming, cited by J.F.R. to prove his point, can rule out these clear contrasts, inasmuch as such passages use the word *coming*, not in its regular sense, but in the sense of proceeding to do the thing at hand, which is not, as proved by the above contrasts, the sense of the word *coming* connected with Christ's Second Advent.

Again, he offers folly on Satan's alleged organization and on all who vote as supporting it. In question meetings, in answer to pertinent questions, and in our Sept., 1928, Herald, we advised the brethren to vote in the 1928 campaign; and we ourself for the first time in 26 years voted, because the Catholic section of Azazel's Goat was through Mr. Smith's candidacy seeking to increase its revolutionism, and we considered it proper to resist this revolutionism, which antitypical Aaron's present work requires him to do. Again, we felt reasonably sure that if Mr. Smith would be elected the hierarchy would still more effectively curtail our public ministry, against which contingency we surely should use a pertinent human right—the ballot—after the example of St. Paul, who, when

Festus to please the Jews made a proposal that would have resulted in St. Paul's death and thus in the stopping of his ministry, made use of one of his earthly rights—his Roman citizenship—in an appeal to Caesar, to prevent the suppression of his ministry (Acts 25: 9-12), as on other occasions he also made use of his rights of Roman citizenship to prevent injury to his further ministering to the Lord's cause (Acts 16: 22, 35-39; 22: 24-29).

We do not advocate a regular use of the ballot by the brethren; but that election involved such questions for us in our public ministry as justified us in using our earthly right to vote, to prevent by lawful means the effort to estop us in our public ministry, as the hierarchy would do, had they elected "their man." The last service for the brethren conducted by our Pastor that we were privileged to attend was a question meeting Sunday morning at the Dallas Convention, Oct. 22, 1916. In that question meeting he was asked whether the brethren should ever take part in elections. He answered after the following import: The privilege of citizenship and of the ballot is one of our human privileges which, like all our other earthly privileges, we at consecration laid on the altar. Hence we should use it or leave it unused in harmony with the Lord's will, as the interests of His cause or duty require. If ever the interests of God's cause or a consecrated person's duty to his family or to others call upon him to exercise his earthly privilege of voting, he should vote, otherwise he should refrain from voting. It is a matter for each one to decide for himself before the Lord. That a consecrated Christian could properly use his citizenship rights to protect his stewardship in the Lord's service, the case of St. Paul using his to prevent damage to his ministry from the Philippian magistrates, Lysias and Festus, proves. So far our summary of our Pastor's answer to the above question. We know of cases

where he advised consecrated parents in the interests of their children to vote in school elections, and post office clerks to vote when the retention of their positions, needed for the support of their families, required it. In advising the brethren to vote in the 1928 election, we followed our Pastor's thought, as to the circumstances of that election *in their relation to our work toward the Catholic section of Azazel's Goat*.

J.F.R., in an article in the April, 1929, Tower, "tactfully" disapproving our thought, sought to show that all voting in civil elections is wrong, because it allegedly implies supporting Satan's organization. If his view of the kingdoms of this world as to Satan's organization were correct, the Lord would not have charged the entire Church throughout its earthly career to pray for the civil rulers, obey, honor and support them, pay taxes to support the governments, and otherwise seek their prosperity. Nor would He have declared that all governments were His arrangement for their subjects and that the civil rulers were His servants in secular matters. Nor would Paul have appealed for protection to them (Rom. 13: 1-6; Acts 25: 10-12; 1 Pet. 2: 13-15). The facts that Satan has succeeded by usurpation and deception in misusing the kingdoms of this world for his ends, and that these frequently do wrong, do not negate the fact that God is the Maker of the present symbolic world with its symbolic heavens and earth (Heb. 1: 10-12). Therefore, to call them in J.F.R.'s sense a part of Satan's organization is blasphemy. While calling them kingdoms of this world, the Bible neither teaches nor implies his sense of Satan's organization. Such a view of them is a perversion of facts and a too extreme emphasis on the facts that they as kingdoms of this world, God's order for the second dispensation, frequently do wrong: and that Satan is (by usurpation and deception without their realizing it) *limitedly* the god, ruler, of this world or order of affairs.

Extreme emphasis always leads to error, as the case under consideration shows. J.F.R.'s pertinent hypocrisy is manifest when we remember that every time he goes to Europe he by oath claims to be a citizen of the U. S., swears allegiance to the U. S. and swears to support, to defend, to preserve, etc., the Constitution, *a thing that he must do to get passports. If his view were correct, he is a sworn citizen and upholder of Satan's organization!* The expression, Satan's organization, is an unbiblical one, and is used by him to teach an unscriptural thought, even as his contrasted thought that God has as His *visible* organization—the Society—is unbiblical and foolish.

He, likewise, has been teaching folly on Rev. 22: 17 (similar to that on Joel 2: 28, *i.e.*, that the Spirit since Sept., 1922, has been poured out on all flesh!), namely, that now the Spirit and the Bride are saying, Come, etc. But this is contrary to the Bible: for (1) as long as the Church is in the flesh the Truth, as symbolic water or wine or eyesalve, is not *free*. It is true that money does not buy it; but, nevertheless, it must be bought, and the price that must now be paid for it is repentance, faith, consecration, hunger for righteousness, humility, meekness, honesty and holiness of heart and mind (Prov. 23: 23; Is. 55: 1-3; Ps. 25: 8, 9; Matt. 5: 6; Luke 8: 15; Rev. 3: 18). Hence now none get the Truth freely. Therefore Rev. 22: 17 cannot apply now. But in the Millennium none of these things, nor any other things will be the purchase price of the Truth. It will then be taken "freely"; for God is determined that all will then come to an exact knowledge of the Truth, regardless of their heart's condition or desires. (Is. 11: 9; 1 Tim. 2: 4; John 1: 9). Moreover, (2) the expression, "water of life," is used exclusively as a designation of the Millennial Truth (Rev. 7: 17; 21: 6; 22: 1; 22: 17). These are the only uses of that expression. The expression, "living waters," on the other hand, applies to Truth of

both the Gospel and Millennial Ages. [(1) Gospel Age: Cant. 4: 15; Jer. 2: 13; 17: 13; John 4: 10, 11; (2) Millennial Age: Zech. 14: 18.] Furthermore, (3) the word *Bride* favors the Millennial application of Rev. 22: 17; for a bride is a woman immediately before, during and for a while after her marriage. On her wedding day immediately before her marriage a woman may be called a bride; but normally this term is used of her during and for a short time after her marriage. The normal use of the word *Bride* is to be understood in Rev. 22: 17 and therefore it refers to the Millennium, as the connection also suggests.

In Rev. 18: 23 the word *Bride* is applied to the entire Church in the flesh and in the spirit in an activity begun Sept. 20, 1914. The following will clarify this so far as the Church in the flesh is concerned: Elijah's coming to Mt. Horeb at the end of the 40 days types the Church coming 40 years after 1874, *i.e.*, in 1914, to the kingdom, in the sense that the last begettal then occurring, all the faithful under the call up to that time will obtain the kingdom, and therefore in God's sight (Rom. 4: 17) they are from then on as in the kingdom. At that time a joint work was begun by the Christ beyond and this side the veil, *i.e.*, the World's High Priest beginning the work toward Azazel's Goat. In the pursuance of this work the entire High Priest has been making His voice heard in Babylon and among the Truth Levites. It is to this work and to this work exclusively that the expression, "the voice of the Bridegroom and of the Bride shall be heard no more at all in thee," applies. Please note in vs. 23 how this is the last thing of good that the Christ will do in Babylon. The same work as is represented under the World's High Priesthood figure with Azazel's Goat is referred to in the above-quoted words under the Bridegroom and Bride figure. But please note: this work belongs exclusively after the entire Christ is won, *i.e.*, in the Epiphany, hence on the

Church's *wedding day* (Col. 3: 4; Rev. 19: 7, 8) AFTER THE ENTIRE CHURCH HAS BEEN WON, when, from God's standpoint, every part of the Church in the flesh is in the kingdom. This use is similar to God's viewing Aaron in beauty and glory at the time of consecration as typing how He looks upon *the faithful* as a class *at their consecration*, *i.e.*, as though they were in glory, in view of what they will become. J.F.R., believing that the Church is not yet completely won, is thereby estopped from applying this passage as having yet entered into fulfilment, as he is also by its setting above given estopped from using it as applying before 1914. Since this passage calls Christ and the Church, Bridegroom and Bride; after the work toward Azazel's Goat began in 1914, and therefore views them from God's standpoint as in part actually married and for the rest as good as married, it does not in any sense favor applying Rev. 22: 17 at any time before the Church is completely won; and the contents of Rev. 22: 17 prove that it refers to a time after the marriage is completed. It is folly to apply Rev. 22: 17 to a time when the Truth is *bought*.

So, too, has he been giving out "folly" on Rom. 13: 1-7, as describing the brethren's alleged duties toward, and subjection to the leaders in the Society, and (inferentially) to him as their chief. He follows the folly offered by the A. V. in its mistranslation of Heb. 13: 7, 17—"them which *have the rule* over you," and "*obey* them that *have the rule* over you and *submit yourselves*." He forgot that the A. V. translators were all Episcopalians, who tried to make the Bible favor clericalism and, hence, mistranslated for that purpose. The expression, "them that have the rule over you," should in both cases have been rendered, *your leaders*, as the margin shows. The word translated *obey*, should have been rendered, *be persuadable*, as it indicates teachableness. The words rendered, "submit yourselves," should have been rendered, *be submissive*, or

leadable, i.e., we are exhorted in Heb. 13: 17 to exercise the two parts of meekness, teachableness and leadableness, toward our leaders. But these parts of meekness, properly balanced by the duty of proving all things and adhering to that only which is proved by such testing to be good, and by the duty of not giving way by subjection for an hour to false teachers (1 Thes. 5: 21; Gal. 2: 4, 5), even if they should pose as "the channel," are as far from counseling the subjection of God's people to their leaders as the east is from the west. The folly of using Rom. 13: 1-7 as a proof that the Lord's people are to be obedient to the leaders in the Church or Great Company, is manifest when we consider that the passage so interpreted commands Nicolaitanism—clericalism—a thing that Jesus hates and commends His people for hating (Rev. 2: 6).

Moreover, the terms of Rom. 13: 1-7 clearly prove that earthly civil rulers are meant. Nowhere in the Bible does the term *hoi archontes*—*the rulers*—(v. 3) apply to officials unless they have at least some feature of a political office. Its use designates that peculiarity of their office; and never is that word Biblically used of the *servants* of the Church. The same remark applies to the word *exousia* in the sense of a ruler (vs. 1, 2, 3). Furthermore, the fact that the rulers here referred to execute wrath as *vengeance* (v. 4) proves that secular rulers are meant; for the Lord's people are forbidden to take vengeance as long as they are in the flesh (Rom. 12: 19-22). Their taking up taxes, tribute, custom, proves them to be civil rulers (vs. 6, 7). Thus the terms of Rom. 13: 1-7 clearly refer to secular rulers, and are opposed to the condition, duties and powers of servants of the Church. It does not surprise us at all that one who for his usurpation, lording it over God's heritage and all around dictatorialness has been widely and properly criticized by the brethren, should seek to twist God's Word into a sanction of his un-servant-like attitude and practice;

but such twists serve all the more to convince sober minded brethren of his true character as the little pope of little Babylon. His false teaching on Rom. 13: 1-7, ascribing to himself and fellow clericalists such authority over the Lord's flock as that passage ascribes to rulers over their subjects, is the parallel of the great pope in great Babylon in ascribing to himself supreme authority and to his hierarchy a subordinate authority with the requirement of obedience to him and them as a consequence. More and more the parallel between the great pope and the little pope is fulfilling.

In the Jan. 1, 1930, Tower he writes some more folly: denying that Bro. Russell was that Servant of Luke 12: 42-44 and Matt. 24: 45-47, and claiming that the servant there treated of is the same as the one of Is. 42—the Christ, Head and Body. This view is evidently false because "that Servant" functions only after our Lord's return (Luke 12: 43; Matt. 24: 46), while the servant of Is. 42, being identical with the servant of Is. 49, as can be seen from a comparison of Is. 42: 6, 7 and 49: 8, 9, refers to the Christ as functioning throughout the Gospel (2 Cor. 6: 1, 2) and Millennial Ages. Moreover, that Servant, the man and maid servants and the household of Luke 12: 42-44 and Matt. 24: 45-47 constitute only the *feet* members of the servant of Is. 42. This, then, proves that the that Servant of these passages is only an individual member of the *feet* of the servant of Is. 42; because he is distinguished from the men and maid servants and the household and is put over them. Hence the claims of the Jan. 1, 1930 Tower on this head, are proved to be false and foolish—exactly what we should expect of a "foolish shepherd." He even dares to charge those who hold Bro. Russell for that Servant as exalting man instead of God, thus seeking to belittle him!

He claims that the prisoners of Is. 42: 7; 49: 9; 61: 1 and Ps. 79: 11 are the Great Company. This we deny in each case, agreeing with our Pastor that the

prisoners in the three passages from Isaiah are those who are in the prison of the tomb. As for Is. 61: 1, 2, we recall that our Lord in Luke 4: 18, 19 quoted as much of it as was due to be preached while He was in the flesh. He designedly omitted quoting the part of v. 2 that referred to the proclamation of the Day of Vengeance, because it was not then due to be preached. If the prisoners of v. 1 were the Great Company, He would have omitted quoting that part of v. 1, because it was not due then to preach their deliverance; for as a class they did not come into existence before 1917. While all through the Gospel Age there have been crown-losers, there was no Great Company as such until the Time of Trouble came (Rev. 7: 14). This is also evident from the tabernacle picture: for there is no place in the Gospel Age tabernacle picture for them before the Epiphany; because the camp for the Gospel Age represented the nominal people of God, the court the justified and the holy the priests (who throughout the Gospel Age have consisted of crown-retainers and crown-losers). Hence, there being no Great Company to serve in Jesus' time with a suitable proclamation, if the prisoners of v. 1 referred to them, Jesus would have omitted that part of Is. 61: 1 as not due to be preached, just as He omitted the part of v. 2 treating of the proclamation of the Day of Vengeance and the whole of v. 3, because these certain things were not due to be preached that day. Accordingly, v. 1 does not refer to the Great Company. Jesus did preach the awakening of the dead—a proclamation then due to be made, as His quotation of the pertinent part of the passage proves.

Again, the connection of Is. 42: 7 and 49: 9 with the respective preceding verse of each one proves that the Great Company is not meant by the there-mentioned prisoners, for the preceding verse in each case shows that the New Covenant will be operating and restitution will be working, the nations will be enlightened,

etc., when the prisoners will be freed; hence they are those in the tomb. As for the prisoner of Ps. 79: 11, the connection implies that there a prayer is offered by the brethren for the deliverance of their persecuted brethren from natural prisons and other forms of persecution, including tortures and deaths. But we think it well to speak of the Great Company brethren as prisoners in both Great and Little Babylon, for this is implied of them in Ps. 107: 10.

In the Dec. 15, 1929, Tower, J.F.R. repeats his old error that Matt. 24: 6-12 refers to the World War and certain accompanying experiences—the Society's persecution and their alleged betrayal by "the opposition," and the witness of v. 14 as his millions fiasco of 1918-1925. Our Pastor in Vol. IV applied Matt. 24: 5-14 as a brief summary of the Gospel Age's history, which is doubtless right. If the former's view were right, vs. 29, 30, referring to the tribulation of vs. 6-10, would prove that our Lord's return did not set in until after the World War was over. It was due to Bro. Chomiak's accepting this view of vs. 6-10 as correct that moved him, logically reasoning from these premises, to conclude that our Lord's return did not occur in 1874 and could not have occurred before the end of the World War. Thus, as a logical consequence, J.F.R. must give up his view of vs. 6-10 and return to that of our Pastor or surrender 1874 as the date of our Lord's return and fix it after the end of the World War. Perhaps he intends to spring this on the Society friends yet; for his chronological views, so far as made known, are squinting in that direction; but this will force him to give up his view of our Lord standing up in 1914. He is in dire confusion on this matter; and some sort of an explosion may be expected of him. We suggest that he be pressed to reconcile his view of Matt. 24: 6-10 with vs. 29, 30 and our Lord's return in 1874. He also stresses another error—claiming that the remnant of Isaiah is his own

persevering followers. The erroneousness of his view is very evident from St. Paul's (Septuagint) quotation of Is. 1: 9 ("remnant") and application in Rom. 9: 29 to the Little Flock, as the few left and delivered from nominal fleshly and spiritual Israel throughout the Age, not exclusively at its extreme end.

In the Nov. 15, 1929, Tower, he renounces our Pastor's teaching on the permission of evil, going so far as to say that our Pastor's thought thereon makes the Lord approve of sin! The Scriptures teach our Pastor's thought. St. Paul tells us (Rom. 11: 31, 32) that God has shut up Israel to their own unbelief with their Gospel-Age afflictions in order thereby to prepare them to be blessed by the mercy of deliverance under the Elect's ministry! In Rom. 8: 20-22, St. Paul tells us that God put the race under the curse, wherein they have suffered all kinds of misery, to the end that they might attain not only a deliverance from the curse, but also the liberty of God's children. Ps. 76: 10 shows that man's sin will be used in a way that shall show forth the wisdom, power, justice and love of God; but the only way sin can do such a thing is so to afflict man as to turn him into hatred of sin, on the principle that the burnt child dreads the fire, even as the chastised child learns to give up the things that bring chastisement to him, and some drunkards are by their suffering and degradation led to reformation. This passage also shows that those who do not permit such sufferings to effect their reformation will be cut off, whereby alone the sins of such persons can be restrained.

The clearest Scripture that teaches our Pastor's thought on why evil has been permitted is Ps. 90, the Psalm—Song—of Moses. The Song of Moses (Rev. 15: 3) is the main theme of the Old Testament, as the Song of the Lamb is the main theme of the New Testament. The Song of Moses is the teaching of man's original perfection, his fall, the curse, the permission

of evil and restitution. According to its subscription, Ps. 90 as the Song of Moses should teach these thoughts, and it does. In vs. 1 and 2 the author of the Divine Plan is presented. V. 1 should be translated: O Lord, Thou *wast* our dwelling place in *a* generation, even *the* generation. Here the original perfection is set forth enjoyed by the race in Adam and Eve in their sinless condition; for evidently God was not the dwelling place of any of the race under the curse before, by the begettal and possession of the Spirit, the Gospel Church came to dwell in God (Col. 3: 3; John 17: 21; 1 John 4: 13, 16). V. 2 shows God's eternity. The curse and restitution as the theme of this Psalm are set forth in v. 3; while v. 4 alludes to a thousand years' period when the return, restitution of v. 3, is to come. Then in vs. 5-10, 15 of the evils—the main ones—of the curse are set forth. Then Moses, in vs. 11 and 12, asks and answers the question, Why was evil permitted? "Who knoweth the power [*meaning*; for one of the senses of the word *power* is *meaning*; as, *e.g.*, in older English one would say, this is the power—sense—of this word] of Thy anger [expressed in the curse]? Even according to Thy fear is Thy wrath [Thy curse on the race is to work in it reverence for Thee. Here is our Pastor's thought taught as to why the curse has been resting on man]."

Vs. 12-17 are Millennial; for as the turning into destruction was described in vs. 5-10, so in vs. 12-17 is described the return therefrom. V. 12 represents the race as praying that it may so review the "all" days of the curse (vs. 9, 10) and the "all" days of the restitution process (vs. 14, 15) as to derive wisdom therefrom, *i.e.*, learn from the former to hate sin and from the latter to love righteousness; for these are the two main ingredients of wisdom for the race. How evidently vs. 11 and 12 teach that sin and evil have been permitted to educate the race to reverence God, which among other things implies hatred of sin!

V. 13 represents the race praying for the return, restitution, and asks God to work it as a change ("repent") of procedure from that of the curse. In v. 14 mercy, joy and gladness mark "all" the days of the race. These "all" days must be an altogether different set of all days from the "all" days of vs. 9 and 10, wherein the woes of the curse were experienced. The difference is this: the latter were the all days in which evil reigned—the curse time; and the former will be the all days in which righteousness will reign—the restitution time. As in the one set of all days God's wrath (the curse) wrought misery (vs. 9, 10), so in the other set God's mercy (v. 14) will work joy and gladness. Note how v. 15 shows that the joys of salvation will be made available to the race undergoing restitution *through the Divine purpose with the days of affliction and the years in which the race saw (experienced) evil*. Here again we are taught that God sentenced the race to the curse that it by contrast in the experience with righteousness might the more readily attain the joys of restitution. In v. 16 the race prays for a knowledge of, and participation in God's restitution work and character (Thy glory). It repeats this prayer in an explanatory way in v. 17, with the added thought that they may be unchangeably made participators in the future Divinely-arranged work of the Ages to come after the Millennium. This Psalm, therefore, teaches our Pastor's thought on why evil was permitted to the race in general; and thus it refutes J.F.R.'s repudiation of that thought.

As a final passage teaching that evil was permitted in order to teach man to hate and forsake sin, we introduce Rom. 7: 13. This passage limits its application of the experience of evil to Israel, and shows that the special evils that the Law brought upon Israel for Israel's violation of the Law were designed to make sin appear as all the more terrible evil to Israel. Accordingly, while the passage is discussing Israel alone

in its relation to the special penalties suffered by it for violating the Law, the principle is the same as that which we found in the other passages above described. Hence, contrary to J.F.R.'s claims, whereby he seeks to rule this passage out of court on the question at issue, this passage contains an application to Israel of the principle according to which evil is permitted and proves our Pastor's teaching on the subject. The former treats this passage as though it were the only Biblical verse used by our Pastor for his pertinent doctrine and then curtly dismisses it as insufficient as a basis for that doctrine.

Against our Pastor's thought he alleges that those dying in infancy and those born and living in idiocy could get no benefit from the experience with evil. We reply that while undergoing the restitution opportunities of the next Age their sinful proclivities will many a time lead them to attempt wrong, which will result in stripes. This will give them by experience of the woes of sin lessons sufficient to enable them to hate and forsake it (Is. 26: 9). His thought that there is no Scripture that shows that the fallen angels will get any good from their experience with evil is disproved by the facts that God is again going to become the Head of those of them that come into Christ (Eph. 1: 10), that Jesus will become their Lord (Rom. 14: 9; Phil. 2: 9-10) and that they will get a trial for life in connection with righteousness (2 Pet. 2: 4; Jude 6), which God is too practical to give them, as also He is too practical to have imprisoned them as a preparation for such a trial, if none of them would be profited thereby. To his objection that those who do their best nevertheless suffer and die, we reply: some of these die the sacrificial death as priests, the others of these die the ministerial death of Levites, whose sufferings do not, therefore, come under the sufferings of the world, but under those of God's people, whose sufferings are for a different purpose from those of the world, *i.e.*,

to fit them in qualities of character for their present and future ministries. *No others than these do their best!* All the rest are under the world's experience with evil. He has, by denying the doctrine of character development, actually, if not verbally, repudiated our Pastor's thought as to why evil has been permitted to the four classes of the Elect, *i.e.*, to work in them characters fitting them for their present and future ministries (Heb. 2: 10, 17, 18; 5: 8, 9; Rom. 8: 28, 29; 2 Cor. 4: 16-18; 1 Pet. 1: 6, 7; Mal. 3: 2, 3).

In his discussion of the permission of evil, after denying our Pastor's thought, he says that the Bible teaches another and a fuller thought as to why God has permitted evil, *i.e.*, to manifest and vindicate His attributes and to demonstrate that He could foil Satan in His controversy with him, by creating a perfect race endowed with everlasting life conditioned on obedience, in spite of Satan's opposition. This same explanation the creeds offer, and, like J.F.R., do not explain how this can be done in permitting sin. On former occasions we have pointed out his sophistical course in putting forth things as contradictory to one another when in fact no contradiction is present, *e.g.*, the title of the most mischievous thing that he has ever written—the most mischievous because, according to the Society's vice-president, Bro. Wise, and many others, it has undermined godliness in many Society adherents—"Character or Covenant—Which?" As we pointed out above, there is no contrast between the two, our covenant requiring, with six other things, character development. So in saying that evil was not permitted in order to teach the race to hate and forsake sin, but in order to manifest and vindicate God's attributes to His creatures and to prove that He could foil Satan in His controversy with him by creating a perfect race endowed with everlasting life conditioned on obedience, in spite of Satan's opposition, he sets up alleged contradictions that are in perfect harmony.

It is, of course, true that Jehovah has permitted sin and evil in order to manifest and vindicate His character, and quite subordinately to demonstrate that He can foil Satan in His controversy with him by creating a perfect race endowed with everlasting life conditioned on obedience, in spite of Satan's opposition. But that there is no contradiction between these thoughts and the thought of God's overruling as to sin *through the afflictions it works to teach the race to hate and forsake it* is evident because this is a part of the means whereby His glorious character will be manifested and demonstrated, and whereby He will bring to perfection and everlasting life obedient men, despite Satan's opposition. J.F.R.'s explanation, denying God's educative use of sin to stir up hatred against itself, as the reason of its permission, just like the creeds, leaves the problem unsolved as to how evil in mankind will reflect credit on God and contribute to His foiling Satan with his own weapon. Hence he has offered a superficial explanation that leaves one of the main factors of the problem out of consideration, while our Pastor goes to the rock-bottom of the question and solves it most harmoniously with the Bible and God's attributes and most effectively with their manifestation and demonstration and His foiling Satan with the latter's own weapon—sin. Whatever is true in his explanation he has gotten from our Pastor or the creeds; and what is lacking in it is due to his rejecting the lacking thing offered by our Pastor. The latter is in this matter shown to be the deep and clear thinker and the former the shallow and erratic thinker.

In the Jan. 15-Mar. 15, 1930, Towers, he has a long article entitled, Jehovah's Royal House, that literally swarms with errors, some of them of fundamental importance; and they furnish another convincing proof of his symbolic drunkenness and his right-eye darkening. One of these is that there is no difference between the begetting and the birth of the

Spirit, and that both of these words apply to what occurred to our Lord at Jordan and when He was raised from the dead. Hence, he teaches that in this life we are born of the Spirit and are "*spirit* creatures." Thus he has gone back to the nominal-church confusion on the subject and to worse yet. Of course, as our Pastor pointed out, the Greek word *gennao* is used for both of these acts, because the Greek word *gennao* has three meanings: (1) *beget* (used of the male only), (2) *bring to birth* (used of both male and female) and (3) *bear* (used of the female only). Denying the first meaning as Biblically not used of the human male or of God, he alleges the second and the third as the only Scriptural meanings the word has, designating the joint parental work of bringing to birth human children, and to God in the birth of the New Creation, which he places at what Truth people have all along considered the begetting of the Spirit. In refutation of his pertinent denial the following passages, among others, prove that the word *gennao* is used in the Bible in connection with human beings and God's begetting *in the sense of the male depositing the germinating seed* "that which was [past tense] begotten [*gennao*] in her" (Matt. 1: 20); "that holy thing which is begotten [literally, that holy thing being begotten—*present* passive participle] shall be called, the Son of God" (A. R. V., Luke 1: 35); "To this end was I *begotten* and for this cause came I into the world" [Here evidently *gennao*, used in the first clause, means Jesus' begetting; for His birth is described in the second statement: *and came into the world*] (John 18: 35).

Undoubtedly in the chronological genealogies of Genesis the Hebrew word *yalad* means to *bring to birth* and not to *beget*. Nor would there be any serious objection to giving that sense to the Greek word *gennao* in the genealogy given in Matt. 1, though one could with equal propriety render it there by *beget*, as practically all versions do, there being nothing in that

section to enable us to limit its use there to but one or the other of these senses. There is, therefore, no need to dispute on the word meaning to bring to birth; but when it is so used, it does not mean *to deposit the seed*, which is the only meaning of the word *beget*. Hence these two meanings refer to two different things which in human generation occur nine months apart. That J.F.R. is entirely wrong in teaching that God's act of depositing the germinating spiritual seed, *i.e.*, the begettal, is the same as the birth of the Spirit, is manifest from John 3: 6-8, where he that is born of the Spirit is said to be *a* [so the Greek] spirit, and invisible like the wind. Therefore we who in this life are new creatures cannot be yet born of the Spirit; for we are neither spirits nor invisible. Therefore our Pastor was right when he taught that the begettal of the Spirit occurred in and as the implantation of the new life in the heart and mind of the consecrated.

To J.F.R.'s denial that there are acts in the begetting (depositing of the germinating seed), quickening, growing, strengthening, balancing, completing and birth of a human being, corresponding to those accompanying the generation of a spirit being or vice versa, we reply that nature proves all of these processes as parts of the generation of a human being, and the Bible teaches every one of them in the complete generation of the New Creation, as has been often proven.

The following will prove this: (1) The begettal occurs through depositing the Word as the germinating seed (Jas. 1: 18; 1 Pet. 1: 3, 23; John 1: 12, 13; 3: 3; 1 Cor. 4: 15; Phile. 10; 1 John 5: 1). This begettal made God's people embryo new creatures (2 Cor. 5: 17; Gal. 6: 15). (2) Later, each one of them was quickened as an embryo (John 6: 63; Eph. 2: 1, 5; Col. 2: 13; 1 Tim. 6: 13). Still later (3) they began to grow in grace, knowledge and service in their embryo condition (2 Pet. 3: 18; Eph. 4: 15; 1 Pet. 2: 2). (4) Thereafter a strengthening of these embryos in every

good word and work set in (Eph. 3: 16; 6: 10-17; Col. 1: 11; 2 Tim. 2: 1; 1 Pet. 5: 10). (5) Then the new creatures develop more as embryos by balancing the various parts of a Christlike character with one another (2 Thes. 2: 17; 3: 3; 1 Thes. 3: 12, 13; Jas. 5: 8; 1 Pet. 5: 10; 2 Pet. 1: 12). (6) Their full development as embryos is completed by perfecting their character, which completely conforms them unto Christ's image (Rom. 8: 29; Luke 6: 40; Eph. 4: 12; Heb. 13: 20, 21; 1 Pet. 5: 10). This makes them as embryos ready for the Spirit birth, (7) which they experience by participating in the First Resurrection, and by which they obtain the Divine nature, through obtaining immortality (John 3: 5-8; Col. 1: 18; Rev. 1: 5; 1 Cor. 15: 20, 23; Jas. 1: 18; 2 Pet. 1: 4; 1 Cor. 15: 50, 52-54). These seven processes, beginning with the begetting of the Spirit and ending in the birth of the Spirit, constitute the acts whereby God creates a new order of beings, and that on the Divine, the highest plane of existence, and correspond to the seven steps in the generation of a human being. This disproves J.F.R.'s claim that there is no parallel between the successive stages in the generation of a human and spirit being.

He also claims that the language: "Thou art My Son; this day have I *brought Thee to birth* [Rotherham] is applied to Jesus at three different times (1) at Jordan, (2) at His resurrection and (3) at His Second Advent. We reply that St. Paul explains this passage, and that three times. Two of these explanations directly apply it to our Lord's resurrection (Acts 13: 33; Heb. 1: 3-5; note carefully the tenses used in the second passage, as the proof that it applies, like Acts 13: 33, to our Lord's resurrection). The other passage is Heb. 5: 5. It likewise refers to our Lord in the glory of the Divine nature; for it is used to prove Him as having been made a High Priest of Melchizedek's order by paralleling it with the statement of His being a priest after the order of

Melchizedek, which proves that it does not refer to Him while in the flesh. Hence our Lord was by God glorified to be made a High Priest in His resurrection, when He became the Priest after the order of Melchizedek. Therefore we deny, on the basis of the threefold use that St. Paul makes of this passage, that it applies to our Lord at Jordan and at His Second Advent; and with St. Paul we limit its application to our Lord's birth of the Spirit in the resurrection. It, therefore, proves that He was not born of the Spirit at Jordan, where He was begotten of the Spirit, but was born of the Spirit in His resurrection; and this proves that our birth of the Spirit did not occur at the time God made us [embryo] new creatures, but will occur in the resurrection when we will be spirits and, as such, invisible (John 3: 6-8).

He thinks that the fact that we are called sons of God now proves that we are now born of the Spirit and are, therefore, what he calls *spirit creatures*. In the same connection he calls Satan a spirit creature; but he seemingly avoids calling us now spirit *beings*; though in another connection he calls Satan a spirit being. This is jugglery with words. When he contends that the New Creature is a reality, not a subterfuge, he tells the truth; but when he thereby insinuates that embryo new creatures are not realities, but subterfuges, he errs. The holy powers that God implants in our brain organs in the begettal and the holy qualities and consequent holy character that by exercise are developed out of these holy powers certainly are realities (2 Cor. 5: 17; Gal. 6: 15). In answer to his claim that we are not embryo new creatures or sons, but born new creatures or sons, because we are called sons of God, we say the following: While we are actually embryo, not born new creatures or sons, we are reckonedly the latter and therefore called such in the Bible. This is proved by both literal and typical passages. A comparison of two literal passages will

show this: "*Now* are we [reckonedly] the sons of God" (1 John 3: 2). "We ourselves groan within ourselves, waiting [hoping for actual] *sonship*; *for we are saved by hope* (Rom. 8: 23, 24, Diaglott).

The types also show this: Our present actual condition as embryos is represented by Isaac being in the womb of Sarah, his birth representing our resurrection—full sonship (Heb. 11: 11; Rom. 9: 9); and our present reckoned condition of being born sons of God is represented by Isaac after his birth, *e.g.*, in his circumcision, weaning, persecution by Hagar and Ishmael and offering up by Abraham (Gal. 4: 28-31; Heb. 11: 17-19). Again, the struggling of the embryos, Esau and Jacob, in Rebekah's womb God expressly explains to represent two nations (Gen. 25: 22, 23) which as to the embryo Jacob St. Paul tells us represents the present actual condition of spiritual Israel (Rom. 9: 10-13), ourselves as actual embryos, but reckoned born sons of God as represented by Jacob in his acts after his birth. This is likewise shown in the case of Benjamin, his being an embryo until his birth representing the actual condition of the Great Company as embryo sons of God, this being proved at his birth, by the death of Rachel, his mother, who, typical of the spiritual elective truths that bring to birth antitypical Joseph (the Little Flock) and antitypical Benjamin (the Great Company) by her death types these truths ceasing to operate with the birth (resurrection) of the Great Company. On the other hand, the Great Company's reckoned condition as sons of God while in the flesh is typed by Benjamin's activities after his birth, *e.g.*, his coddling by his father after Joseph's exile, his being sent to Egypt, his being treated more kindly there than his brethren, his being captured, his being shown his true relation to Egypt's Prime-minister, his going to Palestine and his returning to Egypt. Thus these literal and typical passages prove that we are now actual embryos and reckonedly born sons and

that in the resurrection we will be actually born sons. The above considerations completely refute J.F.R.'s nominal-church view of our now being actually born of the Spirit.

In the same article, Jehovah's Royal House, he sets forth a veritable mass of confusion on the called, chosen, anointed and faithful. He makes the foundation of these errors the error just disproved, *viz.*, that we are now God's actually born sons. He teaches that the call extends only *after* one becomes what he calls a born son, that this call is to sacrificial service, that the Great Company consists of those who do not at all accept this call (to service) and never begin to serve in the high calling, that those who accept this call do so by entering the service of sacrifice as probationary Little Flock members, which makes them the chosen, that these get their full anointing before they begin to serve and that they then must either prove faithful in sacrifice unto death or go into the second death; for they cannot be remanded to the Great Company; for these allegedly consist of those who never accepted "the call" (to service). In elaborating his thoughts above summarized he teaches a multitude of very mischievous errors. The entire article runs through five Tower issues and we could not give details. But we will refute the main positions and with these his details will fall.

In the first place, he gives the words *called* and *chosen*, in Rev. 17: 14 and elsewhere, meanings that they do not have: *called*—invited to serve after one is made a new creature, and *chosen*—approved for such service because one's zeal is accepted and his anointing is completed. These words are never used in the Bible in the senses that he attaches to them. As our Pastor shows in Vol. VI, in the chapter treating of the call of the New Creation, the word, call, is used in a variety of senses, the widest of which includes everything that God does in inviting people out of sin, until He invites

them into the kingdom by the resurrection, *i.e.*, the invitation to wisdom, to justification, to sanctification and to deliverance. Hence it is used to designate each one of these four steps individually, or two or three or all of them collectively, as the following Scriptures prove: In Matt. 9: 13 and 1 Pet. 2: 9 it is used to signify the invitation to repentance and enlightenment—wisdom. In 2 Pet. 1: 10 the call refers to justification, which is made sure by our living in faith such a righteous life as retains the robe of righteousness now and as guarantees it to us as our own forever. This—justified—is the sense of the word *called* in Rev. 17: 14. Then this word is used to mean the invitation by consecration to the high calling—sanctification (Rom. 8: 30; Matt. 20: 16; Eph. 4: 4; Phil. 3: 14; 2 Tim. 1: 9; Heb. 3: 1). Further, this word is used to designate our invitation to share in overcoming all our spiritual enemies and to share in the first resurrection—deliverance (1 Pet. 5: 10; 2 Pet. 1: 3; 2 Thes. 2: 14; Heb. 5: 10). In other passages it is used in two or three or all four of these senses (Rom. 1: 6, 7; 8: 28; 1 Cor. 1: 9, 26-29; Eph. 4: 1; 1 Thes. 2: 12).

The word *chosen*—*elect*, or *election*—is used in two senses to designate: (1) those who by consecration and Spirit-begetting were selected to run for the high calling and (2) those who remain faithful in that high calling. Under the first definition the following, among other passages, belong: Rev. 17: 14; 2 Pet. 1: 10; Matt. 24: 22, 31; Col. 3: 12; Rom. 11: 7; 1 Thes. 1: 4; Mark 13: 20; John 15: 16; 2 Thes. 2: 13; Jas. 2: 5. The following are some that belong under the second definition: Is. 65: 9, 22; Matt. 20: 16; 22: 14; 24: 24; 1 Pet. 2: 6; 2 Tim. 2: 10. That the election—*being chosen*—does not mean the act of approving and anointing one already a new creature for his zealous response to an invitation to service, but is the Lord's part performed in the act of Spirit-begetting, is evident

from the fact that Aaron and his sons as such were chosen to become priests and then afterward underwent the service of Moses' consecrating of them *to be such*, typing that Jesus and the Church were first in their consecration and Spirit-begettal chosen to become priests and then to be such underwent consecration at God's hands; for the New Creature is the thing that becomes the Priest through the anointing (Heb. 9: 15). It is also evident from St. Paul's statement: "God hath *from the beginning* chosen you to salvation *through* the sanctification [begettal] of the Spirit, and belief of the Truth [whose acceptance unto consecration as the germinating seed was on our part the condition for its begetting us]." St. Peter gives the same testimony (1 Pet. 1: 2): "Elect according to the foreknowledge of God *through* the sanctification [begettal] of the Spirit." See also Rom. 6: 3; 1 Cor. 12: 12, 13; Gal. 3: 27-29; Col. 2: 11, 12. The theory under review confuses the response to the call with the quickening, *i.e.*, energizing to service, which occurs in the Under-priesthood after the anointing begins; for it is the anointing that quickens one to service, while the response to the invitation to the high calling is our act of consecration (Rom. 12: 1; Prov. 23: 26; Ps. 45: 10).

His view that those who do not become zealous to serve are the Great Company, is nonsense; for whoever is not zealous to serve, *i.e.*, quickened, is never born at all; just as in the human family, without quickening there can be no birth; for those who would not be quickened would take back their consecration entirely, which would mean totally wilful sin. Moreover, his view that the Great Company consists of those never energized to service is contrary to Sts. Paul's and John's statements on some running well for a while, becoming castaways, as to the prize, but not as to life, but losing a full reward (Gal. 5: 7; 1 Cor. 11: 24-27; 2 John 8); and on those running looking carefully lest, like Esau (Heb. 12: 15-17; 2 John 8, here a

type of the Great Company), they lose their birthright, their full reward, the Divine nature and joint-heirship with Christ and, like Esau, get the lower blessing, Great Companyship. Moreover, lack of love and wrongdoing also put one into the Great Company in spite of great services (1 Cor. 13: 2, 3; Jude 23; Rev. 7: 14; 1 Tim. 1: 19, 20, where the word *faith* means *faithfulness*, which for a while, therefore, Hymenaeus and Alexander had; for their faithfulness is here spoken of as wrecked, leading to their falling into the crown-losing class, and Azazel's hands). Furthermore, if his view were correct, there would have been a Great Company throughout the Age (and not simply crown-losers who still retained the priesthood)—a thing that is untrue, because there was no place in the tabernacle picture to represent the Great Company during the Gospel Age. These crown-losers until 1917 were Priests in the Holy, which disproves the thought under review with unanswerable power.

When he says that since Christ's anointing was completed before He began to preach, the same must be true as respects all the Under-priests, we reply, Not so. In the first place, Christ as a perfect human being had all the graces of the Spirit of a natural man perfectly. That part of the anointing that confers the spiritual qualities on the heart was accomplished unto completion in Him the moment of His begetting and not in the wilderness, where doubtless that part of the anointing that confers the necessary spiritual knowledge for service was completed in Him, though it began immediately at His begetting (Matt. 3: 16). Hence, contrary to J.F.R.'s claim, Acts 10: 38 does refer to the acts described in Matt. 3: 16 belonging to the anointing. Unlike our Lord, we do not receive the Spirit without measure. Hence our anointing, though begun both in head and heart before we begin to serve, goes on a long while after we have started to serve. Another reason for the difference is this:

Jesus' anointing had to be complete before He began to serve, otherwise His ministry would have had imperfections in it, which would have vitiated it; while in our ministry our inevitable weaknesses are covered by His merit. Since the completed anointing confers all the graces of the heart and all capabilities of the head for service; self-evidently our anointing, though begun before, goes on long after we have entered the service of the Lord's Plan as Priests. His confusing the gifts of the Spirit with the anointing is too transparent to call for comment. The Scriptures given above prove that crown-losers have lost their part in the anointing. These considerations completely overthrow his pertinent point.

Especially two Scriptures does he use in an attempt to prove his idea of *chosen* as meaning the approval and anointing of those who respond to his so-called "call" (to sacrifice) as given them *after their Spirit-begetting*: Rom. 8: 30 and 1 Cor. 6: 11. He interprets the call of Rom. 8: 30 to mean an invitation given to new creatures AS SUCH by enzealment for service *to enter the high calling*, which they actually entered at consecration, and Spirit-begetting (Rom. 6: 3; 1 Cor. 12: 12, 13; Gal. 3: 27-29; Col. 2: 11, 12). He interprets the justifying of Rom. 8: 30, not of God's acts, whereby He forgives our sins and imputes to us Christ's righteousness, but as God's approving the *new creature* that zealously accepts the invitation to go on and sacrifice and God's proceeding to anoint him, *i.e.*, to make him chosen. But St. Paul used the word *justify* here in its usual Biblical sense, as the connection proves; for in Rom. 8: 28-30 the four steps of the salvation process are described, as St. Paul implies them in Jesus' office functions as our wisdom, righteousness, sanctification and deliverance (1 Cor. 1: 30), but in inverse time order. Moreover, the passage teaches that all the called are justified, which contradicts his statement that all his called do not respond

and hence they are not all justified in his sense. Further, the passage teaches that all who were called, as it uses the word, had previously to their call been justified, which contradicts his view; for it puts his justification after his call. He does not attempt to explain the glorifying of v. 30. Making his call precede his justifying—his choosing—he must make his choosing precede his glorifying, however he may understand the latter; and, therefore, the passage would force him to teach that all his called are afterwards chosen, and all his chosen are afterward glorified. His principle of interpreting the passage, as giving the acts of v. 30 in their time order, makes necessary the Calvinists' teaching from this passage, contrary to facts and clear Scripture, the doctrine of once in grace, always in grace. His method of interpretation logically requiring all his called to be *afterward* justified, *i.e.*, chosen, contradicting his thought that only a minority of his called are his justified, chosen, proves that this passage contradicts instead of proving his new setting.

So, too, does he fare illy with 1 Cor. 6: 11. He quotes and in brackets interprets this passage as follows: "But [now] are ye washed [from sin by the blood of Jesus, and therefore at peace with God and justified from sin (Rev. 1: 5; Rom. 5: 1)]; but ye are sanctified; but ye are justified [approved because of your devotion to God and because you are chosen by him] in the name of our Lord Jesus [Christ] and by the spirit of our God." Properly the A. R. V. (compare its margin) translates as follows: "but ye washed [past tense] yourselves, ye were sanctified [past tense], ye were justified [past tense]." We therefore understand the passage in harmony with the Scriptural *time order* of the salvation processes to teach the following: by the words, ye *washed* yourselves, is meant, not justification by Christ's blood, but our cleansing ourselves by the Word—the antitypical

laver—from filthiness of the flesh and spirit, as also the connection, treating of abandoning sins, shows (Heb. 10: 22; Eph. 5: 26). By the word *sanctified* we understand our consecration, proved by the past tense of the Greek verb, to be meant; and by the word *justified* we understand God's vitalizing of our justification to be meant. Thus in this passage in their time order cleansing at the laver, consecration at the first vail and vitalizing justification immediately thereafter, which were of course followed by the Spirit-begetting, are set forth. And these three things all imply the necessity of our giving up sin, which the connection shows is the Apostle's thought, while the "justifying" under review is not related to sin, but to sacrifice. If the word "washed" meant justification as ordinarily used, the Greek would prove that we justify ourselves! Hence his thought does not fit the connection; moreover the interpretation under review leaves out of consideration an essential factor in putting aside sins—cleansing ourselves by the Word—which the connection and proper translation require. So, too, the interpretation under review sets aside the usual Scriptural meaning of the word *justify* and gives it a meaning that the Bible nowhere gives it.

In the March 15 installment of the article under review (which came to hand after we had written our remarks above on the article, Character or Covenant—Which?) the writer urges character development, saying that he never taught that we are not to develop character. He said that he meant that our character development would not bring us into the kingdom, as this would imply our meriting it. Would not his claims as to service make it equally merit the kingdom? St. Peter says that under the terms of our call character development—adding the graces, making them active and causing them to abound in us—will bring us into the kingdom (2 Pet. 1: 5-10); while St. Paul tells us that service, and that even to martyrdom,

unaccompanied by love—the chief part of character development—avails nothing (1 Cor. 13: 3). We are glad to see the remark in the article under review, that we must develop character, and that selling books will not bring into the kingdom. But these remarks should have been accompanied, not with the falsehood with which they are accompanied, that its writer did not teach that we are not to develop character; for that is stated and argued for in detail in the Tower article entitled, Character or Covenant—Which? Rather they should have been accompanied with a humble acknowledgment that he had not only taught that most grievous error, but that it has resulted in *much sin* among his responding adherents. He did in that article teach that the kingdom is won by keeping our covenant, whose keeping he limited *to service*, and he has continually emphasized book selling, and still does so, as the best form of sacrificial service now. He is responsible for the extreme emphasis placed on service in Society quarters and for the neglect there of the other six features of our covenant keeping. The hypocrisy of his acknowledgment has, therefore, influenced us to let remain above our strictures as a witness against his Satanic teachings on not developing character in Z '26, 131-136. He must have been finally convinced, by the loud outcries against this error and its terrible results in wicked living in Society circles, that he must withdraw that teaching. [In subsequent articles, as will later appear, he ridicules character development, which proves that he recanted his recantation.]

In the Dec. 1 and 15, 1929, Towers, he makes an attack on our Pastor's view of the Time of the End and the times and the days of Daniel 12, and sets forth foolishness thereon, introducing the attack with the hypocritical statement that he is not intending to attack previously held views. Briefly his view is this: that the Time of the End and the end of the Gentile Times

are identical, and that it came "approximately Oct. 1, 1914" (pars. 8-10, 12, 13, 29 and 36 in the Dec. 1 Tower and par. 1 in the Dec. 15, 1929, Tower); that "just exactly three and one-half literal years, or 1,260 days, by Biblical method of calculation, *after the Time of the End* [italics ours] there began, to wit, 1918, a great persecution of these holy people of God," *i.e.*, that immediately after the Time of the End the 1,260 days of Daniel began, ending 1,260 literal days later; that in the latter part of Jan., 1919, the 1,290 days began (by the claim allegedly then made by an official of the Federation of Churches that the League of Nations was "the political expression of God's kingdom," which claim supposedly put the League into the holy, which he explains as putting it in the place of the kingdom, a counterfeit of it, and thus supposedly made it the desolating abomination); that these 1,290 days ended in the beginning of Sept., 1922, at the Cedar Point Convention, when the announcement was made, "Advertise the King and the Kingdom"; that the 1,335 days began Sept. 1, 1922, and ended in the middle of May, 1926, during the London Convention, at which so much joy was experienced that Society adherents went out and sold 120,900 volumes during the convention, which greatly increased their joy! He further claims that Daniel does not refer in his book to the papacy though he concedes that there may have been a miniature (!) fulfilment of Daniel's prophecy in connection with the papacy in 1799; but he claims that the real fulfilment identifies the Time of the End with the end of the Gentile Times; and that it did not set in before the Lord began dispossession proceedings against Satan's empire. By his oft teaching that the "end of the Gentile Times," is "exactly identical with the Time of the End" and by his claiming that the 1,260 days immediately followed his Time of the End, he shows that he does not carry the Time of the End beyond "approximately Oct. 1, 1914." Of course, his

view necessitates his rejection of practically everything in Vol. III. And we are not to forget that he is by this perversion preparing his adherents to receive his denial that the Harvest began in 1874 and his claim that it began in 1918. Note the cunning of his procedure.

Against his view we have many objections: (1) Daniel tells us that at an appointed time a very arbitrary king would invade and conquer Egypt, then would invade Palestine, then through a naval defeat would return to Egypt and then, because the kings of the north and the south would combine against him, he would return to his own land exactly at the beginning of the Time of the End (Dan. 11: 29, 30, 40-45). No such things occurred just before and at "approximately Oct. 1, 1914"; nor did they occur during any part of the World War; nor did they occur nearer than over 100 years before 1914; but they did occur just before and at Oct., 1799, and not after then; hence the Time of the End did not begin and end in 1914; but it began 115 years before, *i.e.*, Oct., 1799.

(2) The Time of the End is a long-drawn-out period, because it began, as just proved, Oct., 1799, and will end just before Daniel's resurrection and reward as an Ancient Worthy (Dan. 12: 13). This has not yet occurred, nor will it occur for years yet. Hence this disproves "approximately Oct. 1, 1914," as the Time of the End. When our Pastor wrote Vol. III, he believed that the trouble would all be over by Oct., 1914, and that the earthly phase of the kingdom would then be established, and therefore in that volume he taught that the Time of the End, while beginning Oct., 1799, would end Oct., 1914. But when in 1904 he came to the conclusion that the trouble would begin in 1914 and refused thereafter to set a date for its end, he implied that the end of the Time of the End would come later than 1914, at a date he refused to set.

(3) The midnight of the parable (Matt. 25: 1-12) was April, 1877, when the cry, "Behold the Bridegroom," arose; but that night set in Oct. 1, 1799, as we have shown (P '27, 13, on Mark 13: 35; Luke 17: 34), hence that night comes to its first end in 1954, in the *beginning* of its lapping into the kingdom time. This night is the period of the Time of the End, whose lapping end reaches into the kingdom for 25 months more, *i.e.*, Nov., 1956, after which Daniel returns. Hence this overthrows the view that the Time of the End and the end of the Times of the Gentiles are identical, at about Oct., 1914.

(4) In (Hebrew, *be, in*, not *le, at*) the Time of the End Michael stands up (Dan 12: 1). This set in at Nisan 10, 1878 (paralleling His riding into Jerusalem 1845 years before and casting off Israel and cleansing the temple) when He began to exercise executive authority in casting off Babylon, and when by the first harvest sifting He began by the Truth to drive out from His temple class the unworthy. It continued by His awakening the sleeping saints Nisan 16, 1878, and associating them with Him in the kingdom. It—His standing up—then proceeded in a Truth attack upon Satan's empire (Satan, *the individual*, having been bound from 1874-1878 preparatory to the spoiling of his house, Matt. 12: 29), in its religious, aristocratic, political and industrial features, which attack made such a division in Satan's empire between the conservative classes and the radical masses as to threaten it with an overthrow by a revolution of the dissatisfied masses. To avert this threatening revolution and preserve his empire, Satan mustered the nations in two rival alliances for a war in which he hoped to wipe out the division between the conservatives and radicals by making them believe, in each set of nations, that the other set sought their national destruction. Hence the World War. Thus Christ's *Truth* attacks on Satan's empire from 1878 to 1914 were a

part of Michael's standing up. This beginning in 1878, "in the Time of the End," the Time of the End must have begun long before "approximately" Oct. 1, 1914. The parallel dispensations prove this date 1878, and the signs of the times corroborate it, *e.g.*, Christ's *Truth* attacks had so far divided Christendom, as above stated, that by 1882 and 1905 the Triple Alliance and the Triple Entente respectively were completed, as rival and increasingly angry groups of nations and as Satan's counteractive measures; and in 1914 the war set in, which was on Satan's part intended to do away with the danger of a revolution that would destroy his empire. Michael did not, as the article under review claims, begin to stand up "about Oct. 1, 1914"; though about that time an important phase of His standing up did set in. His standing up began in 1878 and will continue as against Satan's empire until the end of anarchy and Jacob's trouble.

We might remark that by the expression, "in [not *at*] that time," of Dan. 12: 1, not the point of the time of the acts described in the preceding verses, but the period of time to which they belong is meant. We have a similar case in Matt. 25: 1, "then." This does not refer to the time of the few preceding verses, which treat of J.F.R.'s activities as that evil servant, but to the period of the Time of the End described in Matt. 24: 14-51 (the last stage of the work of witnessing, v. 14, being performed through the missionary crusade and the Bible societies, which started their work about the beginning of the Time of the End, as the facts of history prove).

(5) During the Time of the End the whole trouble is to occur. Dan. 12: 1 does not say that, just the early stage of the war part of it, as J.F.R. implies, but the entire Time of Trouble, occurs in the Time of the End, including all its stages: war, revolution, anarchy and Jacob's trouble, with famines and pestilences

interspersed; for the reason of the trouble is Michael's standing up in an attack on Satan's empire from 1878 onward, in order utterly to destroy it through the troubles above-mentioned. J.F.R.'s claim that the designation, time of trouble such as never was since there was a nation, means the World War and that Jesus means another trouble—Armageddon—still worse, by the expression, "nor ever shall be," is a pure importation into the text; for Jesus says that the great tribulation would be greater than anything that had yet occurred up to *His* time or anything that would come after His time. Nothing in that text makes such a contrast as J.F.R. suggests, even as the verse shows: "Then shall be great tribulation, such as was not since the beginning of the world unto *this time* [the time of his speaking], no, nor ever shall be" (Matt. 24: 21). Mark's wording in 13: 19 is similar. The Scriptures do not in any one passage use the following language: "a time of trouble such as never was since there was a nation to that time, no, nor ever shall be afterward." Note the difference in Daniel's expression, "to *that* time," and our Lord's, "unto this [His] time." Since Dan. 12: 1 teaches that in the Time of the End the entire trouble will occur, evidently the Time of the End is not identical with the end of the Gentile Times. It began before and ends later.

(6) Dan. 12: 1 further teaches that during the Time of the End the entire elect Church, "*every one* that shall be found written in the book," will be delivered, *i.e.*, from the tomb and this earth by the first resurrection. Hence the Time of the End cannot be identical with the end of the Gentile Times. The parallel Harvests prove that the sleeping saints were awakened in 1878, while some of the saints are not yet delivered from this earth; hence the Time of the End began before 1878 and will last many years yet, which disproves this "new view."

(7) In the Time of the End there was to be much travel and increase of knowledge on all lines of thought, religious and secular (Dan. 12: 4). Such travel began with the invention of the steamship very shortly after 1799, continued with railroads and has increased with trolleys, automobiles, buses, airplanes and airships. And a marvelous increase of secular and religious knowledge marks the period from 1799 onward. If the Time of the End were identical with the end of the Gentile Times, at most a period of fifty days or at least one of one day [10th of the fifth (Aug. 1, 1914) to the 1st of the seventh month (Sept. 21, 1914), or Sept. 21, 1914, "approximately Oct. 1, 1914"] would not be sufficient for the predicted travel, and utterly insufficient for the increase of knowledge, which requires more than fifty days or one day to attain. Hence this disproves Aug. 1-Sept. 21, 1914 or Sept. 21, 1914, "approximately" Oct. 1, as the Time of the End.

J.F.R. tries to evade the thought of much travel and increase of all kinds of knowledge, claiming that spiritual knowledge only is meant by the terms of Dan. 12: 4, *i.e.*, what since 1918, 1922 and 1926 he has been giving his adherents. To this we reply: If his thought were true, it would contradict his view, for the passage says that the knowledge would come *in* the Time of the End, which he claims as identical with the end of the Gentile Times; hence *his* increase of knowledge comes years after his Time of the End. He disputes that the expression, run to and fro, means *to travel*, but claims that it means *to study*, *i.e.*, here the Truth. We deny his claim. He quotes 2 Chro. 16: 9; Jer. 5: 1; Zech. 4: 9, 10 and Amos 8: 11, 12, where the expression, run to and fro, occurs, claiming that it does not in them mean, to travel, but to study. We reply that in every case the idea of traveling is given and that in other verbs of the sentences the idea of study or other things are added. Thus when

2 Chro. 16: 9 says that the eyes of the Lord run to and fro throughout the earth to show Himself strong on behalf of them whose heart is perfect toward Him, the thought is that God's powers of observing, travel from one place to another unto every part of the earth to protect and strengthen His faithful people. Here a figurative traveling is described, because the eyes are figurative; a mental traveling, therefore, from place to place is indicated. Jer. 5: 1 exhorts some to travel by their literal feet throughout all the streets of Jerusalem, and while in such travel to seek to find and observe a righteous man. The running to and fro here is literal, a physical, traveling. What they are told to do amid their travels partakes of the character of study. Figurative travel, a mental movement from place to place, is also described in Zech. 4: 9, 10. Amos 8: 11, 12 describes by the running to and fro the literal travel in search of truth, which marks our day, *e.g.*, by scientists, archeologists, discoverers, explorers, etc. These do not find the Divine Truth by their travels and researches. All of these passages use the words, run to and fro, to mean travel, two of them describing physical, and two of them mental traveling. Whether it is a literal or a figurative traveling, it is nevertheless a traveling that they describe and they prove that the word, therefore, means *to travel*, not *to study*. Hence Dan. 12: 4 is rightly translated in the A. V., E. R. V., A. R. V., Young, Rotherham, the Baptist Version, the I. V., the Margolis V., Leeser, Fenton, etc., etc., etc. In fact it is the higher critics who, wishing by their translations to discount prophecies of patent signs of the times, give the idea under discussion.

The above seven reasons prove that our Pastor was right on beginning the Time of the End with 1799 and ending it just before Daniel's resurrection, a date which he refused after 1904 to fix and which, in the light of the Epiphany, was not due to be fixed in his time, which date

we now see will come in Nov., 1956, in its remotest end, the Time of the End coming to a lapping end from Oct., 1954, to Nov., 1956.

Briefly we will refute some of the subordinate errors of the article on the Time of the End. To its claim that Daniel in Dan. 8-12 represents the faithful people of God in and after the Time of the End, we reply that this cannot be true, for he did not understand those parts of the vision which they have been understanding. If he had typed them, *e.g.*, in Chapter 12, they would not now understand the vision; for in the type Daniel did not understand it. Jehovah sent the Rod of His Strength out of Zion with the commission to rule in the midst of His enemies, not in 1914, as he claims, but in 1874, at Christ's Second Advent. To his claim that the statement of the nations being angry (which he says began in 1914) following the statement made to God, "Thou hast taken to Thee Thy great power and reigned," proves that immediately before the trouble began (1914) God took unto Him His great power, *i.e.*, in 1914, we reply: this same argument would prove that immediately thereafter the judgment of Adam's dead race began, the reward of the Ancient Worthies, as well as of all the Little Flock, and the destruction of the Millennially incorrigible, would set in—absurdities! God took His power and reigned from 1878 on; the nations through Christ's Truth attacks on Satan's empire began to become angry shortly afterwards, so angry that by 1882 alliancing against one another had made much headway and worked much friction; and God's wrath began in 1914. It will be many years until the trial of the dead world begins. The reward of the sleeping saints began in 1878; but with some saints it will not be for years and that of the Ancient Worthies will begin after approximately Nov., 1956. The destruction of the first of the earth's corrupters will come a hundred years later, and that of the last nearly

1,000 years later. Thus Rev. 11: 17, and the other passages that he quotes, do not prove his point as to the Time of the End being "approximately" Oct. 1, 1914.

To his insinuation that our Pastor claimed that the formation of the Evangelical Alliance in 1846 completed the cleansing of God's people, we would say that the insinuation reveals the very imperfect understanding he has of our Pastor's remarks on that Alliance. It did not cleanse, but cut off from any association with it by its creed, the Sanctuary class, that by getting rid in 1846 of the errors, immortality and eternal torment additional to other errors previously given up, became cleansed from the main defilements of papacy. This was not a complete cleansing of God's people, but a cleansing from the defiling errors of the papacy connected with the mass. The cleansing of the 2,300 days is something totally different from that which began in 1878, when Jesus began to cleanse the temple class. Mal. 3: 2, 3 proves that this began early in the Parousia and continues in the Epiphany, among other things, six siftings being used to accomplish it. See Vol. V, Chap. II.

He says that those who talk against the Watch Tower's teaching are really talking against God, and that it proves them to have a bad condition of heart. This implies that God is responsible for the Watch Tower's teachings, including its errors. The Watch Tower publications taught that the Church would leave the world in 1918. Did those who witnessed against this error speak against God? The Watch Tower taught later that the door was closed in 1918 and that the Church would leave the world before 1925, that then the Ancient Worthies would come back and that none would thereafter have to die. Did those who years before 1925 proved these things to be erroneous thereby speak against God? In making God responsible for his errors J.F.R., the little pope of little

Babylon, is counter parting the great pope of great Babylon, who makes the same charges against the criticizers of his teachings. His calling opposers of his errors and wrong official practices, supporters of Satan's organization, is exactly what his great counterpart does as to his opponents. J.F.R. has long ceased being a mouthpiece of God and is Satan's chief servant and mouthpiece among Truth people.

We do not, as he falsely charges, give credit to Bro. Russell for our being led out of symbolic Egypt. So far as we know, C. J. Woodworth invented that thought with the addition that J.F.R. was the Joshua leading God's people into antitypical Canaan's possession. Jesus is the antitype of Moses and Joshua. He led us out of symbolic Egypt and used Pastor Russell as a servant of His in connection therewith, as He also subordinately used other servants therein. But Satan, acting as the little Pharaoh, is and has been using J.F.R. to enslave many of God's people in little Egypt, as our answers prove.

We now come to his folly on the 1,260, 1,290 and 1,335 days of Daniel. Against his 1,260 days as beginning at the end of the Gentile Times (Sept. 21, 1914) we present the following: (1) What we demonstrated above as to what is the real Time of the End—1799 to 1954—proves that the days of Daniel in each case began before his Time of the End.

(2) The breaking of the power of the little horn to devastate—"scatter"—by persecution the holy people's *power, which is the Truth*, was completed at the beginning of the real Time of the End, 1799. Who would claim that since 1799 the Truth has been devastated and thus lost to God's faithful people, as it was in papacy's heyday? Notice that this passage (Dan. 12: 7) does not say, as J.F.R. so gratuitously assumes, and then argues on it as an admitted truth, that God's people would after the 1,260 days no more be persecuted, nor be scattered by persecution. But what it

says is this: that no more after those days would their *power (which is the Truth)* be scattered—devastated—as it once was by the persecutions of the papacy. Punishment indeed in part came to certain false teachers—the Society leaders—for some of their false teachings and wrong acts, but not one item of Truth—the power of God's people—was crushed at that time or since or for 119 years before. Hence the 1,260 days could not have ended then.

(3) The facts unanswerably prove that since 1799 not only has the power of the holy people—the Truth—not gone down to defeat, but since 1829, when the Miller movement began, the vision began to open little by little and more and more, first through the Advent Movement, 1829-1844, especially on the chronology; second, in the cleansed Sanctuary on various matters, especially on the unconsciousness of the dead and death as sin's penalty and on further chronological unfoldings, 1846-1874; third, in the Parousia movement, 1874-1914; and since then in the Epiphany movement. Out of every controversy against its peculiar truths and those previously due, each of these movements emerged triumphant, unanswerably refuting attacks and most gloriously elaborating the Truth as due with ever increasing brilliancy. These are the "physical facts," absolutely indisputable, of the conditions since 1799; therefore since the scattering—devastating—of the Truth, the power of the holy people, ceased since then, the 1,260 days ended then.

(4) The 1,260 days must have ended before the 2,300 days, because by the end of the 2,300 days the Church was cleansed (Hebrew, *justified*, *i.e.*, vindicated) in the sense of being ridded of the defilements in, and by her controversies coming to see and then overthrowing the errors directly or indirectly connected with the mass. This does not mean that by then the Church was cleansed from all error, but from those that were related in any logical way to the specially

desolating teaching of the abomination of desolation, *i.e.*, the mass. Such vindication unto cleansing from everything connected with that defiling doctrine implied the complete victory over every papal argument closely or remotely connected with it—*a thing that proves that previously to 1846 the Truth as the power of this holy people had been freed from desolation* sufficiently to accomplish this, because without such previous freedom it could not have cast off every argument for the mass coming from it or any of its associated doctrines (Dan. 8: 13, 14).

(5) The beginning of the 2,300 days being definitely fixed at 455 B.C. by 490 of them being cut off from their beginning to lead to the events of Dan. 9: 24, which ended in 36 A.D., and the angel's explanations in Dan. 11 and 12 being given to clarify the vision of Dan. 8: 9-12 and certain brief explanations of vs. 13-25, the word *days* in the expression, 2300 days, used in the explanation, standing for years, the word *days* used in the other explanations of the vision, *i.e.*, 1,260, 1,290 and 1,335 (Dan. 12: 7-12) must stand for years. This destroys the view of the article under review on these three periods; for it claims that they are literal days.

(6) The fact that the vision was to speak in the Time of the End, 1799 to 1954 (Dan. 12: 9; Hab. 2: 3), and that through the Miller movement (1829-1844) it began to speak and has been increasingly doing so, proves that not only the Time of the End came before 1829, but that then the 1,290 days ended; for Dan. 12: 10, 11 shows that the wise would begin to understand at the end of the 1,290 days. This also proves the days to be symbolic and disproves Jan., 1919, to Sept., 1922, to be the 1,290 days.

(7) The fact that from the end of the 1,335 days great blessedness would come to the faithful through the very special opening of the Truth from then onward, when "in the end"—the Harvest (the reaping,

1874 to 1914, and the rest of the harvest processes, 1914 to 1954) the vision *would speak and not lie* (Hab. 1: 1-3), and the fact that the glorious Parousia and Epiphany messages have given this joy—O, "joy unspeakable and full of glory!" "Blessed be the Lord!"—prove that the 1,335 days were that many years and that they ended in 1874. This also proves that they—the 1,260, 1,290, 1,355 days—began to count from 539 A.D. and that the papacy is the abomination that maketh desolate, which vindicates our Pastor's view and destroys the view under consideration, that the 1,335 days were literal and began Sept., 1922, and ended May, 1926.

We will now refute some of the details of J.F.R.'s "new view" on these points—mud splashes—that in his blindness, drunkenness and folly he mistakes for lightning flashes. His claim that the wonders (whose duration is asked for in Dan. 12: 6) are God's organization and Satan's organization, is arbitrary and without any justification, is read into the text and is contrary to the answer of v. 7, that they are associated with the crushing of the Truth, and as such are mentioned in Dan. 8: 24. These wonders, therefore, were papacy's wicked and triumphant course and its treatment of others, especially the saints, and of the Truth. His reading into v. 7 the word *days* instead of *things*, *i.e.*, the wonders asked about in v. 6 and answered in v. 7, is refuted by the fact that duration of the wonders is asked about in v. 6 and answered in v. 7. Hence the *wonders* are undoubtedly the *things* meant by the expression, "these things." To his claim that the "he" that scatters the power of God's people (v. 7) is Satan, we reply: Dan. 8: 9-25 being here explained proves the "he" to be the little horn—the papacy. None of the persecutions previous to papacy's desolated the Truth. Since no more crushing of the power of the holy people takes place after the 1,260 days, and since *his* persecution, that of himself and his followers, in 1918 (notice: not crushing

the Truth) *began after* his 1,260 days ended, *his* persecution cannot be meant by the persecution that crushed the power of the holy people; for the latter was to occur *during* the 1,260 days and end with their end, whereas the persecution of his view began after his 1,260 days had to end. Thus from Sept. 21, 1914 (the first day of the seventh month and the full end of the Gentile Times), to Dec. 31 were 102 days; 1915, 365; 1916, 366, and 1917, 365. These total 1,199; and 61 days more bring us to March 2, 1918, after which, if these were the real 1,260 days and if persecution of the Lord's people as distinct from crushing the Truth were meant, as he claims, no persecution of them was to come. But it was March 14, 1918, nearly two weeks later, when the U. S. Government forbade the distribution of the Finished Mystery and ordered the arrest of all who would thereafter distribute it (Z '18, 133, par. 5). The Society leaders were arrested May 8, 1918 (Z '18, 171, par. 4), a few days before which the Society's books, private papers, etc., at the Brooklyn headquarters were seized (Z '29, 372, par. numbered 8. Note how in this last citation *Lawyer* Rutherford falsifies the time of the seizing of the Society's papers and the arrest of its officers, putting these in February, 1918, in order to get them into his 1,260 days!—falsehoods that are manifest by the dates in the citations above given from the 1918 Towers). The scattering (not of the Truth, but) of his followers occurring after his 1,260 days had to end, March 2, 1918, proves the disharmony of his view with the pertinent Scriptures, even if the days were literal. Hence his 1,260 days are not only wrong, but contradict the Scripture requirements which call for the end of the scattering of the holy people's power, the Truth, at the end of the 1,260 days; whereas the American persecution, which he claims is the scattering of the power of the holy people, began after

his 1,260 days had ended; and it only partially ended over a year later!

We should say something on his abomination that maketh desolate—the League of Nations. The papacy is the real abomination that maketh desolate because: (1) it desolated every doctrine, every organizational arrangement and every practice of the true Church; (2) its hierarchy for the most part have been crown-losing new creatures and thus they have really been in the temple (2 Thes. 2: 3-5)—the Church; (3) as Antichrist it counterfeited everything of the Plan; (4) especially it took away the continual efficacy of the sacrifice of Christ by substituting the mass; and (5) its character and history are abominable. These things prove it to be in a real sense the greatest possible desolating abomination. Protestant denials of the ransom did not take away that doctrine from the true Church, nor did they put in the true Church a doctrine that set aside the continuing sacrifice of Christ, as the papacy did, therefore their ransom denials are not related to the real abomination, as he claims. But what doctrine, organizational arrangement and practice of the true Church has the League of Nations destroyed? When was it, in its members (which are nations), in the true Church ("standing in the holy," "in the temple of God"), as a part of it? When did it counterfeit everything of God's Plan? When did it take away the continual sacrifice, by putting in its place a substitute? When did it have toward God's people and the world one thousandth so desolating a character and history as the papacy? When did it ever do anything against the true Church, her teachings, organization and practices that took these away from her? Never! What if some foolish official of the Federation of Churches said it was the political expression of God's kingdom? The papacy said that of mightier institutions, *e.g.*, the Christian Roman Empire and the Holy Roman Empire, than the imbecile League of Nations, the football of

the larger powers! Notice the sophistry of the article under review in that it says that the federation's alleged and resultless declaration above stated put the League in the place of the real kingdom, *i.e.*, made it a counterfeit kingdom. But that did not put one member of it into the Holy—the Spirit-begotten condition—a condition in which the papacy, whose members as a rule have been new creatures, has been, and thus has been *in the Church* and then *seated* itself there, *i.e.*, made itself a god, ruler, there. What transparent folly is J.F.R.'s thought as to the desolating abomination!

He makes his periods longer than 1,260, 1,290 and 1,335 days, for he treats them as consisting of three years and six months, three years and seven months and three years and eight months and fifteen days, solar time, which makes his period in each case longer than it should be, *i.e.*, it makes his 1,260 days 1,278, his 1,290 days 1,309, and his 1,335 days 1,356. As a result the second and third overlap one another. These facts spoil his periods and prevent his applications from being cogent, even if everything else were unobjectionable. And to end the 1,290 (1,309) days at and by a meeting where "advertise the King and Kingdom," with millions now living will never die after 1925 (!) was adopted as a slogan, shows the folly of its propounder. And to say that the blessedness of Dan. 12: 12 came in the joy that was experienced just before and at the sale of 120,900 books (printed, for the most part, contrary to God's will expressed through that Servant, that the Tower editors should publish nothing but Tower articles) during the London Convention in May, 1926, is an expression of lack of proportion as well as of folly in the propounder of the thought.

We believe it is now due time to inform our readers what the sacrifices of the Society *partisans*, especially in their book-selling phases, are. They are in the little

Catholic Church of little Babylon the counterpart of the mass in the large Catholic Church of Great Babylon! A few explanations will make this clear. In the papal counterfeit, the mass offered by a counterfeit priesthood is the counterfeit of the Sin-offering of the Church, the true priesthood. The *partisan* Spirit-begotten Societyites are Great Company members and its other consecrated *partisans are Youthful Worthies*, all of whom claim to be the true, but are a counterfeit priesthood; their sacrifice is, therefore, a counterfeit of the Church's sin-offering, and hence is in little Babylon the counterpart of the mass. The little Catholic Church's hierarchy—the Society's president, the little pope, its pilgrims, the little cardinals, its office managers at headquarters and branch offices, the little archbishops, and its service directors, the little bishops—constitute the little Antichrist of little Babylon, counterfeiting the true Church in the flesh, under Christ, its Head. And the above little mass with their many other errors in doctrine, organization and practice, ever increasing, are evidences that these leaders under and with the little pope in the small Gospel Age are the little abomination that maketh desolate. This little Antichrist has set aside the Sin-offering of the true Church and put in its place the little mass. Thus we see the rock-bottom reason for the great falling away from the Truth that, with ever increasing momentum, is going on in the Society.

In part of the above, as published in the April, 1930, *Present Truth*, we reviewed some follies of right-eye darkening as they had been manifested during about fourteen months previous to that time in J.F.R.'s Tower writings. Since then [up to March, 1931] he has continued to run true to form by publishing as alleged advancing light more of his nocturnal hallucinations. Almost everything that he writes gives to the Lord's people increasing evidence that he is fulfilling the role of the foolish and unprofitable shepherd,

the Jambresite leader among Truth sifters and that wicked servant. We will now review the Towers from April 1, 1930, to Feb. 15, 1931. In practically every one of them J.F.R. reiterates his thought that in 1918 our Lord came to the temple and since 1919 has been gathering the Faithful into, and casting the unfaithful out of it. Not one pertinent proof has he ever offered that connects the Lord's coming to His temple with the year 1918. The parallel dispensations, the chronology, the Jubilees, the 1335 days of Daniel, the Sabbath, the signs of the times and the Pyramid prove that He came there in 1874. If He has been gathering His faithful into the temple since 1919, and that as a special reward, they could not have been there before; but the Bible proves that they have been there ever since Pentecost (1 Cor. 3: 16, 17; 6: 19; 2 Cor. 6: 16; Eph. 2: 21; 2 Thes. 2: 4; Rev. 8: 4; 11: 1; 15: 6). Furthermore, if they were not gathered there before 1919, no one was there before 1919. How, then, could the Lord's people as the seven angels have come out of it with the seven vials since 1886? His false "new views" of Revelation, that make it from chapter 4 onward apply from 1919 onward, were forced upon him by his temple errors, while the demonstrated fulfilment of the bulk of the Revelation before 1914 proves these new views, as well as his temple views, to be erroneous.

In almost every one of the articles under review he reiterates his thought that Satan challenged God to create a man that would keep his integrity. Nowhere does the Bible give such a thought. He seeks to draw this thought from Job as an alleged type of man unfallen, fallen and restored. To this we reply: (1) Satan did not challenge God to find in Job a man who would maintain his integrity; but God permitted Satan, in an answer to his charge that Job's piety was selfish and could be undermined, to seek to prove his charge (Job. 1: 6-12; 2-16). (2) Job is not a type of unfallen, fallen and restored mankind, though he might,

as our Pastor said, be used in certain limited respects to illustrate mankind as such. But there is a vast difference between a limited illustration and a type; for the latter requires a correspondence in every detail between the type and antitype, while it is impossible to find detailed correspondence between unfallen, fallen and restored mankind and the pious, persecuted, suffering Job and fallen man, *e.g.*, Satan failed to corrupt Job, while he did corrupt all humans who will get restitution; Job suffered faithfully as a test of his righteousness; not so Adam and that part of his fallen race that will get restitution; Job got twice as much as he lost, not so will Adam and his race fare; Job's prayers make the sacrifices of his three detractors acceptable; not so will Adam and his race work, for the sacrifices of the worst of mankind as well as of the best of them will be made acceptable by the Christ's sacrifice. Many other reasons could be given in disproof of the thought under review, not to mention the boundless arbitrariness, dogmatism and foolishness in many details of the view under examination. Some day we hope to present to our readers the true typical teachings of the book of Job, with Job's antitype as being priestly (Jas. 5: 10, 11). The idea that J.F.R. sets forth, that God is proving, as an answer to an alleged Satanic challenge, that He can place a race on earth that will maintain its integrity and has been occupying Himself with such a challenged task for more than 6,000 years and will continue with it for 1,000 years more, belittles God and degrades His character and plan. Not as an answer to an imaginary challenge, which God has too much self-respect to accept, but as a demonstration and revelation of His glorious wisdom, power, justice and love in the interests of all free moral agents, is God working out His glorious plans—purposes—with mankind and angels, and will bring them to pass.

Throughout these articles teachings are set forth and

appeals are made that make fear of, and opposition to Satan one of the chief motives of the Christian. As a matter of fact, our trust in God is to be so great that we are not to fear Satan at all, though we are to be on our guard against him. Moreover, opposition to Satan can never be more than a negative side of the Christian life, while constructive work in the study, spread and practice of the Word and the faithful endurance of the incidental experiences belong to the positive and overshadowing side of the Christian life. Moreover, in these articles there is expressed a blatant dogmatism that should put the careful Christian on his guard against their writer. Unproven, foolish and false assertions are time and time again pounded in dogmatically by such terms as: "it follows conclusively," "beyond a peradventure," "beyond contradiction," "beyond the shadow of a doubt," "without the fear of successful contradiction," "unquestionably," etc., etc., etc. As our Pastor said, let us beware of those who try with such dogmatism to pound in their theories. A humble servant of God never would so do; for such are the earmarks of popes—great and *little*—and heady, arrogant, power-grasping and puffed-up, dogmatists.

The last Tower reviewed before them was that of March 15, 1930. The very next issue of the Tower came out with the denial that God has a plan. Thus J.F.R. would cast out of court Vol. I. While he concedes that God has a purpose, he avers that to say that He has a plan would imply imperfection in God and would consequently be blasphemy, the reason for which he alleges is that imperfect men make plans. If they are good ones, they are expressions of man's vestiges of perfection; hence good plans would not imply imperfection in a perfect being. He says that God just wills a thing without planning about it; and it comes to pass. In reply we say that both the Bible and facts prove that God has made a plan and is working

it out. No sophistries on a purpose as opposed to a plan can stand in the presence of the proof. His sophistry on this matter becomes apparent when we remember that while some purposes are without a plan, others are planned. A plan is an arrangement of various co-operating and interrelated features whereby some object is worked out. If a purpose is such an arrangement it is a plan. If not, it is not a plan. God's purpose with creation is to glorify Himself by bringing into existence a perfect animate and inanimate creation, the former on various planes of being and developed through various more or less interdependent processes. Thus God's purpose of bringing such beings into perfect existence worked itself out along the lines of an intricate interlocking and interdependent arrangement, or plan. Not only so, but it did so in constant use of definite periods and precise years, often days, for the accomplishment of its various features, and a precise period of years for the accomplishment of the whole. These facts prove that God's purpose was a plan and they prove the futility of J.F.R.'s claim that a purpose and a plan are mutually contradictory and exclusive.

Having just proven by the facts of the case that God has a plan, we now will prove it from Bible passages. In Rom. 8: 28 the word *purpose* evidently means *plan*; for in this and in the following verses the steps of the plan's development as respects the Church are set forth in reverse chronological order—deliverance, sanctification, justification, instruction. See also 1 Cor. 1: 30. That the word *purpose* in Rom. 9: 11 involves the idea of *plan* is evident from its reference to election as a feature of it. In Eph. 1: 4 God's predestinating a class before the foundation of the world proves a plan in which predestination of classes prevails. V. 5 proves this thought further by showing that the predestination was to sonship in Christ. That this was done according to the good pleasure of His will, as v. 6 shows, so

as to reflect credit upon Him, further proves a reasoned-out plan made many thousands of years before these predestinated ones came into existence. The fact that it is called in v. 9 the revealed *mystery*, the secret, of His will, purposed in Christ, further proves it a part of a plan. And the fact that the chosen ones were predestinated according to the purpose of God, who works out *all* things [of that purpose] according to the *counsel* [plan] of His will, proves that God's purpose is a plan and that He, therefore, has a plan. So completely equivalent in meaning to the word *plan* is the word *purpose* in Eph. 3: 11 that the Diaglott renders it by the word *plan*; and the fact that its various features must run through a number of ages—the plan of the Ages—each one accomplishing a different feature of God's purpose, demonstrates that the word *purpose* here means *plan*. The additional fact that it expresses the manifold wisdom, reasoned Truth, of God proves that it is a plan. His having prearranged this purpose proves it to be a plan. Furthermore, 2 Tim. 1: 9 proves that this purpose was prearranged before ages-lasting times began, which also proves it to be a plan, as well as a purpose.

That God's disposition is one that plans is apparent from the terms of the anointing in Is. 11: 2, *e.g.*, "counsel." God's eternal plan is expressly referred to in Ps. 33: 11 and Is. 46: 10, 11. Other passages prove under the word *counsel* that God has a plan. We submit a few of these: Speaking of the Great Company the Lord says in Ps. 107: 11: "They contemned the *counsel* of the Most High." Jesus as Ransomer is set forth as the center of God's plan, and that as a matter of foreknowledge, in Acts 2: 23: "Who was delivered by the determinate *counsel* and foreknowledge of God." With this agrees Acts 4: 28: "To do whatever Thy hand and Thy *counsel* determined before to be done." When St. Paul said that he had not shunned to declare the whole *counsel* of God he referred to his

explaining every general feature of God's plan (Acts 20: 27). The immutability of that plan is set forth in Heb. 6: 17. Accordingly, both facts and the Bible teach that God plans matters and has a plan. Hence that is error and blasphemy that denies that it is in harmony with His perfection for Him to make plans. Hence the drunken folly in right-eye darkening just considered.

Another form of drunken folly in right-eye darkening is found in Z '30, 102, pars. 21-25, where J.F.R. denies that Ps. 8: 4-6 applies to Adam, and to the race in Adam. He denies that all things were subject to Adam, despite God's statement in Gen. 1: 26, 28 to the contrary, and that he was crowned with glory and honor, though with one hand he restrictively offers such a thought, but withdraws it with the other. He applies the passage exclusively to our Lord in His glorified condition. But the Apostle Paul in Heb. 2: 6-8 does apply that passage to Adam, and the race in him. At the time that St. Paul quoted these words Jesus was crowned with the kind of glory and honor that J.F.R. says the Bible ascribes to Christ in His exaltation; for such had been His ever since His resurrection and more particularly since His ascension (Matt. 28: 18; Rom. 14: 9; Phil. 2: 9-11). But the last part of Heb. 2: 8 says that the one of whom it treats was not at that time over all things, though vs. 6-8 show that he had been over all things, *i.e.*, on earth. Furthermore, that kind of a glory and honor that J.F.R. denies to Adam v. 9 says Christ had while "a little lower than angels" in order to die as man's ransom. Hence it was the glory and honor of perfect humanity—the image (glory) and likeness (rulership, *i.e.*, honor) of God in the human Jesus and in the unfallen Adam. The ransom argument in v. 9 proves unfallen Adam, and the race in him to be meant in vs. 6-8. The connection between vs. 6-8 and v. 9 also proves this thought. That the expression, "son of man" (which he insists proves Jesus to be

meant in Ps. 8: 4-6), in addition to being a title of Jesus (usually occurring in the Greek as *the* son of *the* man) is also in the Bible applied to others, and when so used means man generally or also a human being, is evident from Num. 23: 19; Job 25: 6; Ps. 144: 3, 4; 146: 3; Is. 51: 12; Jer. 49: 18, 33; 51: 43; Dan. 8: 17. Perhaps a hundred times is this expression addressed to Ezekiel, who was neither our Lord nor a type of our Lord. Neither was Daniel (8: 17) either of such. Hence the thought under review is drunken folly in right-eye darkening.

In Z '30, 134, par. 22, another illustration of the same quality is found: for he there says that the Amalekites, the Egyptians, the Assyrians and the inhabitants of Sodom and Gomorrah were not sentenced to death, and disconnects their punishments in every sense from such a sentence. That they were under sentence to death through Adam is directly taught in Rom. 5: 12, 16-19; Eph. 2: 3 and indirectly taught in Rom. 5: 13-15; 1 Cor. 15: 21, 22. It is true that special sins brought an accelerated and emphatic death upon them; but even if they had not been guilty of such special sins, they all as individuals would shortly afterwards have died as a result of inheriting the death sentence from Adam. The drunken folly in right-eye darkening just pointed out is in violent contradiction of two of the seven main features of God's plan: man's fall and sentence in Adam and the Ransom.

In Z '30, 147-153, is an article that denies that the permission of evil is educational or beneficial for either the world or the Church. In this article he is attacking the Scriptural doctrine as to why God has permitted evil for the world and the Church. With the sophistry of the proverbial lawyer misrepresenting matters to a jury, he misrepresents the Biblical view of when the experience with evil works good for the world and then proceeds to refute this misrepresentation,

i.e., he sets up a man of straw and then kicks it over. He puts it like this: Evil *has never* done the world any good; for the world in spite of its sufferings is going on from bad to worse and is now worse than it ever was. We agree that evil men wax worse and worse. But our Pastor in giving the Bible teaching on the educational effect of evil on mankind never said that the effect is experienced while the race is undergoing the experience with evil, but that this effect will be produced during the experience with righteousness, when the race after the experience with evil is over will amid the blessedness of the experience with righteousness, by the *contrasted comparison between the two experiences*, learn to hate and avoid sin and to love and practice righteousness.

All students of the chapter on the Permission of Evil in Vol. I know that this was our Pastor's thought. And this thought he illustrated by the proverb, "The burnt child dreads the fire." It is during the healing process, after a number of burnings are over, that the child learns to dread the fire, as he considers the pains and injuries that were caused by it. So, too, this is the way the Bible sets forth the subject, as shown above, among other things, by our comments on Ps. 90: 11-17, as the clearest Scripture that teaches our Pastor's thought given above as to why God permits evil for the world. We refer our readers to that discussion, and more especially to the Studies, Vol. I, Chapter 7, where the thought is given and proven as above set forth. But he makes matters worse by denying that the permission of evil has done the Church any good. On this point every faithful child of God will from his own experience contradict him; for he has had experiences with troubles and sufferings from which through a faithful use of the Spirit and Word of God he has been enabled to put aside faults and develop good traits.

The Bible emphatically teaches this thought. Jesus,

the sinless One, was by suffering perfected in obedience (Heb. 5: 8, 9), in mercy and faithfulness (Heb. 2: 17, 18) and in every other point of character (Heb. 2: 10). The Bible expressly says that tribulation works (develops in the saints) patience, the final overcoming quality (Rom. 5: 3). Referring more especially to the afflictions of the saints, though other experiences are also included, St. Paul says that all things work together for good to those that love God, which good he particularizes as Christ-likeness (Rom. 8: 28, 29), at which J.F.R. repeatedly casts slurs in some of the articles that will be reviewed in this chapter. St. Paul expressly says that by the perishing of our outward man through afflictions the inner man is renewed daily, and that these afflictions work out a far more exceeding and eternal weight of glory [crystallized character] while we look at things spiritual (2 Cor. 4: 16-18). In a wonderful discussion of the disciplines that God gives His new-creaturely sons, St. Paul shows that they enable us to develop holiness and the fruit of righteousness and help to correct faults (Heb. 12: 10-13). St. James tells us that our trials of faith, including, among other things, afflictions, sufferings, troubles, work such a patience as will effect our perfection of character (Jas. 1: 2-4). St. Peter tells us that these fiery trials, like the goldsmith's fire, which burns the dross out of the ore, refine our character into the glory of the Divine image, as they also result in praise given to God and the honor of rulership coming to us (1 Pet. 1: 7). He also says that afflictions for Christ make the Spirit of glory [the Divine image] and of God abound in us (1 Pet. 4: 14). That afflictions lead the consecrated to reformation, and are therefore sent by God in His faithfulness to them, is also taught in Ps. 119: 67, 71, 75; Is. 26: 16; Rev. 3: 17. The examples of Jacob, Joseph, his ten brothers, Job, David, Hezekiah, Jeremiah, Jonah, Peter, etc., etc., prove their cleansing and upbuilding effect on the

righteous. The history of Manasseh and the story of the prodigal son are illustrations of how in this life some of God's wayward people are by affliction helped to reformation. No amount of drunken and right-eye darkened folly can sophistrize out of these passages and facts the thought of the beneficial ministry of affliction to saints and reformable backsliders. These Scriptures on the design of the experience with evil for the world and the Church prove this, another teaching of J.F.R., to be drunken folly of right-eye darkening.

Another piece of drunken folly in right-eye darkening is found in Z '30, 163, par. 7 to 165, par. 21. Here he sets forth the thought that the angels were not the symbolic stars—teachers—in the dispensation before the flood; but were such during the Jewish Age. We will first show the sophistry of his argument on this point, then will refute his position. The sophistry is this: he confounds the ministries of the angels, who transmitted revelations of God's plan, with interpretative teachings on that plan. It is one thing to minister an original Divinely-inspired revelation of one or more features of God's plan. It is entirely a different thing as the symbolic heavens to interpret, or affect to interpret to the people of a symbolic earth various features of that plan. The passages that he quotes on the activities of the angels during the Jewish Age in being messengers from God with respect to Truth matters refer only to their ministering *Divinely-inspired revelations* as parts of God's plan and embodied as such in the Bible. They do not refer to their interpreting as symbolic stars those revelations to the people in the symbolic earth; for not understanding them as a rule (1 Pet. 1: 12), they could not interpret them. Apart from announcing the Ten Commandments to the whole people of Israel, such angelic ministries were limited to individuals like Moses, Aaron, Miriam, Manoah and his wife, Gideon, Joshua, David and the prophets, who,

then, as stars enlightened the people (Heb. 1: 1). These angels, apart from audibly speaking the Ten Commandments to all Israel, never taught God's people as a whole, which they would have done, had they been the symbolic heavens of the second earth during the Jewish Age. The teachers of Israel were the prophets, priests and Levites, as symbolic stars. This consideration refutes his claim as to the angels being the teachers of God's people during the Jewish Age.

Again, he teaches drunken folly of right-eye darkening when he by way of contrast says that for the Gospel Age the angels *ceased* ministering to the people *as symbolic* stars and others took their place as such stars. The New Testament proves that from 3 B.C. to about 100 A.D. angels were used in ministering parts of the New Testament revelation, as the experiences of Zacharias, the father of John the Baptist, of Mary, the mother of Jesus, of Joseph, Jesus' foster father, of the shepherds of Bethlehem, of Cornelius, of Peter, of Paul, etc., show. Rev. 1: 1 (see also Rev. 22: 8, 16) proves that all the visions of Revelation were by Jesus given to John through the inspired revelatory ministry of an angel, whom the literal John twice attempted to worship and was by him rebuked for it (Rev. 19: 10; 22: 8, 9). We know that an angel ministered St. Peter's vision in Acts 10 and St. Paul's visions mentioned in 2 Cor. 12, because Jesus from His ascension on to 1874 remained in heaven (Acts 3: 21) and used angels as agents to represent Him (Rev. 1: 1). For this reason, while the Spirit enabled the Apostles to see into the new Divine revelations communicated to them after Pentecost, the communication of them to their minds was usually by the ministry of angels, just as in the case of the prophets, who not having the Spirit of begettal, as the Apostles had, could not understand them (1 Pet. 1: 10-12), as could the Apostles. Without angelic ministrations the Spirit enabled the Apostles to understand the

Old Testament revelations as due. Thus the ministry of angels, so far as ministering knowledge instructionally is concerned, was identical in both Ages. They did it, except in the one case mentioned (giving the Ten Commandments), only to the human agents who were to transmit it to the people, but apart from that one case they did not do it to the people directly. Not only so, but the same thing was done in a revelatory way in the Patriarchal Age, as appears from the case of Abraham, Jacob and Joseph (Acts 7: 2; Gen. 12: 1; 17: 1; 18; 19; 28: 12-22; compare with 48: 4, 15, 16; 32: 24-30). Hence the ministry of angels throughout the second dispensation until 100 A.D., so far as the Word is concerned, was not that of interpretative teachers of it—symbolic stars—but was that of agents ministering it inspirationally as a revelation to a few individuals, who in turn became the symbolic stars of it to the people. And this they were throughout the time that the revelation was given by Divine inspiration, *i.e.*, with the Patriarchs, Moses and the Prophets and the writers of the New Testament. Apart from this they did no teaching, *e.g.*, the angel told Cornelius where he could get an expounder of the Word, but did not venture to teach it to him (Acts 11: 13, 14).

Briefly we will now refute J.F.R.'s denial that the angels were the first symbolic heavens and had charge of the world before the flood. That angels have been the symbolic heavens—symbolic stars that enlightened the symbolic earth—in some dispensation is evident from the fact that they are Biblically called stars (Job 38: 7, Is. 14: 13). Above we proved that they have not been the teachers of the people—the stars—of the second symbolic earth. Heb. 2: 5 ("Unto the angels hath He not put in subjection the world to come") proves that they will not be the heavens of the third dispensation, which will be the Christ (Dan. 12: 3; Mal. 4: 2; Matt. 13: 43; Rev. 21: 1). Hence, having been symbolic stars, the angels must have been the

stars of the first symbolic heaven, that before the flood (Gen. 6: 2-4). While on this point we desire to say that the reason is false that J.F.R. has given for limiting the morning stars of Job 38: 7 to the Logos and Lucifer, *i.e.*, that these two only are meant, and not, as the parallelism shows, all angels are meant. He alleges that there are only two stars that can be morning stars. That this is untrue is apparent from the fact that this year [1931] there have been or will be five different morning stars: "Mercury, January 21-26 and September 22-28; Venus until September 8; Mars until May 27; Jupiter until November 15; Saturn, January 5 to April 13." Hence our discussion on the angels exposes some more drunken folly of right-eye darkening in J.F.R.

The next item of drunken folly in right-eye darkening he sets forth in Z '30, 179-184, which teaches that the Little Flock in glory are not the angels who come with Christ in His Second Advent, according to Matt. 25: 31, but that these angels are the spirit-servant angels, and that, furthermore, such angels, and not the saints in the flesh, are the reapers of Matt. 13: 39 and Matt. 24: 31, and that their reaping consists of gathering the saints into the temple since 1919 and driving the unsaintly out of the temple. In refutation of his view of the angels of Matt. 25: 31, we would reply: (1) the phase of our Lord's Second Advent referred to in this passage is that which comes after the Time of Trouble; for it is only then that He comes and sits on His Mediatorial throne and gathers all nations before Him for restitutional opportunities. (2) Only at that time does He come in *His* glory, which includes, from the standpoint of the priestly figure, the garments of glory and beauty. These are not put on until after the entire Christ is beyond the veil and the Great Company has left this earth; for these garments are donned only after the blood of the antitypical Goat is applied, since the Christ does not get the prerogatives and

powers typed by these garments until after the purchase of the world, when God gives the Christ class the powers of blessing the world typed by those garments. (3) Not those spirit servants of God who are, among others, called angels as distinct from God's spirit sons—saints—are to be with Christ at the phase of the coming set forth in Matt. 25: 31 ("all His holy angels *with* Him"), *i.e.*, associates, joint-heirs, partners, but God's spirit sons are to be such (Rom. 8: 17; 2 Tim. 2: 10-12). (4) Long before that phase of Christ's coming referred to in Matt. 25: 31 all the saints will (and that before the Epiphany's end) be with Him in glory (Col. 3: 4), though *His* glory will not be received until some time after the last one of these will be joined to Him. (5) Such a coming must be long after Christ came to His temple (Mal. 3: 1-3), because Mal. 3: 1-3 implies subsequent events that precede the coming of Matt. 25: 31. (6) At such a coming there could be no use of the servant angels, since the kingdom work will then be on, in which the spirit servants, so far as we know, have no part. (7) Hence the angels of Matt. 25: 31 cannot be the servant angels; but must be the son angels, the glorified saints. Hence the drunken folly of J.F.R.'s right-eye darkening on Matt. 25: 31 is manifest.

To his claims on the servant angels' gathering the saints into the temple as the harvest work, we make the following replies: (1) The saints as such, being God's temple from the beginning of the Age, could not since 1919 as such be gathered into it as parts of it. (2) Being parts of the World's High Priest from the outstart of their sainthood, they at once entered, and throughout the Age under their Head have ministered in the temple (Rev. 8: 4). (3) They could not have been gathered into it by the reaping process, seeing that before the reaping they were already parts of the temple and of the World's High Priest and thus were already in the temple. (4) The gathering into the

temple has been by consecration and Spirit-begetting, which is not in any sense ministered by the servant angels, but by human servants of the Truth through the Word of God (Acts 11: 13, 14; 1 Cor. 4: 15; Philemon 10; Jas. 1: 18). (5) Not only does no Scripture state that spirit-servant angels led by the Word any one into consecration and Spirit-begetting—the only way of getting into the temple; but the Bible shows this is done by human agents (Acts 11: 13-15); nor does any Scripture teach that they ever have brought or will bring anyone into the temple, either as a part of it or as a part of the World's High Priest. (6) Throughout the entire sacrificing time only the Christ is in the temple-tabernacle (Lev. 16: 17; Rev. 15: 8); in the Greek it reads, no one, not, no man. (7) Since the means of gathering God's people is the Truth, which was the means whereby Jesus, the Apostles, etc., gathered the Jewish Harvest, and which is the great sound (Ps. 89: 15; 150: 3) of the trumpet (Matt. 24: 31; 1 Cor. 15: 52; 1 Thes. 4: 16) whereby the elect were gathered out of the nominal church (Matt 24: 31), the sickle (Rev. 14: 14), must be the Truth (Acts 11: 14), which not the spirit-servant angels, but the brethren wield, who, therefore, under Christ, the Chief Reaper, are the reapers, *i.e.*, the angels of Matt. 13: 39, 41; 24: 31, as fulfilled facts abundantly prove. (8) The only ministry that the Bible asserts of the spirit-servant angels as respects the Church, apart from having acted as means of revelation to certain individuals, is a providential one, not one by means of proclaiming the Word (Matt. 18: 10; 28: 2; Acts 12: 7; Heb. 1: 14; Acts 11: 13-15).

(9) In Ps. 90: 11, 12, both kinds of angels are meant: the spirit angels help the Faithful by providential services, lest coming into denying the ransom and the Church's share in the sin-offering the feet members dash against the Rock, stumble over the Christ in these two ways; while the human angels—

messengers of the Truth—do this through ministering the Word to the Faithful. (10) If it is true that the spirit angels gathered the Church since 1919 into the temple, why is there no Scripture that contains that thought? We repeat it: J.F.R. has never quoted a passage nor a combination of passages that connects Christ's coming to the temple with 1918, let alone a passage or a combination of passages that prove that spirit angels gather those who have already been saints into the temple as the harvest work, much less from 1919 onward. Therefore his thoughts on these heads are gratuitous assumptions, eisegesis, contrary to Scriptures and fulfilled facts, and thus are proven to be more drunken folly in right-eye darkening.

In Z '30, 195-201 is an article that explains the fruits of the kingdom to be the kingdom message and denies it to be the fruit of the Spirit. Matt. 21: 43 is used as the text allegedly teaching this drunken folly of right-eye darkening. We note that the remark in this text is made by Jesus with reference to the Jewish clergy, who throughout the Jewish Age were required by God through His servants to yield Him fruit, and were blamed for not rendering it even from the days of the prophets to those of Jesus. Against J.F.R.'s folly on this subject we present a number of thoughts: (1) The fruit that God sought from the vineyard keepers during their entire period of tenure, the Jewish Age, could not have been the kingdom message, because such a message did not begin to be due to be given until the days of Jesus (Luke 16: 16; Heb. 2: 3, 4). (2) Such a fruit did not grow on the vines put in their charge by God; for the kingdom message is not a human but a Divine product; hence it could not have been by God required of them. (3) Such fruit could not grow on the fleshly Israelites, the figurative vines; hence God would not have required them to bear it, nor would He have required it as a product of them from the vineyard keepers. (4) If the

kingdom message could be called a fruit, then since God produced it out of His own heart and mind, He must therefore have been the figurative vine that bore it as fruit; hence He would not have required it as the growth of the Israelitish vineyard and at the hands of the vineyard keepers, knowing they bore it not.

(5) The effort to evade this conclusion by saying that there is a difference between producing and bearing fruit is arrant nonsense, because these words, so far as a vine's activity in fruit development is concerned mean one and the same thing.

(6) The distinction between the work of the vine, which under favorable care and climatic conditions produces fruit out of itself, and the work that the husbandman does on the vine to stimulate the vine's productiveness, overthrows his confusion on God's producing the alleged fruit of the kingdom and our (the branches) bearing (which he uses in the sense of carrying) this alleged fruit, *i.e.*, carrying the message to others; and it reveals how utterly at sea he is in attempting an explanation of the figure of the vine's branches bearing grapes as illustrative of people carrying another's product—the kingdom's message—to others; for there is no analogy between the illustration and the thing that he gives as the thing to be illustrated. (7) The fruit of the kingdom must be that which Christ and the Church, the Kingdom, produce out of themselves as new creatures, as their productiveness is stimulated by the work on them of God, the true Husbandman of the Vine of John 15: 1-8. In the picture the sap corresponds to the Word and Spirit, which cause the grapes of the graces to grow (Gal. 5: 22, 23). Hence the fruit of the Spirit is what is meant by the kingdom's fruit and the fruit of the Vine of John 15: 1-9, while the fruit of the vineyard of Matt. 21: 46 should have been the human graces with their products, good works in Israelites stimulated by the Jewish clergy. Such fruit of the Spirit

through its figurative grapes, graces, prompts authorized ones to bear the kingdom message to others.

Unmitigated folly is his teaching that the reapers could not be the faithful brethren, alleging as his reason that this would imply that the Church reaped itself! Of course the Church reaped itself in the sense that some of its members—those figured forth as reapers—reaped others of them—those figured forth by the wheat, as the facts of both Harvests prove ("I sent you to reap that whereon ye bestowed no labor," John 4: 35-38); just as the Church enlightens itself, *i.e.*, the faithful brethren enlighten one another; just as it builds up itself in every good word and work, *i.e.*, the faithful brethren by the Word help one another to grow in grace; and just as the Church comforts the Church in its fiery trials experienced amid its sacrificing as priests, *i.e.*, the faithful brethren comfort one another in trials amid their priestly sacrifices.

In Z '30, 213, pars. 19-21 he says that we cannot glorify God by character development, *i.e.*, by cultivating and exercising the graces. To clarify his thought he gives the illustration of a worldly man of noble character as unable to glorify God. What Truth person who understands the matter ever taught that such a person glorifies God? Having above proven that the fruit of the branches in Christ, the Vine, is the fruit of the Spirit, we quote in refutation of his thought Christ's words, "Herein is My Father glorified, that ye bear much fruit" (John 15: 8). Peter glorified the Father by faithfulness, a grace, in the crucifixion death (John 21: 19). Unanimity among the brethren, a grace, glorifies God (Rom. 15: 5, 6). The brethren glorify God in their spirit—character (1 Cor. 6: 20). Gratitude, a grace, glorifies God (2 Cor. 9: 12, 13; Acts 4: 21; 11: 18; Gal. 1: 24). God's fulfilling His good pleasure in us—perfecting us in every good work (character development and service, Heb. 13: 21), glorifies Jesus (2 Thes. 1: 11, 12). We glorify God in

all seven things of the Christian life, hence in character development, which is one of these seven things (1 Pet. 4: 11, 14), just as sin dishonors God (Rom. 1: 21-31). Of course, service rendered out of a good Christian spirit (character), especially out of love (Col. 3: 14), glorifies God; for it is one of the seven forms of the Christian life, just as service offered in an unchristian spirit (character) dishonors God (1 Cor. 13: 3). The foregoing sufficiently refutes the pertinent drunken folly in right-eye darkening.

In this connection we might well answer his slurs at character development, he sarcastically calling it "developing a *sweet* character" and slandering those who seek to develop character as claiming to be better than others and as doing it from selfish motives, *i.e.*, the attainment of the kingdom, as found in an article in Z '31, 19-25. Bro. Russell and those among the Truth servants who, like him, properly interpreted the Bible on the development of the graces, character development, did not speak of it as "developing a *sweet* character," as J.F.R. scoffingly calls it a number of times. Perhaps by the word *sweet* he means *amiable*. If so, we would say: Amiability is an ingredient of a Christian character, and it is to be exercised, not always, but on all suitable occasions. Under ordinary circumstances and usually God's people are to be amiable, but in dealing with wicked and hypocritical misleaders of God's guileless children, like J.F.R., not amiability, but severity, similar to that which Jesus exercised in Matt. 23 toward the scribes and Pharisees, should mark their feeling, looks and words. We charge him, because of his disparaging and renouncing character development in Christ-likeness, with being largely responsible for the loose and wrong characteristics exercised quite generally by his partisan followers. The degradation of character that he has by his pertinent writings wrought in his partisans, resulting in widespread and numerous disgraceful and immoral

acts and scandals in Society circles, is to be laid in part at his door. Any man who writes against character development in Christ-likeness, as he has done, is a self-proven servant of Satan, whom, as such, God's true people should avoid (Rom. 16: 17; 2 Tim. 3: 6). Again, any one who disparages and slurs at the study of Tabernacle Shadows, as he has done in several of the articles under review, is a servant and representative of Satan among God's people. What he, therefore, says against character development and Tabernacle Shadows study is only some more drunken folly in right-eye darkening.

In Z '30, 227-233; 243-249, he has written an article in which he renounces our Pastor's view of Nebuchadnezzar's dream-image (Dan. 2) and claims that the image represents Satan's organization, that the head of gold represents Satan as head of his organization and that the gold, silver and copper represent the three parts of Satan's invisible organization (supposedly shared in respectively by alleged three orders among the fallen angels) and that the iron legs represent the past great heathen world powers, while the mixture of clay and iron represents Christendom. Against this interpretation we offer the following: (1) It is self-contradictory; for he claims first that the golden head represents Satan in his unfallen and fallen condition, then later he says that the principalities (plural) are the head and are the chief class of Satan's subordinates. Here, then, is a contradiction. (2) Again, he uses Eph. 6: 12 (principalities, powers, world-rulers) as proof that there are three orders of fallen spirits, who respectively, as part of Satan's organization, are represented by the gold, silver and copper. But the passage refers to four classes, the fourth being "wicked spirits" (see margin), who evidently correspond to the "lordship" of Eph. 1: 21 (see Diaglott). The angels of Rom. 8: 38 are a fifth class among the fallen angels and Satan is a sixth (the number of evil and of

imperfection) order among the fallen angels; for he is a cherub (Ezek. 28: 14). Accordingly, there are not three, but six orders among the fallen angels, and this spoils his application conditioned upon there being only three such classes. (3) Even if we were to admit that there are only three classes in Eph. 6: 12, with Satan as the head of gold, there would be three classes for the silver and copper—a contradiction of the theory. (4) The Bible expressly defines the first as Babylon in the words of Daniel addressed to Nebuchadnezzar: "Thou art the head of gold"; for Babylon could be properly addressed in Nebuchadnezzar, because Nebuchadnezzar was Babylon in the sense that Louis XIV called himself France when he said, "I am the State," and in a sense somewhat like that of Bro. Russell's language as the controller of the Society, "I am the Society." (5) The parallel vision of the four beasts in Daniel, the fourth with ten horns, on the basis of fulfilled facts, proves that the metallic man of Dan. 2 contradicts the setting under review; for they are four kingdoms that *come out of this earth* (Dan. 7: 17).

(6) In Dan. 8 God expressly names the second and third of these beasts, calling them, Medio-Persia and Greece, and speaks of the fourth connectedly with the third, because once it was a part of the third. Hence it was Rome. Unutterably futile is the subterfuge of the article under review, that Medio-Persia (v. 20) was not Cyrus' empire, but a part of Satan's invisible empire of fallen spirits, alleging that the earthly Medio-Persian empire could not be meant, because its king is spoken of as being strong enough to resist Gabriel 21 days (Dan. 10: 13). In reply, we point out the fact that the European kings resisted our present Lord in His verbal assaults on them for 40 years before the World War, and for years since they have been resisting His verbal assaults on them preparatory to Armageddon (Rev. 16: 14, 16). Certainly if weaker earthly kings could do that for many years to Christ,

the more powerful king of Persia could have resisted 21 days the less powerful Gabriel. (7) The claim that Nebuchadnezzar types Satan and Daniel the Societyites since 1919 in Dan. 2 is false, for the reason just given. The literal Daniel interpreted literally to a literal person the figurative dream, showing that the symbolic head represented the literal Nebuchadnezzar as the Babylonian Empire, because he was "the State." So is the rest of the interpretation of the symbols literal, even as the nature of a clear and proper interpretation of a symbolic thing should be and also will be literal.

(8) The claim that Daniel's remark (Dan. 2: 28) on God's making known to the king "what shall be in the latter days" means that the whole dream applies to the extreme end of this Age, is too sweeping; for if but a part of the vision refers to things that belonged to the end of the Age, the language of v. 28 is perfectly applicable to such a thought. And since the parallel visions prove that only part of his vision applies to the end of the Age, his claim falls to the ground. (9) The expression, "after thee *shall* arise another kingdom" (v. 39), proves that at the time of Daniel's speaking, the other kingdom had not yet arisen, but was to arise in the future (*shall*), hence could not have been a part of Satan's invisible empire, which had long been in existence. Hence, too, the expression, "*after* thee," refers to time, and not, as the article claims, to rank. (10) The fact that the image was destroyed at once does not imply that all its parts were then to be universal world powers. All that was necessary to fulfill the symbols is that as kingdoms, regardless of the extent of their power, they would exist at the time of the stone's smiting. The parallel visions show that all would not continue to the end as universal powers, *e.g.*, Persia (8: 7). In fact such a thing would involve a contradiction in terms—four universal empires existing at the same time! (11) Dan. 2: 38 does not,

as the article under review claims, teach that Nebuchadnezzar was given rulership over all beasts and fowls, but over those of them *that dwell among the children of men*, domestic animals, and this certainly was true, since they were at his order.

(12) The usual Bible symbolic meaning of gold, silver and copper cannot, as he claims, prevail in either interpretation; for neither Satan nor Babylon was Divine (gold); neither an alleged principality nor power part of Satan's invisible empire, nor the Persian empire, could be truth or faithfulness (silver), nor an alleged world rulership in darkness, nor Greece, could be justified (copper). The progressive degradation in the image's metals represent the progressive degradation in character in the successive world empires, a thing that the Bible teaches and the Pyramid symbolizes in its descending passage. (13) No responsible Truth teacher, much less our Pastor, would teach what the article insinuates, that "Rome was the *first* world power to employ the iron military rule that bruises the people of the earth," unless the word *first* were used to mean, not time, but degree. (14) Egypt and Assyria are not in the vision, because they never were the rulers of the whole Biblical world, and because during the time of the vision they were more or less subject successively to the four world powers. The above reasons sufficiently prove his pertinent drunken folly in right-eye darkening.

In that same article he sets forth the thought that in Ezek. 1, by contrast, God gives a vision of His organization, the visible part of which he alleges the Society to be! We will say nothing more on this chapter than to state that it elaborates, by a number of details, some generalities of Rev. 4. But the interpretation that he offers is almost the limit of drunken folly in right-eye darkening. We also pass by without further comment his contemptuous patronizing of Bro. Russell as a good, but much mistaken

man, than to say that Bro. Russell was one of the wisest and best of saints. The drunken folly in right-eye darkening that holds that our Lord underwent two trials, the one from Jordan to Calvary, and the other from 1914 to 1918 in His supposed war in heaven with Satan requires no comment for its proof.

In Z '30, 259-264 is an article that reeks with "confusion worse confounded" on the Holy Spirit. He denies that the Holy Spirit is an influence, on the alleged ground that God exercises power, not influence (259, par. 2)! These two terms, as used of the Spirit, are synonyms. His definition of the Holy Spirit as being, "the power of God in operation to accomplish His will," is insufficient in several respects, as will appear from the facts that: (1) the Holy Spirit as power is God's power, regardless of whether it is quiescent or active, and (2) in addition the Holy Spirit is also God's disposition in Himself and in all of His free mortal agents who are in heart harmony with Him. Throughout the article under review he never once refers to this second sense of the word; he always in it uses it in a part of the first sense above set forth. And this fact is the clew to the gross darkness in that article. In par. 9 he makes the statement that it is not revealed, "in just what manner the comforter, helper, Holy Spirit or Spirit of the Truth operates." In the first place, in contradiction of him, the statement must be made that the Holy Spirit as power is not what Jesus means by the Comforter, Helper, Advocate (*paracletos*). The reason is very manifest: the Spirit as God's power had been operating on the Prophets and others in the Old Testament, and on the Apostles and the Seventy in the pre-anointing (Matt. 10: 1; Mark 6: 7; Luke 9: 1; 10: 1, 17-20) *before* Jesus promised the latter the Paraclete as a future gift (John 14: 16-18 [their receiving the Paraclete ended their orphanship, which

the article says was with the Church until 1918; for Jesus through the Paraclete came to the Apostles and the rest of the Church], 26; 15: 26; 16: 7). The Holy Spirit as Comforter, Helper or Advocate, means *the new-creaturely capacities and disposition of God in us*. It was this that Jesus promised in the passages just cited, as the new thing that He would send them—a thing which, apart from Himself, had never before been given to any of God's creatures, though some of them—the good angels—had His Spirit in the sense of His disposition; but in them it was minus the Spirit of begetting to the Divine nature, in which it then was in Jesus and in which He promised, as the Paraclete, it would be in the Church, beginning with the Apostles.

To say, therefore, that it is not revealed how the Paraclete operates, betrays gross ignorance on the Holy Spirit; for it operates as our new-creaturely mind enlighteningly and as our new-creaturely heart sympathetically in quickening, growth, strengthening, balancing and crystallizing in Christ-likeness, as well as cleansing from all filthiness of flesh and spirit. It does these things by a conscious application to itself of the pertinent parts of God's Word, by a following out of the leadings of its own previously-developed graces and by a sympathetic use of the co-operating providences of God. This is the Spirit of the Truth—the capacities that the Truth begets and the disposition that it develops unto completion in the Faithful, which, when completed, becomes their eternal character (Ps. 22: 26). Even the operation of the Spirit in the sense of power, as that acts on our new creatures, we understand; for it is the energy that God put in His Word that empowers our new-creaturely responsive minds to understand the deep things, and that empowers our new-creaturely responsive hearts to exercise themselves in every good word and work. Its method of operation on our new-creaturely

responsive minds and hearts is illustrated by the electric lamp. The wire corresponds to the Word, the electricity to the Spirit as power, the filament to our new-creaturely minds and hearts, the turning on of the button, or switch, to the will's responsiveness and the resultant light and warmth to enlightenment of the new creatures' minds and the ardor of their hearts in the graces. The same illustration also clarifies the begetting of the Spirit. For J.F.R. to say that it is not revealed how the Spirit as Comforter, Advocate, Helper, operates, is, therefore, another proof of his drunken folly in right-eye darkening.

The next point of drunken folly in right-eye darkening is his claim that Jesus' presence in His temple makes the intercession of the Spirit unnecessary, and makes an end of it. This confusion is due, in part, to his confounding the work of Jesus as our Advocate and the intercession of the Holy Spirit as our Paraclete. This folly will become manifest by several considerations: (1) It is not, as he claims, the Holy Spirit as God's power, but as the new-creaturely disposition, that intercedes for us (Rom. 8: 26, 27). (2) It intercedes, not by language, but by its graces, yearnings, sufferings and lacks. These appeal to the ever-watchful Father with mighty influence to give us what we need as new creatures, and He thus supplies it. These graces, yearnings, sufferings and needs, will be with us as long as we are in the flesh, and thus until death will intercede for us with the Father. Hence Jesus' coming into His temple, which He did in 1874, did not stop this intercession of the Spirit. (3) Jesus as our Advocate does a work as to our humanity and as to Divine justice, and that as our Justifier and as the Maintainer of our justification (1 John 2: 1, 2); but additionally He also does intercede for our new creatures, but does this in the High-Priestly, not in the Advocate office (Heb. 7: 25; 4: 14-16; 2: 17, 18). Hence Jesus' presence in the

temple could not put an end to the Spirit's intercession. These considerations prove J.F.R.'s pertinent teachings to be drunken folly in right-eye darkening.

Pars. 22, 23, 24 teach that the Holy Spirit since Jesus came to the temple is no more the Church's Helper, Advocate and Comforter. We have the following to say in reply: (1) If this were true, then the whole of the Church on earth since 1874 would go into the Second Death, because the Holy Spirit as Advocate, Helper, Comforter, is the new-creaturely disposition and the only way as long as we are in the flesh that it could cease to operate as Advocate, Helper, Comforter, is for it to die—which means that all new creatures on earth subsequent to 1874 would pass into the Second Death. But if the Spirit as Advocate, etc., were God's power, even then it would be a blunder to say that it was removed from the Church, because that would mean that the Church could not since 1874 be perfected; for without the Spirit in this sense, we could neither have it nor the Word as our Sanctifier; for these are among the main instruments of our new-creaturely development (John 17: 17; Rom. 15: 16; 1 Cor. 6: 11; 2 Cor. 1: 21, 22; Eph. 1: 13, 14; John 14: 16). Some of these passages show that the Spirit in both senses remains with us to the end.

Having already refuted his thought that the spirit-servant angels gather the Harvest and cast out reprobates, it follows that they cannot, as he claims, take the place and office of the Spirit as Advocate, Helper and Comforter in such work. The reason that they cannot minister with the Word to the saints sufficiently to supply their needs is that, as a lower order of beings than the Church as new creatures are now and will be, they cannot sufficiently develop them as new creatures, which they would have to do, if they took the work of the Spirit as theirs, as *e.g.*, a dog could not sufficiently supply the needs of a human.

The proof previously given refutes the idea that they, and not the Holy Spirit, are the ones who make clear to the Church the message due since Christ came to the temple. Not one iota of proof has been given for such an unheard-of teaching. The statement in par. 28, that the Holy Spirit has not been the helper of all new creatures, but only of those who, according to its view, have been allegedly called by God out of the mass of new creatures to enter the high calling, is an error; for such an arrangement as he claims—calling some from among the new creatures to become of the high calling—a thought that we refuted above does not exist and he is in ignorance of what the Holy Spirit as Advocate, Helper and Comforter, is; for even the Great Company must have it as such or go into the Second Death. His view therein is, therefore, drunken folly in right-eye darkening.

But why does he so strenuously advocate such a monstrous, preposterous and transparent absurdity as the taking of the Holy Spirit away from the Church? Before answering this question, let us remark that he has merely asserted that the Holy Spirit has been removed from the Church, and has not offered one verse to prove that such an extraordinary, unheard of, unexpectable and deadly thing would ever be done by God or Christ. The reason is this: His new theory on the man of sin requires him to have something else than the Roman emperors' supremacy as civil and religious rulers to remove as the thing hindering the Antichrist from grasping for their supremacy. And this something else that he hit upon to remove out of the way as the hindering thing is the Holy Spirit!!!

We will now briefly set forth his new view of the man of sin and then by the help of the Holy Spirit, still our Helper, thanks be to God, thoroughly refute it. Our proving some Biblical thing to be disparaging of him usually results in his repudiating in self-defense

formerly-held pertinent truths, and in his inventing new views thereon as an evasion of our proofs. This has been his continued practice since 1918, as many facts prove. It will be recalled that in our last review of his drunken right-eye darkening folly we gave several proofs that he is the little pope in Little Babylon and the head of the little Antichrist is the Little Gospel Age. And he met this proof by his usual trick—by repudiation of the formerly held truth, that the papacy is the great Antichrist, and by the assertion of a new error, *i.e.*, that Antichrist could not come before 1918 and that those who left the Society in 1917 and onward have become the Antichrist since 1919 and onward! Thus each sword-thrust into his right eye makes him all the blinder. This "new view" we will now proceed to refute.

(1) He misstates the matter when he says that certain ones in 1917 (those who faithfully resisted his lawlessness, unholy power-grasping and lording it over God's people) left the Society. They did not leave it. They were driven out of the Society by a series of unrighteous and oppressive acts, world-wide and dishonorable propaganda, mendacious and cruel accusations and persecuting and assassinating tactics, that were just like those by which the papacy drove the saints out of the Catholic Church. (2) The faithful among these have not fallen away from the Truth, while J.F.R. and his hierarchy have from 1917 onward fallen away from the Truth that they learned from Bro. Russell, and that they once believed and preached, just as the real great Antichrist fell away from the Truth that it had learned from the Apostles and had believed and preached. (3) Those who have since been driven out of the Society through the errors and wrongs practiced there and through their disfellowshipment by the Societyites, and who have since ridded themselves of the accumulated errors taught them there, and have come into the

Epiphany movement, hold again the Truth that they learned from Bro. Russell and therefore are not such as are fallen away from the Truth, any more than the saints who were driven out of the Catholic Church by the papacy because of their opposition to its errors and wrongs and were therefore excommunicated by the papacy and recovered the Truth as due, are to be counted among those who fell away from the Apostolic Truth. These considerations prove the Epiphany saints not to be of any of the little antichrists of the little Gospel Age, and of course not of the largest of these little antichrists. (4) The Epiphany movement has no organization, is connected with no organization and co-operates with no organization or other movement, therefore cannot be a part of any Antichrist, which, whether in Great or Little Babylon, in each of its forms must be an organization. These considerations prove that the Epiphany saints are in no sense a part of the man of sin, either in Great or Little Babylon, but they do suggest that the faithful of the Epiphany by the persecuting acts of J.F.R. and his subordinate leaders are, on a small scale, having the same kind of experiences as the faithful saints on a large scale had at the hands of the papacy, which would suggest that there is now a Little Gospel Age, in which there is a little Catholic Church, the largest quarter of Little Babylon and controlled by the little papacy, the little man of sin, whose head is J.F.R., and whose spirit is one that persecutes saints. These considerations also clearly indicate what is the little man of sin.

(5) Against the view that the man of sin, described in 2 Thes. 2: 1-8, did not begin to develop until 1917 to 1919, he set forth the thought that the Bible teaches that the man of sin, the great Antichrist, was in process of development in the days of St. Paul and St. John. The alleged fallers-away from the Truth since 1917 must, therefore, be nearly 1900

years old, if J.F.R.'s view were true! St. Paul in 2 Thes. 2: 7 says, "The mystery of iniquity doth already work." As the expressions, "mystery of godliness" and "mystery of God" (1 Tim. 3: 16; Col. 1: 26, 27; Rev. 10: 7), mean primarily Jesus, the Head, and secondly, the Church, His Body; so, as the counterfeit of this Head and Body as the mystery of godliness or of God (anti-Christ = counterfeit Christ), there was in St. Paul's day an embryo mystery of iniquity, a mystery of Satan, as yet without a developed head and body, but which when developed to the birth stage (Rev. 12: 4, 5) appeared as a head and body—the pope and his hierarchy. Hence this mystery of iniquity could not be those that were by Little Babylon's pope and hierarchy driven away from their brethren in the Society in 1917 and onward; for evidently these have not lived nearly 1900 years. Moreover, St. John assures us that Antichrist was present as a developing thing in his days (1 John 2: 18). "The Antichrist is coming" [Greek present tense; see Diaglott], *i.e.*, Antichrist is on the way. Hence he existed in a developing manner in St. John's days. He further says (1 John 4: 3; Diaglott), "This is the [spirit, teaching, doctrine, as vs. 1-3 prove] of the Antichrist, which you heard that it is coming [present tense; is on the way] and *now it is in the world already.*" Certainly, if the teaching of Antichrist was then in the world its teacher, Antichrist, must then have been in the world; for a teaching implies the existence of its teacher. 2 John 7 (Diaglott) proves the same thing: "For many deceivers [false teachers even of St. Paul's day, 'the mystery of iniquity doth already work,' and before] *went* forth into the world—those who do not confess that Jesus Christ did come in the flesh. This is the Deceiver and the Antichrist." Here St. John teaches that Antichrist existed in his days and also at an earlier time than when he wrote the above

words (in embryo, of course). These facts destroy the view here examined.

(6) With gross deceitfulness J.F.R. holds (Z '30, 275, par. 5, and onward) that 2 Thes. 2: 1-12 teaches that Antichrist does not come until after the alleged coming of the Lord to the temple in 1918 and the alleged beginning of the gathering of the saints into the temple, which it claims was in 1919 and onward. St. Paul does not in vs. 1-4 say that Antichrist comes at Christ's Parousia and the gathering of the brethren beyond the vail, which two things are what he means in verse 1 by the pertinent expressions, and not Christ's alleged coming to the temple (Church) in 1918 and from 1919 onward gathering the saints into the temple; for they (1 Pet. 2: 5; Eph. 2: 20-22; 1 Cor. 3: 16, 17) were parts of that temple from Pentecost onward and as the Body of the World's High Priest were in that temple from Pentecost on (Rev. 8: 4; 1 Pet. 2: 5, 9; Heb. 7: 26, 27). The following is the run of thought in 2 Thes. 2: 1-4: The Thessalonians had imbibed the error that the time of the Parousia and of the first resurrection had already set in. St. Paul beseeches them not to believe that he taught, discoursed on or wrote any such things. On the contrary, he had taught and still taught that before these two things would set in, two great signs must first be enacted: (1) there must be a falling away from the faith that the Apostles taught and (2) Antichrist must be revealed, come into open public activity, seat himself in God's temple, oppose every contemporaneous civil ruler of the Roman Empire and of the Holy Roman Empire and publicly exercise great power. He argues that since these things must precede the Parousia and the deliverance of the Church, but had not yet set in, the Parousia and the first resurrection could not have set in. But time prophecies, etc., etc., proving that Jesus' Parousia (mistranslated in v. 1 as *coming* in the A. V.) set

in in 1874 and that the sleeping saints arose in 1878, Antichrist must before 1874 not only have appeared, but must have seated himself in God's temple, opposed every civil ruler of the two Roman Empires and openly shown that he was a powerful one, a *god*, as the Greek of v. 4 shows. Never has J.F.R. cited one passage that connects with 1918 Christ's coming to His temple, which Mal. 3: 1, 2 and the parallel dispensations, etc., connect with his Parousia, a thing that set in in 1874. These considerations prove the utter erroneousness of the view that connects the falling away from Apostolic Truth, Antichrist's revelation, his seating himself in God's temple, his opposing (what actually is stated to be) every contemporaneous civil ruler in the Roman Empire and its successor and his exercise of very great power, with 1917 and onward.

(7) Again, in order to give itself a semblance of plausibility, this view claims that the day of Christ began in 1918. The Scriptures show that the following things occur in the day of Christ, which is synonymous with the expressions, day of God, day of the Lord (but only partially so with the expression, day of Jehovah, which is from 1874 to 1954); the day of judgment, that day, etc. The people of Christendom would cry in the day of the Lord, "peace and safety," which they did from 1874 onward, amid which cries sudden destruction would overtake them, which began in 1914 (1 Thes. 5: 2, 3). Christ's Parousia and the first resurrection, which respectively began in 1874 and 1878, set in in the day of Christ (2 Thes. 2: 1, 2). Scoffers would scoff at Christ's presence as having set in before the Time of Trouble would come and both the scoffing and the trouble would be in the day of the Lord, which scoffing began approximately in 1876 and continues even yet, and which trouble came in 1914, and both the scoffing and the trouble would be during the thief-like presence of the day of the Lord (2 Pet. 3: 4-12;

1 Thes. 5: 2, 3), due to the thief-like presence of the Lord (Rev. 16: 15; Luke 12: 39). St. Paul and the brethren whom he won for the Lord would be together and rejoice over one another in the day of the Lord, which being together and rejoicing set in in 1878 (2 Cor. 1: 14; Phil. 2: 16; 1 Thes. 2: 19). [The word *parousia* is mistranslated in the last verse as *coming* and shows that the day of the Christ, when this rejoicing would be, began in 1874.] St. Paul and all others who love Christ's appearing get their crowns in the day of Christ, which proves that it was already here in 1878 (2 Tim. 4: 8). The jewels are made up in that day, which making up began with the Harvest in 1874 and with the first resurrection in 1878 (Mal. 3: 17). In that day many would boast of great works, which boasting was throughout the Parousia, therefore from 1874 onward (Matt. 7: 22). The drinking of the new wine during the day of the kingdom began in 1878 (Matt. 26: 29). The brethren were to watch lest that day, which came in 1874, come to them unawares (Luke 21: 36). All these things taking place before 1914, and thus before 1918, prove that the day of Christ, the day of the Lord, began quite a long time before 1918. Hence the falling away and the main acts of Antichrist were long before 1917 and onward.

(8) The Antichrist would work oppositionally to every contemporaneous civil ruler of the Roman Empire and its successor Empire, which, if true, demolishes the view under examination. This is taught in 2 Thes. 2: 4: "The opponent and self-exalter above everyone called a god [ruler] or *Augustused* one."—I. V. The Greek word *sebasma*, translated *worshiped* in the A. V., is from the same root as the Greek word *sebastos* (Acts 25: 21, 25), which is the Greek equivalent of the Roman name Augustus, the highest title of the Roman Emperors and later the highest title of the Emperors of the Holy Roman Empire. The expression, "or Augustused," as explanatory of the

one "everyone called a god," shows who every ruler would be as to whom the man of sin would work oppositionally and self-exaltingly, *i.e.*, it would be the Emperors of the Roman and the Holy Roman Empires, all of whom bore the title Augustus, at least from the time onward from when the beginning of this oppositional and self-exalting activity set in. But the Holy Roman Empire, the occidental successor of the Roman Empire, went out of existence in 1806, having lasted 1006 years. Shortly before its rise the pope finally oppositionally and self-exaltingly freed himself from every vestige of the authority of the Roman Empire's Emperors. Church and World history proves that the pope waged ever-increasing opposition and self-exaltation (at first secretly) against both sets of Augustuses until he prevailed over them. These rulers having long before 1917 ceased to exist, the particular opposition and self-exaltation referred to in v. 4 could not have been exercised after more than a hundred years before 1917. Hence those who were forced out of Society fellowship from 1917 onward could not be the man of sin; for he must have existed while the Roman Empire and while its occidental successor, the Holy Roman Empire, were in existence, to have opposed them.

(9) 2 Thes. 2: 2, 3 not only teaches that the falling away would precede that part of the day of Christ in which the Parousia and the first resurrection would set in, but also that the revelation of the man of sin, his oppositional and self-exalting course against civil rulers of the Roman Empires, his seating himself in God's temple and his openly demonstrating himself to be a mighty ruler, would all precede that—the first part of the day of Christ; while the article under review puts these four acts of the man of sin after its day of Christ set in—1918. (10) The view of J.F.R. on the hindering thing (the presence and activity of the Spirit as Advocate, Helper and Comforter) that prevented the four activities of the man of sin, set

forth in 2 Thes. 2: 3, 4, and that had to be taken out of the way before these four things could be acted out, is not only a most foolish thing, but it also is an impossible thing—if the new creatures living at the time were as such not to die the Second Death. Such an obvious result of his preposterous, monstrous and impossible thought, his right-eye darkening prevented his seeing at all. We have above sufficiently shown it to be Satanic in origin and character, and will say no more on it.

(11) As, according to 2 Thes. 2: 8, the revelation of the man of sin had to await the removal of the hindering thing, as that hindering thing could not be the Holy Spirit as long as new creatures are on earth, and as the hindering thing was something active ("he that hinders"—present tense) in St. Paul's days that then prevented Antichrist from gaining his coveted prize of supremacy, it must have been something connected with an Augustused person, *i.e.*, the Roman Emperor, which, of course, immediately suggests what the hindering thing was: the Roman Emperor's possession of supremacy, supremacy as civil ruler, Augustus, and supremacy as religious ruler, Pontifex Maximus, which, as long as he could maintain it, would hinder Antichrist from gaining it; and to gain which his opposing and exalting himself against the Augustused ones continued until it, the supremacy of the Augustused ones, was taken out of the way. This destroys the view under consideration.

(12) 2 Thes. 2: 8 shows two processes in the overthrow of the man of sin: (1) his consuming; (2) his annihilation. The first was completed before the second started to operate. The second started to operate with the Parousia, when the bright shining, which will destroy him, began to go forth. Hence the consuming process was at an end by 1874. This consuming process was produced by the influence of the secular and religious Truth ("the spirit of His Mouth"—the teaching of His mouthpieces) that our Lord gave out by

secular and religious mouthpieces. It began in its secular aspects in 1295 by truths on earthly matters set forth on the relation of state and church in the controversies between Philip, the Fair, of France, and Pope Boniface VIII. Forward from that time the theories of the papacy on secular powers began to be refuted so thoroughly that its presentations thereon gradually lost power to influence the peoples into secular subjection to the pope, making it possible to strip him bit by bit of such powers. Then starting with Marsiglio's activities, first in 1309 and more particularly in 1324, the Lord by religious reformation-truths set forth by individuals until 1521, and thereafter by religious sects began to consume the religious pretensions of the man of sin, which, receiving its last attack from sects in 1870 by the Old Catholic Church, brought into being by the Vatican Council's papal infallibility decree, was in its doctrines consumed—refuted—this part of the consuming process weakening greatly its religious hold on the world. By 1874 the consuming process had so well advanced that it was ready to be reinforced by the annihilative process. The consuming process having, according to the last clause of v. 8, preceded the Parousia, the view under examination cannot be true.

(13) The annihilative process set in with the Parousia by a bright shining that is arousing such opposition in the masses as will result in Antichrist's complete destruction in the fast-approaching Armageddon. But this bright shining having begun in 1874, the theory under review cannot be true. We (Chap. I of Vol. IV) proved that the word *parousia*—presence—applies to three periods: (1) the reaping time of the Harvest—1874 to 1914 (Matt. 24: 3, 27, 37, 39); (2) the entire Harvest—1874 to 1954 (1 Cor. 11: 26; 1 Thes. 4: 15; 2 Pet. 2: 4); and (3) the entire 1,000 years of the Second Advent (1 Cor. 15: 23); and since we are past the reaping period, and the man of sin is not yet destroyed, the word *parousia*—

presence—in vs. 8 and 9 evidently is used in the second sense of the word.

(14) J.F.R. perverts the meaning of the expression, "whose *coming* [*parousia*—presence]," with which 2 Thes. 2: 9 begins, by applying it to Antichrist's presence, while it is a direct reference to the expression, "His *parousia*," at the end of v. 8, with which it directly connects itself by the relative pronoun, "whose," as the order of the Greek words shows: "by the bright shining of the presence of Him whose presence is *during* an energy of Satan." The claim of the article on this point is that its Antichrist's presence—from 1919 onward—is by v. 9 shown to be characterized by special Satanic activities along deceitful lines, while the passage teaches that our Lord's Parousia in the second sense of the word (1874-1954) would be accompanied by Satanic deceptions of the most delusive kind. While there were doubtless Satanic deceptions accompanying the heyday of the real man of sin—the dark ages—these were as child's play in comparison with the deceptions that Satan has been working from 1835, when modern higher criticism started, until the present and will continue to work until he is put into the bottomless pit after Jacob's trouble, 1956. It is wholly within this period, 1835-1956, that the Harvest—the presence of 2 Thes. 2: 8, 9—in its wide sense, 1874-1954, finds itself. It is throughout this period of 121 years that the darkening of the symbolic sun and moon occurs (Matt. 24: 29). Acts 2: 20 and Matt. 24: 29 show that this darkening would set in before the Parousia—1874. It began through the publishing of three of the most influential of all earlier higher critical books, all in 1835: (1) Vatke's Old Testament Theology; (2) Bauer's Pastoral Epistles; and (3) Strauss' Life of Jesus. The period of our Lord's Parousia in the second sense of the word, according to 2 Thes. 2: 9, was to be *during* this period of Satan's grossest deceptive activity. The period from 1874 to 1954 would

be characterized by the climax of this deceptive period. This is evident when we note the gross deceptions of the six harvest siftings toward the consecrated, the justified and the world, as set forth in Ezek. 9 by the six men with the slaughter weapons slaying in the temple, courts and city. The following is the proper translation of 2 Thes. 2: 9, 10: "whose [Christ's] presence is during [see Thayer's Greek Dictionary of the New Testament on the word *kata* with the accusative case, page 327, col. 2, under subdivision 2, line 10 from the bottom] an energy of Satan by all power and signs and wonders of falsehood and every deception of iniquity for those perishing, because they received not the love of the Truth unto their being saved." Our Pastor's thought, expressed as follows: "whose [Christ's] presence is [accompanied] with an energy of Satan, etc.," is therefore correct, even if it is not a literal translation.

(15) The connection between v. 8 and vs. 9-12 proves that here is a description of the Satanic delusions operating during the Harvest through the six harvest siftings, and resulting in the manifestation of each consecrated one in his true colors. Thus seen, vs. 9-12 do not refer at all to the man of sin as such nor to the conditions prevailing during his heyday. This again proves J.F.R.'s use of vs. 9-12 as descriptive of the man of sin, as being those who were driven away from the Society from 1917 onward, to be error; and our 15 points against his man of sin prove it to be drunken folly in right-eye darkening. Brother Russell's view of the Great Antichrist of the Gospel Age is, by these 15 points against J.F.R.'s effort to set it aside in the interests of his new view, thus proven to be proof against this foolish assault. We have not especially offered constructive arguments in its support, since his exposition of it is thoroughly satisfactory to those whose faith is incorrupt. We have contented ourselves with disproving the new view. And what shall we say of J.F.R.'s charges

against the Faithful, wherein he calls them, the man of sin, the Judas class, that evil servant, the foolish, unprofitable shepherd, the slanderer of his own mother's son, etc., with many reviling terms accompanying his falsely calling them these names? Remembering that the article under review appeared in the Sept. 15, 1930 Tower—a month and a half after the beginning of the third hour of the Friday of the Large Eight Wonderful Days—the time when the large Jesus and the large two thieves were nailed to the cross, and that J.F.R. is the leader of those represented by the impenitent thief, we recognize in these revilings the antitype of the impenitent thief's reviling our Lord. We have given many proofs of his being, as the little pope in Little Babylon, the head of the little man of sin in Little Babylon's Roman Catholic Church and of his being the chief leader of the Judas class among the Truth people, who in 1917 for the antitypical 30 pieces of silver—power and authority in the Church—sold his brethren into tribulation, even as we have already clearly proven him to be that evil servant, the foolish, unprofitable shepherd and the chief Jambresite among Truth apostates.

We know nothing of, nor, apart from his charges, have we ever heard of the Society dissidents getting together to destroy the Society's work. We believe that this is a false charge, a stop-thief cry, due (1) to his trying to frighten his followers to remain loyal to him and turn a deaf ear to the cogent proofs against his revolutionary teachings and methods and (2) to his trying to explain on other than the real grounds why (actually as a part of the large impenitent thief) he and certain of his partisans are undergoing symbolic crucifixion—being widely and publicly set forth as evil-doers by civil officers. In the case of the larger thieves this crucifixion is thoroughly deserved, whereas the Faithful undeservedly undergo it, as the large penitent thief will [written in Feb., 1931] ere long acknowledge. We and the movement with which

we are connected never have opposed the Societyites' real mission—its privilege to reprove the world for sin, for righteousness and for judgment to come, the kingdom testimony. We believe that they got this as their special service in 1917 at the time the mantle went over from antitypical Elijah to antitypical Elisha. In so far as they do this work we pray for them in that work.

We have never before the *public* criticized the many false teachings with which J.F.R. has more or less vitiated that work, our purpose for such a course being our desire not in the least to injure with the public the influence of the Society friends in their ministry to the public. Our criticisms of the errors and wrong methods of the Society, especially of its leader, have been confined to Truth people, and that, apart from our subscribers, almost entirely to the Society adherents themselves. Our policy is to restrict, apart from our subscribers, to Society adherents as far as we can our views that treat of Society matters, just as we do not send our criticisms of P.B.I. conditions among the Society friends, the only exceptions to this course being when the same views criticize matters among both of these groups, *e.g.*, this book will not be sent to our list of P.B.I. addresses, nor did we send, *e.g.*, our refutations of the P.B.I. chronological errors to the Society friends. We criticize the wrongs of each group to its face, not behind its back. The above is, and will remain our practice. Hence the falsity of the charge, under review, so far as we are concerned. In no sense have we ever betrayed any brethren. Our defense of the Truth and Truth arrangements against Levitical revolutionism instead of being a Judas act, is an act of real brotherly service to the Lord's real people, and in due time it will be recognized as such by all of them. Such defense of the Truth and its arrangements against their attackers is a real witness for Jehovah's Name, while J.F.R.'s errors are aspersions on that Name. In due time all real members of

antitypical Elisha will recognize both of these facts. J.F.R.'s ranting in so many issues, following that on the man of sin, against his fictitious Judas, man of sin, evil servant, etc., as trying to destroy the Society and its work, is setting up a scarecrow to frighten his followers away from those who can help them see into his selfish and erroneous designs hid by the mask of pretended zeal for God.

In Z '30, 307-313, he treats of the vineyard of Is. 27: 2, applying it to the Society. The connection (vs. 1, 3-6) shows that it refers to the Millennium and afterwards, when according to v. 1 Satan is to be destroyed, who, by the way, he says will be dead during the 1,000 years, thus interpreting the bottomless pit as hades, a thought that Bro. Russell once held, but later gave up, coming to see that it represented error, which, having no foundation, is a symbolic bottomless pit. The uses of this expression in Rev. 9: 1, 2, 11; 11: 7; 17: 8; 20: 1, 3, prove that it means error, just as the key to it is Truth as its opener, expositor. The symbolism of Satan's being there during the thousand years means that he will be mentally confined within the realm of error, unenlightened by the Truth during that time. This fact implies that physically he will be far absent from the earth, ignorant of what will go on here. The erroneousness of the interpretation of the vineyard, etc. (Is. 5: 1-7), in Z '30, 308-310, applying it to the period from 1878 onward, is certainly disproved by the definition given it in v. 7, as well as by Jesus' allusion to it in Matt. 21: 33-46, as applying primarily to natural Israel. The following will enable one to see through the erroneousness of his applying almost everything good (especially things pertinent to Israel) in type, parable and prophecy, to the time of his movement after 1918, and almost everything therein degenerating from good to bad, from 1878 to 1918: Keeping in mind the parallel dispensations and their Harvests, these symbolic Scriptures have a first application to fleshly Israel, real and

nominal, then to spiritual Israel, real and nominal, as the discourse would suggest, with the climaxes coming to each of these Israels in its pertinent Harvest. How do we know that usually this is the key to such Scriptures? (1) Facts, (2) chronology, (3) the focusing of God's plan about these two Israels, (4) the fulfillments, and (5) the parallels throughout, prove it. It was by this key that that Servant so harmoniously, reasonably, factually and Scripturally opened these types, parables and prophecies. Then because the Gospel Age is being enacted on a small scale these passages have a pertinent tertiary application to the pertinent classes of this small Gospel Age. These considerations destroy his view of Is. 5: 1-7, showing it to be drunken folly in right-eye darkening.

In Z '30, 323-329, he discusses the prize and denies that the Scriptures teach that perfect [untested] love is the mark, but says that the mark is the line or course of *giving the kingdom witness*. The Greek word *skopos* translated *mark* in Phil. 3: 14 in the A. V. and the Diaglott (see word for word translation), but incorrectly rendered *line* in the latter's emphasized translation, has two meanings: (1) a watchman, and (2) "a distant mark looked at, the goal or end one runs to or shoots at," it being derived from a root meaning, to spy, to peer, to look into the distance. See Thayer, 579, col. 2, par. 3; Young, 646, top line of col. 1; Strong's Greek Dictionary, 4649. It never means *line* or *course*, as the article under review claims. Hence running for the mark does not mean pressing on in the course of kingdom witnessing, as the article claims, while rejecting the thought that it is perfect [untested] love. The word occurs only once in the New Testament (Phil. 3: 14). The Septuagint uses the Greek word twice (Job 16: 12, compare v. 13; Lam. 3: 12, compare v. 13). In both cases it means a *mark to shoot at*. It, therefore, means *mark* in the sense of a goal run to, or a target shot at. The former evidently is its meaning in Phil. 3: 14, since it

there cannot mean a watchman or target. It is true that the Scriptures nowhere say that it means perfect [untested] love, just as they seldom define any word, much less a word occurring in the original only once. What it means must, therefore, be gathered from what the Bible teaches to be the attainment for which the saints run. Of such an attainment the Bible certainly teaches love to be the crowning or chief thing, which of course is supported by other things. Love being the law of the New Creature proves it to be the supreme thing for their attainment. The following passages prove this: 1 Cor. 13: 1-3, 13; Col. 3: 14; 1 Tim. 1: 5; 1 Pet. 1: 22; 2 Pet. 1: 5-8, 10, 11; Matt. 6: 33 (God's righteousness being His love working in harmony with His wisdom, justice and power). These passages show that the two main objects of the Christian life are the attainment of love and the kingdom, the latter through attaining the former. Hence the mark of Phil. 3: 14 is love, its prize being the kingdom. Certainly God's people are to spread His Word in harmony with the mission that their class standing before the Lord shows them to have, the Little Flock spreading and defending truths pertinent to the Little Flock, the Great Company and the Youthful Worthies especially, the Great Company and Youthful Worthies spreading and defending truths for the world, pertinent to sin, righteousness and the coming Kingdom. But such witnessing, though highly important and necessary, is subordinate to character development, which reaches its climax in love. It is while speaking against the mark as perfect [untested] love that J.F.R. continues his railing, begun in previous articles, at character development, in ridicule designating it as, "developing a *sweet* character." His disparaging it in the interests of "witnessing" is contrary to 1 Cor. 13: 1-3. Of course his view is drunken folly in right-eye darkening.

In Z '30, 339-345 is an article which uses Is. 66: 5 as a text. This text addresses the Faithful throughout

the Age and especially since 1874 onward, as those whose brethren hated and cast them out, thinking that they thereby did God a service (John 16: 2), and as those who would be exalted in due time, and their excommunicators and prosecutors as those who would be put to shame. With the grossest disregard of his world-wide driving out of Society circles those who have since 1917 disapproved his revolutionisms and those of his partisan supporters against the Truth and its arrangements, and of his world-wide campaign whose slogan was "avoid them," whom he grossly misrepresented in a stop-thief campaign world-wide in extent, just as the pope did with the saints as alleged heretics, he claims for him and his the gracious assurances of the text and for his excommunicates its disapproval! Is. 66: 5 is an accurate description of the faithful brethren who were disfellowshipped, "cast out," by all whom J.F.R. could influence so to do, because they protested against his unholy power-grasping, lording it over God's heritage, corrupting God's Truth and introducing revolutionary arrangements for God's work among God's people in a series of lawless and arbitrary acts that were never in the domain of nominal churchianity outdone, except by the papacy. He whose years-long course of casting out the brethren is so greatly condemned by Is. 66: 5 has the unblushing effrontery to quote this passage as approving him and condemning the faithful brethren who opposed his errors and wrong official practices. In all this he imitates his prototype, the pope of Great Babylon. This turning of things upside down must have made Satan himself, figuratively speaking, hold his sides to keep them from bursting from uncontrollable laughter at this daring stroke of his chief representative among the Truth people, and made him, as soon as under self-control, pat him on the back with a fiendish "attaboy!" Of course, after such a beginning, as may be expected, the article literally reeks with railings at, false

accusations of, and warnings against the alleged diabolical machinations of those whom he designates as plotting against "God's visible organization," whom he alleges to be the man of sin, that evil servant, etc. The mere statement of the above facts is enough to refute his claim on this point for those who know the events among God's people since 1917. They, of course, will recognize his pertinent claims as the stop-thief cry of drunken folly in right-eye darkening.

In Z '30, 373, par. 19, he states that Armageddon will be immediately followed by the establishment of God's kingdom. According to Rev. 16: 14, 16, Armageddon is the battle between the defenders of Satan's empire as now organized on earth and the Lord's great army, more fully described in Joel 2: 1-11; Rev. 19: 11-21. Accordingly, this battle is the symbolic earthquake of 1 Kings 19: 11, 12 and Rev. 16: 18-20, which will destroy Satan's empire as now constituted. After this earthquake, Armageddon, comes the fire of 1 Kings 19: 12, which in turn will be followed by Jacob's trouble. There will be a hectic cessation of pangs between the earthquake and the fire, just as there has been such between the wind and the earthquake. So, too, will there be a short pause, long enough for the last of the anarchists to assemble and go to Palestine, between the fire and Jacob's trouble. All of which proves that the thought under consideration is another piece of drunken folly in right-eye darkening.

In Z '31, 35-41 is an article on the temple with Hag. 1: 14 as text. As usual the good features set forth in the text are applied to J.F.R.'s. movement with the customary exhortation to service and slurs at character development. The principle that we set forth while discussing his perversions on the vineyards of Is. 26: 2; 5: 1-7 will enable us to see through the misuse of the history of the building of the second temple as a type of an alleged temple building intermitted in construction from 1914 to 1919 by lack

of zeal and renewed from 1919 onward. Hag. 1: 14 in harmony with the above-mentioned principle applies primarily to the Israelites mentioned in that verse. Then it has a typical application to Spiritual Israelites' rebuilding the real temple desolated by symbolic Babylonians in the great apostacy and reign of Antichrist. The parallel dispensation and the Pyramid locate the exact time of the stages of this building as well as the antitypes of Zerubbabel, Joshua and the Israelites. The second temple was begun 537 B.C. Then the work thereon stopped for 15 years. Its building was renewed in 522 B.C. and it was completed in 518 B.C. 1845 years after Oct., 537 B.C., bring us to Oct., 1309, when antitypical Zerubbabel (Marsiglio), Joshua (William Occam) and Israel (the faithful co-operating Spiritual Israelites) began the foundation work of raising God's real temple from the ruins into which it was plunged by symbolic Babylon. As in the type, the work was interrupted for 15 years. It was renewed in 1324 by the writing and spread of Marsiglio's famous book, *The Defender of the Peace*, which to this day is the standard work against the papacy's claims to power in church and state. Marsiglio, assisted by Occam, John of Jandun, etc., and supported by Emperor Louis, the Bavarian, succeeded by 1328 in making the temple class a continuing active agency for the Lord thenceforth to the present. This is the antitype as proven by the parallel dispensations, the facts and the Pyramid. We have had the small antitype during the Miniature Gospel Age. It is of course proper to make practical applications of the typical history just considered to any time of building on the antitypical temple; but they are to be viewed as practical applications and illustrations, not as the antitypes, as all sorts of twists in the attempt, made to set forth such as antitypes and not as lessons and illustrations in the article, prove that it is drunken folly in right-eye darkening.

Nineteen hundred years ago
Was that deed of darkness done,
Was that sacred thorn-crowned head
To a shameful death betrayed,
And Iscariot's traitor name
Blazoned in eternal shame.
Thou, disciple of our time,
Follower of the faith sublime,
Who with high and holy scorn
Of that traitorous deed dost burn,
Though the years will nevermore
To our earth that form restore,
The Christ-spirit ever lives,
Ever in thy heart He strives.
When pale misery mutely calls,
When thy brother tempted falls.
When thy gentle words may chain
Hate and anger and disdain,
Or thy loving smile impart
Courage to some sinking heart:
When within thy troubled breast
Good and evil thoughts contest,
Though unconscious thou mayst be,
The Christ-spirit strives with thee.
If to-day thou turn'st aside,
In thy luxury and pride,
Wrapped within thyself, and blind
To the sorrows of thy kind,
Thou a faithless watch dost keep,
Thou art one of those who sleep:
Or, if waking, thou dost see
Nothing of divinity
In our fallen struggling race,
If in them thou see'st no trace
Of a glory dimmed and wan,
Of a future to be won,
Of a future, hopeful, high,
Thou, like Peter, dost deny:
But, if seeing, thou believest,
If the Evangel thou receivest,
Yet, if thou art bound to sin,
False to the ideal within,
Slave of ease, or slave of gold,
Thou the Son of God hast sold.

CHAPTER VI.

SECOND MISCELLANY ON DRUNKEN FOLLIES OF RIGHT-EYE DARKENING.

MORE DRUNKEN FOLLIES OF RIGHT-EYE DARKENING. STILL MORE
DRUNKEN FOLLIES OF RIGHT-EYE DARKENING. FURTHER
DRUNKEN FOLLIES OF RIGHT-EYE DARKENING. MORE FURTHER
DRUNKEN FOLLIES OF RIGHT-EYE DARKENING.

J.F.R. sets up the following claim: "the Scriptures were written for the special aid and benefit of the [his] remnant [his remnant are his followers since 1918; God's remnant, according to Rom. 9: 27-29; Is. 1: 9, are the entire Church especially its parts in the Jewish and Gospel Harvests] now [*i.e.*, since 1918] on the earth" (Z '32, 3, par. 1). To further this thought he (Z '31, 147, par. 7) quotes 1 Cor. 10: 11: "Now these things happened unto them for ensamples [types] and are written for our admonition upon whom the ends of the world are come" to insinuate, among other things, that the book of Esther describes his movement, whereas the expression, "*these things*," in 1 Cor. 10: 11 refers to the incidents in Israel's wilderness journey alluded to in 1 Cor. 10: 1-10. In ascribing practically everything good in the Scriptures to his movement, as the acme of God's work of the whole Age, he betrays the self-centerment usual in conceited errorist leaders who in their hallucinations labor under an exaggerated estimate of themselves and their own work. He repeatedly fulminates against the proper esteem in which the faithful hold our Pastor as that Servant as "worshiping a man," "following a man" and "taking a man as teacher," while to keep them in subjection to him, a man, as teacher he frightens his followers by many threats and insinuations of their falling out of the [his] remnant or out of "line for the kingdom,"

if they should reject *his* lightning flashes [mud splashes] from his temple. The Bible does have quite a deal to say of him and his work; but what it says of him and his work from Dec. 29, 1916 onward, is almost without exception uncomplimentary. For such a person to regard the movement that he controls and teaches as the acme of all God's works connected with His Church on earth, is *prima facie* evidence of pride, though he in words seeks to convey the impression of great humility. As an illustration of some of his pretended humility we might instance his recent refusal to shake hands with the relatively few brethren in the Canal Zone (they are all, or nearly all, colored), alleging that if he did shake hands with them he would thereby betray pride, since he would thereby give them the impression of his being some great one, or he thereby would be tempted to think he was a great one!

In Z '31, 323–330 he has an article entitled, "Taught Of God," that should be entitled, "God's Organization," as that is the line of thought from his viewpoint therein elaborated. In vain throughout this article do we look for a clear definition as to what he means by this ambiguous and non-scriptural term. It is true that he calls it *Zion, the woman of Gen. 3: 15*, and *God's woman*; but what he understands by these three terms is not defined. In Z '31, 323 (3) he says that God's heavenly organization must have been in existence from the beginning, because God is a God of order. In his mind it predates the creation of the human family, for he said that from Eden on God apparently abandoned His woman [Z '31, 325 (9)]; hence it is not a thing limited to producing the elect Church, Head and Body, which is the limitation of the Jerusalem above, of the heavenly Zion, of the woman of Gen. 3: 15 and of Sarah (Is. 54 and Gal. 4). By God's universal organization he may mean God's universal order of affairs from the beginning, according to the first, second and last sentences of

(3). This par. also alleges that God's organization has all along had a heavenly part; and that it has a part that has appeared among men. Both of these parts make up His universal organization, allegedly typed by the earthly Jerusalem.

As an example of confusion we will now quote this entire third par. and we believe that any candid child of God will agree with us that it is very confused. "Everything with Jehovah is orderly, and for no other reason we must conclude that He had an organization from the beginning. That organization is pictured or symbolized by God's woman whom He names Zion. Jehovah set up the city of Jerusalem and put His name there, and that city pictured or represented His universal organization. Both names 'Zion' and 'Jerusalem' represent His organization. The earthly organization of Jehovah, which was Jerusalem [the literal city, as shown in the second preceding sentence], was God's typical organization and therefore foreshadowed His organization that would appear amongst men on the earth and represent His heavenly organization. It is written: 'Jerusalem which is above (the heavenly organization) ... is the mother of us all' (Gal. 4: 26). That means that all who are of the offspring of God's woman are of His organization. The name 'Zion' was also applied to Jerusalem, because the latter was typical of God's universal organization: 'The city of David, which is Zion' (1 Kings 8: 1)."

In this par. he confuses the typical city Jerusalem and Zion with "the Jerusalem that now is," of Gal. 4: 25, which is the Law Covenant and the servants that applied it to Israel's development. He likewise here confuses his own invented "heavenly organization," which he fails to define, with the "Jerusalem which is above," which is the oath-bound promises that develop the Christ and the servants who apply those promises to the Christ's development. In this

par. he makes a literal city God's Old Testament earthly organization! His heavenly organization from the standpoint of its bearing a nation—"the birth of a nation," which he defines as God's placing Jesus upon His throne and sending Him forth in 1914 empowered to reign (Z '31, 324, par. 8), logically must be God, because only God placed Jesus on His throne and sent Him forth empowered to reign. Hence God must be both the Father and the Mother of this nation! This raises the question, how could one person be a nation? If the birth of the nation occurred in 1914 in Jesus' being set on God's throne empowered to reign and in His being sent forth in 1914 in His alleged Second Advent to fight with, and cast Satan and his angels out of heaven to earth, He must be the nation born in a day, according to the consequences of J.F.R.'s pertinent position. If, as he says, this exaltation of our Lord to enthronement, power and commission against Satan's organization was the birth of a nation, in the sense of the beginning of its birth, he says, (!), then the birth of the rest of the nation must mean the seating of the rest of the Little Flock on God's throne, empowered and commissioned to overthrow Satan's organization, which implies their first resurrection as a preceding thing, while he claims that additional to these the children born after Zion's travail (his battle in heaven in 1914 and onward) are also those who since 1918 have been brought into his alleged temple and have been approved as children and parts of his alleged Jehovah's earthly organization. Unmitigated confusion it is to make a birth of Christ's enthronement, empowerment and commission, and that allegedly to have taken place in 1914! He claims that the rejoicing of Is. 54: 1 refers to joy in heaven at the birth of a nation—an individual, Jesus, enthroned, empowered and commissioned (Z '31, 324, par. 8)! In spite of the parallelism of Is. 54: 1, showing that the expressions, "thou that didst not bear,"

and "thou that didst not travail with child," are equivalent, he claims that the expression, "thou that didst not travail with child," means that his heavenly Zion bore a child without travail, *i.e.*, without the fight to expel Satan, etc., from heaven! Accordingly, she—antitypical Sarah—must have others than the one child! Surely the woman of Gen. 3: 15; Is. 54: 1, did not empower Christ to reign, let alone do it in 1914; for this woman is on earth. Much of the above-shown confusion arises from his setting aside our Pastor's clear and factual interpretation of Is. 66: 7-9 as applying to the Little Flock being delivered from nominal spiritual Zion before the trouble would afflict the latter, and to the Great Company being delivered from her after she would enter the trouble, and applying this passage to an imaginary Zion as an alleged heavenly organization of God, which turns out in the first birth to be God!

Such confusions, contradictions and ambiguities just pointed out are the surest proof of the erroneousness of J.F.R.'s alleged and vaunted new light—old darkness in very truth, as the papacy has taught similar things in palming off its counterfeit. One of the mind and heart satisfying characteristics of the Truth is its simplicity; another is its harmony, and a third is its convincing power to the sanctified heart and mind. None of these characteristics are found in J.F.R.'s vagaries launched upon the Church and the world since 1917, beginning toward the world with his counterfeit first smiting of Jordan, and in 1918 with his millions now living never dying after 1925. The simplicity, harmony and convincing power of the Truth on Jehovah's symbolic wife in Gen. 3: 15; Is. 54 and Gal. 4, are an evidence of its verity. A comparison of Is. 54 and Gal. 4 proves that antitypical Sarah is addressed in Is. 54. Who antitypical Sarah is the Scriptures clearly teach: She is (1) the Oath-bound Covenant and (2) its appliers for the development

of the Christ class, and thus is their symbolic mother. That Sarah types (1) these promises is manifest from Rom. 9: 7-9; Gal. 3: 14-18, 29; Heb. 6: 13-20; and (2) the servants who in applying these promises mother the Seed is apparent from Is. 54: 17; Gal. 4: 19, 26-31.

Does one say that such a view makes part of the mother the child? We reply, Not so: God's faithful Little Flock in their capacity *of developing one another* through the oath-bound promises, which are a summary of the Little Flock developing Truth, are a part of the mother; and in their capacity *of being developed* by these they are the children. These two capacities are an experimental fact, which all who experience them know to be such. The distinction that holds here is very similar to the antitypical distinction between the priest and the lampstand, the priest and the table, the priest and the altar. In each case the Christ is typed: The lampstand, in His capacity of enlightening the brethren, the priest, in His capacity of being enlightened by the brethren; the table, in His capacity of strengthening the brethren in every good word and work by the bread of life for their heavenly journey, the priest, in His capacity of being so strengthened by the brethren; the altar, in His capacity of comforting, encouraging, etc., the sorely tried brethren while sacrificing, the priest, in His capacity of sacrificing amid sore trials. Unlike J.F.R.'s confusion in attempting to explain what he vagariously holds on the woman of Gen. 3: 15, Jehovah's symbolic wife of Is. 54 and antitypical Sarah of Gal. 4, our pertinent definition, explanation and proof are clear, simple, harmonious with the seven axioms of Biblical interpretation, convincing sanctified minds and hearts.

He says that the woman of Gen. 3: 15; Is. 54 and Gal. 4 was barren until 1914. St. Paul says she was bearing in his days (Gal. 4: 19, 26-31). He says that

the words of Is. 54: 13 first entered into fulfillment since his mythical temple-entering allegedly occurred in 1918; Jesus says (John 6: 45) that they began to be fulfilled in His day and would continue throughout the Age, because whoever would come to Him—God's children—would be taught of God; and God's children have been drawn to Jesus by the Father throughout the Age. The raising up of such on the last day—the promise of a resurrection (John 6: 44, 45) to such on the last day—does not mean what he seeks to palm off as its meaning—an exalting of one to the alleged privileges of his temple and his drives, in this his last day! It is true, as he says, that St. Paul's quoting Is. 54: 1 in Gal. 4: 27 (when compared with the above-quoted pertinent passages) definitely settles the matter as to who Sarah and the Seed picture, but St. Paul settles it as teaching the view that we have presented and against the view that J.F.R. presents.

His charge (Z '31, 326, par. 16) that those who oppose his view of the Lord's coming to his temple, of Zion, of God's organization, in 1918, and of his then alleged new truths, prove by that opposition as a matter of self-evidence that they are not in the temple, nor of Zion, cannot be true, unless his view of these things has first been proven to be true—a thing that he has completely failed to prove, and a thing that we have proven to be unscriptural, unreasonable and unfactual. His claim that the opposers of his teachings were cast out of the temple (Z '31, 376, par. 25) is thus proven false, though he did drive them away from the Society even from 1917 onward. His claim that Zion's being built up as stated in Ps. 102: 16, means that God's [mythical] organization since 1918 as Jehovah's woman has been going to house-keeping and children-bearing [his partisan followers since 1918], is another example of his very numerous instances of applying a very rare and figurative use of words where a frequent and literal one fits better. To build up Zion

in this life means to develop the Church in grace, knowledge, fruitfulness in service, in endurance of persecution and suffering for righteousness and tests along these five lines. To build up Zion beyond the veil means to establish her as the kingdom in power. His saying that antitypical Sarah's travail (Z '31, 325, par. 13) means that God's heavenly organization fought in 1914 with Satan and his angels in the alleged battle that resulted in Satan and his angels being cast out of heaven to the earth, makes him contradict St. Paul's and Isaiah's statement (Gal. 4: 19, 22-31; Is. 54: 1) to the effect that such travail was the process and accompaniment of bearing her child and did not, as his theory demands, follow her child-bearing.

That he makes the Society as a corporation a part of God's alleged earthly organization is evident from the fact that he teaches that its officers by their election are made the officers of God's alleged earthly organization (Z '31, 355, par. 2), and that his alleged children of Sarah must make use of its equipment, literary and other products, and leadership, or they will be cast out of Zion, [he does, indeed, cast them out of his church (3 John 9-11); but thanks be to God he cannot cast them out of *the* Church]. Thus a corporation authorized and continued by Satan's alleged organization is a part of God's alleged organization—pure Romanism! His lengthy denial that the Society as a corporation was created and authorized by his alleged Satan's organization avails nothing as against the logic of his position; for if, as he claims, the state is a part of Satan's organization (God says that it is an ordinance of God; Rom. 13: 1-6, Heb. 1: 10), and if the state authorized the creation of the Society as a corporation, as it certainly did, then this corporation, an alleged part and controller of his alleged earthly organization of God, is an authorized creature of Satan's organization. His use of the word *organization* is not only non-Biblical, but is employed

to convey an unscriptural thought; for in the first place the real symbolic wife of Jehovah is not an organization at all; for she is (1) the Christ-developing Truth and (2) the servants who develop the Christ through such Truth. Hence neither of these is, nor both of them combined are an organization. In the second place, its thought is a counterpart in the little papacy of the counterfeit organization in the great papacy. Jehovah's symbolic wife is not even the Body of Christ on this or the other side of the veil; for the Christ-developing Truth of course is not the whole nor a part of these two bodies; nor were nor are the Old Testament Worthies who were the personal part of the Covenant during its barren time a part of either of these two bodies, though the faithful of the New Testament servants who have ministered the Christ-developing Truth to the Christ are of these two bodies. It is for these reasons that we deny the propriety of the use of the expression, God's organization, in the Rutherfordian ambiguous senses and caution all to beware of it as Satanic in origin, purpose and use.

There is scarcely an issue in the 22 "Towers" reviewed in this chapter in which he does not rail at those who oppose his errors of teaching and arrangement. Without proof they are continually set forth by him as that evil servant, the antichrist, the son of perdition, the lawless one, the man of sin, antitypical Judas, workers of iniquity, etc. To one who understands the Scriptures and facts that prove that we are now in the Epiphany, living over on a small scale the Gospel Age, in which movements, characters, events and proportionate but shorter time similar to those of the Gospel Age appear, and in which his organization appears as the little Catholic Church, his leading supporters as the little Romanist hierarchy and himself as the little pope, the real meaning of his denunciations of the opposers ["Protestants"] of his doctrinal, practical

and organizational errors becomes at once apparent; for just as the great pope in the large Gospel Age denounced his opponents, among whom were God's faithful people, as Korah, Dathan, Abiram, antichrist, man of sin, son of perdition, lawless one, Judas and workers of iniquity, etc., so he, the little pope, and head of the little man of sin, little antichrist, little son of perdition, little lawless one and little Judas does toward his opponents among whom God's faithful priesthood are. We by no means say the above in railing, but as a matter of true interpretation of the Lord's Word.

He says (Z '31, 132, par. 11, and 134, par. 23) that his opponents, the clergy and his man of sin, will be destroyed *before Armageddon*, which he claims is taught in Ps. 91: 8. We will answer this when answering his view of the book of Esther. To prove the same thought he teaches that Ps. 37 applies now, which is transparent error, when we consider that this Psalm relates to the Millennium and especially to its Little Season, as is manifest from the repeated contrasts between the preserved righteous inheriting the earth, abiding there forever, exalted there, etc., and the rooting out of, and cutting off, etc., of the wicked from the earth in the same period as the above rewards are given to the righteous there described (Ps. 37: 9-11, 18, 22, 27-29, the saints of v. 28 are the Ancient and Youthful Worthies in the Little Season, 34). The inheritance of the earth taught in this Psalm is different from that taught in Ps. 2: 8 and Matt. 5: 5 in this: Whereas the latter inheritance is, as that of the Christ, an ownership of the earth without inhabiting it, the former is, as that of the restitution class, an ownership and inhabiting of it. Notice how he (par. 40) in silence slides over verse 29, which speaks of the righteous referred to in this Psalm as inhabiting and dwelling in the earth forever! He claims (Z '31, 292, par. 6) that he has no fight with anyone. Why

then does he in almost every one of his Tower articles rail at, slander, misrepresent, backbite and warn against those who oppose his revolutionisms against God's Truth and arrangements? In the same paragraph, like the big pope, he applies Is. 66: 5 as against them, whereas he is the one that cast off his brethren, alleging that he thereby glorified the Lord, but thereby he acted out the holier-than-thou attitude of Is. 65: 5, which, just like the big pope, he also applies to the defenders of the Truth and its arrangements for their efforts at character development. In fact he has, also just like the big pope, so far applied, in his continued railing, almost every Bible passage referring to the wicked to his alleged man of sin, many of whom are saints of God. He likewise, as in 1918, again like the big pope, falsely accuses these (Z '31, 329, par. 28) of now betraying him and his partisans to the civil power. Of course, as in 1918, he hopes thereby to keep his disciples in line by a double appeal—the involved suggestion that they are thereby proven to be of the Lord's remnant and that they must move heaven and earth to sell his books in order to remain such, and that his opponents are of the Judas class, and hence must be given no audience of any kind. In this he also acts just like his counterpart, the big pope, in Great Babylon.

He says that in 1918 there were among the Spirit-begotten at least three classes: (1) the selfish, who said that the Lord delays His coming, (2) the discouraged and (3) the faithful. His first two alleged classes are no classes at all. Among the Spirit-begotten in 1918 there were no more than two classes: the Little Flock and the Great Company. An extensive observation of the Truth movements in 1918 qualifies us to say that there were no new creatures in the Truth who in that year denied that the Lord's presence had set in. There is one individual who, from Dec. 29, 1916, onward, while not denying that the Lord's presence had set in

(and the right Greek text of Matt. 24: 48 does not say, My Lord delays *to come*; but My Lord delays [does not do things fast enough to suit me; therefore I will run ahead of Him, instead of waiting on Him, and will do to suit myself]), and that individual is demonstrably J.F.R. Despite repeated correction and better knowledge he continues to quote Matt. 24: 48 in part as, My Lord delays *to come*, and then, with no justification in fact, applies this false reading of the passage to those whom he alleges became the man of sin in 1918 or 1919. All of the facts of the case prove that he is the one referred to in Matt. 24: 48-51.

His charge (Z '31, 117, par. 15) that his opponents hide their hatred with lying lips and utter slander as fact, which certainly characterized his Harvest Siftings, with its about 325 falsehoods mainly his own, so far as we are concerned is not true. We have utterly avoided discussing his personal conduct, criticizing only his official errors of doctrine, organization and arrangement. Our opposition to him is solely made for what the Bible, reason and facts prove of him as an *official*, not as an individual. And it flows not from hatred of him, nor from lying lips, as he charges, but from a zealous love for the Lord, the Truth and the brethren and a zealous hatred for sin, selfishness, worldliness and error, especially when we see these injure God's consecrated people, as his sinfulness, selfishness, worldliness and error have injured them more than that inflicted on them by any other human being. His saying (Z '31, 118, par. 25) that God's people had not been pleasing unto Him until 1918, or preferably 1922, is a direct contradiction of the Bible, which teaches the opposite of all God's Little Flock, (Ps. 147: 11; 149: 4; Heb. 10: 38; 1 Cor. 10: 5, 11; Heb. 11: 5; 13: 16; Col. 1: 10; 3: 20; 1 John 3: 22).

He uses very frequently in every one of his leading articles the expression, Jehovah's name, which, he says, to vindicate is the chief object of God and *his*

remnant. Untruthfully and slanderously he says that up to 1918 the faithful saw only the ransom and deliverance, but not the vindication of God's name (Z '31, 116, par. 11). He claims that his book and booklet selling campaign, which must include, of course, the millions not dying after 1925 propaganda, is the greatest vindication of Jehovah's name ever made (Z '31, 116, par. 11). When we consider the facts that his books reek through and through with error, that they almost always abound with abuse of the clergy and of those who contend for the Truth, instead of being filled with calm, well reasoned arguments from truth, reason and fact, and that the Elisha type, picturing the generally good aspects of the Societyites' public work, apart from the anointing of Hazael and Jehu, is silent on any of their works from 1921 onward until Elisha's death scene, which is post-Armageddon, we are enabled to get the Divine view of his work since 1920. It is unworthy of mention in the same breath with the reaping movement, because it is defiled by so much transparent error, intemperate speech, unreasoned zeal and unwise propaganda. Think of giving the public even a true exposition of Revelation and Ezekiel, which books are for the Church alone; and then think of the totally erroneous viewpoint of almost everything in these books, to say nothing of the millions propaganda and other errors of his movement, and then a fair estimate of the sort of vindication of Jehovah's name the Societyites have been giving the public since 1920 can be made! No doubt those Society friends who, mainly by word of mouth, since the literature furnished them is largely erroneous, by the Truth and by the Spirit truly reprove the world for sin, righteousness and judgment to come (John 16: 8-11) (and with genuine pleasure we recognize that there are many of them who do so), are vindicating God's name; but by the nature of the situation they fall short of vindicating it so well as was

done through the Little Flock during the reaping time.

J.F.R. claims that God's name means His purpose—a thing that he claims was never known before 1922. Then he says that God's purpose is to vindicate His name. This is, of course, reasoning in a circle and gets one nowhere so far as clearness of thought is concerned on God's name. While one feature of God's name is His plan, it has six other features; and when we speak of God's plan vindicating His name, we mean in such a connection by the word *plan* something different from what we mean there by the word *name*, while he makes God's name and what he thinks is His purpose synonymous. This vindication, he claims, is made in defiance and defeat of a challenge that Satan is supposed to have made to God to place on earth a man and race who would keep their integrity as against Satan's attempts at their seduction. In discussing his errors on Job we have overthrown this theory of God's plan. He claims that the purpose of the Christ is to vindicate God's name, purpose, against this imaginary challenge amid Satan's efforts to prevent God's putting such a man and race on earth. This setting is, of course, a mixture of truth and error. Its elaboration in J.F.R.'s writings makes power and combativeness God's main operating attributes and degrades His character and dignity as being wholly occupied in a fight of self-vindication against the imaginary challenge of an unscrupulous foe.

God's true plan is a revelation and expression of His perfect character of blended and controlling wisdom, justice, love and power, all working in perfect coordination with one another through Christ's office work in overcoming the effects of sin (introduced by Satan through Adam and fostered by him in Adam's descendants). In such work Christ delivers from sin first the faith class as the elect, and secondly, blessing through these, the unbelief class as the non-elect with opportunities of deliverance from sin, He actually

delivers the obedient of these; and all this is done that God might have the joy (Rev. 4: 11) of fitting the elect classes for, and giving them eternal life on various spirit planes, and of fitting the obedient of the non-elect class for, and giving them eternal life on the human plane, God's conflict with Satan being not the main, but an incidental part of this program, and not being at all a vindication of His ability to meet an imaginary challenge of Satan, though certainly vindicating His character against any and every aspersion cast upon it, but being altogether a revelation of His character to His rational creatures for their uplift and appreciation, that for their good they may forever celebrate by their thoughts, motives, words and acts, and image forth by their perfection God's glorious character. The reaping movement in a world-wide work most faithfully, holily and truthfully set forth this and therefore showed forth Jehovah's praises a hundredfold more and better than the for a large part unfaithful, defiled and erroneous movement led by J.F.R. has been doing from 1917 onward.

That J.F.R.'s understanding of the expression, Jehovah's name, as meaning God's alleged purpose, is very incomplete, is evident when we recognize that this expression means seven different things. These were understood during the reaping time, yea, most of them by the nominal church, as we will quote in proof from the Lutheran catechism of Dr. Conrad Dietrich, written over three centuries ago; in the face of which he says that the significance of this term has just since 1922 come to be understood. We will first quote from the above-mentioned catechism to prove that several hundred years ago they understood more on the meaning of that term than J.F.R.'s definition of it as *purpose*, if the purpose were truly defined, as it is not by him, shows him to understand of it. Dr. Conrad Dietrich, who died in 1639, in his catechism, which was in circulation before 1625, page

52, of the St. Louis' edition, asks the question: "What does the name of God mean?" and answers as follows: "(1) God Himself (Ex. 3: 13-15; 15: 3); (2) God's attributes (Ex. 34: 5-7); (3) God's will or command (Deut. 18: 19); (4) all that is revealed of God in the Bible, and that serves for the knowledge (Ps. 48: 11), worship (Micah 4: 5), honor, praise and confession of Him (Acts 21: 13)." This answer from a nominal-church source of over three centuries ago is far more comprehensive and complete than the very incomplete and wrongly defined definition—"Jehovah's purpose"—of J.F.R., who says that his understanding of it has only lately become due! It is, when rightly defined, included in what Dr. Dietrich gives under (4).

We understand that this term *name*, and hence the term *Jehovah's name*, has at least seven meanings in the Bible, namely: (1) appellation, like Jehovah, Jesus, John, James, Mary, Martha, etc.; (2) nature (Ex. 3: 14, where the expression, "I AM" [the translation here of the Hebrew imperfect tense, first person, instead of the usual third person, *Yahveh*, wrongly transliterated Jehovah, referring to God in His attributes of being], means His nature; Ps. 83: 18; 99: 3; Is. 42: 8; 62: 2; 63: 16; Rev. 2: 12); (3) character (Ex. 3: 14, where occurs the expression, "I AM THAT I AM," *i.e.*, I Am That I Am Pleased To Be—perfect in wisdom, justice, love and power; Ex. 33: 18, 19; 34: 5-7; Ps. 34: 3; 91: 14; 111: 9) [In Ex. 6: 3 the expression, "My name *Jehovah*" cannot mean God's appellation, since Abraham, Isaac and Jacob knew that and frequently used it, as the book of Genesis shows. Evidently Ex. 6: 3 uses it to signify God's nature as the Eternal, Immortal, Unchangeable, Absolute, Self-sufficient, etc., One, and His character as the Wise, Just, Loving and Powerful One. For details please see P '31, 183, 184]; (4) reputation (Ex. 9: 16; Is. 52: 5; Mal. 1: 11; Prov. 22: 1); (5) word, plan, purpose (Ex. 34: 6—"truth"; Ps. 48: 8-13;

Micah 4: 5; Acts 21: 13); (6) official authority (Deut. 18: 19, 20; Ps. 118: 10, 26; 129: 8; Matt. 26: 9); (7) honor (Is. 42: 8; Mal. 1: 14; Phil. 2: 9-11). Against his statement that the expression, the name of Jehovah, was not understood until after 1922, from when on he claims it became clear as meaning what he alleges to be God's purpose, we say that from 1904 onward we knew the above seven meanings of the expression, one of which is that of Jehovah's plan or true purpose, and our Pastor knew them years before we did. It is true that J.F.R.'s perversion and counterfeits of God's purpose since 1917 and especially since 1922 were not previously known, but they are in the little papacy the counterfeits and perversions that correspond with similar ones in great papacy. Hence his definition of Jehovah's name is verbally only a very partial truth, and in content is an error with very little Truth intermixed, just as his definition (Z '31, 116, par. 10) of what constitutes overcoming—faithfulness in witnessing (which in his sense means selling his books and booklets, giving oral witness of their contents and recommending their alleged verity)—is a partial truth; whereas overcoming mean faithfulness in study, spread and practice of the Truth and in endurance of the resultant persecutions, sufferings and trials. One of his standard methods of deceit is his definitions, which often are half-truths and more often entire errors.

He has in six consecutive issues of the Tower given a hodge-podge full of inconsistencies, self-contradictions, ambiguities, vagaries and blasphemies, as alleged new lightning flashes from his temple, on the supposed antitype of Esther. He sets forth the book as a picture of events connected with his movement. Mordecai is variously defined: sometimes as his faithful up to 1918 and onward (Z '31, 148, par. 15; 227, par. 4); sometimes as those giving the new light since 1918, and especially since 1922, which must mean

himself, since he is the one alleged to be giving it (Z '31, 198, par. 26). Esther represents that part of his remnant who have come in since 1918 and are designated and anointed the queen, Christ's Bride (Z '31, 148, par. 14; 227, par. 4). Ahasuerus represents royal power *in the abstract*. This definition, a splendid example of his methods of deceit, is used to pave the way to making him represent, according to the kaleidoscopic needs of his theory, sometimes Satan, sometimes the civil rulers, sometimes Jesus, sometimes Jehovah, and that at times in the same episode (Z '31, 148, par. 16). Vashti represent the false religious class: the Pharisees of old and those once in line for the kingdom, but proven lawless in 1917 and 1918 (Z '31, 148, par. 17). Haman types the clergy and his man of sin (Z '31, 148, par. 18). The Jews type God's faithful people, of whom Mordecai and Esther were mere representative members (Z '31, 149, par. 19; 153, par. 48). Much more logical is the thought that Vashti, while queen, represents the nominal church as the Lord's mouthpiece up to 1878, and hence reckoned Christ's queen; that Esther represents the Little Flock, which since 1878 displaced the nominal church as the Lord's mouthpiece and hence as Christ's reckoned queen; that Ahasuerus represents our Lord, and that Mordecai types the Laodicean Messenger. We hope to give details on this book of Esther in Vol. X. C. J. Woodworth's *general* setting of the book, as given in a letter in The Watch Tower, and in Comments based thereon is not in our judgment at all correct.

We now will point out the erroneousness of J.F.R.'s view of the book of Esther as typing matters connected with his movement since 1917. He gives a wrong definition of *Esther*, saying the word means *fresh myrtle*, whereas, while Hadassah, her Hebrew name, means *myrtle*, her Persian name, *Esther*, means *star*, and not *the star Venus*, as C. J. Woodworth in his letter in Z '07, 198, suggests. Nor does the myrtle

tree represent J.F.R.'s remnant in his Harvest with his alleged Truth restorations and the alleged joy of his drives. *It stands for the tentatively justified.* In Neh. 8: 14-17 the Israelites dwelling in booths of different kinds of branches type the various Truth professors occupying their different standings—dwelling places—before God as Little Flock members (olive branches), Youthful Worthies (myrtle branches), Second Death members (branches of thick trees), Great Company (palm branches) and the Justified (pine branches). In Is. 41: 19, 20, except for the Second Death class, the same four classes are represented by the four kinds of trees in the first clause, as applying to the Parousia; and the three groups of the Epiphany Levites are represented by the three kinds of trees mentioned in the second clause. Also in Zech. 1: 8-11 the myrtle trees represent the tentatively justified.

J.F.R.'s statement (Z '31, 150, par. 30) that Esther was *certainly* of Benjamin, because of being a cousin of Mordecai, is saying too much. Mordecai was of Benjamin (Es. 2: 5, 6). This would not necessarily imply that Esther was of that tribe, any more than that Elizabeth and Mary being cousins would make them of the same tribe, the former being of Levi and the latter of Judah (Luke 1: 36), because the tribal relation being fixed by the father's and not by the mother's tribe, Esther's father, though being Mordecai's uncle (Es. 2: 7) may or may not have been of Benjamin. Nor can we, as he does (Z '31, 151, par. 35), infer, from the fact that Benjamin adhered to Judah at the separation of the two and the ten tribes over 500 years before, that Esther, because of that adherence, types the faithful remnant steadfastly opposing his man of sin. Hereon several remarks: The descendants of certain ones used to type a certain class do not usually type members of the same class. Jacob and his children and other descendants, Isaac and his children and other descendants, Abraham and his children and other

descendants, Joseph and his children and other descendants, Moses and his children and other descendants, etc., etc., are a few among many examples to this effect. Again, where are the Benjaminites set forth at the separation as typing those who opposed the man of sin? Further, he defines the word (Z '31, 150, par. 35) *Mordecai* as meaning *myrrh*, whereas the word means *warrior* or *warlike*, which certainly fits the true antitype—the Laodicean angel! He unwarrantedly says (Z '31, 151, par. 41) that the Bible and history prove that Ahasuerus was Xerxes. This has been assumed without proof from either the Bible or History as likely by some non-truth writers, whose assumption our Pastor considered probable enough to accept tentatively as such. Non-truth writers with seemingly better probabilities on their side, have assumed that he was Artaxerxes, who sent both Ezra and Nehemiah to Jerusalem for Israel's good, and whose friendliness to the Jews they claim to be a tribute of his regard for Esther. This latter view we consider correct from Biblical and historical sources; for Xerxes reigned only eleven years, whereas Ahasuerus reigned many more than twelve years (compare Esther 3: 7, 13 with 9: 20–10: 3). For the proof of Xerxes' reign being of but eleven years' duration please see the pertinent facts as they are given in the Edgar Brothers' Great Pyramid Passages, Vol. 2, 305–327. Hence J.F.R.'s pertinent assertions are an illustration of the unreliability of his statements on matters of fact in general, and on this subject in particular. His statement (Z '31, 152, par. 43) that Ahasuerus types both Christ and Satan and that his seven chamberlains type the seven heads of the Dragon and the seven stars of the seven churches, is *prima facie* evidence of the error of his view of the entire antitype. This is all the more manifest when he, as shown above, asserts that Ahasuerus types Jehovah also. Sober minds must reject a setting which requires such twists, absurdities and

contrarieties in the antitypical significance. Such incongruities find no place in the true antitype, where Ahasuerus throughout represents our Lord. These incongruities are only a few samples of the stretching, twisting, whittling, ignoring and contradicting necessary to torture the book of Esther into a type of his movement since 1917.

Vashti does not mean *beautiful woman*; it means *beautiful*, regardless of whether a woman or something else is spoken of. Of course, it is in his interests, if he would keep disciples following after him and frighten them away from those whose arguments he cannot meet, and whose communion he forbids his followers to hold, to represent them as antitypical Haman, his evil servant, man of sin, son of perdition, Antichrist, lawless one, Judas, workers of iniquity and anything else he can find unfavorable in the Bible to pin on them, no matter how much wresting and twisting of the Scriptures it requires. Nor does *Haman* mean *noise, tumult, he that prepares the way*, nor does *Hammedatha* mean *he that troubles the law*, as he asserts (Z '31, 152, par. 46), but *Haman* means *Mercury as famed* and *Hammedatha* means *doubly given*. Claiming that Christ's reign began Oct., 1914, that His war with Satan followed immediately and that Christ's victory was followed by the antitype of Ahasuerus' 180 days' feast, whose type occurred in the third year of Ahasuerus' reign, and applying the typical years for so many years in the antitype, he involves himself into a chronological blunder that disproves his setting of things; for the third year (Es. 1: 3, 4) of a reign alleged to have begun in the "autumn of 1914" would be Oct., 1916, to Oct., 1917. But, alas for his theory, the seventh day of a feast of 180 days, when Vashti's rebellion set in, within that third year, even if it were put at its latest possible date, would be in the second half of that period which makes the seventh day of that period about April 7, 1917, while his setting of

things, as he puts it (Z '31, 163, par. 3), requires him to begin the feast in the end of 1917, or the beginning of 1918 (Z '31, 163, par. 4). But it is true that *he* was feasting at the table of power-grasping and lording it over God's heritage and gormandized himself to the full during the third year, 1916-1917, and thereby made a division in the Church, which began June 27, 1917, a half year too early for the rebellion of his antitypical Vashti! He then calls his alleged feast the beginning of the marriage supper of the Lamb (the end of 1917 or beginning of 1918!), whereas the Bible shows that supper to take place after the Great Company is not only invited thereto, which has not yet taken place, but after they leave the world, which will not be for perhaps 20 years yet (Rev. 19: 8, 9). He is further inconsistent in identifying this feast and the one of Luke 14: 17-21, and connecting them with his alleged coming of Christ to the temple (Z '31, 164, pars. 8, 9), which he has all along been claiming for the Spring of 1918, a further proof of his stretching the third year until its end reaches the Fall of 1918, the beginning of the fifth year after Oct., 1914!

He defines his seven wise men in a good sense (in the bad sense they are the dragon's seven heads!) as being allegedly spirit beings, as the *seven alleged angels* of the seven churches (Z '31, 164, par. 12). It will be recalled that years ago we charged that a logical deduction from his new setting of things would force him to make Christ's Second Advent occur Oct., 1914. This he denied, and for years kept saying that he was not changing it from 1874. We charged that this was hypocritical in him and was done because he did not then dare take the mask off the face of his theory. Now he comes out and plainly gives 1914 as the date of Christ's Second Advent (Z '31, 166, par. 23)! Hegai, which means *exile*, he defines (Z '31, 167, par. 31) as *taking away, meditation*. He claims (Z '31, 167, par. 32) that Hegai types *some* [note the indefiniteness]

provision [persons never type provisions] from and after 1918 to prepare God's people for the kingdom, which seems to be his antitype for his meaning of *taking away*; and as an alleged antitype of the alleged meaning *meditation* he claims there has been more study of the Word since 1918 than before. The reverse, of course, is the case among his followers. One of the worst effects of his administration is his prevention of Bible study, necessitated by keeping his partisans busy selling his erroneous books, and devoting so much of the meetings' time to coaching on book selling. Everybody knows that in Society circles study is in part given up; and for the rest the lessons of the Tower must be gone over so rapidly (about 3½ pages at a lesson) that class members cannot be said to study in such meetings. They merely kiss the great toe of the little pope by submitting unquestioningly to his supposed channelship, swallowing without chewing the unhealthful food he gives them. Like the seven counselors of Ahasuerus in a good sense, Esther's seven maids are supposed to be the seven alleged *spirit angels* of the seven churches (Z '31, 167, par. 35)! The spirit angels cannot minister the Spirit or the Word to the Faithful, to whom they minister only providentially (Acts 11: 13, 14). He claims (Z '31, 168, par. 42) that Is. 65: 5, in referring to those who say, "holier than thou," means those who develop character for kingdom fitness. But really for the Gospel Age it means those nominal people of God, especially the clergy, who excommunicated the saints as *defiled* heretics; and in the little Gospel Age, the little papists and protestants (other Levites) who have disfellowshipped the priesthood as *defiled* heretics. He also in the same paragraph claims that Esther's year's preparation types the preparation *for* the anointing for the kingdom, which his new view claims in all cases is offered to only the very zealous among new creatures, whereas the preparation types the anointing

of the Church class as Christ's prospective reckoned queen for taking the mouthpieceship that antitypical Vashti in 1878 lost.

He comes again into chronological difficulties. Actually the seventh year from Oct., 1914 (when he claims that Christ's reign began, typed, he claims, by Ahasuerus' reign beginning), is Oct., 1920, to Oct., 1921. But according to his setting what he falsely claims (Z '31, 169, par. 47) is typed by Esther's being brought to the king in the seventh year of his reign actually began to take place in Sept. of 1922, just about a year after the end of his seventh year, not after the end of seven years, as he tries to gloss it over. Ahasuerus in supremely loving Esther now begins (Z '31, 170, par. 50), but only for a little while, to type Jehovah, an [alleged] fact that Jesus likely had in mind when He said, "The Father Himself loveth you"! But the connection shows that he now is taking Esther to wife, hence cannot therein represent Jehovah; but could therein fittingly represent Jesus. And Esther's feast (Z '31, 170, par. 53) in celebration of the marriage "probably foreshadowed 'the marriage supper of the Lamb' to which God's remnant [hence not the Great Company!] are invited, and to which they have responded, and that this dates from approximately Sept. [in the banner unfurling at the Columbus Convention], 1922." (1) His remark (Z '31, 182, par. 22) that Satan's messengers hide behind the letter of the law in their efforts to injure the faithful, reminds us of his attempting to hide his unholy ambition in power-grasping and resisting of all opposers thereof in 1917 behind an inapplicable law, requiring allegedly the ousting of the four directors. Then he claims (Z '31, 182, par. 24) that God allows Satan, particularly since 1918, and more so since 1922, to seek to destroy the Church! Greater efforts by far were made by Satan in the Dark Ages by great papacy. Rather, since 1917 God has been letting Satan seek to destroy the flesh

of the Great Company, and this, with chronological twists to suit his theory, he misinterprets as Satan's greater efforts to destroy the Church. Esther's being told (Z '31, 196, pars. 9, 11) to declare her nationality, he alleges, types the Societyites' being told to stand forth against Satan's organization by giving the Society's messages, which are his own. This is untrue; for her being urged to declare her nationality was to preserve her and the other Israelites' lives, based upon her influence with the king. Again, it is untrue, for Esther did not stand up against Ahasuerus' empire, which, according to the theory, was the type of Satan's alleged organization. Again, it is untrue because those stood up against were at most servants of Satan, who therefore, would type certain servants of Satan at the time of the antitype. And, finally, the declaration of her nationality was only incidental to, and influential for the Jews' delivery. Hence the alleged antitype falls to the ground. Her declaration of her nationality was only one act of her maintaining her integrity, which to retain God's favor she had hitherto faithfully kept. Hence her telling her nationality could not type the Church's full keeping of its integrity (Z '31, 196, par. 13).

To assert, as he does (Z '31, 196, par. 10), that until only lately have the present Truth people been considered "as like other 'Christians' so-called, merely religionists in the land," is a false and base slander of the Reaping People of God, who were certainly in many ways by "'Christians' so called" persecuted for their stand for Truth and righteousness while reaping the Gospel-Age Harvest. He dares charge God's Little Flock in its reaping members from 1874 to 1914 with being "like other 'Christians' so called." In so doing he reveals himself as acting as the mouth of the little beast in little Babylon, opened "in blasphemy against God to blaspheme His name and His tabernacle and them that dwell in heaven" (Rev. 13: 6). Contrast his

fierce denunciation of the clergy, politicians and capitalists with Bro. Russell's sober, truthful, clear, but tactful descriptions of these, *e.g.*, as in Vol. IV, and at once the spirit of the latter is shown to be that of that wise and faithful servant and that of the former is shown to be that of the Jambresite leader among Truth sifters, that wicked servant and foolish and unprofitable shepherd.

If his pertinent setting of things is right (Z '31, 197, pars. 14, 15), Esther's going to the king for relief could only type the Lord's people going down to Egypt for help—a thing that he denounces; hence he jumps away from his setting of things—Satan's alleged organization typed by the Persian Empire—and makes Jehovah the antitype of Ahasuerus—a procedure that to the discerning is proof positive of the erroneousness of his entire theory of the antitype of the book of Esther. Never once does he apply his definition of Ahasuerus' antitype, royalty in the abstract, *to such*, but always applies it *to persons*, which proves the definition to be a studied subterfuge. He claims that those who hold to Rom. 13: 1-6 as referring to the civil powers, which its various expressions prove it does, have "*gone into the dark*," *i.e.*, have left the Truth. But he has almost entirely left the Truth that held up to 1916, which proves that he is one of those who have "gone into the dark." Par. 35 says that God and His *organization* are the higher powers, which, of course, from his standpoint, includes the Society leaders, especially himself, as the little papal autocrat of them all. Esther's sending word to Mordecai that she would go to the king for the release of the Jews, with preceding fasting, he claims (Z '31, 198, par. 27), types the alleged remnant announcing their determination to prepare to get into line and partake in the Society's drives. This cannot be true, even from the standpoint of his own position, because his view requires this alleged antitype to have set in after 1926—

the 12th year—whereas his supposed Esther had for years entered into and continued in such conformity and drives. Esther's purifying, in his setting, typing preparation for the remnant's anointing, the king's choosing her as bride typing his remnant's choice for the anointing by Christ, her marriage typing the remnant's being made a sharer of Christ's kingdom with Him, by becoming an active part of Jehovah's organization, are examples of three contradictions to his chronological claim on the 12th year now being examined. Our understanding of the typical significance of the 3rd, 7th and 12th years is as follows: The 3rd year, as marking the feast and Vashti's rejection, the 7th as marking Esther's choice by the king, and the 12th year as affecting Persians and Jews type not years but trial times of different classes. The 3rd year types the trial period of the nominal church *as mouthpiece*; the 7th year the trial period of the true Church *for mouthpiece*, and the 12th year, the trial period of the real and nominal Little Flock as to their standing.

Again, His claim that such getting into line and partaking in such drives occasioned Satan to make the original decree to put his remnant, among other things, to physical death; hence the alleged remnant's subsequent act of going to the king for release from the decree could not have caused the decree, for the cause must precede the effect. The same chronological and logical contradictions are manifest in his claim (Z '31, 199, par. 34) that Esther's appearing before the king types the faithful appearing before Christ's judgment seat in his temple, which everywhere he alleges was in 1918 and 1919, which is before the alleged decree was issued. Her thus appearing, he alleges, is in her going from house to house to sell his books and booklets since 1926! Note the change from Jehovah to Christ (par. 34) in his pertinent interpretation of the type, while the actual demands of his setting make, not

Christ, but Satan, the threatener of the danger, and hence the king's antitype here.

Note the folly of Z '31, 212, par. 5: Devils tried to make Ahasuerus cranky at the time of Esther's appearance, but good angels shoved them away and made him good humored! This is when Ahasuerus is supposed to type our Lord sitting in His temple in judgment! This, he says, was just before the remnant appeared before Christ in the temple and received the robe of righteousness, garments of salvation (Z '31, 212, pars. 5, 6), which he everywhere else assigns to 1918 and 1919, but here to 1926! It is also contradictory to his setting that the antitype of her going to the king on behalf of her people occurred in the remnant's selling his books from 1922 onward, while the decree was made in the twelfth year of Christ's supposed reign, 1926.

Note the glaring inconsistency of Haman's being in the scene of the banquet Ahasuerus' prime minister and in that scene typing the cast-off clergy and the alleged man of sin, and in the same scene Ahasuerus typing Jehovah or Christ (Z '31, 213, par. 13). Of course, his charge (Z '31, 216, pars. 35, 36) that the clergy and his man of sin seek the physical death of his remnant is false; but it serves splendidly to make his remnant oppose his man of sin and partisanly support him; but, as the Irishman said, "Thot's the intintion." His view (Z '31, 216, pars. 39–47) that the Bible teaches that civil rulers will destroy the clergy and his man of sin, and that before Armageddon, is false. The civil rulers will mourn over the clergy's destruction, standing helpless afar off therefrom (Rev. 18: 9, 10). It will be antitypical Jehu, conservative labor, the revolutionists, who will kill the clergy in so far as they are Baal worshipers and kissers (2 Kings 11: 11, 18–28). He is led to make this error by claiming (Z '31, 216, pars. 39, 40) that Ahasuerus in executing Haman types the civil rulers destroying the clergy and his

man of sin. He thus makes Ahasuerus type five things in this book: royalty *in the abstract*, Satan, Christ, Jehovah and the civil rulers. Yea, in the banquet scene he first makes Ahasuerus type Christ, then changes him from Christ to the civil rulers at Haman's exposure; and at Ahasuerus' returning and finding Haman pleading with Esther for his life, he changes him to Jehovah; and in his ordering Haman's death he changes him again to the civil rulers! And all this in one scene!

He misapplies Joel 3: 9, 12, which refers to the World War, to Armageddon (Z '31, 229, par. 13), and then makes Armageddon mean all the trouble, whereas (he is silent on the World War as part of the trouble, since it no longer fits his views) it does not refer to anarchy, nor Jacob's trouble, but solely to the revolution (Rev. 16: 14-18), immediately after which, he says (Z '31, 233, par. 48), the kingdom will bless all as its subjects. This cannot be until, not only after anarchy and Jacob's trouble, but after the return of the Ancient Worthies.

Of course, such twists are necessary to his claim (Z '31, 229, par. 20) that the messengers, sent to the Jews, giving them the right to defend themselves from their attackers, type his remnant selling his literature containing the message to the antitypical Jews to fight in Armageddon! The Lord's faithful, allegedly his Jews, are to stand entirely aside and let antitypical Jehu, conservative labor, fight with the financial, clerical and political rulers (Rev. 16: 14). This, from the standpoint of his setting that the Jews type God's remnant, proves, contrary to his view, that the battle of the 13th of the 12th month cannot type Armageddon. His saying (Z '31, 229, pars. 21, 22) that in type and antitype "the Jews" will be aggressors, not simply defenders, contradicts the Bible account that present the Jews as defenders ("*stood* for their lives") and, of course, would represent defending, not

attacking antitypes. This error is to incite to aggressive book and booklet selling! His claim (Z '31, 243, par. 3) that the fact that those who were in 1918 restrained by the government have since been given opportunities to serve proves them to be the faithful, is illogical. The faithful Epiphany friends were not so restrained, and were before, during and after that restraint given the privilege of leading Azazel's Goat to the Gate, etc.; while that restraint, preceded and followed by its participants having opportunities for service (of Azazel), is in line with the thought that it was a fit-man experience. Mordecai's and Esther's being of one family being used by him (Z '31, 227, par. 4) as a proof that they thereby type the espoused of Christ, is transparent folly, as it would prove Jacob and Esau, Joseph and Benjamin, Cain and Abel, etc., to type the espoused of Christ.

What of his claim that his antitypical Haman, the clergy and *his* man of sin, are to be put to death physically by the civil powers before Armageddon? J.F.R. has repeatedly been proven to have made false forecasts. Hence he is proven to be a false prophet and the Lord's people should regard and disregard him as a proven false prophet, according to Deut. 18: 22. Having, since shortly after his presumptuous and busybodying "absolutely-without-authority" cablegram reached England, Feb. 26, 1917, been regarded by him as his leading opponent, of course, from his standpoint we are the leader of his Antichrist, his man of sin, his son of perdition, his lawless one, his Judas, his evil servant and his workers of iniquity. Therefore, according to his theory we are going to be executed physically by the civil rulers before Armageddon. If we are not executed physically by the civil rulers before Armageddon, he will for the "*steenth*" time be proven a false prophet.

But the situation is not one so easily disposed of. We will press it home as we did the 1925 fiasco, which,

from our knowledge of the Biblical Parousia and Epiphany teachings, we forecast as such at least five years before 1925. The Biblical Epiphany teachings prompt us here to declare now in advance of his time for our alleged physical execution by the civil powers, that he in this forecast will again be proven to be a false prophet. Knowing the work the Lord has given us to do after Armageddon, we now call to witness our heavenly Father, the Lord Jesus, the Church Triumphant and Militant, the partisan Society adherents and any other of the Truth people to whose attention this statement may come, that we solemnly declare in their presence that J.F.R. has made a false forecast with reference to the clergy and his man of sin, etc., particularly as impliedly involving ourself, when he forecasts that they will be physically executed by the civil rulers before Armageddon; and we also call them to witness to the fact that we assert that the factual disproof of his forecast will not only prove him a false prophet, to be regarded and disregarded as such, but to have given a totally false setting to the typical teachings of the book of Esther, and to be a completely unreliable and thoroughly false teacher; while the fulfillment of his forecasts would prove us a false prophet and an unreliable teacher. Into such a revelatory testing position has his pertinent forecast put him, and our above use of it put us! As Elijah put himself and the priests of Baal to test, so now we put ourself and him before the heavenly Father, our Lord Jesus, the Church Triumphant and Militant, the partisan Society adherents and any of the rest of the Truth people who shall read this, to a test that will determine which of us is a teacher Divinely enlightened, and which of us is a Satanically deluded and deluding teacher among God's people. We are penning these words Sunday A. M., Jan. 24, 1932.

In Z '31, 243–249 and 259–265, he writes on Ezek. 8

and 9, forcing these chapters into setting forth things from 1919 onward, whereas they portray matters from 1874 onward. Neither our Pastor nor ourself have written on Ezek. 8, though we have detailedly written on Ezek. 9 in Vol. IV, Chap. II, and successfully defended our position therein from an attack from J.F.R. from a standpoint that he now repudiates! Of course, it is quite significant that under our attacks or defenses he is continually compelled to alter his views. We will here give a very brief view of our understanding of the general features of Ezek. 8: Ezekiel in this chapter represents the Little Flock in the reaping time. The presence of Judah's elders represents the thought that the vision concerns the leaders of Churchianity during the reaping time, particularly, though not exclusively, in Protestantism. The likeness (v. 2) represents the Parousia Truth, which enabled the Church to have proper insight (vision) into Churchianity. The temple represents the Church. The image of jealousy symbolizes the eternal torment theory, a counterfeit of the real curse, which the sacrifice on the antitypical Altar cancels. Its being placed beside the altar symbolizes the profanation of the real sacrifice and altar—Christ's death and his humanity for sin's cancellation—through vitiating them, *i.e.*, the eternal torment theory sets these aside, and thus profanes them. The worship of the creeds, organizations and arrangements of Churchianity, fostered by the clergy—the counterfeit 70, Jaazaniah representing the defiled crown-lost leaders—in its profanation of God's Church, is symbolized in vs. 10-12, while the Church studying into this situation and helped thereto is set forth in vs. 7-9. The sorrow of the pertinent churches over the decay of the union of church and state is symbolized by the weeping of the women over Tammuz (vs. 13, 14). Baal worship—power-grasping and lording it over God's people, as exercised by the clergy, especially the

Roman clergy—is symbolized in vs. 15, 16, while vs. 17, 18 contain God's statement on the conditions and the resultant wrath. All of this, without understanding its relation to this chapter, was seen by the Church in the Parousia.

J.F.R.'s remarks on this and the following chapter are characterized by his habitual dullness, vagariousness, arbitrariness and folly, because he forces a meaning on them that does not fit them; since he applies them onward from 1919. He says (Z '31, 244, par. 5) that Jehovah began in 1919 to forewarn the workers of iniquity of their future punishment and to reveal Satan's evil order of affairs, whereas, as a matter of fact, the pertinent warnings and revelations (vs. 17, 18) were given throughout the reaping time, and that on evils in the nominal church, those of the statesmen and aristocrats as such being excluded from this picture. See the chapters on the Day of Jehovah and Kingdoms of This World of Studies, Vol. I, the Times of the Gentiles, the Jubilee, the Parallel Dispensations and the Antichrist of Studies, Vol. II, the Reaping and Pyramid of Studies, Vol. III, Studies, Vol. IV, etc. The punishment began in the World War, five years before his fictitious first warnings are supposed to have begun. We do not doubt that, as the partisan Society adherents have received since 1917 the public ministry of reproof for sin, etc., they have given warning of punishments coming since then. But this was after the Little Flock's warning had been completed and its threatened punishment had begun, and only the latter's warning is symbolized by the one offered Ezekiel to give and the one that he gave. J.F.R.'s image of jealousy is the Devil (Z '31, 245, par. 9)! The abomination of desolation is no more the papacy; but is the Devil's organization, particularly his image of the beast—the League of Nations (Z '31, 245, 10)! It will be noticed that while chapters 8 and 9 speak of abominations profaning the temple,

it does not mention *the* abomination of desolation. Hence, here we have another piece of Rutherfordian eisegesis. The women weeping for Tammuz represent, he says, Epworth Leaguers and Fundamentalists (Z '31, 246, par. 15), whereas symbolically women represent churches. Tammuz, he says (par. 15), represents Churchianity, whereas Tammuz is a Phoenician variation of Osiris [Nimrod] corresponding to the Roman Adonis, whom Venus [Nimrod's wife and mother, Semiramis] mothered and then committed incest with, their unholy union being a type of the union of church and state, especially, but not exclusively, of the Romanist church and the papal state.

His slaughter-weapon men now (Z '31, 259, par. 2) are Jesus and the spirit angels; they used to be the Church after Bro. Russell died! They may, though, now include the risen saints (par. 2)! Their number, six, he says, represents their incompleteness, because they must be completed by his inkhorn man, whom he formerly and erroneously claimed was Bro. Russell alone, but now claims is *his remnant*, as the seventh, whereby the complete number is had (Z '31, 260, par. 4), whereas six, being the number of imperfection and evil, the six cannot represent Jesus, the spirit angels and possibly the risen saints. He says that the slaughter-weapon men cannot be servants of Satan, because God gives them a command (Z '31, 261, par. 7). The fallacy of this is evident from the fact that God in a similar sense gave a command to a wicked spirit to deceive Ahab (1 Kings 22: 19-23), and by His providences sends commands to sifters to work strong delusions (2 Thes. 2: 9-11). In this way the command of Ezek. 9: 5-7 was given. His slaughter-weapon men—spirit beings—he claims physically kill the wicked (Z '31, 261, pars. 10, 11), but the Bible teaches that human beings will kill some (2 Kings 9-11), and famines and pestilences will kill others of them. The whole section being symbolic, of course

the killing must be symbolic. Those who are ink-marked on their foreheads are the millions now living who will never die (Z '31, 262, par. 14)! Despite terrible jolts he seems unable to shake himself loose from the "millions" idea! At least the following is true of many of those who were led to believe that they were among those alleged millions: By the millions propaganda before 1925, symbolic ink, both corrupt and ill-smelling, as such even yet noticeable in the figurative atmosphere, was splattered with bad effect into their eyes, but was inherently too effervescent to *mark* their foreheads. Nowhere in the Bible are others than the Little Flock spoken of as being by God commanded to be marked in the forehead (Rev. 7: 1-3; 14: 1). Hence the inked ones of Ezek. 9 are the faithful Church during the Parousia, when all of them were so marked. One little consideration overthrows his view and proves the slaughter-weapon men to be evil-doers: They defiled God's temple—the Church—(Ezek. 9: 7); and the Bible teaches: "If anyone defile the temple of God, him will God destroy" (1 Cor. 3: 17). Hence these slaughter-weapon men were not Jesus, the good angels and the risen saints, but have been the six sets of reprobates who have led the six siftings of the Harvest.

With Judas-like kisses as professions of love and esteem for Bro. Russell (Z '31, 279, pars. 1-7), he stabs him in the back by repudiating both relationship to his work, main teachings and sympathizers and *the name*, "*Bible Students*," that Bro. Russell usually employed for the Lord's people, *when addressing the public*, in response to their demand for a name as a means of identification. Under the present circumstances we think this fortunate, because his gross errors, unfulfilled forecasts and rowdy mannerisms have altogether too much reflected discreditably upon our Pastor, in his teachings, arrangements, spirit, sympathizers. He then proceeds to give his followers the

name *Jehovah's witnesses*. He claims that God commands this name to be given them. He reaches this conclusion with characteristic mud clearness. He says that to be Jehovah's witnesses (his devoted sectarians, the little pope's symbolic toe-kissers) means that his remnant has received the stone with the new name of Rev. 2: 17 written therein. The fact that the term, *Jehovah's witnesses*, as the sectarian name of his followers, is known by many of the public, proves that it cannot be the new name of Rev. 2: 17, which only its recipients know. Does the fact that his followers went wild with enthusiasm when given this name at their Columbus Convention prove it Divinely given? A balanced Christian never goes wild over anything, though he does have a sober enthusiasm for the Lord, His Truth and His people. Such *wild* enthusiasts are just the ones bigotedly, in cock-sureness of having a monopoly of the Truth and its service, to accept his advice not to discuss religion with those Truth people not agreeing with his teachings (Z '31, 280, par. 1).

The new name of Is. 62: 2; 65: 15, has no reference to his claim that it points out the (sectarian) appellation that he has given his followers; for it refers to the new nature and office that Jehovah gives the faithful beyond the vail. From Is. 65: 15 he claims (Z '31, 292, par. 7) that God wants the Societyites to be called by a new name to distinguish them in the eyes of the public from the so-called opposition! He says (Z '31, 293, par. 10; 295, par. 23) that Is. 62: 1, 2, etc., cannot apply to the Church beyond the vail, because allegedly the nations could not see that God *then* would have an approved people! But God's saying that the Church while in the flesh ("now") will not be recognized by the world as the faithful (1 John 3: 2) proves that Is. 62: 1, 2, must apply to the Church beyond the vail, which proves that the new name of Is. 62: 2; 65: 15; Rev. 2: 17; 3: 12, must refer to the

Church beyond the vail and cannot refer to the Church this side the vail, and therefore cannot sanction the taking as a distinctive (and we should in truth add, sectarian) name, the term, "Jehovah's witnesses," which is not, unless sectarianly used, a name at all, but a description of the Church in her mission to the world during the Gospel Age. The name of Rev. 3: 12 cannot refer (as he claims in Z '31, 294, par. 15) to the name of his sect, because it is common to the overcomers, to the *new Jerusalem* (which is undoubtedly beyond the vail), to Christ and to *God*, who certainly will not give His appellation, Jehovah (Is. 42: 8), to anyone, which proves the word name here does not mean appellation. This passage also proves it, because Jehovah is not one of Jehovah's witnesses, for God says to others than Himself, "Ye are My witnesses." Moreover, the express term, "*Jehovah's* witnesses," does not occur in the Bible, but the term is "My witnesses." All this proves that this newly invented appellation is not referred to by the above considered four passages alleged for it.

He seeks (Z '31, 295, pars. 25, 26) to evade the force of the expression, that the new name is to him that *overcomes*, as applying to final overcoming, by saying that the word does not refer in these verses to final overcoming, but to incidental overcoming during this life. We reply, whenever this word carries a restricted meaning, such as he seeks to apply to it in Rev. 3: 12, etc., the Scriptures use a qualifying term so limiting it, as in the expressions, "gotten the victory *over the beast and over his image*" (Rev. 15: 12), and "*in all these things*, we are more than conquerors" (Rom. 8: 37). But in Rev. 2 and 3 the overcomers who are promised special rewards are final overcomers and their reward in every case is beyond the vail. In Rev. 3: 12, as said above, the word name cannot mean appellation, for the Church never receives Jehovah's appellation (Is. 42: 8), while this verse says

she will get *Jehovah's* name. It evidently means name in the sense of the Divine *nature* here. His connecting (Z '31, 294, par. 16) the white stone with the Urim and Thummim is a wild guess without the slightest vestige of Scriptural proof and contrary to the Scriptural teachings, just as his placing the Urim and Thummim within the fold of the breastplate is a baseless and untrue assumption. The Bible connects them with the twelve stones in the front of the breastplate. It is untrue that only faithful Societyites understand what he claims to be Jehovah's purpose. Our understanding of his pertinent theory has helped us by the Lord's grace to prove it erroneous. His claim (Z '31, 295, par. 20) that the name, *Jehovah's witnesses*, can apply only to the Societyites is silly. It is not an appellation, hence can be nobody's name, unless it is assumed, as in this case, by a sect as its name. Since the Bible does not use it as a name, we do not desire it as such.

J.F.R., in Z '31, 307-313, gives a new view of the highway of holiness of Is. 35: 8, claiming that it has been opened since 1918 and that his faithful followers—his remnant—are the vanguard of Jehovah's army, marching thereon (Z '31, 307, par. 1-3), to be followed later thereon by the Great Company and in the next Age by the Restitution class. This, of course, results from his error of applying almost everything good in the Bible to his movement since 1917, which is supposed to be proven as right by 2 Tim. 3: 16, 17 and Rom. 15: 4. Heb. 12: 12, 13, an allusion to Is. 35: 3, 4, is also supposed to make the highway apply since 1918, despite the fact that St. Paul makes the allusion to the brethren throughout the entire Gospel Age, without blunderingly connecting the passage *dispensationally* with Is. 35: 8, as par. 4 does. Instead of such a connection being a matter "without question of a doubt," as J.F.R. dogmatically says, the true run of thought is the following: God holds out the world's

Millennial paradisaic hope (Is. 25: 1, 2) and the hope of our Lord's Second Advent, as accomplishing the overthrow of Satan's empire and the deliverance of His Church (Is. 35: 4), as an encouragement to His Own throughout the Age to press on in the narrow way, despite weakness of their symbolic hands and feet and timidity of their symbolic heart. He continues (Is. 35: 5-10) to encourage such brethren with a glowing description of the Millennial hopes and prospects. Hence the reference to the weak hands, feeble knees and timid hearts of vs. 3, 4, proves that they are not the ones on the highway, but are the ones to comfort themselves with the hopes that are theirs for the world, centering in that highway. This Biblical answer effectually disposes of the central position of the article under review. Of course Satan seeks to make the new view, that he is through the Society's mouthpiece palming off, seem plausible by certain details, which we will now briefly examine.

In Z '31, 308, pars. 7, 8, he quotes a translation of Is. 35: 8 in his favor from Rotherham, who usually is one of the best of all translators. But in this instance Rotherham is far less correct than either the A. V., E. R. V., A. R. V. or Young. We first give Rotherham's translation of the second half of the verse, asking our readers to note the interpolation that he inserts at the end of the verse and to remember that one of the two main errors under review on this verse rests on this interpolation, and the other upon Rotherham's mistranslation in the first-quoted sentence: "But He Himself shall be one of them traveling the road. And the perverse shall not stray [thereinto]." The interpolation *thereinto* introduces a thought entirely foreign to the text and context. And the first sentence certainly is a mistranslation. The interpolation and false translation are due to Rotherham's reading his nominal-church view of the non-Millennial application of the highway into this passage.

The A.V., E.R.V. and A.R.V. are correct here, barring their interpolations. The unclean who do not pass over the highway are those who in the next Age will not reform (Is. 65: 20). These will not be allowed to pass over its full length. Young renders the second half of the verse as follows: "He Himself is by [for] them: whoso is going in [there is no word in the Hebrew corresponding to the word *in* here] the way—even fools—err not." The Hebrew masculine pronoun *hoo* has in v. 8 as its antecedent the Hebrew masculine noun *derech*, way. To show its emphasis the word *itself* might well be added. The translation *He Himself*, in itself grammatically correct enough, implies an antecedent 4½ verses above, hence is farfetched and interferes strangely with the verse's run of thought. A good Hebrew scholar untrammelled by the creeds in his translation will certainly acknowledge Young's translation here as far better than Rotherham's, despite the latter's usual excellence. The A.V., E.R.V., A.R.V., and Young prove the passage to be exclusively Millennial, since now only the wise (Dan. 12: 10) understand and do not go astray in error. Nor is Rotherham's thought supported by Is. 52: 11, 12, as J.F.R. contends. To his remark (Z '31, 308, pars. 10, 11) that prior to 1917–1919 Jesus' followers were compelled to mingle with Babylonians, but since that time they have been on the highway, we reply that this remark is another proof that he disbelieves that the Harvest began in 1874, but believes that it began "approximately" 1917, 1918 or 1919! He claims that since 1919 the remnant no more are compelled to mingle with Babylonians, who with all others are being kept out of Zion (par. 13). For proof he quotes three undoubtedly Millennial passages: Rev. 21: 27; 22: 15; Is. 65: 15, which, therefore, prove nothing of the kind. In Z '31, 309, pars. 16, 17, he labors to prove that fools are the perverse exclusively, in order to give

such a meaning, with Rotherham, to the word *fools* in Is. 35: 8, applying these, of course, then to his man of sin. We reply that the Bible uses the word *fools* in two senses: those of weak understanding (Luke 24: 25; 1 Cor. 15: 36; Gal. 3: 1, 3), and those of perverse heads and hearts. This fact proves that he has failed to prove that the fools of Is. 35: 8 are the perverse—his man of sin. That they are not the perverse this very verse shows, when it proves that such will not be allowed to pass over its full length. Again, he (Z '31, 310, par. 22) quotes Rotherham's misrendering in v. 10 of the word *bo* by *enter*, whereas the word *bo* must have an associated preposition to have this rendering, and without it is translated *come* or *go*. In Is. 51: 11 Rotherham properly renders the same word, and that in this very same sentence quoted from Is. 35: 10 by the word "come," which he should have done in Is. 35: 10. This overthrows another argument that Is. 35 applies since 1919. In this connection he says that the imprisoning of the eight brethren in 1917 was carrying them away captive to Babylon. Not so; for that would have made them go back to membership in the nominal church. Again, he says (Z '31, 310, par. 23) that Jehovah (Is. 11: 11, 16) fixed the time of the highway by the term "in that day." Yes, we reply, He did; and the remnant of his people here referred to are not His spiritual, but His fleshly Israel, as vs. 11-14 clearly prove. Fleshly, but not spiritual Israel, experiences a second deliverance (v. 11) from Assyria, etc. Moreover, the allusion to the coming out of the land of Egypt (v. 16) proves the same thing: for the coming out from the land of Egypt was after Israel left Etham and entered the wilderness, a Millennial type (Ex. 13: 20).

Since he claims (Z '31, 310, par. 26) that God's earthly organization, his earthly Zion, was not formed until 1919, there could have been no return to it in 1919, as it had never before, according to his

supposition, been formed. This takes away from him the first part of Is. 35: 10 as applying to his remnant: "The ransomed of the Lord [the restitution class] shall return [mostly from the grave; all from the curse] and come to Zion [the Millennial Christ, as God's religious government] etc." Is. 62: 10, in its last clauses [where the Hebrew word for *people* is plural—*peoples*] proves that ever since 1874 the Church is preparing the highway for the people to travel in the next Age, not since 1919 only; and in its first clauses it exhorts to pass through the gates, (1) the gate of consecration and (2) the gate of death and to prepare the narrow way for God's elect people [singular in the Hebrew]. It therefore offers no prop for this new view under examination. Nor do vs. 11 and 12 refer to the highway; but v. 11 refers to Christ's Second Advent as yet future and to the Second Advent message from 1829 to 1874, while v. 12 refers to the elect Church in the Millennium. His attempt (Z '31, 311, par. 31) to refer Is. 49: 10, 11 to the Great Company, because some of its expressions are similar to some in Rev. 7: 14-16, is a failure; for by the expression, "I will make all My *mountains* a way," the four elect classes (Ps. 72: 3) in the kingdom time are referred to. His use of Is. 19: 23-25 (Z. '31, 312, par. 32) is just as futile; for it too is Millennial, Egypt here standing for heathen, Assyria for nominal Christians and Israel for Jews in the Millennium, when only these three classes will become God's people. His claim (Z '31, 312, par. 33) that his Second Deathers (the clergy and his man of sin) will be judged with the rest of the world in the end of the Millennium is just like the Seventh Day Adventists' pertinent error.

When he claims (Z '31, 327, par. 19) that The Tower and the Society, (himself) do not seek to discredit Bro. Russell, he tells a falsehood. His course in earlier years was to put himself on an equality with

Bro. Russell, as his alleged successor, and second, in later years to set Bro. Russell and his pen products entirely aside, with himself occupying the center of the stage, with the suppression of all possible rivals, alleged and real, the recent disbanding of the Tower editorial committee, with himself as the real sole editor, being one of the last and many flagrant examples of such a course. His errors cast aspersions on God's name (plan), despite his protestations to vindicate it. Our and similar defenses of the Truth against his errors are real witnessing for Jehovah and vindication of His name. His claim (Z '31, 327, par. 22) that to hold and confess the teachings given them through Bro. Russell (which according to Lev. 12 are Divinely warranted as the church-developing Truth) is to honor him, not God, is a demonstrable error, and comes with poor grace from one who holds out remnantship for those who blindly and slavishly accept them. Inconsistently he (Z '31, 328, par. 25) applies John 14: 20, 23, which refers to the entire Gospel Age, to 1918 and onward, since when he (elsewhere) claims the Spirit ceased to help and minister to the saints, angels being given them as helpers. Indiscriminately he (Z '31, 328, pars. 22, 28) accuses his dissidents with holding that the Truth stopped advancing at Bro. Russell's death, for this is a false charge in so far as it includes us. He alleges (Z '31, 341, pars. 12, 14) that Ps. 145: 4 teaches that the Ancient Worthies will return and be taught by the Little Flock before the latter leaves the earth. Rather, the similarity of the thought and expression to that of Ps. 22: 30, 31, suggests that the teaching generation of Ps. 145: 4 is the Little Flock and the taught generation will be the restitution class in the Millennium. His thought cannot be true, since the Little Flock must be beyond the veil before the second blood-sprinkling occurs, which guarantees the return of the Ancient Worthies and the world.

In Z '31, 344, par. 37, he teaches that the cleansing

of the branches by pruning is not an individual work, but was a work of cutting off, from 1918 on, from the temple, "God's organization," those not worthy of belonging to it, *i.e.*, his unfaithful and his man of sin. Against such an interpretation we suggest the following: (1) While the vine is one, there are many individual branches on a vine. Hence they symbolize individuals, as Jesus says, "*Ye* are the branches." See the parallels of the many members individually dealt with (Rom. 12: 5; 1 Cor. 12: 12-14, 27; Eph. 5: 30); (2) The *taking away* of the unfruitful branches would correspond to driving away unfaithful priests out of the temple—a thing that must be an individual work, for it is by the individual separation of all the unfaithful that such are driven out of the temple; (3) Such an individual work has been going on throughout the Gospel Age: "*Every* branch that beareth not fruit He taketh away" (v. 2), not simply a mythical casting out of the temple of unfaithful priests since 1918; (4) Such taking away of individual non-fruit-bearing branches (suckers, etc.) is a totally different work from the *cleansing* work by the Word and Spirit and by pruning providences. (5) This cleansing work is also an individual work, taking place throughout the Age, hence not beginning in 1918: "*Every* branch that beareth fruit He purgeth, that it may bring forth more fruit." (6) Of necessity this must be an individual work; for it is through cleansing the individual branches that each becomes clean, which is also true throughout the Age, beginning with the Apostles: "*Now* are ye clean through the word that *I* have spoken unto *you*." (7) His using the parable of the vine and branches as synonymous with his own invented unbiblical expression, "God's organization," disproves his view of a so-called God's organization on earth, parts of which are the Society as a corporation and its officers. Jesus tells us that

He is the vine and His faithful alone are the true branches.

In contradiction to his statement (Z '31, 359, pars. 20–22) that the Society as a corporation (a part of God's alleged organization) was formed by God's people as a whole (if a part of God's organization it would necessarily be formed by Him alone), it should be said that, apart from a corporation, the Society at first was formed as an association of seven individuals in 1881. Then in 1884 these seven individuals adopted a charter and, with it as their constitution, had their association incorporated, *i.e.*, authorized by the state. He seeks (pars. 20–22) to answer our charge that the Society as a creature of the state and as preserved in its existence as a corporation by the state, must have been authorized and is continued in existence by Satan's organization, if the state is a part of Satan's organization, as he contends. We say that he *seeks* to answer this objection; but so far as argument is concerned he gives nothing. He is held captive in the net of his own weaving, twist and squirm, pull and jerk as much as he will: The Society is a part of God's organization, and the state is a part of Satan's organization!

Then he announces the annulling of the "Tower" Editorial Committee (Z '31, 360, par. 26). This is the logical outcome of his unparalleled power-grasping course against our Pastor's will, which he falsely denies (Z '31, 376, par. 24) is a will, calling it "a paper," and which, with his habitual course of telling deliberate falsehoods when serviceable to his self-seekings, he says our Pastor repudiated before his death, thus seeking to reduce it to a scrap of paper. This invention of serviceable falsehoods is a way in which the little pope imitates his step-brother, the big pope, in inventing stories necessary to attain his purposes. The accounts of historical events of both the big and little popes are in large part made up of such

falsehoods. The Reformation, the Parousia and the Epiphany periods have revealed the former's self-interested falsehoods. The Epiphany—this *apocalyptic* day—is revealing those of the latter. He gives as his reason for discarding entirely that will the statement that the Lord's work cannot be done under it. We reply, the devil's work cannot be done by those of God's people whose work the will and charter were Divinely intended to direct, so long as their work is directed by the will and the charter. And because Azazel wants not God's, but his own work done among and by the Lord's people, he uses J.F.R. to set aside God's arrangements for His work and introduce Azazelian ones in their stead. Many of us remember how in the first Tower after the Pastor Russell Memorial number he promised faithfully to do the work in harmony with his teachings and arrangements, which promise he has broken completely.

In giving (Z '31, 361, pars. 27, 28) the qualifications of his "Jehovah's witnesses," he, among other things, alleges that they must have and use his three corporations, printing presses, bookmaking machines, radio, books, booklets, proclamations, etc., and other associated means of making known to the peoples the Society's [his] messages! He further asserts (Z '31, 372, par. 10) that Rom. 14: 10 proves that judgment was begun in 1918 at Jesus' alleged coming to the temple. Nothing in that Scripture, nor in any other, connects chronologically the Lord's beginning to judge His own with 1918. This verse's kind of judging began in 1878 and is still proceeding. Moreover, not only is there no Scripture that says or implies that Christ must wait 3½ years after His return before beginning to judge His own who are in the flesh (1 Pet. 4: 17), let alone in the temple, as he asserts (Z '31, 357, par. 9), but the Bible and facts disprove such a thought. Judging His own in the flesh, after His return, began immediately after His return in 1874.

But such a judging has been in principle going on throughout the Age and is a different one from that of Rom. 14: 10, which the parallel dispensations prove started 3½ years after our Lord's Return, when the awakened saints stood before His judgment seat to hear His decision as to their rewards; for the judging of Rom. 14: 10 is identical with that of 2 Cor. 5: 10; hence does not refer to judging His own who are in the flesh.

In Z '31, 375, pars. 21, 22, he denies Matt. 8: 11, 12 and Luke 13: 28, 29, as applying to the Millennium, applying them to his judging period from 1918 onward. In reply, we say: Matt. 8: 10, as well as the whole episode, proves that the ones cast out, the children of the [typical] kingdom, are Jews; hence Matt. 8: 11, 12, certainly refers to the Millennial Jews, disappointed on finding themselves not members of either phase of the kingdom, and their weeping and gnashing of teeth is their chagrin thereover. Luke 13: 28, 29, being the parallel passage, though put into another connection, of necessity teaches the same thought. Moreover, our Lord's statement in v. 30 confirms this thought; for here He shows that fleshly Israel, which was first in point of time, will be the last of God's elect peoples; while the Church, which is the last in point of time, will be the first among God's elect peoples. It is true that Luke 13: 24-27 applies to the end of the Age, but the shut door (v. 25) proves that Jesus refers in vs. 24-27 to the foolish virgins (Matt. 25: 11, 12) and certain unbegotten consecrators after the last member of the Little Flock was Spirit-begotten. The reason that Luke 13: 28, 29, is put in connection with vs. 24-27 is, not that they refer to the same individuals or classes, but because the foolish virgins and certain unbegotten consecrators in their disappointment at finding they failed of the kingdom will experience a chagrin similar to that which certain Jews of Jesus' time will feel in the Millennium

at their recognition of their failure to attain either phase of the kingdom. The above not only disposes of this new view, but also of the "new view" that the weeping and gnashing of teeth does not mean the above-described disappointment and chagrin, but the writings and speeches of his man of sin against his teachings!

His attempted distinction (Z '31, 67, par. 1) between the expression, the Lord of Sabaoth, as meaning the Almighty God of Battles, and the Lord of Hosts, as meaning the Almighty One over and above His army, is false, since the word *Sabaoth* in the first expression is the same Hebrew word as is translated *hosts* in the second; hence the expressions in Hebrew being identical, their meaning is identical. False is the statement (Z '31, 68, par. 8) that Ezekiel prophesied at approximately the same time as Haggai. There was a difference of nearly 100 years between the beginnings of their respective ministries. He covertly describes himself (Z '31, 68, par. 11) as making his teachings and works clean, because of channelship, a claim similar to that of the pope's teachings and works. If he were the Lord's channel for the priestly work, then he and his teachings and works would have to become clean, if channelship were to remain his. But the Society (now in reality himself) never was or will be the channel for the priestly teachings and works. His are unclean, as Azazelian, and the channel, when ridded of him and cleansed from Azazel's works, will be a clean channel for Mahlite Levite work. He misapplies (Z '31, 69, pars. 13, 16) the type of touching the dead to mean that there is nothing in the character development and ministry of the saints pleasing to the Lord, and to think and say there is, is "touching the dead"—contamination. Contamination by touching of the dead types contamination by heredity from Adam and by Adamically sinful works. It cannot apply to more

than the humanity of the saints, and refers not to their new-creaturely graces and works.

Yes, indeed, let the Lord's people look back and contrast the Little Flock's Parousia work and the Society's work in the Epiphany (Z '31, 70, par. 20), and the difference is found to be strikingly marked in kind and quality of the work, its spirit and its participators; but all of these differences are in favor of the Parousia work. Without any Scripture proof he affirms (Z '31, 70, pars. 22, 23) that the 24th day of the 9th month of Hag. 2: 18 typed Sept. 8, 1922, on which he asserts the tried stone for a sure foundation was laid in Zion. The Bible shows that that stone was laid before Pentecost and that the brethren in the Apostolic days had already come to it as such (Acts 4: 11; 1 Pet. 2: 6). In this citation he says that at that date his remnant was chosen and was approved by being brought under the robe of righteousness, things that he formerly asserted took place in 1918, 1919, and that from Sept. 8, 1922, onward his remnant began to count their blessings. This may be the case for his remnant, but not for the Lord's, which has been rejoicing ever since Pentecost (Acts 2: 46), though more or less interrupted therein by the big pope, between the two Harvests, and after the Parousia by the little pope. The shaking of Hag. 1: 20, 21, he claims (Z '31, 71, par. 29) to be the Battle of the Great Day of God. The Apostle shows (Heb. 12: 26-28) that it covers all the sifting movements, other disruptive movements in Christendom, including, of course, the World War, Armageddon, Anarchy and Jacob's Trouble, untoward experiences and trying conditions of all kinds, including calamities, which are testing persons, principles and things, overthrowing the evil and preserving the good. He misapplies Luke 12: 53, which mainly shows the troubles in natural families incidental to the acceptance of the Truth by members of these, to God as the father, Satan as the

son, God's (?) organization as the mother, and the disloyal child (his man of sin) as the daughter (Z '31, 71, par. 32)!

His application of Ps. 116 (Z '31, 83, par. 3) to his remnant contradicts St. Paul's application of it to the Church (including himself) throughout the Age, in 2 Cor. 4: 13. In Z '31, 84, pars. 8, 9, he denies our Pastor's thought, based on Heb. 5: 7, that Jesus in Gethsemane feared that He might have failed in some particular or might the next day fail in some particular, and as a consequence could have no resurrection ("offered prayers ... to Him that was able to *save Him from death, and was heard*"), and alleges, with no Scripture suggesting such a thought, that His grief was over the thought that His death would appear to prove successful Satan's challenge to God to put a man on earth who would maintain his integrity, a thought utterly without any Biblical basis. If such were the case, He was not *heard*; for that appearance persisted. Z '31, 85, par. 12 has it that the simple of Ps. 116: 6 are the foolish, whereas they are the guileless in God's sight. He does not even refrain from the blasphemy against our Lord's perfection in speech when he asserts (Z '31, 86, par. 23) that it was our Lord's experience that was expressed in the language, "In my haste I said, all men are liars." He misapplies (Z '31, 103, par. 28) the word *father* when used of some Christians in relation to others, as meaning that they are the more developed, whereas the Bible uses this term of some Christians in their relation to others to indicate that they were the ones who ministerially (through the Gospel, as God's representatives) begat the others of the Spirit (1 Cor. 4: 14-16; Phile. 10), as also Paul's relation to Timothy, Peter's to Mark and John's to those to whom he wrote his first epistle additionally show, in speaking of them as their sons and children. Despite the very wording of the texts of Luke 22: 18 and Matt. 26: 29,

that Jesus with the disciples would drink the new wine *in the kingdom*, he asserts (Z '31, 115, par. 3) that *his* faithful ones are now on earth drinking it with the Lord. Then he asserts (Z '31, 118, par. 22, 23) two anointings, allegedly one of qualification, allegedly another of refreshment, oblivious of the fact that the one anointing embraces every qualification of heart and mind for Christship, all of which give refreshment. His contention is further refuted by the fact that the Bible never uses the plural, *chrismata*, but only the singular, *chrisma*, to represent the whole of the Spirit's anointing (1 John 2: 20, 27). The times of refreshment of Acts 3: 19-21 have by his mudsplashes (Z '31, 118, par. 27) ceased to be the Millennium, but are the seasons of rejoicing that his remnant is alleged to be having as sellers of his books and booklets. Under his eisegetical manipulations, "*a* good man," in the passage, "the steps of *a* good man are ordered by the Lord," becomes *the* good man—his remnant (Z '31, 135, pars. 30-33).

One of the peculiarities of the large Antichrist, particularly of its head, the pope, is that of thinking "to change times and laws" (Dan. 7: 25). This refers to the papacy's presuming to change the time features of God's plan so as to have, *e.g.*, the Gospel Harvest from 799–839, the Millennium from 799 to 1799 and the Little Season from 1799 onward, and to change God's laws—the true doctrines and practices—into counterfeit ones. The fact that the Society leaders are the little Antichrist of Little Babylon's Catholic Church, explains much in the course and trend of Society conditions, teachings, arrangements and claims since late in 1916. Among other things, the little pope imitates the big pope in thinking "to change times and laws." That he has changed the laws—the Lord's teachings and arrangements—is manifest from his repudiating one after another those given us by the Lord through that Servant. Likewise he has thought

to change God's times, *e.g.*, antitypical Elijah's period of ministry to the period from about 1875 to 1918, the Lord's return in Oct., 1874, to 1914 or 1918, the Harvest from 1874–1914 to 1918 or 1919 and onward, the Parousia's beginning in 1874 to 1914 or 1918, the antitypical jubilee's beginning in 1874 to 1925, etc., etc. Just as the big pope put counterfeit Harvest teachings and practices into his counterfeit Harvest, 799–839, and counterfeit Millennial teachings and practices into his counterfeit Millennium, from 799 to 1799, and counterfeit Little Season's teachings and practices into his Little Season from 1799 onward, so the little pope has put counterfeit Harvest teachings and practices into his counterfeit Harvest, from 1918 or 1919 onward. Here we emphasize the fact that the key to the teachings and practices of J.F.R. is found in the fact that, as on a large scale the big pope in Great Babylon fulfilled the prophecy of Dan. 7: 25: "He shall think to change times and laws," so on a small scale the little pope has been fulfilling this prophecy in Little Babylon, and therefore has perverted the Biblical times and laws. This explains his past, present and future aberrations. The gnashing of teeth will be felt to their depth.

We will now proceed to review his main new errors that have appeared in the Tower since our last review, which ended with the Jan. 15, 1932 Tower. He almost endlessly repeats, and that without proof, the errors that we have already refuted. These we will not again refute, our answers having received no reply. Nor will we attempt to refute all his new errors and twists, since they are too numerous; but we will review the more important of them. These in practically every instance arise from his attempt to apply about everything complimentary in the Bible to his movement since 1917, 1918 and 1919, particularly about everything of the real Harvest to his counterfeit Harvest and everything uncomplimentary in the

Bible to those who oppose his errors of teaching and arrangement.

First, he gives a number of errors on the idea of rocks in the symbols of the Bible. According to him (Z '32, 35, 2), when God is called a rock, a rock in the sense of a mountain of rock is meant. None of the Scriptures that he quotes, nor any that he leaves unquoted, gives the least hint of such a thought. Scripture symbols convey entirely different thoughts by the word *rock* and *mountain*; for they use the word *rock* to represent strength and protection (Deut. 32: 4, 18, 30, etc.), while they always use the word *mountain* to represent a kingdom, regardless of whether it is strong or weak. (Is. 25: 6, 7; Dan. 2: 35, 44; v. 43 show the weakness of the kingdoms that are in many other places called mountains, *e.g.*, Rev. 16: 20). His implied claim (Z '32, 36, 8) that Jehovah has lately made known that He is their Rock—protector and strengthener—is untrue, since God's people, even in the Jewish Age, knew this, as well as have known it *throughout* this Age. His direct statement, that the fact that He has brought this to their recent attention is proof that we are in the last days, is untrue, since the knowledge of such a thought would prove the last days to have come in the Jewish Age! Yea, Abraham knew this of God (Gen. 15: 2; 17: 1, 2). Nowhere in the Bible, as he claims (Z '32, 36, 10) is the kingdom symbolized by a mountain chain, though when reference is made to it in two or more of its four ruling powers the plural, mountains, is used; but the idea then is that of one mountain with several peaks (*e.g.*, the peaks of the mountain on which Jerusalem is built symbolize it from this standpoint), which are there meant by the expressions, mountains and hills (Ps. 72: 8; 87: 1; Matt. 24: 16). His claim that God's telling Israel to worship Him at Sinai proves that Sinai represents God's organization, which he defines in a way to include also angels and

the Society, is untrue, since it proves no more than the thought that in the Millennial Kingdom the world—antitypical Israel—will be charged to consecrate and live out their consecration under subjection to the Kingdom in its various parts: the Little Flock, the Ancient Worthies, the Youthful Worthies and the Great Company. To palm off his thought he misapplies Heb. 12: 18-24, which refers to the Kingdom, not in the sense of reigning over the world, but in the sense of its establishment beyond the veil since 1874 in Jesus and since 1878 in the Church until before the Ancient Worthies will return.

In Z '32, 37, 11–13, it is alleged that God brought out of His (alleged) organization from 2 B. C. to 33 A. D. a seed—Jesus—and exalted Him above His organization, and that this is meant by God's taking a stone out of the mountain without hands (Dan. 2: 34, 35). The Bible does not teach that God had an organization at that time. The Sarah Covenant existed at that time, but she is nowhere Scripturally called an organization, but a woman. While the Sarah Covenant has during the Gospel Age been bearing antitypical Isaac, this is never in the Bible represented as the taking of a stone out of the mountain. Under an altogether different figure and representing a wholly different thought, a stone is spoken of as taken out of the mountain. But this mountain is Satan's empire ("Out of Egypt have I called My Son") and the stone cut out of this mountain is not Jesus alone, but the whole Christ class (Dan. 2: 44, 45). This passage shows that it is the Kingdom, as the stone beyond the veil, cooperated in by the Kingdom this side the veil, that smites the image. Against his claim (Z '32, 37, 15) that God did not at Christ's exaltation (33 A. D.) seat Christ on the throne of authority, which he alleges is not until Christ's alleged Second Advent in 1914, we reply that Jesus' statement in Matt. 28: 18, "All authority *is* given unto Me in

heaven and in earth," and the Bible statements that at His ascension He sat at God's right hand—place of chief power and favor (Heb. 2: 3; Eph. 1: 20; Phil. 2: 9-11, etc., etc.)—disprove this claim. At His Second Advent the commission was given Him to use His Age-old authority to overthrow Satan's empire, establish His Kingdom and reign for the annihilation of every vestige of the curse (Ps. 45: 3-6; 1 Cor. 15: 23-26). In this connection we might remark that repeatedly, as in par. 15, he gives the explanation to Ps. 110: 1, that Christ was to be seated at God's right hand until the Second Advent begins, when he vacates that place. This shows that he does not understand the meaning of the expression, "Sit Thou at My right hand." To sit at God's right hand means to enjoy God's chief favor and to exercise as His vicegerent His power. Jesus never will leave that right hand. He always will be God's chief Favorite and Vicegerent. Nor does the expression, "until I make Thy enemies Thy foot stool," in time mean the beginning of the Millennium, but the end of the Millennium; for to make His enemies His footstool means to annihilate them, and these enemies are thus shown to be the effects of Satan's reign, not persons (1 Cor. 15: 24-26). The force of the word "until" in this sentence is not to mark the end of Christ's being God's chief Favorite and Vicegerent (1 Cor. 15: 23-26). In Hebraistic modes of thought the word *until* is frequently used to mean not an absolute termination of the thing spoken of, but of certain uses, acts, relations, purposes, accomplishments, etc., of that thing, it continuing on after those uses, etc., end (Matt. 5: 18; 1 Cor. 11: 26; Jas. 5: 7).

His clumsy expression (Z '32, 38, 15) on Christ's becoming the stone of stumbling to *both Israels* leaves the impression that Is. 8: 14 was fulfilled in 1918, though he probably means that it received one fulfillment then and its other in 33 A.D. But even so

amended, his first time statement is false, and his second is only partially true. As to the second we should say that Israel began to stumble in 33 A.D. and that stumbling continued until 69 A.D. when it was complete. As to his first statement it is throughout false; for Christendom began to stumble over the Ransom in 1878 in the great no-ransomism sifting in its threefold sphere of operation among the unfaithful consecrated (sanctuary), justified (courts) and merely nominally professing Christians (city;—Ezek. 9). Ever since the Spring of 1878 no-ransomism assumed all sorts of forms in these three spheres and this persisted until 1914, when the wrath time set in. No-ransomism, which is the form that stumbling over the Rock took (Num. 20: 7-13), began therefore in 1878 and not in 1918; nor did any new forms of no-ransomism set in after 1914. Hence the stumbling was complete in 1914, whereupon the destruction of the tares set in, which includes the no-ransomistic tares. Hence the facts disprove his application of stumbling over the Rock in 1918, and prove that it began in 1878 and ended in 1914. This also disproves his thought of the Harvest beginning in 1918 or 1919—he is not certain which.

Mixing figures and viewpoints he denies Z '32, 39, 21, 22) that the Rock on which Christ builds His Church is the truth that Peter confessed, "Thou art Christ, the Son of the living God" (Matt. 16: 16-19). It is true that Christ is called a Rock and a stone in the Bible (Num. 17: 6; Is. 8: 14; Eph. 2: 19-21), and that the Church is built upon Him as such, even as it is also built upon lesser stones, as the just cited Eph. passage shows. But the Truth is also called a rock and its various parts are called stones in the Bible (Num. 15: 35, 36; 1 Sam. 17: 40; 2 Sam. 22: 47; 1 Chro. 11: 15; Ps. 40: 2; 102: 14). Our Lord mentions this truth so confessed ("Flesh and blood hath not revealed *it* [not Himself, but the truth that

Peter had just confessed] unto thee, but My Father ... and upon *this* rock I will build, etc.") The use of the demonstrative, "this," proves that Jesus by the words "this rock" refers to the truth that Peter had just confessed as the thing that not man, but God revealed to Peter. J.F.R. says his interpretation makes the pertinent Romanist position impossible. God thinks otherwise, for, on the contrary, when in the Reformation the Truth became due against the papal interpretation, the Lord gave the Reformers the interpretation that J.F.R. rejects. Moreover, the papists could very nicely accept his interpretation as the primary one and insist theirs is the secondary one, because, they claim, Peter as *Christ's vicegerent* is the rock too!

Then (par. 21) he rejects the interpretation of the keys as being the twofold power given to Peter to open the closed door for an entrance into the embryo kingdom (1) to Jews and (2) to Gentiles, and says that they are the power to unlock the mysteries of the kingdom to Jew and Gentile. This is untrue for several reasons: (1) Jesus here gave Peter two unique powers; (2) Jesus did not say to Peter that he would give him the keys of the *mysteries* of the kingdom, but the keys of the *kingdom*, powers to open the door of entrance into the Church; and (3) the power to bind and loose (which were the keys of the mysteries of the kingdom) were given to the other apostles (Matt. 18: 18) as well as to Peter (Matt. 16: 19). Thus his error is a confounding of the keys with the power to bind and loose. But why offer different interpretations for the two well established and satisfactory ones? "Variance," a work of the flesh, is the question's answer.

In Z '32, 56, 23, he says that Jesus did not enter the joy set before Him (Heb. 12: 2) until 1914. To this we reply that this joy was one of several forms: (1) pleasing the Father; (2) obtaining the high reward

of the Divine nature and heirship of God, including vicegerency; (3) winning and exalting the Church; (4) blessing the world; (5) extirpating evil; (6) giving everlasting life to the obedient and working eternal destruction to the incorrigible; and (7) amid all this and all subsequent activities glorifying God. Some of these joys He experienced in part before Calvary; others of them in part from His resurrection onward. He entered one phase of these joys in 1914, beginning to annihilate Satan's empire as a part of annihilating evil. Some of them He will enter in the Millennium; others at the end of the Millennium. All of them are progressive; and in some of them, like the last one, He will be progressing eternally. He claims (Z '32, 57, 25, 26) that while up to 1914 the celebration of the Memorial Supper was properly a sorrowful thing, since 1914 it no more is to be sorrowful, but joyful. Both of his thoughts are pure inventions with no foundation in Scripture, reason or fact. The spirit in which the Lord's Supper should be celebrated should as long as the Church celebrates it be the same as from the beginning: Sorrow that our sins brought our Lord to death, sympathy with Him and our fellow body members in their suffering, gratitude for our Lord in dying for us and appreciation for His and the Body's faithfulness in suffering; gratitude and appreciation of our privileges symbolized in the Lord's Supper, rejoicing in the victory of Jesus and those already faithful unto death, prayer for those who have not yet finished their course, hope for their and our victory, faith in everything symbolized by the Lord's Supper, determination to go forward to a successful conclusion and to help our brethren to do the same. These sentiments have not changed and will not change so long as the Church's memorializing will be in order. Our Lord's second presence since 1874 has made no other change in the celebration than to energize us in

the above-mentioned respects, since His presence assures us of more favoring providences and a nearer realization of our hopes and rejoicing on behalf of resurrected saints.

J.F.R. frequently writes articles on the Psalms and seeks to force their application to his movement. We will not go into his details, as we have already refuted his entire viewpoint on this matter. Ps. 68 is one of these that he so treats. We will comment on some only of his points thereon. Commenting on v. 11 (Z '31, 101, 15), which is properly rendered by the R. Vs.—"The women that publish the tidings are a great [large] host," he denies that the word, *women*, should be used in this text, saying that the feminine form is used because it refers to *Zion*, a feminine noun. Against his thought especially two things should be said: (1) The word *Zion* does not occur in the entire Psalm, hence cannot be here referred to. (2) The Hebrew participle, *mevasheroth*, translated in the R.Vs. by the words, "the women that published the tidings," is plural and therefore does not refer to *Zion*, which is singular. The plural feminine properly requires the R. Vs'. rendering. We understand the thought as follows: The women here are symbolic. They refer to the consecrated, who consist or will ultimately consist of the Little Flock as one symbolic woman, the Great Company as 60 symbolic women, and the Youthful Worthies as 80 symbolic women. All of these symbolic women are referred to in Cant. 6: 8, 9, while individually they are the virgins without number of v. 8. These are the women of Ps. 68: 11—a large host who publish the tidings. J.F.R.'s followers contain some of the first woman (the Little Flock), among others, all of one of the 60 Great Company groups and at least one of the Youthful Worthy groups. Thus this passage does not apply to his remnant exclusively. His giving (Z '32, 102, 16) the word *rab* in Ps. 68: 11 the meaning of *great* as

distinct from *large* is a mistake. The meaning is that the number of the women will constitute a very large host, not that his woman [his organization] is great, as he claims.

In Z '32, 117, 14, he defines the symbolic meaning of the word *chariot* in Ps. 68: 17, as *war*, *preparation for war* and *war equipment*. None of the verses quoted in the paragraph prove these to be its specific meanings. It is true that chariots were a part of war equipment and war preparation, but so were also swords, spears, slings, bows and arrows. Never are they used to symbolize war. The word *chariot* specifically symbolizes an *organization*, which may, however, be a part of the equipment of a literal or symbolic war. Every passage of the Bible that uses the word *chariots* symbolically or typically, uses it to mean *organizations* (Ex. 14: 7; Is. 31: 1; 66: 15, 16; etc.). In Z '32, 119, 21, he denies that the words of Ps. 68: 18 ("Thou hast ascended on high, etc.") apply to and at Christ's ascension, and he applies them at Armageddon. St. Paul does not agree with him; for he quotes this verse in Eph. 4: 8, applying it at and to Christ's ascension, when as the Ransomer of the race He made the race His own captive, which formerly was in the captivity of death. Moreover, St. Paul's translation here is inspired and corrects the Septuagint, which Rotherham follows in part; but J.F.R. rejects it in favor of Rotherham's, which renders, "Thou hast accepted gifts consisting of men." St. Paul's application (Eph. 4: 8-12) shows that the gifts here spoken of are not given to, and thus accepted by Christ, but are gifts that He gives to men, some of which, as St. Paul says, are the teachers placed in the Church. The Hebrew word *lakach*, translated here by Rotherham "to accept," usually means "to take"; but quite frequently it means "*to bring*" (1 Kings 17: 10, 11; 2 Kings 2: 20; 3: 15; 4: 41; 6: 13; Gen. 27: 9, 13; 1 Sam. 21: 9; Lev. 12: 8, 6; Num. 23: 11; Judges 11: 5;

1 Sam. 16: 11; 20: 31; Deut. 30: 4). The meaning *to bring* in the sense of *giving* is the significance of *lakach* here, as St. Paul *translates* and *interprets*, and does not here mean *accept*, as Rotherham translates and J.F.R. interprets. Why does he reject an inspired translation and interpretation? It is because they contradict his *new view*. This, of course, refutes his view elaborated in pars. 25-30, by which he contradicts his view expressed above based on Rotherham's mistranslation, and in which he claims that the gifts referred to in Ps. 68: 18 mean the gifts of blessings that Christ is alleged to bestow upon J.F.R.'s unconsecrated sympathizers and the gifts (!) of woe that Christ is alleged to bestow upon his opposers! He applies this passage to mean that at Armageddon Christ will take his enemies captive, *i.e.*, Satan and his cohorts!

In favor of his Seventh Day Adventist view, that Satan, the impenitent angels and the Second Death class will be put to death in Armageddon and remain dead during the Millennium and be awakened thereafter, he quotes Is. 14: 15-17. This passage does not describe Satan's Millennial condition, but his post-Little-Season condition; for it gives the same thought ("narrowly look upon thee") as the *examining*, mistranslated *torment*, of Rev. 20: 10, which is, of course, post-Millennial. Moreover, as Is. 14: 4-23 shows, the passage applies secondarily to Mystic Babylon in its beast and image features, and these go to the lake of fire and brimstone (Rev. 19: 20; 20: 10), which proves that the hell and pit of Is. 14: 15 are Gehenna, the lake of fire, not hades. Therefore, so far as Satan is concerned, Is. 14: 15-17 does not refer to his condition during the Millennium, but to his condition after the Little Season. J.F.R. thinks (par. 22) that Is. 20: 4 teaches his thought, that Christ will lead Satan and his cohorts in a procession as captives, in great shame to them, whereas the king of Assyria is not

Christ, but the papacy, and the verse teaches that the papacy would overpower the worldly powers and sinners and lead them into shameful captivity, which it certainly did in the Dark Ages and in a small way is now doing. He quotes (par. 23) Is. 24: 21, 22, as a proof that Satan and his cohorts will be dead during the Millennium and thereafter will be awakened. This is a false application, for the passage shows that the clergy (the high ones that are on high, the symbolic heavens), the aristocrats and the rulers will be killed in the trouble and after many days, years, but during the Millennium, will be brought out of the tomb (Ps. 22: 29). All who go into hades will come out therefrom during the Millennium and none of them after the Millennium (Rev. 20: 13, 14). None of those who go into the lake of fire whether before or after the Millennium, will come out of it, which refutes J.F.R.'s idea under review. His treatment of Ps. 68 is an illustration of his forcing Scriptures that apply largely to other times and movements to his times and movement—"he shall think to change times and laws."

In Z '32, 163–170 he has an article on Pharaoh and Satan, in which there are some points calling for review. In par. 8 he gives a false definition of the word *Egypt*, viz., *encloser of the sea*, whereas it means, *enclosure, fortress*. Certainly, Egypt does not enclose the sea. Again, he claims (par. 12, and often elsewhere) that the commercial department of Satan's empire is its most powerful part, whereas all along the religious and political departments of that empire have been and are yet more powerful than its commercial department.

In pars. 23 and 24 he gives various translations of Ex. 9: 16: "For this cause have I raised thee up, etc." He rejects that of the A. V., and finally favors that of the Septuagint: "But thou hast been preserved for this purpose, that by thee I might display My power and that My name may be celebrated throughout all

the earth." His main objection is to the rendering, "*I raised thee up*." He denies that God ever raised up Pharaoh and Satan, because, he alleges, this would have made God responsible for, and cooperative in their sins. This sophistry is easily answered when we remember that there are two ways of raising one up: (1) causally and (2) permissively. God did not *causally* raise these up to their exercise of tyranny and other wrongs; but He did *permissively* raise them up in the sense that He allowed no hindrance to prevent their assuming their respective empires. But what is noteworthy in J.F.R.'s rejecting the translation of the A. V. and accepting that of the Septuagint is this, that, as in the case of Ps. 68: 18, he rejects a Divinely inspired translation which contradicts his view, in favor of one that does not contradict his view on the permission of evil. God, Himself, has translated by St. Paul the clause of Ex. 9: 16 in dispute, and He has translated it as the A. V. text gives it. God's translation is given in Rom. 9: 17. Often St. Paul quoted from the Septuagint, but when he desired to give a thought that the Septuagint does not give he corrected it, as we have seen twice above. Further, while the Hebrew word *amad* usually means *to stand*, it often means *to arise*, and the hiphil form of the verb used in Ex. 9: 16 therefore often means *to cause to arise, i.e., to raise up*. The following passages prove this: Ezra 2: 63; Neh. 7: 65; Ps. 106: 30; Dan. 8: 22, 23; 12: 1 (compare with 11: 7, 20, 21; Eccl. 4: 15); 1 Chro. 20: 4; Esther 4: 14; Is. 48: 13; Ps. 33: 9; 119: 90; Amos 7: 9; Gen. 4: 8; 1 Chro. 21: 1; 2 Chro. 20: 23; Dan. 8: 25; 11: 14; 10: 13. God, knowing that the word *amad* has a number of meanings, inspired St. Paul in Rom. 9: 17 to give us the one He intended in Ex. 9: 16, and thus He corroborates by this passage the Bible view of the permission of evil, which J.F.R. rejects. Thus the Divinely

inspired translation overthrows the entire thesis underlying the article under review.

In Z '32, 179–186 is an article on Gog and Magog, in which J.F.R. applies Ezek. 38 and 39 to Armageddon and to the alleged preceding verbal fight into which he is leading his followers with their various drives. According to him, Gog is Satan's chief underling, a fallen angel, the leader of his host in the battle of Armageddon, in which also J.F.R.'s man of sin will allegedly fight against him and his followers. We recall that our Pastor, in *Studies*, Vol. IV, applies this passage to Jacob's trouble in Palestine, which is to be not only after Armageddon, but also after Anarchy. The latter view is evidently right, for the conflict in Ezek. 38 and 39 will occur within one year, and that the last year of the trouble period, while Armageddon will last several years, a hectic peace for several years will follow it, then will follow Anarchy for several years, and thereafter Jacob's trouble will come. J.F.R. makes Armageddon the last phase of the trouble, and therefore has no room for the symbolic fire to follow the symbolic earthquake, which alone is Armageddon. Jacob's trouble he holds to be the trouble of his followers just before and in Armageddon. In the Hebrew of Ezek. 38: 8 the expression rendered, "in the latter years," is to be translated, "in the last one of the years;" and in v. 16 the expression rendered, "in the latter days," is to be translated, "in the last one of the days"—a day here standing for a year. This proves that Ezek. 38 and 39 refer to a period subsequent to Armageddon and Anarchy. Moreover Gog is not Satan's fallen angelic generalissimo, for which J.F.R. offers not the slightest Scriptural proof. Gog represents the leaders of nations, as the enemies of God's people, and Magog represents the led of nations as enemies of God's people. Rev. 20: 8 ("the nations ... Gog and Magog") expressly shows this to be the case in the end of the

Millennium; and therefore, by parity of reasoning, this is true of enemies of God's spiritual and fleshy Israel in the windup of this Age. The anarchists will terribly persecute spiritual Israel, as indicated by Elijah's *whirlwind ascent*, and by the last ones' being "*violently seized by clouds*," the literal translation of the Greek rendered in the A. V. of 1 Thes. 4: 17, "caught up ... in the clouds"; and those of them who go up to Palestine in the last year of the trouble will do the same with fleshy Israel in Jacob's trouble. These few points overthrow the whole line of thought of the article under review. J.F.R.'s error on Ezek. 38 and 39 is another case of his thinking "to change times and laws," and applying almost everything evil in the Scriptures to his opponents and about every good thing in the Bible to his followers.

In an article entitled, *Jehovah's Executioner*, in the July 1, 15 and Aug. 1, 1932, Tower, he gives us a new view on Ahab, Jezebel, Ahaziah, Jehoram, Hazael and Jehu. According to his view, Jehu types Jesus and the Church militant and triumphant, with the angels thrown in to boot, for good measure (Z '32, 196, 4; 198, 18); Ahab represents Satan; Jezebel, Satan's organization, their offspring, the seed of the serpent and Jehu's work represents Jehovah's procedure through Jesus and the Church in destroying what has wrought depravity to man and dishonor to His name (par. 7). This view is, of course, contrary to our Pastor's views, in so far as he expressed them, for on several features of this picture our Pastor did not express himself. Since his death Truth has advanced on this subject, and that in harmony with the foundations that he laid. We have given those details on Ahab, Jezebel, etc., not given by our Pastor, and all of these corroborate his general setting. For these details please see Vol. III, Chapters I, IV and VI. These types, so far as due, having in the minutest details, as given in Vol. III, already been fulfilled, we

have the assurance of faith that our factual and reasonable interpretation of the type is correct, and that the one under review is wrong.

In an effort to stave off an unanswerable objection to his setting, he claims that *Jehu*, after extirpating the house of Ahab and Baalism, ceases to type the Christ and ministering angels as Executioner of God's wrath in Armageddon. But this claim cannot be allowed, if he types them before; for God makes Jehu's having executed his commission the ground of rewarding him with a dynasty lasting for four generations, himself being its first king (2 Kings 10: 30). Hence a part of the reward of antitypical Jehu will be that he will head a four-formed rulership. Hence the picture goes right on through the Jehu dynasty. This consideration destroys entirely the setting that J.F.R. gives; for it would make the Christ displease God. We will briefly answer the reasons that he gives to support his view: (1) Jehu was born in God's Covenant. Answer: So was every other Jew, good or bad; hence this cannot prove that especially the Christ as Executioner of wrath in Armageddon is typed by Jehu. (2) He claims that the meanings of Jehu's, his grandfather's and of his father's names prove it. Answer: An argument from the meaning of names, to be true, must be based on facts, otherwise it is not true. *E.g.*, *Eli* means *high*, but if we should therefrom conclude that he types the Christ as exalted, we would be greatly mistaken; for he types the crown-lost leaders during and at the end of this Age. Again, the meaning of *Nimshi* (Jehu's grandfather) is very uncertain, because lexicographers are not at all certain from what word it is derived. Some define it as *discoverer*, others as *hiddenness*, some as *rescued*, some as *drawn out*. At any rate it could not contribute anything to prove that the Christ is Executioner for Jehovah. *Jehoshaphat* (Jehu's father) does not mean *Jehovah is vindicated*, as J.F.R. claims; it

means *Jehovah judges*. These names' meanings are in harmony with the idea that conservative labor standing for certain proper principles against the wrongs of the clergy, rulers and aristocrats, stands for Jehovah as the source of these principles and therefore through them proclaims Jehovah—"He is Jehovah." Then any one of the above meanings of *Nimshi* could fit conservative labor, as uncovering (*discoverer*) certain evils of the present order, or dealing secretly (*hiddenness*) in its anointing and conspiracy, or being *rescued* from supporting an evil order, or being *drawn out* from others to execute God's vengeance on Satan's empire. So the meaning *Jehovah judges* well expresses the thought that conservative labor, overthrowing Satan's empire at Armageddon, realizes God's judgment thereon. So J.F.R.'s second argument, like his first, proves nothing for his view.

(3) His third argument is also of no validity—God commanded Jehu's anointing. So did God command Elisha's anointing, who does not type the Christ; so did He command Hazael's anointing, and yet at the anointing God through Elisha prophesied much evil of him against God's people (2 Kings 8: 10-13). And certainly Hazael's anointing at God's command did not make him type the Christ; for he was an evildoer. Hence the third argument under review falls to the ground. (4) God gave Jehu his commission. Answer: So did He give Nebuchadnezzar a commission (calling him His servant, Jer. 25: 9) to execute punishment, to deprive the wicked kings of Judah of their royalty and to desolate Palestine, typing Christendom's overthrow and desolation, as he commissioned Titus similarly, but that did not make them type the Christ. (5) Jehu fulfilled his commission well. Answer: So did Nebuchadnezzar and Titus. (6) Jehu invited Jehonadab to view his zeal for Jehovah in standing for certain right principles for which

God stood. But this would no more prove that Jehu types the Christ than that the fact that Jehonadab's ancestors fled and took refuge in condemned Jerusalem from Nebuchadnezzar while he was engaged by Divine commission to execute judgment, is, as J.F.R. alleges, a proof of Jehonadab typing a good class; for this fact of their flight to a condemned place from God's agent executing judgment against it would prove the reverse of what the article claims, *i.e.*, Jehonadab's relation to them proves him to represent a good class whose company would prove Jehu to type the Christ as Executioner of God's wrath in Armageddon. (7) Jehu vindicated God's Word in executing a fulfilment of one of its prophecies of wrath. Answer: So did Nebuchadnezzar and Titus, who certainly did not type the Christ executing the prophesied wrath on Christendom. Thus none of his arguments singly, nor all of them combinedly, prove his point.

Against his view we offer the following objections: (1) The involved types so far fulfilled prove another and different view to be the correct one. (2) God's expressly rewarding Jehu with a four-monarched dynasty for executing His judgment, which dynasty beginning with Jehu himself did many things displeasing to God, proves that the executioner of the antitypical judgment will *for his work* be rewarded with a four-formed government, which is therefore also a part of the antitype, and that the said government will often displease God, and therefore cannot be the Christ's. (3) Ahab cannot type Satan for the following reasons: He repented at Elijah's rebuke (1 Kings 21: 29), which Satan has not done, nor will do. Elijah, at God's command, honored and served Ahab (1 Kings 18: 46), which God will not ask the true Church to do to Satan. Ahab for his repentance was promised immunity from the punishment that would come at the type of Armageddon (1 Kings 21: 29), which antitypically is not promised to Satan. Ahab died

before the type of Armageddon (1 Kings 21: 29), while Satan will not die even in a symbolic way before Armageddon. (4) The Christ class does not as a company serve in Satan's army, as Jehu did in Ahab's army (2 Kings 9: 25). The twist that J.F.R. gives to this will not help him; for Jehu, while executing the vengeance of the Lord, said that he, the alleged type of the Christ, followed after Ahab, the alleged type of Satan! Thus Jehu's remark proves that he represents at the wrath time the same class he represents at the wrath's forecasting.

(5) Jehu was anointed by a son of the prophet, whom J.F.R. rightly says types an unconsecrated class interested in the Truth; hence the Christ must have been anointed by an unconsecrated class! (6) Usually, so J.F.R. says, Jehu represents Jesus as Jehovah's wrath Executioner; but there are connections in which this is so manifestly absurd that he refers them to the Body members, and in the case mentioned above is forced to make him stand for some of them before they become of the Christ class. But this twist cannot be made in the anointing scene; for as the oil was first poured on the head, this type would prove that Jesus has lately, with the rest of the Body members, been anointed by an unconsecrated class! (7) The charge given to Elijah to anoint Jehu would never have been given him, if Jehu represents the Christ. (8) Nor would Elisha have inherited from Elijah such a power, if Jehu typed the Christ. (9) Nor would Elisha have commissioned a son of the prophets to minister the anointing. These last three reasons are self-evident, since the Little Flock does not anoint Jesus and itself (2 Cor. 1: 21); much less does the Great Company or an unconsecrated class anoint the Christ in any sense of the word. (10) The anointing of Jehu cannot represent the anointing of the Christ class, since all of the Christ received of the anointing before it was offered antitypical Jehu.

(11) There is only one anointing of the Christ class (Ps. 133: 2) and it was made at Jordan. And that one anointing has ever since Pentecost been flowing down on the members of the Body as they entered the Body. (12) Jehu's riding with madness (mistranslated *furiously* in the A. V.) could not type anything in the Christ's course, which has the spirit of a sound mind and not madness. (13) Jehu's brutality finds no antitype in anything the Christ class will ever do. (14) Nor does his deceitfulness with the Baal worshippers. (15) Nor his hypocrisy in aspersing those as worse than himself for killing Ahab's sons, which they knew that he wanted them to do. (16) Nor his subsequent sinful course while enjoying the fruits of his executing of God's judgment, which proves that as they were given him as a reward for his work, he must type the same class as he did when he did that work.

Of course, the reasons proving that Ahab did not type Satan also prove that Jezebel could not type Satan's organization. The facts given in Studies, Vol. II and those other facts given in Vol. III of the Epiphany Studies, as well as Rev. 2: 20-23 and the additional fact that women in Biblical types either represent real consecrated or nominally consecrated classes (churches) or covenants, prove that she represents a church—the Roman Catholic Church. Vagueness or silence characterizes J.F.R.'s treatment of Ahaziah and Jehoram of Israel and Jehoram and Ahaziah of Judah in their antitypes. His whole view of Jehu is so inharmonious that he must use him in quite inharmonious relations, generally making him stand for Jesus alone and, when this is impossible, for the Church and, when this is impossible, for some people before becoming the Church, as at the time of Jehu's following Ahab—Satan! But when even that does not suffice, he must stand for the angels! He jumps back and forth repeatedly from 1919, 1922,

1926 and 1931, for a set of incongruous and twisted applications, which gives *prima facie* evidence that his setting of things is incorrect. Then, his applications are usually so vague that he thereby again gives *prima facie* evidence of their unfitness. Real antitypes are transparently clear when due. *E.g.*, Jehu's captains' choosing him as king is supposed to represent the Societyites at the Cedar Point Convention in 1922 voting to advertise the King and Kingdom! How could such an act make the Christ King?! Especially incongruous does this application become when we remember that the cries of advertising the King and Kingdom at that convention were meant to give (and for three years did give) a new impulse to proclaiming that millions living until after 1925 would never die, etc.—proven errors. When we remember that from 1919 to 1925, the Societyites, who were in those years supposed by J.F.R.'s setting to be doing the best of the Truth work, the remnant's work *par excellence*, were giving almost all their public efforts to the service of error, the millions proposition, we may be certain that the pertinent movement was a Satanic, not a Christly one. Mark the absurdity of the application that secrecy's being observed on Jehu's conspiracy at Ramoth-gilead types the Societyites' not talking about themselves while making their public drives! If the setting were true it would type their withholding from their proclamation the announcement that the Christ was secretly working for the defeat of Satan's host at Armageddon—a thing that they proclaimed throughout Christendom from the house-tops!

In Z '32, 243–250, 259–269, he repudiates the Bible doctrine that elders are officers of the Church, asserting that they are unofficial and non-elected mature brethren in the ecclesias. He admits that *bishops* were elected officers in the Church and that they were selected from among the mature brethren (his sole sense

for the idea of eldership);but are no more since 1918 to be elected. Of course he tries to make this seem plausible by quoting passages where the word *elders* is used of non-official well-developed brethren. His citing the following passages (Z '32, 244, 6-8): Num. 11: 16; Deut. 29: 10; Josh. 8: 33; Is. 37: 2, to prove that elders are not officers, is transparent error, for Num. 11: 16 charges that only such elders as were officers (literally, "elders of the people, *even* officers over them") should be chosen for the 70. The passage forbids selecting elders who were not officers; and then God calls them elders after they were selected for their new office (v. 25), proving conclusively that they were called elders in v. 25, because they held the office of the 70. This remark applies to Deut. 29: 10, the proper translation being, "your captains of your tribes, your elders, *even* your officers, with all the men of Israel"; for if the elders here mentioned were not here defined as officers they would be included in the non-official Israelitish men indicated by the words, "with all the men of Israel." This remark applies to Joshua 8: 33, where, after *elders*, it should read, *even officers*; for the 70 were emphatically the ones meant by the *elders, even officers*, while the judges referred to cover those described in Ex. 18: 21, 22, 25, 26; for if the elders here referred to were not officers they would have been included in the nonofficial Israelites under the expression, "all Israel." Again, he quotes Is. 37: 2 to prove that elders were not officials; but the very expression, "elders of the priests" (not the elder priests, please note) were such of the Sanhedrists, the 70, as were priests. Accordingly, all four of these passages that he quotes to prove that the term *elders* does not refer to office incumbents prove that it emphatically does.

His claim (Z '32, 246, 17) that the non-occurrence of the name *elders* in Eph. 4: 11-16 and 1 Cor. 12: 27, 29 proves that elders are not officers of the Church,

is more sophistry, since the Bible uses a multiplicity of names for what we call elders of an ecclesia, *e.g.*, elders, bishops (overseers), pastors (shepherds), teachers, and prophets (if they are discoursing elders). And since the Bible uses the term *elder* for even higher offices than that of local elder (1 Pet. 5: 1; 2 John 1; 3 John 1), clearness as to the ones meant by the expression, "pastors, *even* teachers," justifies the absence of the word elders from these passages. His claim that no text teaches that elders are elected by Divine authority is false, since what the Apostles bound on the Church was of Divine authority (Matt. 18: 18), and the Apostles bound elders as elected officers on the ecclesias (Acts 14: 23; Titus 1: 5); for Acts 14: 23 shows that the brethren elected (*cheirotoneo*, *to elect by raising the hand*) elders in every church, for them, Paul and Barnabas, *i.e.*, as representing these in a certain sense, even as the pilgrims in a certain sense represented our Pastor; and Titus 1: 5 shows that as St. Paul arranged for it (and Acts 14: 23 proves that he arranged for it by election through the Church), Titus was to see to it that elders were appointed in every church in Crete. Hence local elders were by Divine authority elected. His claim that the terms, *bishops* and *elders*, do not refer to the same persons—*teachers in the Church*, is likewise false; for St. Paul directly identifies them in two passages (Acts 20: 17, 28; *episcopos*—*bishops, overseers*; Titus 1: 5-7) and St. Peter does it in one passage (1 Pet. 5: 1-4). In Acts 20: 17 St. Paul is said to send for *the elders* (*presbyteroi*) of the Ephesian ecclesia and then in vs. 18-35 he addresses these very persons and calls those he addresses *episcopoi* (bishops).

No amount of sophistry, such as J.F.R. indulges in (pars. 19-23), can set aside the plain facts of these Scriptures, that the very ones—"elders"—for whom he sent he calls "overseers"—bishops. Again, in

Titus 1: 5-7 he identifies the elders with the bishops, for whose election he charges Titus to arrange; for after mentioning certain qualities that Titus should see that those who were to be elected elders should have, St. Paul gives the reason for their having to have such qualities, *viz.*, that such qualities *bishops* must have. Hence he uses the words, elders and bishops synonymously, to designate the same servants of the ecclesias. St. Peter identifies them in 1 Pet. 5: 1-4. He uses the same figure of the elders feeding the flock, as St. Paul uses in Acts 20: 28 of bishops. Moreover, the word translated "*oversight*" in v. 2 is another form of the root of the word translated *overseer* (*bishop*) in Acts 20: 28, where elders are overseers; and in 1 Pet. 5: 1, 2, elders are those who take the *oversight*, *bishopric* (Acts 1: 20). These elders of 1 Pet. 5: 1-4 are in v. 4, in contrast with the Chief Shepherd, shown to be shepherds, pastors, the term used to designate them in Eph. 4: 11. J.F.R.'s sophistry (Z '32, 248, 23), that if the Holy Spirit has placed elders in the Church, the Holy Spirit must have made mistakes, we answer as follows: Never has a mistake been made in electing any one to the eldership when the Holy Spirit in the brethren dictated the choice; for that Spirit dictates the election of those only whom God wants as elders; for it makes its choice of those only whom the Lord by the proper spirit, talents and providential situations of the candidates, points out to be the Lord's choice. When these three things are not made by brethren the determining factors in influencing them to vote for elders, it is not the Holy Spirit that animates their vote, and hence the Holy Spirit does not appoint those so selected. The Ephesian Church was in its electing of elders—bishops (Acts 20: 17, 28)—guided by those three things, hence the Holy Spirit made such elected ones their elders—bishops. That elders are the chosen servants of the Church is evident from other passages. Jas. 5: 14, by designating

the ones to be called to pray for the sin-sick as, *the* elders of *the* Church, shows by the emphasis of the twice used article that, not mature Christians in general are meant, but such special ones as are designated as the Church's special servants.

The part that the elders played with the Apostles in the conference at Jerusalem (Acts 15: 2, 4, 6, 22, 23; 16: 4), and that those took with James in advising St. Paul (Acts 21: 18), certainly prove that, not mature Christians in general at Jerusalem were meant, but those who as elected representatives of the Jerusalem Church acted as its representatives in giving the desired opinion and the proffered advice. Furthermore, the language of the Greek in 1 Tim. 5: 17 proves this same point: "Let those elders that preside [act as the official representatives, hence elected officers] well be counted worthy of double honor, especially those who *labor* [not simply work, but toil in such sacrifice as exhausts one unto bending down] in the word and doctrine." When to parry off the thought that an election to office is required to put one into a position to fulfill the office works indicated in 1 Tim. 5: 17; Jas. 5: 14, 15; Acts 20: 28, 35; 1 Pet. 5: 1-4; 1 Tim. 3: 2; Titus 1: 9, he says (Z '32, 249, 29) that they do not do these things because of being elected, but because of being sons of God, he again becomes guilty of sophistry; for those not elected to the eldership do not have such duties; and as faithful sons of God would not attempt to arrogate the office of doing them, while those who are elected to do them, do them, because by their election thereto it has become their duty as stewards of God to do them, as St. Paul says in 1 Cor. 9: 15, 16, of himself. When J.F.R. says (Z '32, 260, 6) that the mature could not be made mature by vote, and hence reasons that elders should not be elected, he again reasons sophistically, using the word elder as though it meant only an old person or one mature in grace. The fact of the matter is

this, that exercising an official function as a representative of an ecclesia requires an election for the sake of decency, order and edification, as it is also required to prevent usurpers and would-be leaders from inflicting their conceited, power-grasping, unsought ministry upon a church.

In Z '32, 260, 7; 261, 9, J.F.R. claims that the unity of Eph. 4: 13 could not be reached in the Apostle's days; therefore local churches had to have pastors, *i.e.*, bishops (but no elders, except unofficial mature ones, since he claims elders never were elected servants of the Church). He claims that that unity was reached in 1918, hence no more pastors, teachers, bishops, are Divinely electable since 1918. Against this many things may be said. His reason would dispense with the use of apostolic, prophetic and evangelistic ministers also. Again, he makes the unity consist of perfection of faith, which word he uses in the sense of the Truth. That cannot be its sense in Eph. 4: 14, because that is implied in its conjoined word, *knowledge*. But since he claims that it is just since 1918 that special Truth has been advancing, his kind of perfection of faith has not yet come; therefore the servants of the Church mentioned in Eph. 4: 11 would still be needed. Furthermore, his saying that the unity of Eph. 4: 13 could not have been reached before 1918 proves that he does not understand the Apostle's statement. The unity for which the Apostle stood has existed ever since Pentecost; for as St. Paul defines it in Eph. 4: 3-6, it is the unity of the one spirit, body, hope, Lord, faith, baptism and God; for this is the unity of God's faithful people, the Christ, Head and Body, and that has been ever since Pentecost. This unity does not mean the perfection of [Truth] knowledge, which comes only with the very end of the stay of the Church on earth, since the Truth for the Church will continue to advance until then. The faithful in all stages of the Church had the privilege of

knowing all the Truth then due; and this was sufficient to give them the unity of knowledge that was the basis of faith as the word is used in vs. 6 and 13—(1) mental appreciation and heart's reliance and (2) faithfulness. But all along the true Church had the seven features of unity mentioned in Eph. 4: 3-6. It would have been impossible for her to have been the Church and not to have had them. Jesus' prayer, which was assuredly answered (John 17: 11, 21-23), proves that the Church from Pentecost onward would have the unity of Eph. 4: 3-6, 13; and each one would share in it as he entered and progressed in it. According to the Ephesians passage, in disproof of J.F.R.'s proposition, the Church would always have her general and local Divinely appointed teachers until the Church would be complete and leave the world—until *we all* come to a perfect man—while he claims new ones have been added to the Church ever since 1918. And this disproves his proposition (Z '32, 261, 9; 262, 15, 16) that since 1918 the churches were not to have pastors, teachers, elders, bishops, prophets.

Then he proceeds to change God's organization of the local ecclesias, casting out elders and requiring the local ecclesias to form a totally unscriptural organization. Instead, a service director should be had and should be appointed as follows: A number of candidates should be selected by the local ecclesia and their names be sent to him; and from among these *he* selects the service director. In this he has added another to the very numerous proofs that as the little pope he imitates his step-brother, the big pope, who from a number of suggested candidates appoints the one whom he wants to make a bishop. And his procedure in disrupting the organization of the local churches and organizing them on an unscriptural basis is an exact counterpart of his step-brother's course, who, as the big pope, did that very thing for all local [Romanist] churches. Furthermore, his little Catholic

churches are (Z '32, 264, par. 23) by this new organization to elect a service committee to work with and under the service director—another counterpart of the organization of the large Catholic churches, seen in the special helpers of the bishops. Only such as will be J.F.R.'s parrots, repeating and enacting senselessly what he has taught them (and in requiring this he again imitates his big step-brother, the Roman pope) can be service directors and members of the service committees. His requiring a pledge of his partisan followers (the little pope's counterfeit priests) to go wherever he sends them, and to do there whatever he charges them is another counterpart of the papal counterfeit. No more teachers can be had in these churches (Z '32, 264, 26, 28). Why should there be, since forsooth they are all taught of Jehovah?! But they may have chairmen, who will not teach, but read off the questions on his articles in the Tower, and thus all of the class attendants will teach one another! Of course James' earnest and much needed exhortation (Jas. 3: 1—"Be not many teachers") is no more applicable. It is out of date, since the Holy Spirit has been withdrawn from his church and angels (indeed and in truth, fallen angels) are the teachers and helpers of his church, since 1918. There should be no more deacons (Z '32, 265, 30) elected, since, he claims, there were allegedly none in the Apostles' days (1 Tim. 3: 8-10; Acts 6: 1-6; Phil. 1: 1). But why bother about how things were in the Apostle's day; for has not the Holy Spirit been since 1918 withdrawn and angels taken its place (for his church)?! Fallen ones evidently. Another example of his thinking to change times and laws.

In Z '32, 371–376 he has an article in which he denies that the expression, "In the *dispensation of the fulness of times* He might gather together in one all things in *the* [so the Greek] Christ, both which are in heaven and which are on earth" (Eph. 1: 9),

refers to the Millennium, but claims that it refers to the period of his special movement since 1918. A proper translation of the passage will immediately prove that it does refer to the third dispensation: "That ... He [God] might *again make Himself Head* as to all things in the Christ." In Greek, unlike English, verbs have, in addition to the active and passive voices, the middle voice, which is used instead of the active voice when the latter controls reflexive pronouns; *e.g.*, John loves *himself*. The word above translated, "again make Himself Head," is in the middle voice of the verb *anakephalaioo*. This translation Rotherham, who denies the Millennial work, and whose translation J.F.R. quotes as giving a pre-Millennial thought, of course could not use, and hence twists the passage into something like harmony with his view, making it pre-Millennial. No real scholar will from grammatical reasons alone deny the grammatically exact translation above. Only then would one deny it, if he forces the language into conformity with his preconceived opinions, as Rotherham does in this instance. It is because of denying the Millennial opportunities for fallen angels and dead humans that so-called orthodox translators always darken this passage by incorrect translation.

The above translation being true, the passage is self-demonstrative as being Millennial and post-Millennial. God was once Head of all angels [things in heaven] and of the entire human family [things on earth], but when sin came some angels and all humans cast off His Headship. It is God's purpose through the Elect to establish this Headship again, but only as to all who will be in the Christ [Head and Body]. Through the Millennial and Little Season's work of the Christ God will again make Himself Head, not of all angels and men, but of all of these who will come into and perseveringly remain in the Christ. This translation and our comments on it completely

overthrow the *new view* under consideration. We will briefly answer the main points that J.F.R. presents for his view. He says that the expression, "in the dispensation of the fulness of times," cannot refer to the Millennial and post-Millennial times, because never will anybody, except the Church, be in Christ, hence, he alleges, the expression, "*in Christ*," makes the passage pre-Millennial. But St. Paul does not agree with him, for he shows that the faithful restitutionists will also be in the Christ; for consecration and Spirit-begetting in our Age put one into the Christ as a body member; and in the next Age consecration will put one into Christ as a son, as 1 Cor. 15: 21-23 proves. While it is true that the word *oikonomia* means dispensation in the sense of administration, yet the expression, "the fulness of times," connected with the work of God's again making Himself Head as to all things in the Christ, proves the administration to be in the third administration, the third dispensation. His putting this self-evidently post-Gospel-Age passage into his Harvest is therefore only another of the numerous examples of his imitating his big step-brother in thinking to change times and laws.

In Z '33, 68, 6, he wrongly explains the distinction between *synteleia* and *telos* in Matt. 24: 3, 14. He claims that *synteleia* means the completion of the time that Satan rules by sufferance and without hindrance, and that *telos* means the time of the complete passing away of Satan's world. Hence he claims that the *synteleia* ended in 1914 and that the *telos* will end at the end of Armageddon. According to the Bible the *synteleia* is the Harvest in its fullest sense, in its full work toward the symbolic wheat and tares (Matt. 13: 39-43) and therefore is from 1874 to 1954 and 1956, while the *telos* is only the reaping and gleaning period, 1874 to 1914 and 1916 (Matt. 24: 14; 1 Cor. 10: 11). According to 1 Cor. 10: 11, compared with vs. 6-10, the *telos* ends before the sixth sifting, which

began in 1917; for St. Paul enumerates only 5 siftings as occurring in the *telos* of each of the two (Jewish and Gospel) Ages. Hence it stopped before 1917, when the sixth sifting began. His pertinent change is another example of his Thinking to change times and laws.

In Z '33, 99–105, 115–122, he thinks to change times and laws as to the type of Israel's deliverance. Thus he says that in the commissioning of Moses to deliver, and in the deliverance of Israel, Moses does not always type Christ, but sometimes represents the Church (Z '32, 100, 6; 101, 13). But it was Jesus, not the Church, who was commissioned to deliver antitypical Israel; and no passage indicates that Moses types the Church alone, apart from Jesus Christ. Nor does the type show it. The serpent, according to J.F.R., does not type sin and evil (but see Num. 21: 4-9; John 3: 15; 1 Cor. 10: 9; 15: 56), but what is evil to Satan and his organization (Z '33, 101, 11); while Moses' fleeing from the serpent types the Church fearing the persecution of 1918! But that persecution was not an evil to Satan, hence the application is a misfit. Then he claims (Z '33, 102, 14, 15) that God's saying to Moses, "Put forth thy hand and take the serpent by the tail," was addressed to the Church and types that the Church is charged to spread the message of the Day of Vengeance—which he says is an evil to Satan! But he has repeatedly taught that the command to the Church to proclaim the Day of Wrath was long after 1922, up to when, and for several years afterward, their message stressed, not vengeance, but the millions fable; while the scene (Ex. 3: 4) in Sinai from his viewpoint preceded 1914 or 1918, when Christ is alleged to have come in His Second Advent, typed by Moses' coming to Egypt. Hence this is another misfit. Again, he claims that the act of Moses' putting forth his hand types Jesus destroying Satan's organization. This contradicts the preceding thought, for

the one commanded to put forth his hand must be the one to obey the command, while his view would mean that the Church did not obey the command! Of course such jumping back and forth with explanations contradicting the definitions—somersaults—which his setting of things compels him to do in about every attempt he makes to explain a type to fit his views, is self-evidence of the erroneousness of his views. His mixing up the type of the three signs as given to Moses in the mount and the three signs as wrought by Aaron in Egypt, and thus mixing up their antitypes, is due to his failure to distinguish between what was taught by God to Jesus alone before His Second Advent as to what He should do after it would set in typed by what God taught Moses in the mount, and what the Church wrought after the Second Advent set in, typed by Aaron's working the signs in Egypt. The failure to mark this distinction is responsible for his confusion in introducing the Church into the antitype of the serpent picture and the hand picture as enacted in the mountain. It will be noted that he offers no antitype for the hand and the water picture at all in so far as they enter the account of the proceedings in the mountain. The reason for this omission is this: that they, as related in the mountain experience of Moses, are fatal to his view.

Again, he claims (Z '32, 102, 17) that Moses' reluctance to undertake the mission types excuses that his followers made to undertake their mission. But neither his followers, nor the Church, were commissioned to deliver the world from Satan's empire. This is exclusively Jesus' work, even as in the type Aaron was not commissioned to deliver Israel, but only to act as the mouthpiece and agent of Moses, the deliverer. Moreover, if such excuses on the part of the Church had been made, Aaron, its pertinent type, would have had to make them, which he did not do. Again, he teaches that Aaron's starting out to meet

Moses types the Societyites starting out to meet Christ in 1919. But as Aaron's starting out to meet Moses was before the latter reached Egypt, whose arrival in Egypt types the setting in of the Second Advent, which he variously fixes as during 1914 or 1918, the Church must have started out to meet Christ (which it did in the Miller Movement of 1829–1844) before His Second Advent, which J.F.R. claims occurred in 1914 or 1918. Hence his antitypical starting out to meet Christ is from a year to five years after His Second Advent set in! Their (Christ's and the Church's) meeting, as he says, being in 1922, is again after the Second Advent set in, according to his view, while antitypical Moses and Aaron met one another before the Second Advent set in, *i.e.*, in the Second Advent movement that immediately preceded 1874, wherein they had the Truth on the time of His arrival and looked for it to come in 1874. All of this, of course, upsets his viewpoint; and thus his thinking to change times and laws on this subject ends in confusion, as that of his big step-brother has ended. His claim that God's saying in Ezek. 38 that He will bring upon Israel the worst of the heathen means God will bring upon Satan's organization the worst of the heathen, *i.e.*, that God would bring his nation (Spiritual Israel) against that organization, as its worst enemy, is, in the first place, giving his followers a bad name! Again, this contradicts his symbolic setting for Israel in Ezek. 38, 39, for it is against his alleged Israel (his followers) of these chapters, that the worst of the *heathen* are to come, which we understand to be the worst of the anarchistic remnant that will plunder fleshly Israel in the last year of the trouble.

He claims that the Egyptian magicians' casting down their rods types Satan's agents afflicting the antitypical Egyptians. Such an antitype would require Egyptians to have been injured in the type, which did not take place. The fact that neither

Aaron's cast-down rod, nor that of the Egyptians, afflicted anyone in the type proves that they do not type the infliction of evil, but have to do with teachings with reference to evil, which, of course, refutes the setting of the view under review. Would Aaron's serpent swallowing those of the magicians type the Church afflicting the people more than Satan's servants do? His setting would imply it. His claim (Z '33, 115, 2) that the miracle of the leprous hand was not performed before Pharaoh, cannot be allowed; for it would mean that Moses disobeyed, hence Christ would disobey, God's command so to do (Ex. 3: 21), the silence of the Scriptures as to the fulfilment being not admissible as a proof that Moses and Jesus would disobey a positive command of God.

Again, he teaches that the hand of Moses does not represent God's power, but must represent a creature's activities and services (Z '33, 116, par. 6). Hence he claims that the inactivity of Moses' hand (*i.e.*, while in his bosom) represents the inactivities of the Societyites in 1918–1922 (Z '33, 117, 9, 10). Apart from the refutation that we gave above to such a setting, since in those mountain scenes Moses types certain of Jesus' preparatory Second Advent activities, his view is unfactual; for Societyites were very active from Sept., 1919, to Sept., 1922. They then, engaged in many very large drives, were exceedingly active. He claims that the Nile represents commerce, that the dry land represents the Great Company and other rightly disposed people, and that the pouring of the waters of the Nile upon the dry land types pouring the Truth on the Great Company and others rightly disposed to his work (Z '33, 118, 15). But this contradicts his definition, which makes the waters that constitute the Nile mean commerce, which therefore would make pouring water from it upon the dry land mean pouring commerce upon these two classes! The waters becoming blood, he

claims, type that commerce originated with the devil and is used by him. But that would prove that Christ and the Church who made the antitypical water blood must be the devil! Moreover, it is untrue to say that commerce originated with the devil, though its abuse doubtless originated with, and is fostered by him; for the three foundations of society—the symbolic earth—which God made (Heb. 1: 10), are the right of private ownership of property, government control in human affairs and competitive business. God, in organizing society for the present dispensation, gave these three things and commended their use and protected, *e.g.*, Israel, in their use. It is the fearful abuse of these three good things, fostered by Satan, that has, among other things, made the present symbolic earth evil. Thus we have pointed out various of the errors of the details of his *new view* on the voice of the three signs. The foundation error of his view is, of course, his thinking, as the little pope, to change times and laws, ascribing what refers to the Parousia to his counterfeit of it. We have by an article that passed through sixteen issues of The Present Truth, vindicated the details of our Pastor's setting of Israel's Enslavement and Deliverance as true, and need not repeat these here.

We will now review the follies of right-eye darkening that J.F.R. sets forth on the book of Ruth in six installments of the Tower (Sept. 15–Dec. 1, 1932). In Chap. VI of Vol. IV we have given what undoubted facts and harmony of the facts with the type prove to be the antitype of this book. He applies the story of Ruth from Ruth 1: 2 onward to his movement and thus in this thinks, like his big step-brother, the pope, to change times and laws. The fact that the special period of the pertinent ruling judge is not in Ruth 1: 1 mentioned, is proof that it cannot be a part of the type and therefore cannot point out a corresponding part in the antitype. Hence it proves that

J.F.R.'s claim (Z '32, 278, 22) that the time of the famine that occasioned the emigration of Elimelech and his family from Canaan to Moab is to be placed in the time of Israel's oppression by Eglon, king of Moab, is not only proofless, but also fictioned to enable him to evade the fact that said emigration was disloyal to God's Covenant arrangement for Israel and types a bad thing; for this fact contradicts the whole setting of his antitype, in which he claims (Z '32, 291, 3, 4) that Elimelech types the Holy Spirit and that his emigration from the Covenant land types that the Holy Spirit sometime after 1914 went with J.F.R.'s followers among the great ones of Christendom (whatever that ambiguous thing can mean), while his death (Z '32, 294, 18) types its being taken away from the Church in 1918, which is a gross error, as the Holy Spirit never was, never will be, nor ever can be taken from the faithful (John 14: 16; 1 John 2: 27). This thought is, next to his denouncing character development, the most iniquitous thing he has taught. If the oppression by Eglon had then prevailed, it would have been a compelling reason for Elimelech and his family to remain away from Moab, for people seeking refuge from famine and oppression would certainly not immigrate into the oppressor's domain. Moreover, Eglon's oppression began not longer than 80 years after Israel entered the land (Ex. 17: 9-14, Joshua was scarcely younger than 40 when commanding Israel in this battle; Josh. 24: 29; Judg. 3: 8, 11). This would have made Obed about 190 years old at the begettal of Jesse and Jesse about 190 years old at the begettal of David (Ruth 4: 22; Acts 13: 20, 21)! He gives (Z '32, 277, 15, 16) false definitions for some of the names, in the interest of his pertinent errors. *Boaz* does not mean *fleetness*, but *strength*. *Orpah* does not mean *nape* (of the neck), but *stiff-necked*, *stubborn*. *Ruth* does not mean *female friend*,

companion, but friendship. Judah does not mean praises of Jehovah, but praised.

His thought (Z '32, 278, 23) that the famine of Ruth 1: 1, 2 typed a supposed famine for the faithful from 1914 to 1918 is untrue; for in that time the faithful feasted on Parousia, and the beginning of Epiphany Truth. But it is a fact that from 1917 to the present time his followers have been in a famine of Truth; but this is not typed by the famine of Ruth 1: 1, 2. His statement (Z '32, 279, 25) that it made no difference whether Elimelech lived in Canaan or Moab during a famine, is certainly untrue; for (Heb. 11: 25) we are to choose suffering affliction with the people of God rather than enjoy abundance with the enemies of God. Elimelech's and Naomi's leaving God's people for Moab, contrary to J.F.R.'s thought (Z '32, 279, 29), was a violation of their covenant obligations and blessings, and types something bad. This destroys his view (Z '32, 291, 3, 4) that Elimelech types the Holy Spirit and that his doings type those of the Holy Spirit. Corroborative of the correct thought is Naomi's lamentation over her real losses as chastisements for her and his wrong-doings in leaving the land of Israel (Ruth 1: 3, 5, 13, 20, 21). Thus J.F.R.'s blaming Bro. Russell for disapproving Elimelech's and Naomi's course in leaving Canaan for Moab is blameworthy. The only reason he has for saying (Z '32, 279, 27) that the Moabites represent the great ones of Christendom *hating God's people during the World War*, is the wish to make it so, there being nothing in the text or in other Scriptures to suggest such a thought. When he applies 1 Cor. 10: 6, 11, as a proof that the book of Ruth is typical, he makes a false application, since St. Paul there limits his references to types, to those things which he there mentions. Other Biblical considerations, however, prove that the book is typical. Nothing, except his wish, as father to his thought (Z '32, 280, 3, 4), suggests that

Naomi and Ruth type those who allegedly since 1918 vindicated God's name, Naomi supposedly typing those faithful to him in 1917–1919 (Z '32, 292, 7), Ruth those called into his movement since 1922. His claim (Z '32, 292, 9; 293, 10), that Mahlon and Chilion represent those who have striven to develop character for kingdom fitness, cannot be true, since the Bible everywhere commends such a course as spiritually profitable. He rejects the harvest work done from 1874 to 1916 as *amounting to nothing*, because it involved character development (Z '32, 293, 11)! He thinks (Z '32, 295, 20) that Ruth after deciding to stay with Naomi pictures those who become faithful after 1918, yet elsewhere he dates their decision from 1922 on, while to him Orpah types those who rebelled against his leadership of his movement after 1918. But his partisan followers are Biblically disapproved and some that rejected his leadership are of the Little Flock. Mahlon's and Chilion's death cannot, as he says (Z '32, 298, 26), type those cut off by the beginning of his judgment in 1918, for the Bible teaches that judgment began with the house of God shortly after our Lord's return in 1874 (1 Cor. 10: 6-14). Again, this view is unchronological, because those whom he regards as the ones cut off are those whom the Bible and facts show were cut off by him in 1917 (Zech. 11: 16). According to his setting, Naomi's leaving Moab cannot type God's people leaving Satan's organization in 1918 (Z '32, 296, 28); for his antitypical Naomi left the Nominal Church earlier than 1918 and never went back. Nor can her reaching Bethlehem (allegedly reached in antitype in 1922, Z '32, 297, 33) type his followers' realizing that Christ had come to His temple in 1918; for he teaches that her activities in Bethlehem type his followers vindicating Jehovah's name from 1919 on, as a work of theirs in his alleged Bethlehem, while they never heard of an alleged coming to Christ's temple in 1918.

until years after 1922. Various of his claims as to Ruth and Naomi require them to have come to his Bethlehem in 1918, which is only another of his chronological inconsistencies. His claim (Z '32, 296, 29) of Naomi's calling Ruth (which in the type she certainly did not do, rather the reverse, as Ruth 1: 8-18 proves) types God's *again* visiting the Gentiles to take out of them a people for His name, is unbiblical. God's real activity therein is but one uninterrupted activity, lasting from 36 A. D. to 1916 (Matt. 28: 18-20). His thought (Z '32, 297, 31) that Naomi's (alleged) calling Orpah and Ruth to follow her types the efforts of God's Parousia people, 1874 to 1914, in seeking to bring people to consecration, cannot be a true antitype, for Naomi never tried to induce them to follow her; rather when they attempted to do so she sought to dissuade them. Orpah, he says (Z '32, 311, 20; 312, par. 26), types those consecrated ones who were his followers in line for the kingdom, but in unfaithfulness turned back to the study of Tabernacle Shadows and developing character! If the antitypical famine was from 1914–1918, and the antitypical emigration was between 1914 and 1918 and antitypical Elimelech's death was in 1918, how could Orpah and Ruth type antitypes acting from 1874 to 1914?

He claims (Z '32, 312, 31) that Naomi became God's organization, which is supposed to be the woman of Is. 54, at the time of Ruth's decision, which was, he elsewhere claims, in 1922; but supposedly, as he elsewhere claims, in 1918, 1919, as God's organization, this woman began to bear children and rejoice (though St. Paul in Gal. 4: 27 shows that from Jordan and Pentecost on she did these things); but after in 1922 at her supposed arrival at supposed Bethlehem Naomi should have grieved, which elsewhere he teaches was in 1918! His Harvest he now claims began in 1918 (Z '32, 325, 16, 18). For several years we charged that his setting of things denied the Harvest

as beginning in 1874 and fixed it as beginning in 1918, which charge of ours he for as many years denied. This proves that he acted the hypocrite during those years, doubtless fearing that his followers were not yet prepared to accept such a patent departure from the Truth, which he was then hypocritically claiming he had not changed. Ruth's gleanings, he teaches (Z '32, 340, 6), types not only gathering saints, but spiritual food, which she ate, a splendid example of failing to keep separate the harvest figure from a feast figure! He claims (Z '32, 342, 38) that Naomi wanted Ruth to become Boaz' wife so that King David might be produced—a thing that was entirely unknown to her; for while it was then known that the Messiah was to come from Judah, it was not then known from which family of Judah this would be, nor was it known that it would be through David, for the good reason that David was not *foretold* as a coming one through whom the Messiah would come. This fiction is invented to make his antitype plausible. The near kinsman, he says (Z '32, 356, 7) represents those who refuse to leave off Elijah work to do Elisha work!

Then, because, his setting for the antitype being false, he cannot consistently make Boaz everywhere type our Lord, he must (Z '32, 357, 14) twist him into applying to the Church—his Naomi and Ruth! Then (Z '32, 357, 19) he sets forth the proposition that to become the wife of Boaz Ruth takes the place of Naomi, the latter being in reality the one whom Boaz should have married as the near relation! This, of course, is a blunder, because Elimelech had had children by Naomi, and levirate marriage in Israel was arranged for on behalf of a man who died *childless*, whereupon his brother or other nearest relative residing in the same estate was to take his widow and raise up seed for the dead (Luke 20: 27-32; Deut. 25: 5-10). The reason that Naomi, as well as Ruth, had a claim to the field is that while Ruth's husband

was the firstborn and thus was heir to the main body of his father's estate, Chilion also had a share in it, which had become his widow's, but his widow by forsaking Israel's hopes and becoming a heathen again (Ruth 1: 15) forfeited her share therein, which then reverted to Naomi. It was Ruth's sharing in that field as the widow of the *childless* Mahlon that required her to be taken by the one who redeemed it, to raise up seed for Mahlon (Ruth 4: 5). These facts completely spoil J.F.R.'s fictitious antitype, based on his fiction that Naomi was the one that Boaz should have married. Thus his antitype for the book of Ruth is proven unfactual—by its disharmonies, fictions, twistings and all-around unfitness; while the view of the antitype that we have set forth in Chap. VI of Vol. IV, fits the involved facts and chronology and is in harmony with itself, every Scripture passage and doctrine and the true Harvest as J.F.R. once saw it.

We will continue our review with the May 1, 1933 Tower. In Z '33, 131–137 is an article on, Who is for Jehovah? In par. 3 he sets forth the thought that Joshua (Josh. 24: 14, 15) calling upon Israel to choose that day whom they would serve, the Lord or the idols of the heathen, types our Lord calling upon the people of Christendom to choose between Jehovah and the present gods of Christendom from 1918 onward, Joshua's house allegedly typing J.F.R.'s remnant. Our Pastor's thought is better; for he on the basis of St. Paul's allusion (Heb. 4: 8) gave the passage a double application: (1) to the Gospel Age, particularly to the Jewish and Gospel Age Harvests, though not excluding the time between these, and (2) to the Millennial Age, more particularly to its Little Season. In the Gospel-Age application Joshua types our Lord and His house types the Church (Heb. 3: 6), while the Israelites in general represent the nominal people of God. Through the various calls and

siftings the antitypical Joshua has called upon the latter to choose Jehovah by consecration and by loyalty in consecration, assuring them that He and the Church would serve the Lord. In the Millennial-Age application Joshua types the Christ, Head and Body. His house types the Millennial Levites—the Ancient and Youthful Worthies and Great Company, while the Israelites type the Restitution class. While in a general way the call of the Restitutionists to choose whom they will serve will be given during the Millennium, more particularly and specially will this exhortation be given during the Little Season. On no Scriptural, reasonable or factual ground can this type be limited in its application to the period from 1918 to Armageddon, as J.F.R. claims, though doubtless one of its special Gospel-Age applications is to the Parousia and Epiphany combinedly. In par. 5 he says, the Kingdom shall be preached, etc., applies to a command issued by Jesus after 1918, *i.e.*, after His alleged coming then to the temple, and thereafter to be fulfilled by J.F.R.'s remnant. Even from his own standpoint this cannot be true, for he claims that the end was in 1914; hence from his viewpoint this preaching must have preceded 1914. But the end of the Gospel Age is the Harvest (1 Cor. 10: 11), which began in 1874. Hence Matt. 24: 14 was fulfilled before 1874, *i.e.*, in the distribution of the Bible in every nation, which facts prove occurred by 1861.

In pars. 7-12 he misconstrues the cautions against railing at the present order in Studies, Vol. VI, (607, 608), claiming that in the second reference Bro. Russell said that the Lord's people would be authorized to do such railing later; and then he claims that Bro. Russell thereby forecast J.F.R.'s movement as the one that would do the alleged forecast Divinely pleasing railing at the present order. Neither reference warrants such a thought. The second reference tells the brethren to wait on the Kingdom to rebuke present

evils and to abstain entirely therefrom until the Kingdom comes, when all these difficulties will be rectified. In the meantime the Lord will rebuke them in an agitational way, not by the Little Flock, but by those—the Lord's great army of the unconsecrated—who would agitate in advance to their own and other's injury, as the paragraph implies. The charge to the Lord's people not to rail applies to them eternally in this and in the next life. J.F.R.'s fierce denunciation of the clergy, politicians and capitalists is forbidden railing; and in so far as part of his railing has been directed against some faithful members of the priesthood, between Aug., 1930, and July, 1933, it was his part in the large impenitent thief's railing at the large Jesus undergoing crucifixion.

His statement in par. 16 that the proclamation of the day of vengeance must be made between the time of Christ's coming to His temple and Armageddon requires some correction. This proclamation was partly to precede and partly to follow Christ's coming to His temple. Accordingly, it was done from 1829 onward in the Miller and Cleansed Sanctuary movements and from 1874 (when He came to His temple) onward; and so far as the priesthood is concerned it was to be completed in each country where they were before that vengeance struck that country. Hence it was by them completed world-wide by the end of 1916. The fact that they were to proclaim the day of vengeance as a *forecast* proves that it would be completed in each country before the vengeance set in there. The war began the Lord's vengeance. It began in various European countries variously from 1914 to 1916. America was the last country to enter the World War; hence that vengeance had set in world-wide by April, 1917. Hence before that time the proclamation of the day of vengeance prophesied in Is. 6 and 61, had been made. This proves that J.F.R.'s "proclamations" since 1919, when the first

phase of the vengeance had already ended, are not the predicted proclamation of the day of vengeance of Is. 6 and 61. It also proves that the one which occurred from 1829 to 1874 and from 1874 to 1916 was the Divinely predicted one, and that that of J.F.R. is a counterfeit; for to wait until the vengeance of the day of vengeance had already set in before proclaiming it as coming is *prima facie* evidence of a false movement; and to claim it to be the true movement is *prima facie* evidence of fraud. While the Scriptures teach that the Great Company would make a twofold denunciation of the Nominal Church (Rev. 19: 2, 3), the first corresponding to the second smiting of Jordan and the second to their work from 1919–1920, it nowhere associates these with Is. 6 and 61, both of which forecast Little Flock work.

In par. 29 he says that even if 1 Tim. 2: 1, 2, referred to prayer for civil rulers, on which he later on more than casts doubts, it does not apply since Jesus came to His temple, allegedly in 1918. He gives no pertinent Scripture that proves his point. The charge that St. Paul there gives is not limited to a certain period of the Faithfuls' stay on earth, just as his contrasted charge as to the sisters' not teaching in the Church is not limited as to time, but applies throughout the Church's earthly stay; and since always God's people are to seek to lead a quiet and peaceable life, they are to pray for such blessings on rulers as would conduce thereto. Of course, we are not to pray anything for them that would be out of harmony with God's plan. But we may ask that God would so bless their efforts as would be to His glory and the good of His people. As long as they hold office we are to obey and pray for our rulers as such. When at the end of the paragraph he suggests, slyly of course, that 1 Tim. 2: 1, 2, refers in part to the officers of the Society, he teaches a transparent sophism. In his repetitions he acts apparently on the same

principle on which the Jesuits act—"do not attempt to prove your statements; for the effort to prove arouses suspicion in the minds of the hearers. Repeat, repeat, repeat, and the repetition will gradually be accepted as proof by most people."

In Z '33, 147–153 is an article on Jehovah's Prophet, allegedly based on Acts 3: 22. In this article in par. 1 he misrepresents our Pastor as applying that prophecy particularly to the Little Season at the end of the Millennium, whereas our Pastor applies the verse in the part that speaks of the raising up of the Prophet, even as Peter does, to the Gospel Age, and the rest of the verse to the Millennial Age and its Little Season, which is also the application that he makes of v. 23. Again, he denies that the Prophet here referred to is the Christ, Head and Body, asserting that it applies only to Jesus. But if we closely study Deut. 18: 15-18, we find that St. Peter has quoted it in Acts 3: 22 and 23 from the Septuagint, which gives a composite paraphrase rather than a literal translation. But as v. 15 reads, both in the Hebrew and the English, it proves that the Prophet is a multitudinous one: "The Lord thy God will raise up to thee a Prophet from the midst of thee *of thy brethren* [a Prophet consisting of brethren; hence a multitudinous one]." This Prophet is here spoken of, not only as gathered out of Israel [both typical and antitypical]—"out of the midst of thee," but as consisting *of brethren* of such—"of thy brethren." It will be noted that the expressions, "out of the midst of thee," and, "of thy brethren," are not synonymous. The former tells from among whom the Prophet would be raised up; and the latter tells of whom he would consist. The fact that he would consist of brethren overthrows the central thought of the entire article under review, destroying its claim that this Prophet is Jesus alone, and that His pertinent ministry is from 1918 to the end of Armageddon.

The ministry of Jesus while in the flesh is not, as the article under review claims (par. 5), the teaching referred to in Deut. 18: 15-18. It was during that time that He was being raised up as the Head of the Prophet. Moreover, if Jesus alone were referred to in that passage, fleshly Israel alone would be referred to in the passage as the ones taught; for it was from their midst alone that Jesus was raised up. This fact proves that from both Israels (Is. 8: 14) this Prophet has been raised up, which fact also proves that Jesus alone is not that Prophet. Nor does the passage give any hint on giving such a testimony on Jehovah as J.F.R. claims it teaches (par. 8) and as his movement allegedly has been giving since 1919 (including his 1925 fiasco!). Hence his "irresistible [!] conclusion" (par. 8) is a humbug conclusion. The connection of Acts 3: 19-21 proves that the *ministry* of that Prophet is during the Millennium and at its end. Further, if his view (par. 11) as to those referred to as taught in this passage—his remnant at the Age's end—were true, Jesus would have to have sprung from them, and that since 1918, when the remnant allegedly first came into existence. His claim that Peter's expression (Acts 3: 22), "unto you," *clearly* refers to J.F.R.'s remnant, is as clear as the black mud of Texas after a heavy rain; for Peter applies the words, "unto you," of vs. 22, 23, in vs. 25, 26, as primarily addressed to fleshly Israelites. Neither this text nor any other text teaches what he teaches on Jesus' coming to the temple in 1918 and thenceforth beginning to fudge His own. This theory is read into this and all other Scriptures that J.F.R. alleges teaches it. His statement (par. 21) for the *steenth* time that the division set in among God's people after Passover, 1918 is a demonstrable untruth, as all Truth people know that it started and had its largest single manifestation during 1917; and this fact destroys his whole setting as to the facts of the

Harvest. This untruth is necessary to build up the entire theory that claims the Harvest to begin in 1918, which year's division was much smaller than that of 1917, but it is illogical in that it teaches a harvest sifting before any of his harvest reaping is done. It is in line with the thought that he has been a leader in what is the sixth sifting—large division—since Jesus came to the temple in 1874.

In Z '33, 163–169 is an article on, His Covenant People. He says Deut. 29: 1 refers to his covenant of the Kingdom. But Deut. 29: 1-13 expressly refers to the Israelites' consecration and to the Oath-bound Covenant, as vs. 12-15 show. It was to the earthly features ["as the sands by the sea"] of the Oath-bound Covenant (Gen. 22: 16-18) and to Israel's covenant of consecration that the words of Deut. 29: 1-15 primarily refer, and they were given to Israel according to the flesh, the faithful ones among them alone proving themselves to be Ancient Worthies, who realized the earthly promise as theirs. St. Peter shows the same thing in Acts 3: 25, 26; and according to Gal. 4: 27-31, the spiritual features ["as the stars of the heavens"] apply throughout the Gospel Age to the Seed. He charges (par. 13) that elders, whom he characterizes continually as "elective elders," and who deny his proofless claims that none are Scripturally elected as elders, that their rejection of his views is due to their selfish desire to want to be somebodies, to appear before audiences to show off, to make discourses, etc., etc., etc. Look at his record and you will find none among the Lord's people to equal it in grasping for power, and in hunger for luxury, influence, popularity, prominence, wealth and rulership. We pass by his 1917 record on these points as too well known to need recital. He accepted his position under the charter and will, promising publicly by word and writing to be faithful to our Pastor's teachings, arrangements, charter and will; but, like the great popes

in their relation to the Apostles, he used that position to undermine and overthrow his charter, will and arrangements, to repudiate most of the teachings, to suppress all his publications, to belittle him before the brethren, and to belie and drive away those who advocated our Pastor's ways. He has used his position to set forth a set of drunken follies as truths, and right-eye darkenings as light. He has tyrannized over the Board, the other Tower editors, the Bethel family, the branch offices, the elders and ecclesias of the Society. He has branded some faithful brethren as parts of the man of sin. He has railed at them, the clergy, politicians and capitalists, which is neither the spirit of power, nor of love, nor of a sound mind. He has almost entirely destroyed study meetings, disorganized ecclesias, turned most study meetings into salesmen—coaching assemblies ("pep-meetings"), commercialized the Truth and luxuriated in his wantonness. Such has been the course of the one who rails at elders who disapprove of his teaching, as selfish, power, influence, popularity, prominence, etc., seekers. This glass-house dweller dares throw stones!

The following incident among many others the Church ought to know as revelatory of his attitude toward power and office: The third day after our Pastor's death, *i.e.*, on Nov. 2, 1916, both he and we reached Bethel, he from a business, we from a pilgrim trip. He called us aside, asking us whether Pastor Russell was to have a successor. We answered that we did not know. Knowing that we understood a number of types that pointed out individual acts of leading brethren, he then asked: "Do you not know some Scripture on the subject?" We replied that we did not, having never thought of the subject, but told him, who was betraying a marked interest in the question, that we would think it over, and that if anything came to mind, we would tell him of it. Many brethren will remember that the thought prevailed

among the brethren (a thought that many others and the writer know Bro. Russell held, as more than once he and we spoke on that subject together) that, as the steward of the penny parable, our Pastor was to give the penny—the opportunity of service in smiting Jordan, which many brethren were expecting him to give. The morning of Nov. 3, the day after the above-mentioned conversation with J.F.R., we awoke early, our mind being much weighed down by our beloved Pastor's death. Among others, the thought came to our mind, "Bro. Russell died without giving the penny. He, therefore, while having been that Servant, had not been the steward of the parable who gave the penny." As a matter of fact, he had, unknown to himself and us, given it in its twofold distribution, even as many of us later came to see. Then the thought came to mind, "Here is the answer to J.F.R.'s question: Bro. Russell is to have a successor." Immediately after breakfast, in harmony with our promise, we called J.F.R. aside, telling him we had the answer to his question of the day before. Great interest and eagerness overspread his face; and eagerly beckoning us to follow, he led the way to his room. As soon as we were inside, he locked the door, then asked us what our thought was. We explained it, and he promptly answered, "That is so." Then he asked us whom we thought the successor to be. We replied that we did not know, but he would undoubtedly be a brother of deep humility, loving zeal, deep knowledge of the Scriptures and trusted by the brethren for these three things. Then, enlarging, we added, "We do not need to worry over who he is. In due time the Lord will bring him forward; but let no one seek that place; for woe to him who seeks to '*set*' himself in the Body of Christ." As we think over subsequent events, we feel persuaded that the Lord, knowing of his power-grasping and leading spirit, gave him through these words a warning.

J.F.R. convinced himself without Biblical warrant that he was the steward. He gave as the penny, *Studies*, Vol. VII. All will recall how he taught that it was the penny. He even had a cut of a penny made and printed on the dedicatorial page of that book. One reason why he, without the Board's authorization, had *Studies*, Vol. VII prepared, printed and distributed was his belief that he was the steward. It will be noted that it was on Nov. 3, 1916, that we gave him the thought that the penny parable taught that Bro. Russell would have a successor. The Bible teaches that it was on Nov. 3, 1916, that he began to displace A. H. MacMillan, A. I. Ritchie and W. E. Van Amburgh in the exercise of executive and managerial powers, as the Bible also shows that he drew up his power-seeking by-laws on Dec. 29, 1916. We would here remark that there is a very detailed record of his doings from Nov. 3, 1916, to Aug. 8, 1917, given in several books of the Bible. We came to see this in March, 1917, while yet in Britain, and after our return, April 9, 1917, we watched him closely and saw him fulfilling the details of these types. It was with this thought in mind that on June 23, 1917, we said to him: "I know you like a book, I not only know what you have been doing [since Nov. 3, 1916], but what you are going to do [until Aug. 8, 1917]. The Bible gives a very detailed account of past and future doings of yours." We refused his request to tell him where. We have stated that he luxuriates in wantonness. For one of the proofs on this point we refer our readers to P '34, 68, par. 2–69, par. 2.

In Z '33, 179–186 is an article on His Sanctuary. In it he says (pars. 3, 4) that an epitome of the vision of Dan. 7 shows that Satan's organization has seven heads: Egypt, Assyria, Babylon, Medo-Persia, Greece, Rome and Great Britain. To this we reply that that chapter does not refer at all to Egypt and Assyria,

nor to seven heads, and that Britain is not referred to at all there, not even as one of the horns of the Roman beast. Moreover, without any reference to an alleged Satan's organization whatever, the four universal Gentile empires of the Times of the Gentiles are referred to, which fact excludes reference to Egypt, Assyria and Britain among the empires referred to as such in the vision and explanation of Dan. 7. Again Egypt, Assyria, Babylon, Persia, Greece are not of the seven-headed Scriptural beast, since the harlot was never supported by them, actually did not exist during their domination (Rev. 17: 9). He claims that the three horns plucked up to make way for the little horn are Spain, France and Holland, and that the little horn is Britain, which he asserts is the seventh head of the beast of Rev. 13 and 17. Then he sets up the thought that Anglo-American imperialism is the two-horned beast of Rev. 13. This view cannot be correct, because: (1) Spain, France and Holland have not been plucked up, for they still exist. (2) They have existed as governments more or less contemporaneously with Britain for many centuries, while Daniel shows that the little horn coming up out of the beast's head rooted out three governments that existed before it to make way for itself. (3) Holland as a government never was a horn on Daniel's fourth beast, though it is a part of the Germanic horn of the Rev. 13 and 17 beast. (4) Britain, never having ruled in Italy, can not be one of the horns of the fourth beast of Dan. 7. (5) If this view were correct, that Britain sprouted as the little horn, 286 A. D., it came into existence as the little horn before Spain, France and Holland as governments came into existence, and her defeats of Spain, France and Holland began from 13 to 15 centuries after her sprouting as the alleged little horn. (6) A so-called Anglo-American imperialism is not a government, hence cannot be the two-horned beast. (7) There is no such a thing as Anglo-American

imperialism as governments, though Britain and America have more or less imperialistic policies, but these policies are entirely separate and distinct from one another. A policy is not a horn, which is a government, nor is a policy a beast, which must be a government. (8) If Britain were the seventh head of the ten-horned beast, it can not be the two-horned beast, which is defined as quite different from that. These facts effectually dispose of the new view of the little horn of the seventh head of the Rev. 13 and 17 beast and of the two horns of the two-horned beast of Rev. 13. Of course, it therefore disposes of his new view of the war on the saints (par. 24) as being the persecution of himself and his followers during the World War. Certainly, even his followers were not in that year worn out, thought doubtless more or less for a few months restricted in their Vol. VII, etc., activities, but were then allowed to distribute Bro. Russell's volumes.

His thought (par. 25) on his little horn (Britain) changing times and laws is both nonsensical and unfactual: (1) It was an officer of the Federation of Churches, not Britain, who stated that the League of Nations was the political expression of God's Kingdom. (2) This Federation officer by that declaration made no change in times and laws, as J.F.R. holds, though he stated a thing that, if put into effective operation as a teaching and practice would have thought to make such a change. (3) Britain never put such a teaching into practice. (4) Not Britain, but France has been the most influential force in engineering the policies of the League. (5) The League has never changed a single time or law of the Divine Plan, hence no such changes were made so far as it is concerned. (6) We have above sufficiently refuted the whole setting that he gives to that impotent misfit called, The League of Nations. (7) So far from America issuing a decree that all should worship his

image—the League—America has steadfastly refused to sanction it or join it. Thus we see that while with his little horn no times and laws were changed, he even admitting that God is not allowing it (end of par. 26), there was a real changing, in counterfeiting Gospel-Age times for Millennial times and the Truth as God's eternal laws for error, by the papacy, the real little horn. His claim (pars. 27, 28) that Daniel fixes the time of setting up the abomination of desolation, of the change of times and laws, as occurring after our Lord's Second Advent (Dan. 7: 9, 10, 13, 14), is transparent sophistry. These references show the time of the destruction of the beast and the little horn, and not the time when the little horn would do its devastating work against the saints. Moreover, God began in 1914 to destroy the beast of Dan. 7, hence before, according to the view under examination, the beast made war on the saints, while Dan. 7: 21 shows that it was after that war was over that God began to destroy the fourth beast of Dan. 7. Moreover, in an entirely unwarranted way does J.F.R. mix the visions and interpretations of Dan. 7 and 8.

The article on, His Sanctuary, is continued in Z '88, 195–202. He claims (par. 3) that the fulfilment and the understanding of the vision of Dan. 8: 9-14 are by Dan. 8: 17 proven to belong to the Time of the End. Against this view we offer the following: (1) The word *vision* in Dan. 8: 17 does not simply cover the part of the vision given in Dan. 8: 9-12, as J.F.R. contrary to facts assumes, but refers to the entire vision—vs. 3-14. (2) Manifestly this vision was not in its entirety limited to the Time of the End, for Gabriel's interpretation shows that it begins with Medo-Persia. (3) Rightly translated, the pertinent clause of Dan. 8: 17 reads as follows: "because *for* (not *at*) the Time of the End is the vision," *i.e.*, it is for the understanding and advantage of God's people

living in the Time of the End (Dan. 12: 10). (4) The Time of the End did not begin in 1914, as J.F.R. claims (par. 3), but in 1799, as shown in Chap. V. (5) The date 1914 is assumed without any proof as the date of the Time of the End. (6) God's people got their understanding of the vision of Dan. 8: 3-14 before 1914, which proves that the Time of the End began before that date. (7) J.F.R., as the little pope, being the head of the little Antichrist, of necessity must, like the big pope, furnish counterfeit interpretations on every salient feature of God's Plan; hence his Time of the End as coming after 1914 is a counterfeit Time of the End. His claim (par. 6) that Ireland could not be one of the two horns of the second beast (Rev. 13), because it never was a world power, is false, for it assumes that only *world* powers could be horns. The Heruli, Ostrogoth and Lombard horns were not world powers, neither was the Norman power (in southern Italy), yet they were symbolic horns. He claims that Holland was a horn, yet it was not a world power. His claim that America is one of the horns of the two-horned beast is half-brother to the Seventh Day Adventist thought on this subject. Moreover, the prophecy's saying nothing about the little horn pushing west excludes the U. S. from the picture. Only the needs of J.F.R.'s counterfeit requires this piece of eisegesis. Actually what is papacy's exalting itself to be the symbolic heavens (Dan. 8: 10) he claims means Anglo-American imperialism opposing his remnant! Then, he adds, papacy's setting itself in counterfeit of the Christ as the prince of the host is not the meaning of Dan. 8: 11, but it means Anglo-American imperialism setting itself against our returned Lord as leader of J.F.R.'s remnant!

The taking away of the daily sacrifice, he claims, means preventing the Societyites' doing their work in 1918. That work was the distribution of Studies, Vol. VII

and kindred literature, which the Society now brands as false teaching, while the U. S. allowed the six volumes to be continued in distribution. Their present position as to Studies, Vol. VII and its related literature proves from their own standpoint that that suppression was not one of a Divinely well-pleasing book. Hence its suppression could not have been the taking away of the daily sacrifice, as he contends in pars. 15–24. As a matter of fact, the service of sacrifice of the Lord's people did not cease in 1918, though an Azazelian work at that time was much curtailed. Of course, this new twist is the little papacy's counterfeit interpretation for the true one given by the Lord through that wise and faithful Servant. His claim against the true view (par. 23), that the papacy could not set aside the continual imputation of Christ's merit is only a straw man. No Truth teacher who has understood the subject ever set forth such a claim: Our Pastor's thought was that the papacy set aside the teaching of the continued efficacy of Jesus' merit for all Adamic sin, whether committed before or after justification, by teaching that Jesus' merit avails for the cancellation of the Adamic sin and sins before baptism, later Adamic sins needing the sacrifice of, masses for their cancellation. Whoever accepted that teaching did for himself set aside the continual sacrifice of Christ. One of J.F.R.'s characteristic "methods of deceit" when he wants to set aside our Pastor's teachings, is to give a foolish misrepresentation of them (the straw-man trick) and then refute his misrepresentation; and thereafter set forth his little papal counterfeit as the Simon pure thing. The base of the sanctuary, he claims, (Dan. 8: 11) is his followers, as the alleged last members of the Church: The base of a natural building certainly is not the last things built up into the structure! The Bible pictures are quite different on this subject. When it sets forth the thought that the Truth supports the Church, it speaks

of the Truth as the base, the foundation of the Church (Matt. 16: 18). When it sets forth the chief servants of the Church as the support of the Church, it speaks of them as the foundation, with Jesus as the chief corner stone (Eph. 2: 19-22). It never uses, and that from self-evident reasons, the last ones to become parts of the Church as the foundation of the Church! In Dan. 8: 11 the great ransom teaching and Christ as its Giver are set forth as the base, foundation of the sanctuary.

J.F.R. teaches that the alleged opposition of Anglo-American imperialism to his work is prophesied in Dan. 8: 12. But he has greater liberties for his propaganda in America and Britain than in any other country. His work in Poland is nearly entirely suppressed. It is entirely suppressed in Germany and Italy. If he would fulminate against the other continental European governments as he does against Britain and America, every one of them would suppress his work. The degree of tolerance which the British and American governmental officials show his work in the teeth of the vituperation that he pours out upon them is remarkable—in striking contrast with his intolerance toward them. We might here remark that the governmental opposition that his partisans have undergone since early in 1933 is a part of the breaking of the legs of the two symbolic large thieves, the better ones among them being parts of the large penitent thief, and the bad ones among them, with him as their leader, being parts of the large impenitent thief.

His article on, His Sanctuary, is concluded in Z '33, 211–219. He says (par. 6) that the attempt to explain the cleansing of the Sanctuary prior to 1918, the alleged time of Christ's coming to His temple, was merely a guess bound to be mistaken, since he claims that Christ would first have to be in His sanctuary before He could cleanse it and thus explain its meaning.

Such a view is an unprovable assumption, but also is contrary to facts as to his own position, since its cleansing was properly explained before 1918. He contends (par. 8) that the days of Daniel are literal days. He sets up the proposition (par. 8) that God holds people responsible for their wrongs "only after they have received knowledge" of their wrong. This proposition sweeps away responsibility for sins of ignorance—a thing that is contrary to God's character, whose perfection must condemn all wrong and wrongdoers, though He does so less severely in cases of sins of ignorance than in cases of sins against knowledge. The fact that He exacts the penalty of sin on infants disproves J.F.R.'s proposition. The fact that by nature's laws He inflicts painful penalties on sins done in ignorance also disproves the proposition. Why do we pray for forgiveness of sins of ignorance, if God does not hold us responsible for them? That servant "that knew not [his Lord's will] and did commit things worthy of stripes shall be beaten with few stripes" (Luke 12: 47, 48), is God's sentence of condemnation on J.F.R.'s proposition. While admitting that in 1929 he misinterpreted the 2300 days, he now claims (par. 13) that Daniel's 2300 days began on May 25, 1926, and ended Oct. 15, 1932, but just as in the case of his 1260, 1290 and 1335 days, he has again figured wrongly on the 2300 days; for from May 25, 1926, to Oct. 15, 1932, is a period of 2340 days. Thus:

May 25, 1926 to May 25, 1927=365	days	
May 25, 1927 to May 25, 1928=366	"	(leap year)
May 25, 1928 to May 25, 1929=365	"	
May 25, 1929 to May 25, 1930=365	"	
May 25, 1930 to May 25, 1931=365	"	
May 25, 1931 to May 25, 1932=366	"	(leap year)
May 25, 1932 to Oct. 20, 1932=148	"	
<hr/> Total 2340		"

Thus his period is forty days too long, and that spoils his claim. He claims (par. 13) that according to the Bible way of counting time, 2300 days equal 6 years, 4 months and 20 days. We answer that if he thereby means that the Bible way of counting 2300 is to make them equal to 2340 days, he misrepresents the Bible way of reckoning in a manner similar to that of his step-brother, the big pope, who claims that according to the Bible way of counting, $3 \times 1 = 1$. We have serious doubts that the Bible way of counting makes $2300 = 2340$ and $3 \times 1 = 1$!

Having shown that his period for the 2300 days is a transparent error, let us see of what he makes the cleansing of the sanctuary consist. Instead of making it consist of freeing the sanctuary from the errors fostered by the mass error, he makes it consist of driving out of the temple those whom he calls castaways from his remnant. But Dan. 8: 13, 14, shows that it consists of ridding the sanctuary of those things centering in that which set aside the continued efficacy of Christ's sacrifice and which trampled down the Truth, the Church and the nominal people. This was the mass, from whose every defiling effect the true Church was freed at the end of 2300 years, in 1846, and was not a casting out of such new creatures as failed to remain of the true Church, let alone of his remnant. Moreover, even the actual 2300 days from May 25, 1926 to Sept. 5, 1932, have not seen the complete separation from his remnant of all those who have left his movement. Literally hundreds in the year and $8\frac{1}{2}$ months since then have left him and his movement, and we venture on the basis of Zech 11: 17 to say that thousands will yet leave his movement, until not one new creature nor good Youthful Worthy will remain with him—his remnant will finally be reduced to lapsed Youthful Worthies, lapsed tentatively justified ones, complete worldlings and "second deathers." But apart from what will yet befall him,

the hundreds who are continually leaving him even now, 1 year and 8½ months after the end of 2300 actual days since May 25, 1926, prove that his kind of sanctuary cleansing has not yet been completed, nor has it even entered the beginning of its end. Nonsensical is what he gives as that which will set aside a thing not even remotely connected with the separation of his kind of rejected ones; for he goes on to say that these 2300 days are connected in the beginning with the warning against the Rulers in the proclamation of the London Convention, May 25, 1926, and in the end with the resolution against elders in the ecclesias and in favor of the right (?) way of organizing the ecclesias without elders and deacons, appearing in the Oct. 15, 1932 Tower. How could that warning to Rulers drive out his alleged unworthy ones from his alleged temple? Moreover, very many were before it separated from his remnant.

Against this view we state a number of things: (1) As we showed several years ago when answering his then new view of Daniel's 2300 days, the angel tells Daniel that the vision (Dan. 8: 13, 14) that he had seen in chapter 8, *i.e.*, the one of the 2300 days, had as to its time features 70 weeks cut off of it (Dan. 9: 24), which 70 weeks, 490 days, *i.e.*, 490 years, we know reached from 455 B. C. to 36 A. D. Since these 490 years were only a part of the 2300 days, the 2300 days cannot be literal days of 24 hours, but are literal years. This consideration alone completely destroys the view under study. (2) His view that Anglo-American imperialism could not have been guilty of the sins that they had, according to his view, before committed and that he charges against them, until his proclamation of May 25, 1926, rebuking the rulers of the world for said sins made them guilty of them, cannot be true for the reasons given above. (3) Hence, as Dan. 8: 13, 14, proves, the evils there mentioned as committed were committed during those

2300 days, as v. 14 shows, while his view of the evils as having been committed in the persecution of 1918 makes the evils committed about eight years before his 2300 days began, which again destroys his view. (4) Again, not one hint is given in Dan. 8: 13, 14, nor elsewhere in Scripture, that informing the wrongdoers of their pertinent former sin would begin the 2300 days, which thought is not only based on a demonstrable error, as shown above, and contradicts the statements of vs. 13, 14, but is an invention created to bolster up his demonstrably erroneous view. (5) That which he gives as the ender of the 2300 (actually 2340) days, the Oct. 15, 1932 Tower resolution, disorganizing the Divine organization of ecclesias and organizing in their stead "companies" without elders and deacons, could not be a thing connected with cleansing the sanctuary, since in the little Gospel Age it is a part of the work of the little abomination of desolation defiling the little temple. (6) Having refuted in Chapter V what he says in pars. 20–22 on the 1260, 1290 and 1335 days, we will here simply refer our readers to that refutation without repeating it.

In par. 26 he reiterates his oft-given advice not to discuss their teachings with objectors. This reminds us of a cartoon published in 1903. During the very hot summer of that year many who drove horses sought to shield them from sunstroke by putting caps on their heads. It will be recalled that Mr. Bryan that summer sought to prevent the gold wing of his—the Democratic—party through Mr. Parker, at that time an aspirant for the Democratic presidential nomination, from propagandizing the entire party away from his silver views. A cartoonist touched off the situation as follows: He represented Mr. Parker's face on a \$20.00 gold piece as the sun smiling with golden rays upon the donkey, as the symbol of the Democratic party, and Mr. Bryan as the donkey driver,

putting a cap on the donkey's head to shield it from a stroke from the rays of the golden sun. J.F.R.'s course under consideration is well symbolized in Mr. Bryan's act toward the Democratic donkey! Then he applies (par. 30) the prophecy of the righteous shining forth in the kingdom of their Father (Matt. 13: 43) to his followers since 1918 giving forth his messages, and that in the face of the fact that the passage shows that the pertinent shining forth comes after the tares have all been burned in the fiery furnace, while his shining forth precedes it!

Then in six issues of the Tower, *i.e.*, from that of Aug. 1, 1933, to that of Oct. 15, 1933, he discusses Zech. 1-11. Apart from what he writes on Zech. 11, we necessarily will give only some short refutations of some of his main hallucinations. In changing times and laws (Z '33, 229, par. 14), he entirely separates the time of preparing the way of the Lord and the day of Jehovah's preparation, claiming the former as from 1874 to 1918 and the latter as since 1918. But the Bible shows (Mal. 4: 5, 6) that in a general way, the whole Gospel Age was the time of preparing the way of the Lord, and that in a particular way from 1829 (the Miller Movement) onward, as pictured in the John type, was the time of preparing the way of the Lord (Is. 40: 3-8, compared with vs. 1, 2, 9-11; Matt. 3: 1-4); while the day of preparation is the period from 1799 until the end of the trouble, as Dan. 12: 9-12 and Nah. 2: 3 teach. Without the slightest Biblical hint of such a view and activity, he claims (pars. 20-25) that the rider on the red horse (Zech. 1: 8) was inspecting Jerusalem and pictures Jesus inspecting those in the temple, and that the riders on the other horses picture inspecting angels assisting Jesus in His inspecting work. Rev. 6, treating of similar things, disproves such a thought. The young man of Zech. 2: 1-4 with his measuring line is allegedly (page 243, par. 2) his remnant since 1918, while actually he

represents, generally, the Lord's people, especially Bro. Russell, describing the kingdom message by and from Studies, Vol. VI. It is like the description of Rev. 21: 15-17. The day of the Lord, he claims (246, par. 12), is from 1918 onward, but this cannot be true, since it includes, among other preceding things, the World War. The golden candlestick of Zech 4: 2, 3, he claims (248, par. 18), represents enlightenment and joy, also the organization and witness work of his movement, while Jesus in Rev. 1: 20 defines it as the whole Church, which it is as the enlightener of the brethren. The two olive trees of Zech. 4, he says (248, par. 19), are his two kinds of "Jehovah's witnesses"—those who became his adherents from 1918 to 1922, and those who became such since 1922. But the Bible teaches that they are the Old and New Testaments (Rev. 11: 3, 4, compare with 5-13). Later on he defines them (250, par. 29) as Jesus as Priest and as Executive. The two thoughts are not harmonious. The mountain of Zech. 4: 7, he says (249, par. 22) is the opposition. But they are not a kingdom. It doubtless refers to the nominal kingdom of God (Dan. 2: 45). He says (249, par. 23) that Jesus, the corner stone was finally laid in 1918. The Bible knows of only one laying of that corner stone, and that occurred before Pentecost (Acts 4: 11). J.F.R. endorses the papistically advised and conceived N. R. A. (271), several of whose principles, because of their source, are features of the beast's mark.

Z '33, 259–266 treats of Zech. 5. Its ephah, he claims (par. 8), is a huge judgment measured out; while it being a vessel—teaching—and from the expression, their likeness in all the earth, we understand is to represent the three great errors common to the nominal church: trinity, inherent immortality and eternal torment. He defines its lead as hypocrisy (par. 9); but lead, as a counterfeit of silver, is used to represent error counterfeiting Truth. The woman he defines

(par. 9) as his *man* (!) of sin and the clergy; while as an evil woman she evidently represents the nominal church. The two women who transport the ephah and its woman, he claims (par. 10) are good angels; while they evidently represent the Catholic Church and the Protestant Church, who minister (carry) the three great above-mentioned errors that hold in their power the nominal church. The fact that the two women had wings like a stork, a bird that was unclean (Lev. 11: 19), proves these women to be unclean, hence not good angels. Shinar, he teaches (par. 11), is the state of destruction; while it represents through the confusion of tongues there (Gen. 11: 2, compare vs. 3-9) the sphere of the confused creeds of the nominal church. In pars. 13–26 he attempts to explain Zech. 6, applying it to his movement, and mixes up matters with his usual hallucinations, and to make his applications he ascribes things to the four chariots and the four men of v. 10 that are nowhere Scripturally ascribed to such symbols. In Z '33, 275–283, he publishes an article entitled, Obedience, which, of course, papistically means submission to his movement! The article is supposed to explain Zech. 7 and 8. To him (pars. 2–5) those who asked whether they should continue the fasts held for the evils Babylon inflicted on Israel represent those who hold memorial services for our Pastor! What else, in addition to being transparent folly, is this than charging the Parousia Movement with being Babylonian? Had he not lost the pertinent Truth he might have seen that the inquirers represent some people who came into the Truth during the Parousia and who were wont to ask, if they should not keep up the sad practices that were derived through the evil experiences of spiritual Israel from symbolic Babylon's attacks on them as they went into captivity to antitypical Babylon, *i.e.*, worrying over the dead, the impenitent, the heathen, the saving of souls, penance, etc. He twists (par. 20) the old men

and women of Zech 8: 4 into representing those in his movement from 1918 to 1922 and the boys and girls of v. 5 into representing those of his supporters who came into his movement since 1922. A babe in the Truth should recognize the description as Millennial.

The "no hire" for man and beast, of Zech. 8: 10, he says (par. 24) means that no one could serve during the 1918 persecution, which is untrue; for many of the brethren continued then to sell our Pastor's literature furnished by the Society. The connection shows that this is to occur after the foundation of the Church beyond the veil was laid, but before the glorified temple would be completed. Hence it evidently refers to the time of Anarchy after Armageddon. In many places he casts belittling aspersions on our Pastor, *e.g.*, (par. 27) he disparagingly charges that in Bro. Russell's day about half of the Tower's space was devoted to views from the Watch Tower, but in his own days he has so much of advancing Truth to give that no space remains for views from the Watch Tower! His charge against Bro. Russell on this point is false. We do not remember one issue (and we have read all the Towers from the beginning) that had half of its space devoted to the signs of the times, though God has put His seal of approval on our Pastor's pertinent activity (Is. 21: 5-9; Hab. 2: 1, 2). No, J.F.R. does not publish such signs as Views from the Watch Tower. He fills The Tower with mud splashes, in which he tries to bend almost everything into a prophecy of his movement—thus The Tower is now about entirely devoted to counterfeit signs of the times! In par. 28 he makes the blasphemous statement that prior to 1922 real spiritual Israel was cursed by God. No comment is needed on this statement. The ten men of all the languages of the earth (Zech. 8: 23), according to him (par. 35), are the people who favor his movement, but are not of the remnant. The connection shows that European society (the symbolic earth) is

the whole earth here spoken of, where there are exactly ten language nationalities. Hence the ten men are the ten language groups in national respects. He claims that the Jew here is Jesus. Fulfilled prophecy shows that it is Israel, beginning at the Berlin Congress, 1878.

In Z '33, 291–299, is an article on Melchizedek. J.F.R. says (pars. 4–6) that Zech. 9: 9 is a prophecy of our Lord as Melchizedek, hence applies, he claims, since 1918. This claim in both parts is false, because the Evangelists (Matt. 21: 5; John 12: 15) apply the passage to our Lord's period of humiliation, while Melchizedek refers to him as Priest and King in Glory (Zech. 6: 13). No amount of sophistry on certain omissions can change the application of the passage from our Lord's entrance into Jerusalem to an alleged coming to the temple in 1918, but the passage says nothing of His coming to the temple, as J.F.R. tries to twist it, but speaks of His entrance into Jerusalem. To say that the words, "just and having salvation," were omitted by Matthew because applicable only to the alleged coming to the temple in 1918, is untrue, for our Lord certainly was just and brought salvation when he entered Jerusalem; nor did He enter the temple on an ass, as that would have defiled it, which disproves J.F.R.'s second application. Jesus' approving the people's crying "*Hosannah*" (*save now*) proves that He then brought salvation to Jerusalem; and He lamented over their rejecting it (Luke 19: 41-44). Furthermore, a comparison of the quotation as found in Matthew with it as found in John shows that John omitted even more than Matthew, which on J.F.R.'s principle would mean that it applied to something else than that to which Matthew's quotation applied! Jesus' entrance into Jerusalem on the ass and its foal types, parallels, Jesus' presenting Himself to Christendom in 1878 through the Ransom and the Second Advent teaching, and in the eight large wonderful days typed

the Large Jesus' entrance into the Nominal Church by the same two teachings given by word of mouth and the printed page. The language of Zech. 9: 9 is not a temple prophecy, but of His presenting Himself to Jerusalem as representative of fleshly Israel. J.F.R. explains (pars. 12, 13) the *mishneh*, the double, of Zech. 9: 12, as he falsely explains the *pe shenaim* of 2 Kings 2: 9, *i.e.*, to mean twice as much of the Holy Spirit to be given antitypical Elisha as antitypical Elijah had. Against such a false interpretation the following points hold: (1) *Pe shenaim*, as we have shown, means *two classes*, while *Mishneh* means *double*, here in the sense of a repetition, though a few times it means *twice as much*. (2) His interpretation contradicts his interpretation of the prisoners of hope, whom he falsely defines (par. 11) as the Great Company. But it is to the prisoners of hope spoken of collectively that the prophet declares the double; and, of course, these as allegedly the Great Company do not get twice as much of the Holy Spirit as the Little Flock, regardless of whether we call both antitypical Elijah and antitypical Elisha the Little Flock, as J.F.R. does. Actually the prisoners of hope here are Fleshly Israel. Leeser, as a Jew translating the passage so as to take out of it its application to our Lord, interpolates the words, *good and happy message*, after the word *double*. (4) J.F.R.'s claim that the word here rendered *today* should be rendered, "that day," in the sense of the day of the Lord's alleged coming to His temple, is a false lexical remark made to bolster up his false theory. Matthew's and John's use of Zech. 9: 9 and its connection, as well as the fulfilled prophecy's showing that the double ended for Israel in 1878, prove that Bro. Russell's thought on the passage is correct.

In Z '33, 307–314, J.F.R. has an article on, *Shepherds and Staves*, in which, of course, he makes a special effort to ward off our interpretation of Zech. 11: 15-17

as applying to him. But his effort is a flat failure, as our examination of it will show. In par. 2 he claims that the oaks of Bashan are the capitalists ("big business"). A comparison of Is. 2: 13 and Ezek. 27: 6 proves that the mightiest of the clergy are thereby meant; for in both passages, as the connections show, the clergy are spoken of. This is also shown in Ps. 22: 12, where the inserted word should be *oaks*; for the expression, *bulls* of Bashan, never occurs in the original of the Bible; but that of, *oaks* of Bashan, occurs several times. With the right word inserted, the connection proves that in Ps. 22: 12 the chief priests (the leading clergy) concerned in our Lord's death are meant. Hence in Zech. 11: 2 the leaders among the clergy are meant by the oaks of Bashan. The young lions of Zech. 11: 3 are not the politicians (par. 3), but are the Protestant denominations, which, in comparison with Papacy, *the lion*, are young lions, even as united Protestantism is *the* young lion (Ps. 91: 13), To his thought (par. 4) that in v. 5, by the sellers and shepherds of the flock the clergy, his man of sin and the elders are meant, we reply that such is not the case. It is the Judas class, both in and out of the Truth, whose chief leader among the Truth People is J.F.R., who sell the Lord's flock in the strict sense of the word. And it is the clergy—the leaders—in both large and little Babylon who pity not the sheep, but for their own gain ruthlessly mistreat them. The most conspicuous example of such shepherds among Truth people (vs. 15-17) is J.F.R., whose oppression of God's sheep has for years been crying out to God for vengeance. This vengeance is manifest in God's depriving him gradually of the Truth he once saw, in letting him wander in ever-increasing darkness, as his writings prove, and in gradually depriving him of his influence over new creatures and good Youthful Worthies. He misapplies the expression (v. 6), "I will deliver the men every

one into the hand of his king," to mean that the Lord will have mercy on those not of J.F.R.'s remnant, but sympathetic with his propaganda, by putting them into Christ's hand for safety. The entire verse treats of those in sympathy with present society ("earth") and the punishment coming upon them. They are delivered every one into the hands of his king by coming into the power and control of his own class in organizational respects; thus capitalists have fallen into the control of their capitalistic organizations, laborers into the control of their labor organizations, politicians into the control of their political organizations, clergymen into the control of their religious organizations. Thus, the organization of each group is the king of that group. In this organized condition society ("the land," literally, *the earth*) will be smitten without deliverance.

His claim (par. 6) that v. 6 applies after the Holy Spirit allegedly ceases to function as Advocate, Comforter and Helper, is an impossible thought, because as long as the Church and the Great Company are in the world the Holy Spirit will function in them in these three capacities (John 14: 16). Above we have refuted this thought. The time of v. 7 is from 1874 to 1954, the Parousia and Epiphany. Against his claim (par. 6) that the flock of the slaughter (v. 7) is his remnant, the Great Company and his unconsecrated sympathizers, we give first his own interpretation of the same expression in v. 4, that it is the Little Flock. Notice how this is further proven by the identifying of the flock of the slaughter with the poor [humble] of the flock, in v. 7. Hence those spoken of as fed in v. 7 are the Little Flock, which would, of course, include crown-losers also, as long as they are not yet manifested as Great Company members. Then (par. 7) he claims that the staff *Beauty* represents what he calls, the everlasting covenant, and that the staff *Bands* represents what he calls the covenant for the kingdom. The everlasting covenant he says is an agreement between

God and the race, and was made after the flood, in which God promised no more to destroy the earth with a flood, if man would not shed blood. Against such a thought we premise that God made an unconditional promise to the race, regardless of what man would do or leave undone, never again to destroy the earth with a flood. This was a unilateral covenant, an unconditional promise, just like the Abrahamic and Sarah Covenant, or promise, even as God Himself says (Is. 54: 9; Gal. 3: 20) and therefore bound God alone. Its unconditionality was guaranteed by the rainbow, which disproved, by evidencing that the watery canopy ("waters above the heavens") no longer existed, the possibility of another world-wide flood. While God gave certain prohibitions to the race (Gen. 9: 4-6) after He had given the Noachian Covenant, these did not condition that covenant. J.F.R.'s thought is (par. 14) that man, having murdered right and left, violated his agreement in the alleged eternal covenant, therefore God is no longer bound to His part of that alleged conditional covenant and therefore will break it by bringing on Armageddon, notice of which He is alleged to have given through J.F.R.'s book, *Government!* But the covenant bound God unconditionally never again to *flood* the whole earth. It made no promise, conditionally or unconditionally, not to bring on the Time of Trouble. Hence the trouble will not come by God's breaking the alleged eternal covenant, which J.F.R. claims is meant in v. 10. Moreover, an *eternal* covenant is unchangeable. Accordingly, J.F.R.'s *eternal covenant* is an error, without the slightest foundation in Scripture, reason or fact. Hence it cannot be the staff Beauty, whose cutting asunder cannot mean, as J.F.R. claims (pars. 12, 13), Jehovah's voiding of the unchangeable Noachian Covenant.

If by the covenant for the kingdom, which he claims is the staff Bands (par. 7); he means anything else

than the covenant of sacrifice, which is an unconditional covenant binding us alone to God (Ps. 50: 5); and the Sarah Covenant, which is an unconditional covenant binding God alone to the Seed, he again means something that is without any foundation in Scripture, reason or fact. That a staff is not a feature of a covenant figure, but is a feature of the shepherd figure, is self evident. Hence it cannot represent a covenant, but something connected with a shepherd. A shepherd's staff in the Bible always represents his counterpart's teachings, while a shepherd's rod in the Bible always represents his counterpart's official arrangements (Ps. 23: 4; Is. 9: 4; 10: 15, 24; 14: 5; 30: 31, 32; Jer. 48: 17; Hos. 4: 12). Even where the shepherd picture is not used the staff frequently represents teachings (Zech. 8: 4; Heb. 11: 21). The Bible nowhere uses the staff of a shepherd to represent a covenant. Hence neither Beauty nor Bands represents a covenant. J.F.R. prooflessly assumes this to evade our interpretation of Beauty as representing the Parousia Truth pertinent to the development of the Little Flock, and Bands as representing the Epiphany Truth pertinent to the development of the Great Company. And, like all his evasions, he presents folly for the beauty and wisdom of the Truth interpretations. The pertinency of the figures, their Scripturalness, reasonableness and factualness prove our thought of these two staves to be true, while the impertinency, unscripturalness, unreasonableness and unfactualness of J.F.R.'s interpretations prove his view to be erroneous. What we said above on his everlasting covenant shows these to be the qualities of his Beauty's interpretation; and what we will now say of his teaching on Bands will show the same qualities as applying to it. (1) If Bands is the kingdom covenant, it will never be broken in the sense that he speaks of breaking a covenant, setting it aside; for that covenant abides firm toward the faithful; and it never applied

to the unfaithful. (2) He makes a sorry attempt to explain his views of the breaking of Bands, which, if he really explained, he would find would yield demonstrable error; for if his definition of its breaking, as he used it in reference to the breaking of his everlasting covenant (a repudiation of it) were true, there was no breaking of Bands. (3) The Bible does not speak of breaking, but cutting asunder of both Beauty and Bands, *i.e.*, rightly dividing the Word of Truth. (4) His first suggestion, that breaking of Bands means the breaking of the kingdom covenant with organized Christianity (par. 21), is an impossibility, for the covenant of sacrifice and that of Sarah never were made with organized Christianity; for only the consecrated make the former to God: and God alone makes the latter to the Seed, the faithful new creatures only. (5) His second thought, that such breaking of the covenant for the kingdom as against unfaithful consecrated ones occurred through the separation (breaking of the brotherhood) between his followers (Judah) and those whom he calls unfaithful (Israel), occasioned by his giving his followers the name of *Jehovah's Witnesses* in 1931, is a false explanation; for long years before that his followers were separated from those whom he calls the unfaithful. (6) He confuses the breaking of Bands with the disrupting of the brotherhood between Judah and Israel, while the Scripture shows that the latter is a consequence of the former.

The true explanation of cutting asunder of Beauty appears from the fact that it resulted in the feeding of the flock (v. 11) which recognized it (Beauty) to be the Word of God. Beloved, did not the right dividing of the Parousia enable us to recognize it to be the Truth—the Word of God? Yea, verily. So did J.F.R. once recognize it to be. And did not its right dividing also result in God's breaking His covenant with all the [nominal] people of God? For by

His making His Parousia people the ones through whom He rightly divided the Word of Truth did He not break His Age-long arrangement—covenant—to use the nominal church to be His mouthpiece? He broke that agreement in 1878 when He cast off the nominal church, and this was the purpose and result ("that I might break") of His taking His real people as His exclusive mouthpiece at the beginning of the Parousia for the work of rightly dividing the Word of Truth. Thus Scripture, reason and facts are against J.F.R.'s view of Beauty and are in favor of our view. The same is the condition with reference to Bands. It is the Epiphany Truth pertinent to the development of the Great Company and Youthful, Worthies In what did its right division result? In separating the Truth-loyal and Truth-retaining Little Flock (Judah) and the Truth-disloyal and Truth-rejecting Great Company (Israel), or as v. 14 puts it, "that I might break the brotherhood [union] between Judah and Israel." Ever since Nov., 1916, when there became clear to the writer the first specifically Epiphany truth, a truth that J.F.R. knows we told him, W. E. Van Amburgh and A. I. Ritchie, in their official capacity as the executive committee, on Nov. 10, 1916, the evening before we sailed for Europe, *i.e.*, that the sixth—the Great Company—sifting was coming and that we were going to run into it in Europe, one Epiphany truth after another coming out, the division between the Little Flock and the Great Company has become increasingly in evidence. It was the knowledge of this coming sifting that so depressed us the morning of Nov. 11, 1916, that we were unable to give the Bethel Family a comforting farewell address at the table just before we left for our steamer bound for Britain. Against our view, nothing on the basis of Scripture, reason and fact can be logically urged. And the contrast between J.F.R.'s understanding and ours on these staves will leave no

one who has spiritual discernment well developed in a moment's doubt after a study of them, that the former is drunken folly of right-eye darkening and the latter Truth on the subject.

He teaches (par. 9), as an explanation of v. 8, that its three shepherds are his man of sin, the clergy and class elders and that the one month of v. 8 is the month of Nisan, 1918, when Jesus supposedly came to the temple and cut off from it the three above alleged classes. Against such thoughts many things can be urged: (1) The passage, its connections and the book in which it is found, being clothed in figurative language, the month is to be taken figuratively and therefore stands for a month of years, 30 years, *i.e.*, from Passover, 1878, when Mr. Barbour was cut off from the Little Flock, manifested as such in the No-Ransomism sifting, to Passover, 1908, when Mr. Henniges was cut off from the Little Flock, manifested as such in the Sin-offerings, Covenants and Mediator sifting, the third shepherd being Mr. Paton, who was cut off from the Little Flock in 1881, manifested as such in the Infidelism sifting. (2) According to his own view (par. 21), that the foolish, unprofitable shepherd is his man of sin, he cannot be one of the three shepherds of v. 8, as he claims (par. 9), because v. 15 shows that the foolish, unprofitable shepherd is one still later dealt with than any other treated of before in this chapter—"take thee *yet*"—later on, after the things previously described had at least begun to be dealt with. (3) According to the use of language in vs. 3, 5, and the Bible elsewhere, the clergy as such, whom he calls *one* of the three shepherds, are called shepherds (plural), not a shepherd (singular), while his interpretation makes them called in v. 8 one shepherd (singular). Hence the use of language in this chapter and everywhere else in the Bible proves that these three shepherds are three individuals.

(4) Everything in the preceding and in the immediately

following part of the chapter refers to Parousia matters, except the brief reference to Bands in v. 7; hence the connection proves that the three shepherds were Parousia characters. (5) It is untrue that the class elders, his third shepherd, were cut off from his remnant in Nisan, 1918; for they continued in his remnant as among its chief proponents until recently, even as he elsewhere admits, and some of them as individuals are still with him. (6) Those of the clergy who were cut off from the Little Flock experienced this before Sept. 16, 1914, while most of the clergy never were a part of the Little Flock, and thus never were cut off from it. (7) The same is true of many, whom he considers of the man of sin and of many who have been class elders. (8) Moreover, a clear-cut distinction cannot be drawn by him between his man of sin and some elders. (9) His man of sin, which we have by 15 reasons (Chap. V) refuted, and thereby have proven our Pastor's view to be correct, is a fictitious thing, and therefore is unavailable for application as one of these three shepherds. (10) Class elders, being in part Little Flock members, in part Great Company members, in part Youthful Worthies and perhaps in part Second Deathers, evidently could not be one of the three shepherds. (11) The same being the composition of his man of sin, he cannot be one of the three shepherds. (12) That part of the clergy who never were Spirit-begotten could not be Second Deathers, hence could not be one of the three shepherds. These 12 reasons, besides others, refute his view of v. 8.

His thought (par. 11), that the three classes referred to in v. 9 (actually the Second Deathers ["that dieth"], the uncleansed Great Company ["that is to be cut off," *i.e.*, from the Little Flock, and that is not fed by the Lord while in Azazel's hand] and God's nominal people ["the rest"], all left foodless by the Lord), are the ledlings of his three shepherds,

is not correct, because they are not three mutually exclusive classes, for at least two of them more or less overlap one another. His claim (par. 15), that Jesus by using the language of Matt. 23: 37-39 gave up service to Israel and therefore, according to v. 12, demanded the price [wage] for His service (30 pieces of silver) from the clergy through Judas, who stole the money, is not true to fact, because it would have made Judas' sale of our Lord not a betrayal—it would have made Jesus command the sale and sanction it, and Judas' sin consist of stealing the money, not in betraying our Lord. The true thought of v. 12 is Christ's ministry, dangerous to the Jewish hierarchy, was to them in their curious state of mind a demand that they possess themselves of him as a slave (30 pieces of silver was then the price of a slave), so that as their slave property, they might do whatever they wished with Him—slay Him. Erroneous is the thought that he derives from Jesus' alleged refusing longer to serve Israel, *viz.*, that his remnant by a proclamation made in August, 1931, "A Warning from Jehovah," and by taking the name, "Jehovah's Witnesses," was separated from further connection with Christendom. If that connection be membership therein, it was broken years before. If it be one of service, as he claims, it has not occurred yet; for his remnant is still serving Christendom by proclamations, literature, radio talks, etc. Hence both applications are hallucinations. According to his habit when unable to give even an erroneous explanation of an antitype, he glides over the antitypical 30 pieces of silver in indefiniteness. From his viewpoint of antitypical Judas he, of course, cannot, as he admits, explain the thing symbolized by Zechariah casting the 30 pieces of silver down (par. 20). The connection shows that the Second Advent time is referred to throughout this chapter. Vs. 12, 13, are applicable to Jesus for no other reason than that He is a type of the Church in

the end of the Age. These verses apply to the betrayal of the Church at the end of the Age. It was the ministry of the feet members from 1874 onward, as dangerous to the clergy, that became to them a demand on them that they possess themselves of the Church for the antitypical 30 pieces of silver.

Those who have become antitypical Judas, crown-losers in every case, have sold the feet members for the price of power, influence, advantage, etc., as teachers and leaders. They thus at the time of the purchase were crown-losers, though shortly thereafter became Second Deathers. What they bought was Levitical (Great Company) service. The price of a Levite was 5 pieces of silver (Num. 3: 46, 47). Levite leadership is had separately over the three Levite groups: Gershonite, Kohathite and Merarite, both among Truth people and in the Nominal Church. These threefold leaders, one for each group, would, make the total cost of such leadership among the Truth Levites amount to 15 (3×5) of the antitypical silver pieces, and that among the Nominal Church Levites the same. Thus the total price—power, influence, advantage of Levite leaders and teachers—is 30 antitypical pieces of silver. Among Truth people all sifting leaders have been paid this price of Levite leadership, but have had to betray the feet members whose office stood in their way to get this price. Thus Messrs. Barbour, Paton, etc., by no-ransomism betrayed the feet members to get such power. Messrs. Henningses, Williamson, McPhail, etc., by no-Church-sin-offeringism betrayed the feet members to get such power. Thus, *e.g.*, J.F.R., etc., by revolutionism betrayed the feet members to get such power. And, of course, the Judas section in the Nominal Church did these same things. A secondary application is the following: As 30 pieces of silver are the price of a slave, to whom the owner could do as he pleased, so the "Truth clergy" and nominal church

clergy gave the sifting leaders power, etc., as the price of betraying the feet members to the clergy who use their "slave" unto a cutting off of him from mouthpieceship to the public. The siftlings are the potter, whose possession (sphere of service) is turned into a burial place for strangers (those dying from their standing before the Lord) to the Little Flock through the antitypical 30 pieces of silver; as to them is given the alleged advantage furnished by the use of the antitypical 30 pieces of silver. In contrast with J.F.R.'s inability to explain this matter, we submit the following: The betrayed Church yielded up its control over the power of Levite leadership by letting go of it in the Church and by permitting it to fall into the sifters' hands, who in turn used it as a means of buying a place of burial from siftlings for strangers to the Little Flock, as above described. This it did in the case of Truth and Nominal Church sifters. This, among other things, it is very manifest, was the way antitypical Elijah allowed the mantle to fall into antitypical Elisha's hands, the latter's leaders seizing the control over it and antitypical Elisha in so far as he consisted of siftlings, who received the alleged advantage of the antitypical price for their field of service which became a burial place for strangers to the Little Flock. From the above we can see that J.F.R. is the chief member of antitypical Judas among Truth people, even outranking in this bad eminence Messrs. Barbour, Paton and Henninges, the three shepherds of v. 8. In our Lord's case, he through Judas dropped the 30 pieces of silver in the temple to the potter, by His teachings having stirred up Judas to repentance, the latter therefore surrendering the use of his money for the potter's benefit.

Then J.F.R. (par. 21) comes to the discussion of the foolish and unprofitable shepherd, and by what he offers on the subject furnishes good corroborative factual evidence that he is that shepherd. His evil servant

[a class], he claims, is that shepherd (par. 21); but that class is his man of sin, who, he claims, is one of the three shepherds of v. 8, while v. 15 ("take thee yet") proves that another than any of the three shepherds is meant. Our interpretation (v. 16) of the "cut off" as being the separated Little Flock, the "young" as being the Youthful Worthies, the "broken" as being the Great Company and the still-standers as being the non-progressing tentatively justified, none of whom does J.F.R. serve, as v. 16 shows. The other details of the entire section (vs. 15-17), our readers will find in Chap. III. He interprets (par. 23) the cut off as the Great Company, the young as the hungry ones scattered in the Nominal Church, the broken as those injured by Satan's organization and the still-standers as those not progressing in knowledge. This view cannot be true, for these four lap over into one another. Moreover all of these four things which he gives are marks of the Great Company. So, too, those scattered in the Nominal Church and those not advancing in knowledge are injured by what he calls Satan's organization. Thus, his alleged four classes are not such at all; for there is no clear-cut distinction between them. How different are the clear-cut distinctions indicated in the four classes as we interpret them. Again, as a matter of fact, many of those whom he calls that evil servant do the four things that this passage says the foolish, unprofitable shepherd does not do. Hence his interpretation is false. He says that to take the instruments of this shepherd means to take up the service that they have cast off and to perform it. This cannot be true; for the services of such a shepherd are evil, which the Lord would not have us take up and do; for be it noted that long before a shepherd could become an unprofitable and foolish one the Lord takes away his field of service. Hence his instruments could not mean the Lord's service, even if instruments

should mean the privilege of service, which they do not mean. A shepherd's instruments are two staff and rod, the former representing a teacher's doctrines and the latter his arrangements. The taking up of these means laying hold on his teachings and arrangements for refutative discussion.

This shepherd cannot be a class, as he claims, because when, apart from the Christ as shepherd, more than one shepherd is referred to, even though they be of one general character, the plural is always used of them (Is. 56: 11; Jer. 23: 4; 25: 34-36; Ezek. 34: 2, 7-10; Zech. 10: 3; 11: 3, 5); and whenever the singular number of the word is used, an individual shepherd is referred to (Ps. 23: 4; 80: 1; Is. 40: 11; 44: 28; Ezek. 34: 23; 37: 24; Zech. 13: 7; John 10: 2; Heb. 13: 20). Even as three individuals are the three shepherds of v. 8; so the shepherd of vs. 15-17 is an individual. That he is an individual is further evidenced by his being spoken of as leaving the Little Flock, a thing that is always entered or left individually. The great prominence to which he attains ("in the land"—earth, *i.e.*, throughout society) after leaving the Little Flock also implies his being an individual; for no class leaving the Little Flock has attained, or can attain such great prominence as this shepherd does.

Hence his interpretation of the chapter, especially of vs. 15-17, greatly lends corroboration to our view. God has by undeniable facts so unbreakably fixed this passage upon him as its fulfiller that he will never evade it by the twists that he makes, in his effort to make it apply to his demonstrably non-existent man of sin, evil servant, etc., etc. The arguments that we have given in Chap. III on The Foolish, Unprofitable Shepherd, supplemented by many others, hold him a prisoner as within a cage which will, despite his ineffectual attempts to break out of it, finally crush out his executive and teaching life, even as Bajacet,

the Turkish Sultan, captured by Tamerlane, the Mogul Emperor, was by the latter put into a portable cage and borne about until, in his frenzied efforts to be free, he killed himself.

Then, ignoring the fact that Bro. Russell used Matt. 10: 26 ("there is nothing hidden, etc.") as teaching a general principle applicable during the Gospel and Millennial Ages, he quotes (327, par. 27) one of his applications of it to the Millennial Age, then proceeds to treat that use of it as Bro. Russell's only application of it, then proceeds to refute such a thought—all he does is to kick over a straw man of his own making. That the principle of Matt. 10: 26 is susceptible of general applications to any thing or time covered by its principle, is manifest from St. Paul's statement (1 Tim. 5: 24): "Some men's sins are open beforehand, going before to judgment; and some they follow after [unto judgment]." Then J.F.R. applies it as operating only after 1918 in his temple, despite the fact that Matt. 10: 26, like the rest of the chapter's instructions, applies to the Twelve, to govern their conduct before Pentecost (Luke 22: 35, 36; Matt. 10: 14, 9, 10), hence before they were in the temple! He also says that Jesus' speaking of His telling a thing in darkness means telling something in secret in the temple since 1918 (par. 27), and that despite the fact that it was told by Jesus to the disciples as to a way they had already got and were to give out information, before they came into the temple.

Then he offers a most foolish new view on the penny parable. The new view makes God the householder; Jesus the steward; the laborers those who are in his temple for judgment and do his kingdom service; the penny the name, Jehovah's Witnesses; the day the time after Jesus in 1918 came to the temple for judgment (Z '33, 339, par. 2). His hours are a year long. His day begins Sept. 1–7, 1919 (par. 9), during the Cedar Point Convention. His call-hours are:

the first: Sept., 1919, to Sept., 1920; the third: Sept., 1922, to Sept., 1923 (par. 10); the sixth: Sept., 1925, to Sept., 1926 (par. 11); the ninth: Sept., 1928, to Sept., 1929 (par. 12); the eleventh: Sept., 1930, to Sept., 1931 (par. 13); the twelfth: Sept., 1931, to Sept., 1932. The first trouble with his interpretation is that it makes the day thirteen hours long, *i.e.*, a year too long for his view, for from Sept., 1919, to Sept., 1932, are thirteen, not twelve years. The second difficulty is that the third, sixth, ninth, eleventh and twelfth hours begin a year too late in each case; for the beginning of the third hour is not three (as he makes it), but two hours after the beginning of his first hour. A third weakness: Since he has been having siftings every year from 1917 onward to the present there cannot be the 5 siftings of 1 Cor. 10: 1-14 dovetailed into his five call periods, which is another fatal defect in his new view. Then he makes his penny, the giving of the alleged new name, to have occurred at the Columbus, Ohio, Convention, July 26, 1930, which was over a year and a month before his eleventh hour ended, while the parable requires it to be given after the twelfth hour was over, which his setting would make after Sept., 1932. What if Moffatt does say that the third hour began at 9 A. M., the sixth at 12 noon, etc.? This higher critic is wrong on the subject; even a child should know better; for if the first hour of a symbolic day of twelve years begins at 6 A. M., the second would begin at 7 A. M. and the third would begin at 8 A. M., and the fourth, not the third, at 9 A. M. But J.F.R. uses the 9 A. M. as the beginning of the third hour because he has nothing from Sept., 1921, to Sept., 1922, that can be stretched into the remotest resemblance of a call. But this mistake throws his third and following call-hours out of joint by a whole year or symbolic hour of his kind. He tries to hide the deficiency by making Sept., 1930, to Sept., 1931, the twelfth hour, and that contrary

to the rest of his setting; but in spite of this trick, the giving of his penny occurs over a month before this trick twelfth hour, whereas it should occur after the real twelfth hour.

But there are other wrong features to his new day. While there were special efforts initiated Sept., 1919, and Sept., 1922 (the latter coming a year too late to be during the third hour), there was no special service launched from Sept., 1925, to Sept., 1926; for during that period, though a year too late for what should have been his sixth hour, his 1925 fiasco paralyzed his public work for over a year and he was mending his fences too industriously in covering up his 1925 fiasco to allow the initiating of a special new form of service. The articles that he mentions in the first part of par. 11 and the Indianapolis Convention could not have been a part of his sixth-hour call, coming as they did before its beginning. Giving new teachings is not a call; a call is an arousal to coming into the Truth and to service therein, each one employing at least one new form of service to issue the call. In spite of the article, *A Call to Action*, Nov. 1, 1925, there was almost no response, while there was a very marvelous response to service from Sept., 1919, to Sept., 1920, and from Sept., 1922, to Sept., 1923, though the latter was a year late for the requirements of his day and hour setting. Notice how very vague are his thoughts on the sixth-hour call in par. 11. Again, the declaration against Satan for Jehovah was made at the Detroit Convention, July 30–August 6, 1928, and circulated before Sept., 1928; hence this call came a month before his ninth hour began, though his ninth hour is an hour late. Then consider for awhile his penny. It is a sectarian name and nothing else. Above we refuted J.F.R.'s claim that the sectarian title, "Jehovah's Witnesses," is a Scriptural expression, that it is the promised new name, and that God commanded it to be given as an honorable and distinctive appellation

to J.F.R.'s remnant. Now he tells us that this sectarian name is the penny. We have already shown that it was prematurely given. It lacks other marks of the real penny. It was not given a twofold distribution, whereas the real penny was. His first called were not given it last; those called in his eleventh hour were not given it first. Those who rejected it (his murmurers) did not take it and go to work with it as the real murmurers did with the real penny. The Lord would never rebuke those who in the right spirit rejected or objected to receiving a sectarian name. His Mordecai and Naomi did not receive it after his Esther and Ruth. Moreover, the latter could not be those called in the eleventh hour, since he claims that they are those called from 1922 to the present, his false third hour lasting only to Sept., 1923, while his Mordecai and Naomi were for the most part called before his first hour. Again, his murmurers, the class elders (Z '33, 355, par. 2; 357, par. 8), received his sectarian name gladly and were its chief supporters, and their dissatisfaction was not that the name did not give them enough, as he falsely charges (par. 11), but that his new teachings regarding elders were unscriptural, and on this they were right, hence could not be the parable's murmurers. His claim (par. 16) that his new name was actually given in the first hour, 1919–1920, but not made known until 1931, proves that it was not the penny; for the penny was not actually given in the first hour, but after the twelfth hour, and was known from the first hour on, while his penny was unknown as such until after the 14th hour began. His giving dates in his interpretation is in violation of his teaching on "time is no more," *i.e.*, that the Lord's people should no more pay attention to time features! At any rate, he showed an utter abandonment of exactness on the time features of the parable in his interpretation of it. For stupidity, flatness, unworkableness, this new view of the

penny takes a place in the front ranks of J.F.R.'s follies of right-eye darkening.

Then he sets forth some real Rutherfordian mud splashes, *e.g.*, (1) The expression, supreme love to God, is unscriptural, because it [allegedly] limits love for God (Z '33, 371, par. 4). (2) Love for the brethren means to love them as self (par. 4). [Against this we would say, Such is the love that the natural man should have. Love for brethren is the new commandment of Christ, *i.e.*, to love them sacrificially unto death, as He loved us, while loving as self is only duty love, which does not love as Christ loved us.] (3) The Parousia teaching and work magnified Jesus, not the Father (par. 19); [this he says despite what Studies, Vol. V teaches to the contrary]. (4) The Parousia teaching and work was selfish, because it taught character development and the hope of the kingdom (par. 21)—[a charge against God's elect (Rom. 8: 33)]. (5) Self-seekers among the consecrated will not be awakened until after the Millennium—Seventh Day Adventist doctrine—for which thought he quotes Rev. 20: 13 (par. 27). (6) Jesus' being made perfect through suffering does not mean His being made through suffering complete in nature, organism or character, but that He suffered to disprove Satan's (alleged) challenge of God to place a man on earth who would maintain his integrity (Z '34, pars. 4, 6–10). [The connections of Heb. 2: 10; 5: 7, 8, prove that Jesus' endurance perfected (crystallized) Him in character and won for Him a crystallized, unchangeable, nature and organism—Divine nature.] (7) He claims that Rom. 15: 4 proves that all Scripture has some fulfillment while his remnant is on earth (Z '34, 19, par. 1). How about Daniel's 70, 69, 62 and 1 weeks, the prophecy of the virgin birth, Jesus' birth in Bethlehem and numerous other Scriptures devoted exclusively to the First Advent? There are, of course, numerous other ones that refer to the

period between the Harvests, but he perverts them to his movement; so, too, are there numerous prophecies exclusively Millennial and post-Millennial.

In Z '34, 19–27, he sets aside our Pastor's teachings on Ps. 17: 15, as referring to the resurrection of the Christ, claiming (par. 5) that it is falsely explained in our hymn, No. 105. He sets forth the thought that the Old Testament does not say of its faithful that they hoped for a resurrection (par. 7). Against this please see Job 14: 13; 19: 25, 26 A. R. V.; Ps. 49: 14 (the upright); Hos. 13: 14; Dan. 12: 13; compare with Gen. 12: 1-3; 22: 16-18; compared with Heb. 11: 9, 10, 13, 35, 39; Is. 2: 3 [Jerusalem, and similar contrasts between Zion and Jerusalem, like Is. 62: 1, etc.]; 32: 1 [princes]; 24: 23; Ps. 107: 32 [assembly of the elders]; Joel 2: 28 [old men]. In par. 10 he says that in the Parousia very little was said on the joys of the Lord's return. In contradiction we appeal to the experience and knowledge of all tried Parousia brethren. Studies, Vols. II, III and IV have very much to say thereon, as have the other volumes, particularly Studies, Vols. I and VI. Then he ridicules the brethren as selfish who cherished the hope set before them during the Parousia, claiming that such a hope proves them not to have loved the Lord (par. 11). And this he does in spite of such Scriptures as the following: Acts 23: 6; 24: 14, 15; 26: 6, 7; 28: 20; Rom. 5: 2, 4, 5; 8: 24, 25; 12: 12; 15: 4, 13; 1 Cor. 13: 13; Eph. 1: 18; 4: 4; Col. 1: 5, 23, 27; 1 Thes. 1: 3; 5: 8; 2 Thes. 2: 16; Titus 1: 2; 2: 13; 3: 7; Heb. 3: 6; 6: 11, 18, 19; 1 Pet. 1: 3, 13, 21; 1 Pet. 3: 15; 1 John 3: 3. Then he says that the Parousia brethren who cherished such a hope developed into the evil servant class (par. 13). There is no such a class, but he is the individual who by indulging in self during the Parousia, rather than in the hope set before him, did develop into that evil servant and foolish unprofitable shepherd.

After the foregoing, in an attempt to take out the resurrection hope from Ps. 17: 15 and to construe the passage as applying to his remnant's allegedly being with our Lord in the temple since 1918 for judgment, he offers (par. 17) the following false translation of the Septuagint on Ps. 17: 15: "Let me appear righteous before Thee; let me be satisfied with the display of Thy glory." The following is the proper translation of the Septuagint on this verse, though its translation is not correct, while that of the A. V. is: "I will be seen in righteousness in Thy presence; I will be satisfied when I shall be seen with Thy glory." But, as said before, the A. V. is here correct: "As for me, I will behold Thy face in righteousness; I shall be satisfied when I awake with thy likeness." See Young, also the A. R. V., whose italicized (interpolated) word *beholding* should be omitted. His statement, made to rid the passage of the idea of the resurrection, that Rotherham omits the word *awake*, is false, for Rotherham has it in his translation, for he renders the second clause as follows: "[I] shall be satisfied when awakened by a vision [sight] of Thee." He offers as an alternate for the last phrase, "by Thy appearing." But the A. V., we believe, is a decidedly better rendering here. The connection, which contrasts the sufferings of the faithful in the present with their glories in the future, proves that this passage refers to the resurrection and has no reference to the Lord's people seeing the Lord's presence in the temple, which presence there is since 1874.

Then J.F.R. tells us (pars. 28, 29) that our meeting the Lord in the air (1 Thes. 4: 17) does not refer to the resurrection, but to his remnant's being, while in the flesh, in J.F.R.'s temple since 1918. 1 Thes. 4: 16, 17 describes the first resurrection in its two parts; in v. 16 that part of it experienced by the sleeping saints, and in v. 17 that part of it applicable to the living saints. A theory is hard pressed for proof

that to find it tries to tear out of Ps. 17: 15 and 1 Thes. 4: 17 the saints' resurrection. He claims (par. 32) that a symbolic trumpet means executing [we suppose he means exercising] Divine authority. On the contrary, a trumpet represents a message and blowing it represents proclaiming a message (Lev. 25: 9, 10; Num. 10: 1-10; Joshua 6: 4-20; Rev. 8: 2, 6, etc.). The last trumpet, the trump of God, he claims (par. 33) began to sound in 1914 and ends with Armageddon. He offers no proof for this claim. Then he prooflessly asserts that the last trumpet is not the seventh trumpet. The same events occurring under the last and the seventh trumpet, it evidently is the same (1 Cor. 15: 52; 1 Thes. 4: 15; Rev. 11: 15-18). This last passage proves that it began to blow in 1874 and will end after perfection is restored in man and the earth, which overthrows his thought on the last, the seventh trumpet. His false interpretation of Revelation from chapter 6 onward compels him to deny the identity of the last and the seventh trumpets. Then he asserts (par. 37) that our gathering to the Lord (2 Thes. 2: 1) does not mean our being taken to meet Him in the air in the resurrection, but means J.F.R.'s remnants coming into his teachings as meeting Jesus for judgment in His temple since 1918. Here he confuses the harvest gathering into the Truth, which he perverts to mean to come into his teachings, with our gathering with all the brethren of the Age to the Lord beyond the veil. He reasserts for the *steenth* time (par. 29) the to him known falsehood that the so-called opposition betrayed him and others to the civil authorities in 1918; whereas it was his seditious Tower articles, lectures (*e.g.*, at Tacoma, Wash., advising the public not to buy bonds and take part in the war), mutiny-inciting letters to soldiers in army camps, etc.

In Z '34, 35–42, is the first installment of an article entitled, Hope of a Tree. The tree that he discusses

is the one of Dan. 4, seen in a dream by Nebuchadnezzar. Our Pastor's view is: The tree before it was cut down represents the perfect, sinless race, and after it was cut down represents the race under the curse, until 607 B. C., when the dream, changing to an insane man living as a beast for seven times, represents the race under the curse during the Times of the Gentiles, while the restoration of the beastly man to normality represents the race restored to perfection. This beautiful, factual and evidently true interpretation of our Pastor J.F.R. rejects and offers in its stead one in which Nebuchadnezzar is made in the tree to represent Jesus, Satan, "regal power in the abstract," Satan's alleged organization, or anything else that the needs of J.F.R.'s vagaries require. There is no such reality as "regal power in the abstract"; regal power as a reality must be in the concrete. Philosophers for theoretical purposes make a distinction between a thing in the abstract and in the concrete; but actually the distinction is one only of words so far as the abstract is meant; for by that they mean, not a human being that ever existed, but one's idea of human qualities that they mentally build into an imaginary man. The expression, "regal power in the abstract," is a non-existing thing; it is an imagination; for regal power, actually to exist, must always lodge in a royal person. We recall how this non-existent thing was used by J.F.R. to make Ahasuerus in one scene represent Jehovah, Jesus, Satan and civil officers—four things! Such a thing is a wizard wand to transubstantiate a thing into anything the wizard wishes! The Bible never deals with a thing in the abstract. Its things are always concrete. His use of "regal power in the abstract" is a Satanic trick intended to deceive. It was invented by him to cover up the types' manifest contradictions of his theories, should his definitions be consistently applied to the type.

Nebuchadnezzar, in view of his restoration, makes

the proclamation of Dan. 4: 1, which J.F.R. interprets (Z '34, 36, par. 7) to type Jesus' making proclamations from the alleged temple from 1918 on. This would logically imply that Jesus was represented by the hewn-down tree and the insane man, and was also a sinner (v. 27), who should repent! How evade this conclusion? By the magic wizard wand, "regal power in the abstract!" In the same par. he says that the word *Nebo* in the word *Nebuchadnezzar* points out the latter as the type of our Lord as prophet in the temple since 1918. The Chaldean word *Nebo*, a proper noun, is the name of the god who was the messenger and scribe of the other gods, the Mercury of the Romans. Hence Nebuchadnezzar means, *whom Mercury protects*. Our Lord certainly was not alluded to by that heathen god! In par. 8 he says that the Gospel of the Kingdom could not be preached until after Jesus in 1918 allegedly came to the temple, while he repeatedly tells us that the end came in 1914; and Matt. 24: 14 shows that the Gospel of the Kingdom would be preached to all nations before the end would come. "All the peoples, etc." to whom Nebuchadnezzar made his proclamation in Dan. 4: 1, J.F.R. says (par. 9), are only those who have ears attuned to J.F.R.'s message. He claims (par. 13) that Nebuchadnezzar's declaring in vs. 2, 3, what God had done to him types what Jesus since in the temple after 1918 has been allegedly saying what God has done to Him. This again implies that the tree and the insane man type Jesus. Oh, no! "Regal power in the abstract" makes it apply to Jesus, or not to Jesus, as the wish of the wizard lists.

Then Daniel interpreting the dream of Nebuchadnezzar (par. 19) types Jesus explaining the Truth to the remnant from 1919 on. Here "regal power in the abstract" makes Nebuchadnezzar, the dreamer getting his dream explained, represent the remnant. This implies that the tree and insane man represent J.F.R.'s remnant.

Oh, what a fine hobby horse is "regal power in the abstract"! It hocus-pocuses anything the wizard wants. Actually he always makes the antitype concrete, for always it is some person or thing. He claims (par. 20), without the slightest ground for the thought, that Nebuchadnezzar's calling Daniel (v. 9) the master of the magi (chief of the learned men) implies that the other magi were there present. This is imagining power "in the abstract." In par. 22 he tells us that the tree represents "overlordship over the earth in the abstract," and that this includes Satan and his organization. But these two are concrete; hence there is no "overlordship in the abstract" here. He interprets (par. 23) the tree reaching to heaven to represent that Satan's office of overlordship over the race and the earth is heavenly in origin. "The tree towering above the earth pictures" in the abstract "the overlordship [Satan's, as he in this par. says, which, to be real, cannot be in the abstract, but must be in the concrete] of the earth together with the organization of the earth." He then says (par. 23) that the tree above the ground represents Satan's organization; but since in par. 22 he teaches that the tree towering above the earth is God's creation, he makes God the Creator of Satan's organization. This must have been "in the abstract." Then he declares (par. 24) that the root stock below the trunk, the devil's organization, is man as created in God's image. Then we are told (par. 25) that Satan's organization provides for the needs of all on earth, allegedly typed by all beasts and fowls feeding and shaded under the tree. But this contradicts his picture that the part of the tree under the earth represents man. Again, Satan and the fallen angels, instead of providing for all mankind, have in most cases done the very reverse. How much more reasonable our Pastor's interpretation that unfallen man was the ruler and protector of the beasts.

Then (par. 27) he tells us that the decree (v. 14)

was simply a declaration that the legal right of Satan's organization to rule man and earth was taken away from it when Satan and man sinned. This must be a case of legal authority "in the abstract," for in the same par. he says that the decree was not enforced until 1914. But his view contradicts his oft-repeated statement that Satan up to 1914 ruled by God's authorization, which was given to him in Eden and never taken away until 1914, a thought that we formerly refuted. But there is another absurdity in his thought; for it was some time after the tree was cut down, held in the earth with bands of iron and brass and wet by the dews of heaven, that, the figure changing, the seven times began on the insane man, similarly wet by the dews as the tree was. This would make the seven times begin after 1914. Then he makes (par. 30) the mud-clear statement: The *visible* part of the tree stands for the *invisible* part of Satan's organization and the invisible part of the tree for Satan's visible organization! Then (Z '34, 51, par. 2), after quoting Eph. 1: 10; Dan. 4: 26, he declares: These Scriptural texts *prove beyond all doubt* [italics ours; note J.F.R.'s characteristic dogmatism] that the "tree ... pictures Satan's organization." If it does, its growing up again proves that Satan's organization will not only be restored, but that it will forever glorify God; for the antitypical thing cut down will be restored and forever glorify God. He interprets the expression (par. 8), "the *basest* of men," in the sentence (v. 17), "He setteth over it the *basest* of men," to mean Jesus, giving the word *basest* the meaning of *lowliest*. The word does not mean *lowliest*. The word *basest* is an adjective of the superlative, whereas *shephal* is one of the positive degree. In the first place, its meaning must be made to fit Nebuchadnezzar, in whom the first fulfilment came. He cannot type our Lord in this transaction. The Aramaic word *shephal* here used means *low, abased, humbled*

The last meaning seems best fitted for Nebuchadnezzar and mankind. It is those who will have been humbled by their experience with evil who will gain and retain restitution, as Nebuchadnezzar, humbled by his experience, was restored to the kingdom.

In par. 11 the statement is made that Nebuchadnezzar in Dan. 4: 19 types regal power in Christ's hands. In this verse and chapter there is no suggestion that Nebuchadnezzar so does; for he throughout the chapter acts as the same person in a connected set of events, given a prophetic dream, seeking its interpretation, receiving it, refusing to amend his ways as exhorted (v. 27), sinning, crazed, abased, lives as a beast for seven times, afterward repents, is restored and glorifies God for deliverance. At no stage does he type our Lord. Our Pastor's interpretation fits every detail of the story; the one under study as a thorough misfit is a piece of drunken folly. The claim (par. 11) that he must be Christ, because of Daniel's alleged prayer (v. 19) and the claim that punishment will come, not upon Christ, but upon His enemies, allegedly while He is in the temple since 1918, is false from several standpoints. In the first place, Daniel did not offer a prayer wishing the dream to be fulfilled on the king's enemies; for knowing God's will, that Nebuchadnezzar suffer as forecast in the dream, he would not have tried to interfere with the Divine program by praying against it. The thought that a prayer or wish was expressed by Daniel at the end of v. 19 is based on the interpolated word *be*. The word *is* should be the interpolated word. Daniel's thought is as follows: "O, king, the dream is one in the interest and according to the desires of your enemies and haters," which evidently was the case. In par. 12 he makes the extraordinary statement that Satan became the god of this world in 606 B. C. If that were the case, then this world, the evil order of affairs since the flood, had no ruler until it was nearly

half over. How then could Satan have dominated all heathen nations and more or less dominated most Israelites, the former from the flood, until 606 B. C., if he were not the god of this world? What happened in 606 [more precisely 607] B. C. is that Gentile rulership under a Divine lease became universal, Satan as a god having ruled since shortly after the flood. Certainly the illogical view just examined could not be the product of a sober mind, but must be the view of drunken folly, a sure proof of which lies in the fact that its proponent could have offered it in the face of the wondrously beautiful, clear, harmonious, factual, reasonable and Scriptural view of our Pastor in Studies, Vols. I and II.

In the March 1 and 15 Towers, 67–75, 83–94, is an article entitled, His Name, which should rather have been entitled, The Ten Plagues, as they are the preponderate part of the article. In that article he claims that the ten plagues were poured out through his movement. Here, as in his usual claims, there are no clear-cut distinctions severing as distinct his ten plagues from one another. In this article he makes (pars. 4, 7, 10, 14) the statement that the New Covenant was made at the death of Christ. We defer the discussion of this point until later in this chapter.

Next (par 13) he repudiates another truth that he admits he once accepted—that the Ancient Worthies will become spiritual after the next Age, claiming that Jesus and the Church, being heirs of the earth, will always be its kings and that the Ancient Worthies will always represent them as princes. The sophistry involved in this reason becomes apparent when we recognize that there is no more incompatibility between the restitutionists becoming kings over the earth (Heb. 2: 8; Rev. 21: 24; Matt. 25: 34; Dan. 4: 36) in subordination to the kingship and heirship of the Christ than there was in Adam's being the king of the earth and its animal and vegetable life under God's kingship.

That the Ancient Worthies will become spiritual is manifest from the following: (1) Job, one of them (Jas. 5: 11), by inspiration tells us that apart from his flesh, and after it will have been dissolved into dust, he would personally see God, which can be done by spirits alone (Job 19: 25, 26, A. R. V.). (2) If the Ancient Worthies were to be princes forever on earth, seeing that the restitution class will be kings here eternally after the Little Season, the former would eternally be the latter's inferiors. (3) If they were to remain on earth even as kings, they would have to be degraded from their Millennial superiority to the restitutionists to equality with them eternally, which the Divine attributes would not effect nor permit. (4) The Divine attributes can be depended on to reward them for their Millennial and Little Season faithfulness, which to do will require their receiving more than kingship over the earth, for this will be the reward of the restitutionists for their Millennial and Little Season faithfulness. (5) As Millennial and post-Millennial Kohathites they will have no inheritance in the earth—their inheritance will be heavenly; even as the Priests and other Levites will not have an earthly inheritance, this being typed by Israel's priests and Levites having no inheritance in the land (Num. 18: 20, 23, 24). (6) As antitypical Levites they will be of the Millennial firstborn. All firstborn having their names written in heaven, made heavenly, they will become spirit beings (Heb. 12: 23; compared with Ex. 12: 11-13, 21-23, 37; 13: 1, 2, 11-15, etc.). (7) All of the Levites, hence also the Kohathites, being, with the priests, located about the tabernacle at the same relative distance therefrom, and nearer to the tabernacle than the other Israelites, separate and distinct from the latter, thereby type the eternal spirituality of the entire tribe of antitypical Levi. (8) Israel's giving tithes to both priests and Levites types the eternal inferiority and subjection of the restitution

class to all of antitypical Levi; hence all the antitypical Levites will be spiritual eventually. (9) The Ancient Worthies, having been more faithful than the Great Company, will eventually have a higher reward than eternal human nature, since the Great Company will have such higher reward. (10) The fact that the Little Flock as antitypical Priests and the Great Company as antitypical Levites will be spiritual, implies that all the rest of antitypical Levi will be spiritual. These reasons vindicate our Pastor's thought and refute J.F.R.'s repudiation of it.

Then he tells us (par. 18) that the man of sin is referred to in 2 Tim. 3: 1-9 by antitypical Jannes and Jambres. As already stated, we have by 15 reasons that he cannot answer disproved his view of the man of sin; and by the same 15 reasons have proven that in the little Gospel Age he is the head—little pope—of the little man of sin. But apart from this we can from 2 Tim. 3: 1-9 disprove that antitypical Jannes and Jambres are the man of sin: (1) The man of sin has been in progressive existence ever since the days of St. Paul (2 Thes. 2: 7), while Jannes and Jambres type errorists at the end of the Age exclusively (2 Tim. 3: 1). (2) The man of sin is always presented in the Bible as one symbolic thing, while Jannes and Jambres represent two different classes. (3) These two classes are presented as consisting of many individuals working more or less individually, and not each set as one body, as is the case of Antichrist. Thus for the Parousia all of the false teachers in the nominal churches and among Truth people, as opponents of the Truth, are antitypical Jannes (*he deceives* by oppression); and thus for the Epiphany all of the false teachers in the nominal church and among Truth people, as opponents of the Truth, are antitypical Jambres (*he revolutionizes*). Thus antitypical Jannes and Jambres are members of many bodies and companies, while Antichrist being but one body, his members

are members of but one body. (4) The nominal church and the Truth parts of antitypical Jannes and Jambres have been and yet are of much doctrinal contradiction against one another, while this is not so of the members of the man of sin. (5) The man of sin is only one, and that a separate and cohesive part of antitypical Jannes and Jambres. (6) Antitypical Jannes and Jambres as such are not a counterfeit of the Christ—Antichrist.

The rest of his article, including its second installment, sets forth a view of the ten plagues that makes them allegedly fulfill in activities of his movement. His first plague, turning the waters of Egypt into blood, he claims, is commercialism becoming deadly in its effects. This cannot be true, because water in Bible symbols represents teachings, not commercialism—if it is clear, the Truth; if it is defiled, error. Not only the Nile, which sometimes represents the worldly peoples, but all other Egyptian waters were involved; hence here, not the peoples, but teachings are meant. He claims that this plague began to be poured out at the Columbus Convention, in the resolution entitled, *An Indictment*, which was widely circulated. But this could not have been the thing turning the world's teachings into blood; for it had almost nothing to do with teachings, and it certainly did not make commercialism, which largely produced the World War, so deadly as it was before that indictment. Next, he tells us (par. 29) that the second plague corresponds to the second woe of Revelation. This is not true, for the second plague was that of frogs, which corresponds to the sixth plague of Revelation (Rev. 16: 13). This fact proves that his explanation of the nature and means of the second plague cannot be true. The other eight plagues he treats of in Z '34, 83–94. In discussing the third plague, that of lice, he tells us (par. 3) that Herod Agrippa was eaten by lice, but the Bible says that it was by worms

(Acts 12: 23). Then he says (pars. 6, 8) that the symbolic lice of the third plague are Satan and Satan's agents, which evidently is erroneous, since the antitypical Egyptian sorcerers made them, and so did antitypical Moses. The former could not create Satan and Satan's agents, and the latter would not. He says that his remnant's Truth messages (which ones he does not say, and thus makes no clear-cut distinction in his plagues) made the lice. Hence his message must make Satan and his agents! He claims (pars. 10, 11) that the Society's message on the higher powers made the fourth plague, that of the antitypical flies, and that Satan and his agents are these flies. This makes them the same as the lice, which proves that he does not understand either plague. His fifth plague—antitypical of the murrain on the beasts, he says (par. 14) is a plague upon the world's commercial instruments, agents, schemes, organizations, etc. But this is commercialism and its torment is his first plague. Hence there is no clear-cut distinction between his first and fifth plagues. For in each plague the nature of the plague and the means of the plague differed from these two things in all the other plagues. The message of vengeance is supposed to be the plaguing instrument. But this applies to all his plagues; hence again there is no clear-cut distinction between the plaguing instruments of the plagues. He makes (par. 17) his sixth plague, the antitype of Egypt's sixth plague, the same as the first plague of Rev. 16: 2. This cannot be true, because that would make the antitype of the sixth Egyptian plague come in a time order contrary to that of the first of Rev. 16, which is the first of the last seven. He later suggests his sixth for the fifth of Rev. 16, which only increases the confusion of his setting. He says (Light, 21, to which he refers [par. 17] for more information on the sixth plague) that this plague was the proclamation at the Cedar Point Convention, Sept., 1922,

and that its pertinent work was the pouring out of the first plague of Rev. 16, and the antitype of the sixth on Egypt. But that proclamation, emphasized as the message of the Kingdom then and for three years more, preached the millions-never-dying-after-1925 proposition. Moreover, that message was preached for about three years before Sept., 1922. Hence this plague was a counterfeit and misdated plague, as its supposed message has been factually proven false.

His seventh plague, he claims as (par. 21) that of hail, which was the seventh and last of Rev. 16, is the declaration against Satan and for Jehovah, initiated at the Detroit Convention early in Aug., 1928. Please note that, except for part of the tenth plague, the seventh plague of Rev. 16 was the last chronologically to be poured out. But he gives several others as having been poured out after the plague of hail. Hence he misunderstands the antitype of the seventh Egyptian plague. Our readers are aware that we do not understand the time order of the Egyptian plagues to be the same as those of Revelation. But the seventh of Rev. 16 and the tenth of Egypt are evidently the last two chronologically poured out in the fulfillment. His eighth plague, that of antitypical locusts, he says (par. 25) began in the mass attack May 25, 1932, at Bergenfield, N. J., four years after his seventh plague of Rev. 16 and of Egypt. This, for the reason given above, is wrong, for it should have come chronologically before his seventh. Moreover, as he correctly says, the eighth Egyptian plague corresponds to the first woe of Revelation, which proves that in time it must precede the seventh plague of Rev. 16. This proves that he misunderstands the antitype of the eighth Egyptian plague and the first woe of Revelation. His ninth plague, that of darkness (the fifth of Rev. 16), he says (par. 27) was initiated by the warning addressed to the rulers of the world, issued at the

London Convention May, 1926. But his beast is what he calls Satan's visible organization, which he says consists of Capital, State and Church in all their organizations, as these exist in Christendom. But his 1926 warning was not addressed to any but the civil rulers, who are not even his beast, though they are officers of one of its departments. Hence this is another misfit plague. He says that the three days' darkness represents the time from May, 1926, until Armageddon. But he elsewhere insists that the days of Revelation all symbolize literal days, while already eight years have passed since his three days of darkness began. This shows that he is in darkness on the subject. He says that Pharaoh's threat of death on Moses represented threats by the Romanists and the press against his remnant, and by the police of Plainfield, N. J., coming to his lecture armed to the teeth!

His tenth plague—death of the firstborn (par. 30)—is the eternal annihilation of "the leaders and chief ones in the religious, commercial and political branches of his (Satan's) organization ... which ... includes the [his] man of sin ... the strong-arm squad [police, etc.] and those who put forth their strength to carry forward Satan's schemes, and also the counterfeit of God's kingdom, namely, the League of Nations." That much of this is false is evident from the fact that most of the above-indicated persons never were Spirit-begotten (one of them is even an impersonal thing, the League of Nations), hence cannot go into the second death, and thus are not of antitypical Egypt's firstborn. He says (par. 38) that the typical lamb taken on Nisan 10 into the house types God's receiving Jesus in the temple since 1918. In the first place, in the type the lambs were set aside, but not taken into the houses. In the second place, the setting aside of the lamb was four days before its death, typing Jesus being by the Jewish leaders set aside for death four days before His death.

Then he says (par. 40) that the sprinkling of the lamb's blood on the lintels and door posts types public confession of the blood of Christ, also of Christendom's destruction, and that the New Covenant has been inaugurated toward the remnant. No comment needed. To celebrate the Memorial properly, he says (par. 41), one must take part in his drives. How like his big stepbrother—the big pope—in his demands of service to him as conditional of partaking in the communion.

It will be recalled that we showed that Ruth 4: 9 proves that our Lord by undertaking the pertinent ministry, took over all the power rights of antitypical Ruth (Youthful Worthies) and Naomi (the Great Company, especially in its Society adherents' aspects), derived from their kinship to the lapsed Great Company leaders (antitypical Elimelech) and the lapsed tentatively justified leaders (antitypical Mahlon and Chilion) *i.e.*, Jesus acquired all the rights of management and teaching in such leadership powers from the Society editors and directors. This means that the Lord Jesus from 1920 onward has taken away from these editors and directors the office of being the mouthpiece and managers of antitypical Elisha (antitypical Ruth and Naomi). The latter therefore do not do their work under the teaching and managerial auspices of these editors and directors, and have not been doing so since early in 1920. Their work, in so far as it has been Divinely approved as that of antitypical Elisha, has therefore been a more or less individual work of proclaiming the Truth, mainly by word of mouth, under Jesus' teaching and management. It further follows that whatever they have done under the direction and writings of these editors and directors, particularly those of J.F.R., has unqualifiedly been the work of Azazel; and is not a witness work of and for God; but of and for Satan, in a sense similar to Antichrist's.

The next article that we will review is entitled, His

Covenants, which runs through eight issues of The Tower, April 1 to July 15, 1934. Its main error is that the New Covenant was made at Calvary with Christ for the Church, and that it was inaugurated with J.F.R.'s remnant in 1918. It is, according to this view, a covenant under which the Church has been since Calvary, and which belongs exclusively to the Gospel Age. On this matter J.F.R. has gone into deeper darkness than the Sin-offerings, Mediator and Covenants sifters of 1908–1911; for they properly taught that the New Covenant would operate toward the world in the Millennium, their error being in making it operate during the Gospel Age also. He says that what was actually a *threat* and a part of the curse (Gen. 3: 15) with which God menaced Satan "was in fact a covenant of Jehovah, because it was an expression of His purpose" (Z '34, 198, 22). This is a clear disproof of J.F.R.'s definition of a purpose being a covenant.

He ignores entirely in his list of covenants the all-embracing Abrahamic Covenant of Gen. 12: 2, 3 in its typical and antitypical features, and gives its name to the Oath-bound Covenant. He limits to but part of one of its antitypical features that of Gen. 22: 16-18 (Z '34, 199, 24, 25; 201, 38), thus confounding it and the Oath-bound Covenant. The typical and antitypical Abrahamic Covenant of Gen. 12: 2, 3 is an epitome of the entire plan of God, the entire Bible being its elaboration, while the Oath-bound Covenant is given to the typical and antitypical Abraham and the typical and antitypical seed in their varied relations. He claims that Jesus alone is the Seed of the Oath-bound Covenant (Z '34, 168, 23; 169, 30). He makes the Covenant that God confirmed to Israel in Moab as their part in the Oath-bound Covenant an entirely different covenant from the Oath-bound Covenant of Gen. 22: 16-18 (Z '34, 200, 28, 29), which from his principles it has to be, if as he holds, the Oath-bound Covenant

has Jesus as its exclusive Seed. But the Bible shows that it was Israel's share in the Oath-bound Covenant (Deut. 7: 7, 8; 29: 12-14; Ps. 105: 8-10; Rom. 11: 28, 29), which God confirmed to Israel in Moab. This so-called Moab Covenant he makes typical of his so-called kingdom covenant, which he thinks is taught in Luke 22: 29 as a covenant different from the Oath-bound Covenant. Luke 22: 29 explains a matter that belongs to the Sarah Covenant; and because that Covenant is a promise, the word in it translated by J.F.R. to covenant should be translated to promise. Again, and for the same reason, he makes the Davidic Oath-bound Covenant (Ps. 89: 3, 4, 28, 29, 34) one entirely separate from the Oath-bound Covenant of Gen. 22: 16-18, whereas it is a matter that belongs to that Covenant, the one that promises by an oath that the Head of the chief seed of Abraham would be an eternally royal Descendant of David, a promise that God graciously made to David for the latter's faithfulness. Finally, under our refutations, J.F.R. has abandoned his claim of years' standing, that the Covenant of sacrifice is the Sarah Covenant, and now rightly recognizes it to be our consecration vow. The above are some of his chief pertinent errors. The main purpose and contents of this review will be a proof that the New Covenant operates exclusively Millennially and post-Millennially.

We begin with some pertinent definitions and explanations. The word, covenant, as related to God, is used in three senses in the Bible: (1) in the sense of promises either binding one party—a unilateral or unconditional covenant, or binding two parties to one another conditionally—a bilateral or conditional covenant; (2) such promises *with all their pertinent teachings, institutions, arrangements, etc.*, and (3) such promises with all their pertinent teachings, institutions, arrangements, etc., and *the servants who minister to the covenant's subjects these promises with all their pertinent teachings, institutions, arrangements, etc.*

It will be noted that in each succeeding sense of the word, as above given, all that was in the preceding sense is contained, plus something else. This something else we have indicated by our italics in the second and third senses of the word. Therefore we may speak of the first of these senses as a covenant in the narrow sense of the word, of the second as a covenant in the wider sense of the word, and of the third as a covenant in the widest sense of the word.

Attached to some of God's Covenants were various provisions that do not put obligations on the subjects of the covenants; but are arrangements that they are privileged to use to insure their being kept in the covenants' blessings, *e.g.*, to the Sarah Covenant an Advocate, a Priest, a Prophet, a King are attached, whose work it is to bring the Body of the Seed into a condition to receive and then to continue to receive the blessings of that Covenant; but the pertinent duties of that Advocate, Priest, Prophet, King toward the Body of the Seed are not the duties of that Body, but they have the privilege of availing themselves of the blessings He can work for them. Again, to the Old Law Covenant were attached a mediator, a priesthood, a prophetship, a kingship with pertinent functions that were not parts of the covenant obligating the people to perform the duties of these officials, since they were not actually parts of the contract between God and Israel; but were arrangements conducive to make that covenant work favorably for God and the people. Nor are the obligations of the subjects of such covenants the obligations of those so attached to the pertinent covenants, since they are not under such covenants, *i.e.*, are not their subjects. It is for this reason that many of the antitypes connected with these Law Covenant-attached-features belong to the Gospel Age, *i.e.*, to Christ and the Church, though those of the Law Covenant features that obligate the people type the New Covenant features belonging to the Millennial Age. The same

phenomena appear in certain features attached to the New Covenant, *i.e.*, there are a Mediator, High Priest, Prophet, King, Judge attached to the New Covenant, not as obligating the people to the Former's duties, but to make it operate favorably for God and them. This principle of covenant-attached features that do not obligate the people under the pertinent covenants, but that through other covenants do obligate their officials, and that are the privilege of the covenants' subjects to use in order to insure to them the covenants' blessings, and the non-obligation of the said covenant-attached persons to obey the said covenants' demands on their subjects, because they are not subjects of the said covenants, must be kept in mind or confusion will certainly ensue on the pertinent covenants, *e.g.*, if the Christ class as the Mediator attached to the New Covenant are regarded as its subjects instead of administrators of its provisions for the people's blessing, due to the Christ's relations to the Oath-bound Covenant and their consecration, confusion will arise as to the time of the New Covenant's operation. It is J.F.R.'s disregard for this principle that is responsible for many of his false applications on the subject of the covenants.

As some examples of a unilateral covenant—a covenant binding only one party, *i.e.*, an unconditional promise or promises, we may cite God's Covenant with Noah never again with a flood to destroy society, the symbolic earth (we say the symbolic earth, since the literal earth never was, nor ever will be, destroyed by any thing, Gen. 9: 8-17); our consecration, which is the sacrificial Covenant (Ps. 50: 5); the overshadowing Covenant, which we call the Abrahamic Covenant (Gen. 12: 2, 3), and which is a summary of God's entire plan; and the Oath-bound Covenant, of which the Sarah Covenant is a part (Gen. 22: 16-18). These covenants bind only one party—they are unilateral, one-sided; hence they are unconditional promises. It is for

this reason that the Abrahamic and Sarah Covenants are repeatedly called the promises, binding God only (Rom. 9: 8, 9; Gal. 3: 8-22, 29; 4: 23-31; Heb. 6: 12-19). As examples of covenants which as promises are conditional on the fulfillments of certain obligations assumed by the parties to the covenants or promises—bilateral covenants—we may cite the Mosaic and the New Covenants (Eph. 2: 12; certain features of the Abrahamic promises are here also included). In the former, God and Israel entered into a covenant—contract—with one another, God promising as His part of the Covenant or contract to give Israel life, the right to life and its life rights, if Israel kept the Divinely-given teachings, institutions, arrangements, etc. (Gal. 3: 12, 10), and Israel as its part of the Covenant promising to keep these, if God would reward such obedience with everlasting life (Ex. 24: 3; Gal. 3: 12; Deut. 30: 15-20). These conditional promises constituted the Law Covenant in its narrow sense. That the New Covenant consists of the promises that God and man will Millennially and post-Millennially make to one another on certain conditions is evident from Ezek. 18: 1-24; and these conditional promises will constitute the New Covenant in its narrow sense. God's two conditional Covenants are *contracts* whose terms bind God and Israel to one another.

As an example of the word, covenant, used in the second or wider sense of the word, we may cite the Law Covenant as consisting not only of the above-mentioned conditional promises, but also of the teachings, arrangements, institutions, etc., that were made the basis of the Covenant in its narrow sense, and that as such were obligations of the parties to the Covenant (Ex. 24: 3, 7; 34: 27, 28; Deut. 4: 13; John 1: 17; Heb. 9: 1-10; 10: 1-4). In this sense the Covenant was forty years in its making (Heb. 8: 9; 3: 7, 9), its first parts being certain (not all) features of the Passover, given before they left Egypt, the Sabbath, given before

they came to Sinai, the features given at Sinai, where the contract, the covenant in the narrow sense, was made, and those given after they left Sinai until they were ready to enter Canaan (Ex. 12: 8-50; 16: 22-30, 20-23; and numerous ones in Lev., Num. and Deut). The teachings, arrangements, institutions, etc. (contained especially in the New Testament), whereby God is realizing the oath-bound promises in its Sarah Covenant features to the Christ, are likewise seen to be, with those promises, the Oath-bound Covenant to the Christ in the second sense of the word. Also all of the arrangements, institutions, teachings, etc., of the Millennium will, with the New Covenant promises, be the New Covenant in the wider sense of the word.

As examples of the word, covenant, in the widest, the third sense of the term, we cite the Mosaic, the Sarah and the New Covenants, whenever they are presented as wives of God (Gal. 4: 21-31; Is. 54; 60: 6; Gen. 25: 1-5). This requires explanation and proof. In addition to the conditional promises of the Law Covenant and their pertinent teachings, institutions, arrangements, etc., the covenant in this sense of the word includes *the servants who ministered the covenant teachings, institutions, arrangements, etc., i.e., the covenant provisions*, to his fellow Israelites. The latter as ministered unto, were the children of the Law Covenant. Let us note well this distinction: It is not so much one of the persons as much as of relations of the pertinent persons. When the Israelites *ministered* the covenant provisions to one another, they acted as the mother, antitypical Hagar (Gal. 4: 24, 25); and when *ministered unto* with the covenant provisions by their brethren, they acted as the children, antitypical Ishmael (Gal. 4: 25, 29, 30).

From this standpoint, in the first place Moses was this mother, not in his capacity of giving the covenant provisions, for in that capacity he was the mediator of the Covenant, but after they were given, in his capacity

of ministering them to the Israelites; secondly, in their capacity of so ministering, the elders of the people, especially the twelve princes, the seventy judges, the seventy elders, the priesthood, the Levites, the parents, the prophets, and finally everyone else who would do any teaching of the Covenant's provisions to his fellow Israelites, were added to Moses as parts of the mother. It thus eventuated that all Israelites, in their capacity of ministering to their fellows with the words, etc., of the Covenant, were the mother. In their so functioning they were Jehovah's wife, antitypical Hagar nourishing Israelites as her children. This wife was in existence as such before they reached Sinai; she was in Moses, Aaron and the elders of Israel, who taught Israel in general, and in the heads of the families, who taught their families in particular, certain of the Passover arrangements, already functioning in Egypt, out of which we are assured God called Israel, His *Son* (Hos. 11: 1). Moses was not the friend of the Bridegroom in this case, as J.F.R. claims, because no friend of the Bridegroom was used for any of the Father's symbolic wives, even as typed in Abraham, who, without any friend of the Bridegroom, took Hagar, as his owned slave as a concubine, and not as a full wife, even as he also did with Keturah (Gen. 25: 5, 6). Being a concubine and Sarah a full wife, Keturah could not be since 1918 a successor of Sarah, typing the same thing as she, as J.F.R. contends, claiming (Z '34, 168, 26) that both were the types of his alleged Jehovah's organization, Sarah up to 1918, Keturah since then. Nor could Keturah be such for another reason; her sons were not joint-heirs with Isaac, but were exiles from Abraham's home, so as not to partake with Isaac in his inheritance (Gen. 25: 5, 6).

Turning to the Church's Covenant now operating, in the third sense of the word: It consists of the Oath bound promises (only, however, in their application to the Christ), of all their elaborations, as found in many

Old Testament passages and in practically all New Testament passages, and of the brethren in their capacity of ministering these things to one another. These ministering brethren consist, first, of our Lord, then the Apostles, then the prophets (both those of the Old Testament and the non-apostolic Gospel Age teachers of the general Church), then evangelists, then pastors or teachers, then the non-official brethren of the Church, in their capacity of ministering to their brethren with the Covenant provisions. Thus, in ultimate analysis, antitypical Sarah in the last feature of the Covenant in the widest sense of the word, beside the writers of the Old Testament, is all of the Little Flock's members in their capacity of ministering to one another, while Isaac types these same persons, except the writers of the Old Testament, in their capacity of being ministered unto by one another. The only exception to this is our Lord. He was not nourished by His Little Flock brethren; but He was nourished by the Old Testament writers, who are a part of antitypical Sarah, as we will later show. In the next Age the New Covenant as Jehovah's wife, in the third sense of the word, will include the pertinent promises, etc., and those who apply these to the restitution class: (1) the Christ, (2) the Great Company, (3) the Ancient and (4) the Youthful Worthies, (5) believing Israel and finally (6) all the faithful of the restitution class (Matt. 25: 34-40).

Now to the Biblical proof of this third sense of the word covenant, when one is spoken of as Jehovah's wife. In treating of the Law Covenant and of the part of the Oath-bound Covenant relating to the Christ, in Gal. 4: 21-31, under the figure of Jehovah's—God's, not Christ's—wives, St. Paul mentions Sarah as the type of the latter and Hagar as the type of the former. To prove that Sarah is the mother of us all as members of the Christ class in our capacity of being nourished by her, St. Paul cites Is. 54: 1. Like Sarah, who as the

wife of youth and long into old age was barren, though the married wife, so the one there addressed was barren as the wife of youth and into old age, though the married wife (v. 6). As Sarah, as it were, was forsaken and thus practically a widow in shame of barrenness and in grief, while another, Hagar, was taken in her place; so the one here addressed was in the shame of barrenness in grief, as it were, forsaken and in practical widowhood (vs. 4, 6, 7), when another (the Law Covenant as antitypical Hagar) was taken in her place. And as Sarah was, so to speak, taken again as wife and bore Isaac, so the one here spoken of is reinstated as wife and becomes the mother of her husband's—God's—children (vs. 5, 18). She is given an oath (v. 9) as pledge of her Husband's loyalty to her and to the welfare of her children, as an unconditional Covenant, promise, like that made to Noah after the flood; and this oath given to her proves that she is not simply the Oath-bound promise. V. 17, compared with vs. 9, 10, demonstrates that she consists of the Lord's servants connected by an oath with His Oath-clad Covenant. This truly demonstrates that antitypical Sarah is the Oath-bound Covenant to the Christ with all its Biblical elaborations and the servants who apply these to the children of God, the Christ, in the Oath-bound Covenant. Thus our first proof from Gal. 4: 22-32 and Is. 54: 1-17, demonstrates our third definition of a Biblical Covenant to be correct. During her time of barrenness and practical forsakenment the faithful of the Old Testament were the personal, ministering part of the Sarah Covenant, whose sorrows, ministries and sufferings are described in Is. 54; Heb. 11; Pet. 1: 10-12.

Another proof of this third definition is found in Acts 3: 25. In the preceding verses St. Peter had, by general and particular statements and quotation, said that all the prophets—hence this began with Enoch (acting as Melchizedek), Noah and Abraham (Jude 14, 15;

Gen. 9: 26, 27; 20: 7)—had foretold the times when the Christ would in the Millennium return and introduce the refreshing, literally, the springing up again, with growth and greenness of cut-down and sunburned grass after copious showers that came upon it, *i.e.*, restitution, of all things lost in Adam's fall—every feature of God's image and likeness. He then proceeds to mention two parts of the mother of God's children, which, from his quotation of the third promise of the Oath-bound Covenant, we at once recognize to be antitypical Sarah. These two parts of the mother are (1) the Oath-bound promises (Gen. 22: 16-18), as is evident from St. Peter's quotation of one of them—"in thy seed shall all the kindreds of the earth be blessed" (Gen. 22: 18)—and (2) the prophets who through their Old Testament writings ministered various elaborations of all three features of this Covenant to the Christ (1 Pet. 1: 10-12). "Ye are the children (1) of the prophets and (2) of the Covenant which God made with our fathers, saying unto Abraham, 'And in thy seed shall all the kindreds [families, nations] of the earth be blessed.'" St. Peter addresses them as the children of antitypical Sarah, because the preceding part of his sermon with its Old Testament quotations had already brought them as consecrated Israelites in Moses (1 Cor. 10: 1, 2) into Christ by faith; and in v. 26, St. Peter tells them that this blessing from God in Christ was intended for their cleansing from all human filthiness (2 Cor. 7: 13).

Still another proof of this third definition is St. Paul's expression in Gal. 4: 19, uttered immediately preceding and introductory to his explanation of the Sarah and Hagar types. In this passage St. Paul directly sets himself forth as a part of the mother (antitypical Sarah is such) of God's Little Flock children, and states that as such he was travailing in pain again to bring them to birth, which, of course, is a mother-function: "*My little children, of whom I travail in*

birth again until Christ be formed in you." Because of being a part of this mother, St. Paul, St. John and St. Peter call those to whom they minister the promises their children (1 Tim. 1: 2; Tit. 1: 4; 1 John 2: 1, etc.; 1 Pet. 5: 13). These proofs demonstrate the Biblicity of our three definitions.

We are now ready to present our general arguments against J.F.R.'s position that the New Covenant is a Gospel-Age arrangement made with Christ for the Church at Calvary and inaugurated in 1918 with J.F.R.'s remnant. Our first argument against his general position is that the claim that the New Covenant was made at Calvary and inaugurated in 1918 is a self-contradiction; for to make a covenant and to inaugurate it (this latter is not a Scriptural term) as used in Truth literature are one and the same thing. At Calvary the merit was deposited (Luke 23: 46) that sureties the New Covenant (Heb. 7: 22). Surety is always given in view of the operation of a future thing. When St. Paul, therefore, in 63 or 64 A. D. wrote the epistle to the Hebrews the New Covenant was not yet made; for it was then merely suretied. Hence it was not made at Calvary. Again, what is spoken of as inaugurating the New Covenant, sprinkling the blood on the book and the people as well as on the Tabernacle and vessels (Heb. 9: 18-20), is the making of the New Covenant, or, to put it in another form, is the sealing of the New Covenant. The word *egkekainistai* (v. 18), for which J.F.R. prefers the translation, inaugurate, means *initiate*, and this certainly is its meaning here. The New Covenant will be begun to be initiated in the beginning of the Millennium by sprinkling the antitypical book, Divine justice (Heb. 9: 19-22), which act does not type, as J.F.R. contends, that the law was in force toward the remnant (Z '34, 134, 15), but satisfying justice, like sprinkling the mercy seat. Its initiation will proceed with sprinkling the antitypical people, tabernacle and

vessels during the entire Millennium. It thus takes the whole Millennium to initiate the New Covenant, which is the entire Millennial work of the Mediator in sealing or inaugurating or making it as a contract.

Hence we see that there is no difference between making and inaugurating the New Covenant; both mean its sealing, its initiation, making it enter into operation. Hence to say that the New Covenant was made at Calvary with Jesus, when He entered no covenant, J.F.R.'s proofless claim to the contrary notwithstanding, and was inaugurated for J.F.R.'s remnant in 1918, is a contradiction in terms, separates the making from the inaugurating of it by nearly 1900 years (!), as well as places the operation of the New Covenant in a wrong dispensation. Notice, please, J.F.R.'s juggling in his alleged explanation of the New Covenant's inauguration. He claims that to inaugurate means to induct into an office, which is doubtless the meaning of the word when the inauguration of officials is referred to; then he goes on to explain that the inauguration of the New Covenant is the induction of his remnant into its office since 1918 as Jehovah's witnesses. What has he done by this explanation? He has not thereby explained the inauguration of the New Covenant at all; he has explained the inauguration of alleged officers of the New Covenant! This would be like saying that the U. S. was inaugurated at the inauguration of each president! This piece of juggling, changing the inauguration of the New Covenant into inauguration of its alleged officers, is illustrative of *lawyer* Rutherford's "methods of deceit."

The second argument that we make against his general position is that it is absurd to teach that Jesus is the Mediator between God and the Church (Z '34, 105, 27); because it implies that neither God nor the Church trust one another and will not deal directly with one another, but only through a go-between. This

will appear from the following: There are two classes among men: (1) the faith class (Gal. 3: 7-9, 14, 26-29); and (2) the unbelief class (2 Thes. 3: 2). God's unilateral covenants, *as involved in His plan*, imply that God trusts the subjects of these covenants, and that they trust Him as the Giver of them. Hence these do not need a mediator to guarantee them to one another, though they need a Priest to at-one them and an Advocate to satisfy justice (Heb. 2: 17; 1 John 2: 1, 2). We are God's sons who have, as seen in the priesthood figure, in the one Spirit as the World's High Priest direct access to God in our Covenant through our High Priest's intercession (Eph. 2: 18; Heb. 4: 14-16; 7: 24, 25), and who have as touching our humanity in the Court-of-law picture Jesus Christ, the Righteous, as our Advocate, for our righteousness (Rom. 10: 4; 1 Cor. 1: 30; 1 John 2: 1, 2). Under such circumstances it is most absurd to speak of our having a Mediator between our beloved and trusted Father and us, His beloved and trusted children. What kind of a family would that be in which the father would so distrust his children as not to deal with, and speak to them, and in which the children would so distrust their father as not to deal with, and speak to Him, but would use a guarantor as a go-between for them? This is implied in there being a Mediator between them.

Our third general argument against J.F.R.'s making the New Covenant operate in the Gospel Age is that a mediated covenant can operate only between mutually distrustful parties. Hence the New Covenant will operate between God and the world only, and therefore is Millennial. God and the unbelief class need a Mediator between them (Heb. 9: 13-23; 12: 18-20, 24-27). The following illustration will clarify the subject: Let us suppose that there is a person who desires to build a house of his own materials and according to his own plans, specifications and detailed drawings, and who does not desire to do the actual

building, but desires to have a building contractor do it. Let us further suppose that he does not fully trust the prospective contractor properly and efficiently to use his materials and to follow conscientiously and efficiently his plans, specifications and detail drawings, which things, if not done, will mean loss to him. What would he do? He would require of the contractor a bond, let us suppose, so large as would cover all possible losses, and as the contractor of himself could not furnish. And let us further suppose that the contractor does not fully trust the property holder to pay him the contract price, and would not in his distrust accept his word to pay it or his bond as sufficient. How could they be brought together into contractual relations as to building that house, since neither trusts the other enough to accept his personal word or bond? It could be done by a mediator as follows: Let us suppose that a bonding company or an individual trusted by both can furnish satisfactory bonds for each and thus guarantee each party of the contract to the other. Let us also suppose that this bonding company or individual negotiates with each for the other and satisfies each with the other on the basis of his bonds given to both, and thereby brings them into actual contractual relations with one another. That bonding company or individual by working back and forth between the two parties unto their accepting his guaranteeing both parties of the contract to one another has thereby mediated the contract, was its mediator.

A mediator is not, as popularly supposed, a reconciler of hostile parties with one another, which is a priest's function; but he is the maker and guarantor of a contract as between mutually distrustful parties, who otherwise would not enter the contract. Thus Moses as Mediator between God, who was distrustful of Israel, and Israel, who was distrustful of God, negotiated between them and guaranteed each to the other as to their promises in the Law Covenant

(Ex. 19: 6-9; 20: 18-21; 24: 2-8). The same is necessarily true of the persons involved in the New Covenant as the antitype of the Law Covenant. The New Covenant is for the unbelief class, who do not believe God's conditional promises in the Covenant, and for God, who does not believe the conditional promises of the unbelieving world. The antitypical Mediator, Head and Body, negotiates between them to make them conditionally willing to enter contract relations with one another. To overcome their yet remaining distrust He guarantees the world to God by giving Him the merit of His sacrifice in satisfaction of His justice (sprinkling the book) and by promising to stripe the disobedient unto reformation and to put the incorrigible to death. This guarantees the world to God. The Mediator then will proceed to guarantee God to the world. This he does gradually for 1000 years through imparting his human right to life and its accompanying life-rights to those who will obey him (sprinkling the blood upon the people), thereby raising them step by step out of their physical, mental, moral and religious imperfection into the same kinds of perfection.

Thus the Mediator will take 1000 years for mediating, *i.e.*, making, sealing, inaugurating, initiating or making operative the New Covenant. Once so made the two parties will enter into direct contractual relations with one another, which will first set in during the Little Season. This shows that the Mediator's function is not to reconcile hostile parties, which is the Priest's work, but is to negotiate between mutually distrustful parties, as to a contract and to guarantee them to one another unto their entering contractual relations. These considerations demonstrate the absurdity of teaching that Jesus mediates the trusting Father and the trusting Church into the distrustful contractual relations implied in mediating the New Covenant! The Covenants operating between them are unilateral. On God's part they are the Sarah

features of the Oath-bound Covenant, which is mediated, sealed, inaugurated, made, initiated or made operative by His oath (Gen. 22: 16-18; Heb. 6: 13-18, the word *emesiteusen*, translated *confirmed* by the A. V. in v. 17, literally means *mediated* and is derived from the same root as *mesites*, mediator, Gal. 3: 19); and the one on the Church's part is the Covenant of sacrifice (Ps. 50: 5). Hence the New Covenant does not operate during the Gospel Age nor between God and the Church. It would be a misfit for them!

The unilateral Covenant—the one sided promises—that operates from God toward the Church are the Sarah features of the Oath-bound Covenant, *i.e.*, those features of Gen. 22: 16-18 that develop the Christ class (Acts 3: 25; Rom. 9: 8, 9; Gal. 3: 14-29; 4: 21-31; Heb. 6: 12-20). This is our fourth general argument against J.F.R.'s view on the New Covenant as made at Calvary and inaugurated in 1918. J.F.R. denies that the Oath-bound Covenant is the mother of the Church, claiming that it is the mother of the Head alone, that the sonship of the Church is by adoption alone, and not by a covenant as a mother. He claims that there is no Sarah Covenant, but Sarah represents what he calls God's organization. Every one of the above-cited passages disproves his view. In contradiction to his pertinent view let us see what God says about it. Acts 3: 25 directly quotes the third feature of the Oath-bound Covenant to consecrated Jewish believers in Christ and says that the faithful consecrated are the children of it as a Covenant and of the prophets. Since God is their Father, this Covenant and the servants who applied it, here the prophets, must be the mother, which proves that not Jesus alone as J.F.R. dogmatically affirms, but also the Church are children of the Oath-bound Covenant; nor are they, as J.F.R. as dogmatically affirms (Z '34, 201, 39), adopted children of God as contrasted with God's generated children. They are by Him of His own seed begotten

(John 1: 12, 13; 3: 3-8; Jas. 1: 18; 1 Pet. 1: 23; 2 Pet. 1: 4; 1 John 3: 1, 2, 9; etc.). The Greek word *hyiothesia* should not be rendered by "adoption" or "adoption of sons," as in the A. V. In every case, as all its occurrences prove (Rom. 8: 15, 23; 9: 4; Gal. 4: 5; Eph. 1: 5), it should be translated sonship, as the Diaglott properly gives it.

Gal. 4: 22-31, more particularly 24-28, and most particularly 24, prove that Sarah types The Christ-developing features of the Oath-bound Covenant. Against the plainest kind of language J.F.R. denies this, claiming that Sarah types no covenant at all, but types J.F.R.'s so-called Jehovah's organization (Z '34, 201, 40, 41). He denies that St. Paul explains a type here, affirming that it is an allegory as distinct from a type! Our reply is that all types are allegories, though some allegories are not types; but here the allegory is a type. The word translated in part in v. 24 by the A. V. by the noun, allegory, is not a noun, but is a verb, which the Diaglott properly renders by "being adapted to another meaning," which is exactly what is done with a type when it is interpreted antitypically. Not only so, but the word of v. 24 *autai* translated *these* is the feminine demonstrative pronoun, whose antecedents are the *bondwoman* and the *free woman* of vs. 22, 23. Hence the translation should be, these *women* are [type] two Covenants, which J.F.R. impiously dares to say is untrue, claiming that Hagar is an allegory for fleshly Israel and Sarah for Jehovah's organization (Z '34, 167, 20, 21). Here it is expressly stated that Sarah types one of two Covenants. One of these Covenants is described as from Mt. Sinai, *i.e.*, the Mosaic Law Covenant typed by Hagar v. 24, 25, who is by J.F.R. denied as a type of the Law Covenant, but is by him claimed to type the nation of Israel. This same covenant is, as antitypical Hagar, also described as the present Jerusalem, both of which are used here as meaning the Law Covenant. That Hagar

does not type the Israelitish nation is evident from the fact that her child types such (v. 25). Then in v. 26 the Sarah Covenant typed by the free woman, Sarah, is called the high or exalted Jerusalem. *Ano* we render by the adjective *high* (the Diaglott renders it exalted), just as in Phil. 3: 14 it is rendered by the adjective *high* in the expression *high* calling. The Diaglott properly says that the high or exalted Jerusalem is the [antitypical] free woman, antitypical Sarah, which, v. 24, Paul says is one of two Covenants. These facts demonstrate that Sarah types a Covenant that has children, not only one child, unless they, as in the type, are considered a composite child. What kind of a Covenant? One of a unilateral promise, as vs. 23, 28 and Rom. 9: 8, 9 prove. What kind of promise? Spiritual, as a combination of vs. 23, 28 and 29 proves. What is the promise? Acts 3: 25, quoting from Gen. 22: 18, proves that it is the Oath-bound promise. Of what feature of that promise? The Christ-developing feature of it, as Gal. 3: 14-29; 4: 22-31 and Heb. 6: 17-20 prove. Of what is this feature of the Oath-bound Covenant-promise the mother? Not only of the Head, whom J.F.R. affirms decidedly with capitals "ALONE" to be the Seed; but also the Body, as vs. 26-28, 30, 31; Acts. 3: 25; Gal. 3: 16, 29 and Heb. 6: 17-20 prove. When does this Covenant produce its children? Exclusively in the Gospel Age, beginning at Jordan, as the passages cited two sentences above prove. What do these considerations do with J.F.R.'s views that Sarah does not represent a covenant, that there is no Sarah Covenant, that the only Seed of the Oath-bound Covenant is our Lord, that the Church is under the New Covenant and that the New Covenant is exclusively the Gospel-Age Covenant? As our fourth general argument they do with J.F.R.'s pertinent errors exactly what exploding TNT would do with a soap bubble!

Our fifth argument disproving the view that the

New Covenant was made at Calvary and inaugurated in 1918 is the following: The two sin-offerings seal the New Covenant and are thus shown to be involved in the Mediator picture; hence the Mediator is the Head and Body; and therefore the New Covenant cannot be made or inaugurated until the humanity of the entire Mediator is dead, which disproves J.F.R.'s view under examination, and proves our Pastor's view. This is especially taught in Heb. 9: 13-23. The Mediator of the New Covenant is not a single individual, Jesus, as J.F.R. so gratuitously assumes, 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 (Heb. 7: 26, 27; 13: 10-16; 10: 1-10, 19, etc.). It will be noticed that the peace offerings of Ex. 24: 5 are mentioned as oxen (bullocks). It is not there said what were the burnt offerings, which imply the sin offerings, since they were God's manifested acceptance of the sin offerings. This fact doubtless made St. Paul in v. 13 mention bulls and goats in the type, since the burnt offerings typing perfect humans were bullocks and those typing people in their humanity conditioned somewhat like the Church were of lambs or kids (Lev. 1: 3, 10). The reason why a number of bulls and goats were used at the sealing, making, 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 antitypes of Moses, who through the young *men* (plural) slew the bulls and goats, is shown to be the Christ, the slayer of the better sacrifices (*plural*, v. 23). The plurality of the young men sacrificing the bulls and goats proves a plurality in the antitypical sacrificers. 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's Body (since we, like our Lord, are perfected by suffering, Heb. 2: 10; 1 Pet. 5: 10) in the case of each one of us cleanses his own conscience from the *power* of sin, so that we are 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 be—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: 6). This Mediator—the Head and Body—is such, as His death (the merit being that of Jesus alone) cancels the sins committed under the first Covenant, *i.e.*, those of the Jews, that 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 inheritance. This disproves J.F.R.'s thought that the Church is meant by the expression, "They that have been called" (Z '34, 104, 23).

After some general remarks in vs. 15 and 16 on the

validating of God's blood-mediated Covenants, St. Paul proceeds to explain, type and antitype, the sealing of these 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, corresponding to the atonement day's sprinkling of the bullock's and goat's blood on the mercy seat. That book is thus a copy, type (v. 23), of that thing in the Kingdom of Heaven which is Divine Justice. That sprinkling will be done instantly, and will instantly seal, make, the Covenant Godward. The sprinkling of the people (v. 19) is a copy of the sealing, making, of the New Covenant manward in the earthly phase of the Kingdom of Heaven, and it will take 1,000 years to complete it, *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 then be open to all the non-elect, dead and living—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 the ridding of any error from any doctrinal, corrective, refutative and ethical teaching that may by the Ancient and Youthful Worthies be in any way mistaught during the Kingdom. Note, please, how the Apostle, after speaking of the cleansing of the copies, the types, *i.e.*, the people, the tabernacle and vessels, tells us that their antitypes, 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 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 here (v. 23) designated by the plural term, sacrifices. Therefore, Heb. 9: 13-23 proves (1) that the Mediator of the New Covenant is a multitudinous one—Jesus, the Head and the Church, His Body, of which we will treat under our next argument more particularly and (2) that there are two sacrifices, not one only, that seal, make, the New Covenant operative. This fact destroys the theory under review, because the Covenant is thus shown in its Mediator to involve the Body, a thing that the theory under review necessarily denies. Hence the New Covenant operates after the completion of the Church's sacrifice.

We now offer a sixth argument overthrowing the view that the New Covenant was made at Calvary and inaugurated in 1918—the multitudinousness of its Mediator. Deut. 18: 15-18 shows the Prophet like unto Moses—the Mediator—to be a multitudinous one, "a Prophet from the midst of thee, *of thy brethren*" [a Prophet who would consist of brethren, *i.e.*, a composite one]. 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 to work on the seal and to make it available for His Second Advent uses, 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 of the New Covenant; for we are its servants,

because we further it. We serve, advance, this Covenant in four 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; (3) by helping our brethren to do the same two things; and (4) by reproof the world for sin, righteousness and the coming judgment, whereby the world is some what prepared to receive this Covenant. 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 be made 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—because of 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 legalizes the New Covenant; for through the Gospel-Age sacrifices that seal is made and made available for the sealing of the New Covenant, which will be done during the Millennium, as shown above. 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 in the Mediator is here set forth and destroys the distinction necessary to the theory under examination—that the

Oath-bound Covenant excludes the Body and belongs only to the Head, a thought thoroughly refuted by St. Paul's statement that, antitypical of Isaac, the *brethren* are children of the Oath-bound promise (Gal. 4: 28).

We now present a seventh argument that proves that not only was the New Covenant not made at Calvary and inaugurated in 1918; but that it must come after the Gospel Age: The Lord's Supper proves that not only Jesus' blood, but also that by His blood the blood of the Church is the seal of the New Covenant, which therefore cannot be made, inaugurated, sealed, or initiated, *i.e.*, made operative, until the blood of the entire Church is shed. That additional to the bread and wine representing the body and blood of Jesus they represent the body and blood of the Church is taught by the Apostle Paul in 1 Cor. 10: 16, 17, where he says that the cup represents the partnership of the Church in the Christ's death, shedding of the Christ's blood, and that the bread represents the partnership of the Church in the laying down of The Christ's humanity; and where as proof for the latter proposition he says in v. 17, "We, the many are *one loaf, one body; for* all we partake of the *one bread*." Matt. 26: 28 and Mark 14: 24, as their wording shows, give us the faith justification picture as symbolizing the reckoning to us all of the blessings that the New Covenant will actually give the world in the Millennium and in its Little Season. Hence in these two passages Jesus refers to the wine as symbolizing His blood of the New Covenant.

If the New Covenant's blood were really sprinkled upon us our justification would be actual not reckoned; but our justification being reckoned, Jesus' blood apart from the New Covenant, is only reckonedly sprinkled upon us (1 Pet. 1: 2; Rom. 3: 24-28; Phil. 3: 9), which refutes J.F.R.'s view. But Luke 22: 20 and 1 Cor. 11: 24, altering the language from, "This is my blood of the New Covenant" into, "This

cup is the New Covenant, etc.," give us the Church-consecration picture as the following exact translation with bracketed comments proves: This cup, that which is being poured out for you [to drink], by My blood is [represents] the New Covenant [since it symbolizes its seal]. The A. V. wording makes the word "poured out" modify the word blood, which construction Greek grammar forbids; for the Greek participle "poured out" is in the nominative case, neuter gender, to agree in case and gender with the word *poterion*, cup, in apposition to, and in definition of which it stands, whereas if it modified the word blood, it would have to be in the dative case to agree with the dative case of the word blood. Hence the phrase "by my blood" must not be connected with the participle, as though it were modified by the participle, but as we have translated it, it must first be connected with the words, "this cup" and then, because of their appositional and defining relation, to the words, "that which is being poured out for you [to drink]," as adding Jesus' merit to the thing symbolized by the cup as defined by the words, that which is being poured out for you [to drink]. The thought is this: By Jesus' merit, blood, the cup is made to represent the seal of the New Covenant, which cup is then by the expression, "that which is being poured out for you" [to drink], defined as the suffering of the Church unto death, since in Biblical symbols a cup represents, among other things, the Sin-offering sufferings (Ps. 23: 5; 116: 13; Mark 10: 38, 39; John 18: 11). St. Paul's language is the same, except that he omits the words, "that which is being poured out for you." Hence Luke's and Paul's wording as to the cup and the bread gives us the Church's consecration significance of the bread and cup, which proves that the Church, by Jesus' merit, blood, participates in preparing the seal of the New Covenant, the blood of the New Covenant, hence they prove that not only can the Church not be under the New Covenant,

but that the latter cannot be made, inaugurated, initiated, or sealed, *i.e.*, made operative, until the last member of the Church has completed his sacrifice in death; and therefore this proves that the New Covenant cannot be made until during the Millennium, hence was not made at Calvary, though there all the merit for that Covenant's seal was laid down; and hence it was not inaugurated in 1918, which overthrows J.F.R.'s view of the New Covenant as being over the Church and as operating during the Gospel Age, beginning at Calvary and inaugurated in 1918.

We now come to our eighth general argument against J.F.R.'s view that the New Covenant was made at Calvary and inaugurated in 1918. The mediatorial activity of making the seal of the New Covenant being a work for the entire Gospel Age, the mediatorial activity in applying the seal of the New Covenant being a work for the entire Millennial Age, and the New Covenant as a Covenant coming into operation between God and man at the end of the Millennium, after the Mediator's work is finished, and hence for the eternal operation between God and all who obey its provision, all the disobedient being destroyed without remedy under the post-Millennial trial, in the Little Season, J.F.R.'s view must be a delusion, since it teaches that the New Covenant was sealed at Calvary, by Jesus' blood alone (Z '34, 115, 4), inaugurated in 1918 and ceases to operate with the Church's leaving the world before the Millennium. We will proceed to prove our propositions from the Scriptures and with the proof of each will apply these proven propositions against J.F.R.'s view. We have above proved that Jesus and the Church are the Mediator of the New Covenant, and that during the entire Gospel Age they have been working on its seal, Jesus actually providing the whole merit of it by the sacrifice unto death of His perfect body, life, right to life and its attendant life-rights, which, embargoed 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.

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 has 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 incapable of sealing or inauguration] 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, of which there are two and only two. What precedes the ratification of a blood-sealed 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 proven 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), and like the one God made with Abraham (Gen. 12: 2, 3), 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 represent Moses himself as dead in a sense, even as the atonement day bullock and goat stood for Aaron, and in a sense represented him as dead, 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 from vs. 18 to 22 proceeds to prove that the Old Covenant was ratified, and all its adjuncts were made valid for operating purposes 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 doctrinal, refutative, corrective and ethical teachings, are all made validly operative by the death of "better sacrifices," plural—the humanity of the Head and the humanity of the Body being 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 full Mediator is not yet dead.

Hence J.F.R. is mistaken when he teaches that the New Covenant was ratified at Calvary. Its surety was there completed (He b. 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, Mediator, Head and Body (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, as before pointed out, 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, 63 or 64 A. D., after St. Paul's release from his first Roman imprisonment, the New Covenant was not yet in existence, but at that time was a future thing; for incontrovertibly surety is given not for a past or present, but for a future thing. Hence the New Covenant was not ratified at Calvary. 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 include the feet of the Christ (Is. 52: 7), whose totality is on the altar.

Having given eight general proofs that the New Covenant was not made at Calvary and inaugurated in 1918, we next offer the ninth general proof on this point as given in Jer. 31: 31-34, clarified by St. Paul's quotation of it in Heb. 8: 8-12, to the effect that the New Covenant will in no sense begin to operate until after the Gospel Age is finished; for this passage gives twelve points proving that the New Covenant will not be made until after the Gospel Age is over. J.F.R., to evade the force of Jer. 31: 31-34 and Heb. 8: 8-12 as proving that the New Covenant is exclusively Millennial and post-Millennial in its operation, claims that not fleshly but spiritual Israelites are there meant, Judah meaning the Little Flock and Israel the Great Company. He does great and arbitrary violence to this passage and its context to force upon it his thought. As we expound the text we will expose his violences against it, but will first from the context show that fleshly Judah and Israel are in this section meant. Indeed a larger context (Jer. 30-34) than we will use discusses fleshly Israel. We will confine our contextual proofs to Jer. 31: 22-40. The new thing (v. 22) that God will create, a woman compassing, surrounding, a man, is the Church as a part of the new Creation, whose rest is Christ. She compasses Him

in the sense that she is associated with Him as wife in their combined office work as the Deliverer of outcast Israel, the back-sliding daughter of v. 22. These will be the habitation of justice and kingdom of holiness for Israel restored to and building up Palestine (vs. 23, 24), by which Israel will be rescued from its weariness and sorrow endured during its dispersion (v. 25). This prospect would gladden the Church awakened from its second sleep (1 Kings 19: 5-9; Matt. 25: 5), from about 1846–1874 which prospect would make it not only happy thereafter, but would make even that sleep a sweet thing for the Church (v. 26). V. 25 treats of Israel's hope as centering in the Christ.

Vs. 27-30 are even stronger as applying to fleshly Israel and Judah. The man of v. 27 is the Christ as new creatures in glory—the one new and perfect man of Eph. 2: 15; 4: 13; the beast of v. 27 is their sacrificed humanity considered as the bullock from the standpoint of the consecration picture of Lev. 8: 2. Their seed is the Word of God (Luke 8: 11-15), that of man in its expositions of the Christ as new creatures in their characters, teachings, office and works and that of beast in its expositions of the Christ as humans sacrificed for the salvation of the world. Israel and Judah will be a symbolic field sown with this symbolic seed (v. 27). As a result of this sowing, though during the Gospel Age, due to God's regarding them with disfavor (I have watched over them), plucked up, broken down, thrown down, destroyed (as a nation and God's people) and afflicted, they will by God's regarding them with favor (I will watch over them) be built and planted (developed and made fruitful physically, mentally, morally and religiously). Vs. 29 and 30 demonstrate that what is here discussed cannot, as J.F.R. contends, be the Church's present but is Israel's Millennial experience; for then only no more will people suffer for ancestral sins but only

for their own. Thus the verses that precede the New Covenant verses of Jer. 31: 31-34 refer to natural, not to spiritual Israel. The same is true of the verses that follow. In vs. 35-37 God pledges by the stability of the universe (v. 35) and of the inscrutability of the universe's immensity and of the laws of gravitation (foundations of the earth) His loyalty—Israel's gifts and calling are unchangeable (Rom. 11: 29)—to His Oath-bound Covenant to all fleshly Israel as a proof of their return to His favor, despite their apostacy during the Jewish and Gospel Ages. The rebuilding of literal Jerusalem to be a city for the Lord during the Millennium is pledged in vs. 38-40. Thus vs. 35-40 refer to fleshly Israel.

We will now proceed to prove from Jer. 31: 31-34, especially as it is clarified by Heb. 8: 8-12 that the New Covenant is exclusively Millennial and post-Millennial, and therefore was not made at Calvary, though it was then suretied, nor inaugurated in 1918. The first of these points is indicated in Heb. 8: 8. This covenant is to be made with fleshly Israel and Judah alone. But no covenant other than the certain features of the Oath-bound Covenant offered to them if faithful and actually given to their faithful and the Sinaitic Covenant has been yet made with that nation: It was not made at Calvary with Jesus for spiritual Israel, as J.F.R. affirms (Z '34, 100, (7), (6)). The fact that the nation was cast off from God's favor five days before our Lord's death and has ever since been in that cast-off condition proves that the Covenant promised it in Jer. 31: 31-34 was not made with it yet. Hence v. 8 proves that not by 63 or 64 A. D. had the New Covenant been made with Israel, and facts prove that during the Gospel Age this has not yet been done. It never having been designed by God for spiritual Israel, of course it could not have been made with it at Calvary and inaugurated in 1918. V. 9, by the expressions, "not according

to the covenant," also "and I regarded them not," proves in two other ways that not during the Gospel Age will the New Covenant be made with Israel, with whom alone it is to be made; for the Gentiles coming under it must thereby become Jews. This verse shows that the New Covenant will be different from the one God began to make with them (in certain of the Passover arrangements at the deliverance in Egypt, given before the Israelites came to Sinai) in the day He took them by the hand to lead them out of Egypt. But He has not yet made a different covenant from that one with them. The next clause covers the whole Jewish Age, throughout which "they continued not in [did not obey] My [God's] covenant." The following clause, "and I regarded them not," covers the entire Gospel Age, in which God has disregarded them in the sense of casting them off from His favor for their Jewish-Age disobedience to His Covenant, culminating in their rejection of Jesus. J.F.R. quotes this part of the verse as it occurs in Jer. 31: 32, "although I was an husband unto them," to prove one of his errors. This is a false reading. Ginsburg, the best edition of the Old Testament original, gives the proper reading, even as St. Paul in Heb. 8: 9 gives it: "and I disfavored, disregarded them." J.F.R. has access to Ginsburg's correcting note in Rotherham on Jer. 31: 32 as given by St. Paul in Heb. 8: 9. Why did he not avail himself of the correct emendation given by St. Paul and proven by Ginsburg to be the right one? Was it because the correct reading overthrows his theory, since it proves that the New Covenant will not be made until after Israel's Gospel-Age period of disfavor will have ended—"and I regarded them not"? Certainly God never abhorred spiritual Israel (Is. 54: 8).

Heb. 8: 10 gives five more proofs against J.F.R.'s view and in favor of our Pastor's, as to the time for

making the New Covenant. First, the expression, "after those days," refers to the period following the Jewish Age (when Israel "continued not in" God's Covenant) *and the Gospel Age* (when God disregarded them for their not continuing His Covenant). Hence the New Covenant is to be made, and that only with Israel after the Gospel Age, and therefore was not made at Calvary. Again, this verse teaches that when the New Covenant is made, and that with Israel only, God will put His laws in their minds, *i.e.*, will give them the Truth. But this He has not done during the Gospel Age; for throughout this Age they have been in blindness (Rom. 11: 25-32), while throughout the Gospel Age whatever Truth was due was put into Spiritual Israel's minds. Hence the New Covenant will not be made, and that with Israel only, until after this Age, and was not made with Spiritual Israel at all. Third, this verse teaches that when the New Covenant is made, and that with Israel only, God will make Israel's hearts pure and holy ("write them [God's laws] in their hearts"). Throughout the Gospel Age Israel has not had holy and pure hearts; hence it will be after the Gospel Age when the New Covenant will be made, and that with Israel only, while during the Gospel Age, hence before "after those days" God has been putting the *law of Christ* into Spiritual Israel's heart. Jehovah will be their God (powerful, Covenant Helper) accordingly.

But God is not at all now in covenant relations with and helpfulness toward Israel, while during the Gospel Age, hence before "after those days" God is in the Oath-bound Covenant relations with Spiritual Israel. Hence the New Covenant is not yet operating. Fifth, this verse teaches that when the New Covenant operates Israel will be God's people, which they have not been during the Gospel Age, while during the Gospel Age, hence before "after those days" Jehovah has been Spiritual Israel's God. Hence the

New Covenant will first come into operation after the Gospel Age; and therefore it was not made at Calvary and was not inaugurated in 1918. J.F.R. claims that the statement of this verse on God being their God and on their being God's people (Z '34, 121, 26) proves the language must apply to Spiritual Israel is completely overthrown by the same statement applied to the restitution class in Rev. 21: 3. In v. 11 we find two more: When the New Covenant shall have been made, none will longer need to be taught by others; but ever since the ministry of Jesus began the faithful have had to be taught by their brethren. J.F.R. pretends that his remnant do not now have human teachers, that God and Christ alone are their teachers. *This he knows to be untrue*; for he knows he teaches his remnant by the Tower, his books, lectures, conversations, letters; so do others of them teach one another. So this passage does not apply to his followers, nor to any one else of God's people during the Gospel Age; for the true saints will have human teachers as God's mouthpieces to them as long as they are in the flesh (Eph. 4: 11-14). The passage "they shall all be taught of God" means that while God will teach them He will use His chosen methods in teaching them, which He does through his chosen mouthpieces especially (Eph. 4: 11-14). Hence the New Covenant will come after the Gospel Age; and its promise that they will no longer teach one another will be fulfilled after the Little Season. Again, now all Israel do not know the Lord, nor have they all since Calvary known Him; but when the New Covenant will operate post-Millennially, according to v. 11, all will know Him from the least to the greatest. V. 12 gives the eleventh and twelfth proofs of our understanding of its time of operation. Throughout the Gospel Age God was not merciful to Israel's unrighteousness, a thing that He will be, according to this verse, when the New Covenant is made with them,

with whom alone it is to be made. Again, throughout the Gospel Age God has been remembering their sins and iniquities, and that with high disfavor and severe punishments, while when the New Covenant comes into operation, according to this verse, He will no more remember their sins and iniquities. Thus this section (Heb. 8: 8-12) gives twelve reasons that disprove J.F.R.'s new views on the New Covenant.

We now give a tenth general proof that the New Covenant is not now operating: It is a Covenant of works, though for a while—until the end of the Millennium—it will have more or less grace and mercy attached to it, while the Covenant now operating is one of grace, though not unattended by works. That the New Covenant is a Covenant of works, though temporarily attended by a measure of grace and mercy, is evident from numerous Scriptures, *e.g.*, Rev. 20: 10; Ezek. 18: 5, 9, 11, 13, 19, 20, 24, 27; Jer. 31: 29, 30. The fact that it is the antitype of the Law Covenant also proves that it is a works, as distinct from a grace Covenant. But the Covenant that has been operating since Jordan and Pentecost, being a grace Covenant (Rom. 4: 13-16; Gal. 3: 14-29; 4: 21-31) also proves this, though not unaccompanied by works; for everyone who is in it had previously made a covenant to sacrifice all for the Lord in good works unto death (Ps. 50: 5; Heb. 13: 15, 16). The fact that the Grace Covenant has been operating ever since Pentecost—for our Lord since Jordan—disproves J.F.R.'s claim that the New Covenant—a works Covenant—set in at Calvary.

As an eleventh general argument against J.F.R.'s position on the New Covenant, we would say: The New Covenant, as the antitype of the Law Covenant, cannot set in until the Law Covenant is entirely abrogated. The Law Covenant in those of its provisions that are attached to it for its practical operation, and that do not obligate Israel as a whole has been in

process of abrogation ever since Calvary, yea, ever since Jordan, as soon as they were antityped; but it yet binds Israel in its other features—in all that bound the people of Israel as a whole. The Law Covenant's sacrifices were abrogated at Jordan and Pentecost. Its temple, priesthood, mediator and sacrifices have been set aside (Heb. 10: 9), as is also evident from the fact that they no more exist. Indeed, for the Christian Jew every part of it was invalidated and abrogated when he left Moses and came into Christ (2 Cor. 3: 14). But its contractual features yet bind Israel. They evidently are bound by its ten commandments and those of its ceremonies that are limited to the Millennium so far as their antitypes are concerned—the matter of foods, drinks, festivals, etc. And most manifestly they have been under its curses throughout the Gospel Age, as their punishments abundantly prove. Outcast Ishmael's wandering with outcast Hagar in the wilderness types Israel suffering disfavor for Law violations with antitypical Hagar during the Gospel Age (Gal. 4: 29, 30). This proves that Israel is yet under the Law Covenant, as Ishmael was under Hagar in the type. St. Paul distinctly teaches long after Israel was cast off from God's favor that it was still under the Law Covenant (Gal. 5: 1-3), though he also teaches that Jewish Christians on coming into Christ ceased to be under the Law Covenant (Gal. 5: 1; Rom. 7: 1-6). Heb. 8: 13, which is better translated in the Diaglott than the A. V., distinctly teaches that the Law Covenant had not yet—63 or 64 A. D.—passed away; nor has it since then passed away. This is proved by the present tenses of its participles: "Now that which *is decaying* and *growing* old is near vanishing away." This disproves J.F.R.'s view that the Law Covenant waxed old about the time of Jeremiah and passed away at Calvary (Z '34, 120, 22-24). The present tense of the Greek participle *katargoumenon* (*being abrogated*; 2 Cor. 3: 13) proves

that the ministry of the Law Covenant had not yet been fully abrogated about the year 55 A. D., when St. Paul wrote 2 Cor. Nor has it yet been fully abrogated. Hence the New Covenant cannot yet be operating; for its operation awaits the full abrogation of the ministry of the Law Covenant; otherwise Israel would at one and the same time be under the Old and the New Covenant—an absurdity. The abrogation of certain features of the Old Covenant, like its priesthood, mediator, sacrifices, tabernacle and temple, is due to the fact there is an antitypical Priest and Mediator who is as such not under the Law Covenant and must offer the sacrifices that will avail after their completion in the antitypical Tabernacle and Temple and for the sealing of the New Covenant. For the Priest and Mediator must do these things preparatory to the inauguration of the antitypical Temple for God's abiding, meeting and blessing place for the people and of the New Covenant for their relations with Him. The Old Covenant is thus yet binding on Israel; and therefore the New Covenant cannot yet be in operation between God and them. This argument also overthrows J.F.R.'s view on the time and subjects of the New Covenant's operation and proves our Pastor's understanding to be true.

As a twelfth general argument on the time of the New Covenant's operation we would say that the New Covenant being the antitype of the Old Covenant, it could not be operating before the Old Covenant entirely ceases to operate; while the Covenant that has been operating ever since Jordan and Pentecost began to operate 430 years before the Old Covenant came into existence. The Grace Covenant, which has been in operation throughout the Gospel Age was instituted with Abraham (Gen. 12: 1-3; 22: 16-18; Gal. 3: 15-29; 4: 22-31; Rom. 4: 13-16; 9: 7-9) long before the Law Covenant, even as Sarah, its type, was Abraham's [God's type] wife before Hagar, the

type of the Old Covenant, was his concubine. Hence the Covenant, operating from Jordan and Pentecost on (Acts 3: 25), cannot be the New Covenant; for it operated hundreds of years before the Old Covenant; and the New Covenant, as the antitype of the Old Covenant, cannot have preceded but must follow the Old Covenant, and therefore does not now operate. This overthrows J.F.R.'s view.

As a thirteenth general argument against J.F.R.'s New Covenant doctrine, *i.e.*, that it began effectively to operate at Calvary and was inaugurated in 1918, we would say that the Covenant effectively operating since Jordan and Pentecost offers the Divine nature and Heaven to its subjects, while the New Covenant will offer perfect human nature and the paradisaic earth to its subjects. Hence the Covenant operating effectively ever since Jordan and Pentecost and until the Kingdom is not the New Covenant. The Covenant now operating offers the Divine nature and Heaven to its subjects. This is proven as follows: In 2 Pet. 1: 4 we are told: "Unto us are given exceeding great and precious *promises* [the highest features of Gen. 22: 17, 18 are a summary of these], that by these [even as a mother develops the fetus unto birth] we might become partakers of the Divine nature, after escaping [through our final overcoming] the corruption that is on the world [Adam's race] through lust." In 1 John 3: 2 the same thing is taught: "Now are we the sons of God and it hath not yet appeared what we shall be [we do not yet know what our Divine resurrection bodies will be]; but when He [our Lord] shall appear, we shall be like Him [in nature and office like our Lord, who since His resurrection is the effulgence of God's glory—like God in character—the exact impress of His substance—Divine in nature—upholding all things by His powerful word—God's Vicegerent throughout the Universe, seated at God's right hand, Heb. 1: 3-5]." This is also taught in Col. 3: 4:

"When Christ, our Life, shall appear, then shall we also appear with Him in glory [as His partners, and thus like Him]." Rom. 6: 5 proves the same thing: "If we have been planted in the likeness of His death [have died with Him in sacrifice], we shall also be in the likeness of His resurrection [have resurrection bodies like His—the exact impress of God's substance, hence Divine]." Phil. 3: 20, 21 proves that the Covenant now operating will, among other things, give its subjects for their present body, which is one of humiliation, a body like our Lord's glorified body and will give them a heavenly home, even as now their conduct is such as will be theirs in heaven. John 14: 2, 3 proves that the Covenant operating ever since Jordan and Pentecost gives a heavenly home: "In My Father's House are many mansions ... I go to prepare a place for you; and if I go away, I will come again and receive you unto myself, that where I am [on what plane of existence I will be] there ye may also be [they would spend eternity with Him in a heavenly nature, office and abode]." "So shall we ever be with the Lord" (1 Thes. 4: 17). "Clothed upon with our house from heaven," "eternal in the heavens," "to be absent from the body and to be present with the Lord" (2 Cor. 5: 1, 2, 8), are all expressions proving the same thing. To the same point are the promises in 1 Cor. 15: 42-54, where the faithful from Pentecost on are promised resurrection bodies of incorruptibility, glory, power, spirituality, heavenliness, likeness to Christ's resurrection body, freedom from human nature, possession of immortality and a heavenly home. The foregoing passages are some of the promises implied in the first promise of the highest feature of the Oath-bound Covenant—"Thy seed shall be as the stars of heaven"—heavenly in character, body and abode. We could cite many others, but the above will suffice in proof of our proposition that the Covenant now operating offers

its subjects the Divine nature and office and home.

On the contrary, the New Covenant will give perfect human nature and a perfect earthly home to its faithful subjects. The blessings promised as coming to Israel in Jer. 31: 22-40, after the Gospel Age is past are there described as human and earthly and as New Covenant blessings, and are in certain details touched upon in Ezek. 36: 24-38. They will at once be recognized as human blessings in an earthly home—just the blessings that the New Covenant promises. In both sections Israel's Gospel-Age dispersion among the nations and their return to their own land in an unconverted condition are set forth. Then comes the building up of the land and its cities. Then follows the Covenant's making. Both passages show that they will be cleansed from former sins, that they will be taught God's Word and be given new hearts and God's Spirit. Human hearts—hearts of flesh, human—will be given them, according to both passages, instead of stony hearts—inhuman hearts. They will walk in the Lord's ways, dwelling in the land of Israel, becoming His people and He their God. They will enjoy the abundant fruitage of the earth, nor will they suffer famine any more. The desolate land will be tilled by them and will become like the garden of Eden. The desolate and ruined cities of Israel will be rebuilt and inhabited by multitudes of holy people. Here sinless human beings amid perfect, happy conditions on earth are described as a result of the New Covenant blessings. Ezek. 37 likewise shows that Israel as a united people will dwell in Palestine again (vs. 12-22); and that (vs. 23-28) under the kingship of the Messiah, the antitypical David, they will become God's people and He their God, walking in His ways under the blessings of the (New) Covenant of peace that God will make with them, that God's tabernacle (Christ and the Church) will be among them and that all the nations will recognize the Lord's sanctifying

work on Israel (Rev. 21: 3-5). Ezek. 18: 3, compared with Jer. 31: 28-34, proves that Ezek. 18 refers in part at least to Israel in Palestine, after the Gospel Age, under the New Covenant. The Covenant is shown to be one of works, and not of grace (vs. 4-9), a thing not true of the Gospel-Age Covenant. People no more then will suffer for ancestral sin, a thing not true now; but will suffer each for his own sin (vs. 10-20, 21-30), a thing not now always true. The passage is Millennial and proves that the New Covenant will then operate and that toward human beings, not toward new creatures. Ezek. 16: 53-63 shows that Israel will be restored to her former estate from the tomb (even as Sodom, vs. 53-56, returns from the tomb), as well as from the nations, and will come into a blessed condition in Palestine through the operation of the New Covenant (vs. 60-62), whereby God will become pacified with Israel. Thus Ezek. 37: 26; 16: 60-62 disproves J.F.R.'s claim that Jehovah will make no Covenant with the restitution class, nor with fleshly Israel (Z '34, 117, 10), alleging it would be inconsistent for God to make a covenant with those who broke a preceding one, which claim is contrary to Jeremiah's, Ezekiel's, Hosea's, Amos' and Paul's words. Thus the New Covenant's blessings are earthly—conferring earthly life, nature, abode, works and surroundings. Since these blessings did not abound in Palestine from Jordan to Pentecost on, yea, since it was long after Pentecost, and even after Acts 28, that they were rooted out of their land unto captivity in other lands, whence they must return at the end of the Gospel Age before the New Covenant will be made with them, we conclude that the New Covenant has not yet come into operation. Its giving an earthly nature, blessings and abode, as yet future things, and the Covenant now operating giving the Divine nature, blessings and home, we conclude that it was not made at Calvary, nor inaugurated in 1918.

As a fourteenth general argument proving that the New Covenant did not begin to operate at Calvary, we would say that our faith justification, apart from any works, secures for us reckonedly all the blessings that the New Covenant by works will confer actually on the obedient when it operates. Undoubtedly the justification that has operated since Pentecost is a faith, not a works justification (Rom. 3: 20-5: 1; 10: 4; 1 Cor. 1: 30; Gal. 2: 16-18; 3: 10-13, 24; Phil. 3: 9). Justification is God's act (Rom. 8: 33), whereby for the merit of Jesus He (1) forgives the believer, whether Jew or Gentile, his sins (Luke 24: 45-48; John 20: 23; Acts 2: 28; 10: 43; 1 John 1: 7, 9), and (2) reckons Christ's righteousness to him as his (Rom. 3: 21-27; 10: 4; 1 Cor. 1: 30; Gal. 3: 22; Phil. 3: 9; in most of the preceding passages the expression, "faith of Jesus," occurs and means the faithfulness—righteousness—of Jesus; John 3: 14-16, 18, 36; 20: 31). The same justification we see operated from Pentecost on. St. James, emphasizing works and faith in connection with justification, does not contradict the above; rather he is referring to what we must do in order that the Lord may with safety to us vitalize our faith justification, *i.e.*, actually forgive us our sins and actually reckon Christ's righteousness to us, which before He only tentatively did, *i.e.*, we must do the good works implied in advancing from the beginning of tentative justification (the gate of the court) into consecration (come under the first veil). But our doing these good works did not vitalize, *i.e.*, make actual, our justification by faith, which is exclusively God's act and is done by His grace apart from any merit of our works, solely through Jesus' merit accepted by faith. Thus James' language does not prove that a covenant of works—the New Covenant—has operated and justified from Calvary on, as J.F.R.'s position implies, though he does not express the thought.

When we ask ourselves what the blessings are that the New Covenant will Millennially confer upon Israelites and Israelite-made Gentiles, we find them summed up in Christ's perfect human body and life, right to perfect human life and its life-rights. The right to human life is the Divinely sanctioned privilege of a human being in harmony with justice to exist perfectly, which implies the possession of perfect human physical, mental, moral and religious faculties and life, while the life-rights are the blessings attached to such a right to life, *e.g.*, a perfect earth, climate, home, food, fellowship between God and man (which implies forgiveness of sin) and between man and man, rulership of the earth, of nature's laws and of the animal creation, in so far as man comes in contact with them. These were the main things that Adam lost for himself and his race, and that Christ sacrificed for mankind. Hence He has them as assets to give to man. This He will do on condition of faith and obedience to the New Covenant arrangements in the Millennium (Ezek. 16: 53-63; 18: 4-26; 36: 24-38; 37: 23-28; Jer. 31: 22-38; Rev. 20: 12; 21: 3-5; 22: 3). Thus a works-justification will prevail under the New Covenant. No such thing prevails now; for now a faith-justification prevails. But a justification is a justification, whether it be actually so or reckonedly so, the difference being, not one of fact as to God's judgment, but one of method. Hence faith-justification reckons to the faith-justified all that actual justification really will give, *i.e.*, the perfect human body, life, the human right to live and its accompanying life-rights. Hence we by our faith-justification have reckonedly what the obedient of the world actually will get in the end of the Little Season—the confirmed right to human nature, life and life-rights. Hence the Scriptures speak of our now having everlasting life (reckonedly, of course) through our

faith-justification, as can be seen from John 3: 36; 5: 24; 1 John 5: 12. Hence, also, the Scriptures can properly quote the language of the New Covenant, which applies exclusively Millennially and post-Millennially, in proof of the Gospel-Age justification, since the New Covenant blessings actually given its subjects in the Millennium and Little Season are reckonedly ours now in the Gospel Age, even as St. Paul in Heb. 10: 14-18 does. He does not quote this passage, Heb. 10: 16, 17, from Jer. 31: 33, 34, to prove that the New Covenant now operates, but to prove that Christ's one imputation of His merit for the Church—"them that are sanctified"—forever frees them from the Adamic sin, and also reckons them in the possession of His righteousness, which reckonedly perfects them—a blessing that the world will actually get through obedience to the New Covenant provisions. This reckoned relation to the New Covenant blessings warrants St. Paul's quoting Jer. 31: 33, 34 to prove our eternal perfection from the Adamic sentence and the possession of Christ's imputed righteousness, through Christ's one offering imputed on our behalf and accepted by us in faith, without in the least implying that the New Covenant was made at Calvary and operates over the Church. Praised be our God for this blessing, which gives us all the benefits of the New Covenant reckonedly, without our actually coming under it and its consequent dangers! What does this prove? First, that J.F.R.'s contention (Z '34, 132, 7) that the New Covenant was actually made at Calvary and inaugurated in 1918, to prove which he quotes as an *especially important* argument Heb. 10: 14-18, is false; and, second, that the New Covenant operates exclusively after the Gospel Age, during which its blessings by way of anticipation are reckoned to all believers, tentatively to unconsecrated, and vitalizedly to consecrated believers. In the same connection he argues that the blood of the Covenant wherewith we are

sanctified (Heb. 10: 29) is the blood of the New Covenant, which he alleges proves we are under the New Covenant. This is erroneous and will be recognized as such when we remember that it is the blood of the sacrificial covenant that sanctifies us. Our consecration made and carried out sanctifies us!

Our fifteenth and sixteenth general arguments in proof of the New Covenant's operating exclusively after the Gospel Age, and therefore not since Calvary, are that their faith justification, which anticipatorially reckons the New Covenant blessings to Gospel-Age believers, makes them in their consecration acceptable in the Sarah features of the Oath-bound Covenant, and our consecration is the antitype of the circumcision associated with the Abrahamic Covenant, while the New Covenant consecration is the antitype of that of the Law Covenant. The Bible clearly teaches that we are made acceptable to God in our consecration by our faith justification through Jesus Christ. This is one of the things implied in St. Paul's statement in Rom. 5: 1, 2. Justified by faith through Christ, we therein through Him in consecration have access to the grace of the high calling, in which we stand in Christ. This is likewise taught in Rom. 12: 1, wherein the expression, "the mercies of God"—forgiveness of sins and imputation of Christ's righteousness to us, *i.e.*, faith justification—are set forth as the things that should arouse believers to make, among other things, an acceptable sacrifice. Sts. Paul and Peter say that the priesthood's sacrifices are acceptable to God through Jesus Christ, *i.e.*, through His imputing His righteousness to them (Heb. 13: 15, 16; 1 Pet. 2: 5). Thus their Covenant of sacrifice—consecration vow (Ps. 50: 5)—was acceptable through their faith justification, which makes the consecrated eligible to the Oath-bound Covenant in its Sarah features. It also made the pre-Gospel-Age seed eligible to an earthly feature of that Oath-bound Covenant.

This St. Paul teaches in Rom. 4: 10, 11, 13, 14, 16. This becomes clear when we understand that to Abraham circumcision came after justification as the latter's seal; for circumcision as a type of consecration naturally would come after Abraham's justification by faith, sealing it to him. Circumcision symbolizes the Ancient Worthies' consecration (Rom. 2: 28, 29).

St. Paul's analysis of the parts of the Church's consecration and his calling them the constituents of antitypical circumcision prove completely that the circumcision connected with the Abrahamic Covenant (Gen. 17: 9-14) types the Church's consecration connected with the Sarah Covenant (Col. 2: 11, 12; compare with Rom. 6: 3-5). And the type thoroughly pictures this forth: As in consecration (1) the human will is at once put to death and (2) the body is gradually put to death, so these things are respectively symbolized (1) by cutting away the foreskin and (2) by shedding the circumcised person's blood, which flows for some time. The other side of consecration in its two features is also typed by the other side of circumcision. As in consecration (1) a healing from the natural selfishness and worldliness sets in and (2) good spiritual health is increasingly present as consecration is being carried out; so these two things are respectively typed in the second side of circumcision: (1) in the healing that sets in and (2) in health that is increased as the healing increases. Clearly does St. Paul (Gal. 3: 21, 22) teach that the Oath-bound Covenant in its Sarah features is made available to believers through Jesus Christ's faith—righteousness—which of course they receive in justification by faith. Therefore, from the fact that faith justification in the Patriarchal, Jewish and Gospel Ages made its subjects eligible to the Oath-bound Covenant in various of its features, dependent on their standing before God, and from the fact that faith justification reckoned to its subjects anticipatorially all the New Covenant

blessings, we conclude that the New Covenant could not have been operating from Calvary, nor be inaugurated in 1918, while the consecration associated with the New Covenant is the antitype of the circumcision connected with the Old Law Covenant (John 7: 22). We give the fifteenth and sixteenth arguments together because they are somewhat related. These two arguments prove that the New Covenant must operate after faith justification ceases to operate, *i.e.*, after the Gospel Age, which overthrows the setting of J.F.R.'s New Covenant.

Our seventeenth general argument in proof that the New Covenant operates exclusively after the Gospel Age is: All new creatures have been in the same Covenant as Jesus—the Sarah features of the Oath-bound Covenant. This cannot be the New Covenant, inasmuch as it was not even suretied, let alone operating, until He had died on Calvary. Jesus' sinlessness proves Him not to have been under the New Covenant which is one that forgives the sins of all under it (Jer. 31: 34). Hence none of the Gospel-Age brethren, who stand in the same Covenant with God as He, can be in the New Covenant. Rom. 9: 7-9, compared with Gal. 3: 16, 26-29, proves that the preeminent seed of Abraham is the Christ—Head and Body—the One Seed, the one new man (Eph. 2: 15), the perfect man (Eph. 4: 13). The features of the Oath-bound Covenant typed by Sarah are the mother of this seed, as Rom. 9: 9; Gal. 4: 22-31 and Acts 3: 25 prove. This Covenant is repeatedly called the promise (Rom. 9: 7-9; Gal. 3: 8, 9, 14-19, 29; 4: 23, 26, 28). St. Paul in Heb. 6: 12-17 calls it the promise, and of the promise he speaks as the Oath-bound Covenant. That Covenant developed our Lord as a new creature; and it has developed the brethren as new creatures since Pentecost, as the passages cited above and as Heb. 6: 12-20 prove. This argument is overwhelming on the point before us;

for Jesus as a new creature having been developed by the same Covenant as the brethren from Pentecost on, and Jesus being spoken of thirty or thirty-one years later as suretying the future operation of the New Covenant, none of the Gospel-Age brethren have been under the New Covenant; hence it comes after the Gospel Age. This destroys the whole theory of J.F.R. and proves our Pastor's view.

The Scriptural types on the Covenants likewise prove that the New Covenant operates exclusively after the Gospel Age; and we offer them as our eighteenth general argument against J.F.R.'s new view and in favor of our Pastor's view. God has been pleased to use Abraham and his three wives—rather the one wife, Sarah, and the two concubines, Hagar and Keturah (Gen. 25: 6) to type matters in respect to the three great Covenants. The original and all-embracing Covenant with Abraham is recorded in Gen. 12: 2, 3. It is of seven parts or promises and is a summary of God's plan; and all of God's later Covenants are made operative by what it promises. Its first promise, "I will make of thee a great nation," applies antitypically to all the seed in general, but it more especially applies to the Christ, Head and Body, the fruitful and holy nation of Matt. 21: 43 and 1 Pet. 2: 9. This first promise of the Abrahamic Covenant is elaborated in Gen. 22: 16-18, where it appears as what we call the Oath-bound Covenant, because of God's oath added to it (Gen. 22: 16; Heb. 6: 13-21). It has two aspects, a heavenly and earthly aspect, as is implied by the expressions: the seed like the *stars of heaven* and the seed like the *sands of the sea shore*. Each of these seeds is again divided into two classes: the heavenly into the Little Flock and the Great Company, and the earthly into the Ancient Worthies and the Youthful Worthies. Ultimately the full seed will include the Jews in their capacity of blessing all mankind, and in an attenuated sense, the faithful restitutionists

(Rom. 11: 29; Matt. 25: 34-40). That part of the Oath-bound Covenant, which is but an elaboration of the first promise of the original Abrahamic Covenant, and which applies to the Christ, is typed by Sarah. Sarah does not type those features of the Oath-bound Covenant that develop the Great Company, the Ancient Worthies, the Youthful Worthies, Israel and the faithful restitutionists. She types those promises only which develop the Christ (Gal. 3: 15-29; 4: 23-31; Rom. 9: 7-9). That a feature of the Oath-bound Covenant developed the Ancient Worthies we can see from Acts 3: 25, where St. Peter is addressing certain Christ-believing Israelites indeed, who therefore had been of the Ancient Worthies class, and who living in the end of the Jewish Age and the beginning of the Gospel Age, were given the privilege of transfer into that heavenly feature of the Oath-bound Covenant typed by Sarah. Heb. 6: 12-17 in part and the whole of Heb. 11, particularly v. 39, prove that the Ancient Worthies were subjects of the Oath-bound Covenant in its earthly part. From certain other Scriptures, not quite so clear as the above, we gather that the Great Company and the Youthful Worthies are likewise developed by two other features of the Oath-bound Covenant; so, too, Israel and the faithful restitutionists (Heb. 11: 12). These features of the Oath-bound Covenant are not typed by any of Abraham's wives.

That the Law Covenant is typed by Hagar [flight], who was added to Sarah [princess], is plainly taught in Gal. 4: 23-31. As the seed-promising part of the original Covenant, given first without an oath as the first promise of the original Abrahamic Covenant, was 430 years before the Law, so this fact was pictured forth by Sarah being Abraham's real wife years before Hagar was taken as concubine. But as the concubine bore her son before Sarah bore hers, so the Law Covenant developed Fleshly Israel before antitypical Sarah

developed Spiritual Israel. Later, at antitypical Isaac's weaning time of the Christ class, *i.e.*, during the Jewish Harvest, the Law Covenant and its product—Fleshly Israel—were cast off (Gal. 4: 29, 30) and remained cast off during the Gospel Age (Rom. 9–11; Gal. 4: 29, 30), just like Hagar and Ishmael, who remained cast off during the rest of Sarah's life, antityped by Israel's hardness and consequent rejection by God until the full number of the Elect be won (Rom. 11: 25-27). Sarah, thus continuing, types the fact that the highest phase of the Oath-bound Covenant has been developing the Christ class from Jordan (Matt. 3: 13-17; Acts 10: 38; 3: 25; Rom. 11: 7-9; Gal. 3 and 4), until the end of this Age, when Israel would be recovered.

After Sarah's death Abraham took as a concubine, Keturah (incense), who types the New Covenant. So after the Gospel Age, when the Sarah Covenant will have ceased operating, so far as developing the Seed is concerned, God will take another Covenant as a symbolic concubine. But, one asks, how do we know that Keturah types the New Covenant? We answer, Is. 60: 6, 7 proves this. Is. 60 unquestionably describes the Millennial reign of The Christ, under the picture of a city—Zion (v. 14)—the same thought as is in the New Jerusalem of Rev. 12. Kedar [dark] and Nebaioth [heights] (v. 7) were Ishmael's [whom God hears] eldest, hence chief, sons (Gen. 25: 13), and stand typically for the two principal divisions of Israel as they were designated in the divided kingdom: Israel (the ten tribes under Ephraim) and Judah (the two tribes under Judah), even as we find them set forth in the classic New Covenant's passage—Jer. 31: 31-34. Ishmael's twelve sons (Gen. 25: 16) type Israel's twelve tribes. Hence v. 7 shows how the descendants of Jacob in their two divisions, who will have the New Covenant made directly with them, will be blessed by the Millennial arrangements

—New Covenant arrangements. By Keturah Abraham had six sons (Gen. 25: 2). In Is. 60: 6 the rendering should be: "the dromedaries of Midian [strife, one of Keturah's sons], *even* Ephah [darkness, Midian's firstborn]." Sheba [oath] was the firstborn of Jokshan [bird catcher, overcomers of the fallen angels], another of Keturah's sons. We understand that Keturah's sons, Midian and Jokshan, type respectively Israel and the Worthies, Ephah, typing those believing Israelites now in darkness who will be Millennial overcomers, while Sheba represents the Ancient Worthies, and Dedan (lowly), Jokshan's other son, types the Youthful Worthies in the Millennial Age under the New Covenant. These Is. 60: 6 shows will be Millennially blessed and will prove a blessing; and this proves them under the New Covenant; which we have above proved to be the Millennial Covenant. This in turn proves that Keturah types the New Covenant. The typical relations of Sarah, Hagar and Keturah prove that the first represents the Covenant that develops the Christ, that the second represents the Covenant that developed Fleshly Israel in the Jewish Age, and that the third types the New Covenant coming after the first and second will cease to operate. This typical setting destroys J.F.R.'s theory that Keturah allegedly types not the New Covenant, but his alleged Jehovah's organization, his antitypical Sarah, the latter allegedly typing it until, the former since 1918 (Z '34, 166, 17-20). It also destroys his view of the New Covenant.

We now offer our nineteenth argument against J.F.R.'s position that the New Covenant was sealed at Calvary and inaugurated in 1918 by commissioning the remnant to carry on J.F.R.'s drives (Z '34, 133, 9): St. Paul's clear teaching in Heb. 12: 18-29 that the inauguration of the New Covenant as the antitype of the Old Covenant's inauguration occurs after the Gospel Age and not during its end.

St. Paul traces the type and antitype quite detailedly. To appreciate his argument, let us remember that Israel's march from the Red Sea to Sinai types the progress of Spiritual Israel from Pentecost to 1874–1878 and onward, accordingly, as various stages of the Kingdom's, Mount Zion's, establishment sets in (Heb. 3, 4; 1 Cor. 10: 1-11). Fleshly Israel's three days' march from the Red Sea types the journey of Spiritual Israel in the fifth, sixth and seventh 1,000 years' days of man's history (Ex. 15: 22). The absence of water types the absence of the clear Truth between the Harvests and at the beginning of the second Harvest. The experience at Marah types how life's experiences without the refreshment of Christ are bitter, but with Christ are sweet; also how without the real teachings of Christ the teachings of the creeds are bitter, and that with the former, healing from bitter error comes to the Faithful (Ex. 15: 23-26). The experience at Elim (oaks, *mighty ones*) types how from the Lord's mighty ones, the holy apostles and prophets of the Gospel Age (Eph. 2: 20; 3: 5; 4: 11), refreshment and shelter have come to Spiritual Israel in its desert wanderings (Ex. 15: 27). The experience in connection with the manna (Ex. 16: 1-36) types how the Lord has been giving His hungry Spiritual Israel Christ as the Bread of Life (John 6: 31-69), who is the Truth, which is but a description of Him as such. The experience at Rephidim (Ex. 17: 1-7) with the rock and the water types how Christ (Moses) sacrificed Himself (smiting the rock), from which the ransom Truth flows out unto the satisfaction of Spiritual Israel's thirst (1 Cor. 10: 4). The battle with the Amalekites (Ex. 17: 8-16) types Spiritual Israel's warfare by the Word with sin until the end of the Age. As Moses' uplifted hands supported by Aaron and Hur brought victory to Fleshly Israel, so Jesus' ministry, supported by the Little Flock and Great Company leaders, brings victory to Spiritual

Israel—a prophecy that the Lord will ultimately annihilate sin (vs. 14-16). The selection of the judges (Ex. 18) represents how the Lord has during the Gospel Age been selecting the teachers for the Church, to assist Him in ministering to the people. The third month (Ex. 19: 1, 2) suggests again that it is in the third 1000-years' period after the start of Spiritual Israel's journey that they come nigh to antitypical Sinai—Mount Zion, the kingdom.

Thus when St. Paul says to the Church (Heb. 12: 18, 22) not, "ye are [have] not *come*" but "ye have not *been approaching*, etc.," he addresses not simply the first readers of Hebrews, but the entire Church from Pentecost to the various time stages in the establishment of the Kingdom, *as the antitypes of Israel marching from the Red Sea to Sinai*; even as we have above very briefly outlined the antitypes of Israel's experiences as some of the general experiences of the Church from Pentecost to these various time stages in the establishment of the Kingdom. As we see the antitypes of the things indicated in vs. 18-21, we recognize that they have in part been fulfilling since 1874, are in part now fulfilling and in part will fulfill later, but all fulfilling before the New Covenant's inauguration, facts destructive of the theory under review. St. Paul gives a contrast: "Ye have not been approaching the mount that might be touched [typical of the sight-proof, invisible, condition of the kingdom in its heavenly phase] and burned [typical of the kingdom's indestructibility] and to fire [typing the kingdom's destructiveness to all opposition] and unto blackness [typical of the uncertainty, ignorance and confusion as to God's ways prevailing in the earthly classes during the Parousia and Epiphany, *i.e.*, before the New Covenant will be made] and darkness [typical of the fearful sights and terrible events especially as expressions of error with which this Age is now closing] and tempest [typical of the Time of

Trouble now on the world, beginning with the World War, and to increase in Armageddon, and in Anarchy to come unto a completion] and the sound of a trumpet [the seventh trumpet of Truth on religious and secular things that has been blowing since 1874] and the voice of words [the teaching and discussions of moral and religious duties as the antitypes of the announcement of the ten commandments from 1874 onward. Parts of this we have been hearing on all hands in the exposures of evil and in the cries for justice, and in the clear enunciations of the Truth, and it will continue unto a completion].

"Which they that heard entreated that no word more should be spoken unto them [typical of how those who since 1874 are being exposed for their evils and are being given pertinent commands and prohibitions by the Lord's principles everywhere discussed—and all are being more or less so treated—desire and entreat that this cease]; for they could not endure that which was enjoined [typical of how man's present weaknesses and sins make unbearable to him these exposures, commands and prohibitions]. If even a beast [civil power] touched [offered resistance to, or impinged against] the mountain [kingdom coming more and more into power beyond the veil], it should be stoned [by the Lord's people hurling the principles of God's Word at its misconduct, ultimately ending in its destruction, *e.g.*, rebuking the illicit cooperation of church and state]. And so fearful was the appearance [typical of the terror by night, the troubles of the period ushering in the kingdom] that Moses said, I exceedingly fear and quake [typical of how the Christ class yet in the flesh would be in more or less distress as it lives amid the scenes of the great trouble]." Please note that all of these things happened in the type before the Law Covenant as a contract was made or inaugurated (Ex. 19: 12-20: 21; 24: 1-8). These being the things that precede the inauguration

of the New Covenant, and they being yet in progress of antityping, the New Covenant could not have been inaugurated in 1918. They prove that the making or inaugurating of the New Covenant comes after the Time of Trouble. The people, before they entered the contract that was the Law Covenant in its first sense (Ex. 19: 8), promising to do what God told them in vs. 4-6, do not type subjects of the New Covenant making a promise to keep the New Covenant requirements, since the typical contract was not yet made; but type the Gospel-Age faith-justified people of God, particularly since 1874, in their faith justification promising to live in harmony with the New Covenant's law of justice reckonedly kept as theirs in their faith justification as precedent to their entering the Sarah Covenant privileges, which are typically described in vs. 5, 6, and into which they enter by their Covenant of sacrifice (1 Pet. 2: 9). The promise (Ex. 24: 3) to obey all the Lord asked was Israel's promise to accept and keep the Law Covenant's laws and naturally was made after its main laws were told them in Ex. 20-23, the antitype of which is Millennial. This refutes J.F.R.'s thought that the promise in Ex. 19: 8 types his remnant's promising to be faithful to the New Covenant as preliminary to their getting the kingdom (Z '34, 102, 13).

From v. 22 onward the Apostle tells us what the entire Gospel Church throughout the Age has been approaching. "But ye have been approaching Mount [the kingdom of] Zion [*what gives light*. This defines the Christ class as the Enlighteners of the Millennial world, John 1: 9; Is. 29: 18, 24; 35: 5; 40: 5; 52: 10; 60: 1-22; 1 Tim. 2: 4, Mount Zion here is the antitype of Mount Sinai], unto the city of the living God [the religious government that the almighty and all-energetic Jehovah is in two phases about to establish over the earth for its proper rule and blessing, typed by Moses, Aaron, Nadab, Abihu and the seventy

elders, Ex. 21: 1, 9], the heavenly Jerusalem [the spiritual, religious government, the Christ, typed by Moses, Ex. 24: 1, 9, that will be the foundation of peace, Jerusalem meaning *foundation of peace*, between God and man and between man and man, working a peace that will abide eternally], and to innumerable hosts of angels [the spiritual agencies typed by Moses whereby Satan's empire is being and will be overthrown and the kingdom is being and will be established (2 Thes. 1: 7; Matt. 25: 31). These agencies, of course, belong exclusively at the end of this Age], to the general assembly [of the Little Flock, typed by Moses, which has its first general gathering at the completed first resurrection; hence this was not from 1918 onward] and to the Church of the firstborn [these consist of both the Little Flock, typed by Moses, and the Great Company, typed by Aaron, Nadab and Abihu respectively representing the Millennial Eleazar and Ithamar, Ex. 24: 1, 9, which the type of the two older sons suggests; hence after this Age is ended, since the Great Company as such is developed in the end of this Age; and hence this was not since 1918], who are enrolled in heaven [thus those who either as Little Flock members or as Great Company members finally overcome, a fact that can be in completion only at the end of the Epiphany; hence this cannot have been from 1918 onward] and to God [Ex. 24: 10, 11, who cannot be seen until the end of the Age by the Faithful] the Judge [Rewarder] of all [the overcomers of this Age, a thing that can be completed only after the Epiphany; hence not since 1918. In the following we give what we consider the correct translation of the pertinent clause]; also [in addition to being the judge in the sense of rewarding the overcoming Little Flock and Great Company, He is also the Rewarder] of perfected ones [the Ancient and Youthful Worthies, typed by the 70 elders, Ex. 24: 1, 9-11] just in their

dispositions [as respects faith and righteousness, for which in this life they had or are having trial. This is a thing that cannot come until the Millennium, after the deliverance of the Little Flock and the Great Company (Heb. 11: 39, 40); therefore it could not have been from 1918 onward], and to Jesus the Mediator of the New Covenant [typed by Moses (Ex. 24: 1-8), being the Head of the Mediator, and thus standing for the whole, may be called the Mediator of the New Covenant, without in the least impinging against the thought that the Head and Body constitute the entire Mediator. This overthrows J.F.R.'s thought on his remnant's coming in 1918 to the Mediator as a proof of the Covenant's inauguration, Z '34, 148, 9], and to the blood [not the *imputed* merit that the Church has had from Pentecost onward in her faith justification, but to the *applied* merit that the world will get under the New Covenant, Ex. 24: 5-8] of sprinkling [antitypical of that which Moses sprinkled on the book, people, tabernacle and vessels, Heb. 9: 18-23], which speaketh better things [peace between God and man, and life and blessing for man] than that of Abel [which cried to God for vengeance on Cain for murdering Abel, Gen. 4: 10].

"See that ye refuse not [obedience to] Him [God] that speaketh [by our Lord, Heb. 1: 1, 2]. For if they [Fleshly Israel] escaped not [punishment and death] when they refused [obedience to] Him [God] that warned them on earth [*i.e.*, with respect to the commands and prohibitions of an earthly Covenant], much more shall not we escape who turn away [in unbelief and disobedience] from Him [God] that warneth from heaven [on the commands and prohibitions of heavenly, spiritual Covenants implied in the relations between the Covenant of sacrifice and the Sarah Covenant, our Mother. The 'much more' does not connect the Law Covenant and the Sarah Covenant as type and antitype, but contrasts them, since the

latter is so much higher than the New Covenant, the antitype of the Old Covenant], whose voice then shook the earth [made it quake, Ex. 19: 18, 19]; but now [throughout the Gospel Age] He hath promised, saying, Yet once more will I shake not the earth only [society is now in state, capital, family and labor shaking by awful exposures, conflicts, crises, etc., of the present, incidental to the operation of the secular and religious Truth that the Lord has ever since 1874 been spreading everywhere, bringing to light the hidden things of darkness and making manifest the counsels of hearts, in His epiphanizing all things during His second presence, preparatory to the establishment of His Kingdom and the inauguration of the New Covenant].

"But also the heaven [the powers of spiritual control—the religious systems and leaders, whose creeds, organizations, practices and adherents are, by both the secular and religious Truth that the Lord is giving in His second presence, preparatory for the Kingdom and the New Covenant, being shaken and overthrown, to the discomfiture of the clergy, whose influence is by these exposures being undermined. These conditions, of course, mark the end of the Age and precede the inauguration of the New Covenant, even as their types (Ex. 19: 16-19) preceded the inauguration of the Law Covenant (Ex. 24: 5-8). Hence these shakings are not limited to Truth people as J.F.R. claims, Z '34, 149, 11-14]. And this word, 'Yet once more,' signifieth the removal [destruction in the Time of Trouble with which this Age ends, Dan. 12: 1; Matt. 24: 21, 22] of those things that are shaken [out of place], as of things that are fabricated [erroneously and sinfully made and done], that those things which are not shaken [truly and righteously made and done, and thus not overthrown in the pertinent tests, with which the end of the Age is especially marked

(Mal. 3: 1-4; 1 Cor. 3: 12-15); and thus they stand and do not fall] may remain [everlastingly]." This section with its particulars destroys the thought that the New Covenant was inaugurated in 1918; for the things it describes as preceding the New Covenant's inauguration are still in process of enacting, or are shortly to be enacted; and the things that accompany its inauguration are wholly future.

As the twentieth general argument, we will merely quote and briefly expound 1 Tim 2: 4-6, as a disproof of the theory under review; for J.F.R. claims (Z '34, 101, 10) that the New Covenant is for the Church only, as distinct from the remainder of mankind, and not for the world, and actually has the rashness to quote this passage as a proof for his view. Perhaps he quotes it to forestall its use against him; for this passage, contrary to his teachings, clearly proves that Jesus will be the Head of the Mediator for men: "God willeth to have *all men* [not the elect only, as J.F.R. says (Z '34, 104, 24), but the elect first, then the dead and living non-elect, all of whom together constitute "all men"] to be saved [not everlastingly in eternal life, as J.F.R. says (Z '34, 104, 24), but everlastingly from the Adamic sentence] and [additionally] to come unto an accurate knowledge of the Truth [after being freed from the Adamic sentence. For these two blessings the Apostle in the next two verses gives three reasons]; *for* [the first reason for the two blessings of v. 4] there is one God [the one God is the wise, just, loving and powerful Jehovah, whose unity finds its most emphatic expression in the perfection of His character, wherein perfect wisdom, power, justice and love blend in harmony with one another, and in such harmony dominate His other attributes of character, as well as His plans and works. Such a unity, especially such a character unity, is the first guarantee for the two blessings mentioned in v. 4, since He has sworn to work these two

blessings: (1) to free from the curse; (2) and to give the Truth to all (Gen. 22: 18)], and one Mediator between God and men. [Please note that in treating of the Mediator he does not say He is Mediator of *all* men mentioned in v. 4, but only a Mediator of *men*, not of those who are New Creatures; because Jesus is not the Mediator for the Church. The word *men* in the phrase, 'between God and men,' means *all* non-elect men, dead and living, when the New Covenant operates, *i.e.*, in the Millennium; hence the New Covenant is intended not for the Church, but for all the non-elect, regardless of whether they happen to be living or dead at the inauguration of the New Covenant], the man Christ Jesus, who gave Himself a ransom [a corresponding price for Adam's debt, and thus He is empowered to free all from the Adamic sentence and to give all the Truth] for all men. [This, then, the ransom for all men, is the second reason here given why God wills *all men* to be saved everlastingly from the Adamic sentence and additionally to come unto an exact knowledge of the Truth. This phrase, a ransom for *all* men, again proves that the word *men* in the phrase, 'between God and *men*,' not all men, in v. 5, means only the whole non-elect world, dead as well as living, those with whom the New Covenant will deal in the Millennium], the testimony for its own seasons [This is the third reason for the two blessings of v. 4. Note please the word seasons, plural, not season, singular. The Gospel Age is the due season to give the testimony of the ransom for all men, in order to the deliverance of the Elect from the Adamic sentence, and in order to their coming into an accurate knowledge of the Truth. This has been done on their behalf, that they might have a chance to gain the elective salvation. The Millennium is the due season to give the testimony of the ransom for all men, in order to the deliverance of the non-elect, dead and living, from the Adamic sentence,

and in order to their coming into an accurate knowledge of the Truth whereby they may be put on trial for life everlasting under the New Covenant arrangements]." This passage therefore refutes the New Covenant view of J.F.R. both in so far as it claims the New Covenant was inaugurated in 1918, and in so far as it denies that this Covenant will operate toward all the dead and living non-elect in the Millennium. His faulting (Z '34, 105, 25) our Pastor for saying that the testimony is for all men in their due seasons comes with poor grace, when we consider that our Pastor was his benefactor.

Our twenty-first general argument for the time when the New Covenant will operate, as against J.F.R.'s theory on the subject, is the harmony of the view that we have presented with itself, with all Scripture passages and doctrines, with God's character and the sin-offerings, with the purposes of the Scriptures and with facts, while J.F.R.'s theory is in disharmony with itself, *e.g.*, making the New Covenant (Z '34, 101, 10) operate over those that the Bible calls "new creatures" (Gal. 6: 15; 2 Cor. 5: 17), whereas the New Covenant is an earthly covenant to develop human beings to perfection; also claiming it to be made over 1900 years before it Scripturally will be made to operate, etc. J.F.R.'s theory contradicts all the many passages that we have quoted on the New Covenant. It contradicts numerous Scriptural doctrines, *e.g.*, (1) the multitudinous Mediator, (2) the Covenants, (3) the two sin-offerings sealing the New Covenant, and (4) the exclusive operation of the New Covenant after the Gospel Age. It contradicts God's character; for it makes Him offer the brethren from Pentecost onward things that belie and belittle what He actually did offer and give them. It impinges against the Ransom by making it impossible for it to be used as a corresponding price for Adam and his race in the next Age; for if it sealed the New Covenant

for the Gospel Age none of it would exist after this Age for the world's use. It is contrary to the purposes of God's plan toward the Church and the world. And it denies facts; for all the facts prove that the New Covenant has not yet operated and will not operate until this Age ends. His view, therefore, contradicts the seven axioms.

J.F.R.'s new view on the New Covenant as having been made at Calvary and inaugurated in 1918 is supported by nothing except sophisms, perversions, self-contradictions and extraordinarily arbitrary interpretations. We will merely mention without comment those of them not previously refuted, since they are so glaringly erroneous: (1) *All* God's covenants are bilateral, *i.e.*, conditional; (2) his view of the Oath-bound Covenant's and Jehovah's alleged organization being two women implies that the Seed has two mothers; (3) Moses' mission to Egypt types Jesus' First Advent; (4) it was not an object of the Law to give life to the obedient; (5) Jesus not a Son of the Law Covenant; (6) not fleshly Israel, but his remnant is meant by the Israel of Rom. 11: 25-33; (7) the fullness of the Gentiles does not mean the full number of the Gentile Elect; but the full time up to Cornelius' conversion, 36 A. D.; (8) the ungodliness of Rom. 11: 26 is the Parousial teachings on character development, the Pyramid and obedience to civil rulers; (9) 2 Cor. 3 proves that the New Covenant is the Gospel-Age-operating Covenant; (10) the change into the same image (2 Cor. 3: 18) not one of character but the transubstantiation of antitypical Elijah into antitypical Elisha; (11) Rom. 15: 4 proves the New Covenant, as one of the things previously written about for our learning, operates during the Gospel Age; (12) the servants of the letter (2 Cor. 3: 6) are the admirers of Pastor Russell's writings; (13) the Lord's Goat is his remnant (those following him since 1919); (14) Keturah's children cannot type the

restitutionists: (15) the promise of the Kingdom began to operate in 1918; (16) the Law Covenant made to type the New Covenant's getting a people for God's name; (17) the New Covenant does not give life to its subjects; (18) *all* God's Covenants with others, so far as He is concerned, are eternal; (19) in the transfiguration scene Elijah represents Jesus during the work from 1874 to 1918, and Moses therein represents him as Prophet, Priest and King from 1874 to 1918; (20) Elijah's restoring all things means restituting the things once existing, but later lost in Israel—the doctrine of God's name (which elsewhere he teaches was not restored until 1922) and of the kingdom; (21) the restitution and refreshing of Acts 3: 19, 21 are respectively the restoring of the lost truths and the rejoicing of his remnant since 1919; (22) the residue of men (Acts 14: 17) are his proselytes since 1922; (23) there will be no Millennial Covenant with the restitution class; (24) the only Covenant operating during the Millennium will be the Oath-bound Covenant between God and the Seed.

His course since late in 1916, as described in Matt. 24: 48-51; Zech. 11: 15-17; 2 Tim. 3: 1-9, as well as in numerous types, which some day we will lay before the Church, proves that in head and heart he has gone so wrong that God put a fivefold curse on him, described in the above passages: (1) sudden cutting off from the high calling; (2) gradual loss of the Truth; (3) gradual loss of his influence over New Creatures and faithful Youthful Worthies; (4) a gradual undergoing of the punishments of a hypocrite and (5) a gradual experiencing of great chagrin, sorrow and disappointment. Inexpressibly sad is such a fate; but it is the Divine will for the one who so grossly sinned by omission and commission against the Little Flock, the Great Company, the Youthful Worthies and the Tentatively Justified (Zech. 11: 6), who so grossly transgressed against the Lord, the Truth and his fellow-

servants (Matt. 24: 48, 49); and whose character, as that of the chief of the Truth Jambresites, is so wicked as to be truly described, with that of Jambresites, in 2 Tim. 3: 2-8. This is the root explanation of his gross aberrations. Our perseverance in refuting his errors is not, as he falsely charges, due to a desire to take revenge for his unjust acts against us and to gain his office as president of the Society, but to obedience to the charge of Zech. 11: 15 out of love for God, the Truth and the brethren, and hatred for error, sin and exploitation of the brethren, of which evils he has been very increasingly and grossly guilty. Since May, 1935, we have reviewed no more of his writings, because our reviews sufficiently prove him a hopeless case; and what he has since then (from the Apr., 1935, Tower onward) written is so erroneous, clearly patent as such to Truth people, that it would be unprofitable to use time to refute his ever increasing drunken folly in right-eye darkening; for every new thought he gives shows such folly, adding to the drying up of his arm, which will continue until his right eye will be entirely darkened and his arm clean dried up. "O my soul, come not thou into their secret; unto their assembly, mine honor, be not thou united"—Gen. 49: 6!

I want a sober mind,
 A self-renouncing will,
 That tramples down and casts behind,
 The baits of pleasing ill;
 I want a godly fear,
 A quick, discerning eye,
 That looks to thee when sin is near,
 And sees the tempter fly;
 A spirit still prepared,
 And armed with jealous care;
 Forever standing on its guard,
 And watching unto prayer.

CHAPTER VII. MUSHIISM.

STANDFASTISM EXAMINED. ELIJAH-VOICEISM EXAMINED.
CONCLUDING REMARKS ON MERARIISM.

ALL OF US recall how the Society leaders repudiated their stand on liberty bonds and non-combative service, *after their arrest*. The publication of their reversal of front in several Towers during the Spring of 1918 provoked resentment among not a few brethren the world over, especially in Oregon, Washington and British Columbia. Out of this opposition was born a movement which its adherents called the Standfast Movement, in allusion to their determination to stand fast on the war principles that our dear Pastor announced in Z '15, 259-261. This movement at a Convention held in Portland, Ore., Dec. 1, 1918, adopted a platform of principles and appointed a Committee of seven brothers, who had not been "Secondarily Prophets," to manage what they considered the work of the General Church. This Committee met and organized, Dec. 7, 1918, and among other things arranged for a series of conventions in the larger cities of America. They believed their separation from the Society was the separation of antitypical Elijah and Elisha. They have had on their lecture staff a number of Pilgrims: Bros. Heard, Palmer, Hadley and Wisdom. The last two later left them. They have as Pilgrims several brothers who had not been "Secondarily Prophets." All of these brothers they called Comforters. They met with a considerable degree of success, organizing from Society adherents in a number of places Classes opposed to the Society's war-compromises. At first the leading spirits of the Movement were Bros. Heard and Wisdom. Now [1920] Bro. Heard alone seems to be its leading spirit. Bro.

Wisdom withdrew from the Standfasts, and offered his service to the Olsonites. Failing with them he came to us. We helped him as best we could to an understanding of the Epiphany message. After quite a few interviews he claimed to be in hearty sympathy with the Epiphany Truth. Nevertheless, for good reasons we could not see our way clear to recommend him for Pilgrim service among Epiphany saints; therefore suggested, when he asked us what he should do respecting service, that he work among the Standfast friends. We have heard that he tried to get in with the P. B. I. He has since returned to the Society [later he again left it and joined the P. B. I. He has since died]. We have several letters from him that would furnish rather interesting reading by way of contrast with his letter in the August Tower. We fear "loaves and fishes" rather than principle appealed to him.

The Standfast Movement has a number of good features. Their stand against the cowardly compromises of the Society leaders is to their credit. It is also to their credit that they refuse to follow the Society's devious policies and teachings introduced since Passover, 1918. They would have done better in our judgment had they refused to endorse the Society's new policies from the election of 1917, especially since June 20, 1917. Their failure to see the gross disloyalty of the "Present Management" to the Will, Charter and Arrangements that the Lord gave through "that Servant" seems to imply that they do not have their spiritual perceptions well developed. However, we are glad that they have not gone the full length of the Society's wrong teachings and practices. In an examination of Standfastism it is proper to draw attention to the fact that they set forth as their most prominent article of faith their claim to "stand fast" by "that Servant's" teachings. We are glad to note this desire of theirs. We wish they would carry it out

more thoroughly than they do; for some of them seem to have sadly failed in understanding and in imbibing the spirit of his teachings; for they are even more sectarian and "doting about questions and strifes of words" than the partisan adherents of the Society. They certainly have not followed "that Servant," but Vol. VII, when they teach that the Harvest began in 1878, and ended in 1918 (Z '16, 264, par. 5; Z '16, 263, par. 8; Foreword, Studies, Vol. III, p. ii). Our Pastor gave no other date than 1874 for the beginning of the Harvest, nor did he suggest any other definite date than 1914 for its end. We think their failures properly to apply our dear Pastor's teachings are due not so much to the desire to violate them as to the inability and inexperience of their leaders, both on their Committee of Seven and on their Pilgrim staff. However, the history of Standfastism abounds in such failures.

They endorse everything that the Society did up to March 27, 1918, when they claim that the Lord cast off the Society as His Channel for giving the meat and ruling the Lord's work. Until March 27, 1918, they held, according to the new doctrine hatched out since our Pastor's death, that not he, but the Corporation, the W. T. B. & T. S., was the Lord's channel (D. 613; Z '96, 47). Thus they endorse the great wrongs that "that evil servant" committed against the Lord (saying, "My Lord delayeth"); against the Brethren ("shall smite his fellowservants"); and against the Truth ("eat and drink with the drunken"): Bro. Heard wrote such an endorsement, which was published in the Tower; and at the Shareholders' meeting, Jan. 5, 1918, he returned our friendly, brotherly greeting with a frown and an averting of his face. They endorse the delusions of Vol. VII, the Society's policies and Present-Management tests up to March 27, 1918. Therefore their affinity with the partisan Society adherents in these most important respects

proves the partisan Standfasts to belong to the same general group of Levites as the partisan Society adherents—the antitypical Merarites—the latter being the Mahlite and the former being the Mushite branch of the antitypical Merarites, as we understand matters.

Another peculiar teaching of theirs is that the only things that saints have to do since March 27, 1918, is to "stand fast" by what they had learned and done up to that time; to encourage one another to do the same; and to wait until the time of their change takes place. They give that date for the closing of the door to the begettal; theirs they think is now to "stand fast"; hence their name. This view of things makes them deny that there is any more meat in due season coming from the Storehouse, or that there is any special mission for the Church at this time. Consequently they are blind to the Epiphany, and its special light and work. With such a view of things, of course they are to be expected to oppose the Epiphany Truth and Work; and this they do. In letters written by various of their pilgrim brothers and Committee members—now in our possession—they refer to us as a "snake" that "poisons" those who will read *The Present Truth*. They warn their hearers more against this magazine than against any other published among Truth people, because they say it *seems* to hold so closely to our Pastor's writings that it is almost impossible to see the difference, and yet undermines his teachings! They dismissed one of their pilgrims, Bro. Campbell, because he would not promise to stop reading *The Present Truth*. For holding with our Pastor and *The Present Truth* to the thought that the Harvest began in 1874, they caused him to be disfellowshipped without opportunity for defense, first by the Seattle Church, and then later, under the direct oversight of Bro. Heard, from the Minneapolis Church, refusing him and a number of others, whom they disfellowshipped at the same time, an opportunity to be heard.

Indeed, under the direction of the chairman of the meeting at the latter place, a muscular member of the Class attempted forcibly to eject Bro. Campbell from the room, some of the Standfasts crying out, "Get a policeman!" It seems that calling on policemen to eject orderly persons from places that the Levites in revolutionism wish to monopolize is quite frequent among Levites. It will be recalled that this was attempted against the four Directors; that R. J. Martin several times asked J. F. R., July 27, 1917, in Bethel dining room whether he should not call a policeman to eject us; that within an hour later A. H. MacMillan threatened to have us bruised and jailed, if we did not leave Bethel by night; and one of the Amram leaders here in Philadelphia advised the head of the house, where we were about to lead a Prayer meeting, to call a policeman and by him put us out of the house and into the hands of "*a fit-man.*" *Yet they pose as martyrs suffering for righteousness!*

A marked unscriptural procedure in Standfastism is placing the work of the General Church into the charge of those who have not been "Secondarily Prophets." The Lord is a God of order. He has arranged to give the spiritual work in local ecclesias to local Elders, and the spiritual work of the General Church to General Elders, the Secondarily Prophets. He has nowhere authorized a Committee to have charge of the work of the General Church, much less a Committee consisting of those who are not Secondarily Prophets, though He has arranged for a Board of Seven to administer certain phases of the general work of the Great Company. The Standfast Committee has surely made a fearful mess of things, largely due, we in charity presume, to immaturity, inexperience and inability to manage General Church problems. Another unscriptural feature of Standfastism is its General Conventions' assuming the power to *legislate* for the General Church. When their General

Conventions pass motions these are treated, according to the Convention Report that they published last winter, setting forth some of their troubles, as *legislation for the Church*, and whoever does not agree is disfellowshipped. The history of Standfastism is full of cruel disfellowshipment proceedings, which are instituted on trivial charges. On flimsy evidence disfellowshipment is decreed, and is enforced by refusal of even the common amenities of life, such as an ordinary greeting, or a friendly look, or handshake. Along this line they are copying the Society policies—"avoid them." "The instruments of cruelty are in their habitation." Another unscriptural procedure of Standfastism is the use of Matt. 18:15-18 by Conventions. Matt. 18:15-18 applies to individuals within an ecclesia and to individual ecclesias, but not to sins that affect the entire Church. The Old Catholic error that what applies to an individual ecclesia applies to the General Church has crept in among Truth people, and is manifest in the actions of both branches of the antitypical Gershonites and both branches of the antitypical Merarites.

A gross misapplication of the Scriptures was manifest in the so-called Westward Movement. On account of the fact that the bulk of Standfasts live in the Pacific Northwest, and on account of the impracticability of sending pilgrims to the East, efforts were made to induce all Standfasts that could afford it to move to the West Coast. But matters did not rest there. Their leaders concluded that the Very Elect—the Standfasts—were to be taken to glory last Passover [1920]; but to make it certain that one was of this select company, he had to go West, where as a group the Lord would take all of them in a company away at the Passover. Of course, the Scriptures had to be tortured to appear to teach such a thought. We can well imagine the distress of those believers in this delusion who did not have the means to make

the trip, and of those believers in this delusion, *e.g.*, sisters, whose families did not believe in Standfastism. This did not deter the leaders one whit. They kept up the delusion until Passover found their dupes, not ascending to Glory, but stuck fast in the bogs of disappointment, and stung hard with the arrows of false teachers. It seems almost unbelievable that Truth people—students of the sober-minded writings of our Pastor—could either have concocted or have fallen prey to so patent a delusion. It seems to us that a thorough self-examination and purging out of "old leaven" is the thing most needed by such as have misled and have been misled by so transparent a delusion.

The siftings of Standfastism are characteristic of the movement. So poorly arranged are its work and its relations that it is adapted to all sorts of notions being foisted upon its followers with sifting results. The relations of their Committee and pilgrims to one another and to the Church show this. Their relation to the Society has made them open to siftings from that quarter, and the Society's Conventions of last year in the Pacific Northwest were especially designed to capture members from them. Their Comforter service, *i.e.*, Pilgrim service, is so arranged as naturally to lead to siftings; and the extraordinary amount of money that they put into the "Comforter" service has proven most discomfiting to Standfasts, resulting in its becoming a feature of their sifting of last Fall. Their permitting questions like perfunctory membership in Labor Unions, helping, through the Red Cross, to relieve war-suffering, forced applications of what they imagine to be worshiping the beast and its image, cleansing of their members and cleansing of the sanctuary, and especially the delusion of the Westward movement, are an index of the character of their leadership and of their movement, all of which have led to siftings. Standfastism, as a consequence, seems to be turning into Fallinglooseism,

Fallingoutism and Fallingdownism. As the Scriptures predict of it and the Society, their adherents will largely disintegrate, in part furnishing adherents for other Levitical movements among Truth people, and in part freeing the Priests among them. We are sure that there have been, and are yet, not a few Priests in this movement, evidenced by the fact that they left the Society on a question of principle, gladly suffering reproach for their stand against disloyal compromises. Its errors of teaching and practice, however, as well as its endorsing the gross revolutionism of the Society leaders, up to Passover, 1918, their policies and their Finished Mystery, convince us that the movement as such is a Levitical one, and that partisan Standfasts are the Mushite [deserted] branch of the antitypical Merarites.

From the time the above was written [August, 1920], apart from an article that appeared in P '24, 70, 71, on certain Elijah Voice matters, reproduced further on in this chapter, and apart from passing references to the Standfasts and the Elijah Voiceists, we have written nothing on the Mushites in any of their groups. Therefore, now (April, 1938) we will for completeness' sake add a few particulars on the Standfasts, the No-Committeeites and Elijah Voiceists. Division after division since 1920, has occurred among the Standfasts, whose Standfastism deteriorated into stand-idle-ism, so far as serving the Truth is concerned; but in the Fall of 1923 a movement arose among them, fathered by C. E. Heard and I. C. Edwards, that in the course of less than two years degenerated into communism. About 300 Standfast brethren took part in this movement, which has received much publicity under the name, The Sooke-Affair. We will here quote from a letter a brief description of this movement by one who took part in it until it developed into communism, and who then withdrew from it:

"The Sooke movement originated in the Fall of 1923, in Victoria, B. C. At that time it was working on a cooperative business basis, each receiving a varying wage, suitable to the needs of his family, even though two worked on the same kind of a job. The majority lived in their own rented homes, while others lived in the 'Scott Block,' as their apartment building was called, renting rooms and eating their meals in the dining hall. The lower rooms were all used for business; and one was reserved for a meeting place. When business began to slacken they decided to move farther out, on a tract of land where they could raise vegetables, etc. Here the move to Sooke, B.C., began early in the Fall of 1924. It was during this move that trouble sprang up between the leaders; and C.E. Heard withdrew, going back to Vancouver, B.C. This tract of land, located on Sooke Harbor, 22 miles from Victoria, was bought by a very wealthy sister. They rented a stock farm with cattle and a large vegetable farm, ran a fish fertilizer factory, built a temple, laundry, hospital, barber shop, dentist room—in fact everything that was needful for a colony to exist on. The land was laid out in lots, those who had means bought choice lots at \$100 each, and put up their own tents. Another portion of the land was assigned to those without means, and tents were put up for them in rows, which were not so private. Dissension began immediately, for those who had money or incomes bought good foods to eat in their tents, while those without means had to exist on what they received in the dining hall. This brought the idea of communism, which was then preached; and all were supposed to turn in their money or incomes at the office, run by I.C. Edwards. When he learned that some were holding back he preached a powerful sermon about Achan hiding the silver in his tent, and frightened them so that they even brought the children's banks and emptied them. Many got their eyes

open and withdrew; others would have left, but were penniless. When I.C. Edwards realized this he decided to move farther, bought two boats from the government and moved to Renfrew, about another 22 miles farther away [from Victoria]. Here the remainder of them began to see through his scheme and voted him out, accusing him of spiritual pride, etc. They were simply starved out in this place, having no funds and no way to earn them, so they disbanded and went to new homes. I want to say also that many of these dear brethren would never have gone into this, had they known it would end in communism. Their thought was to be together and work cooperatively. Not one penny of our money was put into this movement and we lived privately in our home at all times, about a mile from their camp, as did a few others."

That brethren who were supposed to have studied what D 473-481 has to say on brethren living more or less together in a cooperative society and in communism could have joined in such a movement certainly does not bespeak alertness on their part. This great blunder hurt Standfastism at least as much as their Westward movement; and the movement continued to disintegrate until now, as forecast in 1920 (this forecast is given above), it is reduced to a few small classes and scattered individuals, the class of C.E. Heard, at Vancouver, being the largest of these. The rise of the No-committeeites in the end of 1919 and beginning of 1920 took away another goodly group and several pilgrims from the original Standfasts, who at first numbered between 2,000 and 3,000 brethren. These objected to the lording, squandering, sectarian and inefficient ways of the Standfasts' Committee of Seven. Both groups insisted that to stand fast meant to cease from all service, and gave free reign to their speculative imaginations in much typing, whereby they went wildly astray. Their inactivity,

with their speculations, reduced them to distressing spiritual poverty. The rise of the Elijah Voice Society in 1923 produced a movement that took away from the other two groups many of their more zealous members. The remaining Standfasts seem to correspond to the Mahlite [*sickly*] Mushite Merarites. The No-committeeite Standfasts, who were the first to break away from the Mahlite Mushites, in 1919 and 1920, seem to correspond to the Ederite [*flock*] Mushite Merarites. These soon fell out more or less with one another and are nearly spiritually dead by reason of their do-nothingism. The Elijah Voice Societyites seem to correspond to the Jeremothite [*heights*] Mushite Merarites. As the Standfasts in their separation considered themselves antitypical Elijah, the Societyites antitypical Elisha and the separation to be that of antitypical Elijah and Elisha, so the No-committeeites thought the same of themselves, of the parent Standfasts and of their separation. The same view, in turn, was held of themselves, of the other Standfasts and of their separation by the Elijah Voiceists after their separation from the other Standfasts. As the most active of the three groups of the Mushites we will give a brief description of them:

A Bro. Hardeson became the starter of the Elijah Voice Society movement. Like some other Standfasts of the two previously existing Standfast groups, he became greatly dissatisfied with the do-nothingism of both groups. Like other Standfasts, he believed that the Society up to Passover, 1918, was the channel; and like them, he also made an idol of Vol. VII, in practice, if not in theory, putting it ahead of the Six Volumes of The Studies. He came to believe that the Little Flock was to be "re-gathered," and hence initiated a movement to "regather" it. This movement became that of the Elijah Voiceists. Additionally, they thought that they must smite Babylon and thus supposedly continue to fulfill Ps. 119:5-9, which

fulfillment was supposedly interrupted by the 1918, 1919 persecution of the Society. Of course, Vol. VII was to be the main means of "smiting Babylon." They also used some tracts, public lectures and private conversations to accomplish this work. They sent their smiting tracts to various civil and military authorities, as well as to non-official Babylonians. As to their work among the Truth people, it was conditioned by their view of regathering the Little Flock. They fully believed in and worked long for the idea that the entire Little Flock, antitypical Elijah, would be gathered to them, as the effect of the "regathering" work. Therefore they appealed by the printed page, especially by their periodical (The Elijah Voice Monthly) and by correspondence, to distant brethren of all Truth groups. Of course, locally they tried to regather from the various classes, by word of mouth, as well as by the printed page. They expected to gain at least the 300 antitypical Gideonites, who they thought would number at least 300, if not more, but they failed to gain even 300. Perhaps their ill success led them to embark on the policy of smiting all Truth people who would not accept their views; for just such a smiting course they undertook and carried out for years. Perhaps, as in our case, of which more anon, much of such smiting was misrepresentation. They used a thoroughly sectarian system of membership, for which cards of admission were required. Their efforts, both toward the public and the brethren, proved fruitless. Their idea of glorification in the flesh proved a delusion. Their reliance on the dates, 1918, 1920, 1921, 1925, and the pertinently expected events that Vol. VII, The Tower and pilgrims gave, up to Passover, 1918, especially for the deliverance of the Church and Great Company and the Ancient Worthies' return, proved great disappointments. Despite these mistakes, demonstrated as such by their failure to come to pass, they continued to hold to the

channelship of the Society and the obligatoriness of its teachings and works up to Passover, 1918. Delusion after delusion was foisted upon them by their amateurish editors' crude speculations. Their 1925 delusion brought in 1926 disillusionment and freedom to some of them from their bondage to Vol. VII and the Society channelship up to Passover, 1918. Their fanaticism is seen in their claiming that to contribute to the Red Cross, to buy Liberty Bonds and to salute the flag were parts of the mark of the beast. This latter thing wrought much evil in their families, due to their children's insisting on saluting the flag, as required by law. The less than 300 Elijah Voiceists were by these things decreased by defection, and now [1938], like the other two branches of the Mushite Merarites, their beliefs and works "scatter them in Israel."

[The following review was written in March and published in the April, 1924, *Present Truth*.] A copy of the Dec. [1923] and Jan. [1924] issues of the *Elijah Voice Monthly* was sent us, presumably by its publishers. It contains, beside a supplement, etc., puerile and lengthy discussions of Society and Standfast conditions, a lengthy review of the P.B.I. views, especially as these teach contrary to *Studies*, Vol. VII on Revelation, and a short attack on us, which is full of misrepresentations and evidences of gross carelessness, ignorance and poor reasoning on the part of its editors. They endorse, as against the four directors and us, *Harvest Siftings*, despite its transparent deceitfulness with about 325 falsehoods defiling its pages, and with most of its letters worked up for the occasion, *e.g.*, the letters from British writers against our return to Britain, etc.; all but one—an undated one—bearing practically the same date prove that they were gotten by characteristically "packed" Rutherfordian tactics. They fault us for not accepting Vol. VII, which even its publishers acknowledge contains

several hundred errors, as they in various Towers suggested that many corrections, and which we know contains many hundreds more. Without offering the slightest proof for their charge, they accuse us of teaching on the Elijah and Gideon types contrary to our Pastor's views. To date none of the opponents of our views on these subjects have been able to answer them from the Scriptures, reason and facts, nor to show disharmony between them and our Pastor's matured views. So their saying that our views on these subjects are contrary to those of our Pastor is a groundless and false assertion. They charge us of being very imaginative in our Amramism Revealed article when we point out, in eight divisions of revolutionary Truth people in three general groups, the antitypes of the eight divisions of the Levites in their three general groups. These divisions will increase to 60 by the time the antitype is full, corresponding to the 60 Levite groups, an antitype of one of which 60 Levite groups the Elijah Voice Society is. Their accusation, that we are imaginative, as against the facts proving our application, is no proof of their charge. Then they fault us because in an article entitled Amramism Revealed we devote a small amount of space to a general view of the Levite groups and divisions and the bulk of the article to the discussion of what the title of the article calls for, but what they falsely call an effort to prove that Bro. Hirsh was not a secondarily prophet—this false charge being made in the face of the article's teaching that he was a secondarily prophet, but was acting out of harmony with the proprieties of his office. These editorial amateurs seem not to know that while related matter may be used as an introduction to an article, the article as a whole should discuss its subject.

But what they evidently set forth as the choice morsel of their charges is the claim that we publish articles and booklets of our Pastor without expressly

stating in those publications that they are his writings, but claiming them as our own writings; for they charge us with palming off his writings as of our own authorship; and they say, among other things, of our course on this point the following: "In plain English such practice is called plagiarism—literary thievery, fraud." This is rather strong. But it proves that these editors, in denouncing us for carrying out our Pastor's desires that his name as author be not printed as such in his books and booklets, are advocating a revolutionistic course for us to follow—a sure proof of their being Levites. Do they not know that our Pastor expressly in his will forbade the Tower editors from indicating his authorship of any of his writings that they might publish? While this provision of the will applies to the Tower editors primarily, it is binding on the publications of all other Societies and Associations in charge of Truth people's work. Therefore, the Elijah Voice Society editors' disregard of this provision of the will, which binds them before the Lord as a Divine arrangement for their publication—that of a Society—proves them to be revolutionists, and therefore Levites. We do not believe that the will applies to an independent publication like *The Present Truth*, published and edited by an individual like ourself; but, as we have stated in *The Present Truth*, we follow its spirit on this point in not disclosing his authorship of his articles in *The Truth*, both because we believe it is in harmony with our Pastor's desire in connection with all using his writings, and because we do not wish to give the Levites what might even seemingly be an example of revolution. When we first decided to publish *The Truth* regularly, we stated (P '19, 104, col. 2, par. 1) that in each issue we hoped to publish an article from our Pastor. And later we told the brethren in print that in deference to the pertinent provision of our Pastor's will, we abstain from indicating the authorship of such articles of his as

appear in The Present Truth. These facts are known to our readers and prove that we are not palming off ourself as the writer of such articles in The Truth. If for lack of space we fail to issue an article of his, we make up for it in a later number by printing two.

These editors also fault us as claiming authorship of the Hell and Spiritism booklets by publishing (not our Pastor's name as their author, but) ours as their Editor and Publisher, quoting in large capitals in proof of their claim the following words from the title pages of these booklets: "Edited and published by Pastor Paul S.L. Johnson, V.D.M." It seems almost unbelievable that *editors of a magazine* could be so ignorant of English as not to know that the *editor* and *publisher* of a book or booklet are not its *author*! Intelligent people know that an editor of a book or booklet is not its author; that his work as *editor* implies that he is not the *author* of the book or booklet in question, but that he takes another's book or booklet and prepares it by additions, notes, indices, preface, etc., for the press; while a publisher of a book or booklet sees it financially, etc., through the press and prepares it for distribution. Thus the words that they quote to prove that we take to ourself the honor of authorship of the Hell and Spiritism booklets, that they cite as a proof of "Self Aggrandizement Illustrated"—the heading that they put in large capitals over the section where they state and discuss this charge—and that they cite to prove that we have violated principles of truth and righteousness, disprove their contention, prove their ignorance of one of the meanings of the word *editor*, and prove them guilty of violating truth and righteousness by making such a false charge, which their evident eagerness to set us forth as an official wrong-doer and their ignorance on one of the meanings of the word *editor* probably occasioned them to make.

They fail to mention that on the title page of

Life-Death-Hereafter (which they say is in parts separately reproduced in the Hell and Spiritism booklets, etc.) we expressly call the book, "A collection of writings of able Bible Scholars, etc.," thus showing that we were publishing a compilation of writings and disclaiming authorship. All our readers know that we announced (P '20, 108, par. 2; 133, 134 [Our Public Work]) the book and booklets as being largely composed of our Pastor's writings, when we stated that they were passing through the press. And when last July (months before the article under review was published) we were preparing to issue our revised and enlarged edition of Life-Death-Hereafter, we republished a statement to the same effect (P '23, 104, par. 2). Thus instead of our claiming expressly or impliedly the honor of authorship of that book and those booklets, we did the very reverse. If one should say, "Why not publish our Pastor's name as author?" we reply that he, for Divinely pleasing reasons, did not desire his name to appear as author, in the form in which he published the writings in question, and we honor his wish by carrying it out. Moreover we have made such additions as would forbid our ascribing authorship of all the contents to him. Five of the chapters of the book appeared in B.S.M.'s whose various editors, of course, never claimed by the fact of their editorship of the B. S. M.'s to be the writers of the five articles in question. The charge of the editors of the Elijah Voice Monthly, that we are guilty of "self aggrandizement," "literary thievery, fraud," is therefore absolutely without foundation in fact, and proves them to be public misrepresenters, and also violators of truth and righteousness. The entire tenor of their criticisms shows an utter lack of sober effort to refute our teachings, and a conspicuous presence of eagerness to set us forth in our office work as an evil-doer.

How about their charge that we sell the booklets at

a fancy price (23c), thereby making merchandise of the Truth? We submit the following facts: (1) These booklets were printed in 1920 when prices were at their peak; (2) the Hell booklet was priced at 19c, not 23c; (3) these prices—19c for the Hell and 23c for the Spiritism booklet—were placed upon them to enable colporteurs to make their expenses; (4) at first they were offered to these and to sharpshooters at 10c and 12c each, in dozen lots, postage prepaid; (5) a little later we offered them to these at 8c and 10c each in dozen lots, postage prepaid; (6) the latter figures are slightly *below cost*; (7) apart from the colporteurs and sharpshooters, they have been by us sold directly to our readers at 10c and 12c each, postage prepaid, and directly to the public at 12c and 15c, postage prepaid, as can be seen from the Herald's standing announcements. These are no fancy prices. We have done the reverse of making merchandise of the Truth; for 98% of our sales have been to colporteurs and sharpshooters at just about or just below cost rates—those mentioned above. Might not such deceitful attacks as those under review suggest that their authors make merchandise of men's souls? They also charge us with changing "the truth originally given in the *seven volumes*" "to suit" our "own ideas," "extend the harvest period," etc. These charges are as false as the others that they make, in so far as they apply to the six volumes and in so far as they refer to those of our Pastor's teachings given in Vol. VII. Our readers know these charges are false, and for them there is need of no further discussion. Not we, but they have extended the reaping period, *i.e.*, from 1914 to 1918. In conclusion, we remark that the brethren who are guilty of such gross misrepresentations as the above—and that in defense of the revolutionisms that they endorse—are in an unclean (Levitical) condition. We pray for them such experiences in the fit man's and Azazel's hands as

may, if it be the Lord's will, eventuate in their cleansing and fitting for their real service as Levites, which the article under review is sufficient to prove them to be.

With the above we bring our discussion of Merariism to a close. The reader will note that, unlike the first five volumes of the Epiphany Studies, which deal with constructive Truth, this volume is polemical, and hence is destructive in its nature. While constructive studies are more pleasant and profitable, and destructive ones by contrast seem rather arid and not so helpful, yet the efforts to introduce wrong teachings and arrangements among God's people to their injury makes it imperative for the faithful Truth servant to use the destructive work of controversy to shield the sheep and lambs from ravening wolves. God's cause requires that, as the builders of Jerusalem's walls had each to have his sword in one hand and his building tool in the other, in readiness to build or to fight, as the occasion required (Neh. 4:17, 18), the Lord's servants are to stand ready to use the Word to build up the brethren or to fight the enemy who seeks to disrupt the Lord's Word, work and people. This is our defense of the polemical—destructive—character of this book; but the attentive reader will note that the fighting is done with the Word of God as the Sword of the Spirit; and in the course of the polemics of this book many a gem of advancing Truth is presented, as well as an abundance of formerly due Truth. May God use this book to shield His people, to repel the adversary's efforts to supplant the Truth and its arrangements by error and its arrangements, and to deliver any of His people who have been made the captives of revolutionistic errors or arrangements or both, and bring them back to the Truth of His Word from which they have been made to stray by unclean Merariism.