

Abilene Christian University

## Digital Commons @ ACU

---

Stone-Campbell Books

Stone-Campbell Resources

---

1947

### A Christian Business Man Writes His Brethren

Norman Davidson

Follow this and additional works at: [https://digitalcommons.acu.edu/crs\\_books](https://digitalcommons.acu.edu/crs_books)



Part of the [Biblical Studies Commons](#), [Business Commons](#), [Christian Denominations and Sects Commons](#), and the [Religious Thought, Theology and Philosophy of Religion Commons](#)

---

#### Recommended Citation

Davidson, Norman, "A Christian Business Man Writes His Brethren" (1947). *Stone-Campbell Books*. 318. [https://digitalcommons.acu.edu/crs\\_books/318](https://digitalcommons.acu.edu/crs_books/318)

This Book is brought to you for free and open access by the Stone-Campbell Resources at Digital Commons @ ACU. It has been accepted for inclusion in Stone-Campbell Books by an authorized administrator of Digital Commons @ ACU.

A Christian Business Man  
Writes His Brethren

---

**A Christian  
Business Man  
Writes  
His Brethren**

by

*Norman Davidson*

225 North Michigan Avenue

Chicago 1, Illinois

---

(Note: Any desired number of copies of this  
will be mailed free on request to the author.)

---

A Christian  
Business Man  
Writes  
His Brethren

by

Norman Davidson

325 North Michigan Avenue

Chicago, Illinois

---

(Note. Any desired number of copies of this  
will be mailed free on request to the author.)

# A Christian Business Man Writes His Brethren

NORMAN DAVIDSON  
225 North Michigan Avenue  
Chicago 1, Illinois

**I** MAKE no claim of writing ability, neither am I a preacher. Further, I am not one of real consequence among us, neither holding nor seeking any position or prominence of any kind. This is my first writing for publication—I have an idea it will be the last, as well.

Traveling much across the country I find discord, division, and strife in the church almost everywhere I go. Knowing God's will, that love, unity, and peace should prevail among brethren, these matters press upon my heart. I sincerely feel something should now be done to try to restore that harmony which one time existed, and should always exist in the body of Christ. Therefore, with a prayer on my lips I am writing unto you, my brethren. I have no wish to press my views upon anyone. All I ask is that you kindly read and consider them.

Some months ago as I viewed conditions and saw the reason for much of the present discord, I sympathized with many of our preachers who are grieved over all this and would like to do something toward improving conditions. But they fear such attacks from those holding ecclesiastical power among us as might injure their influence for life. Consequently almost nothing of constructive value has been done toward a return to true unity and peace among us. Therefore, I resolved, as a business man, to do what I could, and began talking to brethren and writing to others of what was in my heart.

## A HEAD-ON ATTACK

As anticipated, powerful opposition soon developed. Now, I certainly have no complaint against anyone who honestly and sincerely opposes my views. But I would call your attention to some facts concerning this opposition, and

let you draw your own conclusions therefrom. Leading preachers, who were harsh with each other recently on the "war" question, have now *united* in their attacks upon me. Prominent brethren who were once close friends, but who are now far apart and lacking in personal confidence—these have "joined hands" against my efforts. I am reminded of the prominent rival leaders of Pharisees and Sadducees who buried their differences and worked together to destroy our Lord. Certainly I am not to be compared in any way with Him, but when I am only pleading for a more Christian and tolerant spirit among brethren, these modern leaders, too, have buried all their differences and are now united in their utmost efforts to destroy all that I hope may be accomplished.

Quite well they made me realize that the warning, "Woe unto you when all men speak well of you" was one I didn't have to worry about! On they came, loudly shouting their cry of battle, "THEY SHALL NOT PASS," at any who could climb the road leading from the lowland of discord and bitterness to the higher grounds of unity, peace, and love. No preacher among us could survive such an attack. Fortunately, I am not a preacher. Here I still stand, brethren!

#### LETTERS DISHONORABLY TAKEN

My personal, private correspondence was procured under false pretenses by a preacher in the largest circles of influence and was published without consent of either writer or receiver of the letters. My quotations from prominent men were so used to plant fear in the hearts of these brethren and cause them to disavow their previous statements made to me.

Isn't it strange that in the name of loyalty and soundness, leaders among us should stoop to such low levels of dishonor as to follow such tactics? Does this unholy violation tell us nothing of the fundamental unsoundness at heart of those who attack our efforts? Is not this unholy spirit, by which they hope to use their public influence, considerably worse than anything that they attack? And should not brethren who follow them be informed of all the facts? My conviction is that they should, hence my present effort.

## SOME POINTS MADE CLEAR

Before we get further into this discussion, let me clear some points. I do not believe the pre-millennial views. I am not trying to get anyone to accept them. I seek no pre-eminence or recognition for Brother Boll or any other man. Only the Lord Jesus should have pre-eminence in the church. The only thing I seek is PEACE among brethren. Neither Brother Boll nor anyone believing his views, has had anything to do with my efforts or has made even one suggestion. I act on my initiative alone.

## WHAT IS IT ALL ABOUT?

Some may be asking just that—"What is this all about?" Well, here it is. Minor divisions exist from many causes but it seems the greatest of all is over a difference of interpretation of unfulfilled prophecies. More discord has arisen and more division come from this than all other causes.

WHEN, I ask, did this become a test of fellowship? For long and precious years, consecrated men of the Restoration Movement differed upon these questions but nevertheless, let tolerance and love keep them in unity, harmony, and peace. It was only about thirty years ago that a change came.

## WHO CHANGED IT?

WHO wrought this change from unity to carnal division? WHO *first* decided that all holding and teaching premillennial views were to be disfellowshipped? WHO *later* decided that even those holding such views without teaching them should be disfellowshipped? WHO *still later* decided that all who would in any way remain a friend to any of these should be branded as "unsound" and denied fellowship? WHOSE emphasis and insistence brought these changes and alienated brethren in the Lord?

Christ gave authority in the congregations of His body to the elders. Was it these elders, acting under Christ, who made the changes? Did congregations, through these God ordained leaders do this? You know and I know that they did not. Such decisions, such changes of attitudes, such disfellowshipping brethren over dif-

ference of interpretation did not come from, or through, the elders of the churches.

These changes were wrought by influential and powerful preachers who decided where the lines of fellowship were to be drawn. Elders were simply coerced into accepting the decisions of these would-be dictators.

(Let me pause to say I do not question the honesty or sincerity of these men. Beyond doubt they felt themselves right in such actions—Saul of Tarsus felt he was right in persecuting Christians even unto death—but he was *wrong*! I sincerely believe that, likewise, these preaching brethren were **WRONG**! Surely Brother David Lipscomb held the right attitude. He wrote in his Commentary on Romans, page 206: “I have very little confidence in human interpretations of unfulfilled prophecy, because when I look at the fulfillment as given by God, it differs so from what I would have said it meant that I have no confidence in my own interpretations or those of others of what is unfulfilled.” He was not dogmatically sure his interpretations were correct, as are many of our preachers today. His co-worker and co-founder of the college which bears his name, Brother J. A. Harding, both believed and taught a thousand year reign on earth with Christ, after He comes, but Brother Lipscomb worked with him in all harmony and peace.)

#### OUR CREED

The acceptance of this creed (unwritten perhaps, but a creed nevertheless) disrupted the brotherhood and destroyed the peace, harmony, and accord which had prevailed for many years in spite of difference of such interpretation.

Though *added* to the Church by our Lord upon obedience to His word, those whose thoughts on prophecy are found to be out of harmony with said creed are soon *subtracted* by men!!

Brethren, I challenge any man to give Bible passage that instructs us to withdraw from those who differ from our interpretations of unfulfilled prophecy! If fellowship should be withdrawn, we who decline are sinning; if it should not be withdrawn, those who insist that it should are being factious, therefore are sinning.

## RABID EXTREMES

You may ask "How far has this matter gone and how bad is the situation?" Space forbids mention of many cases, so I will mention only a few heartrending ones. In at least the two Tennessee brotherhood colleges it has gone this far. Not only are young preachers being taught to have no fellowship with those who hold the "pre" views, even though those views be held in private, but they are expected to "brand" everyone who believes and holds these views in private, disturbing no one, and also those who will not disfellowship all who so privately hold the views.

How different this is from the policy of former days and our great and good men of yesterday! I have quoted Brother Lipscomb's statement that he had no confidence in his own or any other human interpretations of unfulfilled prophecy. In strong contrast is the position of the man who now heads the school founded by Brethren Lipscomb and Harding. He seems to have absolute confidence in the *infallibility of his interpretations*. He told me, concerning one of our missionaries, who does not accept his interpretations, that no man holding any "pre" views should be "allowed to preach at all." Even though as in this case, the man holds his views in private and does not teach them.

The Apostle Paul wrote, Philippians 1:15-18, that he rejoiced even when *Christ* was preached by brethren whose motives were wrong—"of envy and strife." "Whether in pretense or in truth," Paul was glad when *Christ* was preached. But this school president would deny that *Christ* be preached at all, even though in sincerity and love, by any who may dare to disagree with his infallible interpretations of prophecy! He would even deny salvation to the heathen in Japan whose only chance of eternal life came through the preaching of the missionary referred to above! (Some have thought I must have misunderstood him. But I have given here the impressions made upon me by his statements. I recognize this brother's outstanding abilities and respect and esteem him highly, in spite of our differences, and would be more than glad to know his position is not really so extreme as indicated by his words to me.)



## DEMONSTRATION OF EXTREMES

Now, for another example: For long years a number of capable and consecrated brethren, loved by all, taught in this school. Then, under the changed policies there, they were dismissed, not because they believe the "pre" views, but because they will not disfellowship those who do believe them. They are accused of being "unsound," but their supposed unsoundness consists only in refusal to disfellowship the "pre" brethren. Now they are branded far and wide and every possible effort made to destroy their usefulness in any work for our Lord.

**GET THIS, BRETHREN!** *Today, under policies of the present administration neither of the two founders of this school would be considered as worthy to teach there:—Brother Harding because he believed and taught the thousand-year reign with Christ on earth; Brother David Lipscomb because he did not disfellowship Brother Harding for holding such views!!!*

*Further, if consistent with their actions in other cases, the present administration would not only drop Brother Lipscomb, if living, from any connection with the school, but they would brand him far and wide as "unsound." Remember, brethren, Brother Lipscomb's position was the same as that of the teachers mentioned!*

Now let it not be said I am opposed to Christian education, or am fighting our schools. In years gone by, my lamented father served on the Board of David Lipscomb College. I join with him in feeling that our schools determine, to a large extent, the future of the church. Of course, those now in charge there have a right to their views and policy, but it seems to me that honesty would require that brethren who have supported and helped finance the school, know what these are. I feel that few realize how very far the present administration has departed from the policies and example of "Uncle David." Surely those now helping finance the school should understand these developments which so directly affect the peace of the churches everywhere due to training given those who study the Bible there daily. That explains, partly, why I feel your attention should be called to them.

I am further suggesting that elders in the churches investigate present policies along these

lines of all our schools. Perhaps the two mentioned are not the only offenders.

### WHAT IS TO COME?

Considering all matters previously mentioned, I simply shuddered as I thought what conditions will be in years to come as our young preachers go out to preach, having been indoctrinated in this way. Young preachers holding such rabid doctrines of intolerance, bigotry, discord, bitterness, and strife, supplanting the older men who still believe in that love one for another which our Lord taught and would still follow His ways of peace. I felt and I still feel that something should be done.

“The fruit of the Spirit is love, joy, peace, long suffering, gentleness, goodness, faith, meekness, temperance.”

Brethren, I beg you to stop and think and answer for yourselves a question: If the Campbells and Stone had been animated by this spirit which I am condemning, do you think there would have been a Restoration Movement in America?

### ANOTHER QUESTION ASKED

On the war question great differences of opinion exists among us, yet we differ as brethren. The same might be said of our attitude on a number of points. Now, my question is, WHY on the subject of prophecies, vague *and* intangible and so hard to understand, and which have nothing to do with our salvation, must we divide just because we do not see alike? Why should we make agreement on this ONE subject THE test of fellowship in our brotherhood?

### BOLL FALSELY ACCUSED

Some of Brother Boll's enemies, (I have no other word to describe them), have for years represented him as a man who broke promises and made false statements. They quote statements made in 1915 by Brethren A. B. Lipscomb, F. W. Smith, and M. C. Kurfees, concerning a meeting in Nashville, Tennessee. They state Brother Boll had agreed to cease teaching his prophetic views, but that later he had said he made no such promise.

Now other brethren were present in this meeting, among whom was G. Dallas Smith, a great man of God, who has never in any way been accused of unsoundness. It was by him that the meeting was arranged and under date of January 1, 1916, in a published pamphlet, the complete record of statements made in this meeting. (A copy of this was handed me by the editor of *Gospel Advocate*.) Not only do they give the statements of the three men referred to above, but they also give his own statement. Now note what he has to say:

"I took the initiative which led to the conference. I was then, and I am still, a friend to Brother Boll and the editors of the *Gospel Advocate*. In the main, I was, and I am still, in hearty accord with the contention of the editors of the *Gospel Advocate* on the points of doctrine at issue—if I understand them. But I did not think then, and I still do not think, that Boll is in any sense a "Russellite" or that he is a "dangerous teacher" because of his peculiar views on the kingdom and unfulfilled prophecy. I did not then think that the difference between Brother Boll and the editors of the *Gospel Advocate* was sufficient to lead to any kind of division. I am of the same opinion still. And this is why I took the initiative in the matter of trying to adjust the difference between them.

"As to the conference: I understood then, and I still understand, that Brother Boll persistently refused to agree with men that he would refrain from teaching anything he believed the Bible taught."

Now that is what Brother G. Dallas Smith had to say, and there is no one of the thousands of men and women who now live that knew him, that would ever accuse him of any weakness in the faith or agreement with any error. Yet he says he did not understand Brother Boll to make the promise which others say he made, and *he did not think the difference enough to bring any division.*

***Now if Brother Boll told a falsehood, when he said he did not make this promise, Brother G. Dallas Smith must likewise have falsified, as he said no such promise was made. Plenty of men are glad to accuse Brother Boll of falsifying, but will they accuse Brother G. Dallas Smith of the same?***

What then can be said? Surely I would not accuse the first three of falsehood, any more than the latter ones. I would say that good men just misunderstood each other. That is all that can be said of the entire matter, and hold to justice and truth.

#### MISTAKES BY ALL

I have told of mistakes which we have made. Now I would say that I sincerely feel Brother Boll has made a mistake in featuring his views as I feel he has. As a Christian brother, I have told him so. Further, I do not approve of the Janes Will. In the beginning I told these brethren I felt the will was a mistake and have repeated this many times.

Further, I am sure those featuring the "Pre" views have caused trouble in several places, gone to extremes, and in some cases, have been guilty of "drawing lines." As I have not upheld or defended mistakes made by those with whom I agree, neither do I uphold or defend those made by Brother Boll and those agreeing with him. Surely grievous mistakes have been made by all. Nevertheless, I see nothing in the past which should prevent us from being brethren, in all that word means, in the future.

#### APPEAL TO ELDERS

I beseech you, elders of the churches through America, in the name of our Lord to re-examine the entire matter of proper basis for fellowship among us!

Will you be good enough to consider what Brother Boll and his associates *really teach* and not alone *what their enemies say they teach*. I have examined and I have found that they teach Christ to be the Son of God, even as we. Further they teach that "there can never be any salvation for anyone, anywhere, any time, except through faith in the Lord Jesus Christ and obedience to the gospel." Moreover, they teach that "His church was established on Pentecost" and that "all that are in the church are in the kingdom" and also that "a man cannot be in the church without being in the kingdom." Further, they have said that "even one passage as plain as Colossians 1:13, ought to be sufficient to convince a man that those who

in this day are saved through the gospel are in the kingdom." They accept no innovations in the worship, and so far as any matters pertaining to salvation or Christian living, they are in full agreement with the rest of our brotherhood.

Now here are some things they have been *accused of teaching*, which according to their own writings, they *do not teach*. They do not teach a second chance after death. They oppose "every single distinctive doctrine of Russell" and teach "not so much as one distinctive doctrine of Adventism."

On account of his use of the word "contingent" in an unusual sense Brother Boll's enemies have claimed he taught the church was an "accident" or an "afterthought." Of this Brother Boll writes, "certainly I never had any such ideas or belief. The church was not an afterthought but a matter of God's eternal purpose (Eph. 3:9), and neither did Christ fail to do what he came to do (John 17:4)." They are *accused of teaching* "Solomon's temple will be rebuilt and the old Jewish system with all its ordinances re-instituted." Of this Brother Boll writes, "I know of no Scripture that teaches that Solomon's temple will be rebuilt by restored Israel, nor anything that would lead us to think the old Jewish system with all its ordinances shall be re-instituted. For my part, I have found nothing to substantiate such ideas, but clear teaching to the contrary."

Now, brethren, elders of God's churches, we all agree that our blessed Lord shall one day return. Why not all together rejoice therein and together joyfully await his coming? Why should there be bitterness, discord, and division among us just because we do not understand alike the prophecies concerning things to come to pass after his coming? Surely He will take care of all that in His own way!

#### MAKE THE DECISION!

Must we cease to be a brotherhood or shall we unitedly stand against and eliminate the leadership of the few self-appointed leaders who are responsible for the perpetuation of this carnal division? "Quit you like men, be strong!"

## LET THE ELDERS RULE

Surely elders of the local assemblies have the right to decide whom they shall employ in their work. Let evangelists and editors and school officials cease their meddling and tend to their own tasks, as they allow the elders to attend to theirs. If the elders of any congregation would employ one who disagrees in his understanding of prophecies, let the rest of us mind our own business without any break of fellowship therefrom.

### BROTHER BOLL'S OWN STATEMENT

Following is a statement from Brother Boll, given to me at my request for publication. It speaks for itself. Let us each one consider it in the spirit in which it is written. Let us look into it for agreement, rather than disagreement.

### A STATEMENT

By R. H. BOLL

The writer feels anew the weight of the present existing evil conditions in the brotherhood and an urgent, longing desire for peace, good will, and unity—the true unity of the Spirit—between himself and his brethren in Christ. In so far as division among brethren may have been occasioned by disputed teachings on unfulfilled prophecy, he wishes to go to the utmost limit, consistent with conscience and the will of God, to remove all occasion of stumbling.

The present writer deems it desirable first of all to remove any misapprehension as to his position. He stands committed to no human theory (not even to his own, in so far as he may hold any); nor does he advocate or countenance "speculation." His one and only desire is to get all that God says on every topic, and as a free Christian he feels no necessity of manipulating the testimony of the Scriptures either to please any man or to make it fit any preconceived tenets or human standards of orthodoxy. But while maintaining his liberty and independence, he does not propose to ignore the positions generally held by his brethren; and in whatsoever he feels bound to differ with the views generally current he does not do so because of loving to

differ, or counting himself wiser than others, but only and solely upon the ground of God's word, upon which alone, as simple Christians, we all stand. It may also be in order to add that his study of the Word of God has led him to no clash with the teaching held by his brethren in the church of Christ, in any matter of fundamentals or any point of obedience, or any congregational practice, or in anything that should affect our fellowship in the Lord Jesus Christ. He believes that Jesus is King now, crowned with glory and honor, enthroned on the right hand of the Father. He believes in the full efficiency of the gospel unto its God-designed end, as the power of God unto salvation. Nothing he has found in the Scriptures contravenes these positions.

Then, in regard to controverted matters, he proposes to stand strictly and faithfully upon the word of God:

First—That on the subject of Prophecy or any other Bible theme, I am absolutely willing to speak as the Bible speaks; and to give to every theme so much of prominence and emphasis as the Bible gives it. Neither I myself, nor any of my colaborers, so far as known, would ask more than that, or would want anything better.

Second—That on the subject of Prophecy he is contending for a more faithful study and treatment of the prophetic Scriptures, rather than for any special result of such study; and for sound principles of interpretation rather than any specific result of the application of such principles; and for the great leading facts and features of Bible doctrine on those topics rather than details. By this is, of course, not meant that the results of study, or the details, are regarded as unimportant; but that principles and great facts are first.

Third—That the one great fact of prophetic prediction which is of chiefest value is the Second Coming of the Lord; and that this event is imminent—by which term none of those who have been criticized mean that it will certainly occur in a day, a week, or this year, or even necessarily in our life-time, or at any designated date; but that it is a thing liable to occur at any time, so far as we can know, and is always

to be expected—so much the more now after all the lapse of time. We judge too that it is a Christian's right to note any correspondence of our time with the Lord's predictions. "Watch and be ready, for at an hour that ye think not the Son of man cometh." This doctrine is given the greatest sort of emphasis and prominence in the New Testament, and has been made the basis for exhortation to all virtues and holiness and Christian activity.

Fourth—I do not contend for the right of "Speculation," but am by principle opposed to speculation. This really belongs under the item "First" above, but deserves special mention. probably every uninspired preacher on earth has made a statement at one time or another that could not be substantiated by Scripture; but the preacher who is right at heart will want to be corrected and correct himself when he sees that he has made such a slip.

Fifth—That nothing I have ever taught has had the slightest tendency to prevent any man's doing the whole will of God without addition or subtraction, or has in any wise affected congregational practice, except to spur and inspire unto faith and effort, purity of life and worship.

Sixth—That none of us (if I may speak of my friends as well as myself), so far as I have learned, have subscribed to or are contending for any set theory or system of doctrine; nor do we set ourselves up as wiser or better than others; or claim that we are infallible, or inspired, or miraculously endowed and called of God, or able to answer all the How's that may be raised, or explain every difficulty of Scripture. It is too bad that among Christians a man should have to be put to the necessity of denying such charges, but if it be helpful, I am not above it; nor am I even above the making of any apology or amends in any matter if I have been in the wrong at any time.

Lastly—That none of us, so far as I know, that hold any of the disputed positions on prophecy have ever refused loving fellowship to brethren who differ with us—nor would we do so.

In conclusion, I append the following extract from an old work (by Roger Chillingworth)



which in homely old-fashioned words and spelling, expresses my heart's sentiments:

"There is no sure certaintie but of Scripture only, for any considering man to build upon. This, therefore, and this only, I have reason to believe; this I will professe; according to this will I live, and for this I will not only willingly, but gladly lose my life, though I should be sorry that Christians should take it from me. Propose me anything out of this book, and require whether I believe it or no, and secure it never so incomprehensible to human reason, I will subscribe to it hand and heart, as knowing no demonstration stronger than this: God hath said so and therefore it is true. I am fully assured that God does not, and that men ought not require of any man more than this: to believe the Scripture to be God's word, to endeavor to find the true sense of it, and to live according to it."

In the preface of an English commentary I find the following declaration: "For the exposition herein presented the writers alone are responsible. They represent no school, they speak with no authority, save that authority which is inherent in truth. They not merely recognize a 'right of private judgment,' they insist upon the responsibility of every man to whom, in the Providence of God, the Scriptures come, and in whatever tongue, to read them for himself as he shall one day answer to God therefor. The direct responsibility of man to God is the foundation of human freedom." I could choose no better words to express the principle upon which I stand.

In all this I would endeavor to maintain a spirit of brotherly love—to avoid all personalities, all cutting and hurtful remarks. (If at any time in the past I have been careless in this respect—I shall be glad to make due amends and apology for such wrong.)

From a letter containing some helpful suggestions proposed to us I quote this:

"...in the past, grievous mistakes have been made on both sides in this matter. For those made by us we humbly ask forgiveness and forbearance. Can't we now forgive and forget all such past mistakes, and start all over again? Without compromising any sincere convictions on either side, can't we now, as real brethren in the Lord, press on together unto greater serv-

ice for Him who is so very dear to all of us? For this we most earnestly seek and pray."

To this we can only say, *Amen*. As to aught that has been done and said on "the other side" in which I may have been wronged, I hold no enmity or grudge, but am ready to forgive and forget it all. And wherein I may have erred, or wronged opposing brethren, I desire the same on part of any and all who feel that they have been injured or sinned against by me.

In all our Christian life and teaching love must reign supreme, and though we have all knowledge of prophecy and have not love we are nothing. And that love is kind, doth not behave itself unseemly, seeketh not its own, is not provoked. As the works of the flesh produce division, the fruit of the Spirit brings about Christian unity. I am minded to follow after that.

As to "featuring" the disputed teaching—it is not my purpose to press it unduly or disproportionately (as we above stated) nor to make it obnoxious by undue and offensive emphasis—but only in faithfulness to the word of the Lord, as occasion may require. Also, we recognize the fact that though *the Scripture* is inspired, *our conclusions* are not; and our conclusions are therefore not to be insisted upon as though they were. Only the statements of God's Word are the basis of Christian fellowship.

From the people who call themselves simply Christians—with whom I am wholly at one in all understanding of all that is required to make a man a Christian, and in all matters of congregational practice; who stand upon the whole word of God, willing to test all things by that word alone, in brotherly fellowship with all who stand thus upon the same broad (and narrow) basis—from them I would not be severed or distinguished for any consideration, nor for all the world excluded from their Christian fellowship. To that church I belong; of that people I am one, though the very least and unworthiest. Were I cut off from them I should be at a loss indeed for I have no other plea than theirs, and nothing else to preach or teach, nor any sort of distinctive doctrinal principles to found a sect upon, even if I were capable of so evil a thing—which, please God, I am not.

As for myself—in the fear of God, in the love of the Lord and the brethren, I beg the privi-

lege to study and teach and preach, as God may give me ability and opportunity, and as faithfully as by His grace I may, the whole counsel of God. For this is my fundamental portion and birthright as a child of God in God's house, the one and only church which the Lord established, the only church of which I am a member and to which ever I intend to belong.

*(End of Boll Statement)*

#### IN CONCLUSION

With all this before us, may I ask that we now look at another statement from Brother Lipscomb. Concerning the millennial question, he wrote, page 516—Questions Answered—*"I do not say I believe it or disbelieve it. I do not find enough concerning the matter to fix my faith one way or another. I am no interpreter of prophecies."* Remember, he drew no "lines" against those holding the "pre" views. Was he less "sound" than the preachers, editorial writers, and school officials who today tell us we must disfellowship all who disagree with their prophetic interpretations? Was he less wise than they? Did he know less of the teachings of our Lord than do they?

I repeat, finally, that he did work in all harmony and peace and accord with Brother Harding, co-founder of David Lipscomb College, *who both believed and taught the thousand year reign with Christ on earth.*

Shall we continue in the present torn-asunder state of division and strife, or shall we go back and follow again the example of that grand old man of bygone days?

*This surely is the way to peace among us.* "But why dost thou judge thy brother, or why dost thou set at naught thy brother?" "Let us not therefore judge one another any more." "Be diligent that ye may be found of Him in peace." "And be at peace among yourselves." "Let us therefore follow after the things which make for peace."

