Treasury of Truth No. 118

DEC 19 1930
THEOLOGICAL SEMIN

How Russellism Subverts the Faith

BY R. J. REID

"If the foundations be destroyed,
what can the righteous do?"
(Ps. 11:3.)

LOIZEAUX BROTHERS, BIBLE TRUTH DEPOT
19 West 21st St., New York

BX8526
.R35

...: Western Book and Tract Co., 1730 Telegraph Avenue.
...inn.: J. H. Fleming, Bible Truth Depot, 111-6th St., So.
... Central Bible Book & Tract Co., 703 Fine Arts Building.
...a: Home Friend Office, 418 Church Street.
...ngland: William Blatchley, 27 Lancefield Street.
..., New Zealand: G. W. Plimsoll, 84 Manchester Street.
Sydney, N. S. W., Australia: Bible, Book & Tract Depot, 182 Elizabeth St.

Price: Twenty cents.

LIBRARY OF PRINCETON
12-19-30
THEOLOGICAL SEMINARY
BX8526
.R35

LIBRARY OF PRIN
DEC 19 19
THEOLOGICAL SE

HOW RUSSELLISM SUBVERTS THE FAITH

By R. J. REID



LIST OF SUBJECTS

How Russellism Subverts the Faith 1

How Russellism Subverts the Truth of the Deity of Christ 9

How Russellism Subverts the Truth of the Manhood of Christ 19

How Russellism Subverts the Truth of Everlasting Punishment 32

How Russellism Subverts the Truth of the Authority and Profit of Scripture . . . 50

How Russellism Subverts the Truth as to Conduct in the House of God 59

How Russellism

SUBVERTS THE FAITH

WHEN the Lord asked His disciples, "Whom do men say that I the Son of Man am?" it implied that they knew what sayings were current among the people about Himself, and their importance as referring to His Person. The same principle applies to-day. We should know what men are saying about Him now. Nor is this all; He greatly appreciates our confession of His Name, coming from hearts that have been taught of God; so He asks His own disciples, "Whom say *ye* that I am?" (Matt. 16 : 13–15). And how important is this, when Christendom abounds with systems of error about the Lord on whom our salvation depends!

In a class by itself stands that system of error known as *Russellism* or *Millennial Dawnism*, as set forth in six volumes, entitled "*Studies in the Scriptures*," of which the author is *C. T. Russell.* This system has several agencies of propaganda, as for instance: "*The People's Pulpit;*" "*Watch Tower Bible and Tract Society;*" "*International Bible Students' Association*," etc. It would seem

as if these divers names (for substantially the same thing) are intended to confuse the public as to its identity. Another has justly said, that when the title of the printed matter was changed from "Millennial Dawn" to "Studies in the Scriptures," the new title became an "*alias*," after the old had become identified.

To secure attention, this system employs a semi-Christian phraseology; it endeavors to speak the language of Canaan, although it cannot help doing so with a foreign accent. Nevertheless some are deceived by its "good words and fair speeches" (Rom. 16 : 18). Recently we met an old lady who had been attracted to it by its use of Christian hymns, such as—

> "On Christ the solid Rock I stand,
> All other ground is sinking sand!"

When asked how she would feel if it were proved to her that those with whom she consorted denied the eternal deity and present manhood of Christ, she said: "Oh, brother, do not say such things; I could have nothing to do with people who deny these truths; but those dear people do not hold the blasphemies you mention!" Alas! several have been turned from the "old paths" through lack of discernment, like this old lady. But remember that some who are not so easily deceived by appearances, may be partly to blame for defection of simple folk by permitting copies of "*Studies in the Scriptures*" to lie upon their tables or bookshelves, as

thousands do. What is this but a lack of sensitiveness as to the Christian's duty in regard to the truth?

Unlike those fairly sound creeds (which still show weakness on many points as to the truth) Russellism is *anti*-Christian. *It is false on every crucial issue.*

A few of its many errors may be briefly indicated before examining more fully those that give a special notoriety to the system.

Russellism denies that the Holy Spirit is a person. But God's word says: "The Spirit of God hath made me, and the breath of the Almighty hath given me light" (Job 33 : 4). Our Lord Jesus said, "When He, the Spirit of truth, is come, He will guide you into all truth; for He shall not speak of Himself, but whatsoever He shall hear, that shall He speak : and He will show you things to come. He shall glorify Me: for He shall receive of mine, and shall show it unto you" (Jno. 16 : 13, 14). He is everywhere present (Ps. 139: 7, 8); He can be grieved (Eph. 4: 30); Ananias and Sapphira lied to Him (Acts 5: 3, 4); He selected Barnabas and Saul to evangelize the nations (Acts 13 : 2).

Russellism limits the ransom Christ paid to mere physical death. It alleges that suffering was only incidental to the ransom. The judgment from God for our sins endured by our Saviour upon the cross has no place in it. The "curse" borne

by our Lord, the place of distance and crying, "My God, my God, why hast Thou for saken Me?" forms no part of Russellism's "ransom."

Russellism gives the ransom a merely human value. It argues that the life our blessed Lord laid down was only equal to ransoming *one* person, Adam; adding that as Adam was held accountable for the human race, when Jesus ransomed Adam, the race was included in the resulting benefits. It belies Paul's adoring words, "The Son of God, who loved me, and *gave Himself for me*" (Gal. 2 : 20). If its teaching were true, Paul should have said, The Son of God who gave Himself for *Adam.*

Russellism says the "little flock" becomes joint-sacrificers with Christ in atonement. It avers that "the price is not yet fully paid;" that "the atonement sacrifice will be finished" when every member of the little flock is made "a living sacrifice;" whilst Scripture declares that "without shedding of blood is no remission;" that "Christ was *once* offered to bear the sins of many," and that by that solitary sacrifice, offered once for all, atonement has been made.

Russellism denies that all the "justified" are saints. It says that only those who have attained to a high degree of devotedness are saints and compose the true church—the "little flock." But the apostle Paul calls the Corinthians "saints;" "sanctified;" "the Church of God;" "the temple of God;" "the body of Christ" (1 Cor. 1: 2;

3: 16; 12: 27), though he had much to reprove among them.

Russellism's "little flock" is a select class. Its "peculiar people" is an inner circle of believers —*themselves* of course — and not all believers taken from among Jews and Gentiles, set apart, sanctified, as God's own treasure, distinct from the world, as God's word throughout the Epistles teaches.

Russellism teaches that Adam had "eternal life" in his original state, and lost it when he fell, and that no one has it now. It says that that life is supported by material food; that in the millennium mankind will be tested as to their worthiness to receive it; that the majority will be approved as worthy, and a minority will be annihilated as unworthy. But our Lord Jesus Christ says: "He that believeth on Me *hath* everlasting life" (Jno. 6: 47)—has it *now.* "This is the record that God *hath* given to us eternal life." Having received the Son of God, the believer has life eternal—not independently, but he has it as having the Son: "He that hath the Son hath life; and he that hath not the Son of God, hath not life" (1 John 5: 11, 12). Christ is that Life; He is the *source* or fountain of eternal life, and apart from Him there is none. This life is characterized by the knowledge of the only true God and Jesus Christ whom He has sent (John 17: 3). Moreover He is the Bread of life—the One by whom we are nourished from day to day (Jno. 6: 35).

Russellism says the "little flock" raise themselves to a plane whereon they are begotten of God. Having degraded eternal life, it affirms that to be begotten of God is a blessing higher than eternal life, but that it stops short of "new birth," asserting that no one who is born again could die.

Russellism declares that in the resurrection, and not before, the approved will be "born again." This it avers is equivalent to receiving "immortality." It says that immortality implies self-existence, the possession of life as an independent source, and the ability to communicate it. It owns that only God had it at the outset, but says that Christ obtained it as a reward for dying, and that the "little flock" will also receive it for yielding itself up as a "living sacrifice." Thus this system, which denies the truth of the divine Trinity, has no difficulty about deifying the "little flock." It offers the reward of deity to its votaries.

Russellism says that Christ is now exclusively a spirit. The scripture it cites for this is: "The last Adam was made a life-giving Spirit" (1 Cor. 15: 45). But Scripture calls *man* (who has a "spirit, and soul, and body," 1 Thess. 5: 23) a living *soul.* He is thus distinguished from angels, who are exclusively *spirits.* Yet Scripture also speaks of man as a "spirit" in these words: "We have had fathers of our flesh which corrected us, and we gave them reverence: shall we not much

rather be in subjection unto the Father of *spirits*, and live?" (Heb. 12: 9). In this way is man distinguished from a lower creation, as by "soul" he is distinguished from a higher creation—man being of complex nature. Now, in resurrection, the Lord has taken the place of "last Adam"—the head of a new race, in which His unique glory is revealed as "a *life-giving* Spirit." This we can never be; for we shall ever be *dependent* creatures—ever dependent on Him, however blessed our portion. But never in Scripture is there a hint of manhood being given up—neither in our Lord nor in our case.

Russellism says that Christ in His pre-human state was a creature. It says He was the first and highest *creature* of God, and quotes: He is "the firstborn of every creature"—"the beginning of the creation of God" (Col. 1: 15; Rev. 3: 14), thus applying texts which refer to Christ since incarnation to the glorious uncreated Son of God our Creator! Nor do these texts refer to *time*, but to His dignity and headship. Thus as risen He is called firstborn "from among the dead" (Col. 1: 18), as the Head of a race after His order. Similarly Jehovah says, "Israel is my son, even my firstborn" (Ex. 4: 22); *i. e.*, head of the peoples of the earth.

Russellism says that Christ came to earth in 1874, and is now present upon it, although invisible; also that we are in the millennium. In the millennium!—the bloody fields of Europe have cried

out so loudly against this lie that comment is unnecessary in the year 1919.

We conclude these brief references to a few of the Russellite errors by saying that *its scheme of prophecy* is a mass of confusion, failing as it does to distinguish between the Church period and the prophetic times. For the Church, belonging to heaven and not to earth, forms a parenthesis in the course of prophecy. Prophecy relates to the earth, it has Israel as its centre; and the course of prophecy (interrupted by Messiah's rejection) will not be resumed till the Church has been translated to its heavenly home.

Let us now look more closely at the principal errors which the system in question strenuously labors to establish. *Why* it does so, we shall see.

The principal object of Russellism is the denial of the truth as to—

(1) **Everlasting Punishment.** And as the greatest barrier to this denial is—

(2) **The glory of Christ's Person ;** it seeks to lower Him. This it seeks to support by—

(3) **Nullifying those texts which expose its errors.** Finally it contends for—

(4) **Lawlessness without rebuke in the house of God.**

We shall examine these four errors. But let us begin with Russellism's effort to lower the glory of the Person of Christ.

HOW RUSSELLISM SUBVERTS THE TRUTH OF THE DEITY OF CHRIST

It says :

"Our Redeemer existed as a spirit-being before He was made flesh and dwelt among men. At that time, as well as subsequently, he was properly known as 'a god'—a mighty one. As chief of the angels and next to the Father, he was known as the Archangel (highest angel or messenger), whose name, Michael, signifies, 'Who as God,' or God's representative. As he was the highest of all Jehovah's creation, so also he was the first, the direct creation of God, the 'Only Begotten,' and then he, as Jehovah's representative, and in the exercise of Jehovah's power, and in his name, created all things,—angels, principalities and powers, as well as the earthly creation."—Vol. 5, p. 84.

Here we are told that the Lord Jesus was the only 'direct" creation of God, after which He became the Creator Himself, and God ceased to be the Creator directly.

However, if Genesis says, "In the beginning GOD created," etc., John says of the WORD, "*All things* were made by Him ; and without Him was not *anything* made that was made." Creatorship was not transferred from a first to a second Creator, but He who created at the outset, completed the work He began. He, the eternal Word, created "the anointed cherub," who became Satan (Ezek. 28 : 14) ; He created Michael the archangel, and all the angels; He created man ; He created *everything* that was

created. And there is grace in this, for as the Word, He it is that expresses God's mind. As someone has remarked, There is in the creation a hint of revelation to follow far greater than that evidenced in the things made. It intimates the desire of God to reveal Himself and to communicate His purposes. What a pledge that in the fulness of time God would manifest His love!

The eternal *Being*, the eternal *abode*, and the eternal *Deity* of the Word are affirmed in John 1: 1, "In the beginning *was* the Word, and the Word was *with* God, and the Word was *God*."

(1) "In the beginning was the Word." Yes! He is the eternal, self-existent One—"Who *is*, and who *was*, and who is *to come*, *the Almighty!*" (Rev. 1 : 8). He is the great I AM (Isa. 9 : 6).

(2) "The Word was *with* GOD." The word *Elohim* denotes plurality of persons. Hence, "In the beginning God (*Elohim*) created," describes the act of those Divine Persons subsequently revealed as the Father, the Son, and the Holy Spirit. But "while the noun '*Elohim*' is plural, the verb '*bara*' is singular. The action is one" (S. Ridout). And to this agrees Prov. 8, revealing the second person in the Trinity—*Wisdom*—in the unclouded communion ever subsisting between the Divine Persons

(3) And John delights to show that "The Word was *God*;" and he declares that it was *Christ's glory* that Isaiah saw when seraphim exclaimed,

"Holy, holy, holy, is Jehovah of hosts" (Isa. 6: 3; John 12 : 38–41), and that *He* is "the true God and eternal life" (1 John 5 : 20).

Russellism teaches that the Lord Jesus was "a god," subordinately so (as the printer's type suggests), in the sense, although in higher degree, in which Moses was "a god to Pharaoh" (Ex. 7 : 1). Again it says, He was the archangel Michael, chief of the angels—the highest angel or messenger. It was thus He was "a god." But see how Scripture destroys such evil teaching: "Yet Michael, the archangel, when contending with the devil he disputed about the body of Moses, durst not bring against him a railing accusation, but said, The Lord rebuke thee" (Jude 9). Not being set over the devil, the archangel did not presume to rebuke him, but committed this to the Lord who could both rebuke and command Satan, saying, "Get thee hence, Satan." Michael the archangel was therefore *not* the Lord. But to continue :

"We are told that our Lord, before he left his glory to become a man, was 'in a form of God'—a spiritual form, a spirit being; but since to be a ransom for mankind he had to be a man of the same nature as the sinner, whose substitute in death he was to become, it was necessary that his nature be changed. And Paul tells us that he took not the nature of angels, one step lower than his own, but that he came down two steps and took the nature of men—he became a man; he was made flesh—Heb. 2 : 16; Phil. 2 : 7, 8; John 1 : 14 . . . Notice that this teaches not only that angelic nature is not the

only order of spirit being, but that it is a lower nature than that of our Lord before he became man, and he was not then so high as he is now (Phil. 2 : 8, 9)."—Vol. 1, pp. 177, 178.

Having said that the Lord Jesus in His *pre*-human existence was the highest angel, Russellism now says that He had a higher, or super-angelic, nature. But what Scripture says of Him is this : "Who, being in the form of God, thought it not robbery to be equal with God: but made himself of no reputation, and took upon Him the form of a servant, and was made in the likeness of men" (Phil. 2: 6, 7). Being "over all, God blessed for ever" (Rom. 9: 5), He had the right to humble Himself thus. He considered not His divine place and glory a thing to be grasped or clutched at, but voluntarily humbled Himself. While His *Person* could not change, remaining ever "God over all," He could and did take a "servant's form," and "was made in the likeness of men." The Jews understood well His words when He said that "God was His Father." They said He made Himself "equal with God." What *infinite grace* such a humbling of Himself, and such a journey betokened! Ah, yes ; He passed the angels by, came down and became a man to bear our guilt upon the cross. Blessed be His name!

The following passage of Isaiah 40 : 9–11, "O Zion, . . . Behold your God ! Behold, the Lord God will come with strong hand, and his arm shall rule for Him : behold, his reward is with

Him, and his work before Him. He shall feed his flock like a shepherd: He shall gather the lambs with his arm, and carry them in his bosom, and shall gently lead those that are with young," is likewise subverted by Russellism, as follows:

"We are told that here surely is one passage in which our Redeemer is called by the great name of Jehovah. But we answer, No; he is here called the '*arm*' of Jehovah as in other places: the mighty arm of Jehovah 'shall *rule for* him,' until he shall have put down all authority and power opposed to Jehovah and his righteous law."—Vol. 5, pp. 46, 47.

This text, which speaks of Jehovah's "arm," speaks also of His "hand" and His "bosom." Will Russellism, which tells us that Jehovah's "arm" is a person, be consistent enough to say that His *hand* and *bosom* are persons also? By no means. Its interpretation therefore is but a subterfuge, and Isaiah 40 *does* teach that our Redeemer "is called by the great name of Jehovah." His coming "with strong hand" when "His arm shall rule for Him," teaches that He will then assert His rights by *force*, whereas today His power is used in blessing, as it is written: "Thou hast given Him power over all flesh, *that He should give eternal life* to as many as Thou hast given Him" (John 17: 2).

But again:

"We are asked to consider Isaiah's statement (8: 13, 14) as proof that the name Jehovah is properly applicable

to our Lord. It reads: 'Sanctify Jehovah of hosts himself; and let him be your fear, and let him be your dread.' The stress is laid upon the next verse, which without specifying *who* declares, "He shall be for a stone of stumbling and for a rock of offence to both the houses of Israel.' We cannot admit this as proof; for, quite to the contrary, the context shows a third party (besides Jehovah and the Prophet), even our Lord Jesus, who says, 'Bind up the testimony, seal the law among my disciples. And I will wait upon *Jehovah;* Behold I and the children which *Jehovah* hath given me' (Isa. 8 : 16–18; compare Heb. 2 ; 13."—Vol. 5, p. 49.

The contention here is, that while we believe that Isa. 8 speaks of Jehovah as a stumbling stone to the Jews, and Luke 20 : 17, 18 teaches that *Jesus* is that Stone (hence that He is Jehovah), Russellism asserts that the Stone in this passage is "a third party" who says, "I will wait upon" Jehovah, but not himself Jehovah. To consider this, let us take other examples.

In Dan. 7: 9–14 the prophet speaks thus : "I beheld, till the thrones were cast down [set], and the Ancient of Days did sit, whose garment was white as snow, and the hair of His head like the pure wool" (ver. 9). "I saw in the night visions, and, behold, one like *the Son of Man came* with the clouds of heaven, and came to the Ancient of Days" (ver. 14). Thus the Ancient of Days (the eternal God) is distinguished from the Son of Man, the Lord Jesus. According to Russellism's "third party" plea, this would prove that the Son of Man is not the Ancient of Days.

But the prophet continues: "I beheld, and the same horn made war with the saints, and prevailed against them; *until the Ancient of Days came.*" In the former passage, "the Son of Man came" to do what this latter passage says "the Ancient of Days" came to do. Hence, although distinguished in their respective glories, as Man and as God, they are one. And Rev. 1 : 13, 14 confirms this. For when John sees "One like unto the Son of Man," who says, "I am He that liveth, and was dead; and, behold, I am alive for evermore," he at once identifies Him as the Ancient of Days, thus: "*His head and His hairs were white like wool, as white as snow.*"

Take another example: "I give thee charge in the sight of God, who quickeneth all things, and before Christ Jesus, who before Pontius Pilate witnessed a good confession; that thou keep this commandment without spot, unrebukeable, until the appearing of our Lord Jesus Christ; which in His times He shall show who is the blessed and only Potentate, the King of kings, and Lord of lords; who only hath immortality, dwelling in the light which no man can approach unto; whom no man hath seen, nor can see: to whom be honor and power everlasting. Amen" (1 Tim. 6 : 13–16). Timothy is charged to keep the apostle's commandment until Christ's "appearing," when the King of kings "shall show" or manifest Him. Thus Christ Jesus is distinguished from the King of kings. Neverthe-

less when He who is "the Word of God" appears from heaven, He is identified as the King of kings (Rev. 19 : 11–16). The blessed Man whom "*every eye shall see*" shall then be manifested as "the blessed and only Potentate, the King of kings, and Lord of lords ; who only hath immortality, dwelling in the light which no man can approach unto ; *whom no man hath seen, nor can see.*"

It is therefore apparent that Russellism's plea that the Lord Jesus could not *be* Jehovah, because He would "wait upon" Jehovah, is as unfounded as would be the plea that the Son of Man could not *be* the Ancient of Days, because He "came to" the Ancient of Days ; or that He could not *be* the King of kings, because the King of kings "shall show" Him at His appearing.

Scripture presents the Lord Jesus as the dependent Man waiting upon Jehovah, and also declares He *is* Jehovah. It presents Him as coming to the Ancient of Days, and also says He *is* the Ancient of Days. It speaks of the King of kings showing Him, and also declares He *is* King of kings Himself—so true is it that in the inscrutable glory of His person "no man knoweth the Son but the Father" (Matt. 11 : 27).

But, once more, see with what boldness Russellism perverts the Word of God :

"'Bethlehem Ephratah, . . . out of thee shall he come forth unto me that is to be ruler in Israel ; whose goings forth have been *of old, from everlasting*' (Mic. 5 : 2).

These words we are asked to accept as proof that Jesus was Jehovah—from everlasting to everlasting—because Moses declared, '*Jehovah* . . . from everlasting to everlasting, thou art God' (Psa. 90: 1, 2). . . . What then is meant by the words of Mic. 5 : 2? We answer that they can well be understood thus: 'Whose goings forth have been [foretold] from of old, from everlasting.' "—Vol. 5, p. 45.

There is no pretense here that a correct translation calls for the word "foretold;" this system boldly interpolates it on its own responsibility. Tampering with the holy records, it adds to the words of God, notwithstanding the warning, "*Add thou not unto His words, lest He reprove thee, and thou be found a liar*" (Prov. 30 : 6). In this text God declares of His Son: "His goings forth *have been* from of old, from everlasting." Russellism replies: They were *foretold* from of old, from everlasting. God asserts the eternal being and activity of the Son. Russellism inserts a word to nullify that assertion. God says the smitten Sufferer of Calvary is Jehovah manifest in flesh. Russellism replies to Him, saying, It is not so. What ungodly effrontery!—and that to degrade the person of the Son!

We have seen then that every text appealed to by this system repudiates it, and insists that Jesus is Jehovah. Nor is this merely the teaching of the texts cited, it is the sense of *all* Scripture. There is legitimately no room in the universe for the denial of this. For if "All things were created *by* Him, and *for* Him" (Col. 1 : 16),

He is not only the Cause of the universe, but its Object of worship. Can it be conceived that the moral Centre of all things is merely a *creature?* Shall the Object of a redeemed creation's praise receive honors impossible to be rendered to God? Shall our hearts be conscious of a link with One who has personally won them to Himself as God has not? No, no! In rendering to the Lord Jesus the homage and praise due to our ever blessed and glorious Redeemer, it shall never be forgotten that that Redeemer is God Himself.

HOW RUSSELLISM SUBVERTS THE TRUTH OF THE MANHOOD OF CHRIST

We turn again to Mr. Russell's books, in which he says:

"We see that in Jesus there was no mixture of natures, but that twice he experienced a change of nature; first, from spiritual to human; afterward from human to the highest order of spiritual nature, the divine; and in each case the one was given up for the other."—Vol. 1, p. 180.

"It was absolutely necessary that he should be a man—neither more nor less than a perfect man."—Vol. 5, p. 95.

"Our Lord avers that he *existed* before Abraham. Nor do the Scriptures in any place intimate that the existence of the Only Begotten ever ceased from the time it began, as 'the beginning of the creation of God,' until it ceased at Calvary for three days; after which he was raised from the dead to die no more, death having never more dominion over him (Rom. 6: 9). The incident of his birth as a human being "a little lower than the angels," for the purpose of being man's sin-sacrifice, did not involve a death to the spirit-nature pending the birth as a human babe, but merely a transference of his life from a higher or spirit-nature to a lower or human nature. Hence, our Lord's words, 'Before Abraham was I *am*,' signify that there had been no cessation of his existence at any time in the interim, and positively identifies Jesus, the Son of God, in the flesh, with the *Logos*, the firstborn of all creation."—Vol. 5, p. 90.

"As the natural sleep, if sound, implies total unconsciousness, so with death, the figurative sleep; it is a period of absolute unconsciousness—more than that, it

is a period of absolute non-existence. . . . Our Lord's being or soul was non-existent during the period of death . . . The man Christ Jesus suffered for us death in the most absolute sense of the word—everlasting destruction . . . The *man* Jesus is dead, for ever dead." —Vol. 5, pp. 329, 362, 466, 454.

In a former chapter we have seen that Mr. Russell affirms that the Lord was "the Archangel" *before* He became flesh and "*subsequently.*" This implies that He was a man and the archangel also; it betrays confusion in the mind of its author, for his saying that He was "*a man neither more nor less*" cancels it. But this cancellation, although another error, is *the* error that represents Russellism in a way the first error does not.

In the extracts given above, Mr. Russell says of our Lord:

(1) He became a man "neither more nor less."

(2) The *life* He had as an angel was transferred from a non-angelic nature to a human nature.

(3) This transfer did not involve a death to the nature abandoned, but signified that as there had been no cessation of His existence in the interim, His identity with the *Logos* had been preserved.

(4) At Calvary, the existence whereby the identity had been preserved, ceased for three days, Christ having become non-existent for three days.

(5) Although no more than a man, as such He was destroyed forever.

In examining this, many absurdities will have to be passed over; we will look at but two of their principal doctrines.

First, that when Jesus died the existence which identified Him with the *Logos* ceased "for three days;" the identity thus being lost "for three days."

Second, that "the *man* Jesus" came to an end *for ever*, became non-existent for ever.

Non-existence for three days is the same as for ever, of course, for it means annihilation; and there can be no annihilation for three days. Russellism says that Jesus was *no more* than a man, and then adds that *as a man* He has been annihilated *for ever*. It teaches therefore the eternal annihilation of Christ.

However, this is denied—but only in terms of evasion. For instance, when Dr. Haldeman's paper, "Millennial Dawnism, or the blasphemous religion which teaches the annihilation of Jesus Christ" appeared, although its author was accused of misrepresentation, the accusers were careful to ignore the evidences which Dr. Haldeman had adduced in support of his charges. Seeing no answer to them, the present writer wrote to headquarters at Brooklyn, inquiring for anything on hand dealing with the Haldeman assertions. The answer received speaks for itself.

Sept. 18, 1916.

"As we do not have anything directly refuting the absurd statements of Dr. Haldeman about the teachings of

Pastor Russell we will send you a special edition of the *Watch Tower* and also some copies of the *B. S. Monthly*, the reading of which will show you that he does not teach the annihilation of Christ.

"*Dy. File K.*"

Thus does Russellism evade the evidence of its sin, and lodge its denial in general terms. The reason is evident. *It does teach the annihilation of Christ.* In fact it argues that death, whether inflicted upon Christ or upon any one, is always *annihilation.*

A pretense, however, is made that the force of this has been lessened so far as mankind is concerned (although *never* so far as Christ is concerned). Hence the sentence :

"The Adamic death has been turned, by reason of the divine plan and the ransom, from being a *destruction* to a *suspension* of existence, called sleep."—Vol. 5, p. 330.

But the hollowness of this pretense is shown in what follows with astonishing degree:

"Those who speak and write intelligently upon the subject (for instance the inspired Scripture writers), as if by common consent, speak of the unconscious interim between death and the resurrection morning, in which sensibility (sentient being) is suspended, as a '*sleep.*' This death-'sleep' is so absolutely a period of unconsciousness that the awakened ones will have no knowledge of the lapse of time. Indeed 'sleep' is merely an accommodated term, for really the dead are dead, utterly destroyed, except as God's wisdom preserves their identity, and has decreed through Christ their awakening,—their re-organization and resuscitation, and this indeed will be *re-creation* . . . With any power and wisdom less

than that of our Creator guaranteeing the resurrection, we might justly fear some break or slip by which the identity would be lost, . . . But . . . He who knows our very thoughts can reproduce them in the new brains . . . The identity of the individual will be preserved, by reason of his being awakened to exactly the same conditions which he lost in death."—Vol. 5, pp. 344, 346, 347, 343, 478.

Thus the death turned from destruction to sleep is *re*turned from sleep to destruction; and we are coolly told that what "inspired Scripture writers" said about "sleep" must be taken as an accommodation, but that "*really*" the dead are "*utterly destroyed.*" Even this is still worse confounded by the attached clause,—"*except* as God's wisdom preserves their identity." How it is preserved we shall see later, but for the present let this be clear;—Russellism says:

(1) At death man is utterly destroyed.

(2) By the divine plan and ransom this destruction has been turned to sleep.

(3) But this sleep is "really" *utter destruction.*

Surely this is the wandering of an abnormal mind!

But let us now consider Russellism's method of preserving *identity.* It assured us that the identity of Jesus with the *Logos* had been preserved by the continuity of His life from a pre-human existence. Now we are told it can be preserved by "*re-creation,*" to former conditions. In the "new brains" of the re-created being,

thoughts are reproduced which were in the *old* brains of the being who became absolutely non-existent. This is a *second* way of preserving identity.

There is, however, a *third* implied. For Russellism having shown that the second is by re-creation to former conditions, teaches that Christ was *not* re-created to former conditions but to new conditions as a spirit-being, higher than He was before He became man. Manifestly this implies a *third* way of preserving identity, a way that is not explained—we are thankful to say.

Alas, at what a loss is this speculation! The precious, well-known Christ, followed and loved down the ages, disappears for ever. And, solemn though it be to say so, If this cult has a Christ, it is a false one.

With what comfort then we return to the Scripture record of Christ's identity through every part of His journey from heaven to earth and from earth back to heaven. It declares that when He died He went to paradise (Luke 23 : 43). Precious thought! Russellism answers that "Christ was buried;" and devout men "carried Stephen to his burial;" that if Christ and Stephen were laid in the grave, they were nowhere else. Russellism is wilfully ignorant that in speaking of the burial of Christ or His witness Stephen, *Scripture speaks of their bodies.* It limits its language to the *subject* in hand. If the subject is the Lord's burial, *He* is *buried;* if the subject

is the unseen state, *He* is in *paradise.* In the former connection He is viewed in relation to the body; in the latter in relation to the soul. And that is why Scripture records that when the penitent thief died *he* went to paradise whither his Saviour had preceded him, and where He welcomed him. With no excuse, for himself, but self-condemnation, this man was the only one in that dark hour who justified Christ and looked to Him in faith. His eyes anointed to perceive the glory of the Sufferer at his side; beyond every present obstacle he looked to His righteous rule in the millennial age. He foresaw the King in the day of His manifestation taking the kingdom, and thus appealed: "Lord, remember me when Thou comest in thy kingdom!" And his gracious Saviour exceeded his request. He virtually said: You have looked on to the day of my manifestation in kingdom-glory and craved my compassion *then*, but I say unto thee, "*To-day shalt thou be with Me in paradise.*" This was no reference to the time when the Lord uttered the words (as Russellism alleges), but to the time when the thief would be "remembered." It was present grace for a needy suppliant.

And thus too was our precious Redeemer comforted in the hour of His unutterable sorrow; thus did He both sow and reap and rejoice in the work He loved so well to do; thus did He rescue from the very jaws of hell a sinner that seemed doomed beyond recall, bring-

ing him to paradise as a trophy of the Cross. How natural, how sweet and simple is the Bible evidence of the unbroken identity of the individual, whether it be that of our blessed Lord or of ordinary men and women. How different is its narrative of facts to the cold, far-fetched and contradictory speculations of Russellism.

But to proceed:

"God proposes the judgment of the church during this gospel age, for the prize of eternal spirit-being; and the judgment of the world during the Millennial age, for the prize of everlasting human perfection . . . God's plan of salvation for the general race of Adam is to extend to each member of it, during the Millennium, the *offer* of *eternal life* upon the terms of the New Covenant sealed for all with the precious blood of the Lamb . . . The offer will be "restitution" (Acts 3: 19-21) to life and health and perfection of *human* nature—the same that Adam possessed as the earthly image of God before his fall from grace into sin and death."—Vol. 5, pp. 408, 402.

Now let the cost of this be pondered. The man Christ Jesus becomes non-existent for ever, that Adam might be re-instated and re-produced in a race after his order. The man Christ Jesus must have no generation as such, so that Adam might be displayed in future ages in a generation derived from him!

Indeed, this is false and very wicked. Scripture negatives it at every approach. Scripture says believers have died in the death of Christ: "Ye are dead, and your life [*eternal life*] is hid with Christ in God" (Col. 3: 3). Again: "Know-

ing this, that our old man is crucified with Him, that the body of sin might be destroyed, that henceforth we should not serve sin. For he that is dead is freed [*justified*] from sin" (Rom. 6: 6, 7). "For in that He [Christ] died, He died unto sin once: but in that He liveth, He liveth unto God. Likewise reckon ye also yourselves to be dead indeed unto sin, but alive unto God through Jesus Christ our Lord" (Rom. 6: 10, 11). The believer is dead with Christ, and is called upon to reckon himself so. It is *in Christ* and not in Adam that *he lives* before God. Wherefore the Holy Spirit has been given to engage his heart with Christ, and form him in his ways according to that Pattern. To use typical language: the "oil" is put upon the *blood* and not upon the flesh (Exod. 29: 21); the gift of the Spirit involves the setting aside of what we were in Adam, in order that Christ might be reproduced in us.

Russellism may reply that it contemplates blessing according to Christ's pattern for the "faithful" of the church period, and that its Adamic resuscitation is future and millennial. But Christians will not be deceived by this. Right well do they know that God has not two kinds of salvation for the children of men. They know that whatever the scope of testimony in any given dispensation, Christ alone was, Christ alone is, and Christ alone shall be the salvation of God. All the redeemed of every age, what-

ever the character or measure of blessing, they derive it from the one Mediator between God and men, the Man Christ Jesus. God has not been working in a Church age according to the pattern of *Christ on a small scale*, while contemplating work in the Millennium according to the pattern of *Adam on a large scale*. Oh, how Russellism serves Satan's purpose to diminish the glory of the Man Christ Jesus! Its volumes pursue the subject to a nicety to leave no room in God's eternal purpose for the Man Christ Jesus.

But even this is not enough: it must be *brutal* as well. Hence, speaking of the Lord's body, it says:

"We know nothing about what became of it . . . Whether it was dissolved in gases . . . no one knows." —Vol. 2, p. 155.

In this way does the loveless system from Allegheny, Pa., express its innermost feelings, with no pretense of argument. Devoid of those safeguarding instincts which would insure a measure of reverent language, Russellism cannot restrain an underlying Satanic hatred of the true Christ—the Christ of God. Like the second Beast of Rev. 13 (which had an *appearance* of Christ, having "horns like a lamb," it betrays its diabolical character when delivering its message,—"he spake as a dragon"), so does this evil society betray its foreign accent while attempting to speak the language of Canaan. How estranged must they be who *could* thus speak of

the body of Christ—that body which God had prepared for Him; the only human body in which the will of God was perfectly carried out; the temple of God—that holy shrine whence shone the light of God in a dark world.

But we turn to Scripture, in which every page, whether in Old or New Testaments, points to the *Man* Christ Jesus. Even Adam was "the figure of Him that was to come" (Rom. 5 : 14).

Christ is the Man of God's Purpose

The "Second Man," Christ, is revealed in contrast with the "first man," Adam. The first "is of the earth, earthy;" the second is "out of heaven" (1 Cor. 15 : 47, *N. T.*). And although Mr. Russell explains this latter to mean the future appearing of Christ from heaven, it is manifestly a contrast between Adam and Christ *in their origin and nature.*

The "Last Adam" is revealed as superseding the first forever; He is the *last.* There shall be none other. As such, He is a life-giving Spirit —the blessed Man of God's delight, who communicates spiritual life to a race derived from Him. And although the recipients of this life continue their pathway here in their natural decaying bodies, and die as do the unregenerate, the life they have in Christ Jesus is beyond the reach of death, and should give character to their life here on earth.

The Last Adam is a victor. He is the true

David returned from conflict and bearing the proof of victory. Man lay under the penalty of death, but now God has *a Man in resurrection* in the power of an endless life. This is the great triumph of God over the forces of evil. It provides a basis unreachable by death whereon He places those who submit to the gospel. "For since by man came death, *by Man* came also the resurrection of [from among] the dead" (1 Cor. 15 : 21).

The Agents active in the resurrection of Christ were the Father, the Son, and the Spirit (Rom. 6 : 4 ; John 2 : 19 ; 1 Pet. 3 : 18). Note how specific are the words of Christ : "Destroy this temple, and in three days I will raise IT up,"—that body of "flesh and bones" from which the precious blood had flowed, for "without *shedding of blood* is no remission." Therefore Christ's body in resurrection is the witness of accomplished redemption. Hence His words: "Handle Me, and see, for a spirit hath not flesh and bones, as ye see Me have" (Luke 24 : 39), dispelled forever the infidel assumption of the disciples that in resurrection He was merely a spirit impersonating a man.

This same testimony is rendered through the apostles by the Holy Spirit come from heaven. Listen : "*This Man*, after He had offered one sacrifice for sins for ever, sat down on the right hand of God" (Heb. 10 : 12). Consequently He is the Way of blessing—"*Through this Man* is

preached unto you the forgiveness of sins" (Acts 13: 38). Moreover, by and by God "will judge the world in righteousness *by that Man*" (Acts 17: 31).

He it is too who, after the millennial reign, shall deliver up the kingdom to God, even the Father, and take forever the place of subjection in the manhood He retains; "that God (the Father, the Son, and the Spirit) may be all in all." God will be "all" as the Object of universal worship; and "in all" as having His place in the affections of a redeemed creation. And the One who will bring matters to such an issue will be the Man who shall exemplify in Himself and in the race derived from Him, the place proper to man and the glory due to God (1 Cor. 15 : 24–28).

HOW RUSSELLISM SUBVERTS THE TRUTH OF EVERLASTING PUNISHMENT

Russellism says :

"The meaning of the Hebrew *sheol* (*hades* is its Greek equivalent) can scarcely be expressed by any one English word : it signifies *hidden*, or *extinguished*, or *obscure*—the condition or state of death : it is not a place but a condition, and perhaps the word *oblivion* would more nearly than any other in our language correspond with the word *sheol* of the Hebrew and *hades* of the Greek."—Vol. 5, p. 354.

In examining this appeal to Hebrew and Greek, made by Russell, *preparatory to a denial of everlasting punishment*, the present writer, only knowing as much of these languages as Mr. Russell—which is nothing—will have to furnish a point of contact by agreeing to the three meanings given *sheol* or *hades*. As to the conclusions based upon them, that is another matter.

What then has been concluded as to

Sheol or Hades ?

Well, we are told that it signifies "hidden, or extinguished, or obscure—the condition or state of death."

And what is death ?

Russellism always says that "Death is the condition of absolute non-existence."

How was this determined? Has some proof been furnished?

Not at all! We are merely *told* it is "the condition or state of death."

But to return. It says that *sheol* or *hades* signify "hidden, or extinguished, or obscure." Be it so. But what does "hidden" mean? Heretofore a thing hidden was considered *out of view.* Thus if a person was referred to as in *hades*, he was said to be where his former associates on earth saw him no longer. It was said: *He is in the unseen state.* But this is what Russellism denies. It says he is "non-existent."

As to *extinguished*,—it signified that that which gave light or heat had ceased to do so. Hence if a person was referred to, it would be said: How hath the candle of the wicked been put out! or, What a burning and shining light he was!

Obscure signified something dim or faintly perceived. And such a word aptly describes sheol or hades. Indeed there was but One who could draw aside the curtain and disclose to view the unseen state (Luke 16).

It appears, then, that the word "*oblivion*" deduced from "hidden, or extinguished, or obscure" cannot be made to mean non-existent, and the attempt to make it do so completely breaks down. The old meaning of sheol or hades therefore remains; namely, "*the unseen state.*"

We may now consider Russellism's appeal to Scripture on the subject of

Everlasting Destruction

"'Fear not them which kill the body but are not able to kill the soul . . . but fear him that can destroy both body and soul in Gehenna' (Matt. 10: 28). Here the power of God to destroy the soul is positively asserted, and that by an unquestionable authority. We are aware that a crooked theology has sought to wrest the Scriptures, and therefore asserts that this signifies that God is able to *destroy the happiness* of the soul in Gehenna, but that he is unable to destroy the soul itself. We reply . . . that the word 'gehenna' here used signifies 'the Second Death,' utter destruction—to all souls which will not hear God's great Prophet."—Vol. 5, pp. 332, 333.

But, reader, consider what the text says: If men kill the body, they cannot kill the soul. This would be untrue if the soul dies when men kill the body, as Russellism teaches; for in that case the slayer of the body is the slayer of the soul as well. But Scripture, rejecting the idea of the soul's death, changes the word from "kill" to "destroy," saying: God "can *destroy* both body and soul in Gehenna." The word for "destroy" is also rendered "perish," "lost," "marred." "No man putteth new wine into old bottles: else the new wine doth burst the bottles, and the wine is spilled, and the bottles will be *marred*" (Mark 2: 22). As F. W. Grant has well said: "The bottles are destroyed *for the purpose for which they were originally destined*; and so is man, whether as the subject of the first death or of the second. In either case he is set aside from the place for which he was originally created; in

the first death, temporarily; in the second, eternally. But the bottles exist, though 'destroyed:' they do not cease to be; neither does man. This is the Biblical force of destruction." Wherefore we read: "If thou wilt not hearken unto the voice of the Lord . . . the Lord shall send upon thee cursing, . . *until thou be destroyed*" (Deut. 28: 15–20, 61, 62). "And it shall come to pass, when all these things are come upon thee, . . . and thou shalt call them to mind . . . and shalt return . . . and shalt obey . . . that then the Lord thy God will turn thy *captivity*" (Deut. 30: 1–3).

In all this how evident it is that destruction is *ruin.* A prosperous people are reduced to pitiable straits in captivity: *they are destroyed.* Yet upon repentance they are recovered.

To this it may be objected that whereas the destruction referred to in these texts is merely temporal, that under consideration is *eternal.* True; but in either case the thought in "destruction" is the same, be the duration for a limited period or for eternity. In the former, opportunity to repent is given; in the latter it is *eternal* ruin.

None realized better than the martyrs that when men killed the body, the soul still lived. Hear the testimony of George Wishart: "For the word's sake and true gospel, I suffer this day by men, not sorrowfully, but with a glad heart and mind. For this cause I was sent, that I should suffer this fire for Christ's sake . . . This

grim fire I fear not. And so I pray you . . . not to fear them that slay the body, and afterward have no power to slay the soul. . . I know surely, and my faith is such, that my soul shall sup with my Saviour this night." The apostle Paul, similarly, desires "to depart, and to be with Christ, which is *far better*" than remaining here (Phil. 1: 23). And although unselfishly he elects to remain for the sake of the Church, he avers that "to be with Christ" is a great increase in the blessedness which he already enjoyed upon earth. Did he delight in Christ here? He would delight in Him far more there. Was he refreshed by the love of Christ here? He would drink more deeply of that fountain "in Immanuel's land." Was communion with God his portion in this life? When he would "depart" he would enjoy it to the full. Altogether his portion would be "far better." But Russellism is a stranger to this and its blessedness. Instead, it consoles the ungodly with an assurance of *extinction*. No apostle, no early Christian, no suffering witness for Christ ever believed that those who killed the body could close their intercourse with God by ushering them into non-existence. Russellism does!

But some may ask: Why is Russellism so anxious to prove that death is "a state of non-existence," an "everlasting destruction"? The answer is: It is to prove *its denial of everlasting punishment*. So it annihilates all who die,

even Christ. If it could prove that death is a state of non-existence the doctrine of endless woe must be false. For what "fearful looking for of judgment and fiery indignation which shall devour the adversaries" can subsist alongside this theory? What tyrant, degenerate, or blasphemer will tremble at the prospect of *non-existence?*

A sort of saving clause is however introduced. Death, they say, when inflicted "the first time" is but until the "*re-creation;*" and only when inflicted "the second time" is it without promise of re-creation. Meanwhile we are expected to forget that (according to Russellism), whether inflicted the first or second time, *the thing inflicted is the same*, namely "everlasting destruction," said to be "absolute non-existence."

We quote from another as follows:

"But it is perfectly in place here that I should ask those of you who have logical minds to tell me how it is that those who die the *first* time—all who die now—and are everlastingly destroyed—how they can come to life again, and again be everlastingly destroyed?

"If they suffer everlasting destruction the *second* time, I am sure it must be plain even to a little child that they do not actually suffer *everlasting* destruction the first time; and if they do not suffer *everlasting* destruction the first time, when they were *said* to be everlastingly destroyed, how can we be sure that the everlasting destruction the second time is everlasting

destruction at all? Who can be sure that those who have been *twice everlastingly destroyed* may not come to life again to go through *an everlasting destruction* for the third time; and who can be assured that this possible third everlasting destruction may be able to *keep them destroyed?* If the first everlasting destruction does not destroy, as Russellism by its *second* everlasting destruction proves it does not, what guaranty is there that Russellism's everlasting destruction destroys at all — even the first time"— (*I. M. Haldeman*).

The Unseen State Unveiled by Christ

As to the narrative in Luke 16 concerning the rich man and Lazarus, Russellism says:

"To regard it as a literal statement involves several absurdities, for instance, that the rich man went to 'hell' because he had enjoyed many earthly blessings and gave nothing but crumbs to Lazarus. Not a word is said about his wickedness. Again, Lazarus was blessed, not because he was a sincere child of God, full of faith and trust, not because he was good, but simply because he was *poor and sick.*"—"*What say the Scriptures about hell?*" —p. 37.

This is an error. No tale takes up *every* aspect of truth relating to its characters, but only those necessary to its moral, and the moral of Luke 16 is not the wickedness of the rich nor the goodness of the poor. But as the Pharisees who were present had derided the Lord's teaching because they "were covetous," the narrative deals

with *covetousness and its consequences:* it being assumed that this consists in an unjust retention of one's possessions; not merely in the desire to possess.

The Lord had likened man to a steward entrusted with "goods" for which he will be held accountable. If he uses them (whatever they may be) in view of a day of reckoning, all will be well; but if he does not, disaster will overtake him. Thus it is apparent that the charge of absurdity in a literal interpretation of this part of the tale is based upon failure to read the context.

But the rich man had not only lived covetously, *he had ignored the tesitmony of Scripture.* Consequently when he asked Abraham to send Lazarus to warn his five brethren, he is reminded, "They have Moses and the prophets; let them hear them." In contrast with the rich man, however, Lazarus (already a national son) had become one of Abraham's *spiritual* children (Gal. 3: 7). For Abraham is called "the father of all them that believe" (Rom. 4: 11). Evidently then, Lazarus had *heard* Moses and the prophets. Therefore what more suitable place for him than his father's bosom, and what apter description of his spiritual relationship?

Nevertheless Russellism reminds us:

"Again, the coveted place of favor is 'Abraham's bosom,' and if the whole statement be literal, the *bosom* must also be literal, and it surely would not hold very

many of earth's millions of sick and poor."—"*What say the Scriptures about hell?*"—pp. 37, 38.

But it is owned that Luke 16 contains figurative language. What is denied is that on this account *the narrative* cannot be literal. An illustration will show why.

"James Benson having read some fiction of the sea disappeared from home three weeks ago. But one voyage of sea-faring life was enough for James. It seems that Captain Strong's discipline so filled his cup of misery that he concluded, "There is no place like home!" It was therefore a penitent youth who appeared at the old home last evening, and who was welcomed back to the bosom of his family." Now, no one supposes that the "cup of misery" or the "bosom of his family" is a literal cup or bosom. But is the tale therefore not literal? Surely it is evident that the ship, the captain, the youth, etc. *are* literal. Similarly, the notion that Luke 16 cannot be literal, because it contains figurative language, falls to the ground.

But again:

"The thought would not be, that a spirit finger would take a drop of literal water to cool a literal tongue."—*The Bible Students' Monthly*, Vol. 6: No. 11.

Quite true. For Scripture precludes the idea of the *body* being in hades, and therefore shows that literal water and a literal tongue are not intended. But it does speak of *a man suffering in*

hades. When the Lord says: A certain man went to hades, and suffered there, we know that to hades he went and suffered. He did not go *bodily*, it is true, but he went nevertheless. He did not *suffer* bodily in hades, for his body lay in the grave, but *he suffered* there, none the less. The *Lord* says so.

In its extremity to rid itself of this passage, Russellism seeks to explain that the suffering described is merely figurative of the *temporal* suffering of the Jews since the fall of Jerusalem.

It says:

"The Lord wished to show that great sufferings or torments would be added to the Jews as a nation *after* their national dissolution and burial, and that they would plead in vain for release at the hand of the formerly despised Gentiles."—"*What say the Scriptures about hell?*"—p. 40.

But if so, why speak of such sufferings *in hades?* Has not Russellism declared there is no room for the idea of suffering of *any* sort in hades? Therefore its explanation of *these* sufferings (although false) is a complete surrender of the claim that hades is the "state of non-existence."

We return therefore to the Lord's presentation of conditions in the unseen state. From it we receive the impression that the impenitent are already tormented in hades. Some may not have been clear as to what was figurative and what was literal, but all *did* receive a whole-

some impression from the Lord's words; coming down the ages the impression so imprinted itself upon the conscience and mind that Mr. Russell testifies that for nineteen centuries nothing appeared that could alter it. His words are :

"We have never seen any lucid interpretation except that which we now present."—*The Bible Students' Monthly*, Vol. 6, No. 11.

That is to say, the impression which has solemnized myriads and turned their attention to divine realities, which has turned many from their wicked ways, has retained its hold upon the serious-minded, and has never been offset until Russellism came with a lucid explanation to show that the impression received had been wrong! In other words: Those who received a wrong impression from the figurative language of the Lord, will have that impression removed by the literal language of Mr. Russell! Wherefore he tells us that the rich man's appeal for a drop of water to cool his tongue was fulfilled in the following way:

"The fulfilment came when the Jews of this country in a general petition requested the President of the United States to co-operate with other 'Christian nations,' and intercede on behalf of their members in Russia that they might have more liberty and less persecution, that their torments might be cooled."—*The Bible Students' Monthly*, Vol. 6, No. 11.

But the Bible says it is *the tormented man* who

intercedes for his *non*-tormented brethren. Russellism interprets this as the political pressure of comfortable American Jews on behalf of tormented Russian Jews. Nor is this all. It puts the President of this country in Abraham's place, and in his mouth the most hopeless message that ever fell on human ears. Is there a record in Washington of this crushing refusal to the agonizing appeal of those unfortunate people? Yet this is the foolish explanation Russellism gives of Luke 16 : 23–31.

We think it must be apparent to all that Mr. Russell's interpretation is far from "lucid;" that in fact it is that of a trifler. And it is to be hoped that precious souls will turn resolutely from his fables to the words of Him who cannot lie.

The Eternal Issue

Seeing that the earth was made for man (Ps. 115 : 16), death demonstrates that he has forfeited the right to remain upon it. But if he cannot remain upon the earth, his unfitness for heaven is solemnly implied. Hence Scripture shows that death is not the *whole* penalty of sin, saying: "It is appointed unto men once to die, but *after this* the judgment" (Heb. 9: 27). Judgment therefore, in this connection, is neither probation nor regular administration. It is God's "strange work" (Isa. 28: 21), which, though a necessity, affords Him no pleasure.

But before considering the final judgment we will look at a sentence of Russell as to the sin-penalty. He says:

"The penalty is *death*, not *dying;* and death is the absence of life, destruction."—Vol. 5, p. 465.

Of course every Christian knows that the penalty for sin is death, not dying; but when Russellism adds its own idea as to death being "destruction" (which it always says means *annihilation*), the Christian replies: "The wages of sin is death," but *death is not annihilation!*

Let us ask however: Does anyone say that death means "*dying?*"—Yes.

Who? Mr. C. T. Russell.

What!—It may seem incredible, but read on:

"'Death and *hell* (*hades, oblivion*) delivered up the dead which were in them: and they were judged, every man according to their works' (Rev. 20: 13) . . . This scripture shows us that at the proper time not only will the dead (those under sentence of death, who have not yet gone into the tomb) be granted a full trial or judgment, to determine their worthiness or unworthiness of life everlasting, but also all of those who have gone into *sheol* (*hades, oblivion*), shall also come forth from unconsciousness, from the sleep of death to be judged. This scene of judgment is located in the millennial age, which is the 'day of judgment' for the world, as the Gospel age is the day of judgment for the church."—Vol. 5, p. 379.

If the amazed reader now asks, Why does Russellism deny the literalness of "death" in

our text? let him know that that system always perverts those texts which expose its fallacies.

It had maintained that the *dead* are non-existent; also that *hades* is the state of death. It had labored much to show that death and hades are identical, seeing there can be no difference between nothingness and nothingness. But when Rev. 20 : 13, 14 makes a distinction, saying : "Death *and* hades delivered up the dead which were in *them*," and it begins to appear that the Christian view is correct — that "death" is the condition of bodies without souls, and "hades" the condition of souls without bodies—Russellism is compelled to admit there is a distinction that needs to be explained.

And how does it explain? It changes death to *dying*. It says the dead (of Rev. 20) are those under sentence of death "who have not yet gone into the tomb."

Again and again it has employed a catch-phrase insinuating that the refusal of its non-existence shibboleth was a denial of the reality of death. "The dead are really dead!" was the catch-phrase. But when it suited its purpose it was quite prepared to change death to "*dying*," and that in a text that admits of no such interpretation. For if death can be changed into dying in the passage, *hades* is equally subject to change; but hades is interpreted literally, and only death is spiritualized. Why this arbitrariness? There is but one answer : Russellism

evades an encounter with a text that exposes its central error, and it does so by spiritualizing one half of the text, and leaving the other half to be taken literally.

In this way does Millennial Dawnism prove kinship with the strange woman of Prov. 5 : 6—"Lest thou shouldest ponder the path of life, *her ways are moveable*, that thou canst not know them." Verily it is time that *we* reply: "The dead are really dead!" The dead of Rev. 20 are not the dying who are alive, but *the dead who are really dead!*

But it is desirable we should understand the main features of Rev. 20. Let us note, then, that in 19: 11–21 John declares he saw the King of kings consign "the beast and the false prophet" to the lake of fire. Whereupon chap. 20 opens with a description of Satan's confinement in "the bottomless pit" during the millennium. Meanwhile the impenitent dead are *not* raised, and so far as they are concerned, Mr. Russell's millennial probation is a myth. For "*The rest of the dead lived not again until the thousand years were finished*" (vers. 5, 6). Only those who have part in "the first resurrection" reign with Christ during the millennium; whereas "the rest of the dead" *remain dead* until the great white throne is set up a thousand years later.

But "when the thousand years are expired, Satan shall be loosed out of his prison," and be permitted to test the loyalty of the human race

to its King at the end of that period, to manifest those who merely *feign* obedience to Him. Much will come to light at this test. The question whether *man* is blameable for his condition will then be conclusively settled. For how often has his continuance in sin been excused by his environment! How often has it been said that nothing could be more unjust than to punish poor creatures who have led such a precarious existence, and are only lawless because unenlightened. It is accounted a small matter that man was tested by perfect goodness in Christ—whom he crucified; and it is forgotten that it is in the sphere where the gospel testimony by the Holy Spirit has gone forth, that man's opposition is most pronounced.

However, vast multitudes are going to be tested in an environment of an unparalleled time of rest and prosperity through a thousand years of Christ's rule. The test then will be : *Are there any who wish to renounce allegiance to Him?*

Satan therefore is permitted to come upon the earth; his practised eye discovers its disaffected units, consolidates them, and fans their discontent into revolt. All pretense of submission is then thrown off. The good Administrator of the only long-lived era of peace and prosperity which this sin-blighted world ever saw, is repudiated, and the devil is hailed as a deliverer from His yoke! A vast army flocks to his standard with intent to crush the loyal. "And they

went up on the breadth of the earth, and compassed the camp of the saints about, and the beloved city: and fire came down from God out of heaven, and devoured them. And the devil that deceived them was cast into the lake of fire and brimstone, where the beast and the false prophet are, and shall be tormented day and night for ever and ever" (Rev. 20: 9, 10).

Thus is he finally cast, at the close of the millennium, where the beast and the false prophet were cast ere it began, and where they still *are* when Satan enters upon his eternal doom.

Subsequently, the Great White Throne comes into view. Hence it is evident this scene of judgment is not a probation, neither is it "located in the millennial age"—it is final. Evidence is adduced and punishment awarded. It takes place *after* the millennium, *after* a subsequent revolt is quelled, *after* the earth and the heavens have fled away, when every book of evidence is complete: it ushers in eternity.

The throne is *white*, signifying the purity of Him who is "of purer eyes than to behold evil" (Hab. 1: 13)—the God who is light. It expresses the character of the Judge, in whose light everything is perfectly manifested.

The impenitent dead are now raised in their bodies. *They are no longer disembodied.* Death and hades have yielded them up, and they are judged according to "the things done in the body." It is in contrast with "the resurrection of

life" that this resurrection is called "*the resurrection of judgment*" (John 5: 29, *N. T.*). The guilty "stand before God," and Scripture tells us it is God *the Son* who judges them: "For the Father judgeth no man, but hath committed all judgment unto the Son, that all men should honor the Son, even as they honor the Father" (John 5: 23). This implies that by incarnation the Son had become liable to the denial of His personal glory as God, in a way the Father had not; hence He is given the place of exclusive Judge.

Death and hades are cast into the *Lake of Fire* —those provisional time-conditions give place to a fixed eternal one. Those on trial are convicted on positive and negative evidence: their *works* comprising the former, the *absence* of their names from the book of life the latter. Hence none who appear there are exempted from condemnation. All who hear the sentence are "cast into the lake of fire" (Rev. 20 : 15).

What a doom! It is eternal! It is "*for ever and ever!*" (ver. 10). It is co-existent in duration with the life of God (4 : 9); it is *eternal banishment from God, and eternal confinement by God.* He will not permit the corrupt to extend the corruption. Sin *was* permitted *here;* but God's sentence declares that He will *not* permit evil *in the eternal abode of the redeemed.* He will protect the redeemed creation by confining within strict limits all evil workers.

HOW RUSSELLISM SUBVERTS THE TRUTH OF

THE AUTHORITY AND PROFIT OF SCRIPTURE

Mr. Russell makes the following assertions:

(1) Scripture has been given in some instances to conceal the truth until he came to reveal it.

(2) It is dangerous to read Scripture apart from his six volumes of interpretation.

(3) Its ordinarily received translations are unreliable.

We will now consider

THE FIRST ASSERTION

"There are some statements in Scripture with reference to the manner of the Lord's return and appearing which, until critically examined, appear to be contradictory of each other. And no doubt they have for centuries served the Divine purpose of concealing the truth until the due time for it to be understood: and even then, from all except the special class of consecrated ones for whom it was intended."—Vol. 3, p. 142.

The apostle John, however, says: "Let that therefore abide in you *which ye have heard from the beginning*. If that which ye have heard from the beginning remain in you, ye also shall continue in the Son, and in the Father" (1 John 2: 24). Were those thus addressed mistaken in

supposing they had heard the truth from the outset? Was John himself aware that some of it was purposely concealed until "the due time" for its revelation to a special class eighteen centuries later? Or when we read in "the Revelation" thus: "Blessed is he that readeth, and they that hear the words of this prophecy, and keep those things which are written therein: for the time is at hand" (Rev. 1: 3), was there, after all, a *concealment* of the truth in the name of revelation? Russellism is bold enough to affirm it! For, speaking of the Revelation, it says:

"Nor has that book ever been, until *now*, all that its name implies—an unfolding, a Revelation."—Vol. 1, p. 27.

It deems such an assertion necessary in order to prepare its readers for a plan framed to divert them from the Bible to its six volumes. Meanwhile some Russell adherents taking alarm made an effort to save themselves in the following way:

"In the issue of the 'Watch Tower' for Sept. 15, 1909, Pastor Russell has personally set forth the view that he alone is 'that servant' referred to in Matt. 24: 45–47; Lk. 12: 42–44. Long before that view was publicly indorsed by him, thousands of 'Watch Tower' readers asserted that it was true, and made it a test of fellowship among themselves, including, we deeply regret to say, some of us whose signatures are attached to this letter.

"Pastor Russell has, through the 'Watch Tower,' and in answer to questions at meetings of the Tabernacle congregations, expressed his disapproval of meetings held for Bible study unless such study was in connec-

tion with those works of which he is the author or editor, and has stated that 'he doubted whether much good had ever been derived from all the independent Bible study undertaken in the past.' When a request was made at the opening of the Brooklyn Tabernacle, before the entire congregation of 300, that a Bible study meeting long previously in existence in Brooklyn should be continued under the auspices of the Tabernacle, the unfavorable remarks made concerning such meetings by the Pastor resulted in the request being denied, only 17 out of the entire number present voting to uphold the principle we all, including Pastor Russell, have stood for in the past."

Let us re-capitulate. Some members of "the household" complain that the "meat" supplied is tainted; that there seems a disposition to distrust the Word of God in Russellite headquarters. They do their best to make room for it,—and fail in the attempt. Then they issue a statement describing how matters stand. There is restraint in its tone, there is a note of sorrow or of pleading in it, there seems to be even a hint of self-judgment in it. But *the incident is closed.* And if there are any who still feel inclined to go directly to the Book, they must understand that this is denied them. "*That servant*" says so.

The evil in all this is, if possible, intensified in

THE SECOND ASSERTION

"If the six volumes of 'Scripture Studies' are practically the Bible, topically arranged, with Bible proof-text given, we might not improperly name the volumes, 'The Bible in an arranged form.' That is to say, they are not merely comments on the Bible, but they are practically

the Bible itself . . . Furthermore, not only do we find that people cannot see the divine plan in studying the Bible by itself, but we see also that if anyone lays them aside and ignores them and goes to the Bible alone, though he has understood his Bible for ten years, our experience shows that within two years he goes into darkness. On the other hand, if he had merely read the 'Scripture Studies' with their references and had not read a page of the Bible as such, he would be in the light at the end of the two years, because he would have the light of the Scriptures."—*Watch Tower*, Sept. 15, 1910.

One may well wonder after this why the author of such language so strongly condemns the Pope for saying: "I claim to be the Supreme Judge and Director of the conscience of men, . . . I am the sole, last, Supreme Judge of what is right and wrong;" when he makes a similar claim himself. For who does not know that the Pope recommends the reading of the Bible, *provided its readers accept that interpretation of it which he guarantees.* Once recognize *that*, and you are wished God-speed in the reading of the Bible—yes! by the Pope.

But Mr. Russell insists upon the recognition of *his six volumes* in preference to "the Bible as such," affirming that if you refuse them this recognition and read the Bible instead, you will go into darkness even had you been in the light for ten years previously! After pretending a direct appeal to Scripture—until his creed was formulated and fixed, he now binds his adherents to that creed, adding that its readers will

remain in the light even if they read not a page of the Bible as such.

This reminds us of what J. H. Newman relates in his "*Apologia*" that when an Anglican he became indebted to Dr. Hawkins for having taught him "the doctrine of tradition : . . . that the sacred text was never intended to teach doctrine, but only to prove it, and that, if we would learn doctrine, we must have recourse to the formularies of the Church ; . . . after learning from them the doctrine of Christianity, the enquirer must verify them from Scripture."

That is to say, *Tradition* is to be the guide, and Scripture a subsequent check.

Regarding the manner in which "the formularies" have been made in that church whence came the "*Apologia*," let us hear Cardinal Gibbons. He says :

"When a dispute arises in the Church regarding *the sense of* Scripture, the subject is referred to the Pope for final adjudication. The Sovereign Pontiff, before deciding the case, gathers around him his venerable colleagues, the Cardinals of the Church ; or he calls a council of his associate judges of faith, the Bishops of Christendom ; or he has recourse to other lights which the Holy Ghost may suggest to him. Then after mature and prayerful deliberation, he pronounces judgment, and his sentence is final, irrevocable and infallible."

Russellism cannot measure up to this for plausibility. But whatever difference there may be in appearance, it is evident that in principle there is no difference between the Papal and Rus-

sell system *as regards an authoritative standard of truth.* Both fear that Scripture is liable to misunderstanding or perversion in a way *their* presentment of things is not. Hence Rome offers "the formularies of the Church" and the Bible *as explained thereby;* Russellism offers "the six volumes of Scripture Studies" (and if you like it) without "a page of the Bible as such."

But it may be asked: Is it not true that there has been misunderstanding and perversion of the Bible? True! But this is not lessened by depriving it of its direct authority over the conscience.

Of course the text, "Remember them which have the rule over you, who have spoken unto you the word of God: whose faith follow, considering the end of their conversation" (Heb. 13: 7), is sometimes cited in defense of official authority in teaching. But those referred to are properly called "*guides:*" they are *not* "lords over God's heritage." They present *the word of God.* They explain and apply *Scripture*, so that those instructed may see for themselves *in Scripture* what the way of the Lord is. Scripture is the authority whereby teacher and taught are bound. The former explains, gives *the sense of* that part he expounds, while the latter must test by Scripture the justness of his explanation.

It may not be in vain to add, although it may not seem to be directly in question, that although Scripture recognizes individual *teachers* as such,

it nowhere recognizes "the Church" as a teacher. It is the *support*—"the pillar and base of the truth" (1 Tim. 3 : 15), and is held accountable as such notwithstanding failure; but it is not a teacher: it is to be *subject to* what *God* says; hence the believer is called upon to hear "what the Spirit saith to *the Churches*" (Rev. 2: 7). And this must be conveyed in the very words of God to be authoritative.

We may now consider

THE THIRD ASSERTION

"Remember that not all ministers know of the errors of the translators, and deliberately cover and hide those errors from the people . . . It is the professors and learned ones who are most blameworthy . . . There is evidently a sort of understanding or etiquette among them, that if they wish to maintain their standing in the 'profession,' they 'must not tell tales out of school.'" —"*What say the Scriptures about hell?*"—p. 11.

Who are the "professors and learned ones" accused here? Evidently *not the higher critics. They* are agreed with Russellism in its attack upon the ancient landmarks. Who then are these "professors and learned ones?" Manifestly it is those who take refuge in a "Thus saith the Lord." That handful of believers who, amid the polite sneers of the world-church continue to adhere to what God has said; these are branded as "learned" tricksters by the Russell cult. No others *can* be referred to.

Now no sober Christian will assert that our

Authorized Version of the Scriptures is perfect, nor that any of the accredited translations are without fault. Hence all such avail themselves of every help in securing a just account of what God has said. Nevertheless there is cause for thankfulness that in our *Authorized Version* so little of a serious character is open to question. Drastic treatment however has been accorded it by Mr. Russell. And, in order to lend weight to his alteration of texts which expose his errors, he poses as having some knowledge of the languages in which the Bible is written—thus provision is made for the contingency of being found at variance with it.

A readiness to appeal to the original Bible-tongues before a mixed audience was quite a habit with Mr. Russell; indeed, it is one of the earmarks of theorists of his type. Someone has said: They introduce their fads "in clouds of Greek." Mr. Russell was an expert at sweeping these clouds in the face of his listeners. But please, let no one be blinded by this maneuver, for, as a matter of fact, our author *doesn't know that language*. Listen to the testimony taken under oath before the Court of Law at Hamilton, Ont., March 17th, 1913.

"'Do you know the Greek?' asked the attorney? 'Oh, yes,' was Russell's reply. Here he was handed a copy of the New Testament in Greek, by Westcott & Hort, and asked to read the letters of the alphabet, as they appear on the top of

page 447. *He did not know the alphabet!* 'Now, asked Mr. Staunton, 'Are you familiar with the Greek language?' 'No,' said Mr. Russell, without a blush! When he saw that he was caught, then he admitted that he knew nothing about Latin and Hebrew."

These are the credentials of the man who would rob us of our precious, tested, long-known Bible, and confer upon us the meaning of words and passages he adduces in support of his creed! And let us remember that even *his* version is only to be read in a supplementary way. If the creed is read (Russell's 6 vols.), failure to read a page of *any* Version of the Bible augurs no danger.

May we then turn with horror from a system which brazenly presents itself to us in place of "the Bible as such." May we turn the more resolutely to *the Bible* and read it prayerfully, thankfully. It is written: "No prophecy of the Scripture is of any private interpretation" (2 Pet. 1: 20). Surely this casts us upon the Author, for, although the reference is to the prophetic writings, the principle applies to all Scripture; showing that no one part is *self*-interpreting, but must be read in relation to every other part of the divine whole.

HOW RUSSELLISM SUBVERTS THE TRUTH AS TO

CONDUCT IN THE HOUSE OF GOD

In a circular, scattered broadcast, Mr. Russell says:

"I charge Rev. Haldeman, D. D., with attempting to throw dust into the mental eyes of Baptists by horribly misrepresenting my teachings to which I call attention, by cracking over their heads the whip of fear. When he declared my teachings to be 'the blasphemous religion which teaches the annihilation of Jesus Christ' he intended his untruthful words should scare timid 'sheep' and hinder Bible study. He not only helped to hide the 'key of knowledge,' but in this unscrupulous way he tries to keep the Lord's people from finding it."

This impeachment of Dr. Haldeman's motives in unveiling Mr. Russell's *teaching* is certainly not lacking in boldness, coming as it does from one who publicly disallowed *Bible*-study in the "Brooklyn Tabernacle" unless subservient to his theology; but it is kindred to his personal tirade upon Rev. J. J. Ross for unveiling his *conduct.* Here are the words:

"The statements of Rev. J. J. Ross are a tissue of falsehoods. The man is thoroughly unreliable, loving and making lies. Apparently he is incapable of telling the truth. Financially irresponsible, a suit against him for

damages could neither punish him nor stop him from lying."—Letter to *The Republican*, Oakland, Md., Oct. 2, 1918.*

But one of Mr. Russell's friends proves most conclusively

The Lawlessness of Russellism

There is an elaborate, illustrated pamphlet, in defense of Mr. Russell's teaching and conduct entitled, "A great battle in the ecclesiastical heavens—as seen by a lawyer." In it, the author undertakes to expose the tactics employed in

---

* A tract by Prof. Morehead, of Xenia, Ohio, exposing the doctrines of Millennial Dawnism was published some years ago by the publishers of this pamphlet, and a copy put in Mr. C. T. Russell's hands. He then wrote from Allegheny, Pa., to the Publishers, saying that this tract was doing him great wrong, and that the Publishers must know the law had severe punishment for libelling ; and that unless this tract was *withdrawn, with apology*, he would use the law to its fullest extent against its publishers.

They answered that the evil doctrines exposed were *quoted* from the "Millennial Dawn" volumes in their possession, and that they would welcome a public examination in Court; so that Mr. Russell was quite free to prosecute; that it would serve to show publicly the real character and error of his teaching.

Some time after, a second letter was received from Mr. Russell saying that, following the Master's example, he would not prosecute, but counted upon the Publishers' *Christian character* to cease from publishing this tract.

Such are the "moveable ways" of "Pastor" Russell: First *threat*; then a little *flattery*, to avoid exposure.—[ED.

what he calls the "assassination" of Mr. Russell's character. The writer referred to is *J. F. Rutherford, legal counsellor.*

Let us note one of the opening paragraphs:

"Jehovah governs the Universe by fixed laws or rules, which we call principles. The man who acts in harmony therewith is governed by principle. The one who acts contrary thereto is controlled by passion. The parties to a great fight may be foreshadowed, and the right or wrong thereof be determined, by the application of these fixed principles."

Assuming there is no question as to who are those controlled by passion in this "great fight," Mr. Rutherford proceeds to point out on page 6, that some professing Christians have resorted to,

"Slander, misrepresentation, and vilification of a Christian gentleman who is giving his life to teaching the people to follow Christ."

Yet, with characteristic inconsistency, this accusation occurs in a pamphlet with a repulsive cartoon entitled, "Pastor Russell in the critics' Den," and contains bitter charges of evil motives against all his opposers. In his pamphlet Mr. Rutherford strongly censures what he considers an unjust disposition to circulate evil reports about the *conduct* of his client, but feels quite free to impute evil *motives* to those opposed to him. Not content, however, with inveighing against what he might consider unfairness or inaccuracy, and not content even with imputing evil motives, he adds:

"Even if the charges made by them were true, no justification could be found in the Scriptures for uttering them."—p. 6.

Here then is a principle laid down, after a preamble about law, which respect for God's character compels us to examine; and as several texts of Scripture are quoted in its support, we must look at *them.*

They are: "Speak evil of no man." "Who art thou that judgest another?" "Thou shalt not bear false witness." "Vengeance is mine, I will repay; saith the Lord."

We need not consider the text about "false witness" seeing the question raised is, How to act "if the charges were true."

The first text, "Speak evil of no man" (Titus 3: 2), is quoted by Mr. Rutherford in support of his contention that known sin in a professed servant of the Lord ought not to be mentioned. Let us look at this:

Titus is instructed as to the course he is to pursue in the Cretan assembly. Among other things he is to "put them in mind to be subject to principalities and powers, to obey magistrates, to be ready to every good work, to *speak evil of no man*, to be no brawlers, but gentle, showing all meekness unto all men." Is there anything here to show that known sin in a professed servant of the Lord ought to be passed over in silence? Is the rebuking of sin evil speaking? Is judging sin committed under cover of a Chris-

tian profession, evil speaking? Manifestly not. But our lawyer misapplies the text to this, "Even if the charges made were true."

His second text is: "Who art thou that judgest another?" (Jas. 4: 12). Addressing Jewish believers among "the twelve tribes" James exhorts them not to take the place belonging only to the "law-giver" by pronouncing on matters God alone could judge of. To do so would be to assume the place of "judge" rather than "*doer* of the law." Hence the question: "*Who art thou that judgest another?*"—virtually, Who put you in the place of God? But the injunction not to judge matters only known by God, in no wise suggests that known sin in the life of a public teacher should be ignored.

The third text is: "Vengeance is mine; I will repay, saith the Lord" (Rom. 12: 19). But is seeking to protect the people of God from their destroyer called "vengeance?" Or is such an insinuation the enemy's tactics, putting "darkness for light, and light for darkness?" (Isa. 5: 20). The apostle concludes his epistle to the Romans with practical exhortations consistent with the epistle's gospel teaching, saying: "If it be possible, as much as lieth in you, live peaceably with all men. Dearly beloved, avenge not yourselves, but rather give place unto wrath: for it is written, *Vengeance is mine; I will repay, saith the Lord.*" We are therefore not to institute a suit against them "for damages;" and we are not to refrain

from so doing merely because they are "financially irresponsible." But this does not mean that flagrant sin in one who calls himself a "brother" should be passed over in the house of God.

In 1 Cor., chap. 4, we are taught

What we are NOT *to Judge*

In verse 3 the apostle asserts that man's judgment as to his work in ministry had no authority over him. "Yea," he says, "I judge not mine own self." He did not assume to be qualified to make a full and exact pronouncement upon his work. Then in verse 4, he adds: "I know nothing by [against] myself,"—he had a good conscience. Nevertheless he says, "Yet am I not hereby justified." Now if the apostle Paul, although having a good conscience in the matter, could not give an authoritative judgment upon all parts of his service, how absurd it would be for the Corinthians to do so. The only one capable of so doing was the Lord—"He that judgeth me is the Lord." Therefore it is written, "Judge nothing before the time, until the Lord come, who both will bring to light the hidden things of darkness, and will *make manifest the counsels of the hearts:* and then shall every man have praise of God" (ver. 5). Such and kindred texts reveal the danger of reading *motives*, and pronouncing on matters that have not fully come to light.

Important though this is, Scripture is nevertheless emphatic about

What we ARE *to Judge*

The apostle Paul bewailed the levity that sheltered an immoral person in the Corinthian assembly, and, explaining the danger of such an attitude, says: "*Therefore put away from among yourselves that wicked person*" (1 Cor. 5 : 13). In so saying, was he acting contrary to the word, "Speak evil of no man?" Had he need of being asked, "Who art thou that judgest another?" When he aroused the Corinthians to excommunicate the incestuous person in their midst, was he fostering in them a spirit contrary to the text, "Vengeance is mine; I will repay, saith the Lord?" Nay! Was it not he who, when the work of judgment bore fruit in the ways of the erring one, counselled them to receive him back, and to confirm their love to him, saying: "Forgive him, and comfort him, lest perhaps such an one should be swallowed up with overmuch sorrow" (2 Cor. 2: 7)?

Ah! in God's house all conduct contrary to the gospel is an affront to the Holy Spirit, and a denial of His presence therein; hence the apostle in writing to Timothy instructs him "how thou oughtest to behave thyself in the house of God" (1 Tim. 3 : 15), and tells him to see to it that only the true "*doctrine*" be taught at Ephesus (where he then was), knowing that otherwise

evil behavior would soon appear as the legitimate fruit of evil doctrine.

Believers "are builded together for an habitation of God through the Spirit" (Eph. 2 : 22), and as the Spirit, by whom God dwells in His house, came from Christ in glory, the Christian's conduct is to be regulated by God's revelation of Himself in Christ. Hence, if any question arise as to conduct, the test will be : Is this according to God; is it expressive of His character as revealed in Jesus; does it answer to the place His grace has given us in Him?

Consider then the unrighteousness that substitutes for all this the idea that, **"Even if the charges made were true, no justification could be found in the Scripture for uttering them!"** Consider also the temerity that precedes such a principle with a seeming regard for law—"Jehovah governs the universe by fixed laws or rules, which we call principles. The man who acts in harmony therewith is governed by principle. The man who acts contrary thereto is controlled by passion. The parties to a great fight may be foreshadowed, and the right or wrong thereof be determined by the application of these fixed principles."

May we not ask then : Does Mr. Rutherford suppose that sin and ruinous doctrine found in a public teacher should be passed over, and that this is according to law? Does he think it expresses harmony with those fixed laws or rules

whereby Jehovah governs the universe? If the "right or wrong in the present great fight" is determined by the application of these fixed principles, what *must* be said about Russellism after its advocacy of sheltered sin?

Alas! we are dealing with a system *opposed* to these "fixed principles" of Jehovah's government. Russellism is a *lawless* system. It is so inoculated with the spirit of error that it actually quotes Scripture in support of lawlessness,—for "Sin is lawlessness" (1 John 3: 4, N. T.).

In conclusion then, let us say: We "have not so learned Christ" (Eph. 4: 20). We were lawless once, alas, asserting our independence of God; but, in them that are "born of God," a change has been operated. God has manifested Himself to such as a Saviour-God, whose heart of love is expressed thus: "Who will have all men to be saved, and to come to the knowledge of the truth" (1 Tim. 2: 4). And we have heard the voice of Jesus say, "I, if I be lifted up from the earth, will draw all men unto Me" (John 12: 32). The earth-rejected Christ, now glorified, is our Saviour, and God's eternal Centre for His people. Having turned to Him in faith we have been not only justified from our guilt, but united to Him for ever. *He* is the "Centre and Sun" of God's universe of blessing. *He* attracts the hearts and controls the lives of those He has saved from sin and Satan's power. "*He* is our life" (Col. 3: 4), and on Him we are dependent

for ever. The holy city, the heavenly Jerusalem shall need none other light than the glory of God, and "the Lamb is the light thereof" (Rev. 21: 23)—*The Lamb*, once offered in sacrifice for sin! What a sweet and eternal reminder of how the redeemed family will have been brought there!

My reader, have you owned to God your sinfulness, your ruined state, and become subject to His Son? Remember, He cannot be disappointed in you. *He knows you*, yet He is calling upon you to turn from yourself to His Son. He presents Him to you to be believed in and submitted to. God's eye rests with infinite delight upon Him who met the claims of His righteous throne upon the cross, whereof He has given proof in that He has raised Him from the dead, enthroned Him in glory, and sent down the Holy Spirit to bear witness to it in the preaching of the gospel (1 Pet. 1: 12). Turn to Him in faith, put your case in His hands, and confess Him as your *Lord;* for it is written: "If thou shalt confess with thy mouth the Lord Jesus, and shalt believe in thy heart that God hath raised Him from the dead, *thou shalt be saved*" (Rom. 10: 9).

It will be your happy privilege then, together with God's people, to await the coming of our Lord from heaven, who will translate the redeemed to meet Himself in the air, according to 1 Thess. 4: 13–18; and after the marriage of the Lamb is celebrated in heaven (Rev. 19: 5–9),

will come forth accompanied by the myriads of His saints to overthrow all rebellion, bind Satan, and establish His righteous rule upon the earth (Rev. 19: 11–21; Jude 14, 15).

Meanwhile you will learn to sing here what will be sung more sweetly on high:

"Of the vast universe of bliss,
The Centre Thou, and Sun;
The eternal theme of praise is this,
To Heaven's beloved One:—

Worthy, O Lamb of God, art Thou
That every knee to Thee should bow."

Date Due

JY 27 '54
AP 20 '55
MY 11 '55
NOV 15 1957

BX8526 .R35
How Russellism subverts the faith.
Princeton Theological Seminary-Speer Library
1 1012 00044 6494