

Russellism

or

Millennial Dawnism Exposed

Analysis Of The Doctrine

Charles T. Russell, author of the "Millennial Dawn Series" of books is a *Materialist*, a *No-kingdomist*, a *Restorationist*, a *Second-Chanceist*, an *Annihilationist*, and a *Probationist*.

As a *Materialist*, Mr. Russell holds that the entire man, "spirit and soul and body" (1 These. 5: 28) is entirely mortal, and thus is subject to death in the absolute or unrestricted sense of relapsing into utter unconsciousness at death. He further affirms mortality of those whom he supposes will be saved in course of the Millennial age, and even affirms that angels are mortal beings.

As a *No-kingdomist*, Charles T. Russell holds that God's kingdom, mentioned in John 3:3-5, is not yet established, and will not be till after the first resurrection. Then as a *Restitutionist* this same author holds that all mankind who do not accept the gospel before death shall be restored to life in the resurrection, and that their restoration will bring them back to the condition of Adam and Eve in Eden before their fall from the favor of God.

As a *Second-chanceist*, Mr. Russell claims to believe that all who have not and will not in this life become obedient to the divine will shall have abundant opportunity, under favorable circumstances, in course of the Millennial age to become Christians. At the same time he admits that some, even under the favorable circumstances which he imagines will exist in the Millennial age, will not become Christians.

As an *Annihilationist*, Mr. Russell claims that all who do not accept Christ in the course of the Millennial reign will be blotted out of all existence. He even claims that the Devil will thus be blotted out, and in eternity there will be no conscious existence anywhere in the universe, except that which will be found in eternal glory.

Finally, as a *Probationist*, Mr. Charles T. Russell, of

Allegheny, Pa., holds that all who will become Christians in course of the Millennial age will be forever mortal even as he claims that all angels will forever be. As a result he holds that all such in the "ages to come" will always be on trial or probation, and will always be liable to sin. As a final result of his theory he claims that all those who will actually sin in course of the ages to come will be blotted out of all existence and so remain during eternity.

MATERIALISM EXPOSED.

The doctrine of Materialism is not peculiar to Charles T. Russell of Allegheny, Pa. The ancient Sadducees were materialists of the most intense type, and the fact that Paul as a Christian claimed to be a Pharisee ought to be sufficient to condemn all modern materialism because the Pharisees held that man consists of an immaterial spirit as a distinct entity, as well as of a material body. See Acts 23:1-8; Zech. 12:1.

But here we present evidence of Mr. Russell's materialism. On page 187, Vol.1, of his "Millennial Dawn Series," he says, "Not only have we evidence that immorality pertains only to the divine nature, but we have proof that angels are mortal, in the fact that Satan who was once a chief of their number, is to be destroyed. (Heb. 2: 14.) The fact that he can be destroyed proves that angels as a class are mortal."

Then on page 209 he says, "Thus was Adam before he fell grander than any other earthly creature, not by reason of any difference in the *life principle* implanted, but because of a grander *organism*."

In opposition to such statements the reader is first of all referred to the fact that when God had formed material man of the dust of the ground he "breathed into his nostrils the breath of life" (Gen. 2:7), which was something that he did not in behalf of any of the lower orders of creation. The reader is next referred to the difference between "the spirit of man that goeth upward, and the spirit of the beast that goeth downward to the earth" (Ecc. 1.3: 21), as evidence against the idea that man is entirely mortal, "spirit and

soul and body." 1 These. 5: 23. Our next reference is to Eccl. 12:7, which mentions man's departure from this world in these words: "Then shall the dust return to the earth as it was: and the spirit shall return unto God who gave it." As another Old Testament evidence the reader is referred to Zech. 12:1, where God declares himself to be the one who "stretcheth forth the heavens, and layeth the foundation of the earth, and formeth the spirit of man within him." Coming to the New Testament the reader is referred to the fact that "a certain rich man" and "a certain beggar named Lazarus" both had a conscious existence after death. (Luke 16:19-31.) If some one says that this is a parable it becomes the reader to consider that no inspired man ever called it a parable, and that the words, "and there was a certain beggar named Lazarus" are just as definite as these words: "There was a certain man in Caesarea called Cornelius." (Acts 10:1.) To this it should be added that there is no more evidence that the case mentioned in Luke 16th chapter was a parable than that the one mentioned in Acts 10th chapter was a parable. Our next reference is to the fact that Paul wrote of an "outward man" and an "inward man" belonging to Christians, and that these are so different that the former may daily "perish" while the latter may he daily "renewed." (2 Cor. 4: 16.) Finally we refer to the fact that Paul wrote of a man existing and receiving revelations "out of the body." (2 Cor. 12: 14.) The foregoing testimony is not all that is found in the Sacred Text against materialism, but it is sufficient to show all who are possessed of ordinary reverence for divine testimony that the doctrine of materialism, which teaches that man is entirely mortal, "spirit and soul and body" is a falsehood.

OBJECTIONS CONSIDERED.

1. God said to Adam, "for dust thou art, and unto dust thou shalt return." Gen. 8: 19. But if this refer red to all that there was of Adam, the whole man, then the breath that God breathed into his nostrils (Gen.2:7), and the "spirit" that God formed "within him" (Zech. 12:1), was all dust! Was the breath that Jehovah breathed into Adam's nostrils nothing but dust? The most ordinary reverence will not so admit. Common sense and common honesty will forbid.

2. "In death there is no remembrance of thee: in the grave who shall give thee thanks." Psa. 6: 5. "The dead praise not the Lord, neither any that go down in to silence." Psa. 115: 17. Yes, but that same writer who knew that he would die said in the next verse, "We will bless the Lord from this time forth and for evermore. Moreover a New Testament writer named John wrote of "the souls" of martyrs, crying unto God between death and the first resurrection. (Rev. 6: 9- 11; 20: 4, 5.) Now if the doctrine of soul-sleepers be correct, then the foregoing scriptures would be contrary to each other. But scripture is not contrary to scripture; neither does the Holy Spirit contradict Himself. It is only the *erroneous interpretation* of uninspired men that contradicts inspired scripture on any question. Thus when God said to Adam, "Dust thou art" the soul-sleeper interprets that God meant that the entire man was dust, though he dares not to affirm that the breath which the Almighty breathed into his nostrils and the spirit which he formed within man is dust. On the same principle the soul-sleeper interprets that in Psa. 6: 5, and 115: 17 David was writing concerning the entire man when he used the words "death," "grave," "dead" and "silence" when in fact he was writing only of that which dies and goes into the grave and is silent even as Solomon used the words "dieth" and "dust" in Eccl. 3:19, 20, and then declared that the spirit of man goes upward to God while the spirit of the beast goes downward to the earth. See Eccl. 8: 21; 12: 7. Thus the soul-sleeper has nothing in his favor except his own erroneous interpretation. Not one statement of divine testimony sets forth his doctrine. But when he finds a scripture that he can interpret in his favor he looks at it even as a dog looks at his dinner. Neither that which precedes nor that which follows is of any value to him. But every other passage of the Sacred Text must be ignored or explained to suit his interpretation. By this irreverent method of procedure he deceives himself and all others who have confidence in him.

3. Another objection which soul-sleepers or materialists urge is that no word which means "immortal" is by any inspired writer ever applied to mankind. But this objection is an unmitigated falsehood suggestive of brimstone. In 1 Peter 3: 4 the word *aphthartos*, which means "incorruptible, immortal, imperishable, undying, enduring," is applied to woman, and in the Common

Version is translated "not corruptible." That same word is applied to God in Rom. 1:23, and is there translated "incorruptible." It is the same word that is translated "incorruptible" in 1 Cor. 9: 25, and by the words "incorruptible" and "incorruption" in 1 Cor. 15: 52, 53, 54, where the immortalizing of the body is mentioned. Now, what twist of interpretation does the reader suppose that the soul-sleeper gives 1 Peter 3: 4 in order to break it's force? We know from acquaintance with him that he will take the word "ornament," which is not in the original text as shown by the italic letters in which it is printed, and will say that the word *aphthartos* refers to that and not to the word spirit. When in answer to such a twist he is inquired of how a mortal spirit could have an immortal ornament he remains as speechless as the man who failed to put on the wedding garment that was provided for him when questioned on the subject, or if he speaks he makes a further exhibition of his irreverence and folly.

NO-KINGDOMISM EXPOSED.

Our next duty is to present evidence that Mr. Charles T. Russell, the Millennial Dawnist, is a *No-kingdomist*. On page 277 of the first volume of his "Series" of books he presents the interview between Christ and Nicodemus so as to obscure its meaning and suit his notion. As it is too lengthy to quote in such an article I am now writing I state its substance. Mr. Russell, in his representation of that interview sets forth that the expression "born of the Spirit" in John 3:5 means *the birth from the grave in the resurrection*, by which birth he claims that those who serve Christ in this world will become spirit beings and then they will see the kingdom of God, but not before. Then in order to break the force of what is set forth in the Savior's parables on this subject, likewise the clear teaching of Col.1:12,13, which declares that Christian's have been "translated into the kingdom of God's "dear Son," Mr. Russell on page 283 expresses himself thus; "In the parables of our Lord, the Church is frequently called the kingdom; and the apostle speaks of it as the kingdom over which Christ now reigns, saying that God hath translated us out of the kingdom of darkness into the kingdom of his dear Son." Having admitted this much he proceeds and explains, and explains till he seems to think that he could on

page 284 say to his unsuspecting readers, "The Church at present, therefore is not the kingdom of God set up in power and glory, but in its incipient, embryo condition." Farther on he writes of "the church" as the "embryo kingdom," thus substituting such words as "incipient" and "embryo" in order to break the force of the Sacred Text and at the same time make an effort to save himself from a direct contradiction of what that text declares. In opposition to all such abominable trifling on the part of Charles T. Russell of Allegheny, Pa., I present the following from the Savior: "Verily I say unto you, There be some standing here, who shall not taste of death, till they see the Son of man coming in his kingdom." Matt. 16: 28. "And he said unto them, Verily I say unto you, That there be some of them that stand here, who shall not taste of death till they have seen the kingdom of God come with power." Mark 9:1 Thus the Savior declared that he would come "in his kingdom," and that "the kingdom of God" should "come with power" while some then with him should still be living on the earth. Such testimony connects Christ and his kingdom, and shows that the kingdom of Christ and the kingdom of God are the same, and points unmistakably to the day of Pentecost mentioned in Acts 2nd chapter when the Holy Spirit came down from heaven and the church was established. Here we dismiss Mr. Russell's No-kingdom irreverence and folly.

RESTORATIONISM EXPOSED.

The author of the "Millennial Dawn Series" of books we have declared to be a *Restorationist*. On page 71 of his first volume he says, "The third epoch-'the world to come'-future from the second advent of Christ, comprises the Millennial Age, or 'times of restitution.'" On page 73 he says, "During the Millennial age, there will be a restitution of all things lost by the fall of Adam (Acts 8: 19-21), and before its close all tears shall have been wiped away." On page 112 he says, "But let us examine the prophecy farther. After comparing Israel with Sodom and Samaria, and pronouncing Israel the most blameworthy (Ezek. 16: 48-54), the Lord says, "When I shall bring again their captivity, the captivity of Sodom and her daughters, and the captivity of Samaria and her daughters, then will I bring again the captivity of thy captives in the

midst of them." The captivity referred to can be no other than their captivity in death; for those mentioned were then dead. In death all are captives; and Christ comes to open the doors of the grave, and to set at liberty the captives. (Isa. 61: 1; Zech. 9: 11.) In verse 55 this is called a "return to their former estate-restitution." In regard to the foregoing paragraph we state that it would be difficult to imagine a worse jumbling or more evident misapplication of scripture. It reminds us of what a negro candidate for the ministry said in answer to questions concerning Jezebel. He said, "She was a woman-a bad woman-and they threw her out of the window, and they gathered up of the fragments twelve baskets full." The use Mr. Russell makes of the latter part of Ezekiel 16th chapter illustrates the danger of anyone venturing to apply divine prophecy who does not understand divine history and doctrine. In the foregoing paragraph its author ignores the difference between Israel and Judah, not knowing, it seems, that Samaria represented Israel and Jerusalem represented Judah. He also ignores the fact that according to God's history neither Israel nor Judah ever was or ever will be restored to their "former estate," which would be an estate of rebellion and wickedness. He also ignores Dan. 12: 2 which says concerning those in their graves, "And many of them that sleep in the dust shall awake, some to everlasting life, and some to shame and everlasting contempt. He likewise ignores the Savior's more complete teaching on the same subject. "Marvel not at this: for the hour is coming, in the which all that are in their graves shall hear his voice, and shall come forth; they that have done good, unto the resurrection of life; and they that have done evil, unto the resurrection of damnation." John 5: 28, 29. Shall such history and prophecy combined be set aside by a mere interpretation of a man who seems never to have read the Bible through even once in order to learn what it teaches? To ask this question is to answer it in the negative. But this is not all. Mr. Russell refers to Isa. 61:1, and Zech. 9:11, as proofs of his idea concerning restitution in the resurrection. But unfortunately for him one of those scriptures is quoted in the New Testament and is applied to Christ's earthly advent without the slightest intimation that there will be any future application of it, while the other has no reference to the subject, except by Mr. Russell's forced interpretation. in the light of such exposures what shall we say of

Mr. Russell? We shall simply say of him as Christ said to the Sadducees, "You do err, not knowing the scriptures, nor the power of God." Matt. 22:29

Second Chanceism Exposed

The author of the "Millennial Dawn Series" of books is a *Second-Chanceist*. On page 130 he says, "But would not this be giving some of the race a *second* chance to gain everlasting life? We answer—The *first* chance for everlasting was lost for himself and all his race, 'yet in his loins,' by Adam's disobedience. Under that original trial `condemnation passed upon all men;' and God's plan was that through Christ's redemption-sacrifice-Adam, and all who lost life in his failure, should, after having tasted of the exceeding sinfulness of sin and felt the weight of sin's penalty be given the opportunity to turn unto God through faith in the Redeemer. If anyone chooses to call this a 'second chance,' let him do so: it must certainly be Adam's second chance, and in a sense it is the same for all of the redeemed race, but it will be the first individual opportunity of his descendants, who, when born, were already under condemnation to death. Call it what we please the facts are the same, viz., All were sentenced death because of Adam's disobedience, and all will enjoy (in this life or the next) *a full opportunity* to gain everlasting life under the favorable terms of the New Covenant." Then on pages 142 and 143 the same author says, "The character of the judge will be a sufficient guarantee that the judgment will be just and merciful, and with due consideration for the infirmities of all, until the willing and obedient are brought to the original perfection lost in Eden." "The trial will be more favorable than the first because of the experience gained under the first trial." I

Thus Mr. Russell teaches that all will have a second chance to gain everlasting life who did not gain it here in this life, and that their second chance will be more favorable than the first. One of his arguments to prove such doctrine is set forth on page 131 thus: "And as the Apostle declared, this grace of God—that our Lord Jesus gave himself a ransom for all, must be 'testified' to all 'in due time.' Rom. 5:17-19; 1 Tim. 2:4-6." Then in the conclusion of page 126 he says, `To this end—that man might have a free *will* and yet

be enabled to profit by his failure in its misuse, in disobedience to the Lord's will-God has provided not only a ransom for all, but also that a knowledge of the opportunity thus offered of reconciliation with himself shall be testified to all in due time." Now let the reader turn to 1 Tim. 2: 6 and notice that the words "to all" are not in the text. Yet they are necessary in order to make out Mr. Russell's theory and so he slyly uses them. By so doing he shows himself to be irreverent and his doctrine to be unsound.

In opposition to this entire theory of the wicked being raised from the dead to a second chance for eternal life we refer again, as we formerly did under another heading, to the Savior's words in John 5: 28, 29. "Marvel not at this: for the hour is coming, in the which all that are in the graves shall hear his voice [the voice of Christ], and shall come forth; they that have done good, unto the resurrection of life; and they that have done evil unto the resurrection of damnation." Thus Christ says that evil doers shall be raised unto "damnation" while Russell says that evil doers shall be raised to their "former estate" in order to have "a full opportunity to gain everlasting life. The reader can choose between Christ from heaven and Russell from Allegheny City.

ANNIHILATIONISM EXPOSED.

The author of the "Millennial Dawn Series" of books has been declared to be an *Annihilationist*, and we now give proof with exposure of the doctrine. On page 121 he says "The Scriptures inform us that when the activity of the evil principle has been permitted long enough to accomplish God's purpose, it will forever cease to be active, and that all who continue to submit to its control shall forever cease to exist. (1 Cor. 15: 25, 26; Heb. 2:14.) Right-doing and right-doers, only, shall continue forever." Then on page 127 this author says, "The severity of the penalty was not a display of hatred and malice on God's part, but the necessary and inevitable final result of evil which God has allowed man to see and feel. God can sustain life as long as he sees fit, even against the destructive power of actual evil; but it would be as impossible for God to sustain such a life everlastingly, as it is for God to lie. That is, it is morally impossible. Such a life could only become more and more a source of unhappiness to itself and others;

therefore, God is too good to sustain an existence so useless and injurious to itself and others, and his sustaining power having been withdrawn, destruction, the natural result of evil, would ensue. Life is a favor, a gift of God, and it will be continued everlastingly only to the obedient."

Such reasoning is irreverent, presumptuous and contemptible. Its author presumes to sit in judgment upon God, and to decide what he can not do beyond what the Bible declares on the subject. Besides, this author in his reasoning on the question of annihilation or utter blotting out of the wicked makes use of the words "destroy" and "destruction" in the absolute or unrestricted sense. He seems not to know that they are never thus used in the Bible. On the contrary they are always used in a *modified* or *relative* sense. For instance, God said to the Israelites, "O Israel, thou hast destroyed thyself; but in me is thy help." Hosea 13: 9. On the same principle Paul wrote when he declared that when Christ will come again the wicked "shall be punished with everlasting destruction from the presence of the Lord and from the glory of his power." 2 These. 1: 9. But that does not mean that they will be blotted out of all existence. On the contrary in Mark 9: 43-48 we find it stated three times that when the wicked shall be condemned they will be cast into hell "where. their worm dieth not, and the fire is not quenched." Now, what explanation do the Dawnites give of this? One of them said to the writer that the word "hell" in the foregoing scriptures referred to the valley of Hinnom near Jerusalem where dead bodies of animals were cast to be burned, and where the fire never went out, also that the word "worm" referred to the "maggots" in those dead bodies. Has the reader ever known of any maggots that would live in the fire? But I need not pursue this any farther. When men will discard their common sense and common honesty in order to break the force of scripture that is against their theory they are hopelessly blind, and will not learn their mistake till their irreverent spirits shall be dismissed from their rebellious bodies and they find themselves ready to depart for Hades to share torment with the rich man mentioned in Luke 16th chapter.

In regard to the wicked being blotted out from all existence

it seems that Rev. 22: 11 should have caused every man inclined to the doctrine of annihilation to have turned from it with fear. John there says concerning the "unjust, let him be unjust still," and concerning the "filthy, let him be filthy still." But how could the "unjust" continue to be *unjust* or the "filthy" continue to be *filthy* if they are to be blotted out of all existence? The Apostle John says of such characters *Let them BE*; the Annihilationist says, *Let them NOT be*. Again, in the 15th verse of the same chapter the Apostle John said that "without" the holy city are "dogs, and sorcerers, and whoremongers, and murderers, and idolaters, and whosoever loveth and maketh a lie." But the annihilationist says that without the holy city there will be no conscious existence, for even the devil is to be blotted out. Mr. Russell says that it is "morally impossible" that God should sustain an existence in unhappiness. (See page 127, Vol.1, of Millennial Dawn Series.) But all this folly and contradiction of God's word results from failing to study God's word so as to learn what is the constitution or constituent elements of man. It was the devil that contradicted God in the garden of Eden. When Peter contradicted Christ he placed himself on the devil's territory, and thus the Savior justly called him "Satan." (Matt. 16: 21-23.) When Russell contradicts Christ he places himself on the devil's territory, and it would be in harmony with scripture to call him a messenger of Satan.

PROBATIONISM EXPOSED.

Charles T. Russell, of Allegheny City, Pa., is a *probationist*. That is to say, he teaches that those whom he supposes will become obedient in course of the millennial age will be eternally on trial. On page 107 of Vol.1, he says of such as he supposes will have a chance to repent beyond the resurrection, "If any, enlightened by the Truth, and brought to a knowledge of the love of God, and restored (either actually or reckonedly) to human perfection, become 'fearful,' and 'draw back' (Heb. 10: 38, 39), they, with the unbelievers (Rev. 21: S), will be destroyed from among the people. Acts 3:23. This is the second death." Then on page 186 he says, "The great mass of mankind saved from the fall, as well as the angels of heaven, will always be mortal; though in a condition of perfection and bliss, they will always be (if that mortal

nature which could suffer death, the wages of sin, if they would commit sin. The security of their existence will be conditioned, as it was with Adam, upon obedience to the all-wise God." Now then, what is to be gained by the whole enterprise? Simply that such as disobey in this life may by obedience in the millennial age be restored to the sinless condition of Adam and Eve before their fall from the divine favor, from which condition it will be possible for them to fall at any time in the ages to come! Of course, according to Mr. Russell's theory, there will be no devil to tempt them, and thus they will have one advantage over our first parents. But that advantage dwindles when we consider that after the devil will have been bound for a thousand years and during that long period not suffered to tempt the nations, yet on being released he will find an innumerable host ready to accept his leadership and fight against the saints. (See Revelations 20th chapter.) Our first parents sinned the first chance that they had, and the nations which the devil will find when released from the bottomless pit will accept him as their leader the first chance that they will be suffered to have. Then what assurance have we that some one may not arise occasionally or semi-occasionally in the "ages to come" who will rebel against God and tempt others to do the same even as Satan did In heaven? None whatever. Mr. Russell writes concerning the great advantage which experience with sin in this life will be to those whom he supposes will be restored to the perfection of the Edenic state. But all history is against him. Not more than one in ten of the human family seems benefitted by experience with sin in this world even under the most favorable circumstances. On the contrary, it generally seems as if the more experience one has had with sin the greater is that one's degradation, and the less possibility of benefitting remains. Here we close our analytic exposure of Millennial Dawnism.

OTHER ERRORS EXPOSED.

On pages 229-231 and other pages of the first volume of the Millennial Dawn Series of books is found the irreverent doctrine that Christ was not in any sense divine when he was here on the earth, but was simply "a perfect man." His right to the name "Immanuel"—God with us—his right to be called "the Son of God" in any special sense is denied. But it is maintained that when the

Holy Spirit came upon Jesus there was "the begetting to a new nature-the divine-which should be fully developed or born when he had fully accomplished the offering-the sacrifice of the human nature.....Then after being dead three days, he was raised to life-to the perfection of spirit beingtherefore at and after his resurrection, was a spirit-a spirit being, and no longer a human being in any sense."

Now aside from the irreverence and folly of such reasoning let the reader notice its direct contradiction of Luke 24: 36-43 where Jesus showed himself to his disciples after his resurrection saying, "Behold my hands and my feet, that it is I myself: handle me, and see; for a spirit hath not flesh and bones as ye see I have." Then he showed them his hands and his feet, called for something to eat and ate of material food before them! This one contradiction of divine history will convince every honest reader whose attention is called to it that Charles T. Russell is a reckless asserter of falsehood whose theory has made him hopelessly blind concerning the truth set forth in God's Book.

Next, we notice wherein Mr. Russell contradicts himself. On page 109 he says: "Israel as a nation was typical of the whole world," and on page 221 he says that Israel "as a nation, were typical of the Christian Church, the `holy nation, the peculiar people.'" Thus we find that he contradicts himself as well as the word of God.

But here is another instance. On page 262 Mr. Russell says, "We must expect God's kingdom to be inaugurated before the fall of the kingdoms of this world, and that its power and smiting will bring their over throw." Then on page 266 he predicts "a world-wide revolution, in the overthrow of all law and order; that anarchy and distress upon all classes will be the result." Then he says, "In the midst of this confusion the God of heaven will SET UP his Kingdom, which will satisfy the desires of all nations." Thus on one page this reckless author says that God's kingdom will be set up *before* the fall of the kingdoms of this world, and on another page he declares that it will be after "the overthrow of all law and order," and after "anarchy and confusion" will prevail that, "in the midst of this confusion the God of heaven will set up his kingdom."

Now we come to expose Mr. Russell's foolish reasoning about the expression "in due time" recorded in Rom. 5: 6, 1 Tim. 2: 6. In the former place Paul wrote, "In due time Christ died for the ungodly," and in the latter he wrote that Christ "gave himself a ransom for all to be testified in due time." Upon such language Mr. Russell tries to play his tune of nothing being understood until it becomes due, or the time has arrived for it to be fulfilled. Thus on page 26 he says, "Paul tells us that God has made known to the Christian Church the mystery [secret] of his will which he had purposed in himself, and never before revealed, though he had recorded it in the dark sayings which could not be understood until due." Then on page 70 he says of Paul's visions, as mentioned in 2 Cor. 12:2- 4, "Doubtless these were some of the things which John afterwards saw, and was permitted to express to the Church in symbols, which may only be understood as they become due." In opposition to all this we refer the reader to Rom. 16: 25, 26, and to Eph. 8: 14), where it is distinctly stated that certain things were a mystery while they were kept secret with God and were not revealed to men. But when they were revealed they were a secret no longer, but even the Ephesian brethren could by reading understand Paul's knowledge in the mystery of Christ. In the light of such teaching I submit that Mr. Russell's expressions-"which could not be understood until due," and "which may only be understood as they become due" *are additions to the word of God.* Paul teaches that certain things were kept secret till the time came for them *to be revealed*; Russell teaches that after being revealed they can not be understood until due to be fulfilled. This is the false keynote to the false music with which he has deceived himself and others. Then the chorus to his music consists of the doctrine of second-chanceism, and that chorus we have found to be a falsehood. The expression "due time" as found in the scriptures referred to means God's due time for making certain features of his revelation known, and when that time came then it was man's time to inquire concerning them and study them and understand them. If he even hears a report of them, but will not inquire concerning them, he is in a degree responsible. (See Luke 11: 31, 32.)

In Luke 12: 32 the Savior said to his disciples, "Fear not little flock: for it is your father's good pleasure to give you the

kingdom." That "flock" was little then, but afterwards it increased to hundreds of thousands even before there was any very serious falling away from the faith. Then John in his vision on Patmos saw a hundred and forty-four thousand male virgins from among the Jews. (Rev. 7: 16; 14:1-5.) Besides these John saw an innumerable company gathered from all nations who will constitute the redeemed from among the Gentiles. But Mr. Russell adopts the expression "little flock" and uses it as a sort of secret-grip or counter-sign to his readers. Then in order to make the flock appear as little as possible he figures up earth's billions and says on page 17 of the first volume of his series of books, "The various creeds of to day teach that all of these billions of humanity, ignorant of the only name under heaven by which we must be saved, are on the straight road to everlasting torment." The various creeds of today teach nothing of the kind, and the statement that they do is strictly incorrect. Universalism teaches that all will be saved regardless of character, and Calvinism teaches that all the elect will be saved regardless of age or nationality. Protestants generally teach that all that die in infancy or early childhood will be saved, and those who constitute that class number about one-third of the human family. What then becomes of Mr. Russell's reckless statement? He seems to illustrate Isa. 44: 20. In order to present a strong probability in favor of his theory he has misrepresented near or about every Protestant denomination. He should consider the last part of Rev. 21:8.

On page 67, Vol. 1, Mr. Russell says, "The first of these periods or `worlds,' under the ministration of angels was a failure." Now in view of the faith of Abel and Enoch and Noah with his family, all of whom are mentioned with honor in the New Testament, it seems marvelous that any man who claims to believe the Bible to be God's written revelation to man could be sufficiently irreverent to write thus concerning the period that elapsed before the flood. But from the standpoint of forewarning, as well as examples of faith, that period was not a failure, and Mr. Russell should feel ashamed that he ever said so.

On page 69 we find the following: "It should be remembered that this earth is the basis of all these `worlds,' and dispensations,

and that though ages pass and dispensations change, still the earth continues-'The earth abideth forever.' (Eccl. 1: 4.) Carrying out the same figure, Peter calls each of these periods a separate heaven and earth. Here the word heavens symbolizes the higher or spiritual controlling powers, and earth symbolizes human government and social arrangements. Thus the first heavens and earth, or the order and arrangement of things then existing having served their purpose, ended at the flood."

In regard to what has just been copied from Mr. Russell's first volume, I deliberately state that it would be difficult to imagine how more confusion could be set forth in the same space.

1. The word "forever" in Eccl. 1: 4, is used in its absolute or unrestricted sense, which ignores the connection in which it is found, and contradicts the Savior in Matt. 24: 35, also the apostle Peter's language in his second letter, 3rd chapter and 10th verse.

2. In 2 Peter 3: 6 we read, "Whereby the world that then was, being overflowed with water perished." But Mr. Russell passed from "the world" in the text to "first heavens and earth" in his imagination, which he explains by the words-"order and arrangement of things," which he evolves out of his own irreverent mind. Thus one assumption follows another in quick succession so that the vagaries of the Book of Mormon are suggested.

In conclusion I wish to bring against Mr. Russell's theory the charge that it makes the righteous sad and gives comfort to the wicked. The former are made sad to think that any man would spend his time advocating a theory in such direct contradiction to the clear teaching of God's word, while the latter are comforted in the assurance that they may be permitted to sin as much as they see fit during this life and yet have a chance for salvation under favorable circumstances after the resurrection. Thus in Charles T. Russell, of Allegheny City, Pa., is fulfilled what God said to the false prophets in course of the Jewish age.-"Because with lies ye have made the heart of the righteous sad, whom I have not made sad; and strengthened the hands of the wicked, that he should not return from his wicked way, by promising him life." Ezek. 13: 22.

One other statement ought to be made. From the manner in

which Mr. Russell speaks of what he calls "the Christian Church" we gather that he does not regard the "little flock" which he thinks will be so highly honored as consisting simply of those who accept his theory. Therefore as he has in his second volume stated that 1914 will be the year for the gospel age to close and the millennial period to be introduced we can all afford to wait that long. I regard his chronological calculations wrong, but even if they should prove correct they would not prove his theory correct in opposition to what the Sacred Text plainly declares. Then let us all wait.

DANIEL SOMMER.

Added remarks—The following was written near or about twenty years ago, and was published as a tract. A reprint of that tract now seems in order, though Mr. Russell has died and his doctrine concerning the end of the Gospel Age in 1914 has been proved wrong by time and in its developments.

But the followers of Mr. Russell are not all discouraged. Even his financial troubles, his domestic disaster, and his unfavorable court record—all these combined seem not to have caused all of them to lose all confidence in him. Besides, as a successor of Mr. Russell a certain lawyer named Rutherford has been entertaining them and certain others by declaring, "Millions now living will never die." And this declaration affords them some comfort.

A follower of John Calvin once declared to me "You can never get me to move till you cut my throat from ear to ear." By this declaration I understood him to mean that he would never turn from Calvinism till I had taken away from him every argument on which he could rely. As memory serves me I turned from that Calvinist without another word. I had shown him that John Calvin was wrong in several prominent particulars. But that did not discourage him. He had to be shown that Calvin was wrong, **in every particular** before he would change and turn from him. I fear the same is true with many of Mr. Russell's followers. But the hope that they have not all gone that far, and the hope `if preventing others from accepting Mr. Russell's peculiar doctrines—these hopes have encouraged me to consent to a reprint of my tract against

those doctrines. When, a man pretends to be a Greek scholar, and then, when offered a volume in Greek, shows that he is not able to read and translate a line of it, then his friends should begin to **doubt his integrity, his truthfulness, his honor, and even his purposes.**

When a man pretends to be a religious reformer, and therefore an exemplar to his followers in regard to behavior—when such a man is convicted of such indiscretions in domestic and social life that his wife feels constrained to sue for divorce with alimony and gets it, then those that confide in him **should lose confidence in his integrity.**

When a writer is convicted of the crime of adding to God's word and with taking from it, or even with ignoring any part of it, that is against his theory, then those that read after him **should have their doubts about him.**

When a pretended religious reformer advocates doctrine that gives comfort to the wicked, while in their wickedness, and thereby encourages them to remain in it, and thus makes the heart of the righteous sad **then that pretender should be regarded as a tree whose fruit is not good.**

When a man that pretends to be a believer in the Bible will declare to his followers that if they will read his writings for a certain period of time they will then not need to read the Bible, **then his followers should regard him as a dangerous man.**

When a religious teacher ignores the Church of the New Testament, and forms an "association" that is not a church, and when he declares to his followers that they do not need to have membership even in the Church of the New Testament, **then his followers should begin to doubt him.**

When a teacher sets before his pupils the example that when a scripture can be strained to suit his theory then it should be strained to the utmost, and when it can be contracted so as to suit

his theory their it should be contracted to the utmost-when he sets such an example **he should be rejected as a deceiver.**

If anything was clearly set forth in Mr. Charles T. Russell's writings, then certainly the doctrine that the Gospel Age would be ended, and the Millennial Age would be introduced in 1914 was thus set forth. And if anything is clear to the world of mankind that reads and thinks certainly this is clear: **The Gospel Age did not end nor did the Millennial Age begin in that year:** And except the fact that Jerusalem has ceased to be trodden down of the Mahometans. and the Jews have the privilege of returning to Palestine-with these exceptions **all things continue near or about as they were before 1914.**

These facts and considerations concerning them should cause the followers of Mr. Chas. T. Russell to doubt their safety under his leadership, or the leadership of any one that advocates the same kind of a doctrine.

Many of Mr. Russell's followers seem to be plain and humble people, but I have never found any of them that seem to have read the whole Bible with care. But they have read it only in special parts or fragments. the doctrine that they should take the truth, the whole truth, nothing but the **truth—this doctrine seems never to have occurred to them.** I therefore urge this doctrine upon them, for in accepting it is their safety for this world, and the one to come. I intend this to be my final appeal to them. And I entreat them to lay aside the writings of Charles T. Russell, and read their Bible from beginning to end in order that they may become wise unto the salvation that is offered in the gospel of Christ as revealed in the New Testament. and as offered by the Churches of Christ.

D. S.