

THE WORD AND WORK

VOLUME LI, DECEMBER, 1957

E. L. JORGENSEN AND J. R. CLARK, EDITORS

THE WORD AND WORK, 2518 Portland Avenue, Louisville 12, Ky.
Entered at the Louisville, Kentucky, Post Office as second class matter.
Single subscription \$2.00; Clubs of four or more \$1.75 each.

First Proposition

"Resolved: The Bible teaches Christ's second coming shall follow His reign of 1000 years upon the throne of David. All who deny this are unworthy of fellowship."

FIRST AFFIRMATIVE

L. Wesley Jones

We express deep appreciation to *Word and Work*, and *The Preceptor*, their editors and their publishers for the courtesies extended in preparing this debate for publication.

Brother Stanford Chambers and I are opponents in only one sense: We believe in different ways of accomplishing the same end. He desires to see brethren united. So do we. In this we cannot oppose him. In this we do not oppose him in this debate. In this we join with him. While *we hold* that the differences involved in our beliefs about the second coming of Christ are too extensive and serious in their nature as to permit fellowship, *he* does not agree, and we trust will show why. We have hope that he will tell us what the nature of these views is in Bible language, that will allow us to differ *as we now do*, and still have fellowship.

We have studied the writing of a half-century or more among our brethren on these questions of the second coming. One thing has been universally true: When our brethren who agree with Bro. Chambers have been persuading with us to accept their views they have stressed the seriousness of them. We have been told that their views and ours are two conceptions from which flow "widely divergent, doctrinal consequences and profound effects." (Does Bro. Chambers believe this?) But when questions pertaining to the relationships of the brethren are being discussed, premillennial convictions and all opposing views are passed off as much less consequential. We are asked, "And you would disfellowship us for *that*?" as brother Chambers has himself asked us. And we predict if the reader will notice he will observe the same two contradictory emphases in this debate. When Brother Chambers is seeking to prove his beliefs, they will be grave and serious, but when the question of fellowship is studied he will treat the beliefs much more lightly.

We sincerely respect Brother Chambers for his sincerity and would not otherwise enter this discussion with him, and pray with him, and with you from the outset that truth and unity may more widely prevail at its conclusion.

“Resolved: The Bible teaches Christ’s second coming shall follow His reign of 1000 years upon the throne of David. All who deny this are unworthy of fellowship.” The first sentence of this proposition is not believed by Brother Chambers because of the point of time involved. We do not now know why he disbelieves the second sentence.

As to the first part of this proposition, we are affirming that Christ’s reign upon David’s throne began at the time immediately following His resurrection. We believe that this is a reign of 1000 years or of long duration. It is to us logical and harmonious for the figure of 1000 to refer to a *great number of years* in Revelation 20, where the reign of Christ is the subject, just as it is for 1000 to refer to a *great number of hills* in Psalms 50:10, and to a *great number of times* in Deut. 1:10, 11. We believe the last two interpretations will not be disputed. That the reign is *upon the throne of David*, is not a matter of dispute.

It thus becomes obvious that if we can prove that Christ is *now* upon the throne of David for a reign of great duration, the first sentence will be proved.

A debate of this length must have some confinements. We are choosing those which we believe will give the debate the greatest scope and require the least words. Our proof for the first part of the proposition will be offered from *the use of the Psalms in the book of Acts*. We have chosen the Psalms because so many of the prophecies of the Old Testament concerning Christ in other books are found a second time in them. There is hardly any other book that would have the breadth of the Psalms in prophecy concerning Christ.

We have chosen Acts from the New Testament since it contains the preaching of several apostles. In making these choices we do not intend to imply a reluctance to consider any passage Brother Chambers wishes to introduce.

ACTS TWO AND PSALMS 132 AND 89

“Men and brethren, let me freely speak unto you of the patriarch David, that he is both dead and buried, and his sepulchre is with us unto this day. Therefore, being a prophet, and knowing that God had sworn with an oath to him, that of the fruit of his loins, according to the flesh, he would raise up Christ to sit on his throne; he seeing this before spoke of the resurrection of Christ, that his soul was not left in hell, neither his flesh did see corruption” (Acts 2:29, 30).

At least three Psalms are involved in these words of Peter’s, including the two in the heading above. In our Analysis, we wish to ask some questions to which answer will be given.

(1) Do these Psalms refer directly to the reign of Christ on the throne of David? Yes, and believe this will not be disputed. That Psalms 132:11 referred to here by Peter specifically (v. 30), for

example, has this reign as its subject, we think cannot be questioned.

(2) Did Peter cite these passages for the purpose of declaring them fulfilled? This is vital to our investigation. If Peter is making some other use of them, their value to us in this affirmative is nil. If we cannot show that Peter is declaring them fulfilled, we are sure that Brother Chambers can expose our error.

We inquire, if not cited for this reason, what other? It would not be to prove the resurrection of Christ, for this was established from prophecy by the quotation already given from Psalms 16:8-11. Neither is this to say that Peter could not have used two references to prove the same point. The question is, would this citation of Psalms 132 have proved, *at all*, the resurrection of Christ? After having quoted Psalm 16 (vs. 25-28) Peter again cites *it* as proof of the resurrection *after* the citation of Psalms 132. Note the order: (a) *Psalms* 16 as a portion of the proof of the resurrection; (b) *Psalms* 132 to show a thing accomplished in the resurrection; (c) *Psalm* 16, *again*, saying, "He seeing this before spake of the resurrection of Christ, that his soul was not left in hell, neither his flesh did see corruption." *Seeing what before?* That Christ as the fruit of David's loins, according to the flesh, was to be *raised up* to sit on his throne, in fulfillment of God's oath. Raised up, Peter? Yes, and since the resurrection was necessary to the fulfillment of it, God had promised that His flesh would not see corruption.

Just here we ask the force of the expression, "seeing this before." Note for comparison Galatians 3:8. Here the same words are employed and the translation is as in the Revised of Acts 2:31—"Foreseeing." Paul says, "And the scripture, foreseeing that God would justify the heathen through faith, preached before the gospel unto Abraham, saying, In thee shall all nations be blessed." Paul thus declares that when this promise was made (Gen. 12:3) that it was with a view to the present truth, that "they which are of the faith, the same are the children of Abraham." (v. 7). It has the same force in Acts 2:31. When David spoke of the resurrection of Christ, he did so with a view to the present truth that Christ hath been raised up to the throne of David in fulfillment of God's oath. We implore Brother Chambers to show that this is not the force of the expression in Gal. 3:8 and Acts 2:31 or accept the conclusion we've drawn and let there be unity.

(3) Is there any point of time in Peter's statement of fulfillment? Indeed! The resurrection of Christ is an historical event. If it is not, it has no value to the Christian—our faith is vain, and we are of all men most miserable. Our hope is absolutely dependent upon the historicity of the resurrection of Christ. When one *speaks* of the resurrection he speaks of a definite (and glorious) event in this world's history. To *speak before* of the resurrection of Christ, is to speak prophetically of a *definite event*—A specific happening in history. *This* was Peter's point of time of which the Psalmist spoke when he saw before that Christ was to sit on David's throne. And we have already seen the force of the expression "seeing this before."

PSALMS 2 AND ACTS 13

“And we declare unto you glad tidings, how that the promise which was made unto our fathers, God hath fulfilled the same to us their children, in that he hath raised up Jesus again; as it is also written in the second Psalm, Thou art my Son, this day have I begotten thee. And as concerning that he raised him up from the dead, now no more to return to corruption, he said on this wise, I will give, you the sure mercies of David. Wherefore he sayeth also in another Psalm, Thou shalt not suffer thy Holy One to see corruption.” (Acts 13:32-35).

That the “second Psalm” is a description of the reign of Christ on the throne of David, we do not believe our opponent will dispute. If he does, we shall deal with it then. Now for some questions and answers:

(1) Does Paul declare something from Psalms 2 fulfilled? A child will answer, yes, “God hath fulfilled the same . . .”

(2) Does he declare all relating to Christ’s reign in the Psalm fulfilled? Some will say, No, very loudly, and then begin to point out details in the Psalm, which according to their interpretation and understanding of present conditions have not been fulfilled. We are forced by our belief in Paul’s plenary inspiration to hear him *first*, and make all other conclusions from what he says.

The “decree”, “Thou art my Son, this day have I begotten thee,” was to be made as the “king” sat upon the “holy hill of Zion.” This is no ordinary announcement. It is not just the Father’s confession of his son. It is the “decree”. It is an exultant outburst to a proven Son; a victorious Son; a Son made King. Either Paul declares this Psalm fulfilled, or he mutilates it, removing one clause from its context, making a perverted use of it. Which is it, Brother Chambers?

IMPORTANCE OF THESE PASSAGES

To illustrate the importance of these two arguments in this debate, we call attention to a prophecy, the subject of which is not the reign of Christ. In Acts two, again, Peter cites the prophecy of Joel, in 2:28-32. This prophecy concerns the work of the Holy Spirit. Peter says, concerning certain events of that day, “this is that which was spoken of the prophet Joel.” (He does not quote all that Joel said, incidentally.) Since Peter, by the inspiration of the Spirit has declared the prophecy fulfilled, I dare not take *any* position on *any* passage, or hold *any* view on *any* passage concerning the work of the Holy Spirit that would contradict this declaration. Peter’s word is so final in this matter that all my convictions, interpretations, opinions and views on every passage in the New Testament on the work of the Holy Spirit, must be made to conform to and be in harmony with his declaration in Acts 2:16.

Similarly, Peter and Paul have *declared* the prophecies in Psalms studied, fulfilled—for example, “God hath fulfilled the same *unto us* . . .” This is equally plain with “this is that”. Conclusion: I dare not hold *any* view on *any* passage relating to the reign of Christ on David’s throne that will contradict these declarations. To do so has such serious consequences as will now be described.

THE SECOND SENTENCE OF THE PROPOSITION

Christians do not determine who are worthy of their fellowship. This determination is made for them, and follow it they must, though often painful. They cannot walk with the *modernist*, for he pushes forward the dates of Old Testament prophecies, because he questions the supernatural element in relating facts ahead of time. The *modernist* is unworthy of the Christian's fellowship, and this is determined for him by God. He comes, bringing another doctrine. He teaches heresy. His faith is not according to the tradition of the apostles. (2 John 10, 11; Titus 3:10; 2 Thess. 3:6).

The *denominationalist* (within and without the church) is unworthy of the Christian's fellowship. He says that one interpretation of a verse is as good as another (in fulfillment of prophecy, or in stating the plan of salvation.) The inherent instability of this propaganda is demonstrated in hurtful divisions among professed believers in Christ, which are excused by the denominationalist with the same propaganda, that one way is as good as another.

The *premillennialist* (who believes that Christ is not now on David's throne) holds a conviction that is a combination of these hurtful systems. For, which is more harmful, to move forward the date of a prophecy or to move forward the date of its specified fulfillment? Or, which is the more divisive, to say that "one is as good as another," or to hold views upon passages that plainly violate other clear statements of scripture? There is an element of modernism and denominationalism in every known premillennial view. We unhesitatingly aver that it is for this reason that the religious sects have been able to absorb the upsurge of these speculative teachings that has characterized the last century, and this without violent results or breaks of fellowship among them. Why? Because sects *are* denominations and denominations of today and yesterday are both liberal and modernistic. The church of the Lord, standing against modernism and being not a denomination could not, can not and must not quietly absorb the teachings and their teachers.

AND FINALLY BRETHREN

Two vastly opposite systems of thought are involved in this debate: Two tremendously different ways of dealing with God's word. We are in this discussion because we believe the system of interpretation identified with men like Brother Chambers leads to conclusions which jeopardize the very foundations of the Christian faith. In fact, if he does not know that the greatest amount of liberalism in the church of Christ, outside of those who are avowed modernists, characterize the premillennialists, he is, though honest, very blind. There is no part of the "brotherhood" which so frequently fraternizes with the sectarians, endorses the preaching of prominent protestant preachers, and so widely accepts members upon sectarian baptism as those whom he now seeks to defend. These are but the *logical, natural* consequences of a system of teaching characterized by both modernism and denominationalism. Brother Chambers, "Come ye out from among them . . ."

FIRST NEGATIVE

Stanford Chambers

First of all I wish to endorse the expression of gratitude by Brother Jones to the two magazines for opening their columns to this discussion; also to reciprocate the kindly words he writes concerning his respondent. And if "we must all be made manifest before the judgment seat of Christ," as Paul says, then there should be no lack of serious intent to hold and to set forth the Word, "the truth as it is in Christ Jesus." This responsibility rests upon the reader, likewise.

Let it be realized that space allotted for the discussion of this thing vital to the body of Christ, fellowship, limited as it is, compels brief, condensed statements. Quotations must answer without the whole context appearing. The references given will enable the interested reader to get the quoted portion in its setting, which is his responsibility. The lazy way will be to take the favorite disputant's *ipse dixit*, but responsibility is not escaped by such method. "Search the Scriptures," like the Bereans of old, and with the same commended purpose.

Our readers are thus to know that this discussion is resultant of our challenge of some time ago of the righteousness of a public action taken and advertised against a congregation getting established at a new point. The action was so palpably unprecedented, yet given that publicity that we felt it an impelling duty to challenge to a public discussion of the matter in the city where such action was agitated. Any beliefs responsible for such action were also challenged. Counter propositions were offered, but our challenge, which had the priority, was not accepted.

Later our challenge was published in *Truth Advance* and in *Word and Work*. For the challenged action has become a practice, the practice of disfellowshipping brethren and congregations of Christ over differences concerning future things foretold by the prophets of God. It is laid down that certain views must be subscribed to to be counted worthy of fellowship. Brother Jones took up the published challenge, proposing, however, that a written discussion be carried on in *The Preceptor* and in *Word and Work*. After long correspondence concerning propositions, there materializes what you are now privileged to read. The oral discussion has been under consideration by other brethren.

Now the disfellowshipping practice challenged is prompted by a zeal and determination to force upon an entire "brotherhood" certain amillennial views, a basic tenet of amillennialism, a form of postmillennialism. Brother Jones is affirming this amillennial tenet, declaring its acceptance essential to fellowship in the body of Christ. The challenged practice of excommunicating brethren who do not subscribe to this amillennial belief, which is being forced as a test of fellowship, then, is the occasion of this discussion. It is the wedge being driven to the cleavage of the log. This writer has no liking for

debates, and but for the sake of Christian fellowship involved in this unprecedented way as it is, he would not now be so engaged.

Brother Jones has been reading "writing of a half century or more among brethren on these questions of the second coming." For almost a century and a half, beginning with the pioneers of the Restoration Movement," brethren have written on these lines, but not one of them ever took such a stand as expressed in Brother Jones' last clause. His affirmation puts the Pioneers outside the fellowship of their own movement!

For Barton W. Stone plainly stated in an article of length (Christian Messenger, Dec., 1833): "The second coming of Christ is at the commencement of the millennial reign on earth." Brother Jones' proposition puts it following said reign. But what is worse, he pronounces "unworthy of fellowship" all who deny it. Stone's whole article is such a denial. Brother Jones and those for whom he speaks erect a "wall of partition" that divides themselves off from Barton W. Stone and all who occupy similar ground. This "wall of partition" is of later erection.

Shall we quote from such men as Scott, Campbell, Pendleton (his son-in-law), Creath, Barclay, Begg, Rotherham, Lard, Bittle, Sommer, Brents, Harding, et al.? e. g., see report of 4th of July meeting in *Millennial Harbinger*, repeated in Popular Lectures and Addresses, p. 368, "After dinner Brother Walter Scott delivered a very interesting address on "The Great and Notable Day of the Lord;" and, adds Campbell, "which is to introduce the millennium." That enormously more could be quoted from the men mentioned, much more from these three, will not be disputed.

These men, so far as we are concerned, do not speak as having authority, neither are we classifying them. What is proved is that they could say these and like things with no marring of peace and fellowship. Who among the Pioneers would not have challenged the drawing of an ecclesiastical curtain between brethren and churches of Christ, the ugly thing displayed before the world today? Witness next Saturday's church page in the Louisville papers, four kinds of churches of Christ (one independent of all others appears irregularly), a travesty on the plea for unity on the Bible, the while is being demonstrated division instead! My brethren, these things ought not to be." This writer is finishing up his sixtieth year in the ministry of the word, and such a spectacle never presented itself until the last few years.

No, we do not imply that error should be let go as if of no consequence; but "in meekness correcting them that oppose themselves" (which all errorists do to a greater or less extent) is the Bible way, the while the principles laid down in Rom. 14 and 15 are to be observed with all diligence, Setting a brother at nought is forbidden on the one hand, and "receive ye one another" (15:7) is the divine command. "The eye cannot say to the hand, I have no need of thee." Who disregards this instruction inevitably causes division by so doing, and before he is aware can bring himself under the discipline of Rom. 16:17.

There were differences at Rome, and Paul makes use in his instruction of two differences which were the instigation of differences in practice; even so, the one on either side of the issue was to receive the other, was not to set the other at naught. Is your heart in sympathy with Paul's admonition? and "the kingdom of God", into which they had been translated... "is righteousness and peace and joy in the Holy Spirit" (Rom. 14:17).

Obviously enough, where differences exist, somebody is in error, and Paul is not forbidding further instruction on the matter; he does some of that in the very same connection, but it was their fellowship one with another he was safeguarding.

Now those differing over future things who are represented in this discussion are alike relying on the full inspiration of the Scriptures, are executing the Great Commission in respect to "all authority" of the Lord Jesus, teach the same "first principles," observe the same order of worship, practice the same ethical teaching, depend on the same mediatorial ministry of Jesus at the throne of grace, adore Him seated upon His Father's throne in heaven, expect Him to come again to receive His own unto Himself, whether living in Him or fallen asleep in Him, to subdue all things and abolish the last enemy, even death. What then is the trouble? That throne on which Christ now sits and reigns with "all authority" over His heavenly realm, "angels and authorities and powers being made subject to him" (1 Pet. 3:22), and over His church, His kingdom here on earth—that throne must be conceded, in order of fellowship, to be the throne of David promised Him. Jesus designates the throne He sat down upon the throne of His Father (See Rev. 3:21), but it is humanly decreed that, upon penalty of excommunication, you must call that throne David's throne. And "the middle wall of partition" has been constructed to stand between those who call the Eternal Throne of God to which Jesus was called by His Father (Ps. 110:1) the throne of the Father according to the flesh—between those who do and those who do not call that Eternal Throne the throne of David. It makes the difference between "the faithful" and those unworthy of fellowship!

The irony of it all: Pioneers could say things like what we have just quoted (and we could fill a book with like things) and have their tombs garnished and be otherwise deservedly honored by those who mark as heretics their brethren today for saying the same things. For what is taught today by brethren that is objected to that cannot be read in the writings of Pioneer brethren?

Brother Jones presents a belabored argument as proof that Jesus, raised up to sit on David's throne, is seated thereon. Peter declared "God hath made him both Lord and Christ, this Jesus whom ye crucified." That goal of his message he reached convincingly, and from deep conviction they cried out. To reach that goal he made effective use of Ps. 16; also other Psalms like the 89th and 132nd, to identify Jesus with that seed promised in the oath-bound Davidic covenant. No Psalm proved that Jesus rose. It took eye-witnesses to do that,

but if Messiah's resurrection was foreshown to David (which presupposes death, even if other revelations to David had not foretold that), and it is shown that Jesus' whole experience corresponded to the Messianic forecasts, then the testimony of twelve eyewitnesses, with their God-given credentials plainly manifest, produced the desired results with "about three thousand souls."

"He came unto his own, and his own received him not." They "denied the Holy One" and put Him to death. This was foreseen, and in anticipation of that it was revealed to David as per Ps. 110, quoted also by Peter, previously referred to by Jesus, "Sit thou on my right hand" . . . the place awaiting Him and to which He ascended in triumph.

No, the reign of Christ from Pentecost and continuing is not from David's throne; it is from the Eternal Throne of "my Father," says Jesus (Rev. 3:21). That throne never was David's and never will be. "They that were his own received him not", they slew Him, and the Father exalted Him to His own right hand, foreknowledge of which was given David in Ps. 110, and the same Psalm served the Lord Jesus, so that a joy was set before Him, as shown in Heb. 12:2. From that exaltation on the Father's throne, He reigns over His heavenly realm and over His church, His kingdom here below. Brother Jones' argument cannot put Him on David's throne, neither can any inconsistencies he may have observed in "Premillennialists." Just likely as not every such case can be matched by cases among "Amillennialists." My neighbor is judging the church of God by some church members he judges inconsistent. Brother Jones cannot name a "Modernist" who is premillennial, but we can all name numbers who are amillennial.

For over sixty years this writer has been preaching Peter's Pentecostal sermon, every word of it, every fulfillment he declares. Brother Jones fails to put his finger on any statement by Peter or by any other that Jesus sat down on David's throne, or that He sits on David's throne. That God's throne in heaven became David's throne, or that David's throne was ever transferred to heaven, is speculation, and brethren denying Brother Jones' proposition deny it because it is speculation, deny it for the absence of Scripture stating it, and then for denying it are unworthy of the fellowship of "the faithful" though they do not deny one single Scripture!

But He was raised up to sit on David's throne. Put to death, He could never sit on David's throne as promised unless raised from the dead. His death was foreknown, was anticipated, and the purpose of God was in no way defeated, nor will it be. "Though it tarry, wait for it" (Hab. 2:3).

The reign of the thousand years is contemporary with the incarceration of Satan. The reader can check on this. Read Rev. 20:1-7. Six times this period of time is set forth as one and the same period of time. John wrote prophecy, not history. Pentecost was far in the past. Associated with Christ in the thousand years' reign

are those who were martyred by the beast, and his regime is going full force when the Lord Jesus comes as per 2 Thes. 2:8. Those whom the beast beheads are among others to reign with Christ the thousand years, the same thousand years of Satan's imprisonment.

The thousand years' reign of the Prince of Peace is to be the reign of peace foretold from of old. This time since Pentecost till now is anything but that, and is designated "this present evil world" (margin, "age". See Gal. 1:4).

David's righteous branch (Jcr. 23:5) "shall reign as king and deal wisely, and shall execute justice and righteousness in the land." He has not yet thus executed justice and righteousness. That He will do when He takes the throne of David. Let us not do violence to our God-given knowledge and reason by persuading ourselves that He has executed justice and righteousness these nearly 2000 years.

"Withstand in the evil day," says Paul (Eph. 6:13, and setting), and this "evil day" is not the "day of Christ"—the day looked forward to (1 Cor. 1:8; Phil. 1:10, et al.).

Satan is not yet serving his 1000 years' prison sentence. Instead he is, Paul for it, "the prince of the powers of the air, the spirit that now worketh in the sons of disobedience" (Eph. 2:2). Again Paul: "Satan fashioneth himself into an angel of light" (2 Cor. 11:14). Peter for it: "Your adversary the devil walketh about as a roaring lion, seeking whom he may devour" (1Pet. 5:8). It is not to Satan's disadvantage if Christians feel assured that he is in that shut and scaled pit of the abyss.

During the 1000 years' reign of Christ Satan is to be serving his prison sentence so as to "deceive the nations no more till the thousand years be finished" (Rev. 20:3). It was over a half century after pentecost that John wrote (1 Jno. 5:19), "The whole world lieth in the evil one." So the nations were then being deceived by Satan, transforming himself into an angel of light. Hence the fact of his nationwide deception is clearly unveiled. Clearly even the "child" can see "not yet all things subjected to him" (Heb. 2:8).

Peter's word on Joel's prophecy concerning the outpouring of the Spirit, "this is that" (Acts 2:16), Brother Jones takes very literally. Of course, Peter spoke the truth, and let not its contradiction be expected. Again "this is that" in the filling in Acts 4:31, and "this is that" at the household of Cornelius in Acts 10:44. Peter did not say This is *all* of that. And "the earnest of the Spirit" (2 Cor. 1:22), that is, the down payment, is as a guarantee of more of the same to follow.

No, Peter did not mutilate Joel's prophecy by making use of but a portion, the portion then meeting fulfillment, just as Jesus before him had not mutilated Isa. 61 when He stopped in the middle of verse 2 (See Luke 4:18-20), and as also Paul did not mutilate the second Psalm in making use of the portion which he could pronounce fulfilled. And the "child" who can see that Paul, in his speech related

in Acts 13, shows Ps. 2:7 fulfilled, can also see plainly that Ps. 2:9, e. g., has never been fulfilled. The "child" can see that the apostle says (Heb. 2:8), "We see not yet all things subjected to him."

Scripture records the fact of God's oath-bound promise to set the promised Seed of David on David's throne. His death is also foretold, likewise His resurrection, and by that as a fact, His death failed to defeat God's purpose concerning Him. His resurrection is Satan's defeat. Scripture records His resurrection, likewise the exaltation to the Father's right hand, His reign and intercession there. If it could be found in Scripture that He sat down upon David's throne, or that He sits on said throne, or that David's throne ascended to heaven, there would be no controversy. All agree that said throne is promised Him; all agree that God's promise will be kept, and that in the keeping of the promise God raised Him up, raised Him up to sit on the promised throne. If the Scripture said what Brother Jones attempts to prove, it would be a different matter. Brother Jones has not found us the passage. Nevertheless, the promise is true; the fulfillment will come. "Though it tarry, wait for it" (Hab. 2:5).

This disputant hardly feels convicted of the charge of duplicity concerning the seriousness of the differences between the premillennial and the amillennial views. Any view becomes serious when it is forced as a test of fellowship. And this is the thing we challenge.

SECOND AFFIRMATIVE

L. Wesley Jones

There is naturally so very much that Brother Chambers has written with which we disagree that a beginning place is difficult to choose. But may we preface all remarks with a similar plea to his, that each reader study these matters for himself. Do not assume that because you have thought upon these things for many years that all is well, and that no fresh thought may come your way. *Think*, before it is too late! *Think*, as surely as you love the Lord and His Church!

It is, in the first negative, as we said that it would be. When Brother Chambers is discussing the question of fellowship he passes over our differences as "views". They are just the differences between "pre", "post" and "a". After all, brethren should be able to get along in complete peace and fellowship as he supposes the "pioneers" did, and still hold to divergent views no more serious than "pre", "post", and "a".

We would appreciate Brother Chambers reading a complete definition from any of the great works on the Second Coming of Christ that will show this writer to be either Post-millennial or A-millennial. We implore him to choose one removed from our own controversy in the Lord's Church to insure fairness. We have read several and haven't yet found one that describes what we believe. Since he accepts the term premillennial, but we decline to accept "a" or "post"; and since he charges that we are "a" or "post", perhaps he will favor us with this called-for definition.

In discussion with sectarians outside the church, we are reminded that Luther and Wesley and Calvin, et al., though they were not inspired and did not "speak with authority", did not believe baptism necessary to salvation. We are cautioned against holding "views" on baptism that would exclude these men from the great church of the Lord. Granting that Brother Chambers correctly represents the pioneers (and he knows that this has long been in dispute), we ask, What is the difference in his method and that of the denominationalist? It is more important to be right than to have Luther, Wesley, Calvin, Scott, Campbell, Stone, *et al.*, in my fellowship. As much as I desire it, it is more important to be right than to have Brother Chambers in my fellowship.

Brother Chambers, again we ask, Do you believe our respective views are two conceptions from which flow "widely divergent, doctrinal consequences and profound effects?"

This covers the first three pages of Brother Chambers' first negative—For, we believe the kingdom *is* "righteousness, joy and peace". We believe men should be instructed thoroughly before they are disfellowshipped. And we believe that this debate is being conducted in harmony with both of these principles. If our respondent will point out inconsistencies we will reply.

"WHAT THEN IS THE TROUBLE?"

The trouble is, according to Brother Chambers, that we have made the "Father's throne" the throne of David. And, we demand that he accept this conclusion or be disfellowshipped. Later he says, "If it could be found in the Scriptures that He sat down upon the throne of David, or that He sits on that throne, or that David's throne ascended to heaven, there would be no controversy."

While we do not agree that this is ALL the trouble, we propose to respond to this challenge and end the controversy. In concluding our definition of terms (to which Brother Chambers offered no objection) we said, "It thus becomes obvious that if we can prove that Christ is *now* upon the throne of David for a reign of great duration, the first sentence (of the proposition) will be proved." We are told that Christ is not on David's but the "Father's" throne.

While it is true that due to the lack of space some quotations must be abbreviated, we desire these to appear in full, that their combined force may be felt. "And also Solomon sitteth on the throne of the kingdom. And moreover the king's servants came to bless our lord king David, saying, God make the name of Solomon better than thy name, and make his throne greater than thy throne. And the king bowed himself upon the bed. And also thus said the king, Blessed be the Lord, the God of Israel, who hath given one to sit on my throne this day, mine eyes even seeing it." (1 Kings 1:46-48). "Then sat Solomon upon the throne of David his father, and his kingdom was established greatly." (1 Kings 2:12). "Then Solomon sat on the throne of the Lord as king instead of David his father, and prospered; and all Israel obeyed him." Brother Chambers, if Solomon

was on the "throne of the Lord" and the "throne of David" at the same time, being *one throne*, why do you say that Christ cannot be on David's Throne because He is on the Lord's? Please answer! But will this end the trouble?

ONLY A SYMPTOM

This idea that Christ cannot be on David's throne because He is on the Father's is only a symptom of what is the real trouble that troubleth Israel. Brother Chambers is looking for a kingdom, a throne and a reign of the very sort that David had. He thus adds materialism to his liberalism. He no more grasps the reality of the New Kingdom under Christ than Nicodemus could readily grasp the meaning of the New Birth. When Christ said *birth* to Nicodemus he could think only of a womb and delivery. When one says *kingdom* or *throne* to Brother Chambers he cannot think of anything but literal, geographical dominion, and an earthly seat of authority.

The fact is, that the new birth is set forth in figurative language (in John 3:1-7) with its basis in the Old Testament. In the same manner Christ teaches on our spiritual relationship in to Him with language couched in the Old Testament when He says, "Whoso eateth my flesh, and drinketh my blood, hath eternal life." (John 6:54). The answer to all problems relating to the statement are found in the very Old Testament background with which the Saviour introduced His words. (v. 49). If one will apply the same simple principles he uses in understanding the New Birth and the New Relationship to all that the New Testament teaches about the New Kingdom under Christ (on David's Throne) the controversy will end. Each is a subject set forth in terms rooted in the Old Testament.

But to use the method Brother Chambers uses for the kingdom, on the New Birth or the New Relationship would make Christianity a system of fleshly cannibalism.

ACTS TWO AND PSALMS 132 AND 89

Since our Brother-Opponent introduced the local, Louisville scene (with the separate newspaper ads. and the local deplorable division) allow us to point out in connection with our difference over the meaning of Acts 2:30, 31, that one preacher on the local scene, whose work is with a congregation that places its ad. along beside others in Brother Chambers' fellowship, has said regarding this passage, "If it (the kingdom to which Christ was to be raised) was spiritual, Christ need not have been raised." Now we're sure Brother Chambers has access to this quotation and to the context so that he can find out if we've abused it. We believe the throne and the kingdom to which Christ was raised is spiritual (not material). That it is *actual* is not in dispute. But whether it is spiritual, with Christ on David's throne, His Father's throne, and the Church composed of Baptized Believers making up this spiritual kingdom, living in the "peace that passeth understanding", this is disputed. And it is disputed to the point that it is now said that if we are right, if the kingdom and the throne are spiritual, then "Christ need not have been raised." Brother Chambers, do you know of any pioneers that held that *view*? Do

you agree with this *view*? What would one have to deny to make him unworthy of your fellowship, if the resurrection of the Lord is not enough? (Remember as you answer that we are charged with making His resurrection unnecessary!)

Most all that we said on the Acts 2 text was overlooked. It was only asserted that David's Throne was the ultimate purpose of the resurrection. Nothing was said about the Resurrection of Christ being a point of time. Nothing was said about our parallel use of Gal. 3:8. The point was completely missed on "mutilation". Certainly Christ did not mutilate Isaiah 61. The point is that all of a prophecy does not have to be quoted to declare it fulfilled. His very illustration of Isa. 61 and Christ shows this clearly. Brother Chambers, was the rest of the verse in which Christ stopped in the middle, not fulfilled in the Lord's personal ministry, simply because he did not quote it all here?

In a separate letter Brother Chambers says that he didn't have the space to deal with all that we said and that he will take it up next time. We sincerely hope, for the sake of unity, truth and all that's sacred that these are some of the things that he has in mind to deal with in the next negative.

PSALMS 2:7 AND 2:9

Brother Chambers gave about two sentences to our argument on these Psalms and Acts 13 and simply asserted that v. 7 of Psalms Two has been fulfilled, but v. 9 has not been. His "proof" is the very kind we said he would give. On this point in the first affirmative we asked, "Does he (Paul) declare all relating to Christ's reign in the Psalms fulfilled? Some will say, No, very loudly and then begin to point out details in the Psalm, which according to their interpretation and understanding of present conditions have not been fulfilled." The only variation from this for Brother Chambers, was that he was even weaker. He didn't even point out the details. He said that anybody could see that they haven't been fulfilled and speaks of the evil he sees in our day.

THIS IS WHAT WE MEAN BY MODERNISM, IN THE PRE-MILLENNIAL SYSTEM. Our opponent asks for a premillennialist who is a modernist. Brother Chambers, all of them who deny a plain Thus saith the Lord, as you have in this negative. Dear Brother, this *is* modernism. You may *feel* that Satan is not bound. But no verse that you read says so. You may *feel* that sins run rampant everywhere, but no verse that you read says so. You may *feel* that there is no realm of peace in the world under the reign of Christ. But no verse you read says so. You may *feel* (and in this there should be shame) that Christ does not now execute justice and righteousness in the land, but that's *just an opinion*.

"What then is the trouble?" The trouble is that brother Chambers is looking for a literal "land" in which Satan is to be bound with a chain that rattles to the human ear, where there is no evil, where there is physical peace, and where Christ will execute His justice from a literal throne. We would as soon look for Christ as a

“literal branch”. *Does sin reign everywhere? Does 1 Pet. 5:8 say that Satan has complete freedom to deceive the people of the world? Then what is the meaning of 1 John 5:18? There is a place where the “wicked one” does not touch the child of God. This place is in the gospel of Christ, the Word of God, the seed of the kingdom. (1 John 3:9). Here men are not deceived by the “prince of the power of the air”, for their minds are enlightened by the truth of the gospel. (2 Cor. 4:1-4).*

Brother Chambers, you claim belief, contrary to many premillennialists, that Christ is now reigning over His Church, His Kingdom. You said this in your negative. Then tell us, what does He now execute? Is His performance, His execution of some different nature? **BROTHER CHAMBERS, IN HIS NAME, WHAT DOES HE NOW EXECUTE?** If He reigns He must execute *something*. What IS it?

For the sake of clarity, Brother Chambers, will you in your second negative list the verses of Psalms 2 that are fulfilled and the ones that are not? Understand, we are accepting them all as fulfilled because we believe Paul so declared in Acts 13; just as Peter said Joel 2 was fulfilled in Acts 2. Neither of them mutilated the verses by quoting just portions. The question in Acts 2 (regarding Joel) was not whether this was the only fulfillment. Our point was that with the words “this is that” Peter declared this to be the age of the fulfillment—fulfillment of all the prophecy *from* which he quoted, even though he did not quote all. Just so in Acts 2:30, 31 Peter declares these Psalms fulfilled—declares this to be the age of their fulfillment. For this reason we look not for another age.

FRUITS OF PREMILLENNIALISM

The Lord said, “Ye shall know them by their fruits.” Brother Chambers says that premillennialists preach the same gospel, follow the same worship, teach the same first principles, practice the same ethical teachings, etc., as do those of us who reject premillennialism. Does Brother Chambers mean himself, or premillennialists in general, *in the body of Christ?* Does he include those of the very *Word and Work* family who endorse the preaching of Billy Graham? Does he include the representative person from one of the oldest premillennial congregations in town who this week told my Lutheran friend in the West End that infant baptism is just a matter of belief, just as were his convictions that the proper subjects for baptism were adults? Does he include an officer in the same church who told a Baptist lady we later baptized that she would be welcome in that congregation with her Baptist baptism like so many others had been?

Dear Brother Chambers, isn't it apparent to you that when men spend their lives setting aside a “this or that”, that sooner or later their system will develop these weaknesses in the faith once delivered? Alas, they will either preach other error or they will countenance it and bid it godspeed with their fellowship. We have not called names out of deference to you, for we do not believe that you can conscientiously endorse these practices. And as one younger, yes, much, in

His Majestic Service, we implore you to renounce them, and the system of teaching which has led our beloved brethren into them.

CONCLUSION

We are clear in conscience before God in saying that you have not answered our two—just two—Affirmative arguments. Everything you have said about sin in the world, we believe. But this cancels not out the Righteous Reign of the Seed of David, upon His Throne, the Father's Throne, to which He was raised from the dead, in fulfillment of inspired prophecy.

You have said some things about Rev. 20 with which we can agree (such as the fact that Christ's reign and the binding of Satan are simultaneous), but you have drawn conclusions from your interpretations that are in violent contradiction to Acts 2 and 13. This you surely recognize to be a method of the modernist—To array scripture in contradiction against itself.

SECOND NEGATIVE

Stanford Chambers

Brother Jones is affirming that the Bible teaches that Christ's second coming follows the thousand years' reign of Christ on David's throne, and is also affirming that all who deny this are unworthy of fellowship. We deny that the Bible so teaches, and so must positively deny the disfellowship practice to be warranted.

We are charged in this connection with having denied a plain "Thus saith the Lord." Which one, we wonder? Paul's statement on the fulfillment of Psalm 2:7? See Acts 13:33. There Paul is saying that by raising Christ from the dead God was fulfilling the promise made to the fathers, and he gave Ps. 2:7 as one reference in which the promise is found. He does not say that the second Psalm had been fulfilled. Read the Second Psalm and see what is foretold. Brother Jones asks that we point out in detail what of that Psalm has not been fulfilled. We'll answer in the words of the apostle, "We see not yet all things subjected to him" (Heb. 2:14), and allow that it takes care of the details. Does that make the apostle modernistic?

Or does Brother Jones charge us with denying the plain "Thus saith the Lord" concerning Solomon's sitting on the throne of the Lord, as stated in 1 Chron. 29:23? Now, instead of denying that, we believe it, every word. The throne of David, on which Solomon sat, was Jehovah's. Jehovah established it, delegated it to David and David's dynasty. Jehovah never released His claim upon it, and when David's line forfeited the delegated right to reign, Jehovah exercised His prerogative and withdrew it. It was Jehovah's kingdom over Israel as stated in 1 Chron. 28:7. So the people were Jehovah's; the kingdom was Jehovah's; the throne was Jehovah's. But that in nowise makes the throne in the heavens David's. Such logic will never prove Brother Jones' proposition. The Son of God who ascended to the throne of His universe, from whence he reigns supreme over "angels

and authorities and powers" (1 Pet. 3:22), and over His church and kingdom here below, can and will occupy the throne of His father David according to plan and promise. The *transferred throne* speculation will not help to make it effective.

But more of such logic: "You may feel that Satan is not bound," says Brother Jones, "but no verse that you read says so." I certainly do feel that Satan "goeth about as a roaring lion," even as Peter warns, and to feel that he is incarcerated as John foretells is utterly impossible until I can read the verse "that says so." Brother Jones "says so," and puts events of his imprisonment back before Pentecost. All the New Testament inspired writings were produced after Pentecost, and how strange that such an important event as that has not been mentioned in one of them! John writes "the book of this prophecy," not a book of history. Rev. 20:1-7 is John's vision of a future event.

Again, "You may feel that sins run rampant everywhere," says Brother Jones, "but no verse that you read says so." I read (Eph. 2:2) how that Satan is "the spirit that now worketh in the sons of disobedience," and how that "we know . . . the whole world lieth in the evil one" (1 John 5:19). "We know" by using our senses "to discern good and evil," as we are expected to do (Heb. 5:14).

But listen further: "You may feel that there is no realm of peace in the world under the reign of Christ. But no verse that you read says so. You may feel (and in this there should be shame) that Christ does not now execute justice and righteousness in the land" (Brother Jones has reference to Jer. 23:5, which we quoted in our first negative), "but that is just an opinion," says Brother Jones. Question: Is Paul expressing mere opinion in presenting the picture of Rom. 3:10-18? Another question: Is there less of unrighteousness now? and less of that deceit and destruction and misery? Ask our officials whose duty it is to execute justice and righteousness. Ask our F. B. I. Ask our Security Department. No, no, Satan is not in the abyss; he is the "god of this world," even as the inspired Paul designates (2 Cor. 4:4).

Does Brother Jones mean to say that since that "peace that passeth knowledge" is indeed to be found (thank the Lord) in some souls redeemed, that the forecasts are thereby satisfied which have long envisioned permanent, world-wide peace, peace like a river, peace to extend from the river to the ends of the earth, peace that shall have no end? As yet it is "Peace, peace, when there is no peace," except in spots where regenerated men and women allow the "peace of God" to possess their hearts and minds. Few church members (in comparison) do that. Alas it is so.

Here's hoping Brother Jones does not assume that the negative has the laboring oar, but go to the task which is the affirmative's and cite us to the verse to read telling us the thing which he is attempting to prove in his proposition.

The things written in the 132nd Psalm are precious things, the 89th likewise, the 2nd and the 110th. Peter's sermon on Pentecost is indispensable, every sentence in it. But in no one of them nor in any

other citation does it say that Jesus ascended and sat down on David's throne. He expressly designates it His Father's throne that He sat down upon when He overcame. That was when He overcame death. From the Father's throne nor from any other could He reign had He been "holden" of death. Peter identifies the Jesus whom they as eye witnesses testify as risen from the dead as the Messiah of the Psalm from which he quotes, who is pledged by oath to sit on David's throne. David, so promised, is also foreshown his death; nevertheless the promise is made secure unto David by his being foreshown His resurrection. Peter's main Old Testament text to Israel on Pentecost is Psalm 16. The use made of the other Psalms is to bring conviction that the risen Jesus is the Messiah, the Christ. The 3000 were so convicted. Raised up, indeed, to sit on David's throne, and rest assured the Davidic covenant will be kept. Then will He "execute" as per Jer. 23:5; as per 2nd Psalm, the 110th, et al. Then will Satan be consigned to his prison. When He is bound as the Scripture foretells he'll be bound so that we know it, and will not have to have someone prove it to us. When he is thus bound he will know it. He will then be no longer "the god of this world;" will no longer be the "prince of the powers of the air, the spirit that now worketh in the sons of disobedience"; will no longer be able to "transform himself into an angel of light" to deceive the hearts of the innocent.

Brother Jones urges the question, "What does He (Christ) now execute?" He is "far above all rule, and authority, and power, and dominion, and every name that is named, not only in this world (age, margin), but also in that which is to come, and he put all things in subjection under his feet" (Eph. 1:21, 22). In regions away from earth are the heavenly principalities. They do His will in such a way that the Savior could hold their doing His will in heaven as exemplary. Willing obedience that. Satan's principalities are made subject to Him, and we are afforded a few glimpses of how He may do some executing in that realm. When He comes He will do some executing in that company. But His executing is from His throne eternal in the heavens, not from David's throne.

His reigning over His church and kingdom below is in grace. "We are not under law, but under grace," "this grace wherein we stand ." And "set your hope perfectly on the grace to be brought unto you at the revelation of Jesus Christ" (1 Pet. 1:13). Those who constitute His kingdom here are willing subjects who love Him and keep His word. They avail themselves of His Spirit's help in their infirmities (Rom. 8:26) "who also maketh intercessions for us according to the will of God." They not only seek to do "that good and acceptable and perfect will of God," but a burden of their prayer is ever, "Thy will be done on earth as it is in heaven." Theirs is a "high calling," and consecrated to their Lord in truth and love and joyful gratitude, they constitute the very highest type of kingdom. Brought up from the state of condemnation they have been raised to the plane of justification, sanctification, consecration, and glorification awaits them. They should be the happiest people on earth, and of all of them the world lying in the clutches of the evil one should

take knowledge that they have learned of Jesus. "And by this shall all men know that ye are my disciples, when ye have love one for another."

But the 2nd Psalm and the 110th Psalm see some executing yet to be performed. Read Ps. 110:5-7 in connection with 2:8-9. And this execution is plainly located "in the day of His wrath." Thus, also Jeremiah. Should the reader appreciate yet further light here let him read Jer. 30:7-24. And for sunshine after rain read Ps. 67 and others. The 72nd Psalm is good tonic. And Hab. 2:14, "For the knowledge of the glory of Jehovah shall cover the earth as the waters cover the sea."

It is not purposed to leave unrecognized the fact that our Lord who is letting the nations go their own way and reap accordingly, exercises over-ruling power, but that is not what we mean by His "kingdom". He has always exercised over-ruling power. Babylon could go only so far, and no farther. Be assured that is as true concerning Russia today. Who needs to be confused on the subject of His kingdom because of these facts? Is it to the interest of somebody's cause to raise a fog and a dust?

Is any perturbed at the thought of such a thing as "physical peace" in the meaning of the prophecies concerning peace? "They shall beat their swords into plowshares and their spears into pruning-hooks. Nation shall not lift up sword against nation, neither shall they learn war any more" (Isaiah 2:4; Micah 4:3). Micah in the next chapter prophesied, "Thou, Bethlehem . . . out of thee shall one come forth unto me that is to be ruler in Israel; whose goings forth are from of old, from everlasting." As the scribes upon the inquiry of the "Wise men" correctly interpreted Micah 5:2, so by the same rule shall we correctly interpret Micah 4:3. By whose authority is any other method of interpretation applied to 4:3? When Micah 4:3 is executed so will be executed the justice and righteousness longed for and promised in Jer. 23:5 and numbers of other prophecies. Believing in that in no wise infringes upon "the peace that passeth knowledge" or our enjoyment of it, which, thank God, is ours to enjoy in grace right while the nations are beating their plowshares in swords and their pruning-hooks into spears (Joel 3:10.) And our peace as a "fruit of the Spirit" may be thus so enhanced that we richly enjoy the same while the nations are warring or preparing for war. It did not depress Isaiah nor those to whom he ministered to foresee "the whole earth is at rest, and is quiet; they break forth into singing." The Psalmist foresaw good cause to say, "Oh let the nations be glad and sing for joy; For thou wilt judge the peoples with equity, And govern the nations upon earth" (Ps. 67:4). So shall it be when "the kingdom of the world has become the kingdom of our Lord and of His Christ" (Rev. 11:15).

Brother Jones charges me with believing in a "literal throne." He is permitted to charge also that I believe in a literal heaven. A "literal Branch"? Well, there are "literal" branches besides those that grow on trees—"branch of mathematics," branch of science,"

"branch of the Aryan stock," etc., etc. "I am the light of the world": Does light have to be from a flame of fire to be "literal" light? Maybe that term "literal" is over-worked. The term originally was used as the antithesis of allegorical. "Lamb of God" is not allegory; neither "the throne of the Lamb"; nor "Lamb's Book of Life". Does Brother Jones believe "the lake of fire" is literal? My guess is he does. Does Brother Jones believe that in order for a thing to be literal it must be material? That is, must it be composed of the elements of which our kind of materials are made?

"There is a place," says Brother Jones, "where the 'wicked one' does not touch the child of God." Thank God for our refuge in Christ, but that is not the "place" of Satan's incarceration, "his prison" (Rev. 20:7). Moreover, "minds once enlightened . . . (having) tasted the good word of God" even "the powers of the age to come" gave occasion for reproof of Heb. 6, and shall we dare say that Satan could not touch them? And it was right by the side of the good seed of the kingdom the tares were sown, and "the enemy that sowed them was the devil." Sounder doctrine on this line is "resist the devil, and he will flee from you." This is the admonition to the saints of God in this time when Satan is unbound, going "about as a roaring lion, seeking whom he may devour" as 1 Peter 5:8 says. One's method of interpretation is terribly at fault (back of it some "conception" or theology or philosophy impelling thereto) if it causes a watering down of such Scripture teachings as well as a watering down of the prophecies and promises of God. Brother Jones says many unwarranted things and presents interpretations novel indeed. It is to be kept in mind that he has a case to make out, so there is a felt need of bringing up this and that for the build-up that would seem to warrant the disfellowship practice.

It is not ours to be defending somebody's "liberalism" on baptism or any alleged unscriptural position on some prophecy or other. Brother Jones has the laboring oar in defending his proposition. Proving is his job; checking up is mine, and so far in our checking we have not found the proof; have not been cited to the passage teaching the proposition being affirmed. (What Brother Jones is calling "liberalism" on baptism can be found also on his side of the drawn curtain.)

Material versus spiritual: Brother Jones is terribly fearful that any future reign of Christ from David's throne would not be spiritual, but altogether materialistic. And why? Why, if under His reign? Wouldn't He be sufficient guarantee? Brother Jones does not deny that the church of God is spiritual, yet it is here on this material earth, is composed of members in material bodies, housed in material buildings, garbed in material dress. Must we hold to the abstract, avoiding the concrete conception, in order to avoid appearing materialistic in the eyes of the undiscerning? If by materialistic is meant unregenerated, let it be known that the throne of David will not again reign over an unregenerated or unconverted nation. Ezekiel (36:26,ff.) and others of God's prophets instruct us better than that if we permit it.

Requested definition of terms: "Post" and "pre" are well known prefixes. "A" is short cut for anti, against. "Millennium" is a thousand years. The prefixes attached to the word express the conceptions of the relation in time of the coming of Christ to the millennium of Revelation. All who look for His coming before that thousand year period of John's vision are premillennial. All who put His coming after that envisioned period are postmillennial. That is what Brother Jones is affirming. The amillennial position is that there is no future millennium, that the present dispensation is it, which therefore makes His coming after, hence amillennialism is a brand of postmillennialism. Brother Jones and all represented by him are amillennial. This proposition embodies the basic tenet of the amillennial "view", and without just what Brother Jones is affirming there could be no such thing as amillennialism.

We need no books for this but the dictionary. We are not charging Brother Jones up with the various notions and theories and opinions advocated by one and another of those who are postmillennial. I have a letter from a Texas brother affirming that the Bible shows there are two Satans, and challenges us to deny. A tract from another brother denies that there is any personal devil, "devil is evil personified." And so on! !

Thrones defined: Throne occupied by the Son of God, the eternal throne to which He ascended, "far above the heavens"; the throne of the Father, but the Son's as well. "Of the Son he saith, Thy throne, O God, is for ever and ever;" (Heb. 1:8). The throne He left when He "emptied himself" (Phil. 2:7) to come to the rescue of His fallen creature man. The throne He returned to when He had wrought out His redemption. "Father, glorify me with thine own self with the glory that I had with thee before the world was." "Received up in glory" (1 Tim. 3:16) shows that prayer fulfilled. So He is seated with the Father on the throne occupied also by the Son from before the foundation of the world, before David was, before David's throne was, before Jehovah's throne over Israel. That throne above the heavens never was David's, never will be. Jesus as Son of David was denied sovereignty over Israel and David's kingdom, and until Romans 11:25 is fulfilled, the throne of His Father David remains as Hoesa 3:4 foretells, and verse 5 must wait. This is in keeping with Peter's word to Israel in Acts 3:21,ff. Glorious things remain to be set forth in our next.

Second Proposition

"The Bible teaches that Christ's second coming shall precede the thousand years' reign of the twentieth chapter of Revelation."

FIRST AFFIRMATIVE

Stanford Chambers

The Bible teaches that Christ's second coming shall precede the thousand years' reign of the twentieth chapter of Revelation.

Our proposition is the opposite of what Brother Jones has previously affirmed, only we have no need of a fellowship clause, since our practice of fellowship is not an issue. We enjoy fellowship with the brother who differs with us where it involves us in no wrong practice or commitment to unscriptural doctrine. We believe the instruction of Romans 14 is to be taken with all seriousness. Fellowship, however, in its very nature, is mutual, and cannot be forced. Two at least are always involved and responsible.

Had Brother Jones been able to cite the Scripture declaring that Jesus ascended on high and sat down on David's throne, or any Scripture teaching us that David's throne was transferred to heaven, or any reference to Jesus as occupying said throne, and then brethren denying such passages of God's word, he might have made out his case.

"All who deny this" (Christ now reigning on David's throne) "are unworthy of fellowship," affirms Brother Jones. His bringing up other matters to establish unworthiness, like somebody's inconsistencies whom Brother Jones classifies as "Pre", is an admission of a felt need for something more than is contained in the proposition in order to justify the disfellowshipping practice we have ever challenged.

We are not concerned about the defense of any "system of teaching" labeled "Premillennialism," being committed to but one system of teaching, viz., the Word of God.

We have no "A", "Post", or "Pre" group or party that we desire to defend, else we'd do as sectarians in general do and erect an ecclesiastical curtain for the protection of the party fellowship. As before stated, there are inconsistencies in plenty on Brother Jones' side of the curtain.

Jesus arose, ascended to heaven, is seated now on the throne he left for man's sake, the throne eternally His, never David's, but eternally the Father's. Hear Paul: He "counted not the being on an equality with God a thing to be grasped, but emptied Himself, taking the form of a servant, being made in the likeness of men; and being found in fashion as a man, he humbled himself, becoming obedient even unto death, yes the death of the cross," and from such depths "God highly exalted him, and gave unto him the name which is above every name, that in the name of Jesus every knee should bow . . . and

that every tongue should confess that Jesus Christ is Lord, to the glory of God the Father" (Phil. 2:6-11).

In the shadow of the cross, He prayed, "Glorify thou me with thine own self, with the glory that I had with thee before the world was." Paul says He was "received up in glory" (1 Tim. 3:16). Read Revelation, chapter 5, and be assured that His glory is all the greater for His having been slain here. Also note that His Father's glory has likewise been augmented by the same.

He and the Father are one—one in purpose, one in every activity (apart from the Son's emptying Himself and enduring His earthly career), the one never acting independently of the other. "All mine are thine, and thine are mine." His Father's throne is the Son's and always has been; always will be. For "Of the Son he saith, Thy throne, O God, is for ever and ever" (Heb. 1:8). Exercising his kingly powers, He created the universe, "for without him was not anything made that hath been made" (John 1:3). "Angels and authorities and powers...made subject to him," obey Him as He reigns from that throne. So do those who know Him here below, having been translated into His kingdom, as per Colossians 1:13. Reigning from that throne, He executes the divine will in blotting out the sins of those who respond to the gospel. There as High Priest (after the order of Melchizedek) He functions as Mediator and Intercessor, and as living Head of the body the church.

As to the world's lying in "the evil one" (1 John 5:19), He overrules and restricts, as He has done from the beginning of Gentile nations. Israel in unbelief is subject to His over-ruling and chastening hand, preserved through the centuries, being "beloved for the father's sake," and will be preserved until "the times of the Gentiles be fulfilled" (Luke 21:24).

Doubt not, as some actually do, that the throne the Son of God now occupies and reigns from is the throne He occupied before He "became flesh and dwelt among us," and from long before the foundation of the world. Isaiah saw Him there, and it was while one of the Davidic line was reigning (under Jehovah) on David's throne. Isaiah, describing his vision, said, "Mine eyes have seen the King, Jehovah of Hosts" (6:5). What Isaiah there writes as to people's not hearing or seeing or understanding is repeated by Jesus more than once, an instance of which is in John 12:39, 40. John, reciting Jesus' quotation of the Isaiah passage, adds, "These things said Isaiah because he saw his glory and spake of him." That is, of Jesus. The meaning of this "name which is above every name" (Phil. 2:9, 10) is Jehovah-Savior. Jehovah, the Father's name? Surely, and the Son's by inheritance. Let our thinking be in full accord.

So, Hebrews 1:8 again: "Of the Son he saith, Thy throne, O God, is for ever and ever." Fear not nor hesitate to call Him God. Paul says (Col. 2:9), "In him dwelleth all the fullness of the godhead bodily." You were baptized into the name of the Father and of the Son and of the Holy Spirit—the Godhead. The Father is God, but He is not the Son; the Son is God, but He is not the Father; the Holy Spirit is God but He is not the Son nor the Father. These three are

one, yet each has His function as a person of the Godhead, but neither is ever purposing, planning or acting independently. Too much for our little minds? Granted, but it would be a little God, if we were able to comprehend Him. "We walk by faith, not by sight," or full knowledge.

The second person of the Godhead, called the Logos ("the Word"), "became flesh, and dwelt among us" (John 1:1-5, 14). He came to "put away sin by the sacrifice of himself" (Heb. 9:26). He clothed Himself in a human body that He might "taste death for every man" (Heb. 2:9). Having accomplished that for which He came, He went back to the Father and to the throne He had left. While in His limitations in the flesh, He could and did find consolation in the foreword of the Father, "Sit thou on my right hand until I make thine enemies thy footstool" (Ps. 110:1).

So He ascended on high and took His rightful place, being the "only begotten of the Father" (John 1:14), having been also begotten of the Holy Spirit in the womb of the virgin to become the Son of man, and Son of David, and again begotten from the dead (Acts 13:33) to become the "firstfruits of them that are asleep." Since it behooved the Christ to suffer and die, He must be raised up (and so it was decreed and fulfilled), if He was to sit on the Eternal Throne, or if He should sit on the throne of David, His father according to the flesh, the hope of all Israel.

But "he shall appear a second time apart from sin (not as a sin offering) unto salvation to them that wait for him" (Heb. 9:28). (Not too many "wait for him".)

Think not, as many seem to think, that He abdicates the throne He now occupies at the Father' right hand in order to "appear a second time" as foretold. Never. "Thy throne, O God, is for ever and ever." "Of the Son," this is written. But does He not leave the right hand of the Father? Hear Him: "Henceforth ye shall see the Son of man sitting at the right hand of Power, and coming on the clouds of heaven" (Matt 26:64, et al.). "The Son of man shall come in the glory of the Father" (Matt. 16:27 et al.). No demotion, no abdication, no loss of position or power or glory. Instead it is ever "from glory to glory," it is His "glorious appearing" (Titus 2:13), following which "the knowledge of the glory of Jehovah shall cover the earth as the waters cover the sea" (Hab. 2:14).

Our proposition has somewhat to do with the time of His coming, that is, the relation in time to the thousand years' reign of Rev. ch. 20 (specifically mentioned six times in six verses there). Brother Jones denies our proposition, claiming to find His coming deferred till after the thousand years of John's vision. Impossible.

Hear Peter's second recorded message to Israel, found in Acts, ch. 3, and the divine demand upon that nation: "Repent ye, and turn again, that your sins may be blotted out, that so may come seasons of refreshing from the presence of the Lord, and that He may send the Christ who hath been appointed for you, even Jesus; whom the

heaven must receive until the times of restoration of all things, whereof God spake by the mouth of his holy prophets that have been from of old" (Acts 3:19-21). Again, "Unto you first, God, having raised up his Servant, sent him to bless you, in turning every one of you from his iniquities" (v. 26, Read all between). Repent . . . that he may send the Christ . . . appointed for you." Israel has not repented. Can any other cause be assigned for His not yet appearing? There could be some significance in the word to the servant inviting guests to the least (Luke 14:23) "that my house may be filled." Obviously the house as yet is not filled.

That little word "until": Jesus remains in heaven "until the time of restoration." The "restoration" foretold remains to be fulfilled. We are aware that it is claimed by some that this present dispensation is what is meant by "the times of restoration," but again, impossible. After 1900 years of it, what has been restored?

"Jerusalem shall be trodden down of the Gentiles until the times of the Gentiles be fulfilled," said Jesus (Luke 21:24). Jerusalem is still trodden down of the Gentiles, so "the times of the Gentiles" have not yet been "fulfilled." As long as "the times of the Gentiles" continue unfulfilled, "the times of restoration" are not on. They do not run—have not been running, parallel.

"I would not, brethren, have you ignorant of this mystery, lest ye be wise in your own conceits, that a hardening in part hath befallen Israel, until the fulness of the Gentiles be come in" (Rom. 11:26). "The fulness of the Gentiles" has not yet come in, the hardening in Israel continues. Jerusalem is still trodden down, the times of the Gentiles continue, "the times of restoration" are not yet, Jesus remains in heaven, and will, according to Peter, "until the times of restoration."

Initiatory to the "restoration of all things" spoken by God's prophets will be the destruction of "the lawless one," the "son of perdition," the "man of sin" as per 2 Thes. 2:8, also Rev. 17:14, more fully envisioned in Rev. 19:11-20. With this beast is also destroyed his right-hand man, "the false prophet". These two of the Satanic trio of Rev. 16:13, by whom the kings of the earth are demonized and stirred to attempt Har-Magedon, mobilizing their armies against the Lamb, the beast and the false prophet go to their doom in the lake of fire, while the other one of the trio, the prince of demons and the instigator of all the activities of the other two, Satan, is forthwith arrested and incarcerated in the abyss, which is shut and sealed over him for the thousand years of his prison term. The "infernal trinity" put out of the way, the restoration proper can begin.

"When Christ who is our life shall be manifested, we also shall be manifested with him in glory" (Col. 3:4). Second Thessalonians 1:10 envisions Him in His coming "to be glorified in his saints." In the same connection is to be seen more of that clearing away of hindrances to the decreed restoration. In the two passages referred to and in others, is "the revealing of the sons of God" (Rom. 8:19, ff.) which the groaning creation waits for, deliverance of which is a part

of the restoration decreed. Verse 23 shows how that the revealing of the sons of God comes with the redemption of their bodies, which, in turn comes with the return of Christ. "They that are Christ's at his coming" (1 Cor. 15:23).

It is "until the times of the restoration" that the heaven receives the Christ appointed for Israel. The restoration waits for the Restorer. The restoration will not be man's creation or by man's restoring. The thousand years' reign John foresees is a reign of Christ and His glorified, crowned, and enthroned saints reigning with Him. He is now "bringing many sons unto glory" (Heb. 2:10). Their qualifying is now, their revealing is future, when He shall appear. Their reigning awaits their receiving their crowns, which will be as Paul declares in 2 Tim. 4:8. These constitute the company John sees and designates "the first resurrection." According to Revelation 20:4 the first resurrection is a great company. It reminds of Romans 8:17, which shows that if we suffer with Him, we "shall also be glorified with him." And the reigning John foresees is contemporary with Satan's thousand years' imprisonment, his deceiving of the nations thus prohibited. Necessary to the restoration, that.

Peter's address to Israel (Acts 3) shows clearly that the restoration he refers to embraces Israel's restoration, very particularly so. This is emphasized in the three untils already made note of. Here is where the throne of David plays its divinely decreed, important part.

"For unto us a child is born, unto us a Son is given; and the government shall be upon his shoulder: and his name shall be . . . Prince of Peace. Of the increase of his government and of peace there shall be no end, upon the throne of David and upon his kingdom, to establish it, and to uphold it in justice and righteousness from henceforth even for ever" . . . (Isa. 9:6,7).

Note that it is to be "upon the throne of David and upon his kingdom." David's throne and his kingdom Israel are identified. They are inseparable. Now in ruins (Amos 9:11), that kingdom and throne are to be established again. Thus says Amos and many others. Not so is the throne Christ occupies, as it has never been in ruins. See also Gabriel's announcement to Mary: "The Lord God shall give unto him the throne of his father David: and he shall reign over the house of Jacob forever; and of his kingdom there shall be no end" (Luke 1:32, 33). Note "over the house of Jacob."

Paul, praying for his kinsmen, devotes chapters 9, 10, 11 of Romans to Israel, past, present, future. Says (11:23), "God is able to graft them in again." Says (11:15), "What shall the receiving of them be but life from the dead?" Says (11:25), "A hardening in part hath befallen Israel until the fulness of the Gentiles be come in." That hardness is to undergo a softening, a melting, and then Hosea 3:5 will come to pass. Hosea says, "in the latter days." Do we wisely ignore present day developments?

Who thinks that because of Israel's unbelief and rebelliousness God is forever through with them should read Leviticus 26:44, 45. Note that word "utterly." Paul reminds us, "The gifts and calling of God are not repented of" (Rom. 11:29). "So all Israel shall be saved" (11:26), but "they are not all Israel that are of Israel" (Rom. 9:6). "It is the remnant that shall be saved" (9:27). The remnant is not only of Israel, but the true Israel. Hence 11:26 will come to pass. What change must take place is shown in Ezek. 36:26, 27, et. al. A nation in whom God puts His Spirit is a spiritual people. The house of Jacob over which the Son of David is to reign forever will be a spiritual house. And over all (including what John foresees in Rev. 11:15), is His body, the church, glorified and enthroned with Him (Rev. 20:6) for that age, and henceforth for ever.

FIRST NEGATIVE

L. Wesley Jones

We realize it is easy to make boastful claims in debating, calculated to cause the careless reader to accept the spirit of assumed victory rather than to study with care the arguments having been presented. But even being aware of this we say with clear conscience that our case is now made with clarity on the use of Psalms in the Book of Acts. Consider the facts, is all we ask.

ACTS 2 AND PSALMS 132

In two installments we have implored Brother Chambers to consider the meaning of the words, "seeing this before". In the first we used some detail in setting forth our convictions as to their meaning and illustrated this with Gal. 3:8, in which the same language is used with the same force. We haven't seen a *mention* of this point—not a word. Paul said the present Gentile justification was foreseen in the promise to Abraham. Peter says that Christ's present reign on David's throne was foreseen in the promise to raise Him from the dead. If our opponent had only said after missing it the first time, that he had overlooked it, we could have believed him.

PSALMS 2 AND ACTS 13

Here the question is whether only that section of the Psalm has to do with the resurrection of Christ is fulfilled, while the portion having to do with His reign remains to be. Brother Chambers believes the latter. But let us see, once again. "God hath fulfilled the same unto us their children, *in that* he hath raised up Jesus again; as it is *also* written in the second Psalm, "Thou art my Son, this day have I begotten thee."

The inseparable connection between the Lord's resurrection and His reign, a connection made by the apostles in both of these passages in Acts, is a thing Brother Chambers refuses to acknowledge. What is it, Paul, that God hath fulfilled unto us? *He hath raised up Jesus*. And, Paul, is that IT? God hath raised up Jesus *as it is also* written in the second Psalm. In our first affirmative we dwelt upon the "decree of acknowledgment. To the king on the Holy Hill of Zion, God said, "Thou art my Son . . .". Then, Paul, in what *manner* did God

fulfill His promise to raise Christ? As it is written in the second Psalm. The promise was fulfilled in the manner of the second Psalm where the exalted majesty of Christ on the throne of David is recognized by His Father, God (Cf. Heb. 1:1-6).

THIS IS THAT

We have asserted that Brother Chambers denied a plain "thus saith the Lord." He replies that he has been preaching Acts 2 for over sixty years. We doubt that not, but in this there is hardly proof, dear elder brother, that you have preached the truth. This is no answer to the argument.

You haven't met the argument. You said in your first negative that Peter didn't say, "this is all of that". We admitted that freely, and said its only force is that this "is the age of the fulfillment." Your comment on this is unfortunate for your cause, for you surely know that we aren't trying to prove that the time of Acts 2 or Acts 13 was the time of *all* of the fulfillment of the Psalm quoted; but we do say that *this* is the age of their fulfillment. Now would you take a position on the work of the Holy Spirit on any other passage in all of God's word that would contradict Peter's affirmation concerning Joel's prophecy? Then why take so many positions on so many passages in so much of God's word that contradict Paul and Peter in Acts 2 and 13?

THRONES – GOD'S AND DAVID'S

Brother Chambers believes "every word" of our proof that Solomon sat on God's throne and David's throne at once. He doesn't deny that it was David's throne when Solomon sat upon it, just because it was God's throne too. Then he agrees it could be both at once. At that time the fact that it was *one* didn't exclude its being the *other*. But, *now* it does! Brother Chambers, answer *please*, as we asked you before, if it could be God's and David's when Solomon was upon it, why cannot it be now? Now you said in your second negative that Jesus is not on David's throne now because it is the Father's throne, and used three of your seven typewritten pages of your first affirmative proving Christ left and returned to His Father's throne. We believe this with all our hearts. Now deal with our point of difference on this as you were obligated to do in your negative. You evaded it, dear brother; consciously or otherwise. Now, please answer!

PEACE, SATAN'S INCARCERATION AND THE EXECUTION OF JUSTICE

In substance, these are the three objections Brother Chambers files to our belief that the second Psalm (and prophecies of like nature) are fulfilled, and these make up much of his affirmative. Our serious disagreement is over the place of the peace, the nature of the binding of Satan and the character of Christ's reign of Christ and His kingdom. His considerable space on the word "literal" was unnecessary for we had already said concerning such matters that whether they are "actual" is not in dispute. We defined the word literal each time we used it, within the same sentence, so that no misunderstanding is possible if our words are fairly construed.

PEACE IS CERTAINLY PROMISED DURING THE REIGN OF CHRIST, and we believe every passage that Brother Chambers quoted and the many more he could have used to prove this point. We said he believes in physical peace, and, if he denied it we couldn't find it. He responded by quoting passages which he thinks will prove the peace physical, but we don't know whether he thinks for sure for he didn't make any application of the verses. From the affirmative we get a glimpse of his conception of this peace. God once exercised a limited reign over Babylon, the enemy of God's people, even as He does now over Russia. Now he didn't tell us, but we guess he means that just as Israel had no peace with Babylon, we have no peace with Russia; therefore the reign of peace is not yet on. Brother Chambers, if all Russians were converted to Christ by the preaching of the gospel in keeping with the great commission, would we have peace with them? Please answer.

It would have helped the debate and Brother Chambers if he had dealt with the material we offered on the eating of Christ's flesh, the new birth, etc. *Flesh* is just as *physical* as plow-shares, and birth as much as *physical exertion as beating*. The peace to prevail during the reign of Christ is described in terms of the language of the Old Testament (in the prophecy cited) just as the *New Birth* and the *New Relationship*.

Furthermore, our Saviour said, "These things have I spoken unto you that in me ye might have peace. In the world ye shall have tribulation..." (John 16:33). He said, "I came not to bring peace but a sword." LET BROTHER CHAMBERS PRODUCE THE PASSAGE THAT SHOWS THAT *THE PEACE* OF CHRIST'S REIGN WAS *EVER* PROMISED TO BE WITH THE UNSAVED IN ANY AGE. It was always promised for the relationship between the unregenerated and God, and between the regenerated and others like himself! Now, dear brother, don't continue reading passages on peace until you have dealt with these. You implore me to use the "laboring oar", but if my oar were any larger your boat would already be sunk. This is but one of a half dozen illustrations in even such a short debate of affirmative and negative argument that you are choosing to ignore. If you think it unworthy of consideration, show why. Many don't share your well-kept secret.

SATAN IS NOT NOW BOUND, we are told because John gave a picture of him, and John wrote prophecy, not history. Didn't the Lord say to him, Brother Chambers, "Write the things which thou *hast* seen, and the things which *are* and the things which *shall be* hereafter? Doesn't that make three tenses?

SATAN IS NOT BOUND because he is a "prince of the power of the air", and because he "walketh about". These do not say, Brother Chambers, that Satan is not bound. That's *your* interpretation of them. The evil in this present world doesn't argue that Satan isn't bound. That's your interpretation of it. If we were to agree that this is a matter of doubt, if it were to be a matter for settlement by interpretation alone, our readers must see that your method of interpretation contradicts the clear "this is that" of God's word. We

have proved Christ is now reigning on David's throne, and you agree that Satan's binding is to be simultaneous. You cannot answer the arguments on Christ's reign, so you seek to prove them wrong by asserting that the Devil is still completely loose. And somewhere you become so completely confused about this that you say, "Thank God for our refuge in Christ, but that is not the 'place' of Satan's incarceration...". Certainly not. What of ours did you understand to mean that Satan's prison is in Christ?

The Christian is in Christ, kept by His word, through faith. While walking by faith the "wicked one toucheth him not". As long as there is *any place* where the saved cannot be touched by the Devil, the Devil is restricted, he is bound. His prison is the wicked world he has made for himself, which becomes smaller as more are converted to Christ, where all his sons are bound and imprisoned—my brother would not hesitate to say that the unsaved are *bound by sin* or *in sin*.

WE ASKED BROTHER CHAMBERS TO TELL US WHAT CHRIST IS NOW EXECUTING. If he answered we couldn't find it. He said something about another realm *where* he executes. We didn't ask where, we asked *what*?

WHAT HAPPENED TO THE QUESTION OF FELLOWSHIP?

The second negative (where he was obligated to discuss the matter) brought very little more than the mention of the question. He doesn't believe "the practice (of disfellowship) to be warranted." Brother Chambers, we knew this is what you believe. We are wanting to know why. Why didn't you comment on the one who added to our local "travesty on the plea for unity" by saying that if one believes the kingdom spiritual he made the resurrection of Christ unnecessary? Why were you not clear in stating your attitude toward one who allows the position quoted on infant baptism? We know you don't believe that, so just what must one teach before he is unworthy of your fellowship? Please say something about the prominent member of your fellowship who endorses the preaching of Billy Graham. Your comment on these things will make the calling of names completely unnecessary.

The only response we saw from you on this was to the effect that there is some of this (error) on the other side. *There is!* But the treatment of it is where the difference lies. It isn't fellowshipped. There is no effort to pass such by as the matters of indifference described in Romans 14. *We don't believe that whether our Lord is on David's throne is a question comparable to the eating of meats*, which was a question of indifference. We don't believe that whether Billy Graham preaches the gospel is a question comparable to those matters of indifference about which Paul could say, "For neither if we eat are we the better; neither if we eat not are we the worse."

When such errors as we have named above are tolerated by a fellowship, and when such questions as those between us are relegated to a position of indifference (the word being defined as Paul did in 1 Cor. 8:8) there is an issue you cannot as brethren just overlook because *some* of you still preach faith, repentance and baptism as always necessary to salvation.

PRE, POST AND A

A dictionary is hardly enough in some circumstances to define a term. To this our brother must agree. Such is true in this case. A dictionary before me defines "Baptist" as "One of a Christian denomination who baptize adult believers only, and who maintains the necessity for immersion." Ignoring the misuse of the word "Christian", this hardly unfolds even the essentials of Baptist belief. Just so, any legitimate definition of postmillennialism contains essentials of this system that even Brother Chambers would not bind on us.

LORD'S KNOWLEDGE TO COVER THE EARTH

We are reminded that the knowledge of the Lord is thus to be widespread during the reign of Christ, and that since it isn't now this just couldn't be the time of His reign. Again, Brother Chambers needs to deal with what we've said about the New Testament Kingdom being presented often (because it was addressed to the Jews, too) in terms of the Old Testament. Moses's law had been to the Jews only. Gentiles were virtually excluded. There was no plan for spreading *this* knowledge to all. Now there is a GREAT commission. The gospel is for every nation under heaven. *Wherever* men fear Him and work righteousness they are accepted of Him. If the gospel (the KNOWLEDGE) is not spread it is not because such is not His Plan.

Brother Chambers might just as well look around and say, So many are not saved, therefore it is not God's will that all come to repentance!

HEBREWS 2:8

While no argument has been used on this passage, it has been twice quoted and we give it notice. Don't keep *quoting* it Brother Chambers. Deal with this answer, to your implications from it. Why are not all things subjected to Christ? Because Christianity is designed to appeal to the will and many men, most men, choose to be children of the devil. One might well ask, Why would not all the people of Jerusalem accept Christ's offer of refuge in Matthew 23:37?

TIMES OF THE GENTILES

Another three pages of Brother Chambers' seven were devoted to the restoration of all things, the times of the Gentiles, liberal citations from whole chapters without argument. Sir, our space *is* short, granted. But this doesn't mean that you can quote and cite, without making connections and arguments. We believe the passages you quoted and cited—more of the latter than the former. To twist the passages you cited and reach the conclusion that Christ is not now reigning on David's throne, you must deny that "all the Gentiles" may now "seek after the Lord." (Acts 15:15-17). Here are the "ruins" of the prophecies. Here is the word "all" used of the Gentiles as it is used of the Jews in Romans 11:26. Is it fully the will of the Lord for any Gentile to see Him? Then why is the tabernacle of David not set up? Why are its "ruins" not restored? If the ALL of Romans 10:26 (cited by you) is to be interpreted to mean that Jews as a *nation* will be restored under an earthly monarchy, why does this not mean that *every Gentile will positively be saved*? Not that this is God's will for *all* to be saved, Jew and Gentile, thus having peace, universal in men's hearts: but that it will unquestionably happen.

In virtually every paragraph you assumed the point to be proved. You said, the Christian's reign awaits the crown promised Paul. You assumed this to be our reign with Christ on earth. Why could it not be the "crown of life" of Revelation 2:10? Why not the kingdom of which we are heirs—inheritors—our inheritance reserved *in heaven?* (James 2:5; 1 Peter 1:4), Why assume the "man of sin" in 2 Thes. 2:8 is envisioned in Revelation 19? Prove it.

CONCLUDING QUESTION: Since Peter declares the prophets of the Old Testament could not even themselves understand the burden of their message, not having the fulfillment, how can you be so emphatic as to their meaning while claiming that we don't have the fulfillment? (1 Peter 1:10-12). What insights have you they didn't have?

SECOND AFFIRMATIVE

Stanford Chambers

Christ's second coming is to precede His reign of Revelation.

Brother Jones complains that due attention has not been given his arguments. It is true that we have not taken them up item by item, though our inclination has been strong to do that, and it is just possible that we have regretted it more than he, being unable for lack of space.

However, every argument offered or that may be offered on the relation in time of Christ's return and His reign has been and is answered by the one statement by the apostle Peter, to say nothing of the many, many other Scriptures given and cited. Acts 3:21 settles that question. Here we give it again. "Even Jesus: whom the heaven must receive until the times of restoration of all things, whereof God spake by the mouth of his holy prophets . . ."

"The times of restoration" all agree, belong to His reign. Restoration is a must because of the earth's being a rebellious province, so far refusing to be in subjection to Him by whom "the worlds were framed." Hence Hebrews 2:8.

The heaven must receive Him until the times of the restoration. Another "must." This is not argument, is not inference, but plain statement of fact by inspiration given. Who does not get it let him examine the statement. Let no preconception hinder.

Jesus rejected here, returned to heaven and to His place on the Eternal Father's throne, the throne He had left for man's sake, the throne eternally His, being the Son of God. He is in heaven yet, though he promised to return. He "must" remain there "until the times of restoration" foretold.

Peter does not say until the times of restoration are fulfilled. When Jesus delivered His Olivet discourse, He revealed that Jerusalem would be "trodden down of the Gentiles until the times of the Gentiles be fulfilled." If Peter had meant that "the times of restoration" must be fulfilled before Jesus is to return, that is the way he would have stated it, and we'd know by that that we have a long time yet to wait for His coming. It does not read, until after the times of

restoration, but "until". Who dares add to the inspired word? He who doctor's Peter's word feels the need to do so to make it fit his theory. To doctor the Word is not to heed it.

Let us examine more in detail Peter's statement and save spending time in argument. Peter is speaking to the representatives of Israel (Acts 3:12). In v. 19 he commands, "Repent . . . and turn again (be converted), that your sins may be blotted out, that so there may come seasons of refreshing from the presence of the Lord; and that he may send the Christ who hath been appointed for you, even Jesus: whom the heaven must receive until the times of restoration" . . . Read the rest of it.

To be resultant upon Israel's repentance (which is not even yet) :

- a) "sins blotted out."
- b) "seasons of refreshing from the presence of the Lord."
- c) "that he may send the Christ appointed for you."
- d) not to be "until the restoration of all things" spoken "by the mouth of his holy prophets."

Observation: Jesus remains in heaven; "the times of restoration" are not yet. Jerusalem is yet "trodden down of the Gentiles;" "the times of the Gentiles" are not yet fulfilled. Israel has not yet turned or been converted; her restoration more often foretold by the prophets of old than any other restoration is not yet; her hardening continues till now, and will "until the fulness (full quota) of the Gentiles be come in" (see Rom. 11:25). "The times of the Gentiles" now on are not "the times of restoration" foretold.

There is nothing to be found in Peter's speech on Pentecost that his speech in Acts 3 contradicts. There is nothing in Paul's speech in Acts 13 that his instructions in Romans 11 contradicts, nothing in it that contradicts 3:21. Unthinkable. There is not even a seeming conflict.

The tabernacle of David fallen and in ruins is embraced in the foreseen restoration of Israel. See Amos 9:11,ff.; Acts 15:14,ff. James speaking by inspiration for our Lord: "I will return, and I will build again the tabernacle of David which is fallen; and I will build again the ruins thereof, And I will set it up" (Acts 15:16).

When will He return to do this wonderful thing? "After these things." What things? the taking out from among the Gentiles "a people for his name." That process is still going on where the gospel is effectively preached, will continue until the fulness of the Gentiles be come in." "After these things I will return" . . . Paul says as much in Rom. 11:25, 26.

As for Israel, as yet Hosea 3:4 is still on; when Israel's hardness gives way, and the marvelous change of Ezekiel 36:26, 27, et al. comes to pass (which will correspond in time with the coming in of the fulness of the Gentiles, and the completion of the "taking out from among them a people for His name") then will come to pass Hosea 3:5, Ezek. 37:24ff., in fact the whole of the chapter and its marvelous restoration under the greater David. (The purge of Jer. ch. 30 plays its part.)

The questions that are raised and the difficulties to understanding that loom are not determining factors. It is not wrong to seek a proper understanding, but a lack of understanding cannot defeat the purpose of God in the bringing of His plans to fulfillment. We'd love to take up every one of the difficulties looming up, indeed, every "argument" presented did our allotted space only permit.

At this juncture is a logical time to remind us that the covenant of promise is that "all families of the earth be blessed," and this promise was in the same words passed on to Jacob. God purposed the blessing of all nations through the one nation. Paul says, "the gifts and calling of God are not repented of." Our Lord never acknowledges defeat. Israel is chosen to be "the head and not the tail," and when Jeremiah 30 is finished, the same foreseen in Zech. 14, the "desolations He hath made in the earth" (Ps. 46:8,ff.) and the chaos will be converted into order, for He "maketh wars to cease." Then "All nations shall praise him" (Ps. 67:1-7), that is, "all the peoples," "the kingdom of the world" having become the kingdom of our Lord and of his Christ" (Rev. 11:15), and the reign of Rev. 20, His "great mountain" which is to fill the whole earth (Dan. 2), materializes. The Lord's church, glorified and enthroned as in John's preview (Rev. 20), occupies that highest exaltation of all, and for which her trials and testings during her pilgrimage here fit and prepare her, for "if we endure, we shall also reign with him" (2 Tim. 2:12); "if we suffer with him, we shall also be glorified with him" (Rom. 8:17).

No, the tabernacle of David is not a type of the church. It was not a sanctuary for worship; it was David's dynasty, his royal line, which before its overturn (Ezek. 21:27), foreshadowed the glorious reign when it is restored and occupied by the greater David of the Davidic covenant, "when he shall come whose right it is." The throne of David of old was not a type of the throne at the right hand of the Majesty in the heaven, for that throne existed before the foundation of the earth.

Our Lord's church is not a built-again something at all, but an out and out new creation, purposed, however, from before the foundation of the world. It was not built upon any "ruins", but upon "this rock." Denominations try to make out a continuity of both the O. T. and N. T. "congregation" or "church," but we hardly acknowledge their success.

Christ's church is higher, destined to be far higher, than any restored Israel (which is not to detract from Israel's glory), for "apart from us they should not be made perfect" (Heb. 11:40). In Ps. 45 is not the Psalmist given a preview of the true church in glorification with the King as the queen at His right hand"? And as "Queen" will she not be enthroned with Him to reign conjointly with Him? Is not that what He has planned for her? So John's preview of the reign in Rev. 20, following His presenting her unto Himself, even as planned (Eph. 5:27). All of which she is being disciplined for during her pilgrimage here below.

While here Jesus refused to be made King in the realm of bread and fish; He refused to be King over an unregenerated Israel. But when Ezek. 36:26, 27 and like forecasts are fulfilled, and God bestows

His Spirit, then Israel (like the church even in physical bodies as it is), will be spiritual, and God will be in the midst. Such was the divine purpose even in calling Abraham, and "the gifts and the callings of God are not repented of." Does He ever acknowledge or accept defeat?

The new Israel, then, will be the head (and not the tail) over the nations, the glorified church above, being over all. Such is God's order. It is destined to shape up so when "the kingdom of the world will have "become the kingdom of our Lord and his Christ" (Rev. 11:15). A reign of a thousand years constituting one age or dispensation (the 7th), will be but preparatory, after all, for the reigning "unto the ages of the ages." (See Eph. 3:21, et al.)

"Of the increase of his government and of peace there shall be no end, upon the throne of David and upon his kingdom" . . . (Isa. 9:6, 7). David's throne and David's kingdom, inseparable, are to perform a most important part in the divine economy, when in "the times of restoration" will be established peace and righteousness in universality and in perpetuity. It will not be a modified righteousness, or justice, as of now. It will not be a modified peace nor a modified binding of Satan as of now, for in "this present evil age" (Gal. 1:4) Satan's cause flourishes as never before in the history of mankind. Christ's reign will not be a modified reign, for by divine decree "all things are made subject to him" (Eph. 1:22, et al., including Heb. 2:8, in which verse it is stated, "but we see not yet all things subjected to him." That word "yet" means that we have not come to the end of the story. The decree will not fail.)

Are some puzzled about the law observances in the forecasts of Israel's future? First, they do not involve the church, by that time in the glory. The new nation will keep her jubilees as never in the past. What meaning they will have! Celebrations and memorials will be in order, having due occasion. Under her Messiah, there will not be one offering of any description that cannot be made a fitting and helpful "memorial."

Brother Jones does not do justice to himself in his reasoning about the Solomon-Jehovah throne. Of course it was Jehovah's throne occupied by David, then by Solomon, and the rest of David's dynasty, till Jehovah took it back as He did in the days of Zedekiah. Solomon's temple was Jehovah's, but that does not identify it as the temple of God in heaven. Solomon was David's son and "the anointed of Jehovah," but that does not identify him as the anointed Son of God in heaven.

Is Jesus equal to a governance from the throne of His Father and from His throne inherited from David? Would He have to abdicate the throne of Ps. 110:1 to occupy the throne of his father David, from which He is to "reign over the house of Jacob for ever" (Luke 1:32)? Don't measure Him by man. Queen Elizabeth did not abdicate to come to the province across the seas. Her grandfather once went to India and sat upon a throne which was his there as "Emperor" of India. Did it detract from his power or prestige as king of England? It greatly enhanced it.

A thousand years intervening between the N. T. Christians and the return of their Lord was unthinkable to them, for they were not so taught, Brother Jones' proposition to the contrary, notwithstanding. His warning "Watch, for ye know not when your Lord shall come" prohibited it. That waiting attitude of disciples everywhere contradicts it. See 1 Thes. 1:10; Phil. 3:20; 1 Cor. 1:7, et al. "That blessed hope" (Titus 2:13) is to the contrary (hope made up both desire and expectation). James 5:7, "Be patient, brethren, until the coming of the Lord," and "The judge standeth at the doors," would contradict any one's saying that it was taught that Christ's second coming follows the thousand years' reign. Paul to Timothy: "I charge thee that thou keep the commandment . . . until the coming of our Lord Jesus Christ" (1 Tim. 6:14,ff.). If there had been such teaching as Brother Jones affirms, Timothy would have known it, to say nothing of Paul. Were the early disciples deceived? No. Jesus made allowance that His coming might not be until the fourth watch, but He also warned that it might be the first. Alertness is the important thing. So, to the very end He warns "Watch" (Rev. 16:15) and the last word from Him is, "Yea, I come quickly." Does your heart say "Amen" to that and pray the last prayer of the Bible, "Even so, come, Lord Jesus"? There is something fundamentally wrong in that preaching that does not bring the results seen in those early Christians, the waiting, watching, looking, hoping, expectant attitude. But they say, "nearly 2000 years have intervened". That is history, not prophecy. Beware of placing another thousand between, or even one. If your heart feels dread and fear instead of "that blessed hope," examine that heart or check up on that teaching received.

We have referred to the Pioneers of the "Restoration Movement" as to doctrine and fellowship: It would take a volume to print things favorable to our proposition. What would happen to one of our "sound" journals today if it should publish the following published in the Millennial Harbinger of 1832 volume? "Luke 1:32: 'And the Lord shall give unto him the throne of his father David, and he shall reign over the house of Jacob for ever'. Unless, then, we identify the throne of David with that of the Eternal Father, which would be blasphemy, we must acknowledge that the session of Messiah on His own throne . . . belongs to another period." Extract from the article by J. A. Begg. "Worthy of a very candid and attentive consideration."—Editor Alexander Campbell. This present-day practice would deny Pioneers fellowship in their own movement!

Now to Revelation, the ground of (unwarranted) controversy: Yes, in three tenses, and the third or future tense starts in very definitely with 4:1, where John is to be shown "the things which must come to pass hereafter." From there on is not history, but prophecy, hence, "the book of prophecy." Avoid the error of trying to find events in history that fit things making up John's preview. Note the sequence of events.

Now, in 16:13-16 is exposed that diabolical plot of the Satanized Triumvirate (Satan, Beast, False Prophet) to demonize the kings of the earth for the girding for Har-Magedon. The plot is felled by one fell stroke and once for all by the coming of the King of kings

in 19:20 – 20:3. Exit the “Infernal Trio” and their hosts. See also 2 Thes. 2:8. With the beast and the false prophet in the lake of fire and Satan in the abyss, (“The wicked world he has created” is not the abyss.) the reign of peace ensues under the “Prince of Peace” as in Isa. 9:6, 7, His “first resurrection” company reigning with Him, according to plan and purpose, their resurrection having taken place prior to 19:7. There the Lamb’s wife is in heaven adorned and ready for “the marriage of the Lamb,” the occasion of heaven’s “Hallelujah Chorus.” Her only way to enter heaven is by resurrection and translation. 1 Thes. 4:17 precedes Rev. 19:7. John does not relate the event of the rising, but gives his vision of the resurrected after they, enthroned, have begun to reign. Who cannot see (whose eyes are not goggled) the coming of the King in chapter 19 and the glorious reign without a rival in the chapter that follows? Then will have come to pass 2 Thes. 1:8-10; Jude 14; as many another forecast, including Col. 3:4. It is then that Hab. 2:14 comes to pass, in glory manifestation.

“The knowledge of the glory of Jehovah shall cover the earth as waters cover the sea.” Such knowledge of His glory does not precede the manifestation thereof.

Now we must give way for Brother Jones final. Our thanks to him for the courteous treatment accorded his “opponent,” to *The Preceptor* and to *Word and Work* for freely publishing this discussion, to all earnest readers, and above all to our Savior, Son of David, Son of God.

And now the Bible must and will have the last word. Amen.

SECOND NEGATIVE

L. Wesley Jones

“‘The heaven must receive him until the times of the restoration’. Another ‘must’. This is not argument, it is not inference, but plain statement of fact by inspiration given.” This is the way that Brother Chambers describes his use of Acts 3:21 as an argument to end all argument. After excusing himself for not having taken up all our points (which excuse he offered several times) he says that Acts 3:21 “settles the question”. Again, “every argument offered or that may be offered . . . is answered by the one statement” of this verse—Acts 3:21.

Dear readers, Acts 3:21 is no inference— It is a plain statement of fact. But here is that which Brother Chambers subtly combines with it which Peter does not say “by inspiration.” Brother Chambers’ inference is that what God hath spoken “by the mouth of his holy prophets” refers to an age following Christ’s return. But note: Peter gives an illustration. He cites Moses, Deut. 18, in the next verse. To which age does this refer, dear brother? This will tell you in which age we will find the *times of restoration!* Thus we have the “plain statement” that answers all Brother Jones has said that Brother Chambers has not had the space to consider.

Gentle friends, Brother Chambers had the same amount of space Brother Jones had. This you can see for yourself by counting the pages. In this debate one of us could not even speak faster than

the other. And yet some of the material we offered in the first affirmative, seven installments back, has not been noticed, in spite of our begging Brother Chambers in every installment. (e.g. Gal. 3:8).

The pattern has been this: We have offered argument on (1) *the reign of Christ*, (2) *the peace in Christ*, (3) *the place of the Gentiles and the Jews in God's plan*, and (4) *the fulfillment of prophecy*. We did this in our affirmatives. In his negatives he ignored much of this and attempted *some* negative argument. When he came into the affirmative Brother Chambers began quoting and citing scriptures on (1) *the reign of Christ*, (2) *the peace in Christ*, (3) *the place of the Gentiles and the Jews in God's plan* and (4) *the fulfillment of prophecy*. It was supposed that we would argue with these scriptures; but such we were unwilling to do. So what do we have in our brother's last affirmative? Another set of scripture quotations.

Brother Chambers, we are no more disposed to argue with the scriptures cited and quoted in your last affirmative than we were those in your first. We believe Acts 3:21; but we don't your wild assertions about it for which you offered no proof. You speak of plans to "save spending time in argument," but honorable argument is what you agreed to give. Don't you realize that to be fair to our readers, our arguments were as valuable as yours? That we would just as soon save time from answering your arguments? That you had as much obligation to take time to answer ours as we yours?

On one typewritten page where Brother Chambers wishes for more "alloted space" to permit the answer to every argument, he cites 16 passages of scripture, often quoting two or three words, suggesting by their very use that we do not accept these. This we deny. In some cases we have given specific points (as with Romans 11:26, e. g.), often making the points even though no argument had been offered on the passages, and while our response was completely ignored, the passages are read again as a part of a disconnected labyrinth.

Having thus *saved time* Brother Chambers comes along with a proposal in correspondence that if the publishers agree he would like to have more discussion. We are agreeable and perfectly willing, but if there were as much left over by Brother Chambers' time-saving devices from another one as from this one, and then we were to have the two sets of left-overs, what good could be accomplished?

Yes, Peter said that Christ is coming again. But *where*, to sit upon David's throne? *Where?* Truth demands that we know *where?* From the beginning of the debate we have had before us the *where* of Peter's decree on Christ's coming to sit on David's throne. It is in Acts 2:31. Many times does Peter say Christ is coming, but Peter's decree as to when Christ would sit upon David's throne is in Acts 2:31: "He seeing this before spake of the resurrection of Christ . . ." The significance of the historical event of the resurrection of Christ, the meaning of *seeing this before* as used in Gal.

3:8, the comparison with Peter's earlier "this is that"—these were all left out by a man who had to save time from argument, but would now like further debate if the publishers are agreeable.

THE GENTILES

Ignoring the meat of our argument on Acts 15:16, which he obviously recognizes to be a key to the entire question of the Gentiles' place in God's plan, Bro. Chambers misquotes and misuses James' words. He conveniently overlooks the fact that James is *QUOTING prophecy* in verse 16, and not voicing it. This one thing alone would have saved Brother Chambers three pages of his first affirmative and almost as much in this one. Kind reader, open your Bible to Acts 15 and see if James is quoting prophecy or making prophecy. James says that Peter's experience in the house of Cornelius (related in verses 7-11) is in agreement with the picture foreseen by the prophets. Thus did the prophets say (v. 17) that the Gentiles might seek after the Lord (even Cornelius and his household had sought the Lord), even as all Gentiles may now seek Him through the gospel of Christ.

Bro. Chambers' position places a limiting influence upon God's grace to the Gentiles *now*. According to his statement Gentiles may not now share in the benefits of the kingdom of grace, as baptized into Christ, and therefore the seed of Abraham (Gal. 3:26-29), for this prophecy has not been fulfilled. (Amos 9:11; Acts 15:16 ff).

"Church . . . built . . . upon this rock"

"Our Lord's church is not a built-again something at all, but an out and out new creation . . . It was not built upon any 'ruins', but upon 'this rock'." Now, Brother Chambers, where did you expect to find disagreement here? Were you debating with us when you said that? Did you say this in answer to our argument on Acts 13, or the one on Heb. 2:8 or Isaiah 2 or John 3, 6 or 16? Were you reinforcing your convictions since so many of your other points would logically make the church a substitutionary assembly?

Were you answering the question we asked about 1 Pet. (1:10-12) when you said this? Remember? We asked how you could understand the "unfulfilled" prophecies you are professing to handle so smoothly, when the prophets themselves could not understand them till fulfilled? Now, Brother Chambers, you read from Zechariah, Isaiah, Ezekiel, Psalms and from Revelations which you say is a book of unfulfilled prophecy. You *use* the questions to imply that Christ will be on David's throne after His second coming; you unfold what you believe to be a beautiful picture of the very materialistic kingdom which you and other premillennialists expect as did the Jews of the first century; and then you chide us for not being able to grasp this picture well enough to fellowship with you in spite of the fact that from our two positions "flow widely divergent views and doctrinal consequences." If *we* cannot know the fulfillment of the prophecies by the inspired statements of Peter in Acts 2 and Paul in Acts 13, and James in Acts 15 (as we have argued), how can you know them at all? If the prophets could not know them without fulfillment, how can you know them? Why didn't you answer, Brother Chambers? The readers will want to know *why*? Were you saving time and space? Was this too "*novel!*"

And, Brother Chambers, when you excitedly aver that "nothing in Paul's speech in Acts 13 . . . contradicts Acts 3:21," etc., you are not answering us. This is what we affirmed in the first installment. And in the same we showed how you make contradictions by your speculations on the prophecies. Until you deal with these (we suppose in another debate) you will not have proved otherwise.

Ezekiel 36, Jeremiah 30 & 31

When a man has a theory he can pretty easily lift verses from here and there and weave them into a fabric of respectability. But watch him! Sooner or later he will make some sweeping statements that within themselves completely overthrow the theorist. In stating his "fullness of the Gentiles" theory, our brother says Ezekiel 36:26, 27, and Jeremiah 30 are to be fulfilled at the end of the present *times of the Gentiles* when the Jews shall again possess their land. He goes into the "whole chapter" business, and this is where his trouble comes. Jer. 30 and Ezek. 36 go hand in hand in this fulfillment according to Brother Chambers. They are prophetic pictures of the restoration of Israel, and hence of events in association with the *second* coming of Christ, and the beginning of His reign on David's throne. Hence, with a wave of the wand we have whole chapters declared by Brother Chambers as seeking their fulfillment in the *second* coming of Christ, after the times of the Gentiles.

But, lo, read the first chapter of Jer. 31: "At the same time saith the Lord, will I be the God of all the families of Israel, and they shall be my people." AT THE SAME TIME of the events prophesied in chapter 30 (and hence, according to Brother Chambers, the events of Ezekiel 36) the events of Jer. 31 are to be fulfilled. Now read Jer. 31:15 which the Holy Spirit declares fulfilled in Matt. 2:17, 18, which you recognize to be the *first* coming of Christ. Then compare Jer. 31:31-33 and Heb. 8:6-12, for here is one of the prophecies we teach our children the earliest, for it is one of the clearest in its statement of fulfillment. This is the prophecy which Paul declares is fulfilled in the reign of our "high priest, who is set on the right hand of the Majesty in the heavens . . ." (Heb. 8:1), and this was to come to pass "at the same time" as the events of Jer. 30 and Ezek. 36. He is thus a "priest upon his throne" (Zech. 6:13) in fulfilling Jer. 31:31-33. If a "priest upon his throne" he sits and *rules* upon his throne, according to the same verse of Zechariah. Praise him! King of Kings, a priest forever . . . !

BROTHER CHAMBERS WANTS TO CHANGE FROM A DISCUSSION OF THRONES TO ONE OF TEMPLES. His first objection was (see his own words), that Christ is now on David's throne because He is on His Father's. We showed, and got his agreement, that it could be both. Now he changes to temples and wants to know if this would identify Solomon's temple as the Lord's in heaven. No, for there is no verse that says so. Verses say David's throne is God's. We read them. You agreed to them, and you won't face the conclusion. Your objection was completely eliminated.

"THAT WAITING ATTITUDE OF DISCIPLES EVERYWHERE CONTRADICTS," says Brother Chambers, any possibility of a thousand years between the admonitions of 1 Thes. 1:10; Phil.

3:20, etc., and the second coming. Sir, do you not know that it has been over 1900 *years* since these warnings were given? Did the Lord deceive these people? Did He not know it would be more than 1900 years before He would come? Do you consider these warnings less effective because 1900 years have gone by and He hasn't come? Do they mean less to you now—As you consider that He may not come for another 1900? Not so to us. We know that we are as close to His coming as to death, for beyond that, there shall not be a moment to make ready: Unless, some one has a second-chance theory he would like to prove in another debate, where there is more space!*

AGAIN 2 THESS. 2 AND REVELATION are connected with only assumptions and assertions. Brother Chambers, we just can't take your word for these things, as surely as some will, without investigating, and as much as we would like to get along with you, perfectly.

IT WILL BE INTERESTING FOR OUR READERS TO COMPARE Brother Chambers' assertion that everything in Revelation is prophetic from 4:1 to the end, with a careful study of Rev. 12:1-5.

MILLENNIAL HARBINGER AND FELLOWSHIP

Having already said that we would rather be right in God's sight and be judged a workman that need not be ashamed in handling his word than to have the fellowship of Brother Campbell or Brother Chambers, and having gotten no response from our space-saver, the new comment on Alexander Campbell needs no further review. But since this debate was to have included a two-way discussion of fellowship, and has been an almost one-way affair, our readers deserve a little further enlightenment. Premillennial churches in this area are honey-combed with liberalism. Brethren moving to Louisville should know that if they just go to a "Church of Christ" they may well sit at the feet of a preacher who has endorsed much of the typically sectarian preaching of Billy Graham. (Brother Chambers doggedly refuses to tell us if he endorses Graham, or the *brother-premillennialist* who endorsed Graham, or the statement of the *brother* who endorsed Graham.)

The same preacher and others fully fellowship several prominent members of their flocks who are members of these "Churches of Christ" on Baptist baptism, and who openly announce this to prospects for gospel obedience, and use their positions thus gained in premillennial churches to discourage Baptists from being baptized into Christ at other congregations. No clear lines are drawn between their practices and sectarianism. There is no singular identity maintained.

***Editor's Note:** We regard this statement not only as "new matter" introduced in the final negative contrary to all rules of logical controversy, but also as an unfair and damaging insinuation. We asked the negative to delete it but to no avail. Brother Chambers may wish to write on the line at another time, and if so, space is open to him in this journal. For the present, we have judged it best to close off the debate in the space originally agreed upon by those concerned.

As to a debate on the chance-after-death doctrine, we are not averse to it—provided, of course, we could represent or sponsor the negative side!

Those of us who believe that Christ is now fully reigning with all authority are told by some of these same preachers that we might as well believe that Christ was never raised from the dead; thus our faith is vain and we are yet in our sins.

Why mention all these facts of public record? Because we have shown from the beginning that when men reject a "thus saith the Lord", occupy positions that reflect on divine authority, and jeopardize the faith of Christians, it is a short road to modernism and sectarianism.

At the outset we stated the sense in which we believed Brother Chambers to be an "opponent". It stands to now that he desires fellowship without unity: That he has introduced Romans 14 as the only basis for unity, and then will not specifically tell us if the reign of Christ is in the same category with eating meats. We don't believe it is and showed why. Brother Chambers saved space—he did not reply.

WHERE ARE WE NOW? NO WHERE, *UNLESS* our readers will study for themselves. As yours truly, in Christ, and for truth, we stand ready to answer questions and study with any interested person.

It is our prayer that solemn heed will be given to the last word which the Bible must and will have.

