

The
NICHOL - BRADLEY
DEBATE

C. R. NICHOL, Christian
A. S. BRADLEY, Materialist

HELD AT RULE, TEXAS; APRIL 20-22, 1906

REPORTED BY
W. W. GOLDEN
WRITER OF BYRNE SYMPLIFIED SYSTEM OF SHORTHAND

PUBLISHED BY
MRS. C. R. NICHOL
CLIFTON, TEXAS

ORDER FROM
NICHOL PUBLISHING CO.
CLIFTON, TEXAS

COPYRIGHT, 1907, BY
MRS. C. R. NICHOL
CLIFTON, TEXAS

THIRD EDITION

INDORSEMENTS OF MR. GOLDEN

Mr. W. W. Golden, Tyler, Texas.

DEAR SIR: Your work as reporter here in our court has been entirely satisfactory to us, and we have heard you freely complimented by other members of the bar. We especially note the ease and rapidity with which you are able to report the most rapid and difficult evidence; and while we know nothing of the different "systems," we are ready to say that the system that produced you will satisfy any one who is looking for rapid, neat, and accurate work.

Yours truly,

GREEN, WATKINS & RICHARDSON,
Attorneys at Law.

This is to certify that I, Tom Harris, District Attorney of the Third Judicial District of Texas, have had occasion to speak very rapidly in the cross-examination of witnesses, while W. W. Golden, a writer of the Byrne system of simplified shorthand, reported same with ease—and, too, without having to call on me to stop or repeat; and, to my astonishment, he reads every word of same as though it were print. I take pleasure in recommending this system to any one desiring to become an expert in shorthand writing.

TOM HARRIS,
Attorney.

When Mr. Bradley refused to correct the transcript, I then wrote and asked him if he had any objection to its being published just as it came from Mr. Golden, and he replied: "I have no objection to your publishing it, pro-

vided you make the statement in the book that I deny its being correct; and remember that I will not put my name to it in any way."

I regret very much that Mr. Bradley has refused to indorse or correct the transcript to the extent that he thinks it is incorrect. I am certain that any one that has ever heard Mr. Bradley will appreciate the most excellent work that Mr. Golden has done in reporting the debate.

MR. GOLDEN'S AFFIDAVIT.

Tyler, Texas, February 25, 1907.

This is to certify that I, W. W. Golden, do solemnly swear that the speeches contained in this book are as delivered by Elders C. R. Nichol and A. S. Bradley at Rule, Texas, on April 20, 21, 22, 1906.

W. W. GOLDEN,
Reporter.

Subscribed and sworn to before me, this 25th day of February, 1907.

S. G. FRIERSON,
Notary Public, Smith County, Texas.

Term expiring June, 1907.

AGREEMENT

Having agreed to meet Charles R. Nichol in an oral debate at Rule, Texas, it is understood that Mr. Nichol is to secure a competent stenographer, who shall report the debate. Mr. Nichol is to furnish me with a typewritten copy of my speeches as they come from the stenographer, and I agree to correct them for the sum of \$10. It is further agreed that neither of us are to add new argument to the manuscript nor change any argument as made orally. Mr. Nichol is to bear all expenses of putting the debate in book form and paying the stenographer.

(Signed) A. S. BRADLEY.
CHARLES R. NICHOL.

I contracted with the Tyler Commercial College, Tyler, Texas, for a stenographer to report the debate. They furnished Mr. W. W. Golden to do the work.

When I secured the transcript of the speeches and sent them to Mr. Bradley, he refused to correct them, claiming that the work of the stenographer was not what it should be, intimating that I had not secured a competent man to do the work. As to the ability of Mr. Golden, note the following indorsements, as well as the fact that the speeches of Mr. Bradley appear in the book just as they came from him, without one word of correction.

The Nichol - Bradley Debate

FIRST PROPOSITION.

"The Scriptures teach that the kingdom of Christ was established on the first Pentecost after the resurrection of Christ." (Charles R. Nichol, affirmative; A. S. Bradley, negative.)

NICHOL'S OPENING ADDRESS.

Gentlemen Moderators, Ladies and Gentlemen:

I count myself happy to appear before you this morning as the affirmant of the proposition you have heard read by the moderator. Let me congratulate you as the recipients of divine favor and myself on your presence. I trust our association will be mutually congenial and edifying.

The question that we are to discuss is not like the political issues that engross the minds of the people today and become dead issues before the opening of the next campaign. Political questions are ephemeral—they are soon forgotten; but the one before us this morning is of eternal moment. Our well-being here and hereafter is contingent on the truth connected with my affirmation.

Let me define the terms of my proposition. I mean by "Scriptures," the word of God; "teach," to declare in round terms, or the logical conclusion deduced therefrom; "kingdom of Christ," a body of people ruled by the

Christ, who, as King, has sent forth his law; "Pentecost," the great feast day of the Jewish dispensation, which came fifty days after the passover. On the "first" one of these days after the body of Christ came forth from the sepulcher the kingdom was "established"—brought into existence.

If there is a point that my opponent does not understand, he will please let me know, and I will be more lucid. I am very solicitous that the issue be clearly understood, that we may not spend time over questions not germane.

Let me quicken your interest in the discussion. I firmly believe, and shall contend, that if the kingdom is not in existence, if it has not been established, men are not saved, the people of Christ are an unsaved body of individuals, their sins have not been forgiven, they are not the children of God; in short, if no kingdom now, then no salvation now. Let my opponent deny the statement, and the proof shall be forthcoming.

Daniel declared, some 600 years before the birth of Christ, that the time would come when God would set up a kingdom. The Jews were expecting someone who in the power of their God would become their King. This Messiah they longed for, and the establishment of the promised kingdom. The last of the old prophets, Malachi, passed away, and in the economy of God the time had not come for the establishment of the kingdom; but when the Christ appeared among men as a teacher, he declared: "The time is fulfilled, and the kingdom of God is at hand." (Mark 1:15). Please note the expression: "The time is fulfilled." When Daniel made the promise, the time was not "fulfilled;" but Christ, while among men, declared: "The time is fulfilled." The time being fulfilled, we may certainly look for the establishment of the kingdom very soon after this statement of Christ.

Christ said unto Peter: "I will give unto thee the keys

of the kingdom of heaven." (Matt. 16:19). We do not understand that Christ gave Peter literal "keys," such as we use with which to lock our houses, but that "keys" as used in this passage is a symbol of power. Peter received the power by which he made known the "how" to enter the kingdom. My opponent admits that Peter used "the keys of the kingdom" on Pentecost, the Pentecost of my proposition, and that by obeying his commands made known by Peter, people were added to the church—became members of the church. I submit that since Christ in A. D. 30 said, "The time is fulfilled," and in A. D. 32 promised Peter the "keys" of the kingdom, and Bradley admits that Peter used the "keys of the kingdom" on the Pentecost of my proposition, then the kingdom was at that time in existence and will not be established at the second coming of Christ, as Mr. Bradley contends.

"Verily I say unto you, That there be some of them that stand here, which shall not taste of death, till they have seen the kingdom of God come with power." (Mark 9:1). In this passage Christ very plainly declares that some of the ones to whom he was speaking would live to see the kingdom come with power. As certain as Christ spoke correctly, as certain as the people to whom he spoke have all died, just that certain has the kingdom come—come with power. The passage is rhetorical. "Some standing here, which shall not taste of death, till they have seen the kingdom of God come with power," is but to say that some of them would die before the kingdom came, but all of them would not; and, in truth, Judas did die before Pentecost. Christ said the kingdom would "come with power." If we can learn when the "power" came, we will know when the kingdom came; for the "kingdom" was to come with "power." After his resurrection, Christ said to his apostles: "Tarry ye in the city of Jerusalem, until ye be endued with power from on high." (Luke 24:49.) The Lord assured them

of the power by saying: "Ye shall receive power, after that the Holy Ghost is come upon you." (Acts 1:8.) When were they to receive the power? The Christ said they would receive the power when the Holy Spirit came upon them. The Holy Spirit came on them on "the first Pentecost after the resurrection of Christ"—the time my proposition calls for. (1) The kingdom and the power were to come together; (2) the power and the Spirit were to come together; (3) the Holy Spirit came on the first Pentecost after the resurrection of Christ. (Acts 2: 1-4.) Since the Spirit came on the first Pentecost after the resurrection of Christ and the "power" was to come when the Spirit came, the power came at that time; but the kingdom was to come when the "power" came, but the "power" came on the first Pentecost after the resurrection of Christ, therefore the "kingdom" came at that time—the "first Pentecost after the resurrection of Christ," the time my proposition calls for. I am certain that my opponent will never make an effort to show that I am incorrect in the contention that I make on these passages. I insist that this argument proves my affirmation true. All other arguments that I make on this point will be a work of supererogation.

But that you may know how impregnable is my position, I will present many other arguments showing that the kingdom has been established.

CHRIST AFFIRMS THAT HE IS KING.

"And Pilate asked him, saying, Art thou the King of the Jews? And he answered him and said, Thou sayest." (Luke 23:3.) The answer, "Thou sayest," is from the Greek words "Su legeis," defined in Thayer's Greek-English Lexicon: "Prop., *thou sayest*, i. e., thou grantest *what thou askest*, equiv. to *it is just as thou sayest; to be sure, certainly.*" Paul says that Christ witnessed the good confession before Pontius Pilate: "I charge thee in the sight of God, who giveth life to all things, and of

Christ Jesus, who before Pontius Pilate witnessed the good confession." (I Tim. 6:13.) The confession before Pontius Pilate witnessed by Christ was that he (Christ) was King. In the face of these very plain statements of Christ and Paul that Christ is King, my friend, Bradley, flies and declares that Christ was not then and is not now King. True, John says of Christ: "For he is Lord of lords, and King of kings." (Rev. 17:14.) My opponent assures us that he knows that Christ is not King. It is strange to me that a man will become so completely wrapped up in a false theory that he will deny the very plainest statements of inspiration.

Regarding the preaching of Paul at Thessalonica we find the following: "These that have turned the world upside down are come hither also; whom Jason hath received: and these all do contrary to the decrees of Caesar, saying that there is another king, one Jesus." (Acts 17:6-7). No question about it, friends; Christ is King, and the apostles so preached during their ministry.

The Scriptures are just as plain in stating that the kingdom exists. Listen: "Who hath delivered us from the power of darkness, and hath translated us into the kingdom of his dear Son." (Col. 1:13.) Paul says that they were "translated into the kingdom." For there to be a "translating" there must be a passing out of one state or thing into another state or thing. Paul says they were delivered from the power of darkness—passed out of darkness, became the children of light. But more; they were "translated into the kingdom." Mr. Bradley, Paul says that they were "translated into the kingdom." What do you say? You cannot say "translated into the church," for Paul says "translated into the kingdom." Do not forget that the word "translated" ("metestesen") means "to transpose, transfer, remove from one place to another." (Thayer.) The brethren at Colosse were taken out of "the power of darkness." Into what did they enter? You cannot say "translated into" church,

if church differs from kingdom. Mr. Bradley, don't forget to tell us into what these people were "translated," if Paul is not right in his statement—viz., that they were "translated into the kingdom."

The apostle John is just as positive as Paul on the matter of the existence of the kingdom, and he affirms that he was a citizen of the kingdom. Hear him: "I John, who also am your brother, and companion in tribulation, and in the kingdom and patience of Jesus Christ." (Rev. 1:9). Just as certain as John told the truth when he said he was a "brother" of the people to whom he wrote, just that certain was he in the kingdom. I insist that the language cannot be plainer. John says that he was *in the kingdom*. Mr. Bradley, tell us if John told the truth when he said that he was in the kingdom. If he was not in the kingdom, where was he?

ARE WE GREATER THAN CHRIST?

"And from Jesus Christ, who is the faithful witness, and the first begotten from the dead, and the prince of the kings of the earth. Unto him that loved us, and washed us from our sins in his own blood, and hath made us kings and priests unto God and his Father." (Rev. 1: 5, 6.) In this passage John declares: (1) Jesus Christ is the faithful witness; (2) he is the first begotten of the dead; (3) he is the prince of the kings of the earth. The word "prince" ("Archon") means: "A ruler, commander, chief, leader." (Thayer.) Not only does John state that Christ is the "prince of the kings of the earth," but he says (4) Christ loved us, (5) washed us from our sins, and (6) made us "kings and priests unto God." Just as certain as Christ "loved us," just as certain as he has "washed us from our sins," just that certain has he made us "priests and kings unto God." Though John says that the people to whom he wrote were "priests and kings

unto God," Mr. Bradley says that Christ is not King. My dear sir, are we greater than Christ?

"Even he shall build the temple of the Lord; and shall bear the glory, and shall sit and rule upon his throne; and he shall be a priest upon his throne: and the counsel of peace shall be between them both." (Zech. 6:13).

ON HIS THRONE.

1. Jesus was to be "priest upon his throne." (Zech. 6:13.)

2. He was "Priest" in the days of the apostles. (Heb. 4:14.)

3. Therefore he was on "HIS THRONE" in the days of the apostles.

Again:

1. Jesus was on his throne when "sitting." (Zech. 6:13.)

2. He was "sitting" in the days of the apostles. (Eph. 1:20.)

3. Therefore he was on "his throne" in the days of the apostles.

RULE.

1. Jesus was to "sit and rule upon his throne." (Zech. 6:13.)

2. He "sit" in the days of the apostles. (Heb. 1:3.)

3. Therefore he "ruled" in the days of the apostles.

REIGN.

1. Jesus was "reigning" when the Gentiles trusted in him. (Rom. 15:12.)

2. Gentiles trusted in him in the days of the apostles. (Acts 15.)

3. Therefore he was "reigning" in the days of the apostles.

BUT HE IS KING.

1. Jesus is "King" when "Lord." (Rev. 17:14.)
2. But he was Lord in the days of the apostles. (Acts 2:36.)
3. Therefore he was "King" in the days of the apostles.

KINGDOM.

1. He who is "upon his throne," "King," and "reigning" has kingdom.
2. Jesus was on "his throne," "King," and "reigning" in the days of the apostles.
3. Therefore he had kingdom in the days of the apostles.

"Even he shall build the temple of the Lord; and he shall bear the glory, and shall sit and rule upon his throne; and he shall be a priest upon his throne: and the counsel of peace shall be between them both." (Zech. 6:13.) He is to be "priest upon his throne"—not off of his throne, but upon his throne. If he is now "priest," he is "upon his throne," for he was to be "priest upon his throne." This being true, he could not be "priest" till he reached his throne. "If he were on earth, he should not be a priest." (Heb. 8:4.) If on earth he could not be a priest, but he was to be "priest upon his throne," this throne, then, could not be on earth, for he would then be priest on earth; hence he must be priest where the throne is. But he was not and could not be priest on earth; therefore the throne was not and could not be on earth. If I can prove that Christ is priest, I thereby prove that he is on "his throne." Right gladly do I address myself to the proof of the proposition that Christ is priest. "Seeing then that we have a great high priest, that is passed into the heavens, Jesus the Son of God." (Heb. 4:14.) Jesus, then, was not only priest, but high priest, when the Hebrew letter was written. At that time, then,

he was "upon his throne;" for he was to be "priest upon his throne." Being on his throne, the kingdom was established; for throne and kingdom are inseparable. Of Christ it was said: "Thou art a priest forever after the order of Melchisedec." (Heb. 7:17.) Melchisedec was "priest and king." "For this Melchisedec, king of Salem, priest of the most high God." (Heb. 7:1.) Melchisedec was "priest and king," and Christ is priest after the same order; then he is, must be, "priest and king," too. But Christ was to be "priest upon his throne," but he is now priest; then he is now upon his throne. But he was to be "priest after the order of Melchisedec," who was "priest and king;" then Christ must be Priest and King upon his throne; being King upon his throne, he has kingdom; being King upon his throne, we contemplate his reign.

"Men and brethren, let me freely speak unto you of the patriarch David, that he is both dead and buried, and his sepulcher is with us unto this day. Therefore being a prophet, and knowing that God had sworn with an oath to him, that of the fruit of his loins, according to the flesh, he would raise up Christ to sit on his throne; he seeing this before spake of the resurrection of Christ, that his soul was not left in hell, neither his flesh did see corruption. This Jesus hath God raised up, whereof we all are witnesses. Therefore being by the right hand of God exalted, and having received of the Father the promise of the Holy Ghost, he hath shed forth this which ye now see and hear. For David is not ascended into the heavens: but he saith himself, The Lord said unto my Lord, Sit thou on my right hand, until I make thy foes thy footstool. Therefore let all the house of Israel know assuredly, that God hath made that same Jesus, whom ye have crucified, both Lord and Christ." (Acts 2:29-36.) "The Lord said unto my Lord, Sit thou at my right hand, until I make thine enemies thy footstool. The Lord shall send the rod of thy strength out of Zion:

rule thou in the midst of thine enemies. Thy people shall be willing in the day of thy power." (Psa. 110:1, 2.) How long is Christ to reign on his throne at the right hand of the Father? "For he must reign, till he hath put all enemies under his feet. The last enemy that shall be destroyed is death." (I Cor. 15:25, 26.) No one can be destroyed as long as he has ruling power. Death, one of the enemies—indeed, the last one—is to be destroyed before Christ abdicates the throne at the Father's right hand. This will be at the end of time—the end of the world—when the graves give up the dead. If Christ is not King now, he will not be while the world stands.

When Christ ascended to be seated at the Father's right hand as King and Priest on his throne, "there was given him dominion, and glory, and a kingdom, that all nations, people and languages should serve him." (Dan. 7:14.) When he entered heaven, the inaugural address was delivered: "Lift up your heads, O ye gates; and be ye lift up, ye everlasting doors; and the King of glory shall come in. Who is this King of glory? The Lord strong and mighty, the Lord mighty in battle. Lift up your heads, O ye gates; even lift them up, ye everlasting doors; and the King of glory shall come in. Who is this King of glory? The Lord of hosts, he is King of glory." (Psa. 24:7-10.) On his royal robes was written: "King of kings, and Lord of lords." Being King upon his throne, his law should go forth. (Acts 2:1-44.) His plenipotentiaries are empowered, nations are assembled, Spirit speaks through the apostles, the announcement by them is made: You crucified Jesus, but God has raised him from the dead and seated him at his right hand on the throne of David. He is now Lord and Christ. When the people hear this, they cry for the law of him who is seated on the throne of David. The law goes forth, and three thousand hear and obey; and by their obedience they become citizens of the kingdom, are delivered from

the power of darkness and translated into the kingdom. (Col. 1:13.) Christ, David's Son, is enthroned; his law has gone forth; he is ruling in the midst of his enemies. (Psa. 110:1-3.)

KINGDOM AND GLORY.

When Christ was in his personal ministry, he was not glorified, nor was the Spirit given; indeed, the Spirit was not to be given till he was glorified. "The Holy Ghost was not given; because that Jesus was not yet glorified." (John 7:39.) When Christ entered into his *glory*, he received the *kingdom*. To contend that the kingdom has not been established is to contend that Christ has not been glorified. Hear the proof of this statement: "Then came to him the mother of Zebedee's children with her sons, worshiping him, and desiring a certain thing of him. And he said unto her, What wilt thou? She said unto him, Grant that these my two sons may sit, the one on thy right hand, and the other on thy left, in thy kingdom." (Matt. 20:20, 21.) You will please note that the desire of the woman was that her boys should have the seats at either side of Christ in his kingdom. Now let us read again: "And James and John, the sons of Zebedee, come unto him, saying, Master, we would that thou shouldest do for us whatsoever we shall desire. And he said unto them, What would ye that I should do for you? They said unto him, Grant unto us that we may sit, one on thy right hand, and the other on thy left hand, in thy glory." (Mark 10:35-37.) Thus you note that while the account in Matthew says the kingdom, Mark speaks of it as the glory. Indeed, they believed that to be on the Lord's right hand in the kingdom was to be with him in his glory; and such must be the truth, or they were laboring under a deception, and Christ by his silence allowed them to remain deceived—more, by his silence he contributed thereto. So certain as Christ did not contribute to the deception of the

disciples, just that certain is it that when he entered into his glory he possessed the kingdom. To say, as does my opponent, that Christ does not possess the kingdom, is to declare that he has not been glorified. Mr. Bradley, are you ready to say so much? Let us see if Christ has been glorified; if so, when. "Ought not Christ to have suffered these things, and to enter into his glory?" (Luke 24: 26.) His glory came after his suffering. "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, and they brought him near before him. And there was given him dominion, and glory, and a kingdom." (Dan. 7:13,14.) He was to receive the glory when he went to the Father with the clouds. When did he thus ascend? After his resurrection. (See Acts 1:9.) When he ascended, the angelic host shouted: "Lifted up your heads, O ye gates; and be ye lift up, ye everlasting doors; and the King of glory shall come in." (Psa. 24:7.) He was then "received up into glory" (I Tim. 3:16) and "crowned with glory" (Heb. 2:9). Not a question about it; when he entered into his glory, he received the kingdom, or the disciples were deceived, and he allowed them to entertain this false idea.

CHRIST IS KING WITH POWER

While Christ was on earth, before his death, he affirmed that he was King, as I have proven in this address. After he entered the strong man's house and spoiled his goods, he came forth from the grave and declared: "All power is given unto me in heaven and in earth." (Matt. 28:18.) If there was the power of a King in heaven or in earth, Christ had that power. When he ascended to God, he still had "all power" and was King. He was seated on the throne, and "principalities, and power, and might, and dominions" were made subject to him. He had while on earth promised Peter the keys of the king-

dom, and Mr. Bradley says that Peter used the keys on the Pentecost of my proposition; but there was no kingdom there, he says. Pshaw!

All Christians worship Christ as King. They are striving to form their lives, shape their characters, and seal their destiny in keeping with the law of Christ, the King. We hail Christ as the Spirit declares him: "KING OF KINGS, AND LORD OF LORDS." (Rev. 19:16.)

BRADLEY'S FIRST REPLY.

Gentlemen Moderators, Ladies and Gentlemen:

I am happy to come before you this morning to deny the proposition that has been read in your hearing. I am glad of the opportunity to meet my friend and have the debate published in book form, that the people may see the truth of God presented and false doctrine exposed, for the people do not understand the truth. I say that I am glad that this debate is to go before the world in book form.

If I did not believe the proposition that you have heard read and that Mr. Nichol is affirming to be wrong, I would not be here this morning denying the proposition.

Now, I don't want to say anything that will be untrue of my opponent; and if I mistake him in any way, I will deem it a favor if he will correct me in the statement.

Now, in confirmation of the fact that I am right in denying that proposition before us and that the kingdom has not been established, let us note some of the things that Mr. Nichol has said. He read Mark 1:15: "The time is fulfilled, and the kingdom of God is at hand." You will note that he is affirming that the kingdom was established on the first Pentecost after the resurrection of Christ, and this passage don't say one word about Pentecost. There is nothing in the passage that goes to prove his proposition. If he will give the book, chapter, and verse that says that the kingdom was set up on the first Pentecost after the resurrection of Christ, I will give up the proposition. He can't do it, and hence he is wrong. He connected Mark 1:15 with Matt. 16:17-19:

"And Jesus answered and said unto him, Blessed art thou, Simon Bar-jona: for flesh and blood hath not revealed it unto thee, but my Father which is in heaven. And I say unto thee, That thou art Peter, and upon this rock I will build my church; and the gates of hell shall not prevail against it. And I will give unto thee the keys of the kingdom of heaven: and whatsoever thou shalt bind on earth shall be bound in heaven: and whatsoever thou shalt loose on earth shall be loosed in heaven." Now, I don't see any connection between these two passages that justifies any one in saying that the kingdom was established on the first Pentecost after the resurrection of Christ. I fail to find anything in this passage that says that the kingdom has been established at any time. I admit that Peter used a "key of the kingdom of heaven" on Pentecost, but I do not admit that the kingdom has been established. Yes, respected friends, I admit that Peter used a key of the kingdom of heaven on the Pentecost that my opponent says the kingdom was set up on, but I do not admit that the kingdom was established then. I do not agree that Christ has ever been crowned as King. Why don't I admit it? Because there is nothing in the divine truth of God that says so.

Now, respected friends, my opponent all the way through his speech has used the word "keys," and says that I admit that Peter used the "keys" of the kingdom on Pentecost. I don't admit any such thing, and he knows it. There were two "keys," and Peter only used one "key" on the day of Pentecost; and he will agree with me on this subject, too. Don't misrepresent me.

Now, then, respected friends, in regard to these "keys of the kingdom of heaven," I want to say that the first "key" was used by Peter on Pentecost, and teaches men what or how they obey God, or, as my opponent says, how to "enter the church;" but note the fact, respected friends, that the church and the kingdom are not the

same thing; they come from different Greek words; and, therefore, the kingdom has not been established. Now let us look at it from this standpoint: Express the point of how to enter into the kingdom of God. The first "key" was used by Peter on Pentecost, and was to teach them how to stay in the church and enter into the kingdom. Entrance into the kingdom begins with obedience to the gospel. When a man believes, repents, confesses, and is baptized, he passes out of a state of condemnation into a state of justification. These two keys combined are to teach a man how to become a Christian and how to live a Christian. Yes, the word "key" means authority, or power; and by the authority of God, Peter made known how to enter the church and live a Christian, that we may enter the kingdom when it is set up.

Note the fact, respected friends, that there were two keys of the kingdom of heaven. My friend would have you believe that Peter used both keys on Pentecost. I have shown you that he used one key then, and that showed them how to enter the church, and the other key was to teach them how to live a Christian, that they might enter into the kingdom, for Peter says: "Add to your faith virtue; and to virtue knowledge; and to knowledge temperance; and to temperance patience; and to patience godliness; and to godliness brotherly kindness; and to brotherly kindness charity. For if these things be in you, and abound, they make you that ye shall neither be barren nor unfruitful in the knowledge of our Lord Jesus Christ. But he that lacketh these things is blind, and cannot see afar off, and hath forgotten that he was purged from his old sins. Wherefore the rather, brethren, give diligence to make your calling and election sure: for if ye do these things, ye shall never fall: for an entrance shall be ministered unto you abundantly into the everlasting kingdom of our Lord and Savior Jesus Christ." (II Peter 1:5-11.) Note the fact, respected

friends, when the kingdom is established, it is to be an everlasting kingdom—it is forever. Are we living in an everlasting kingdom now? So, now, in regard to the keys of the kingdom, I hope that you all understand the explanation that I have made in regard to them. When the kingdom is established, it will be an everlasting kingdom; we, when we enter it, will be in it forever; there will be no getting out of it.

Now we invite your attention to the argument and the scriptures that were introduced about the "power" and the kingdom. Let me begin reading a few verses before the one that he read, that you may understand what it means. I begin to read at Mark 8:34: "And when he had called the people unto him with his disciples also, he said unto them, Whosoever will come after me, let him deny himself, and take up his cross, and follow me. For whosoever will save his life shall lose it; but whosoever shall lose his life for my sake and the gospel's, the same shall save it. For what shall it profit a man, if he shall gain the whole world, and lose his own soul? Or what shall a man give in exchange for his soul? Whosoever therefore shall be ashamed of me and my words in this adulterous and sinful generation; of him shall the Son of man be ashamed, when he cometh in the glory of his Father with the holy angels. And he said unto them, Verily I say unto you, That there be some of them that stand here, which shall not taste of death, till they have seen the kingdom of God come with power." My friend tells you that the power came on Pentecost; but note the fact, respected, friends, that there is not a word said in the passage about the kingdom being established on Pentecost, nor of Christ having power then. I want to say that when Christ comes to establish the kingdom, it will be an everlasting kingdom; and as there is no everlasting kingdom now, it has not been established. Now, then, in reference to this passage of scripture. You will

note the fact that Christ is the speaker; then he is the first person; and he speaks to the "you," the second person; and there is also a "them" spoken of, which is the third person. The "them" of whom Christ speaks in the passage is the "generation" spoken of in the preceding verse. "Them" refers to "generation" for its antecedent. Christ said that some of "them" of that generation would not taste of death till the kingdom came, and I believe it. Yes, sir, "generation" is the antecedent of "them."

I want to say, respected friends, that if my honorable opponent will introduce one passage of scripture that says that the kingdom was established on the first Pentecost after the resurrection of Christ, I will quit the debate. Just give us one, friend Nichol. There is not one in the Bible.

Respected friends, he tries to prove one thing by another. He finds that "power" came on Pentecost, and then he says: "Therefore the kingdom came then." I can prove infant baptism the same way.

I want to say, respected friends, that if Christ had a kingdom he would be King of that kingdom. He is not king now, and will not be till he comes again.

Now let us read I Tim. 6:13-15: "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, unrebukable, 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 the Lord of lords." Christ was born to be Prophet, Priest, and King. He is Prophet and Priest now, but he is not King now. I don't want it understood that I don't believe in the kingdom of Christ, but I don't believe that it has yet been established, and I don't believe that Jesus was King before the day of Pentecost; and if my friend was debating with a Baptist, he would not admit that

Christ was King before the day of Pentecost, either. No, sir, he would not admit that Christ was King before Pentecost if he was debating with a Baptist preacher. If I can't prove that my friend is wrong, I will quit the debate. You notice, respected friends, that my opponent proves everything by a "therefore." He takes one thing and proves another by it, but I take the word of God.

Now, then, respected friends, my honorable opponent read to you from Luke 23:1-3: "And the whole multitude of them arose, and led him unto Pilate. And they began to accuse him, saying, We found this fellow perverting the nation, and forbidding to give tribute to Caesar, saying that he himself is Christ a King. And Pilate asked him, saying, Art thou the King of the Jews? And he answered him and said, Thou sayest it." He then read about a good confession before Pontius Pilate; but, respected friends, is there one word in all this about the kingdom being established on the first Pentecost after the resurrection of Christ, or on any other day? Not one word; and he knows it, too; but he must say something. Of course I admit that Jesus Christ was a crowned Prince; but has he ever returned and established his kingdom. That is the question, respected friends; and I tell you that my opponent will never undertake to answer it. Why? Because he knows that if he does, he will have to give up the debate. He knows this.

My opponent is very anxious to prove that Christ is King, and reads to you from Acts 17:6, 7. In this passage he thinks he has the proof that Christ is King. I read it, too, that you may note what it says: "And when they found them not, they drew Jason and certain brethren unto the rulers of the city, crying, These that have turned the world upside down are come hither also; whom Jason hath received: and these do all contrary to the decrees of Caesar, saying that there is another king, one Jesus." You will note the fact, respected friends, that

these people that said that Christ was King were the enemies of Christ. Yes, sir, the enemies of Jesus said that he was King. Shame on the man that has to resort to what the enemies of the Lord said to prove his doctrine! Mr. Nichol, give us book, chapter, and verse where a man of God ever said that Christ was King. You read Acts 17:6,7, and that is what wicked men said about Christ. A man of God never said it. We all admit that these wicked men said that Christ was King, but God never said anything in confirmation of my opponent's belief that the kingdom has been established. He, of course, is a logical fellow, and can make things look very plain to some of you; but he has not, and cannot, read the proof text to prove his contention in this matter.

I will continue to look at the scriptures that he has introduced as proof of his proposition, and show you that it is not proof at all of the position that he has taken in this matter. Col. 1:13: "Who hath delivered us from the power of darkness, and hath translated us into the kingdom of his dear Son." Rev. 1:9: "I John, who also am your brother, and companion in tribulation, and in the kingdom and patience of Jesus Christ." There is not one word in either of these passages that says that the kingdom was set up on Pentecost or at any other time, as he affirms. I will have more to say about these passages later in the debate, and show you that the position that I contend for is in perfect harmony with all the Bible, while the position that my opponent holds cannot be harmonized with many passages that we find in the book of God. Come up, friend Nichol, and let us have some debating on this question.

Respected friends, when the kingdom is set up, it will be an everlasting kingdom; and if you will note this scripture, you will see plainly that it has not been set up, and, therefore, we are not in it: "And besides this, giving all diligence, add to your faith virtue; and to virtue

knowledge; and to knowledge temperance; and to temperance patience; and to patience godliness; and to godliness brotherly kindness; and to brotherly kindness charity. For if these things be in you, and abound, they make you that ye shall neither be barren nor unfruitful in the knowledge of our Lord Jesus Christ. But he that lacketh these things is blind, and cannot see afar off, and hath forgotten that he was purged from his old sins. Wherefore the rather, brethren, give diligence to make your calling and election sure: for if ye do these things, ye shall never fall: for so an entrance shall be ministered unto you abundantly into the everlasting kingdom of our Lord and Savior Jesus Christ." (2 Pet. 1:5-11.) From this you see that when the kingdom is set up, it will be an everlasting kingdom; you also see that we are not in the kingdom. Peter was writing to the brethren, to the people of God, and telling them that they must enter into the kingdom. Then it was not set up at that time, and they were not in the kingdom. If they were already in the kingdom, I will be pleased if my friend will tell us how they could enter into it. In a kingdom, and then have to enter into it? We wait and see what he has to say about it. Listen to Paul: "And the Lord shall deliver me from every evil work, and will preserve me unto his heavenly kingdom. to whom be glory for ever and ever. Amen." (2 Tim. 4:18.) I want to ask my friend this question: You say that you are in the kingdom; now tell us, Are you in the heavenly kingdom? Is the kingdom you are in a heavenly kingdom? Note that down, friend Nichol, and don't forget to tell us. Respected friends, you watch for his answer to this question. See if he tells us whether the kingdom he claims to be in is a heavenly kingdom. The kingdom the Bible talks about is a heavenly kingdom. Watch for his answer.

I invite your attention again to what Paul said to Christians in Acts 14:32: "Confirming the souls of the

disciples, and exhorting them to continue in the faith, and that we must through much tribulation enter into the kingdom of God." From this you see that Paul and the other disciples were not in the kingdom. Let my opponent show how this harmonizes with his position that the kingdom has been established, and that the disciples are now in it.

I want to impress on your minds, respected friends, that when the kingdom is set up it will be an everlasting kingdom—it will always be the same. You watch and see if my opponent will say that he is in an eternal kingdom now, it is an everlasting kingdom. The kingdom of Christ is to be an everlasting kingdom; therefore I contend that the kingdom of Christ has not been established.

My opponent says that he is in the kingdom. Now listen to the book of God: "Verily I say unto you, Among them that are born of women there hath not arisen a greater than John the Baptist: notwithstanding he that is least in the kingdom of heaven is greater than he." (Matt. 11:11.) Will you people note that Christ says that the least in the kingdom of heaven is greater than John the Baptist? And should he make such a claim, would you all believe it? If he is in the kingdom, then it is true; but we are not in the kingdom now, for it has not been established.

Before the day of Pentecost, and Mr. Nichol says that the kingdom was not set up till Pentecost, I find this statement: "But if I cast out devils by the Spirit of God, then the kingdom of God is come unto you." (Matt. 12:28.) If we take this passage alone, it seems that the kingdom was set up at that time—the time Christ was talking to the people, before Pentecost; but when we take all the truth of God, we see that it was not. If Mr. Nichol was debating with a Baptist, he would show from this passage that it means that God's Royal Majesty was among them—that it refers to Christ and the principles

of the kingdom. Just so with the passage that he quotes to prove that the kingdom is in existence since Pentecost. Again (Matt. 23:13): "But woe unto you, scribes and Pharisees, hypocrites! for ye shut up the kingdom of heaven against men: for ye neither go in yourselves, neither suffer ye them that are entering to go in" before Pentecost. If Mr. Nichol was debating with a Baptist, he would show that this has reference to the rejection of Christ in his preparatory work. But when he finds a passage after Pentecost that reads like this one, he says that it means that the kingdom was established on the first Pentecost after the resurrection of Christ. O, yes; of course it does!

Again: "The law and the prophets were till John: since that time the kingdom of God is preached, and every man presseth into it." (Luke 16:16.) This is another passage spoken before Pentecost. My friend declares correctly that the kingdom was not in existence then, though it speaks of men entering it, or pressing "into" it, and I agree with him; but when he gets this side of Pentecost and finds a passage that says "into the kingdom," it means that the kingdom has been established, and that people are in it. Strange, indeed! My friends, when the kingdom is set up, it will be an everlasting kingdom. When a man gets into the everlasting kingdom of our Lord and Savior Jesus Christ, he can't get out.

I believe, respected friends, that Jesus Christ is Priest, but he is not King. He has not returned to take up his kingdom, and it will be an everlasting kingdom; yes, sir, it will be a heavenly kingdom. He is Priest now, but that does not signify that he is King now or that he has a kingdom; and you can't put your finger on the book, chapter, and verse that says so in the Bible.

My opponent makes an argument from Rev. 1:5, where Christ is called the "Prince" ("Archon") of kings;

but this does not signify that he was King then or is King now. Let us read Ps. 105:17-22: "He sent a man before them, even Joseph, who was sold for a servant: whose feet they hurt with fetters: he was laid in iron: until the time that his word came: the word of the Lord tried him. The king sent and loosed him; even the ruler of the people, and let him go free. He made him lord of his house, and ruler of all his substance: to bind his princes at his pleasure; and teach his senators wisdom." Joseph was made a prince, ruler ("archon"), after he was sold as a slave, but by no means was he a king and as proof of it we invite your attention—[Time expired.]

NICHOL'S SECOND AFFIRMATIVE

Gentlemen Moderators, Ladies and Gentlemen:

I am much pleased to appear before you to continue my affirmation after I have paid some attention to the effort of my opponent. I don't know when I have heard an attempted reply that is as amusing to me as the speech to which you have listened so very patiently. But when I remember that I have all the vantage ground, I am not surprised that he makes such a weak effort. I shall note his statements in the order presented, and then advance with my affirmative work.

He very graciously informs you that if I will read the passage that says the kingdom was established on the first Pentecost after the resurrection of Christ, he will give up the debate. Indeed! If I had the passage that said so in so many words, this would not be a debatable question. The issue then would be, if any issue: Is the statement of the Scriptures true? But mark my words, Mr. Bradley will deny the Bible before this proposition is closed. The real question between us is: Does the kingdom exist? Was it established on the "first Pentecost," as I affirm, or at any other time? You will remember that my opponent contends that the kingdom has not been established. All my work on the *time* when it was established—that is, all the arguments I offer to prove that it was established on Pentecost—is a work of supererogation, so far as the real issue is concerned between us; but I had to state the *time* of its establishment to get him to debate. I am always ready to affirm what I teach.

Commenting on Mark 1:15, "The time is fulfilled, and

the kingdom of God is at hand." He says that the passage does not say one word about Pentecost. Quite true is his statement in that respect. I did not so contend. I tried to emphasize the thought that during the days of Daniel the promise was made that the time would come when God would set up a kingdom, but the time was not *then* fulfilled. When Christ appeared among men as a teacher, he said: "The time is fulfilled, the kingdom of God is at hand." Or, as given in Luke 10:9: "The kingdom is come nigh unto you." From these passages I argued that the kingdom was to soon be established.

In making my argument on "the keys of the kingdom" (Matt. 16:19), I stated that Mr. Bradley admitted that Peter used these "keys" on the Pentecost of my proposition. He replies that I misrepresent him; that Peter only used *one key* on Pectecost. I accept the correction, for I certainly know his position; but it does not relieve Mr. Bradley of the difficulty. Mr. Bradley says that "key" is a symbol of power, and that Peter used *one key* on the Pentecost of my proposition; but the kingdom was not established; there was no kingdom there. Pshaw! Bradley, do you use the "keys" of the house before the house exists? But he gets worse and worse confused. He says that the people that obeyed the commands by Peter delivered (and he was using the "key" when he delivered them) became members of the church. I submit that if the church differs from the kingdom, if a man in becoming a member of the church does not become a member of the kingdom, then Peter burglarized the church of Jesus Christ; for he was given the "keys of the kingdom," and Mr. Bradley says that he opened the church with one "key" of the kingdom. It is passing-ly strange that Peter opened the church with the "key" of the kingdom, if to enter the church is not the same as to enter the kingdom. Hard pressed for argument is the man that must contend as does Mr. Bradley. According

to him, the church and the kingdom are two very different institutions; the church was established on the Pentecost of my proposition, but the kingdom will not be established till Christ comes again. Peter was given the "keys of the kingdom," and with one of them opened the church. If I give you the "keys" of my store and you go and open my private residence with them, you are guilty of burglary. This is just what the gentleman's argument charges Peter as doing. He was given the "keys of the kingdom," and with them opened the church, which, according to Mr. Bradley, is an institution wholly different from the kingdom. Bradley, you ought to be ashamed of yourself. The truth is, gentlemen, the people that obeyed the commands by Peter delivered on the day of Pentecost became members of the kingdom, or church. I shall show this presently.

Of all the ridiculous positions that I have ever heard, my friend conjures it up in attempting to reply to Mark 9:1, 2. He asked you to note the reading of the last of the preceding chapter: "Whosoever therefore shall be ashamed of me and of my word in this adulterous and sinful generation; of him also shall the Son of man be ashamed, when he cometh in the glory of his Father with the holy angels. And he said unto them, Verily I say unto you, That there be some of them that stand here, which shall not taste of death. till they have seen the kingdom of God come with power." Mr. Bradley attempts to show his knowledge of grammar in commenting on this passage, and succeeds admirably in displaying his ignorance. He says: "Christ is the speaker, the first person; he speaks to the 'you,' the second person; but you will note that there is also a 'them,' which is the third person; and the 'them' refers to 'generation.'" Says he, the passage means: Some of "them" ("*generation*") will not taste of death till "they" ("*generations*") see the kingdom come with power. My, my! What profound

ignorance! A twelve-year-old schoolboy that doesn't know more about the law of language than that should be whipped. He talks about "generation" being the antecedent of "them." Mr. Bradley, the pronoun must agree with the noun in gender, number, and person. Do you mean to say that "them" and "generation" agree in number? "Them," "generation!" Some of "them," "generation!" Pshaw. Christ had called unto him the multitude, with his disciples, and was talking to them. Before the talk ended Christ said unto them (the multitude and the disciples): "Verily I say unto you, That there be some of them that stand here, which shall not taste of death, till they have seen the kingdom of God come with power." I read the same passage from the Revised Version: "Verily I say unto you, There are some here of them that stand by, who shall in no wise taste of death, till they see the kingdom of God come with power." Christ plainly said that there were some of the people to whom he was speaking that would live to see the kingdom come with power; indeed, he said that some of the very ones of the multitude and of the disciples that were standing by him would not taste of death till they saw the kingdom come with power. There was no third person in the matter. Christ was speaking to the disciples and the multitude as they stood before him, and declared that some of them would not taste of death till they had seen the kingdom of God come with power. If the kingdom has not been established, some of the ones to whom Christ spoke are still living. Bradley, is that the best that you can do when you try grammar?

Mr. Bradley tells you all that I am a very logical fellow. I am sorry that I can't return the compliment, but my high regard for the truth will not let me say so much for him.

His reply to my argument proving that Christ is King is that if I was debating with a Baptist, I would not ad-

mit that Christ was King before Pentecost. In this, as usual, he is incorrect. I contend that Christ was King before Pentecost, but he was not *crowned* till that day. You need not be throwing kisses at the Baptists.

Remember, please, that the "good confession" that Christ witnessed before Pilate was that Christ was King. The argument stands unnoticed.

Attempting a reply to the argument made from Acts 17:7, the gentleman says it was the wicked people that said that Christ was King. Indeed, they were only reporting what the apostles had preached—viz., that Christ was King.

Mr. Bradley says that when a man gets into the kingdom, he can't get out. [Mr. Bradley shakes his head.] That was your statement—just such stuff. The Lord says that some will be gathered out when he has delivered us from the power of darkness, and "hath translated us into the kingdom." He does not say that they will be translated into the kingdom at the beginning of the millennium, but "hath translated us into the kingdom." The word "translated" is from the Greek "metestesen," and means: "To transpose, transfer, remove from one place to another." (Thayer.) The same word is used in I Cor. 13:2: "And though I have the gift of prophecy, and understand all mystery, and all knowledge; and though I have all faith, so that I could remove ["metestesen"] mountains, and have not charity, I am nothing." In Col. 1:13 Paul affirms that God "hath delivered us from the power of darkness." "Deliver" ("ruomai"); "To rescue, to deliver." Not only have we been rescued, delivered from the power of darkness; but we have been translated ("metestesen"), removed, transposed, transferred into ("eis") the kingdom. Mr. Bradley, will you please tell us, since Paul says these brethren at Colosse had been delivered, rescued, from the power of darkness and translated into the kingdom, if they were not, in

fact, in the kingdom, where were they? What is the force of "translated" and "into" in this passage?

"Wherefore we receiving a kingdom which cannot be moved, let us have grace, whereby we may serve God acceptably with reverence and godly fear." (Heb. 12: 28.) "Receiving" ("paralambano"): "To receive something transmitted." (Thayer.) Paul very positively says that they had received the kingdom, and the promise of Christ has been fulfilled: "And I appoint unto you a kingdom, as my Father hath appointed unto me." (Luke 22:29.) This kingdom was appointed unto them by Christ, and Paul says that they had received it. Still, my friend, Bradley, says that it has not been established. More, this kingdom which they had received is identified with, indeed is, the kingdom spoken of by Daniel, which would "never be destroyed." (Dan. 2:44.) We have received "a kingdom which cannot be moved." "Moved" ("asaleuton"): "Unshaken, unmoved; not liable to disorder and overthrow; firm, stable." (Thayer.) "I John, who also am your brother, and companion in tribulation, and in the kingdom and patience of Jesus Christ." (Rev. 1:9.) Mr. Bradley, was John in the kingdom? Was he a brother of the people to whom he wrote?

Our attention is invited to 2 Pet. 1:10, 11: "For if ye do these things, ye shall never fall: for so an entrance shall be ministered unto you abundantly into the everlasting kingdom of our Lord and Savior Jesus Christ." From this passage my opponent argues that the kingdom has not been established. I am certain that we are in the kingdom now, and that if we do as Peter directs in this passage we will enter into the everlasting kingdom. We are now in the "first dominion" (Mic. 4:8) of the kingdom; and when we enter into the bright home, we will then be in the everlasting kingdom. Indeed, if we live faithful lives, we will have an entrance ministered unto us "abundantly." The word "abundantly" is from the

Greek "plousios," which is rendered "richly" in Col. 3: 16: "Let the word of Christ dwell in you richly ["plousios"] in all wisdom." The word of Christ dwells in every Christian; yet Paul exhorts them that they let it dwell in them "richly," or abundantly. Because my opponent finds where Peter speaks of an entrance being ministered unto us "abundantly" into the everlasting kingdom he contends that we are not in the kingdom at all. The same method of argumentation applied to Col. 3:16 would force the conclusion that the word of Christ does not dwell in us, and I think this is nearly true of my opponent. Say, Bradley, Bradley, Bradley, does the word of Christ dwell in you? 2 Cor. 1:12; 12:7; and Eph. 3:20 are parallel expressions.

In this life Christians have joy; still they are to enter into joy. "Whom having not seen, ye love; in whom, though now ye see him not, yet believing, ye rejoice with joy unspeakable and full of glory." (1 Pet. 1:8; see Gal. 5:11; James 1:2; John 15:11.) Thus you see that we have joy in this life. But note: At the last day, when we receive our rewards, it will be said unto the faithful: "Enter thou into the joy of thy Lord." (Matt. 25:21.) Though we have joy, we are to enter into joy. Just so, though we are now in the kingdom, we are to enter into it. It is the measure of joy and the abundance of the entrance. This more than complements the gentleman's speech.

Your attention now to some advance work:

To be converted is equal to entering the kingdom. (Matt. 18:1-3.)

Be converted, that your sins may be blotted out. (Acts 3:19.)

John wrote to those whose sins were forgiven. (1 John 2:12.)

1. Those whose sins have been forgiven have been converted. (Acts 3:19.)

2. John wrote to those whose sins were forgiven. (I John 2:12.)

3. Therefore, John wrote to converted people.

1. All converted people are in the kingdom. (Matt. 18:1-3.)

2. John wrote to converted people.

3. Therefore the people to whom John wrote were in the kingdom.

1. If people are in the kingdom, it is in existence.

2. John wrote to people who were in the kingdom.

3. Therefore the kingdom existed when John wrote.

1. Conversion equals entering the kingdom. (Matt. 18:1-3.)

2. Conversion equals remission of sins in Christ's name. (Acts 3:19.)

3. The existence of the kingdom and remission of sins in the name of Christ are, therefore, coextensive.

1. Remission of sins in the name of Christ and the existence of the kingdom are coextensive.

2. Remission of sins in the name of Christ was preached the first time on the first Pentecost after his resurrection. (Luke 24:49.)

3. Therefore the church, or kingdom, was established on the first Pentecost after the resurrection of Christ.

1. Christ said to his disciples: "Ye may eat and drink at my table in my kingdom." (Luke 22:30.)

2. At Christ's table the Lord's Supper is eaten. (I Cor. 11:29.)

3. The disciples ate the Lord's Supper in the days of the apostles. (I Cor. 11:20; Acts 20:7.)

1. The Lord's table is in his kingdom. (Luke 22: 28-30.)

2. The disciples ate at the Lord's table. (I Cor. 11:20.)

3. Therefore the disciples ate in the kingdom.

1. The disciples could not eat in a kingdom that did not exist.

2. But the disciples did eat in the kingdom of Christ.

3. Therefore the kingdom existed when they ate at his table in his kingdom.

1. Translated into the kingdom, where we receive redemption through the blood, even the remission of sins. (Col. 1:13.)

2. Believe and be baptized, and you shall be saved. (Mark 16:15, 16.)

3. Born of water and the Spirit, enter the kingdom. (John 3:5.)

1. Salvation is in the kingdom. (Col. 1:13.)

2. The baptized believer obtains salvation. (Mark 16: 15, 16.)

3. Therefore the baptized believer is in the kingdom.

1. All baptized believers are in the kingdom.

2. The Samaritans were baptized believers. (Acts 8: 12.)

3. Therefore the Samaritans were in the kingdom.

1. No one can be in the kingdom that has not been established.

2. But the Samaritans were in the kingdom.

3. Therefore the kingdom existed when that meeting was held.

1. To believe and be baptized equals entering the kingdom.

2. To be born of water and the Spirit equals entering the kingdom.

3. Therefore to believe and be baptized is equal to being born of water and the Spirit, for things that equal the same things equal each other.

By one Spirit we are all baptized into one body. (I Cor. 12:13.)

1. The baptized believer enters the kingdom. (John 3:5.)

2. But the baptized believer enters the body. (I Cor. 12:13.)

3. Therefore the kingdom and the body are the same institution.

1. The one body is the church of Christ. (Eph. 1:22, 23.)

2. The body and the kingdom are the same institution.

3. Therefore the church and the kingdom are the same institution.

1. The conditions of salvation mentioned in Mark 16:15, 16, are equal to the terms of the new birth (John 3:5), which inducts into a kingdom.

2. These conditions and this salvation were offered to the world on the first Pentecost after the resurrection of Christ for the first time.

3. Therefore the kingdom into which these conditions bring us was established on that day.

WHEN RECEIVED.

"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, and they brought him near before him. And there was given him dominion, and glory, and a kingdom, that all people, nations, and languages should serve him: his dominion is an everlasting dominion, which shall not pass away, and his kingdom, that which shall not be destroyed." (Dan. 7:13, 14.) The "Ancient

of days" is God; the "Son of man" is Christ. Daniel says that he saw the "Son of man" come to the "Ancient of days" with the clouds, and then he received the kingdom. When did Christ go to God with the clouds? "And when he had spoken these things, while they beheld, he was taken up; and a cloud received him out of their sight. And while they looked steadfastly toward heaven as he went up, behold, two men stood by them in white apparel." (Acts 1:9, 10.) Here we find Christ going to God with the clouds, at which time he was to receive the kingdom. Again: "And as they heard these things, he added and spake a parable, because he was nigh to Jerusalem, and because they thought that the kingdom of God should immediately appear. He said therefore, A certain nobleman went into a far country to receive for himself a kingdom, and to return." (Luke 19:11, 12.) Christ is that "nobleman," and has gone into that "far country" (heaven) to receive the kingdom.

Mr. Bradley invited our attention to Luke 16:16: "The law and the prophets were until John: since that time the kingdom of God is preached, and every man presseth into it." Mr. Bradley wants to know if I think that the kingdom was in existence in the days of John, before Pentecost. Most certainly not, and that passage does not intimate that it was. The law and the prophets were till John, but they did not cease then; but with John there was an additional revelation. Luke says that *since* the days of John *all men* press into the kingdom. How long *since* the days of John before *all men* could press into the kingdom? You will please remember that during the personal ministry of Christ he bade his disciples go only to the Jews; he actually forbade them going to the Gentiles. (Matt. 10:6, 7.) After his resurrection, he told them to go to all the world, to every creature; but wait, said he, in Jerusalem till you are endued with power from on high. (Luke 24:49.) This

power was given on Pentecost, and that was the first time that all men could come to the Lord, and is the time that Luke spoke of. You will remember that it was years after Pentecost when Luke wrote.

Mr. Bradley introduced several other passages of scripture along the same line, and wants to know if I will contend that the people entered the Kingdom in the days of Christ's personal ministry. The kingdom was promised many years before the advent of Christ into this world, and we may say that it existed in promise and prophecy before the birth of the Savior. During the days of John the Baptist and the work of the Lord in his personal ministry, when they were preparing material for the kingdom, we say that the kingdom existed in a preparatory sense; the material out of which the kingdom was formed was then being prepared, and those that accepted the word and the Lord are said to have entered into the kingdom. Many of the Jews entered into the kingdom in this state of preparation with gladness, while the Gentiles were not even invited. This was not the kingdom established, but only the material being prepared out of which the kingdom was formed.

Hear David: "The Lord said unto my Lord, Sit thou at my right hand, until I make thine enemies thy footstool." (Ps. 110:1.) In this passage David says that Christ was to "sit" at the Father's right hand till all enemies are conquered. When he comes again, all enemies will have been conquered. Christ has been seated at the Father's right hand. (Eph. 1:20.) Christ was raised and seated on the throne of David, the throne that he was promised. "Therefore being a prophet, and knowing that God had sworn with an oath to him, that of the fruit of his loins, according to the flesh, he would raise up Christ to sit on his throne." (Acts 2:30.) Here we have the promise that Christ was to be raised to sit on the throne. That he has been raised, no one accepting the

Bible as true will question. The word "sit" in this passage is from "kathisai," which means: "To make to sit down, to set, appoint; to confer the kingdom upon one.—Acts 2:30." (Thayer.) Christ has been raised and seated on the throne of David, had the kingdom conferred upon him. Note, again, Christ was to have the "key" of David. My opponent says correctly that "key" is a symbol of power. Then Christ was promised the power of David. "And the key of the house of David will I lay upon his shoulder: so he shall open, and none shall shut; and he shall shut, and none shall open." (Isa. 22:22.) If this promise has been fulfilled, he certainly is King, for the power of a king David had; indeed, David was king and exercised power as such. This same power Christ was to have. Listen: "And to the angel of the church in Philadelphia write; These things saith he that is holy, he that is true, he that hath the key of David, he that openeth, and no man shutteth; and shutteth, and no man openeth." (Rev. 3:7.) No question about it, my friends; Christ has the "key of David." Indeed, if there is the power of a King in heaven or on earth, Christ has that power; for he very positively says: "All power is given unto me in heaven and in earth." (Matt. 28:18.) Either there is not the power of a King in heaven or on earth or this statement is false. As for me, I know that the power of a King exists, and I most stoutly believe the statement of Christ.

Mr. Bradley says that "church" and "kingdom" are not the same, for the words have different meanings. Such a conclusion does not necessarily follow. "Author," "father," "husband," and "President" are words having different meanings; yet we may correctly apply them to Mr. Roosevelt. It depends on what relationship you consider as to what word you use. God's people are (1) as having been chosen out of sin—church; (2) as an organization—body of Christ; (3) as to government—what are they, Mr. Bradley?

"But ye are a chosen generation, a royal priesthood, a peculiar people." (I Pet. 2:9.) Nations are of three kinds as regards government—viz: empire, with its emperor; republic, with its president; and kingdom, with its king. God's people are called a "holy nation." If this nation is an empire, who is its emperor? If a republic, who is the president and who are the lawmakers? Mr. Bradley, tell us what kind of people are Christians as respects government. Certainly every one knows that they are citizens of a kingdom, and that Christ is the King.

"If ye fulfill the royal law according to the scriptures, Thou shalt love thy neighbor as thyself, ye do well." "Royal" is from "basileion," which Thayer defines: "*Of or belonging to a king, kingly, royal, regal.*" To be sure, we have the law of Christ; but this is a "kingly law," or the law the King has issued. This being true, we must have the kingdom; for only the King has the right to issue laws. Christians are governed by the law of that King; they are citizens of the kingdom. Indeed, Christians are kings themselves, as is declared: "And hath made us kings and priests unto God and his Father." (Rev. 1:6.) "But ye are a chosen generation, a royal priesthood." (I Pet. 1:9.) "Royal" ("basileion"): "Royal, kingly, regal." (Thayer.) We are a kingdom of priests. Mr. Bradley, are we greater than Christ? We are kings, and you say that Christ is not.

BRADLEY'S SECOND NEGATIVE

Gentlemen Moderators, Ladies and Gentlemen:

I am happy to come before you again this morning to continue the investigation of the word of God. I was indeed surprised at friend Nichol to see him leave his proposition in his very second speech. He has simply, by leaving his proposition, given it up. He says the issue is: Does the kingdom exist? Has it been established? He affirms that the kingdom was established on the first Pentecost after the resurrection of Christ, and we will expect him to try to prove it, though we know that he can't do it. He said that if he did not prove that the kingdom was set up, he would take his seat. Did he do it? He did not prove the proposition to you; nor did he take his seat, either. He can't prove his proposition, for there is nothing in the book of God to substantiate his proposition. I know that my friend Nichol can get up here and make things look mighty plain to you people, and you all believe what he says. He is a very logical fellow, I know, and he shows it up beautifully, and all that, and he just carries some of you people right off with him; but if you will notice him, my friends, you will see that he proves everything with a "therefore." He takes two things and puts them together, and proves another by it. He goes on this plan: There is the ground out there, and there lies a post-hole auger; and because there is the ground and the post-hole auger, therefore there is a hole in the ground. That is the way he makes his arguments. You watch him. He says that Christ is King, and that Christ has glory; therefore he has a kingdom and the kingdom has been established. That is his

way of proving his proposition. But we have a way of proving things, and I thank God for it.

He wants to know if the word of God dwells in me. Yes, sir. But how do you know that it will be in me more?

I have asked my friend if the kingdom that he says that he is in is a heavenly kingdom, and he has never answered it. He knows that if he answers it he will have to give up the proposition, and he don't want to do that; so he will pay no attention to my question. Elder Nichol is a good logician, and all these things; but he don't read the scripture to prove his proposition. He illustrates this way and that way, and all these things, and first one thing and then another, and makes it all look mighty good; but that is not the thing. He also tells you what Elder Bradley says. I don't do that way, my friends; but I tell you what the book of God says.

Now, respected friends, you will notice that my opponent scatters all over the book of God and tries to pick out things to prove his proposition; but he has made a failure. He made an argument about Christ being Priest and King. Now, I admit that Christ was born to be Prophet, Priest, and King; but Christ was not prophet when he was in the manger in Bethlehem; he became Prophet after that. He is Priest now, and will be when he comes again. He is Prophet now; but when he comes again and takes his throne, he will be King then, and his prophesying will be over with then. Let us not fail to understand that the Scriptures teach of what shall be, and not always of what is now. Listen: "Even he shall build the temple of the Lord; and he shall bear the glory; and he shall sit and rule upon his throne; and he shall be a priest upon his throne; and the counsel of peace shall be between them both." (Zech. 6:12.) Christ became Priest when he went to heaven. I admit that; and he will be Priest when he comes upon his throne; and when he comes upon his throne, he will be King then,

and this scripture will then be fulfilled. He is not on his throne now.

My friend says that after Christ rose from the dead he had all power in heaven and in earth. Yes; I admit that, too. The scripture plainly says that he has all power, but he is not executing it. Here is where my friend is wrong. He is trying to make you all believe that Christ is executing the power—that he is King, and that the kingdom has been established. This is where he is wrong. Yes, Jesus has all power; but he is not executing that power. Why? Because it is not time yet. He has not returned to take up his throne; and, therefore, he is not using that power that he has in earth. He is not ruling and reigning now. He is now on the throne of God. When he comes again, he will then sit upon his own throne. Because he is now on the throne of his Father does not signify that the kingdom has been established. Respected friends, Elder Nichol is wrong on this proposition, and I will show you that he is before this debate closes.

Now let me read to you from Dan. 7:13, 14 (note the reading, respected friends): "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, and they brought him near before him. And there was given him dominion, and glory, and a kingdom, that all people, nations, and languages, should serve him; his dominion is an everlasting dominion, which shall not pass away, and his kingdom that which shall not be destroyed." Note the fact, respected friends, that this is an everlasting kingdom; it is not to be destroyed. When will it be established? My friend says that Christ went to heaven, and the kingdom was established then on Pentecost. The book of God in this passage says that when Christ "came," not "went," he received the kingdom. When Christ ascended, he "went;" but he is to come again, and that is the time that Daniel speaks of when he saw him

“came,” and then he will receive the kingdom, just as this passage says.

My opponent wants me to tell what kind of government we, the people of God, have. He says that we are citizens of a kingdom. I say that we are not. Let us read the passage that he has introduced: “But we are a chosen generation, a royal priesthood, a holy nation, a peculiar people.” (I Peter 2:9.) We are a “peculiar people,” not a kingly people.

My friends, we are too willing to believe the different theories that are taught; and if you were not so full of prejudice, I would have no trouble in showing you that Elder Nichol is wrong; but some people will not hear the truth, and in confirmation of this I will read you Matt. 13:14: “And in them is fulfilled the prophecy of Esais, which saith, By hearing ye shall hear, and shall not understand; and seeing ye shall see, and shall not perceive.” It seems that some people don’t want to see the truth.

You did not state me correctly about not getting out of the kingdom. I said if a man “entered” the kingdom, he could not get out. Those that you read about in Matt. 13 being gathered out of the kingdom did not “enter” it; they were “caught” in the kingdom. Christ says that the kingdom is like a fish net, which catches of every kind. When Christ comes, the kingdom will be set up—cast like a fish net. Some will be “caught” in it. The ones caught in the kingdom will be gathered out, but the ones that “enter” the kingdom cannot get out. The ones that were gathered out *did not* “enter the kingdom;” they were caught in it. Now listen. I take a mouse trap and bait it and set it here on the desk. A mouse comes along and goes in the trap for the bait; it enters the trap. I pick up the trap [he illustrates with a book] and slap it down over the mouse that is running across the desk, and catch it. It did not “enter” the trap, but was caught in it. The ones that are caught in the kingdom will be

gathered out, but those that "enter the kingdom" cannot get out. Ever since Adam sinned against God sinners have been associated with the people of God; but when Christ comes back to the earth to take his seat upon his thorne and rule upon this earth, then he will separate the good from the bad. Yes, sir; I believe this, respected friends—that he will separate the good from the bad and his kingdom will be composed of the pure and holy. I have shown that Christ's kingdom has not been established, and he will yet return to take his seat upon his throne; and, of course, when he returns to take his kingdom, he will separate the good from the bad, and all will be peace and joy when Christ takes his seat upon his throne to rule and reign over the kingdom.

I want to tell you, friend Nichol, that you can hypnotize some of these people, but you can't hyponotize me. Some of you people seem to think that all this is mighty funny; but if you listen to the scriptures that I present, you are likely to think differently before this debate is over.

Yes, sir, I said that "them" refers to "generation" for its antecedent; yes, sir, "them" agrees with "generation." I am willing for this debate to go before the world in the book and let them examine it for themselves, let the truth be what it may, and I trust that they will follow the Lord and Savior Jesus Christ.

My opponent had a great deal to say about the "keys of the kingdom of heaven" in his last speech. I think that I made that matter plain to you all. The question is about the establishment of the kingdom. Even if the church was established on Pentecost, it is not the kingdom, and my opponent will not say that it is.

Let us read from Acts 14:22. Note the fact, respected friends, that we have not yet entered the kingdom of God. Hear the passage: "Confirming the souls of the disciples, and exhorting them to continue in the faith, and that we must through much tribulation enter into the

kingdom of God." From this you see that the disciples were not in the kingdom of God, and I conclude that it was not established. They had to suffer much tribulation to enter into the kingdom. We are suffering that tribulation in this life; but when the kingdom is set up and we enter into it, we will not have tribulation. The kingdom will be established when the Lord comes again. The position that I hold harmonizes with all the truth of God, while my opponent cannot show harmony with the position that he contends for in this debate, and you see if he can harmonize the Scriptures with the position that he holds.

My friend attempted an argument on 2 Pet. 1:5-11. I read the passage again: "And besides this, giving all diligence, add to your faith virtue; and to virtue knowledge; and to knowledge temperance; and to temperance patience; and to patience brotherly kindness; and to brotherly kindness charity. For if these things be in you, and abound, they make you that ye shall neither be barren nor unfruitful in the knowledge of our Lord Jesus Christ. But he that lacketh these things is blind, and cannot see afar off, and hath forgotten that he was purged from his old sins. Wherefore the rather, brethren, give diligence to make your calling and election sure: for if ye do these things, ye shall never fall: for so an entrance shall be ministered unto you abundantly into the everlasting kingdom of our Lord and Savior Jesus Christ." Well, now, my respected friends, we see nothing in this that confirms the position that my friend contends for, for he says that the kingdom has been established; but this passage goes to show plainly that the kingdom has not been set up, and that we must live the Christian life if we would enter into the kingdom when it is established, when Christ comes again.

You remember that I asked him to tell this people if the kingdom of Christ is a heavenly kingdom. You remember I read where Paul says that God would preserve

him unto the heavenly kingdom. Mr. Nichol says that he is in the kingdom now. I asked him to tell if he was in a heavenly kingdom. You note, respected friends, that he did not answer that question. Why did he not do it? Because he knew that if he did, he would have to give up the proposition. If it is not a heavenly kingdom, Paul lied; and he don't want to make Paul out a liar. Paul says that we must enter into the kingdom, and that it is a heavenly kingdom. Then it is not on this earth, and friend Nichol is not in the kingdom. My opponent did not notice that; he passed it by unnoticed. Why don't friend Nichol do like I do? I notice his arguments.

I do not believe that Christ was King before Pentecost, and he knows that Christ did not have a kingdom before Pentecost, but he will have a kingdom when he comes again to take his seat on his throne.

I don't always understand that man Nichol, he says so many things and talks so fast; but I will do the best that I can to answer all that he says.

Replying to the argument that I made from Luke 16: 16, he says that all men could not enter till Pentecost, and that that is the time that Luke had reference to. He can't show that all men entered the kingdom then, and they did not. Only the Jews entered then into the church.

Now, respected friends, that my opponent may have ample time to look into the truth of the facts, I want to invite your attention to twenty passages and objections to his position and that go to confirm the position that I contend for.

1. Ps. 72:9: "They that dwell in the wilderness shall bow before him; and his enemies shall lick the dust." This passage refers to the time when the kingdom will be set up, when Christ shall rule over the kingdom. His enemies have not bowed before him and have not licked the dust; therefore the kingdom has not been set up.

2. Ps. 72:10: "The king of Tarshish and of the isles

shall bring presents: the king of Shebo and Seba shall offer gifts." This has not been fulfilled; therefore the kingdom has not been established.

3. Ps. 72:11: "Yea, all kings shall fall down before him." All kings have not fallen down before him; therefore the kingdom has not been established.

4. Ps. 72:11: "All nations shall serve him." All nations do not serve him; therefore the kingdom has not been established, and Christ has not become King.

5. Dan. 7:27: "And the kingdom and dominion, and greatness of the kingdom under the whole heaven, shall be given to the people of the saints of the most High, whose kingdom is an everlasting kingdom now, and all dominions shall serve and obey him." If there is a kingdom now, it is an everlasting kingdom, and all dominions do not serve and obey him; therefore the kingdom has not been established.

6. Dan. 2:35: "Then was the iron, the clay, the brass, the silver, and the gold, broken to pieces together, and became like the chaff of the summer thrashing floors; and the wind carried them away, that no place was found for them: and the stone that smote the image became a great mountain, and filled the whole earth." In this connection Daniel is describing earthly governments. When the kingdom of God is set up, all human governments will cease. But all human governments have not ceased; therefore the kingdom of God has not been established.

7. "When the kingdom of God is set up, his joy shall fill the whole earth." His joy does not fill the whole earth; therefore the kingdom of God has not been established.

8. Matt. 16:28: "Verily I say unto you, There be some standing here, which shall not taste of death, till they see the Son of man coming in his kingdom." Note the fact, respected friends, that they are to see him coming in his kingdom. They have never seen him come in his

kingdom; therefore the kingdom has not been established.

9. Matt. 25:31, 32: "When the Son of man shall come in his glory, and all the holy angels with him, then shall he sit on the throne of his glory; and before him shall be gathered all nations; and he shall separate them one from another, as a shepherd divideth his sheep from his goats." He has never come with his holy angels to sit on the throne of his glory; all nations have never gathered before him; therefore the kingdom has not been established.

10. Luke 19:12: "He said therefore, A certain nobleman went into a far country to receive for himself a kingdom, and to return." Christ went into the far country, but has never returned; therefore he has never established his kingdom, he has never received the kingdom.

11. [No. 11 was not given.—Stenographer.]

12. Matt. 6:10: "Thy kingdom come. Thy will be done in earth, as it is in heaven." His will has never been done in earth as it is in heaven; therefore the kingdom has never been established.

13. 2 Tim. 4:1: "I charge thee therefore before God, and the Lord Jesus Christ, who shall judge the quick and the dead at his appearing and his kingdom." He has never judged the quick and the dead; therefore his kingdom has never been established.

14. Rev. 11:15: "And the seventh angel sounded; and there were great voices in heaven, saying, The kingdoms of this world have become the kingdoms of our Lord and his Christ; and he shall reign for ever and ever." The kingdoms of this world have never become the kingdoms of our Christ; therefore the kingdom has never been established.

15. Rev. 11:7, 8: "Saying, We give thee thanks, O

Lord God Almighty, which art, and wast, and art to come; because thou hast taken to thee thy great power, and hast reigned. And the nations were angry, and thy wrath is come, and the time of the dead, that they should be judged." When the kingdom is set up, it will be the time of "the wrath to come." But this time has not come; therefore the kingdom has not been set up.

16. Rev. 11:18: "The time of the dead has not come." Therefore the kingdom has not been set up.

17. [No. 17 was not given.—Stenographer.]

18. Ps. 72:12: "For he shall deliver the needy when he crieth; the poor also, and him that hath no helper." This will be when the kingdom is set up; but this has never been done; therefore the kingdom has never been set up.

19. Rev. 11:14-18: "The second woe is passed; and, behold, the third woe cometh quickly. And the seventh angel sounded; and there were great voices in heaven, saying, The kingdoms of this world have become the kingdoms of our Lord and of his Christ; and he shall reign for ever and ever. And the four and twenty elders, which sat before God on their seats, fell upon their faces, and worshiped God, saying, We give thee thanks, O Lord God Almighty, which art, and wast, and art to come; because thou hast taken to thee thy great power, and hast reigned. And the nations were angry, and thy wrath is come, and the time of the dead, that they should be judged, and that thou shouldest give reward unto thy servants the prophets, and to the saints, and them that fear thy name, small and great; and shouldest destroy them that destroy the earth. This has never been fulfilled, and it is to take place when Christ begins to reign; therefore he is not reigning now, and the kingdom has not been established.

20. My last objection is that the Bible nowhere says that the kingdom was established on Pentecost. The

book of God says not one word about it having been established on any day, and the way that my friend makes these things look so plain to you all is that he takes two things and proves another thing by it. [Time expired.]

NICHOL'S THIRD AFFIRMATIVE

Gentlemen Moderators, Ladies and Gentlemen:

I am glad that, after having had some more of the good things of this life, we are privileged to meet and continue the investigation of the word of God. My opponent tells you that I gave up my proposition in my second speech. Remember, the real issue between us is: Has the kingdom been established? I affirm that it has. The exact date of its establishment is not the real issue between us. I teach that it was established on the Pentecost of my proposition, and my arguments on this point are sufficient. I expect to give the major portion of my time to the question: Does the kingdom exist? Has it been established? This is what the gentleman denies. Mr. Bradley says that if I will read the passage that says the kingdom was set up on Pentecost, he will give up the proposition. Would it not be very remarkable for him to do so? Mr. Bradley says the church was established on the Pentecost of my proposition, but he is unable to read the passage that says so in that many words; but if it is the teaching of the Bible, it is sufficient.

Mr. Bradley says that the word of God dwells in him. But Christ says that it should dwell in us richly—abundantly. Paul, writing to the church at Colosse, exhorted them that they let the word dwell in them richly—abundantly; still, at that time the word was dwelling in them. Mr. Bradley says that he can understand how this is true; but when I read that we are in the kingdom (Col. 1:13) and are to have an entrance “ministered unto you abundantly into the everlasting kingdom,” he is lost, and can't understand how it can be true that we are in the kingdom, and still we are to enter into the everlasting

kingdom. I am sorry, but I am not responsible for his denseness, for which I am truly thankful.

The gentleman calls me a very logical fellow, but complains because I use the word "therefore." I did use it several times in my last speech, but it was in drawing the conclusion from premises that I had stated. You note that he did not attempt to show a mistake in premise or conclusion. With becoming modesty I shall accept his compliment, but I would have been pleased for him to have shown why I was not entitled to use the word "therefore."

He is a very promising gentleman. He promises to show you all that I am wrong before the debate closes.

Zech. 6:13: "Even he shall build the temple of the Lord; and he shall bear the glory, and shall sit and rule upon his throne; and he shall be a priest upon his throne." In attempting to reply to my argument in a former speech, the gentleman says that Christ is Priest. But note, please, that he was to be Priest on his throne. If he is now Priest, and Mr. Bradley and the apostle Paul say that he is, then he is on his throne; if on his throne, he is King. Pshaw! Bradley, you remind me of a modern Elijah. I wonder what his side of the debate will look like when he gets through with it.

"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, and they brought him near before him. And there was given him dominion, and glory, and a kingdom." (Dan. 7:14.) Here it is plainly stated that when Christ went to the Ancient of days with the clouds he was to receive the kingdom. "And because they thought that the kingdom of God should immediately appear. He said therefore, A certain nobleman went into a far country to receive for himself a kingdom, and to return." (Luke 19:11, 12.) In this passage Christ presents himself as the nobleman. He went into the far

country when he went to heaven. Indeed, when he went to heaven, he went with the clouds, and Daniel said he would. "And when he had spoken these things, while they beheld, he was taken up; and a cloud received him out of their sight." (Acts 1:9.) No question about it, my friends; Christ went to heaven, the far country, went with the clouds of heaven to receive the kingdom, which he certainly did, for Paul says that we are in the kingdom. (Col. 1:13.)

In answer to my question, "What kind of government have we as Christians?" Mr. Bradley replies: "We are a peculiar people, and have a 'peculiar' government." Well, grant that we have a "peculiar" government, though the Lord does not so say, what kind of a government is it—despotic, monarchal, or republic? God says that his people are "peculiar," but what is their form of government?

HOLY NATION—WHAT KIND OF GOVERNMENT?

"But ye are a chosen generation, a royal priesthood, a holy nation, a peculiar people." (1 Pet. 2:9.) The people of the Lord are declared to be a nation. All nations have some form of government. Will my opponent tell us what the Lord's people are as respects government? I know of three forms of government—viz., republics, oligarchies, and kingdoms. Mr. Bradley, what are the people of the Lord as respects form of government? Paul says they are "kingdom." (Col. 1:13.) Watch for Mr. Bradley's answer.

Earthly kingdoms have benefits of a temporal nature only—meats, drinks, protection of property, life, personal and social rights. The benefits of earthly kingdoms are temporal. The kingdom of Christ is not of this world. "The kingdom of God is not meat and drink; but righteousness, and peace, and joy in the Holy Ghost." (Rom. 14:17.) You know, my friends, the rights and benefits

of a kingdom are for the citizens of the kingdom, and only for them. People out of a kingdom have no right to the blessings and immunities of the kingdom.

"The kingdom of God is not meat and drink; but righteousness, and peace, and joy in the Holy Ghost." Bradley says that he is not in the kingdom; hence it follows that he has no part in righteousness, peace, and joy in the Holy Spirit.

But this is not all. Bradley says he is not in the kingdom, but Paul says that he and his brethren were "delivered from the power of darkness and translated into the kingdom." (Col. 1:13.) Now, since my opponent declares that he is not in the kingdom of God, and there being but one other place for him to be—that is, in the kingdom of the devil—it follows that he must be in the kingdom of the devil. Since a man standeth or falleth to his own master (Rom. 14:4), Mr. Bradley must look to the devil for his reward.

Mr. Bradley is conceding some. He admits that Christ has "all power," but is not executing it. (He means exercising.) Then we have it. Christ is King, has all power; but Bradley says that he don't have a kingdom. Shucks! Bradley, what is the matter with you?

Worse and worse. Hear him: "When we enter the kingdom, we can't get out." Listen to the Lord: "So shall it be in the end of this world. The Son of man shall send forth his angels, and they shall gather out of his kingdom all things that offend, and them that do iniquity." (Matt. 13:41.) O, no; they can't get out of the kingdom! Such ignorance is not excusable in any one, much less in a man that poses as a preacher.

Of all the absurd positions that I have ever heard, Mr. Bradley sprung it in his last speech. He says that when the kingdom is set up, it will be like the fisherman casting a net and catching fish. So, says he, when the kingdom is set up, it will be cast like a net, and some will be caught in it. The ones caught in the kingdom

will be gathered out, but the ones that enter the kingdom can't get out. He says that a fish never entered the net that did not want to get caught. In that he displays more ignorance. The fish that enter the net do not want to get caught, but want the bait, if, indeed, the net is baited; if not, it is the merest accident that the fish enters the net. He illustrates further: "Now I take a mouse trap and set it on this table; a mouse comes along and goes into it after the bait; it enters the trap. But I pick up the trap and slap it down on a mouse, and thus catch it; it did not enter the trap, but was caught in it. The ones that enter the kingdom can't get out, but the ones that are caught in it will be gathered out." I have no idea what the man will say next. The ones that are caught in the kingdom did not want to be in it, and the Lord "caught" them. The ones that "entered" the kingdom were after the blessings in it; but having entered, they can't get out, no matter how wicked they may become. Bradley, aren't you ashamed of yourself?

Mr. Bradley says that I hypnotize you people, but that I can't hypnotize him. I shall make no effort to hypnotize you, Mr. Bradley, for only strong-minded people can be hypnotized, and that makes you exempt.

The gentleman refers to Mark 9:1 again: "And he said unto them, Verily I say unto you, That there be some of them that stand here, which shall not taste of death, till they have seen the kingdom of God come with power." He reasserts that "them" refers to "generation." To this I replied in a former speech, and further notice is not necessary.

My opponent is much exercised because I prove that Christ was King before Pentecost, and says that if I was debating with a Baptist, I would deny this very point. In this, as usual, he is mistaken. Christ was King, but not *crowned*.

"For the kingdom of God is not in word, but in power." (I Cor. 4:20.) The gentleman files twenty ob-

jections to the position that I hold; and while they are not worthy of note, I will notice a few of them, though not one of them militates against the truth as I present it. He says that my contention is not true, because when the kingdom is established, "the iron, the clay, the brass, the silver, and the gold" were "broken to pieces together, and became like the chaff of the summer thrashing floors; and the wind carried them away, that no place was found for them: and the stone that smote the image became a great mountain, and filled the whole earth." This purported objection is drawn from the second of Daniel. Nebuchadnezzar in his dreams saw a great image, with "head of fine gold," "breast and arms of silver," "belly and thighs of brass," "legs of iron," "feet part of iron and part of clay." Mr. Bradley says that when the kingdom is set up, this image is to be thus broken up; and he says that it has not been done; therefore the kingdom has not been established, and I am wrong in my contention. Here he displays not only a lack of biblical information, but shows that he is not posted in history. Daniel, in interpreting the dream, describes four kingdoms, all of which have passed away. Daniel says to Nebuchadnezzar: "Thou art this head of gold." Thus we have the head of the image named. Then follows the description of the three following kingdoms, and Daniel concludes by saying: "And in the days of these kings shall the God of heaven set up a kingdom." In the days of THESE kings. Please note that Nebuchadnezzar is called "THIS head of gold." "THESE" is the plural of "THIS." THESE kings must include "THIS head of gold." Then Nebuchadnezzar is included in the expression, "THESE kings;" and since only four are named, only four can be included in "THESE kings." But these four kingdoms have all passed away; and if the kingdom has not been set up, Daniel was a false prophet. The kingdom of God began very small; but it

is to grow till it fills the whole earth, as Daniel said it would.

Another of his objections is: "Thy kingdom come. Thy will be done in earth, as it is in heaven.' As his will is done by all that are in heaven, so when the kingdom comes, all on earth will do his will; but all on earth do not his will now; therefore the kingdom has not come." Pshaw! Bradley, I am surprised at you. The Lord taught the disciples to pray for the kingdom to come; not only so, but they were to pray for his will to be done. There is no intimation that all men would do his will when the kingdom came. Some people do the will of the Lord now, so are there some that are in the kingdom now. "And hath translated us into the kingdom." (Col. 1.)

Another objection: "I charge thee therefore before God, and the Lord Jesus Christ, who shall judge the quick and the dead at his appearing and his kingdom.' Christ has not appeared, has not yet judged the dead; therefore the kingdom has not been established." I submit that a better translation of the passage is found in the Revised Version—viz., "by his appearing and his kingdom." Being members of the kingdom, we will be judged by the kingdom—i.e., by the laws of the kingdom.

My opponent talks of Christ coming to this earth to sit on the throne of David, and then says he will have the kingdom. As usual, he is wrong. The throne of David is not on this earth, and will never be. "Once have I sworn by my holiness that I will not lie unto David. His seed shall endure forever, and his throne as the sun before me. It shall be established forever as the moon, and as a faithful witness in heaven." (Ps. 89:35-37.) From this we learn where the throne of David is and where it is to stay. Christ has been raised and ascended to heaven and seated on the throne. (Acts 2:20).

"Of the increase of his government and peace there shall be no end." (Isa. 9:6.) "The stone that smote the

image became a great mountain, and filled the whole earth." (Dan. 2:35.) "The kingdom of heaven is like to a grain of mustard seed, which a man took, and sowed in his field: which indeed is the least of all seeds: but when it is grown, it is the greatest of all herbs, and becometh a tree, so that the birds of the air come and lodge in the branches thereof." (Matt. 13:31-32.) You have never heard a materialist try to show any sense in these statements of inspiration, in harmony with their position on the kingdom, but I shall note that later. I can conceive of only three ways by which a kingdom can increase: (1) Increase of territory, (2) increase of power in the hands of the king, (3) increase in the number of subjects. Christ can't increase as King, for he has "all power" "in heaven and in earth." The increase could not be in territory, for in the beginning it was through heaven and earth. (Col. 1.) I affirm that the only way for there to be an increase is in the number of subjects, or citizens, of his kingdom. The kingdom of Christ does not increase by natural generation; but being a spiritual kingdom, it is by regeneration. "Ye also as lively stones, are built up a spiritual house, a holy priesthood, to offer up spiritual sacrifices." (I Pet. 2:5.) In the growth of the kingdom of God there was not the roar of war dogs, catapults, or unsheathing of carnal swords. Its increase was (is) unlike that of any kingdom ever heard of on earth—no field of carnage, slaughter, and devastation. In setting up the Lord's kingdom there was not so much as a bruised blade of grass or the faint flicker of the smallest taper, no violence, no coercing; they were "willing subjects." Not of this world is my kingdom, declared our Lord. As the prophets and the Lord declared, in its incipiency the kingdom was small, like a mustard seed; a small bit of leaven, not full grown. "The number of names together were about a hundred and twenty." (Acts 1:15.) Truly it was small. Think of the scene.

On one hand, the kings of earth, with regal spender and earthly power, wealth untold and subjects unnumbered; on the other, a small, very small, company—one hundred and twenty—without earthly prestige or financial aid. Their best Friend they buried in a borrowed sepulcher; but trusting in the power and protection of the King on David's throne, they unfurl the banner of the Christ — the "KING OF KINGS, AND LORD OF LORDS" (Rev. 19:16)—and through love press the claims of him who has all power. The conflict begins, and the first time the claims of the Prince of Peace—the King of Righteousness—are presented, three thousand accept. A victory is won; they are delivered from the power of darkness and translated into the kingdom. (Col. 1:13.) Here you note an addition to the hundred and twenty. The heaven is working. But a few days pass, when five thousand more accept the King on David's throne. The number now is more than eight thousand. Many more became obedient to the King. (Acts 5:14.) See the mustard grow. No time to note the growth by thousands. Jerusalem rejoices in a Savior's love, shouts the praise of heaven's King. These people rejoice as the recipients of the King's approval. The wonderful tidings of the King on David's throne are no longer confined to Jerusalem. By swift feet, loving hearts, and glad tongues, the news is carried beyond her confines. Happy souls declare that the time has been fulfilled, and that he has come whose right it is, and the kingdom has been established. Judea, Samaria, Rome, Corinth, Ephesus—soon to the uttermost part of the earth the glad news goes, and the people accept the Anointed as their Ruler. Loyal subjects of the King are still declaring the glad tidings; and on they will—must—go, till he is known from the metropolitan city to the African jungle, from the temple of learning to the heathen hovel; on shall the message go, till the earth shall become vocal with the praises of him who is "King

of kings;" on will the message go, till no more of earth's inhabitants will receive the King. Then will the angel stand upon sea and land and by him who liveth for evermore declare that time is at an end. The Lord then comes; the graves give up the dead; death is destroyed; and "then cometh the end, when he shall have delivered the kingdom to God, even the Father."

The new birth bears some relationship to the kingdom, and must have some attention in this connection. Jesus said: "Verily I say unto thee, Except a man be born of water and of the Spirit, he cannot enter into the kingdom of God." (John 3:5.) The position of materialists on the new birth is such that they are logically driven to deny the future existence of infants and idiots, heathens, and all those who die in their sins.

1. They teach that in this life we are begotten—that is, Christians are begotten of the Father, but are not born of the Spirit till the resurrection—born of the Spirit at or in the resurrection. Note: Connection with life begins when we are begotten. Should this union with life terminate before birth, then the birth will only be a *still birth*, for the begotten one is dead. But they say men—the Christian man, as well as all others—are wholly mortal, and at death cease to exist; everything that goes to constitute man dies. If that be true, and they are correct on the birth of the Spirit being at the resurrection, the Lord will carry on the work of "*still-borning*" on a wholesale plan. If they are correct on the nature of man and on the new birth, the result is "not to be;" there will be no future existence.

2. Nothing can be born till begotten; and as they teach all infants, idiots, and rebels against God die without being begotten (remember, they teach that when we die we cease to exist), they can never come forth from the grave by a birth of the Spirit; for they have not so much as been begotten, and certainly birth is contingent on begetting. Christians are those who have been born

of water and the Spirit. They are children of God. "The Spirit itself beareth witness with our spirit, that we are the children of God." (Rom. 8:16.) "And because ye are sons." (Gal. 4:6.) It would be appreciated by all of us if my opponent would tell us how we are the children of God. If we are the children of God, and Paul says that we are, it is due to birth law being operative. Of those born Peter says: "As newborn babes, desire the sincere milk of the word, that they may grow thereby." (I Peter 2:2.) Mr. Bradley, you say we are not born. Tell us: Do you feed babies on milk before they are born? Was Peter addressing those who were only begotten—the embryo—and telling them to do as if they were born? Shucks! If we have not been born of the Spirit, if Christians have not been born of the Spirit, how could Peter say: "Ye are built up a spiritual house?" (I Pet. 2:5.) The truth is, my friends, we are the children of God by virtue of having been born of the Spirit, and are, therefore, in the kingdom. The kingdom, then, is in existence. "Except a man be born of water and of the Spirit, he cannot enter into the kingdom of God." (John 3:5.) If we can determine what birth "of water and of the Spirit" is, we can determine about the kingdom.

1. He that doeth the will of the Father enters the kingdom. (Matt. 7.)

2. The one born of water and the Spirit enters the kingdom. (John 3.)

3. Therefore to be born of water and Spirit is to do the will of the Father.

1. Must be born of water and Spirit to enter the kingdom. (John 3:5.)

2. Must do the will of the Father to enter the kingdom. (Matt. 7:21.)

3. Man can't do birth from the grave.

4. Therefore birth from the grave is not birth of the Spirit.

1. He that doeth righteousness is born of him. (I John 2:29.)

2. But the one born of him "doeth his will" and enters the kingdom.

3. Therefore to be born of water and of the Spirit is to "do his will"—to do righteousness.

1. God's commandments are righteousness. (Ps. 119:172.)

2. Man must do righteousness to be born of him.

3. Therefore man must do commandments to be born of him.

4. But man that is born of him enters the kingdom.

5. The man that doeth his commandments is born of him.

6. Therefore man that doeth his commandments enters the kingdom.

7. But man must be born of water and Spirit to enter the kingdom.

8. Hence to be born of water and Spirit is to do the commands of God.

1. He that doeth righteousness is born, and he that is born enters the kingdom, and righteousness is in the gospel; then it follows that he who obeys the gospel is born of God.

2. But the man that is born of water and the Spirit is born of God. Hence, birth of water and the Spirit is obedience to the gospel; and as the man that is born of water and the Spirit enters the kingdom, it follows—

3. That the man that obeys the gospel enters the kingdom.

1. God takes vengeance on those who obey not the gospel. (II Thess. 1:7.)

2. God takes vengeance on none but sinners.

3. Therefore man is sinner till he obeys the gospel.

4. But the one who obeys the gospel does righteousness.

5. The one who does righteousness is born of him.

6. The one that is born of him enters the kingdom.

7. Therefore the one that obeys the gospel enters the kingdom.

1. One must do the will of the Father to enter the kingdom.

2. Man must do the will before he dies or after the resurrection.

3. If he does the will before he dies, he enters the kingdom before he dies.

4. If he dies before he does the "will of God," then he must do the will after he is resurrected before he can enter the kingdom.

5. Away goes the theory that man is resurrected into the kingdom; and if not resurrected into the kingdom, the birth of the Spirit is not the resurrection, nor does it take place in the resurrection.

6. Doing the will of the Father brings into the kingdom; but no man can *do* resurrection—the thing you say brings into the kingdom.

7. You cannot say that man does the will in this life, and is, therefore, entitled to resurrection into the kingdom; for doing the will brings us into the kingdom, and no one can *do* the resurrection—the thing you say brings into the kingdom.

The truth, as you all know, is that we have been born again and are in the kingdom. "And hath translated us into the kingdom." (Col. 1:13.)

Bradley's position is that the kingdom will be set up at the beginning of the millennium, when he says those who have obeyed the gospel will be resurrected—born of the Spirit, he says—and constitute the citizens of the kingdom. If that be true, none will enter the kingdom during the thousand years; for "the rest of the dead lived not again until the thousand years were finished."

(Rev. 20:5.) And Bradley says that we must be resurrected to enter the kingdom, but none are resurrected during that period. Thus the kingdom does not, cannot grow. It sends forth not so much as one blade; it does not remotely resemble the parable of the mustard seed; it is not the kingdom the Bible speaks of as growing till it fills the whole earth. But worse and worse. Grant for the sake of the argument that the kingdom is not set up till the beginning of the millennium, and is composed of those that reign with Christ the one thousand years, which will only be those that were "beheaded for the witness of Jesus and for the word of God." (Rev. 20:4.) Remember that during this thousand years the devil has a seal set upon him, that he should "deceive the nations no more, till the thousand years should be fulfilled." (Rev. 20:3.) At the expiration of the thousand years, which is the entire reign of Christ, according to Mr. Bradley, Christ is to deliver the kingdom to God, and that will be the end of the world. Listen: "In the end of this world. The Son of man shall send forth his angels, and they shall gather out of his kingdom all things that offend, and them that do iniquity; and shall cast them into a furnace of fire." (Matt. 13:41). If Bradley is correct, (1) the kingdom is established at the beginning of the millennium; (2) it will be composed of those who reign with Christ; (3) but these are the martyrs only; (4) the reign of Christ will last for only one thousand years, at the expiration of which time comes the end of the world, when Christ gives the kingdom to God; (5) as before proven, none will enter the kingdom during the thousand years—it does not, cannot grow; (6) the devil is bound during the thousand years; (7) but at the end of the thousand years—the end of the world, says Bradley—God is to send forth his angels and gather out of his kingdom the ones that offend. Since the kingdom could not grow one bit during the thousand years and at the

end of the thousand years the angels are to gather the offenders out of it, it must get smaller—"swinks up." Bradley, that is not the kingdom spoken of in the Bible, for the one there brought to view is to grow till it fills the whole earth. Again, these martyrs, who Bradley says are the only members of the kingdom, reign with Christ the one thousand years, were faithful, loyal men of God during their life on earth. Through all the temptations of Satan and bitter persecution of his allies they were faithful, being beheaded before they would recant or cease to serve the Lord. But when the kingdom is established, according to Bradley, and the devil bound, these men who were so faithful during their life on earth, dying martyrs, are born of the Spirit (resurrected, says Bradley), enter the kingdom, and begin to reign with Christ, says Bradley; but during this reign of one thousand years they become so offensive that at the end of the thousand years Christ sends forth his angels and gathers the workers of iniquity out of the kingdom. The reign of Christ, according to Bradley, means the damnation of some of the ones that died martyrs for the cause of Christ. My friends, the doctrine of Bradley is not found in the Bible.

BRADLEY'S THIRD NEGATIVE.

Gentlemen Moderators, Ladies and Gentlemen:

I am happy to come before you this evening to continue the investigation of the word of God. I am made to wonder why Elder Nichol denies that he gave up the proposition in his second speech. He most certainly did. Now if we are going to stay with the proposition, why not do it? What is the use of having a proposition if we do not debate it?

Now, respected friends, I want to say that Elder Nichol, in giving you what Bradley says, always gives it to you a little different from the way that I say it. You note the fact that he takes what I say and twists it a little and makes it sound like he wants it to sound; and, of course, he makes it look very plain to some of you.

I want to say again, respected friends, that Elder Nichol gave up his proposition in his very second speech. If he produces any proof in support of his proposition, he will have to do it yet. He has not proved to you that the kingdom was established on the first Pentecost after the resurrection of Christ, and he can't show that it has been established. You will notice, respected friends, that friend Nichol scatters all over the book of God to find his points and find things by which to try to prove his proposition and say the things that he does about this matter. When he shows that the kingdom was established on the first Pentecost after the resurrection of Christ, or that it has been established at all, I will give up this proposition, and not before.

He is continually getting off of the issue on to some other subject. We are not debating other subjects now, Elder Nichol. Let us get through with this subject first,

and then at some future time, if you want to debate on something else, I stand ready to debate with you on whatever subject you want to debate on. He gives you what A. S. Bradley says about the matter. I don't do that way; I give you the book of God and what it says about the matter. Friend Nichol, let us get at the proposition and have some debating here.

He says that Elder Bradley says that the church was established on the first Pentecost after the resurrection of Christ. I never said any such thing. There was not an elder in the church then. He can't read in the book of God that the church was established on the first Pentecost after the resurrection of Christ. I did not take any such position that the church was set up on Pentecost.

Now, respected friends, we next call your attention to Dan. 7:13, 14: "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, and they brought him near before him. And there was given him dominion, and glory, and a kingdom, that all people, nations, and languages, should serve him: his dominion is an everlasting dominion, which shall not pass away, and his kingdom that which shall not be destroyed." How does that strike you, Elder Nichol? There is an everlasting kingdom spoken of—a kingdom that shall not be destroyed; when it is established, all nations shall serve him. There is nothing said about this kingdom having been established. All nations do not serve him now. Is this the book of God, or is it Elder Bradley? Now if I were to do like Elder Nichol, I would say: "The truth hurts, don't it, Elder Nichol?" But I am too much of a gentleman to say that; but we will pass on and let that pass, for that is not debating. Now, respected friends, let us note this scripture and see when it says that Christ is to receive the kingdom. Christ, when he ascended, "went" into heaven; he did not go from heaven, but he

went into heaven. Now in this passage Daniel was on the earth, and says that Christ "came" with the clouds. He saw the Son of man, and he "came" with the clouds, not "went" with the clouds. When Christ comes again, he will come with the clouds and receive the kingdom. That is the time that Daniel has reference to in this passage. Friend Nichol says that Christ received the kingdom when he "went" to heaven with the clouds, and Daniel says that he will receive it when he comes with the clouds. Yes, sir; Daniel says "came," not "went." Elder Nichol, it is "came." Respected friends. Elder Nichol is wrong on this passage of Scripture. Christ has not come again; consequently he has not received the kingdom and is not on his throne executing his power.

Now, respected friends, I want to call your attention to the fact that Elder Nichol did not notice the objections that I read in your hearing. Did you notice that? Why did he not notice them? Because he knew that if he did he would have to give up his proposition, and, therefore, he passed them by unnoticed.

I now call your attention to Matt. 2:6: "And thou, Bethlehem, in the land of Judah, art not the least among the princes of Judah: for out of thee shall come a Governor, that shall rule my people Israel." But you will note that it does not say "does rule," but "shall rule." It is in the future—in time to come.

Again, says my honorable opponent: "Elder Bradley, did you ever know fish to go in the net just because they wanted to go in the net, Elder Bradley?" Yes, sir, lots of them. I want to be caught in the kingdom of God; there are inducements there; and, by the grace of God, I am going there. Yes, respected friends, there are inducements there, and I want to get into the kingdom of God. But my friend Nichol—he does not want to get into the kingdom of God; he is already in the kingdom, according to what he says. Why don't my friend come up and grapple with the arguments that I make and let

us have some debating here? I think that we ought to put in the time debating the proposition. If my friend Nichol has given any proof yet, I can't see it, and I don't think that any one else can. But my friend Nichol is a pretty good reasoner, and, therefore, he makes it look pretty plain to some of you; but, respected friends, there is really no debating about it. I want to give you what I say from the book of God, for I realize that I will be held accountable for what I say, and I want it to be the truth. I want to so live and act that I can enter into the kingdom of God. There are inducements there, and I want to get to that place, and, by the grace of God, I am going to that place. Though I have to go through tribulation to get there, I am going; and, gentlemen moderators, ladies and gentlemen, that is the only way that any one can ever hope to get into the kingdom of God. I am not like my friend Nichol; I am not already in the kingdom of God. I have not yet reached that place, but he is already there, according to his argument; but because I say these things, he says I don't produce any argument in this matter. Paul says that we have to suffer tribulation to enter the kingdom, but my friend Nichol says that he is in the kingdom. Then he don't have any tribulation.

Respected friends, did you notice that Elder Nichol did not notice the objections that I filed? There were twenty of them. He did not notice them, and that is not all; he will never. Why? Because he knows that if he does he will have to give up his proposition; and, therefore, he passes them unnoticed. And, too, I may say another thing is that they do not fit his points. That is the reason why, respected friends, that he does not notice these objections. It is not because there is logic in them, but from the simple fact that they are not made to fit his points. That is the reason. These objections are the word of God, and he knows that he can do nothing with them; therefore he lets them pass. Now,

respected friends, you know that he did not pay any real attention to these objections that I read in your hearing, not a single one of them; but he is a debater—yes, sir, he is a debater, and all that.

Again, I asked him if the kingdom of Christ was a heavenly kingdom, and if the kingdom that he says was established on Pentecost is a heavenly kingdom. He has paid no attention to that, just like he does all the points that I make. Elder Nichol, put that down and answer it. Is Christ's kingdom a heavenly kingdom, and are you in a heavenly kingdom? He is afraid to come up and grapple with the question; but, as I have said before, he takes what I say and turns it around and makes it sound like he wants it to sound, and displays a little logic, and some of you people think that that is the way of the thing. I don't do that way. I don't twist what he says.

Now, respected friends, I want to call your attention to the fourth chapter and the first verse of Second Timothy: "I charge thee therefore before God, and the Lord Jesus Christ, who shall judge the quick and the dead at his appearing and his kingdom." You notice, respected friends, that he is to judge the quick and the dead at his appearing and his kingdom. He has not done this; he has not judged the quick and the dead; therefore his kingdom has not yet been established; and my friend Nichol has not produced one argument that proves that it has, and he can't produce one.

He asked me if the word of God dwells in me. Yes, sir, it does.

I believe that Jesus Christ will not be crowned as King until he comes again. He is not on his throne now, but on the Father's throne. Jesus is not now reigning, respected friends, but he will in the future; but he is not at the present time, as I will show before this debate closes; and at the right time I will show you by giving you some argument on this very point to show you that

he is not crowned as King. I will do this when my honorable opponent, Mr. Nichol, produces some argument to show that he has been crowned as King.

Now with respect to this passage: "Thy kingdom come. Thy will be done in earth, as it is in heaven." (Matt. 6:10.) Now, I want to say that God's will is not done in earth as it is in heaven. His will is done universally in heaven; and when the kingdom is established, his will will be done universally on earth. Therefore, I say that the kingdom has not been established. If the kingdom was established, God's will would be done on earth as it is in heaven.

Now, with respect to this question, you remember that friend Nichol said that, according to my position and my argument, the kingdom of Christ would continually diminish. Now, respected friends, friend Nichol knows that I said no such thing, and that such is not according to my argument; but this is another case where he just twists my argument a little and makes it look that way. As I said before, he takes what I said and changes it up just a little and makes it sound very plausible to some of you all; but if you will consider the way that I say it and then look at the way he says it, you will see quite a difference. Just notice, now, and see for yourselves. But he is a debater, and knows just how to make it all appear the very way that he wants it to look.

Respected friends, my opponent had much to say in his last speech about the new birth. That is not the subject under consideration. Let us debate the kingdom; that is the question before us for consideration. What does he want to get off on another subject for? I read John 3:5: "Verily, verily, I say unto you, Except a man be born of water and of the Spirit, he cannot enter into the kingdom of God." Now let me invite your attention to Acts 14:22: "Confirming the souls of the disciples, and exhorting them to continue in the faith, and that we must through much tribulation enter into the

kingdom of God." Now the question that I ask is this: Note the two facts, respected friends—that we must through much tribulation enter into the kingdom of God and that we must be born again to enter into the kingdom of God. Now, then, respected friends, if we are in the kingdom of God, what is the use of having to suffer tribulation to enter into the kingdom? We all have these persecutions, and they are necessary to entrance into the kingdom of God, Paul says. Now, then, if we are already in the kingdom of God, how is it that we have to suffer tribulation to enter into it? If we have been born into the kingdom of God, we are not out of it now; but Paul says that we have to enter into the kingdom through much tribulation. How can a man enter into a thing that he is already in? Now, I would like to know this: If we are in the kingdom of God, how can we enter into it? I want my friend Nichol to explain this in his very next speech. I wonder if he will do it, or pass it by unnoticed. Now, then, if Elder Nichol will come up and grapple with these things, we will have some debating here, and I am sure it will be a benefit to him. The new birth is not the question for debate now. I believe that we are the children of God by faith in Christ Jesus.

Let us next turn, respected friends, to Ezek. 21:25-27: "And thou, profane and wicked prince of Israel, whose day is come, when iniquity shall have an end, thus saith the Lord God; Remove the diadem, and take off the crown: this shall not be the same: exalt him that is low, and abase him that is high. I will overturn, overturn, overturn, it: and it shall be no more, until he comes whose right it is; and I will give it him." Thus you see, respected friends, the God of heaven will turn everything over to Christ when he comes. It is in the future, when he comes back to take his seat on his throne and reign. He is to have the throne of David.

Now, respected friends, we wish to call your attention to Hos. 3:4, 5: "For the children of Israel shall abide

many days without a king, and without a prince, and without a sacrifice, and without an image, and without an ephod, and without a teraphim: afterwards shall the children of Israel return, and seek the Lord their God, and David their king; and shall fear the Lord and his goodness in the latter days." They were to return to David, their king. This refers to Christ, who is to have the throne of David and be their King.

In this connection let us read Luke 1:31, 32: "And, behold, thou shalt conceive in thy womb, and bring forth a son, and shalt call his name Jesus. He shall be great, and shall be called the son of the Highest: and the Lord God shall give unto him the throne of his father David." Thus you see that Christ is to have the throne of David and rule over his kingdom. I am going to prove to you by the Scriptures that he has not been given that throne, and will not have it till he comes again. He must "come," and then it will be given to him—when he comes the second time. For my friend to prove that the kingdom has been established, he must prove that it was established when Christ came the first time, and not at his going away, because Christ is to receive the kingdom when he comes, and not at his going away.

Now, respected friends, I want to call your attention to Acts 15:13-17: "And after they held their peace, James answered, saying, Men and brethren, hearken unto me: Simeon hath declared how God at the first did visit the Gentiles, to take out of them a people for his name. And to this agree the words of the prophets; as it is written, After this I will return, and will build again the tabernacle of David, which is fallen down; and I will build again the ruins thereof, and I will set it up: that the residue of men might seek after the Lord, and all the Gentiles, upon whom my name is called, saith the Lord, who doeth all these things." From this you note that Christ is to have the throne of David. When he returns, he will build the tabernacle of David—be given the throne

of David and have the kingdom. You remember the scripture that I read that "a certain nobleman went into a far country to receive for himself a kingdom, and return." This is it. Christ has gone into the far country, but he has not returned. When he returns, he will receive the kingdom. Why don't my friend Nichol notice these things? The truth is, he does not want to notice them, because they don't fit his points; that is the reason. It is not because he forgets them or can't notice them, but he can't make them fit his points and his position; therefore he passes them by unnoticed. I don't do him that way.

Now, then, respected friends, we call your attention to Matt. 16:28, 29, again: "Verily I say unto you, There be some standing here, which shall not taste of death, till they see the Son of man coming in his kingdom." Now, Mr. Nichol, what do you think of that? Will you say that they have seen Jesus coming in his kingdom? Did they see him come in his kingdom on Pentecost, the time that you say the kingdom was established? If the kingdom was established then, he came at that time, and he is to come again. Respected friends, that man has Christ coming three times, according to his contention in this matter, and the book of God don't say anything about Christ coming three times; and, therefore, I don't believe that it is true. But he is a debater, and must say something. My friends, when the kingdom is established, the Lord will come in it; and it will be the second coming of the Lord, and not the third, as my honorable opponent has it by his argument.

Again we call your attention to 2 Tim. 4:1. I have read this in your hearing before; but that you may note the connection, I read it again: "I charge thee therefore before God, and the Lord Jesus Christ, who shall judge the quick and the dead at his appearing and his kingdom." Do you all see anything in this that looks like the kingdom has been established? No, sir. When the king-

dom is established, it will be when the Lord comes in it to judge the quick and the dead. He is to judge them at his appearing, and that is when the kingdom comes. Mr. Nichol, did Christ judge the quick and the dead on Pentecost, the time that you say the kingdom was established? In connection with this, listen to the thirty-first verse of the twenty-fifth chapter of Matthew: "When the Son of man shall come in his glory, and all the holy angels with him, then shall he sit upon the throne of his glory: and before him shall be gathered all nations." Yes, sir. When he comes the second time, he will be on his glorified throne. Then the kingdom will be established, and he will judge the quick and the dead, as Paul says, at his appearing and his kingdom. He is not on that throne now; and as proof that he is not, I invite your attention to Rev. 3:21: "To him that overcometh will I grant to sit with me in my throne, even as I also overcame, and am set down with my Father in his throne." Now, Elder Nichol, how does that strike you? Sit with me in my throne, even as I have overcome, and am set down with my Father in his throne. Note the fact, respected friends, it says that Christ is on the Father's throne now; but he is to sit on his throne at some future time, and that will be when he comes the second time, and then the ones that have overcome will set with him in his throne. That is the Scriptures for it, respected friends, and according to them the kingdom has not been set up; and, of course, we are not in it; but we may enter into it, for Paul says (Acts 14:22) through much tribulation we may enter into the kingdom of God. This is the same thing that is spoken of in Revelation, where it says that if we overcome we will set with him in his throne. [Time expired.]

NICHOL'S FOURTH AFFIRMATIVE

Gentlemen Moderators, Ladies and Gentlemen:

My opponent complains about the way I conduct my part of this discussion. I am not surprised at him, for I am making no effort to please him. He insists that I have produced no argument germane to the affirmation that I have made. I guess you all should vote him your thanks for the information he gives. He presumes on your inability to know an argument when you hear one. He is only whistling to keep up courage. Don't blame the poor fellow.

He continues to insist that Christ is not King. My friends, our time is too short for me to be continually repeating the argument on that point. You all are not dense, like my opponent. You well remember the argument and the scriptures on that very point. Not only does inspiration declare that Christ is "KING OF KINGS, AND LORD OF LORDS," but it very plainly says that the brethren at Colosse had been "translated into the kingdom." If Mr. Bradley would grapple with what I have presented and quit his begging, it would be much more interesting.

"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, and that brought him near before him. And there was given him dominion, and glory, and a kingdom, that all people, nations, and languages, should serve him: his dominion is an everlasting dominion, which shall not be destroyed." (Dan. 7:13, 14.) In this Daniel says that the Son of man (Christ) came to the Ancient of days (God) with the clouds and received the kingdom. In Acts 1:9 you find the record of Christ

ascending with the clouds to God, and he was then to receive the kingdom. More, all nations were to serve him. All nations do now serve him—i.e., men of all nations. The invitation was sent to all nations, in fact, from the city of Jerusalem on the Pentecost of my proposition. (See Luke 24:46-49; Acts 2:39.)

Mr. Bradley says the kingdom will be established when Christ comes the second time. Indeed! Daniel said he was to "come to the Ancient of days" and receive the kingdom. When he comes the second time, will he "come to the Ancient of days?" Is God to be at one place then and Christ at another, and Christ is to *come to* God and receive the kingdom? Pshaw! When Christ comes the second time, God is to be with him. Christ will not then *come* "to the Ancient of days," but will come with him. Sir, you should read your Bible some.

Mr. Bradley continues to insist that the fish that enter the net want to go into it. Not true. They want the food in the net, unless it is a gill or a tramble net, and then they are caught therein, and you say all those caught therein will be cast out. Then, in the very face of that statement, you say: "I want to be caught in the net, for there are inducements in it." Have you forgotten that your contention is that the ones "caught" in the net will be cast out, and now you want to be caught in it? What is the matter with you, anyway?

Our attention is invited to Acts 14:22: "Confirming the souls of the disciples, and exhorting them to continue in the faith, and that we must through much tribulation enter into the kingdom of God." I shall gladly pay my respects to this passage. Paul, in Col. 1:13, says that we have been "translated into the kingdom," but in this passage says that we must enter it. I am certain that both passages are true; that we are in the kingdom now and must enter into it. In Acts 14:22 he contemplates the kingdom when all the subjects will be glorified, freed from pain and temptation incident to life

on this earth—the kingdom when delivered to God. We are now in the “first dominion” of the kingdom. (Mic. 4:8.) “I John, who also am your brother, and companion in tribulation, and in the kingdom.” In this passage you note that John says he was “in tribulation.” Mr. Bradley says that John was “in tribulation,” but John says “*and in the kingdom.*” Mr. Bradley says that he was not in the kingdom. Strange, strange indeed that he accepts as true the statement “in tribulation” and rejects the statement “in the kingdom.” Certainly he has received a strong delusion. While John was “in tribulation and in the kingdom,” still it was through this “tribulation” he was to enter into the kingdom in its glorified state—the kingdom when we will have immortalized bodies, the kingdom when all offenders will be gathered out of it. It is the “everlasting kingdom” Peter speaks of, when God reigns. There will then, when Christ turns the kingdom over to God, be no change in the kingship. God will reign from then on; the subjects will be there through all eternity—always, everlastingly.

Let me correct a mistake. In one of my preceding speeches I said: “Mr. Bradley says that the church was set up on the Pentecost of my proposition.” He replies: “I have never said any such thing. There was not an elder in the church then.” Sorry that I misrepresented him. Remember, Bradley don’t believe that the church was established on Pentecost. The only reason he assigns is: There was not an elder in it then. Truly, such ignorance as he displays is not excusable. Peter was in the church at that time, and he declares that he was an elder. (I Pet. 1:5.)

Mr. Bradley, please tell us how we can be “translated into the kingdom,” and Paul says that we have, if the kingdom doesn’t exist.

Mr. Bradley says that we are God’s children “by faith.” True, it is through acts of faith, acts prompted

by faith that works by love, that we become the children of God; but tell us, Mr. Bradley: Are we really the children of God?

The gentleman attempts a counter argument on Ezek. 21:26, 27: "Thus saith the Lord God; Remove the diadem, and take off the crown: this shall not be the same: exalt him that is low, and abase him that is high. I will overturn, overturn, overturn, it: and it shall be no more, until he come whose right it is; and I will give it him." Note, please: "*This shall not be the same.*" Christ says: "My kingdom is not of this world." (John 18:36.) Again: "*Until He come whose right it is, and I will give it him.*" Has Christ come? Christ certainly claimed to be the King. (Matt. 27:11.)

"For the kingdom of God is not meat and drink; but righteousness, and peace, and joy in the Holy Ghost." (Rom. 14:17.) Tell us, Mr. Bradley: Has "righteousness" come?

I am astonished at the argument that the man makes on the "throne of David." He contends that Christ is to come back to this earth and sit on the throne of David, when the kingdom is established. His argument is based on Acts 15:13-15. It shall have my attention. "After this I will return, and build again the tabernacle of David, which is fallen down; and I will build again the ruins thereof, and I will set it up: that the residue of men might seek after the Lord, and all the Gentiles, upon whom my name is called, saith the Lord." God selected David's family to be his royal family through all time. (2 Sam. 7:12-19.) Verse 16: "And thine house and thy kingdom shall be established forever before thee: thy throne shall be established forever." When Christ appeared as a teacher among men, no one had for years, of David's seed, sat on the throne. David's throne (house) had fallen into decay—fallen down. It was to be rebuilt, re-established, before the Gentiles came in. "'Anoikdomeso ten skenen David ten pepto-

knian' (quoted from Amos 9:11)—for the family or royal line of David, fallen into weakness or decay." (Robinson.) Mr. Thayer, in his lexicon, of the "tabernacle of David," says: "'E skenen David' (from Amos 9: 11)—family reduced to decay or obscurity." From this we learn that the "tabernacle of David" has reference to the family of David, and not to a literal throne on this earth, with a literal scepter. (1) The *royal* family of David had fallen into decay—for centuries no one of his seed had been on the throne; (2) God made promise that he would raise seed to sit on his throne; (3) God promised to raise this seed, that the Gentiles might seek after him; (4) but the Gentiles have been converted (Acts 10); (5) therefore of the house of David one now rules. Mr. Bradley says that God will not raise this seed till Christ comes the second time. Then, according to his contention, the Gentiles can't be saved now. You note that the statement is very plain: "I will return, and build again the tabernacle of David, which is fallen down; and I will build again the ruins thereof, and I will set it up." Why? "That the residue of men might seek after the Lord, and all the Gentiles, upon whom my name is called." But Bradley knows and preaches that the Gentiles can be saved now, and certainly he knows that his contention is false on this passage.

On whose throne was David placed as king? "Then sat Solomon upon the throne of David his father; and his kingdom was established greatly." (I Kings 2:12.) "Then Solomon sat on the throne of the Lord as king instead of David his father." (I Chron. 29:23.) Language can't be plainer; the throne of David was the Lord's. Indeed, David never owned a throne in his own right.

Prophets declared that Christ should sit on the throne of David, which is the Lord's throne. "His name shall be called Wonderful, Counselor, The mighty God, The everlasting Father, The Prince of Peace. Of the increase of his government and peace there shall be no end, upon

the throne of David, and upon his kingdom, to order it, and to establish it with judgment and with justice from henceforth even forever." (Isa. 9:6,7.) "He shall be great, and shall be called the Son of the Highest: and the Lord God shall give unto him the throne of his father David." (Luke 1:32.) That Christ was promised the throne of David is not a question; but has he received that throne? I insist that for centuries he has been on that throne. Where is the throne of David? "Once have I sworn by my holiness that I will not lie unto David. His seed shall endure forever, and his throne as the sun before me. It shall be established forever as the moon, and as a faithful witness in heaven." (Ps. 89:35-37.) Christ was promised the throne of David, which throne is in heaven. We need not expect to find him on that throne on earth. Was Christ ever promised any other throne than that of David? "Men and brethren, let me freely speak unto you of the patriarch David, that he is both dead and buried, and his sepulcher is with us unto this day. Therefore being a prophet, and knowing that God had sworn with an oath unto him, that of the fruit of his loins, according to the flesh, he would raise up Christ to sit on his throne." Christ was raised to "sit" on the throne of David. What was he to do when he "sit" on the throne of David? "The Lord said unto my Lord, Sit thou at my right hand, until I make thine enemies thy footstool. The Lord shall send the rod of thy strength out of Zion: rule thou in the midst of thine enemies." (Ps. 110:1, 2.) (1) The throne of David is in heaven; (2) David's throne is the Lord's throne; (3) Christ was raised to sit on David's throne; (4) Christ is to "sit at right hand" till all enemies become his footstool; (5) he was to "sit at right hand" and *rule* in the midst of his enemies; (6) Christ has been seated at the right hand of the Father. "Which he wrought in Christ, when he raised him from the dead, and set him at his own right hand in heavenly places." (Eph. 1:20.) The word "sit"

("kathisia") means: "To confer the kingdom on one.—Acts 2:30." (Thayer.) (1) Christ was raised to "sit" on David's throne; (2) David's throne is the Lord's throne; (3) David's throne is in heaven; (4) Christ says, I have "set down with my Father in his throne;" (5) but he "sat" down when he ascended; (6) to "sit" is to have the kingdom conferred on one; (7) therefore when Christ ascended, he "sit" on the throne of Father (David), had the kingdom given to him; (8) Christ says that he has "the key of David;" "key"—power; (9) Christ has the power of David, "key of David," and has sat down with the Father in his throne; (10) but the Lord's throne is David's throne; (11) therefore Christ has been seated on David's throne; (12) he has been declared "Lord of lords, and King of kings." (Rev. 19:16.)

Mr. Bradley realizes that he can't meet the argument that I made from Mark 9:1, and now tries to break the force of it by filing objections. He wants me to note the account given by Matthew in the 16th chapter and 28th verse: "Verily I say unto you, There be some standing here, which shall not taste of death, till they see the Son of man coming in his kingdom." With seeming confidence of my inability to answer, he inquires: "Did they see Christ come in his kingdom on Pentecost?" Yes, sir! While with them, he said: "Ye shall not have gone over the cities of Israel, till the Son of man be come." Plain, positive statement he was to come to them before they went to all the cities of Israel. On Pentecost Christ came in power, not in person. He had promised them the Holy Spirit if he went away. The Spirit was to give them power and glory. When they received the Spirit, they understood what he meant when he said: "I will not leave you comfortless: I will come to you." (John 14:18.) He came to them in the person of the Holy Spirit. This is how he came before they had gone over the cities of Israel. On the Pentecost

of my proposition the Holy Spirit came. Christ then came. "I will not leave you comfortless: I will come to you." But when the Spirit came, the power came; when the power came, the kingdom came; and this was on Pentecost; and then they saw him come in the kingdom. He then came in the power and person of the Holy Spirit. He had also promised: "I am with you always, even unto the end of the world." (Matt. 28:20.) Not with them in person, but he came unto them in the power and person of the Holy Spirit on Pentecost, and was with them in the person of the Holy Spirit, as he promised. (John 14:18.) Yes, he came on Pentecost.

Another objection is made to the truth, and an argument is attempted by Mr. Bradley for the position that the kingdom will not be established till the second coming of Christ in person. He introduces Matt. 25:31: "When the Son of man shall come in his glory, and all the holy angels with him, then shall he sit upon the throne of his glory; and before him shall be gathered all nations." (1) When he comes, he will be on the throne of his glory. (2) When he comes, all nations will be gathered before him, and he will separate the sinners from the righteous. (3) This all takes place at his coming. The adverb "then" means "at that time." (4) Then, at the time of his coming, he separates the good from the bad; he will be on the throne of his glory, and all nations will be before him. (5) The wicked will not be raised till the end of the thousand years. This settles the fuss my opponent makes about Christ coming and reigning a thousand years and then gathering the nations. (6) When he comes, all nations will be gathered—it is the judgment day. (7) What is meant by sitting on the throne of his glory? (1) Christ said: "The Holy Spirit will glorify me." (John 16:14.) (2) The Spirit is in that work now in the kingdom. When the Spirit shall have accomplished that work, then Christ is on the glorified throne—i. e., the work is

consummated; Christ is glorified in his saints. He has then reigned till the last enemy is conquered. He then turns the kingdom over to the Father. The work of glorification is complete. He sits on the throne of his glory, having conquered all; hence, throne of glory. Certainly when he comes he will be on the throne of his glory. He is on that throne now, and will be on it when he comes. Bradley, did you not know that it is not till after he comes that he delivers the kingdom to the Father? He will still be on the throne when he comes.

Mr. Bradley will not try to show that I am wrong by noticing the arguments that I make, but tries to show that I am incorrect by establishing a counter line of argument. He insists that I pay some attention to Rev. 3:21: "To him that overcometh will I grant to sit with me in my throne, even as I also overcame, and am set down with my Father in his throne." From this passage the gentleman contends that Christ is now on the *Father's* throne; but when the kingdom is established, he will be on *his* own throne. When Christ came forth from the grave, "all power" was given to him; he then ascended to heaven, and was seated on the throne of the Father—the promised throne, the throne of David. The Father had held the power up to that time; he then turned it over to the Son. It is his power now; it is his throne now. It was the Father's throne. He gave it to the Son, and it is his now. Christ overcame, and has sat down as Priest on *his* throne. All Christians that overcome will be given an entrance abundantly into the everlasting kingdom. This will be the kingdom of Christ delivered to the Father. They will sit with Christ forever in his kingdom as turned over to the Father.

Note the positive statement that Christ has been seated as King: "Yet have I set my king upon my holy hill of Zion. I will declare the decree: the Lord hath

said unto me, Thou art my Son; this day have I begotten thee." (Ps. 2:6, 7). Remember, this is the statement from the second Psalm. (1) God sets his King on Zion; (2) he declares the decree—viz.: "Thou art my Son." Has this been fulfilled? Let us see: "And we declare unto you glad tidings, how that the promise that was made unto the fathers, God has fulfilled the same unto us their children, in that he hath raised up Jesus again; as it is also written in the second Psalm, Thou art my Son; this day have I begotten thee." Here Paul says that something written in the second Psalm has been fulfilled; and he even quotes a portion of the verse, so that it is not possible for us to mistake the very thing that he affirms was fulfilled. The conclusion is inevitable that Christ is King and has been set on the holy hill of Zion. Such plain statements cannot be covered by the sophistry of false teachers. In the face of such plain statements, I am met by my opponent with the statement that the Lord is not King.

"I appoint unto you a kingdom, as my Father hath appointed unto me; that ye may eat and drink at my table in my kingdom." (Luke 22:29.) When Jesus received a kingdom, it was the one appointed unto him. Certainly when he received it he had it. When the disciples received a kingdom, it was the one appointed unto them and received from the one who appointed it. They could not receive a kingdom from Jesus before he had one: neither could they have had a kingdom till they received it. But they had received a kingdom when the Hebrew letter was written. "Wherefore we receiving a kingdom which cannot be moved." (1) Jesus had a kingdom when he received it; (2) the disciples had received a kingdom when the Hebrew letter was written; (3) therefore Jesus had a kingdom then. Prior to that time he had received the kingdom; he received it when he went into the far country, when he went to the Ancient of days with the clouds.

In my opening address this morning I made the statement that if the kingdom was not established, we were not saved. I thought Mr. Bradley would question the statement, but to the present he has passed it by. I now ask your attention to the proof of the statement. "Then said Jesus unto his disciples, Verily I say unto you, That a rich man shall hardly enter into the kingdom of heaven. And again I say unto you, It is easier for a camel to go through the eye of a needle, than for a rich man to enter into the kingdom of God. When his disciples heard it, they were exceedingly amazed, saying, Who then can be saved?" Christ very plainly says that it is not likely that a rich man will enter into the kingdom of God. The disciples are astonished, and inquire, if that be true: "Who then can be saved?" Thus you note, the disciples understood that the saved people were in the kingdom—that salvation and the kingdom were coexistent. Such is the truth, too, or Christ allowed them to continue in the deception, and by his silence contributed thereto. He who contends that the kingdom is future must contend that salvation is future, and that the people of God are an unsaved body of individuals.

1. The ones who do the will, says Jesus, enter the kingdom. (Matt. 7.)

2. None will be saved but those that do the will.

3. Therefore to be saved in the kingdom, one must do the will.

1. No doing will, no saved.

2. No saved, no kingdom.

3. Hence, no doing will, no kingdom.

Again:

1. No doing will, no saved.

2. No doing will, no kingdom.

3. Therefore, no kingdom, no saved.

NO CHURCH.

Mr. Bradley teaches that men obey the gospel in this life, and are born of the Spirit in being resurrected. Since entrance into the kingdom is contingent on the birth of the Spirit (John 3:5), he contends that none enter the kingdom till resurrected. But since obedience to the gospel takes place in this life, only those who obey the gospel in this life will be resurrected into the kingdom. Those who obey the gospel in this life are the church—enter into the church; and in the resurrection they are born of the Spirit and become the kingdom, says Bradley. It follows, then, that no part of the church will be in the kingdom till resurrected—till they come forth from the grave. He teaches that the church is in existence now, and that men enter it by obeying the gospel. More, he says when Christ comes the second time he will cause all the faithful church members to be born of the Spirit, and they will then be the kingdom—citizens of the kingdom. It follows, then, that when the kingdom is established, the church will cease to exist, as such; there will only be the kingdom. You teach, Mr. Bradley, that when Christ comes he will set up the kingdom, and that it will be composed of the material (persons) that is in the church, and that Christ will reign with them one thousand years on this earth. Don't forget, friends, that Bradley teaches that man must obey the gospel to enter the church, and be born of the Spirit—resurrected, he says—to enter the kingdom. It follows, then, that no man can enter the kingdom till resurrected. But only those who enter the church will be born of the Spirit—resurrected—into the kingdom, says Bradley. Mr. Bradley, do any obey the gospel during the thousand years? If yes, what do they enter as a result of such obedience? There is no church, for you say it has become the kingdom. But people must be born of water and of the Spirit to enter the kingdom.

If during the one thousand years people enter the church, though according to your theory there is no church then; since entrance into the kingdom is contingent on birth of the Spirit, and you say that is the resurrection, then during the thousand years people must be resurrected to enter the kingdom. If you say Christ has a church during the thousand years, you teach that he has two institutions—church and kingdom—at the same time; for you teach that the church is no part of the kingdom. Then, which will be the greater—church or kingdom? Did it take all the church members to make the kingdom? If not, then the kingdom is only a part of the church—only some of the people of God are in the kingdom when Christ reigns. You are forced by your doctrine to annihilate the church to get a kingdom; and when you destroy the church, you do away with obedience to the gospel—the act you say that brings into the church. No obedience to the gospel, you say, no birth of the Spirit into the kingdom. This makes damnation for all who live during the thousand years, save only those, you say, who are in the kingdom. Remember, Bradley says that Christ will only reign one thousand years. If you are right, sir, when you say that none but the resurrected saints will be in the kingdom, should you contend that during the thousand years people obey the gospel and become members of the church, you thereby have two institutions, and the kingdom is composed of only a part of God's people. What will become of the saints that die during the thousand years, or do any die? Should any obey the gospel during the thousand years, they cannot enter the kingdom; for none but those born of the Spirit (you say birth of the Spirit is at the resurrection) enter the kingdom. But they must die before they are resurrected; and if they die, they will not be resurrected till the end of the thousand years. "The rest of the dead live not again till the thousand years are fulfilled." (Rev. 20:4.) Since you say Christ

only reigns one thousand years and at the end of that time delivers the kingdom to God, it follows that they will never reign with Christ. Bradley, how does the kingdom you talk about grow? How do people enter it?

BRADLEY'S FOURTH NEGATIVE

Gentlemen Moderators, Ladies and Gentlemen:

You noticed that about all that my friend Nichol had to say in his last speech was about the one thousand years; but there is no debating in all that, and I trust that you people will see it that way before this debate is closed.

You notice that my friend Nichol is as I said he was before; he always takes what I said and changes it around a little and makes it look his way; and, of course, he makes it look plausible to some of you people. That is his way of doing, and he knows just how to do it, for he is a logical fellow and a debater.

Now, respected friends, you remember that he said to me: "Bradley, aren't you ashamed of yourself?" Yes, respected friends, I want to say that I am ashamed, but it is because I have ever met this man in debate; but I thank God that I am not ashamed of the word of God and my advocacy of it in this debate. I am willing for this to go before the world and let the people judge who is right and who is wrong. I am anxious for them to see the truth. Yes, sir; I want to say that I am ashamed of but one thing, and that is that I have ever met this man in debate. But this is all brought on by my friend Nichol to create prejudice against me, so that he can make his points look clearer in this debate. I want to say, respected friends, that he will have to get up something better than that before this debate closes if he expects to prove his contention in this matter, for he can't do it that way, neither can he prove it by the book of God; and he knows it, too. He refuses to answer my arguments in this matter, and resorts to something else

to try to show that Bradley is wrong and that he is right. I tell you, respected friends, that that man is smart, and he knows the truth about this matter; if he did not, he would not know how to get around it so easily. Yes, sir, he has studied this question, and knows just how to evade and when not to notice what I have to say in my speeches.

Now, noticing the gentleman's arguments in the order in which he presented them, we will take up what he said as I come to them. First, Elder Nichol seems to lay great stress on what I have said, and says that, according to the argument and position that I hold, the kingdom will not be set up till the beginning of the one thousand years, and that it will be smaller at the end of that one thousand years than it was at the beginning of that time; for he says that I teach that at the end of that time the Lord will gather the offenders out of the kingdom. Nichol said that they would be gathered out at the end of the thousand years. I did not say any such thing. They will be gathered out at the end of the gospel age, when Christ comes. Mr. Nichol knows that this is the position that I hold, but this is just another case in which he just turns what I say around a little to make it fit his points; and some of you, without stopping to think of the things I've said, likely take what he says to be the truth in the matter; but I want to tell you, respected friends, that he knows that he is twisting what I said just a little to make it fit his points, for that is the only way that he can answer what I have to say; and, therefore, he has to resort to something in order to have anything to say to fill up his time. Now, isn't that so, Charlie? O, excuse me, Charlie! He don't like for me to call him Charlie.

But back to the subject about the decrease of the kingdom of the Lord Jesus Christ. I want to say that I never did say anything of that kind, and you all know that I never said anything of that kind. I did not say

that they would be gathered out at the end of the thousand years, and thus the kingdom would get smaller, and I don't believe any such. This gathering out will be at the end of the gospel age, when the Lord comes. I want to say to you that the kingdom of the Lord will grow and grow. God bless you! It will grow till it fills the whole earth—yes, sir, till it fills the whole earth; and I believe that people will be born into that kingdom, and it will be an everlasting kingdom, and they will be in it forever; for such is the teaching of the word of God.

According to my friend Nichol, part of the kingdom is in heaven and part of it is on earth. He reads Eph. 3:15—that the whole family in heaven and in earth are named for Christ. That is so, but it is not the kingdom. Christ is in heaven now on the throne of his Father, and you note that there are two thrones spoken of. I read you the passage (Rev. 3:21): "To him that overcometh will I grant to sit with me in my throne, even as I have overcome and am set down with my Father in his throne." There are two thrones spoken of in this passages. Christ is now on the throne of his Father; but when the kingdom is established, he will then be on his own throne, and his kingdom will be on this earth; and as proof of the fact I read to you Dan. 7:27: "And the kingdom and dominion, and the greatness of the kingdom under the whole heaven, shall be given to the people of the saints of the most High, whose kingdom is an everlasting kingdom, and all dominions shall serve and obey him." Thus you see that the kingdom is to be under the whole heaven and is to be an everlasting kingdom. This will be when Christ comes to rule over the people of God. According to the contention of my friend Nichol, we are already in the kingdom. But the kingdom is to be an everlasting kingdom, but there has been no everlasting kingdom established; therefore the kingdom of God has not been established and we are not in the

kingdom. The kingdom has not been established, and my friend Nichol cannot prove that it has according to the Bible; but he can take the things that I say and fix them up a little his way and make it sound all right; but that is not the thing, respected friends. What we want is to look into the word of God and learn what it teaches, and that is the plan that I am following.

We wish now, respected friends, to call your attention to Acts 15:13-16: "And after they had held their peace, James answered, saying, Men and brethren, hearken unto me: Simeon hath declared how God at the first did visit the Gentiles, to take out of them a people for his name. And to this agree the words of the prophets; as it is written, After this I will return, and build again the tabernacle of David, which is fallen down; and I will build again the ruins thereof, and I will set it up: that the residue of men might seek after the Lord, and all the Gentiles, upon whom my name is called, saith the Lord, who doeth all these things." You note that Christ is to return, and then will this be fulfilled. The kingdom will then be established, and not till then; he will then be given the throne of David, and we will then be in the kingdom. Respected friends, the kingdom of Jesus Christ is not a kingdom of tribulation, in which we have sorrow, but it is contrary to all such. We are not in the kingdom now, but we have tribulation now; and through much tribulation we must enter into the kingdom, Paul says.

Now we call your attention to Dan. 7:13, 14, again. My friend has had much to say about this passage, but let us look at it carefully: "And 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, and they brought him near before him. And there was given him dominion and glory, and a kingdom, that all people, nations, and languages, should serve him: his dominion is an everlasting dominion, and his kingdom

that which shall not be destroyed." My opponent says that the Ancient of days is God. He is wrong about it. The Ancient of days is "the olden times."

[Mr. Nichol: "Will you please restate that?" Mr. Bradley: "Yes, sir." God is not the Ancient of days; the Ancient of days is "the olden times."]

Christ is to "come" and receive the kingdom, and Mr. Nichol says that he received the kingdom when he went away. I am certain that you all can see that he is wrong in his position.

Mr. Nichol introduced Rom. 14:17: "For the kingdom of God is not meat and drink; but righteousness, and peace, and joy in the Holy Ghost." Righteousness, peace, and joy are the principles of the kingdom. Certainly I contend that we have the principles of the kingdom. The way that Mr. Nichol has it, we have the kingdom in us and we are in the kingdom. I believe that we have the principles of the kingdom in us, but the kingdom don't exist.

[Some of the audience laughed. Mr. Nichol: "Don't laugh, friends." Mr. Bradley: "They can't help it when they look at you."]

Yes, sir; I believe that we have the principles of the kingdom, and that we have the law of the kingdom, and that we are in the kingdom by faith and hope. But the kingdom of Christ will not be established till he comes again, when we must all appear before the judgment seat of Christ; and, according to the Bible, friend Nichol cannot prove anything contrary to this, and he knows it, and that is the reason that he dodges these objections and arguments that I bring up before him.

Now, respected friends, you will notice that friend Nichol seems to lay special stress on what Elder Bradley says; but he brings no argument from the word of God, and that is the only way that he can get anything to look like he wants it to; but I have read and read you from the word of God in this matter, and, in fact the word of

God is all that we have to resort to as proof in this debate, and why not believe what it has to say about it? It is a fact that we have to leave it to the word of God; and if we are not going to do this, we had as well quit trying to debate this subject and get some other subject. I admit that we have the principles of the kingdom of God, but the kingdom will not be established till Jesus Christ comes again. Friend Nichol tries to prove by changing what I say that I don't believe in the kingdom at all; but I want to get you to listen to the word of God, and I think that you will see better than that before this debate closes.

Respected friends, you remember that I have proved that the kingdom will be an everlasting kingdom; and when we enter into it, we will be in it forever; but we must have eternal life if we are to be in it forever. Now, I invite your attention to the Scriptures to prove that we will not have everlasting life till Christ comes again; and, therefore, the kingdom will not be established till then. Let us read James 1:12: "Blessed is the man that endureth temptations: for when he is tried, he shall receive the crown of life, which the Lord has promised to them that love him." We don't have the crown of life now in this world; but if we then endure temptation, we will receive it when the Lord comes; we will then enter into the kingdom, for we have endured temptation and suffered much tribulation. Again (Tit. 1:2): "In hope of eternal life, which God, that cannot lie, promised before the world began." You note that we don't have eternal life now, and will not have it till the Lord comes. The kingdom is an everlasting kingdom, and those in it will have eternal life; but we don't have eternal life now; therefore the kingdom has not been established. We don't get eternal life in this world, do we, Elder Nichol? Is that so, Charlie? O, excuse me! I meant to say Elder Nichol. But, again, to prove that we do not have eternal life in this world, I read Mark 10:30: "But

ye shall receive a hundredfold now in this present time, houses, and brethren, and sisters, and mothers, and children, and lands, with persecutions; and in the world to come eternal life." Now then, respected friends, you can see that since the kingdom is an everlasting kingdom, we must have eternal life when we get in it; and since we don't have eternal life till we get in the other world, till Christ comes, the kingdom will not be established till then.

Respected friends, we want to call your attention to scriptures to show that the kingdom has not been established, and will not be till Jesus Christ comes to take his seat upon his throne. We invite your attention to James 2:5: "Hearken, my beloved brethren, Hath not God chosen the poor in this world rich in faith, and heirs of the kingdom which he hath promised to them that love him?" Has promised it—yes, has promised it—but has not given it to them. Note it, my friends: "Heirs of the kingdom which he hath promised." My opponent says that the kingdom has been established, and that we are in it. The book of God says "hath promised"—yes, has promised it to them that love him. He will give it to them when the proper time comes for him to give it to them, and that will be when he comes to take his seat on his own throne, and not before. I trust that my distinguished opponent will pay his respects to this argument. Elder Nichol, you say that you are in the kingdom, and the word of God says that God has promised the kingdom to them that love him. Will you please explain this matter and show it harmonizes with your position?

I now call your attention to I Cor. 15:20-28. I read to you from the Twentieth Century New Testament: "But the truth is, Christ has been raised from the dead, the first fruits of those who are at rest. For since it was through a man that death came, so, too, it is through a man that there will come a resurrection of the dead.

For as through Adam all men die, so through the Christ will all return to life. But each in his proper order—Christ as the first fruits, then at his coming those who belong to the Christ. Afterwards will come the end—the time when he gives his kingdom into the hands of his God and Father; but not until he has overthrown all other rule and all other authority and power. For he must reign as King till God has put all his enemies under his feet. Death will be the last enemy to be overthrown; for God has placed everything under Christ's feet. (But when it is said that everything has been placed under Christ, it is plain that God who placed everything under him is not included.) Then when everything has been placed under him, the Son will place himself under God who placed everything under him, so that God may be all and in all." Now, what do you think of that, Elder Nichol? It is the truth of God, and you cannot deny it. Note the fact: In Adam all die, but the kingdom of God is an everlasting kingdom, and none die in it; therefore we are not in it. You note that this passage says that when Christ comes, those in him will be made alive; and afterwards will come the end, when he will deliver the kingdom to God. Christ is to come, raise those that are his; and after that he is to deliver the kingdom to God, and he will be all and in all. He will be on his throne when he comes, and not till then. When he comes the dead in Christ will be raised and will reign with him, and after that he will deliver the kingdom to God the Father. I notice some of you people back there laughing. This is the first time that I ever saw the word of God laughed at.

I want my friend Nichol to put his finger on the passage of scripture that teaches what he preaches; I want to see it. I want to say, respected friends, that if Elder Nichol was debating with a Baptist he would not say that the Christ was King before Pentecost, but be-

cause he can bring up different points he says it in this debate.

The Lord will bring all in subjection to him after the resurrection, and not till then; for that is the time that he is to rule and reign. This is according to what the Scriptures have to say in this matter. Elder Nichol leaves the impression that it is easy to live right in this world, and that we have no sorrow, and everything is a paradise here now; but, respected friends, Paul says that the people of God have tribulation here.

My opponent offered a syllogism on conversion. I admit that conversion is necessary to entrance into the kingdom of God, but that does not prove that the kingdom is in existence now or that we have entered it. Certainly we must be converted before we can enter into the kingdom.

1. A man is elected President and then seated.
2. The election takes place in November.
3. He is not seated till the next March. Just so we are converted in this life, and will enter the kingdom when it is established.

I admit the syllogism he made on Col. 1:13 and Rev. 1:9.

Now let me call your attention to the scripture that Elder Nichol has read so often in this debate (Col. 1:13), "Who hath delivered us from the power of darkness, and hath translated us into the kingdom of his dear Son;" and Rev. 1:9: "I John, who also am your brother and companion in tribulation, and in the kingdom and patience of Jesus Christ." These passages do not say one word about the kingdom having been established. I want to say, respected friends, that if we had a proper rendering of these two passages they would not read as they do. The position that I hold harmonizes all the scriptures, while Elder Nichol can't harmonize the Bible with the position that he holds. Paul says in Acts 14:22: "Confirming the souls of the disciples, and exhort-

ing them to continue in the faith, and that we must through much tribulation enter into the kingdom of God." From this you note that we are not in the kingdom. Then let us read II Pet. 1:5-11: "And besides, giving all diligence, add to your faith virtue; and to virtue knowledge; and to knowledge temperance; and to temperance patience; and to patience godliness; and to godliness brotherly kindness; and to brotherly kindness charity. For if these things be in you, and abound, they make you that ye shall neither be barren nor unfruitful in the knowledge of our Lord Jesus Christ. But he that lacketh these things is blind, and cannot see afar off, and hath forgotten that he was purged from his old sins. Wherefore the rather, brethren, give diligence to make your calling and election sure: for if ye do these things, ye shall never fall: for so an entrance shall be ministered unto you abundantly into the everlasting kingdom of our Lord and Savior Jesus Christ." This, again, says that we are not in the kingdom, but that it is to be entered. Then you remember that Christ says in Rev. 3:21 that he is on the Father's throne, but that he is to have a throne of his own in the future, when he comes with all the holy angels in his glory when he is to judge the quick and the dead. Yes, my friends, I say that the position that I hold harmonizes all the Bible, and that if we had a proper rendering of Col. 1:13 and Rev. 1:9, they would not read as they do in the King James translation.

The kingdom of our Lord and Savior Jesus Christ will be an everlasting kingdom.

My friend reads Mic. 4:8, about the "first dominion." I wonder how there can be a "first dominion" in an everlasting kingdom. The Revised Version says "former dominion."

Respected friends, I call your attention again to the passage that I have asked my friend to notice; but he will not say one word about it, for he knows that he

can't do anything with it, that it is against the position that he contends for; therefore he passes it by unnoticed. I read it to you once more (2 Tim. 4:18): "And the Lord shall deliver me from every evil work, and will preserve me unto his heavenly kingdom." Yes, "will preserve me unto his heavenly kingdom." I ask my opponent if the kingdom of Jesus Christ is a heavenly kingdom and if he is in a heavenly kingdom; but he will not answer the question. No, sir; he won't. He is afraid to. He knows that if he does he will have to give up the proposition, and he don't want to do that. Note my words, respected friends; he never will answer that question.

My friends, let me impress James 2:5 on your minds: "Hearken, my beloved brethren, Hath not God chosen the poor of this world rich in faith, and heirs of the kingdom that he hath promised to them that love him?" "Yes, sir, "heirs of the kingdom which he hath promised to them that love him." We are preserved unto the kingdom which he has promised to us, and through much tribulation must enter into it. [Time expired.]

NICHOL'S FIFTH AFFIRMATIVE

Gentlemen Moderators, Ladies and Gentlemen:

I am delighted that after another night, with the protection of our loving Heavenly Father, we are permitted to meet this morning and continue the investigation of the word of God. I notice many present that have not before attended the discussion. For their benefit I will for a few moments speak of yesterday's work. This being the last speech in which I want to introduce new matter, I will speak more rapidly than in my former speeches.

I am affirming that the kingdom of God was established on the first Pentecost after the resurrection of Christ, while my opponent teaches that the kingdom will not be established till the second coming of Christ. The real issue between us is: Has the kingdom been established? According to my opponent's theory, Christ will reign for only one thousand years, and the kingdom, instead of growing, will get smaller; but I will note that later. We have learned that the brethren at Colosse were "translated into the kingdom." (Col. 1:13.) I have insisted that they could not be "translated into the kingdom" if it did not exist. Your attention has been called to the statement of the apostle John, who in no uncertain language declared that he was in the kingdom: "I John, who also am your brother and companion in tribulation and in the kingdom and patience of Jesus Christ." I have been unable to get my friend to deal with these statements. We have learned that Christ has been crowned King, and that the people of God are in the kingdom. I have insisted that the kingdom has been established. Mr. Bradley says the kingdom will be set up at the begin-

ning of the millennium, and that Christ will reign for only one thousand years. I have insisted that if that be true, the kingdom gets smaller; for, per his theory, none can enter it during the thousand years, and at the end of that time, says my opponent, is the end of the world. At the end of the world the angels are to gather the offenders out of the kingdom. Mr. Bradley appreciated this argument, and in his last speech says: "They will be gathered out at the end of the gospel age." My, my, man! What is the matter with you? You contend that the kingdom will not be established till the beginning of the millennium age, and now you have them gathered out of the kingdom before it exists. Pshaw! What will you say next?

My distinguished opponent says that if I will put my finger on the passage that says the kingdom was established on Pentecost he will give up the proposition. Is it not passingly strange that he would do such a thing? Since you are so bent on putting fingers on passages, will you please put your finger on the passage that says the kingdom will be established at the second coming of Christ? Can't you see an inch in front of your nose?

Yesterday I made an argument from Dan. 7:13, 14: "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, . . . and there was given him dominion, and glory, and a kingdom." This passage and the argument that I made has bothered the gentleman very much. In every speech he has tried to break the force of the argument. Daniel says that he saw the Son of man—Christ—come with the clouds to the Ancient of days—God—and there was given him a kingdom. In Acts 1:9 we have the record of Christ ascending to God with the clouds, going into the far country to receive the kingdom. (Luke 19:11, 12.) Realizing the miserable failures he has made, he makes a final effort, and in his last says: "The Ancient of days is not God, but the olden times."

In the name of reason, what will the man say next? Listen, according to Bradley: "And came to the Ancient of days, and they brought him near before him." They brought him, the Son of man, near before HIM, the "olden times." In this he makes the personal pronoun "him" refer to "olden times." Pshaw! What next? Listen to verse 9: "I beheld till the thrones were cast down, and the Ancient of days did sit [i. e., according to Bradley, the "olden times" did sit], whose garment was white as snow [i. e., the garment of the "olden times" was white as snow], and the hair of his head like the pure wool [i. e., the "olden times" had a head and hair on it like pure wool]: his throne was like the fiery flame [i. e., the "olden times" had a throne like the fiery flame], and his wheel was burning fire [i. e., the "olden times" had wheels like a burning flame]." Bradley, aren't you ashamed of yourself? The gentleman said in his last address yesterday that he was ashamed of having met me in debate. I am not surprised at the statement. When I was a green schoolboy, I proposed to engage my school-teacher in a debate. He whipped me so completely in the debate that I was ashamed of myself, and am yet, to think that I had no more sense than to engage him in a debate. We understand, Mr. Bradley, why you are ashamed of having met me.

Replying to Rom. 14:17, my opponent says: "Righteousness, peace, and joy are the principles of the kingdom. We have the principles of the kingdom." When he said that, I gave a hearty "amen." Whereupon he said: "Yes, sir; we have the principles of the kingdom, and the laws of the kingdom, and the seed of the kingdom, and are in the kingdom by faith and hope." Great are his admissions; still he says the kingdom has not been established, and will not be till the resurrection.

Mr. Bradley, if a man does not believe as you do, is he saved, is he your brother? Say Bradley? [Mr. Bradley answers: "No."] Thank you, sir. Now, friends,

brethren, remember that. He has been masquerading among my brethren, the people that disbelieve the things peculiar to him, and calling them brethren, gaining their confidence, and then causing trouble by his carnal doctrine. He has been acting a hypocrite all the time, yet claiming to be a Christian. Shame on you! Pardon the digression. Let us look at his admissions.

1. We have the principles of the kingdom.—Bradley.
2. We have the seed of the kingdom.—Bradley.
3. We have the laws of the kingdom.—Bradley.
4. We are in the kingdom by faith and hope.—Bradley.

And I may add:

5. The Lord says that we are the children of the kingdom.

We have the laws of the kingdom, says my distinguished opponent, with his wonderful store of erudition; but he says there is not yet a King nor kingdom. True, we are governed by these laws of the kingdom; but Christ, who gave the laws, is not King, nor are we in the kingdom; indeed, the kingdom does not exist, says the gentleman. Strange! In truth, my friends, Christ is King; and, as such, he gave the laws of the kingdom; the kingdom has been established, and his people are in it.

Now watch him. Mr. Bradley, you say "we are in the kingdom by faith." But are we really, actually, in the kingdom—in fact, are we in the kingdom? We are in the kingdom "by faith," but are not *really* in it. Listen: "Ye are all the children of God by faith." (Gal. 3:26.) Mr. Bradley, you say we are in the kingdom "by faith," but are not really in the kingdom. Paul says that we are the children of God "by faith." Tell us, please, are we really, actually—in fact, are we the children of God? "The Spirit itself beareth witness with our spirit, that we are the children of God." (Rom. 8:17.) "And be-

cause we are sons, God hath sent forth the Spirit of his Son into your hearts, crying, Abba, Father." (Gal. 4:6.) Mr. Bradley, tell this people in your next speech if we are really, actually, the children of God.

My opponent has asked me a number of times: "Is the kingdom a heavenly kingdom?" I shall gladly give him the information he wants and badly needs. Christ is on the throne in heaven. Angels, principalities—in fact, the heavenly hosts—are subject to him. The whole family in heaven and earth are named for him. We are in heavenly places in Christ Jesus. Yes, sir; the kingdom of Christ is a heavenly kingdom; it is, he says, "not of this world." We are in that kingdom now, but not in the department of the kingdom that is in heaven, where Christ is. Paul, though in the kingdom, says that Christ would preserve him unto the heavenly kingdom—i. e., preserve and receive him into the department of the kingdom where the glorified are, with mortality and pain left off. Any other information you desire? I have now complemented all the gentlemen has produced, and shall hasten with my work, sowing the seed of the kingdom.

Mr. Bradley says that this is the time to sow the seed of the kingdom; that the word of God is the seed of the kingdom; and that we should sow it now. Do I state you correctly? [Mr. Bradley answers: "Yes."] Very well. Do you not know, sir, that the seed is not designed to produce the kingdom? When God made man, he placed in him the power to perpetuate the human family. When he created the vegetable kingdom, he designed that it should be perpetuated; and we have the seed for that purpose. We sow wheat—not to produce the vegetable kingdom, but to perpetuate the wheat, one of the members of the vegetable kingdom. Truly, when you sons of toil have with a hand of plenty scattered the wheat—seed—in the fall of the year and reaped the harvest in the June following, you have product—fruit—of the

vegetable kingdom, the result of sowing; but the fruit is in the field before the harvest, and is as truly fruit of and belongs to the kingdom as when in the granary. The fruit of the seed must be of the same nature and belong to the same kingdom as the seed, or it does not produce, as the Lord said it would, after its kind. Mr. Bradley says correctly that the word of God is the seed of the kingdom. Will you please tell us, sir, to what that product of the seed belongs? Do you say that Christians are the fruit of the seed and are members of the church, and that church differs from kingdom, is no part of the kingdom? Then the seed does not produce after its kind, and there will never be any fruit of the kingdom. The gentleman says that the kingdom does not exist now, and will not till the millennium. If that be true, why sow the seed to perpetuate a kingdom that does not exist? If the kingdom does not exist till the millennium, it is foolishness to sow the seed. Bradley, do you think that the seed of the kingdom will produce the kingdom? Again: "The field is the world; the good seed are the children of the kingdom." (Matt. 13:38.) The seed of the kingdom belongs to the kingdom; so also the children of the kingdom belong to the kingdom.

My opponent files another objection: "Hearken, my beloved brethren, Hath not God chosen the poor of this world rich in faith, and heirs of the kingdom which he hath promised to them that love him?" He contends that since we are heirs of the kingdom which is promised, we are not in the kingdom. With him I want to insist that we are heirs to what we have not inherited. We are "heirs of salvation" (Heb. 1:14); yet we are saved now (Eph. 2:5). There is an eternal salvation we are heirs of and will be received in the world to come. (Mark 10:29.) It comes at the end of faith. (I Pet. 1:9.) We are heirs of the grace of life (I Pet. 3:7), but there is a form of grace we have received (Eph. 3:7; 2 Cor. 6:1). We are in the kingdom now, "translated into the kingdom" (Col. 1:13),

and are heirs of the everlasting kingdom—i. e., the everlasting state of the kingdom, when it shall be turned over to the Father. "Giving thanks unto the Father, which hath made us meet to be partakers of the inheritance of the saints in light." (Col. 1:12.) They had already inherited something in the light. (Acts 26:18.) These Colossians were made worthy to be partakers with them in that inheritance. Locate the light, and you locate the inheritance. "Who hath delivered us from the power of darkness, and hath translated us into the kingdom of his dear Son." (Col. 1:13.) "But now are ye light in the Lord; walk as children of light." (Eph. 5:8.) Since they were "translated into the kingdom," and as the children walk in the light, then it follows that the light is in the kingdom. They received the inheritance in the light, but the light is in the kingdom; therefore the inheritance is in the kingdom. The inheritance is "redemption through his blood."

At last my opponent attempts to do something with Col. 1:13 and Rev. 1:9. As if he were the embodiment of all wisdom, he asserts that if the passages were correctly translated they would read differently. Strange that he doesn't turn translator. He has turned grammarian once in the discussion. Quite a grave charge he makes against all the translations. He tries the passages by his theory; and when they have gone through his befuddled mind, and no way can he bend them to meet his doctrine, he says: Wrong translation. Of course they are, for A. S. Bradley says they are. Pshaw! The monumental gall and colossal cheek the man possesses is wonderful.

Let us note some of the absurd things according to the position of Bradley. "And I saw an angel come down from heaven, having the key of the bottomless pit and a great chain in his hand. And he laid hold on the dragon, that old serpent, which is the Devil, and Satan, and bound him a thousand years, and cast him into the bot-

tomless pit, and shut him up, and set a seal upon him, that he should deceive the nations no more, till the thousand years should be fulfilled: and after that he must be loosed a little season. And I saw thrones, and they that sat upon them, and judgment was given unto them: and I saw the souls of them that were beheaded for the witness of Jesus, and for the word of God, and which had not worshiped the beast, neither his image, neither had received his mark upon their foreheads, or in their hands; and they lived and reigned with Christ a thousand years. But the rest of the dead lived not again till the thousand years were finished." (Rev. 20:1-5) Mr. Bradley teaches that at the beginning of the thousand years spoken of in this passage Christ is to come, raise the saints, and set up the kingdom. If such be the case and Mr. Bradley wants to be in that kingdom, he had better get some one to decapitate him, for I would have you note that John says only those who were "beheaded for the witness of Jesus and the word of God" lived and reigned with Christ the thousand years. If Bradley is right as to the time when the kingdom is established, it will be composed of martyrs only; and if he wants to be in that kingdom, he must die a martyr. I don't mean a theological martyr, either. Mr. Bradley, tell us who Christ and those composing the kingdom you talk about will reign over, seeing that "the rest of the dead live not again until the thousand years were finished." According to Bradley, Christ will reign only one thousand years, then deliver the kingdom to the Father. I propose to show that, per this system of his, there will not be a soul saved from the beginning to the close of the reign of Christ; and instead of the reign of Christ being a blessing, it will be a curse to the world. It means damnation to all that live and die during the thousand years.

According to your theory, men must obey the gospel in this life before they can be born of the Spirit (and you say the birth of the Spirit is the resurrection from

the dead) into the kingdom. Again, you say that when a man obeys the gospel, he becomes a member of the church; and if he lives a faithful member of the same, he will be resurrected into the kingdom. (1) You say that at the beginning of the millennium the reign of Christ begins, the kingdom is set up, and is composed of those that obeyed the gospel in this life, and at the beginning of the millennium were born of the Spirit—resurrected—and thus constituted the kingdom. (2) You destroy the church in making the kingdom. (3) Do any obey the gospel during the thousand years—the entire reign of Christ, according to you? If “Yes,” what do they become members of? Your theory destroys the church in making the kingdom. The church doesn’t exist, according to you. Christ is King of the kingdom, and not head of the church. (4) Do you say people obey the gospel during the thousand years? If “Yes,” do the citizens of the kingdom do the baptizing? If “Yes,” into what are they baptized? You can’t say they are baptized into Christ, for to be baptized into Christ is to be baptized into his body, and the body is the church, and you destroy the church to get a kingdom. (5) Men must enter Christ to be saved; but to enter Christ is to enter his body, and the body is the church, and your doctrine destroys the church to get a kingdom. You have no church during the thousand years, and this is the entire reign of Christ, according to you. Then there can be no baptizing into Christ during that time, and, therefore, no saved. Bradley, your zeal is worthy of a better cause than you have espoused. But let us suppose that the church does exist during the thousand years; that your theory admits of its existence, which it doesn’t; not a soul that is in the church can get into the kingdom till the end of the thousand years, for you say none enter the kingdom till they are resurrected. It will then be too late for them to reign with Christ, for you say that at the end of the thousand years the kingdom is given to God. Accord-

ing to your theory, there is no church during the thousand years. But let us grant that there is, and that people become members of it during that time. The church would then grow; but since you say that the church is no part of the kingdom, the kingdom doesn't grow one bit during the thousand years—can't gain a member till the church members die and are resurrected, which is the birth of the Spirit, according to you, and they will not be resurrected till the end of the thousand years. The Bible says the kingdom will grow till it fills the whole earth—that there is to be no end to its increase. Your theory has it the same size during the entire time you say Christ is to reign, and at the end of that time it "swinks up," for the angels gather the offenders out of the kingdom. Bradley, you ought to be ashamed to teach such "tomfoolery" under the garb of religion.

KINGDOM CAN'T GROW.

Bradley says that Christ will not have a kingdom till the beginning of the millennium, at which time he says Christ is to come to the earth and begin his reign on the throne of David; that the kingdom will be composed of those who obey the gospel in this life and are born of the Spirit, which he says is at the resurrection. The reign of Christ, according to Bradley, lasts just one thousand years, for at the end of that time he says Christ will deliver the kingdom to God, and he becomes "all in all." Then during the thousand years the kingdom must grow to fill the whole earth. (Dan. 2:35.) I challenge my opponent to show how one soul can become a member of the kingdom during the entire thousand years according to his theory. (1) According to Bradley, those that obey the gospel have to be born of the Spirit—resurrected, he says—to enter the kingdom. (2) He says the kingdom will be established at the beginning of the millennium, which he says is at the second coming of Christ; that the saints will then be raised and reign with Christ the

thousand years. (3) You will please remember that the "rest of the dead live not again till the thousand years are finished." (Rev. 20: 4.) Who can enter the kingdom during this thousand years, and how do they enter it? Per your false doctrine, not one soul, sir. Do you say that those who are living on the earth at the beginning of the millennium who have obeyed the gospel and the ones who may obey it during the thousand years may enter the kingdom? I reply: Not so, sir, according to your theory. Only those born of the Spirit enter the kingdom, and you say the birth of the Spirit is at or in the resurrection. Then none can be born of the Spirit till resurrection, and can't be resurrected till they die; and if they die, they become a part of the dead, and "the rest of the dead live not again until the thousand years are finished," hence can't be born of the Spirit into the kingdom, per your doctrine. Bradley, how does the kingdom you talk about grow? Don't forget to tell us.

PASSOVER.

"And he said unto them, With desire I have desired to eat this passover with you before I suffer: for I say unto you, I will not any more eat thereof, until it be fulfilled in the kingdom of God." (Luke 22:15, 16.) The Jewish passover was killed in Egypt (Ex. 12), but perpetuated in the wilderness. Christ, our passover, was killed in the world, but perpetuated in the kingdom. The eating and drinking is in the kingdom, and designed to show the Lord's death till he comes. After he comes it will not be possible to eat and drink to show the Lord's death till he comes; for when he has come, he has come. Bradley says that the kingdom will not be established till the Lord comes. If such be true, they will not be able to eat and drink in the kingdom, for they were to eat and drink to show the Lord's death till he comes. "For as often as ye eat this bread, and drink this cup, ye do show the Lord's death till he come." (I Cor. 11:26.) "I ap-

point unto you a kingdom, as my father hath appointed unto me; that ye may eat and drink at my table in my kingdom." (Luke 22:29, 30.) They were to eat and drink at the Lord's table, but this table was to be in the kingdom. (1) Paul very plainly says that the brethren at Corinth ate at the Lord's table. (I Cor. 10:20-23.) (2) But this table was in the kingdom. (3) Therefore when the brethren at Corinth ate at the Lord's table, they ate in the kingdom. To eat in a kingdom that does not exist is impossible, but they did eat in the kingdom; therefore the kingdom existed, and they ate and drank in it.

No one has a right to establish a government on a territory till he has conquered the head—ruler—of that territory. Satan held the power over the kingdoms of this world till Christ entered the strong man's house, conquered him; and then he had the right to establish his kingdom, which he did. The power Satan now has is usurped. Christ, by conquest, is rightful Ruler. After he conquered Satan, he began to reign with men, and they eat and drink in his kingdom to show his triumph till he comes.

KINGDOM DOESN'T GROW.

"Except a man be born of water and of the Spirit, he cannot enter into the kingdom of God." (John 3:5.) Mr. Bradley teaches (1) that the church has been established, and that men become members of it by obeying the gospel; (2) that the kingdom will be established when Christ comes the second time; (3) that the birth of the Spirit is in or at the resurrection of the dead; (4) that men must obey the gospel and be resurrected to enter the kingdom. The conclusion is inevitable, then, that Christ will not have a kingdom till there is a resurrection of those who have obeyed the gospel—the church members. Then (1) there must be a resurrection of those who have obeyed the gospel, and they constitute the church, before there is a kingdom; (2) the kingdom must exist before people can enter it; (3) then, according to

Bradley's position, the kingdom must exist before there is a birth of the Spirit—resurrection; (4) but those born of the Spirit enter the kingdom, says Bradley, though there is no kingdom for them to enter. Again, according to Bradley, (1) those that have obeyed the gospel are the church—members of the church. (2) The kingdom will be composed of the members of the church. (3) The church is one institution, and the kingdom is another. Christ does not have two institutions at the same time. (4) When the kingdom is established, the church ceases to exist, for it takes the material—members—of the church to make the kingdom, says Bradley. Don't forget the kingdom will not exist till the resurrection, he says. (5) The kingdom is established at the beginning of the one thousand years spoken of in Rev. 20, he says; and Christ will reign only one thousand years, he asserts. (6) At the beginning of this one thousand years, says Bradley, Christ comes, resurrects those who have obeyed the gospel, and the reign of Christ begins. (7) Where is the church then? It has become the kingdom. No church then, only a kingdom. (8) Men can't enter the kingdom without being born of the Spirit, and Bradley says that the birth of the Spirit is in or at the resurrection. (9) Then none will be born of the Spirit from the beginning to the close of the reign of Christ, for "the rest of the dead live not again till the thousand years are fulfilled." (Rev. 20:5.) Not one soul resurrected during the thousand years; but the birth of the Spirit is in or at the resurrection, says Bradley; then not a soul born of the Spirit during the thousand years. (10) There is not a soul more in the kingdom at the close of the reign of Christ than at the beginning of it, according to Bradley. Not a soul enters the kingdom during the entire reign of Christ. (11) Christ said: "The kingdom of heaven is like to a grain of mustard seed, which a man took, and sowed in his field: which indeed is the least of all seeds: but when it is grown, it is the greatest among herbs, and

becometh a tree, so that the birds of the air come and lodge in the branches thereof." (Matt. 13:31, 32.) The kingdom Bradley talks about does not grow one bit; in fact, it gets smaller. Note the proof: "So shall it be in the end of the world. The Son of man shall send forth his angels, and they shall gather out of his kingdom all things that offend, and them that do iniquity." (Matt. 13:40, 41.) Bradley, how does the kingdom you talk about grow?

Materialists teach that when we are born of the Spirit we will be able to come and go like the wind. If they contend correctly when they say that the spirit in man is breath, air, wind, then that which is born of the wind would certainly be wind, and, I presume, could come and go as any other wind. Again, they contend that the spirit in man is no part of man; then since that which is born of the Spirit is spirit, man will never be born of the Spirit, for it is the spirit that is born of the Spirit and the spirit is no part of the man, they say. If they are right, they are wrong; and if wrong, wrong, anyway. They tell us that after Christ was raised from the dead he entered the room where his disciples were in an invisible manner. The Bible doesn't say or teach any such. Some of the disciples had not seen him since he was raised, and were alarmed at his sudden appearance. He bade them handle him, saying: "A spirit hath not flesh and bones, as ye see me have." (Luke 24:39.) Query: If there was no flesh to be born, could, would it be possible for flesh to be born of flesh? If materialists are correct in contending that the spirit in man is no part of man, can man ever be born of the Spirit, since it is the spirit that is born of the Spirit? According to them, man will never be born of the Spirit; and if not born of the Spirit, he will never enter the kingdom. Bradley, do you, in fact, believe there will be a kingdom? If "Yes," what will be in it?

INFANT DAMNATION.

“Verily I say unto you, Except ye be converted, and become as little children, ye shall not enter into the kingdom of heaven.” (Matt. 18:3.) If the kingdom does not exist now, and the everlasting—the glorified—state of the kingdom is contemplated in this passage, the following is true: (1) None but converted people enter the everlasting kingdom. (2) None but those that understand with the heart can be converted. (Matt. 13:15.) (3) Infants and idiots can’t understand with the heart. (4) Therefore infants and idiots can’t enter the kingdom. (5) But the everlasting kingdom is in heaven. (6) Therefore infants and idiots can’t enter heaven. Bradley, renounce your false doctrine and accept the truth. (1) Those not converted can’t enter the kingdom; (2) infants and idiots can’t be converted; (3) therefore they can’t enter the kingdom. How about it, Bradley? The truth is, my friends, the kingdom in its present state is referred to, into which infants and idiots can’t enter for lack of conversion, and can’t be converted because they can’t understand with the heart. This only excludes them from the present state of the kingdom, but not from the everlasting state—the glorified state. The doctrine that the kingdom does not exist certainly involves infant damnation.

DELIVER THE KINGDOM TO THE FATHER.

“Sit thou at my right hand, until I make thine enemies thy footstool.” (Ps. 110:1.) Has Christ been seated at the right hand of the Father? “Which he wrought in Christ, when he raised him from the dead, and set him at his own right hand in the heavenly places.” (Eph. 1:20.) How long is he to “sit” at the right hand? “Sit thou at my right hand, until I make thine enemies thy footstool.” Christ is to remain at the right hand of the Father till all enemies are conquered. In short, Christ

is to remain at the Father's right hand till all enemies are conquered. He will be at the Father's right hand on the eternal throne till the final resurrection. "For he must reign, till he hath put all enemies under his feet. The last enemy that shall be destroyed is death." (I Cor. 15:25, 26.) No one who has ruling power can be destroyed so long as that power is exercised over one single person. Death, one of the enemies—indeed, the last one—is to be destroyed before Christ, the King, leaves the throne at the Father's right hand. It follows, then, that he will remain at the right of the Father till the last human being is brought forth from the grave by the resurrection. This being true, if he is not now on "his throne," he will never be while the world stands.

"For we must all appear before the judgment seat of Christ." (II Cor. 6:10.) "Who shall judge the quick and the dead at his appearing and his kingdom." (1 Tim. 4:1.) "Behold, he cometh with clouds; and every eye shall see him." (Rev. 1:7.) (1) Every eye shall see him. This places his coming at the general resurrection. (2) At his appearing he will judge the living and dead. (3) "Sit thou at my right hand, till I make thine enemies thy footstool." "Then cometh the end, when he shall have delivered up the kingdom of God, even the Father; when he shall have put down all rule and all authority and power. For he must reign, till he hath put all enemies under his feet. The last enemy that shall be destroyed is death." (I Cor. 15:24-26.) "And when all things shall be subdued unto him, then shall the Son also himself be subject unto him that put all things under him, that God may be all in all." (I Cor. 15:28.) It can't be plainer. When Christ was seated at the Father's right hand, it was ordained that he should remain there till all enemies are destroyed. The last one, Death, must be subdued unto him. But so long as Death holds in her confines one person, she is not destroyed as a ruler. Then Christ will remain at the Father's right hand till

the general resurrection—the resurrection of just and unjust. He will not, cannot, come one thousand years before that time and establish a kingdom, as Bradley teaches; for at the time of his coming, instead of receiving a kingdom, he will deliver the kingdom to God. Instead of taking power to rule then, he will be subject to God. Bradley says that when Christ comes he will receive the kingdom; Paul says that when Christ comes he will deliver the kingdom to God. Sir, this people accept the Bible.

BRADLEY'S FIFTH NEGATIVE

Gentlemen Moderators, Ladies and Gentlemen:

As the negative of the proposition, I am happy to come before you again to continue the investigation of the proposition, as it pertains to the truth of God, and yet happy that I am on this side of the proposition; for I see no reason why I should not be, for my friend has not yet produced an argument on the question that goes to prove what he claims. Therefore, I am glad that I am on the negative side of this question—not only from this standpoint of view that he has not produced an argument in the matter, but that what I say is the truth of the word of God, and I believe that it is true; therefore I am going to stay by it and cling to that which is good, and not turn away for something that is untrue, like the gentleman has been presenting in your hearing.

Now, before I forget it, I will answer the question that my opponent asked me about people being saved who do not believe as I do about this matter that we are debating. Yes, sir; I teach that unless a man believes as I do on this question he will not be saved; for I believe the truth of God about the matter, and those that do not believe it will not be saved. Now, I ask you the same question. Now, Elder Nichol, do you believe that those that do not believe as you do will be saved? Will they? Say? [Elder Nichol does not answer.] Now you see there, friends; he won't come out and answer my question as I did his, because he is afraid to. That is the reason that he refuses to answer my question like I do his. I did not do him that way. I give you the book of God for what I say; and, therefore, I am not afraid to

stand by it in this matter. But he is doubtful about the matter; therefore he won't answer my question, from the fact that he knows that if he does he will get into a tight place, and that would never do for Charlie. No, sir; he won't answer that question. Now if I was to do as he does, I would say, "The truth hurts, don't it, Elder Nichol?" as he says Bradley; but I won't say that, but will leave that for you people to judge, as you can see for yourselves, and there is no use in me going further in this matter.

Respected friends, Elder Nichol is trying to prove that the kingdom was established on the day of Pentecost, the first Pentecost after the resurrection of Christ. I want to say that when he reads the passage that says so I will give up this debate, and not before. I have read to you from the book of God that when the kingdom is established Christ is to come in the kingdom, and they will see him come in the kingdom. I read the passage again (Matt. 16:28): "Verily I say unto you, there be some standing here, which shall not taste of death, till they see the Son of man coming in his kingdom." Now if the kingdom was established on the first Pentecost after the resurrection of Christ, as my friend contends, then Christ came at that time; and since he is to come again, then, according to the contention of my opponent, there will be three comings of Christ. Well, respected friends, the book of God only speaks of two; so I guess my friend Nichol has got the Lord Jesus Christ in the notion of coming the third time, for I know that my Bible says nothing about his coming a third time; and, therefore, I don't believe that he will come three times. He has come once and died for the sins of the world, paid the penalty, and has gone into the far country to receive for himself a kingdom; and when he returns, comes the second time, he will have that kingdom, and will take unto himself his great power, and will rule and reign

forever and ever. This is the third coming of the Lord Jesus Christ, for my opponent has three comings, for he believes that Christ came and died; and then he says that the kingdom was established on Pentecost; and if it was, Christ came at that time, for he was to come in the kingdom, as I have proven; and then he is to come at the end of the world, when there will be the resurrection. Thus, according to the doctrine of Elder Nichol, he has the Lord coming three times; and such is not in accordance with the book of God, and I don't believe in any such, and I am satisfied that you all don't, either; but this is the best that he can do for his position, and he has to do something.

Note the fact, respected friends: Christ came into this world and died, was buried and resurrected, and has gone to the glory world; and when he returns, that will be his second coming, and that will be the time when he will take his seat on his throne and rule and reign forever and forever; and the people of his kingdom will be selected, and the kingdom will be an everlasting kingdom that shall not be destroyed. Yes, sir; when he comes, the kingdom will then be established. He says: "Verily I say unto you, There be some standing here, which shall not taste of death, till they see the Son of man coming in his kingdom." When he comes is the time when the quick and the dead will be judged, Christ proclaimed King, and the kingdom established, and he will be Ruler of the kingdom; and consequently the efforts of my friend to prove that the kingdom has been established is not worth anything in this debate, and amounts to nothing when it comes to proof.

Now, I don't want to be misunderstood in this matter. I don't mean to teach that one must not live right in this life and do good; not that at all; but so far as the kingdom is concerned, we are not in the kingdom and will not be till the resurrection. We must obey the Lord

in this life if we are permitted to be in the kingdom when it is established.

I call your attention to John 14:15, 16: "If ye love me, keep my commandments. And I will pray the Father, and he shall give you another Comforter, that he may abide with you forever." Thus, my friends, you note that the Comforter was promised to the disciples, and the Comforter has come; but that is not the Lord, and when the Lord comes, he will then be Ruler of his kingdom which the God of heaven will give him.

According to the contention of my friend, he must think that there are two kingdoms; that the Lord has a kingdom and that God has a kingdom; that Jesus is on his throne and that God is on his throne. I guess that he thinks that they are running in opposition to each other.

His proposition is that the kingdom was established on the first Pentecost after the resurrection of Christ; but, respected friends, if he has read you one passage of scripture that proves his affirmation, I would like to see it; but he has not thus far proved his proposition to you, and he will have to do more reading than he has if he proves his proposition to any one that thinks, and he has not much time to prove his proposition in, for he has only one more speech on this question; but if he can prove his affirmation in that speech, I want him to do it. To the present he has not proved his proposition, and I believe that the people are too smart to believe that he has; and, as I said, if he will read just one passage of scripture from the book of God that goes to prove his proposition, I will give up the debate and not go any further in this matter; but he has not done this, and that is not all; he cannot; and so we conclude that his kingdom has not been established. Not only is this true of Mr. Nichol, but there is no man that can prove that the kingdom has been established; for it cannot be proven, for there is not in the book of God a passage to be found

that will prove the proposition; hence it cannot be proven, for the inspired word of God is the only source that we can get proof on this proposition.

Most of the gentleman's last speech was about the one thousand years, but he made nothing out of it; so there was nothing in his last speech, as well as the other speeches that he has made on this question, so far as the establishment of the kingdom is concerned. The resurrection of the dead will be when Christ comes seated upon his throne, and then the good will be taken from the bad, and the righteous will reign with Christ a thousand years, and it will be a joyous reign. Mr. Nichol continually talks about the gathering out of the kingdom spoken of in Matt. 13:41: "The Son of man shall send forth his angels, and they shall gather out of his kingdom all things that offend, and them that do iniquity." The gathering spoken of in this passage will be at the end of the gospel age, and not at the end of the thousand years—the reign of Christ.

The kingdom of God has not been established, for the book of God does not say that it has; and surely if it has been established, it would say something about it. If the kingdom has already been established, Christ would be on his throne and Ruler of the kingdom; but it has not been established, and will not be till the beginning of the millennium. Then Christ will be "Lord of lords, and King of kings," and will rule all the nations and govern every soul. All things will be submitted unto him, and all nations will bow before him and shall worship him. This is the word of God for it, and it must be true, or else it would not be in the Bible.

My opponent says that I am wrong in my contention, for he says that the kingdom is to grow till it fills the whole earth, and that, according to the position that I contend for, there can be no growth of the kingdom, but that it will get smaller. He wants me to tell how the kingdom can grow during the thousand years, accord-

ing to the position that I am contending for. We are born into the kingdom during the thousand years.

[Mr. Nichol : "Do you mean that we are born into the kingdom by natural birth?" Mr. Bradley: "Yes, sir; the kingdom will grow during the thousand years by people being born into it by natural birth."]

My opponent says that he can take my own argument and prove that the kingdom has been established. I would like to see him do that. He has not yet proven that the kingdom has been established; and if he intends to prove it in this debate, it is about time that he was doing it. If he can prove it by the arguments that I have made, it is more than he can do by the word of God. All that I have said has been against the position that he is contending for, and I don't think that what I have said can be made to prove that the kingdom has been established. I said in the beginning that I believed that the kingdom would not be established till the Lord comes again, which will be the second coming; and I still believe that is true, and I will continue to so believe till I am shown otherwise. I cannot afford not to believe the teaching of God's word just because a man gets up and makes a few logical points, as they may seem, to try to make people believe something else. I said that my friend had not made a single point in the confirmation of his proposition, and I repeat the statement. There is not a passage of scripture in the Bible that says that kingdom has been established, and no man knows it better than my opponent does; but he has a theory to establish, and, of course, he must contend that it has been established. Since there is not a passage in the book of God that says a word about the kingdom having been established, how are we to believe that it has? We cannot believe a thing unless the Bible says something about it. We must not add to nor take from the word of God.

You will note, respected friends, that my opponent has much to say about what he says the word of God

means, and not only what he says, but he seems to lay a good deal of stress on what I say about the word of God on this subject. If you will notice, you will see that he is not giving you the word of God on this proposition, and you don't have to believe a thing just because he says that it is true. So be certain that you get the word of God, and not what he says about this matter.

My friend wants me to say whether we are really the children of God. He asked: "Are we really, actually, in fact, the children of God?" No, sir; we are the children of God by faith. Just as we do not have eternal life really, actually, in fact, but have it by faith (we have it in hope and promise, but we do not actually possess eternal life), just so we are the children of God by faith, but we are not really the children of God now. We are in the kingdom by faith and hope, but we are not really in the kingdom; for it has not been established, and will not be till the Lord comes, as I have shown in this discussion.

Let me call your attention now to James 2:5 again: "Hearken, my beloved brethren, Hath not God chosen the poor in this world rich in faith, and heirs of the kingdom which he hath promised to them that love him?" Note the fact, respected friends, and the expression "hath promised;" not "hath given," but "hath promised." "Heirs of the kingdom which he hath promised." A promise means something to be performed at some future time. That being the case, we have the promise of the kingdom and the joys that are in it, and do not have it now. We have not yet received the kingdom which God has promised to them that love him, but we are heirs of it now, and will receive it when the Lord comes the second time, according to the word of God. You can all see that Elder Nichol is wrong in the contention that he is making here.

Now, my friend did finally answer my question in a roundabout way in reference to whether Christ's king-

dom is a heavenly kingdom or not. He, as I said, answered, but he wound round mightily before he did so; and I want to tell you that it hurt Elder Nichol to say that, too; but, nevertheless, to answer my question he had to tell the truth, hurt or not.

Now, respected friends, I want to call your attention to some more strong arguments which go to show that the kingdom has not been established and will not be till the Lord comes again to take his seat upon his throne. Let us read Ps. 72:11: "Yea, all kings shall fall down before him: all nations shall serve him." Let us begin with the sixth verse of this chapter and read down to the twelfth: "He shall come down like rain upon the mown grass: as showers that water the earth. In his day shall the righteous flourish; and abundance of peace so long as the moon endureth. He shall have dominion also from sea to sea, and from the river to the end of the earth. They that dwell in the wilderness shall bow before him; and his enemies shall lick the dust. The kings of Tarshish and of the isles shall bring presents: the kings of Sheba and Seba shall offer gifts. Yea, all kings shall fall down before him: all nations shall serve him." This will all be fulfilled when Christ becomes King, when the kingdom is established; but this has not been fulfilled, the kingdom has not been established. Some declare that this was fulfilled when Trojan bowed before the Lord; but such is not true, respected friends; and as these things spoken of in this scripture have not been fulfilled, I contend that the kingdom has not been established.

Respected friends, I want to call your attention to Dan. 7:27: "And the kingdom and dominion, and the greatness of the kingdom under the whole heaven, shall be given to the people of the saints of the most High, whose kingdom is an everlasting kingdom, and all dominions shall serve and obey him." As I have said before, the kingdom is an everlasting kingdom; and when

it is established, all nations will serve the Lord and obey him; but all nations do not now serve and obey the Lord; therefore the kingdom has not been established. There are nations on the earth today that do not know of Christ.

[Mr. Nichol: "What nation is it, please that does not know Christ?" Mr. Bradley: "China." Mr. Nichol: "I demand the proof that the Chinese nation does not know of Christ." Chairman Moderator: "Give your proof, Mr. Bradley." Mr. Bradley: "I have not the proof, so I withdraw the statement. Now, I want to say, respected friends, that I don't withdraw my belief in this matter, for I know this to be true; but as I have not the proof a hand, I will leave it and pass on; but this it not to go in the book.]

Now, respected friends, we wish to call your attention to Revelation, the eleventh chapter, and, commencing with the fourteenth verse, we will read down to the nineteenth: "The second woe is past; and, behold, the third woe cometh quickly. And the seventh angel sounded; and there were great voices in heaven, saying, The kingdoms of this world are become the kingdom of our Lord, and of our Christ; and he shall reign forever and ever. And the four and twenty elders, which sat before God on their seats, fell upon their faces, and worshiped God, saying, We give thee thanks, O Lord God Almighty, which art, and wast, and art to come; because thou hast taken to thee thy great power, and hast reigned. And the nations were angry, and thy wrath is come, and the time of the dead, that they should be judged, and that thou shouldest give reward unto thy servants the prophets, and to the saints, and them that fear thy name, small and great; and shouldest destroy them which destroy the earth." My friends, this passage refers to the end of the world, the time of the dead, the resurrection, and the rewarding of the people of God, at which time John says the kingdom is to be established. If the king-

dom has already been established and we are in that kingdom—children of the kingdom, as my friend says—there would be no use of a resurrection. But Christ has died and been resurrected, and so must we to be brought together and judged for that kingdom. I think that you all can see that the kingdom has not been established, for the kingdoms of this world have not become the kingdom of our Lord and his Christ, nor has the time of the dead come. Certainly my opponent is wrong in the position that he is contending for.

When the Lord returns to take his seat on his throne, we will reign with him, according to the word of God. We are not reigning with him now; therefore he is not on his throne now, and the kingdom has not been established; and the only way that my friend Nichol can make it appear that it has been established is for him to get up some of his logical statements—that is, seemingly logical points—and present them to you; and, of course, some of you believe what he says. That is the way that he does. I am glad that I don't have to do that way, for I have the Bible on my side of this question; and if my opponent was not a fine debater, he could not make things look so nice for his side of this question.

Now, respected friends, I want you to begin to look for yourselves and see if the contentions I have made are not the truth as brought direct from the Bible, and nowhere else; but, on the other hand, the contention of my friend Nichol has been altogether on some of his seeming points that there is nothing in and a little twisting of the points that I have brought in, and outside of this you will see no other points that he has made in this debate. I am sure that if down in his heart he were to make an honest confession, he would say the same thing; for, according to the word of God, he can say nothing else.

You have seen, respected friends, that the arguments that I have put before you all the way through this debate have been dodged by my opponent; and the reason

is that they don't fit his points, and he can't find anything to meet them with, for they are the truth and come from the book of God. All that I have tried to tell you in this matter is the truth; and I assure you that I will never, never tell you anything but the truth when I am reading the word of God, for I know that I am accountable for what I have to say. [Time expired.]

NICHOL'S SIXTH AFFIRMATIVE

Gentlemen Moderators, Ladies and Gentlemen:

I am glad that the gentleman is warming up to his work some. I had hoped that after the refreshing sleep of the past night he would contribute to the interest of the discussion by offering some arguments bearing on the issue from a negative view point. As usual, he begs like a baby and talks about my logic and my being a logical fellow. I thank him for his compliment; but he has obligated himself to prove that the proposition that I am affirming is untrue, and we would be glad if he would address himself to his obligation, and not engage in so many complimentary statements.

I try to control my risibles, to laugh on the inside; but at times I "bubble over." It is amusing to hear the absurd statements of the gentleman, and at the same time it is sad to note the ignorance of the man.

He makes another attempt on Matt. 16:28: "Verily I say unto you, There be some standing here, which shall not taste of death, till they see the Son of man coming in his kingdom." Mr. Bradley inquires, with a flourish and apparently with much confidence: "Did they see Christ coming in the kingdom on Pentecost?" Yes, sir. Had you noticed my reply in a preceding speech, it would not be necessary to answer this same question again. Christ said to his disciples: "Verily I say unto you, Ye shall not have gone over the cities of Israel, till the Son of man be come." (Matt. 10:23.) Though Christ had appeared to men—yea, was even then with his disciples—he declares to them that he would come before they had finished the work of canvassing; indeed, he

says that he would come before they succeeded in visiting all the cities of Israel. Again: "I will not leave you comfortless: I will come to you." (John 14:18.) In this passage the Lord very plainly promised the disciples that he would come to them. Hear him again: "And, lo, I am with you always, even unto the end of the world." (Matt. 28:20.) Has Christ come to them? Most certainly he has. He came to them in the power and person of the Holy Spirit on the day of Pentecost. This is how he came to them, and they saw him come in the kingdom on that day. To this Mr. Bradley must agree, or contend that the apostles are yet on the earth and have not gone over the cities of Israel; for Christ assured them: "Ye shall not have gone over the cities of Israel, till the Son of man be come."

Mr. Bradley says: "The offenders will be gathered out of the kingdom at the end of the gospel age." In reason's name, Bradley, what is the matter with you? In one breath you say the kingdom will not be established till the inauguration of the millennium age, which age is after the close of the gospel age, and in the next breath you say the gathering out of the kingdom takes place at the end of the gospel age. According to your theory, that is before there is a kingdom for them to be gathered out of. Shucks! This, my friends, is the way that a man has to dodge and change positions to attempt to defend a false theory. Straitened the condition and hard pressed for something to say is the man that will thus contradict his own statements.

My distinguished opponent has at last come to the realization that he must name some way for the kingdom to grow. I feel to congratulate myself, too, that he has admitted that the kingdom does not grow by people being born again. Indeed, per his theory, when the kingdom is established, it will be impossible for men to be born again; and, per his theory, he contends that they can't be born again in this life. If he is correct in his

contention, none save the resurrected ones are born of the Spirit. I have plainly proven that during the entire thousand years (and this is the entire length of the reign of Christ, says Bradley), not one soul will be resurrected; and if the birth of the Spirit is at the resurrection, not one soul will be born of the Spirit. But birth of the Spirit is necessary to entrance into the kingdom; and since, per his theory, none will be born of the Spirit, none will enter the kingdom; and if none enter the kingdom, the kingdom will not, cannot grow. I have insisted that the gentleman tell us how the kingdom he has been talking about could grow. The one the Bible reveals is to grow till it fills the whole earth. At last he has made the effort, and a miserable mess he has made of it. He is cognizant that there will not, cannot be a birth of the Spirit during what he calls the reign of Christ, per his theory; so he apparently closes his eyes and bids all revelation defiance and gives us the *modus operandi* by which the kingdom will grow. Hear him: "They are born into the kingdom during the thousand years—*born into it by natural birth.*" There, now, you have it. The kingdom will be established, composed of those that are born of water and the Spirit, at the resurrection, says Bradley; but more, it grows to fill the whole earth by "*natural birth,*" he says. Let us see. The kingdom will not be established till the resurrection, says Mr. Bradley, and must then grow till it fills the whole earth, and it grows by "*natural birth,*" he says. Well, if the kingdom is not established till the resurrection, I submit that those in the kingdom will be in the "resurrected state," and so Mr. Bradley contends. Now think of it. In the resurrected state there will be a kingdom that will grow till it fills the whole earth, says Bradley. My, my! Man, what will you say next? Listen to the Lord: "For in the resurrection they neither marry, nor are given in marriage." (Matt. 22:30.) In the resurrection there will be no marriage; still you say the king-

dom will grow by "*natural birth*." The ones you say enter the kingdom by "*natural birth*," not being the result of married relationship, are illegitimates. Thus by your God-dishonoring doctrine you have the kingdom to grow to fill the whole earth by the birth of bastards. Shame on you!

You remember that I insisted that he tell us if he believed the people of God are "really the children of God." Hear his answer: "We are not really the children of God; we are the children of God by faith." I knew I would drive him to that position. The man that denies the birth of the Spirit and the existence of the kingdom is logically forced to deny the Bible when it says we are "children." "The Spirit itself beareth witness with our spirit, that we are the children of God." (Rom. 8:17.) The Holy Spirit declares that we are the children of God, and my distinguished and original opponent declares that we are not. The Spirit bears false testimony, according to Bradley; and he talks just as if he knew. True, the Spirit testifies that the people of God have been born again (I Peter 1:23), and are the children of God; but my antagonist says we are not the children of God. He is but trying to extricate himself from the difficulties that he has become entangled in by trying to establish a false doctrine. He said: "We are in the kingdom by faith and hope." I inquired: "Are we really in the kingdom?" He answered: "No." I then asked his attention to the following: You say "we are in the kingdom *by faith*," but not really children. Since the Holy Spirit says we are the "children of God by faith," are we really the children of God? To this he replies: "We are not really the children of God; we are the children of God by faith." I wonder if his brethren were prepared for such a denial of the word of God. Near the beginning of this discussion I predicted that he would deny the Bible before the debate closed.

He makes another effort on James 2:5: "Heirs of the

kingdom which he hath promised to them that love him." Certainly we are heirs of the kingdom—the everlasting state of the kingdom, the glorified state of the kingdom; still we are in the kingdom. We are saved now; still we are the heirs of salvation. I replied to this fully in a former speech.

Let me have your attention now for a few moments to some of the admissions that the gentleman has made in the debate.

1. "We have the principles of the kingdom."—Bradley.
2. "We have the laws of the kingdom."—Bradley.
3. "We have the seed of the kingdom."—Bradley.
4. "We are in the kingdom by faith and hope."—

Bradley.

This is Bradley on one hand; on the other, he says: Christ is not King; the kingdom has not been established. I submit, my friends, that, according to the admissions of Bradley, the kingdom does exist. Christ has given the law, and Bradley says that it is "the law of the kingdom." He is correct in this; but who but A. S. Bradley does not know that if the law given by Christ is "the law of the kingdom," the giver of the law is King, and the kingdom exists? Is it possible that even A. S. Bradley don't know that "the seed of the kingdom" belongs to the kingdom and is designed to perpetuate the kingdom? Bradley says that he is sowing the seed of the kingdom, though the kingdom has not been established. Sowing the seed to perpetuate the kingdom, when, according to him, the kingdom has never been brought into existence, eh? Pshaw! Don't laugh at him, my friends; he is an object of pity. Be a man, Bradley. Give up the carnal doctrine that makes you run counter to the Bible and all sense, except nonsense.

The remainder of my time I shall give to my resume. My affirmation: "The kingdom of Christ was established

on the first Pentecost after the resurrection of Christ." God, through the prophet Daniel, promised to set up a kingdom. From the time that the promise was made we may read to the close of the Old Testament Scriptures, and the kingdom was not set up. When Christ appeared among men, he said: "The time is fulfilled, and the kingdom of God is at hand." "The kingdom of God is come nigh unto you." I have insisted that soon after these statements were made the kingdom was established.

"Verily I say unto you, that there be some of them that stand here, which shall not taste of death, till they have seen the kingdom of God come with power." (Mark 9:1.) Or, as in the Revised Version: "Verily I say unto you, There are some here of them that stand by, who shall in no wise taste of death, till they see the kingdom of God come with power." Certainly the kingdom was at hand. Christ very plainly said that some of the ones hearing him speak would live to see the kingdom come with power. Truly the kingdom was nigh, the time was fulfilled. More, the kingdom was to come with "power." If we can locate the time when the "power" came, we will know when the kingdom came; for the kingdom was to come when the power came. After his resurrection, Christ said to his disciples: "Tarry ye in the city of Jerusalem, until ye be endued with power from on high." (Luke 24:49.) But when did this power come, or has it come? "But ye shall receive power, after that the Holy Ghost has come upon you." (Acts 1:8.) The power was to come when the Holy Spirit came. But Christ bade them go to Jerusalem, and there wait for the power. Let us follow them to the city of Jerusalem. Here we find them assembled (Acts 1:1-26), waiting for the promised power, which was to come when the Spirit came. Listen: "And when the day of Pentecost was fully come, they were all with one accord in one place. And suddenly there came a sound from heaven as of a

rushing mighty wind, and it filled all the house where they were sitting. And there appeared unto them cloven tongues like as of fire, and it sat upon each of them. And they were all filled with the Holy Ghost, and began to speak with other tongues, as the Spirit gave them utterance." (Acts 2:1-4.) Here we note that the Spirit came. When? On the Pentecost of my proposition. But the promise was that they should receive power when the Spirit came. Did they receive "power" on this occasion—Pentecost? Most assuredly; for they "began to speak with other tongues, as the Spirit gave them utterance;" and the power came with the Spirit, on Pentecost. Christ promised that the kingdom should come with power, but the power came on Pentecost; therefore the kingdom came on that day—the day my proposition calls for. More, Christ said some of them should not taste of death till the kingdom came with power. This is equivalent to saying that some of them would die before the kingdom came with power. Did any of them taste of death before Pentecost? Certainly; Judas died. If my opponent is correct in his contention, all of them have tasted of death, and the kingdom has not come with power, and Christ made a false statement.

"Thou art Peter, and upon this rock I will build my church; and the gates of hell shall not prevail against it. And I will give unto you the keys of the kingdom of heaven." (Matt. 16:19.) My opponent agrees that "key" means authority, or power; that it is a symbol of authority, or power; that Peter used *one* "key" on the Pentecost of my proposition; and that the people then became members of the church. I submit that we do not use the "keys" of an institution till the institution exists. If Peter used a "key" of the kingdom on the Pentecost of my proposition (and Mr. Bradley says he did), the kingdom existed then. Bradley says that Peter opened the church (to use a common expression) with the "key"

of the kingdom. If to "open the church" is not the same as to "open the kingdom," Peter was a theological burglar; for, according to Bradley, he opened the church with the "key" of the kingdom, and Bradley says that the kingdom and church are two different and very distinct institutions. Pshaw!

We are agreed that "key" is a symbol of authority, or power. Is Christ King? Mr. Bradley declares that he is not, while I insist that he is. Let us see. "And Pilate asked him, saying, Art thou the King of the Jews? And he answered him and said, Thou sayest it." (Luke 23:3.) "'Su legeis:' 'Thou sayest'—i. e., thou grantest *what thou askest*; equiv. to *it is just as thou sayest*; to be sure, certainly." (Thayer.) Not only did Christ affirm that he was King, but Paul says that it was confessed before Pontius Pilate, and calls it "the good confession." More, Paul preached that Christ was King (Acts 17:7), and John says that Christ is "Lord of lords, and King of kings" (Rev. 17:14.) Certainly Christ is King; but has he power? Hear him: "All power is given unto me in heaven and in earth." (Matt. 28:18.) Then he is King, with all power. But I am not through. "And the key of the house of David will I lay upon his shoulder; so he shall open, and none shall shut; and he shall shut, and none shall open." (Isa. 22:22.) Has Christ received that "key"—power? "And to the angel of the church in Philadelphia write; These things saith he that is holy, he that is true, he that hath the key of David, he that openeth, and no man shutteth; and shutteth, and no man openeth." (Rev. 3:7.) Christ has the "key"—power of David; but David was king; so Christ has the power of King David. But more, he has all power in heaven and in earth. Christ is certainly King, with power. Has he a kingdom? He certainly has power and is exercising it, for he "shutteth, and no man openeth." Has he a kingdom? "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, and they brought him near before him. And there was given him dominion, and glory, and a kingdom." (Dan. 7:13, 14.) Plain the statement. Christ was to receive the kingdom when he went to the Ancient of days with the clouds. When did he thus go to the Ancient of days—God? After his resurrection. "And when he had spoken these things, while they beheld, he was taken up; and a cloud received him out of their sight." (Acts 1:9.) It was then that he "went into a far country to receive for himself a kingdom and to return." (Luke 19:12.) So certain as the word of God is true, just that certain has he received the kingdom. He was to receive the kingdom and return. "Verily I say unto you, There be some standing here, which shall not taste of death, till they see the Son of man coming in his kingdom." Has he returned? Certainly he has. He assured his disciples of his return, saying: "I will not leave you comfortless: I will come to you." (John 14:18.) On the day of Pentecost he came to them in the person and power of the Holy Spirit. Then they saw him come in the kingdom. Has he a kingdom? "Who hath delivered us from the power of darkness, and hath translated us into the kingdom of his dear Son." (Col. 1:13.) "I John who also am your brother, and companion in tribulation, and in the kingdom and patience of Jesus Christ." (Rev. 1:9.) To be sure, he has a kingdom, and Christians are in that kingdom—"translated into the kingdom." Have we laws for this kingdom? O, yes; Mr. Bradley says that "we have the laws of the kingdom." True, you all do not accept Mr. Bradley as authority, and I don't wonder. Let inspiration be heard: "If ye fulfill the royal law." "Royal"—kingly—law. We are in the kingdom; not only so, but we are priests. "But ye are a chosen generation, a royal priesthood." (I Pet. 2:9.) "Royal priesthood"—kingdom of priests. "And hath made us kings and priests unto God and his Father."

As members of the kingdom, do we have a memorial institution? Assuredly we do. "Ye may eat and drink at my table in my kingdom." Whose table is it? The Lord's. Where is the Lord's table? In his kingdom. Do we eat at the Lord's table? If we are Christians, certainly we do. (See I Cor. 10th and 11th chapters.) Then it follows that since the table is in the kingdom and we eat and drink at that table, we eat and drink in the kingdom; but we could not eat and drink in a kingdom that does not exist, but we do eat and drink in the kingdom; therefore the kingdom has been established.

We are in the kingdom—"hath translated us into the kingdom;" but we may conduct ourselves in such a way that at the end of time, the harvest, the end of the world, he will "send forth his angels, and they shall gather out of his kingdom all things that offend, and them that do iniquity." If we add to our faith, virtue, knowledge, temperance, patience, godliness, brotherly kindness, and charity, we will never fall, never become offenders or workers of iniquity, and will have an entrance "ministered unto you abundantly into the everlasting kingdom of our Lord and Savior Jesus Christ"—the kingdom where there will be no offenders, where God reigns, where we have freedom from all temptations incident to this life. It will then be the glorified—the kingdom delivered to God.

To his disciples Christ said: "I appoint unto you a kingdom." Have they received it? Indeed, they have. "Wherefore we receiving a kingdom which cannot be moved." Indeed, there is no question about it. This is the very kingdom promised in Dan. 2:44, which could never be destroyed; and we have received it, and Paul says that it "cannot be moved."

Christ was to sit and rule upon *his throne*. Is he on his throne, or is he King on the throne of some one else?

ON HIS THRONE.

1. Jesus was on "his throne" when sitting. (Zech. 6:13.)
2. He was sitting in the days of the apostles. (Eph. 1:20.)
3. Therefore he was on his throne in the days of the apostles.

KING.

1. Jesus is King when Lord. (Rev. 17:14.)
 2. He was Lord in the days of the apostles. (Acts 2:36.)
- Therefore he was King in the days of the apostles.

RULE.

1. Jesus was to "sit and rule" upon his throne. (Zech. 6:13.)
2. He "sat" in the days of the apostles. (Eph. 1:20.)
3. Therefore he ruled in the days of the apostles.

REIGN.

1. Jesus was reigning when the Gentiles trusted in him. (Rom. 15:12.)
2. Gentiles trusted in him in the days of the apostles. (Acts 15.)
3. Therefore he was reigning in the days of the apostles.

NO KINGDOM, THEN NO SALVATION.

Christ said to his disciples that it was not probable that rich men would enter the kingdom. "Verily I say unto you, That a rich man shall hardly enter into the kingdom of heaven. And again I say unto you, It is easier for a camel to go through the eye of a needle, than

for a rich man to enter into the kingdom of God. When his disciples heard it, they were exceedingly amazed, saying, Who then can be saved?" (Matt. 19:24,25.) Thus you see that the disciples thought that only those who entered the kingdom could be saved. Such is the truth, or Christ allowed them to entertain this false idea, and by his silence he contributed thereto. Indeed, those, and only those, that are in the kingdom are observing the law of the Christ; and Mr. Bradley says that it is the law of the kingdom. But to observe the law of the Lord is necessary to the salvation of one; and this law is the law of the kingdom, and the law of a kingdom is for the subjects—citizens—of that kingdom.

KINGDOM—GLORY.

You will remember the argument I made showing that when Christ entered into his glory he was to have the kingdom. To this my opponent did not see fit to make a reply. It was the desire of the Zebedee children to be on the right and left hand of the Lord in his "glory." (Mark 10:35, 36.) But in Matt. 20:20 it is said that their desire was to be on the right and left hand of the Lord in his "kingdom." Thus you note that "in thy glory" and "in thy kingdom" are used to mean the same thing. He who contends that Christ does not possess the kingdom must contend that he has not been glorified.

DAVID'S THRONE.

My opponent has had much to say about the throne of David. I shall note that matter for a moment. David never owned a throne in his own right. The throne occupied by him was the property of another, and not his, save by right of occupancy. The throne did not belong to David, but to another—the Lord. Note: "Then Solomon sat on the throne of the Lord as king instead

of David his father, and prospered; and all Israel obeyed him." (I Chron. 29:23.) The statement is plain that the throne that David sat on was the Lord's throne. Then we understand that when we read of the throne of David it is only the Lord's throne on which David ruled, and is called David's for the reason that he ruled on it. It was not his in his own right. We are forced to the conclusion that David was on the Lord's throne and ruled over Israel by the authority of the Lord. When the time came for the coronation of Solomon, it is said that he ruled over Israel instead of David on the throne of the Lord. Since that called David's throne was so called for the simple reason that he occupied it, and not because he owned it in his own right, so the Son of David, Christ, being now seated at the right hand of the Father, on the throne of the Lord, all power in heaven and in earth being given to him, he is on the Father's throne and ruling by the authority of the Father. As the throne upon which David ruled was the Lord's and was called David's throne because he occupied it, so the throne on which Christ is ruling is the Lord's throne. It is sometimes called the throne of David, but the throne was the throne of David and is the throne of Christ only by right of occupancy. Christ was raised to sit on the throne of David. The throne is in heaven. He was promised the throne of his father, David; and he says that he has overcome and is set down with his Father in his throne. But he was to be Priest on his throne. "And he shall be priest upon his throne." He is Priest now. Then he is on his throne now; but he says that he is on the Father's throne now. Thus we learn that that called his throne and that called the Father's throne are the same. But the throne on which David ruled was the Lord's throne, and Christ is now on the Lord's throne. Then he is ruling on that which was called the throne of David. He (Christ) is at the right hand of the Father, Priest upon his throne. How long will he remain there?

TILL ALL ENEMIES ARE CONQUERED.

"Behold, he cometh with clouds; and every eye shall see him, and they also that pierced him: and all kindreds of the earth shall wail because of him." (Rev. 1:7.) This passage declares that when he comes all shall see him; even those that pierced him shall look upon him. This, we know, will be at the general resurrection, when all are raised, when all—every one—comes forth from the grave. Again: "Who shall judge the quick and the dead at his appearing and his kingdom." (2 Tim. 4:1.) Positive the statement that at his appearing he will judge the quick and the dead. It is not, as Mr. Bradley says, that he will raise some at his appearing and rule with them a thousand years, and then raise the others. This brings us to and will enable us to fully appreciate the passage in the Psalms—viz.: "Sit thou at my right hand, until I make thine enemies thy footstool." (Ps. 110:1.) How long is Christ to remain at the right hand of the Father? Till all foes are made his footstool. Is he at the right hand of the Father now? Most certainly. "Which he wrought in Christ, when he raised him from the dead, and set him at his own right hand in heavenly places." (Eph. 1:20.) Christ is at the right hand of the Father, and is to remain there till all enemies are conquered. This is so declared in the following: "Then cometh the end, when he shall have delivered up the kingdom to God; when he shall have put down all rule and all power and all authority. For he must reign till he hath put all enemies under his feet. The last enemy that shall be destroyed is death." (I Cor. 15:24-26.) I am fully persuaded that this audience fully appreciates that, according to this testimony, when the Lord ascended, he was seated at the right hand of the Father, and that he will remain there till all enemies are conquered. The last enemy is death, and an enemy cannot be, is not, destroyed as long as he rules. Then

death will not be destroyed as long as he holds one in his domain. Then it follows that the heavens will retain Christ till all are brought forth from the grave, but that will not be till the general resurrection. Christ will not, cannot come a thousand years before the general resurrection and set up a kingdom and rule on the throne of David. At the time he comes, instead of receiving a kingdom, he is to deliver the kingdom to the Father; and Christ will then be subject to God, as is declared: "And when all things shall be subdued unto him, then shall the Son also himself be subject to him that put all things under him, that God may be all in all." (I Cor. 15:28.) Thus we see that when he comes, instead of then taking power and ruling, he will be subject to the Father. When Christ comes again, it will be to judge the world in righteousness—to reward his friends and punish his foes. We will then be through with all things below.

INFANT DAMNATION.

According to the position of my opponent, I insist that the logical conclusion of his doctrine is infant damnation. True, he says that he does not believe that infants will be damned, and I am willing to accept the statement that he makes as to what he believes; but that does not prevent the deduction from the position that he contends for in this debate. If he is right in his position on the kingdom, I submitted the following argument, and he makes no attempt to show that such does not follow. Hear the argument. Jesus said: "Verily I say unto you, Except ye be converted, and become as little children, ye shall not enter into the kingdom of heaven." (Matt. 18:3.) If there is not a kingdom now and the everlasting kingdom—the kingdom in the glorified state—is contemplated in this passage, the following is true: (1) None but converted people enter the glori-

fied state of the kingdom. (2) None but the ones that "understand with the heart" can be converted. (Matt. 13:15.) (3) Infants and idiots can't "understand with the heart." (4) Therefore infants and idiots can't enter the kingdom. (5) But the everlasting—glorified—state of the kingdom is in heaven. (6) Therefore the infant and idiot can't enter heaven.

Hear the truth about the matter. The present dominion of the kingdom is contemplated in the passage, into which infants and idiots cannot enter, because they cannot be converted, and they can't be converted because they cannot "understand with the heart." This only excludes them from the present dominion of the kingdom, but not from the kingdom in the glorified state. The doctrine of my opponent certainly involves infant damnation.

CHRIST IS KING.

In a former speech I have asked your attention to the statement made by Christ before Pilate, in which he plainly states that he is King. You remember the argument. I have not time to repeat it at this juncture. Paul, while at Thessalonica, preached that Christ was King. (See Acts 17:1-7.) John wrote: "These shall make war with the Lamb, and the Lamb shall overcome them: for he is Lord of lords, and King of kings." (Rev. 17:14.) Again: "And he hath on his vesture and on his thigh a name written, KING OF KINGS, AND LORD OF LORDS." (Rev. 19:16.) Not only so, but he has given his law; and Mr. Bradley says that it is the law of the kingdom. We are subjects of Christ, and are governed by that law. Indeed, we are

IN THE KINGDOM.

"Who hath delivered us from the power of darkness, and hath translated us into the kingdom of his dear Son." (Col. 1:13.) Paul says that these brethren were

"translated into the kingdom." He does not say that they will be translated into it at the beginning of the millennium, but he "hath translated us into the kingdom." They were delivered from the power of darkness and translated into the kingdom at the time Paul wrote. John is as positive in his statement: "I John, who also am your brother, and companion in tribulation, and in the kingdom and patience of Jesus Christ." (Rev. 1:9.) My friends, can a statement be plainer? The only reply that my opponent makes is: If we had a correct translation of these passages, they would not read that way. I am sorry that he will not translate them for us. Of the many translations, he will not name one that he will indorse. I insist that you all cannot fail to see that the kingdom has been established.

"And I appoint unto you a kingdom, as my Father hath appointed unto me; that ye may eat and drink at my table in my kingdom." (Luke 22:29, 30.) While Christ here says that he appointed unto them the kingdom, Paul later says: "Wherefore we receiving a kingdom which cannot be moved." (Heb. 12:28.) "Receiving" is present perfect tense, and is rendered in the Syriac-Murdock's translation: "Since, therefore, we have received a kingdom."

While the children of God rejoice, have joy now (1 Pet. 1:8), they are to enter into joy (Matt. 25:21-23); but the entering into that joy is contingent on our faithfulness. Just so, while we are in the kingdom now (Col. 1:13), we are to enter into the glorified state of the kingdom; and our entrance thereinto is conditioned on our being faithful—adding to our faith, virtue, knowledge, temperance, patience, godliness, brotherly kindness, and charity. I beg you who are in the kingdom to be faithful to the Lord, and you will enter into the kingdom in its glorified state, where we will be freed from the temptations incident to this lapsed state. May the Lord bless you. [Time expired.]

BRADLEY'S SIXTH NEGATIVE.

Gentlemen Moderators, Ladies and Gentlemen:

I come before you to make the last speech on this proposition. You remember that my opponent is affirming that the kingdom was established on the first Pentecost after the resurrection of Christ. Now, noticing his contention, I invite your attention to Col. 1:13: "Who hath delivered us from the power of darkness, and hath translated us into the kingdom of his dear Son." I want to ask my friend the question: Does this passages say one word about Pentecost, or the kingdom being established on the first Pentecost after the resurrection of Christ? I would like for him to have explained this in his speech, but you see that he passed it by. There was absolutely nothing in his speech that went to prove that the kingdom was established on the first Pentecost after the resurrection of Christ or at any other time; and consequently he leaves his proposition unproven, and he will have to leave it that way, so far as the word of God is concerned. He cannot prove by the word of God that the kingdom was established on the first Pentecost after the resurrection of Christ or at any other time. We have given him every opportunity to prove this, and he has failed to do it. All that he has done in this debate is to make a few seemingly logical points, and that was all that there was to them. I know that he could not prove his proposition by the Bible, but I did think that he would make some arguments for me to answer, that the debate would be interesting to the people.

Now, respected friends, we will call your attention to 2 Tim. 4:18: "And the Lord shall deliver me from every evil work, and will preserve me unto his heavenly

kingdom: to whom be glory for ever and ever. Amen." We are in the kingdom now, says Elder Nichol. I want to say, respected friends, that it doesn't seem that way to me, and I don't believe that it does to you. I know that we are not in heaven, and the kingdom that the book of God talks about is a heavenly kingdom, and any one with two good eyes can see that we are not in heaven. I wonder if my friend thinks that he is in heaven? Paul says that God would preserve him unto the heavenly kingdom. We will not enter that kingdom till the resurrection. If we are already in the kingdom, I want to know what is the use of a resurrection; and I asked my friend that question, and you see that he did not answer it. Why? Because he knew that if he did he would have to give up his proposition. It was impossible for him to answer it in view of his contention; so he had to pass it by. And I tell you, my friends, that you have noticed all the way through this debate he has continually dodged the arguments and questions that I have put before him, and the reason was that he had no point to answer them with, and what he did have did not fit there; so he had to try to turn my arguments around and make something else out of them, and he failed at that. So you see, respected friends, that he has lost his proposition. He failed to make my arguments look as if they were something else, for they were the word of God, and God is smarter than Elder Nichol; so he could do nothing with it. He could wind me up if it were me alone; but I am thankful that I do not depend on myself to prove this proposition, but have the word of God with which to prove it.

Note the fact, respected friends, that I have shown you that the kingdom is an everlasting kingdom; that when it is established, Christ will be King and seated on his throne; that he will rule and reign for ever and ever; that we are not in the kingdom now, and that, therefore, the kingdom has not been established; and

that the contention that my friend makes along this line is wrong, it is not in accordance with the word of God, and is, therefore, not true and cannot be accepted; hence we will have to disregard what he says in this matter as being any proof at all. Everything that I have read you from the book of God has gone to prove that the kingdom has not been established, and will not be till the second coming of the Lord; and not one thing that my opponent has read has gone to prove that his proposition is true, and I trust you all are intelligent enough to see it in that light, and I am certain that you are; for I don't see how you can see otherwise, for it is not according to the book of God that the kingdom has been established. That the kingdom has not been established and will not be till Christ returns and is seated on his own throne, I have plainly proven.

My friend is continually giving you what A. S. Bradley says, and I give you what the word of God says; and if he would give you what A. S. Bradley says and tell it straight, that would be all right; but, as I said before, he takes what I say and turns it around just a little, so as to make it sound like something else, and then replies to it in his own way; but I want to say, respected friends, that that is not debating, and I don't see why my friend does that way. He has refused to come out with any argument on his proposition, and it seems to me that when a man gets up a proposition he should be able to prove it; but this my friend has failed to do, and now he has had his last chance in this debate, and the debate will close on this proposition, and he has not proven a single proposition, as you all can see for yourselves.

I have repeatedly said that I would give up the debate if my opponent would put his finger on one passage of scripture that says that the kingdom was established on the first Pentecost after the resurrection of Christ or at any other time, and he has failed to do so from the be-

ginning to the end of this debate. Now, what do you think of such as that, respected friends? I call it a complete failure on his proposition.

I want to ask you, respected friends, to remember the way that my opponent has done all the way through this debate. I am sure that you all could see that he has been uneasy all the time, and that he realizes himself that he is on the wrong side of this proposition, and that he cannot find scriptures or arguments to prove the contention that he has been making, and that consequently he has proven nothing, and that he has lost the question entirely and can't help it. I am sorry for the man; he has made such a blunder in the proposition; but I hope that he has learned something, and that he will do better when he enters another debate.

Yes, he says that I need to read the Bible; that I know nothing about it; but I want to say, respected friends, that that is the word of Elder Nichol, and not the word of Bradley. All that I have said is the word of God, and I have read it directly from the book of God. I have read it just as it is in the Bible, and have not changed it one bit; for I know that I will be held accountable for what I say, and I am careful to read the word of God correctly, and not to add to nor take from it, as my friend has done all the way through this debate; but that is all that he could do, and, of course, he had to do something; but I had rather give up the debate altogether than to misrepresent the word of God. All that I ask of you, respected friends, as regards the contention that I have made in this debate, is to remember the truth and read for yourselves in his discussion, and you will see plainly that the contention that I have made is nothing but the word of God, the plain statements of the Bible; that all that I have said has come direct from the word of God. This one thing I have tried to do, and that is to read you the truth in this discussion and to speak nothing but the word of God. I am not a logician,

as my friend is; but I am happy to know that I need not be, for the word of God is before us, and what need have I to be a logician to prove the position that I have contended for in this debate? I want to tell you, respected friends, that if it was not for the fact that my opponent has a natural talent to be a logical fellow he could not make things look so plain to you, and that is the only reason that it looks so clear to you all in such cases as my friend presents, for I know that he makes it mighty strong; and I want to say if I did not know Charlie, I would be almost tempted to believe them myself; but I am glad to know that he can't run those things over me, and I hope that he has not succeeded in running them over you all, and I feel certain that he has not; but if you are not careful, he will be pretty likely to make some of you believe that he is telling the truth.

My friend says that he is still waiting for me to prove that the kingdom was not established on Pentecost. Well, I want to say that I have given you the word of God, and that is all that I have done and all that I expect to do, and what I have given you goes to show that the kingdom has not been established; and I want to say to you that I am still waiting for my friend to say something that proves that the kingdom has been established, but I have been waiting all the way through this debate, and he has refused to give it, because it is not in the book of God to produce; and I assure you if it was there he would have known just where to have found it, and it would have been brought forth before this debate closed. I was in hopes that he would produce some argument so that we could make the subject interesting; but, after all, he has not done it, and I am left alone in this discussion, and all the arguments on the subject are the ones that I have put before you.

Now, respected friends, I want to give you my recapitulation of the argument, so far as I have time, that I have made in this discussion, that you may get the con-

nection and see more clearly the truth in the contention that I have been making and the absurdity of the position that Mr. Nichol has been advocating. I now call your attention to Luke 1:32, 33: "He shall be great, and shall be called the Son of the Highest: and the Lord God shall give unto him the throne of his father David: and he shall reign over the house of Jacob forever; and of his kingdom there shall be no end." Note the fact, respected friends, that there is to be no end to the kingdom; and I want to say that if we are in the kingdom now, then Christ must be on his throne and reigning over the people; but we know that Christ is not yet on his throne, and that there will come an end to the present things.

My opponent argued that Christ came in the kingdom on Pentecost, and that he is to come again at the end of the world. Thus, according to his argument, he has three comings of the Lord Jesus Christ. The Lord speaks of only two comings. Now, whose word will you believe—the word of God or the word of Elder Nichol? When the Lord returns to the earth, then he will begin his reign, and not before that time; and we will not be in the kingdom before that time, I am sure; but my friend Nichol is already in the kingdom, he says, and will not have to be resurrected, according to his position. I guess he intends to live forever and forever; but the book of God says that we all must die, and I guess that that means Elder Nichol, too.

I know that the Lord has gone into the far country to receive for himself a kingdom and return. As proof I invite your attention to Luke 19:11, 12: "And as they heard these things, he added and spake a parable, because he was nigh to Jerusalem, and because they thought that the kingdom of God should immediately appear. He said therefore, A certain nobleman went into a far country to receive for himself a kingdom and return." Jesus Christ has gone into the far country to receive the kingdom; and when he returns, it will be established,

and he will be the Ruler of that kingdom. Again, respected friends, we call your attention in this connection to Matt. 25:31-34: "When the Son of man shall come in his glory, and all the holy angels with him, then shall he sit upon the throne of his glory: and before him shall be gathered all nations; and he shall separate them one from another, as a shepherd divideth his sheep from the goats: and he shall set the sheep on his right hand, but the goats on the left. Then shall the King say unto them on his right hand, Come, ye blessed of my Father, inherit the kingdom prepared for you from the foundation of the world." Now, friend Nichol, what do you think of that? Note the expression, respected friends. When he comes, then shall he sit upon his throne. If the kingdom was established, he would most certainly be on his throne today. But the book of God says that when he comes, then he will sit on his throne. Thus I show you that he is not now on his throne, and consequently the kingdom is not established; and now the question is: Will you believe it?

As I have said before, respected friends, I want to be understood in this matter. I want you to understand that I teach that a man must live right in this life; and in confirmation of my position I invite your attention to 2 Pet. 1:5-8: "And besides this, giving all diligence, add to your faith virtue; and to virtue knowledge; and to knowledge temperance; and to temperance patience; and to patience godliness; and to godliness brotherly kindness; and to brotherly kindness charity. For if these things be in you, and abound, they make you that ye shall neither be barren nor unfruitful in the knowledge of our Lord Jesus Christ. But he that lacketh these things is blind, and cannot see afar off, and hath forgotten that he was purged from his old sins. Wherefore the rather, brethren, give diligence to make your calling and election sure: for if ye do these things, ye shall never fall: for so an entrance shall be ministered unto

you abundantly into the everlasting kingdom of our Lord and Savior Jesus Christ." Thus you see that a man must live right, and that we are yet to enter into the kingdom. If we do all these things, we will enter into the kingdom. I am certain that you all believe what Peter says about this matter—that we will enter into the kingdom. Mr. Nichol says that he is in the kingdom now, and Peter says that we have to enter into the kingdom, and Paul says that through much tribulation we must enter into the kingdom of God, and he was writing to converted people when he wrote that.

Let us read Rev. 11:14-18 again: "The second woe is past; and, behold, the third woe cometh quickly. And the seventh angel sounded; and there were great voices in heaven, saying, The kingdoms of this world are become the kingdoms of our Lord, and of his Christ; and he shall reign for ever and ever. And the four and twenty elders, which sat before God on their seats, fell upon their faces, and worshiped God, saying, We give thee thanks, O Lord God Almighty, which art, and wast, and art to come; because thou hast taken to thee thy great power, and hast reigned. And the nations were angry, and thy wrath is come, and the time of the dead, that they should be judged, and that thou shouldest give reward unto thy servants the prophets, and to the saints, and them that fear thy name, small and great; and shouldest destroy them that destroy the earth." My friends, this time has not come, and the things mentioned in this scripture are all to take place when the kingdom is established; but these things have not taken place; therefore the kingdom has not been established.

Ps. 72:9: "They that dwell in the wilderness shall bow before him; and his enemies shall lick the dust." This has not been fulfilled; therefore the kingdom of God has not been established, and there is nothing in the book of God that says that it has. When the kingdom of God is established, all kings shall fall at his feet

and serve him. Ps. 72:11: "Yea, all kings shall fall down before him; and all nations shall serve him." This has never been done; therefore the kingdom of Christ has never been established.

I want to impress on your minds, respected friends, the fact that the kingdom has not been established, and that the word of God does not teach that it has been. We now call your attention to Dan. 7:27: "And the kingdom and dominion, and greatness of the kingdom under the whole heaven, shall be given to the people of the saints of the most High, whose kingdom is an everlasting kingdom, and all dominions shall serve and obey him." I say, respected friends, that all kingdoms and dominions do not serve and obey him, and most certainly all the people here know that they do not; but when the kingdom of God is established, all nations and dominions will serve and obey him; and since they do not now, I insist that the kingdom has not been established.

When will Christ receive the kingdom? When he returns, of course, (Luke 19:11, 12.) Jesus Christ has gone into the far country to receive a kingdom and to return; and when he returns, he will be on his throne, for the word of God says so in plain language. I read it (Matt. 25:31, 32): "When the Son of man shall come in his glory, and all the holy angels with him, then shall he sit upon the throne of his glory." He is now upon the Father's throne, for he says: "To him that overcometh will I grant to sit with me in my throne, even as I also overcame, and am set down with my Father in his throne." From this you note that Christ is not on his throne now; but the time is coming when he will be on his own throne, and not on the throne of the Father, and that will be when the kingdom is established.

Rev. 11:15: "And the seventh angel sounded; and there were great voices in heaven, saying, The kingdoms

of this world are become the kingdoms of our Lord, and of his Christ; and he shall reign for ever and ever." The kingdoms of this world have not become the kingdoms of our Christ; therefore the kingdom of Christ has not been established.

Rev. 11:18: "And the nations were angry, and thy wrath is come, and the time of the dead, that they should be judged, and that thou shouldest give reward to thy servants the prophets, and to the saints, and them that fear thy name, small and great; and shouldest destroy them that destroy the earth." This has not come to pass, and again we must say that the kingdom has not been established.

Paul says that we are preserved unto the heavenly kingdom, and I am certain that if we are preserved unto the kingdom we are not in it now; and you remember the scripture that I read from James, in which he says that we are heirs of the kingdom which God has promised to them that love him. We all know that that which is a promise to us we do not possess, and the book of God plainly says that the kingdom is promised to them that love the Lord; and, of course, we are not in the kingdom.

Peter says that if we will add to our faith, virtue, knowledge, temperance, patience, godliness, brotherly kindness, and charity, we will have an entrance ministered unto us abundantly into the everlasting kingdom; and Paul says, when writing to the Christians, that through much tribulation they must enter into the kingdom.

I want to tell you, respected friends, that everything that I have said on this question came from the book of God, and I trust that you will take it for your good. [Time expired.]



The Nichol - Bradley Debate

SECOND PROPOSITION.

"The Scriptures teach that man is wholly mortal and unconscious from death till the resurrection." (A. S. Bradley, affirmative; Charles R. Nichol, negative.)

BRADLEY'S FIRST SPEECH.

Gentlemen Moderators, Ladies and Gentlemen:

I am happy to come before you as the affirmant of the proposition that we are now to investigate. The proposition that I am to affirm is that man is wholly mortal and unconscious from death till the resurrection, according to the Scriptures. I now invite your attention to the terms of my proposition and the definitions that I give to them. I mean by "Scriptures," the word of God; I mean by "man," the creature that God created—formed—out of the dust. "And the Lord God formed man out of the dust of the ground." (Gen. 2:7.) Thus you note the first man, Adam, was formed of the dust of the ground. That is the man of my proposition. We are the same as Adam was. "Wholly mortal." I mean that all that goes to constitute man is subject to death. "Unconscious:" I mean that when man dies he doesn't know anything from the time that he dies till the resurrection. "Death:" I mean by death, when God takes away the breath by which we are animated.

I think that I have now defined my proposition so clearly that there can be no misunderstanding respecting the points of issue, and I hope that you all will see that the contention that I am going to make is nothing but the truth of the book of God; for I shall read you from the Bible, and I will not undertake to prove my proposition by a "therefore," nor will I take the points of my opponent and change them around to read my way.

Again we call your attention to Gen. 2:7: "And the Lord God formed man of the dust of the ground, and breathed into his nostrils the breath of life; and man became a living soul." Please note that the man was formed of the dust of the ground, and that God breathed into the man the breath of life, and man became a living soul. We now read Ps. 104:29: "Thou hidest thy face, they are troubled: thou takest away their breath, they die, and return to their dust." Thus you see man was created out of the dust of the ground; and when man dies, he returns to the dust. If man was not wholly mortal, he would not return to the dust, but would go to heaven as he is here on earth.)

Now, to prove to you that man is unconscious, we call your attention to Eccles. 9:4, 5: "For to him that is joined to all the living there is hope; for a living dog is better than a dead lion. For the living know that they shall die: but the dead know not anything." You note the fact, respected friends, that "the dead know not anything;" and so I contend that they are unconscious. We will not stop here, my friends, but will call your attention to numerous things in the book of God that go to show that my proposition is true; and all that I ask you to do is to give me your attention in this matter, and, with the help of God, I can show you that the contention that I am to make on this proposition is nothing but the truth of the book of God. Now, I ask you to watch me and see that I have nothing to present on this question

but what I read to you from the Bible, for that is the only place that we can go to get proof on this matter. So now let me have your attention to Eccles. 12:7: "Then shall the dust return to the earth as it was: and the spirit shall return unto God who gave it." When man dies, he certainly returns to the dust. God created man out of the dust of the ground; and when he dies, he returns to the dust. When God created man out of the dust of the ground, he put the spirit in the man; but the spirit is no part of the man. You will note the fact, respected friends, that God created the man out of the dust of the ground, and that the man dies and returns to the dust. When we come forth from the dead at the resurrection, we will be new creatures; we will then be like the Father. Listen (Ps. 17:15): "As for me, I will behold thy face in righteousness: I shall be satisfied, when I awake, with thy likeness." Do you see that, respected friends, we shall be like him when we awake in his likeness? And that will not be till we come forth from the grave at the resurrection; and this is in accord with 1 John 3:2: "Beloved, now are we the sons of God, and it doth not yet appear what we shall be, but we know that, when he shall appear, we shall be like him; for we shall see him as he is." We are not like the Lord now, but will be when we come forth from the grave.

The Lord Jesus taught men while he was here on this earth that men must die, and that after death there would be a resurrection. Note the fact, respected friends, man is to die. God formed the first man out of the dust of the ground and breathed into his nostrils the breath of life, and the man became a living soul. Now when man dies, he returns to the dust, and is unconscious; he is mortal. The spirit returns to God, who gave it, but is no part of the man.

Now we call your attention to some scriptures in the New Testament. We first call your attention to Matt.

17:1-9: "And after six days Jesus taketh Peter, James, and John his brother, and bringeth them up into a high mountain apart, and was transfigured before them: and his face did shine as the sun, and his raiment was white as the light. And, behold, there appeared unto them Moses and Elias talking with him. Then answered Peter, and said unto Jesus, Lord, it is good for us to be here: if thou wilt, let us make here three tabernacles; one for thee, and one for Moses, and one for Elias. While he yet spake, behold, a bright cloud overshadowed them; and behold a voice out of the cloud, which said, This is my beloved Son, in whom I am well pleased: hear ye him. And when the disciples heard it, they fell on their face, and were sore afraid. And Jesus came and touched them, and said, Arise, and be not afraid. And when they had lifted up their eyes, they saw no man, save Jesus only. And as they came down from the mountain, Jesus charged them, saying, Tell the vision to no man, until the Son of man be risen from the dead." Now, respected friends, we see that this scripture is the account of a vision, and not a real occurrence. It is true, according to the scripture; but it was a vision, and not something actual or real. Moses and Elias were not there in fact, but only in a vision. So this does not militate against the position that I hold. Now in this connection we call your attention to Acts 9:10-12: "And there was a certain disciple at Damascus, named Ananias, and to him said the Lord in a vision, Ananias. And he said, Behold, I am here, Lord. And the Lord said unto him, Arise, and go into the street which is called Straight, and inquire in the house of Judas for one called Saul, of Tarsus: for, behold, he prayeth, and hath seen in a vision a man named Ananias coming in and putting his hands on him, that he might receive his sight." This, my friends, was not something that actually occurred, but was, as the passage says, a vision, just as we have in Acts 10:11-12, where we have the account of the great sheet let down

from heaven to Peter filled with all kinds of beasts, fowls, and creeping things. Now that was not a literal sheet actually filled with the beasts and fowls and creeping things, but it is called a vision. Just so Moses and Elias did not really appear on the mount; it was only a vision, and does not go to show anything in proof of the position that my friend holds in this debate. In Rev. 9:17, John speaks of seeing horses in heaven; but it was only a vision, and horses were not really in heaven. We must not take these visions as literal occurrences.

We now invite your attention to Luke 20:32-38: "Last of all the woman died also. Therefore in the resurrection whose wife of them is she? for seven had her to wife. And Jesus answered and said unto them, The children of this world marry, and are given in marriage: but they which shall be accounted worthy to obtain that world, and the resurrection from the dead, neither marry, nor are given in marriage; neither can they die any more; for they are equal unto the angels; and are the children of God, being the children of the resurrection. Now that the dead are raised, even Moses showed at the bush, when he calleth the Lord the God of Abraham, and the God of Isaac, and the God of Jacob. For he is not the God of the dead, but of the living; for all live unto him." This, my friends, is a lesson by the Lord to prove to the people that there will be a resurrection of the dead; and it doesn't matter whether we are dead or alive, we will all have to give an account unto God how we have lived in this life. In harmony with this passage I call your attention to Rom. 14:7-9: "For none of us liveth to himself, and no man dieth to himself. For whether we live, we live unto the Lord; and whether we die, we die unto the Lord: whether we live therefore, or die, we are the Lord's. For to this end Christ both died, and rose, and revived, that he might be Lord both of the dead and living." Note the fact, respected friends, whether we live or whether we die, we

are the Lord's, and he is the Lord of the dead and the living. Thus you note that some are dead and some are living.

We invite your attention now to Acts 9:36-41: "Now there was at Joppa a certain disciple named Tabitha, which by interpretation is called Dorcas; for this woman was full of good works and almsdeeds which she did. And it came to pass in those days, that she was sick, and died: whom when they had washed, they laid her in an upper chamber. And forasmuch as Lydda was nigh to Joppa, and the disciples had heard that Peter was there, they sent unto him two men, desiring him that he would not delay to come to them. Then Peter arose and went with them. When he was come, they brought him into the upper chamber: and all the widows stood by him weeping, and showing the coats and garments which Dorcas made, while she was with them. But Peter put them all forth, and kneeled down, and prayed; and turning him to the body said, Tabitha, arise. And she opened her eyes, and when she saw Peter, she sat up." I want to ask my friend if he thinks there were two Dorcas; and if he says "Yes," I want him to tell which Dorcas it was that had made the coats and garments. Was there one Dorcas in the upper room that Peter took by the hand and told to arise, and another Dorcas, the inner Dorcas that had gone off somewhere? If you say that this is the way of it, you will please tell us which Dorcas it was that had made the coats and the garments—the inner Dorcas or the outer Dorcas, the Dorcas that was there in the upper room or the inner Dorcas that had gone off somewhere?

Rom. 5:12: "Wherefore, as by one man sin entered into the world, and death by sin; and so death passed upon all men, for that all have sinned." Yes, all men have sinned and come short of the glory of God, and all men are to die. Adam sinned, and he died; and so we must all die in Adam, but we will be made alive in

Christ; and in confirmation of this fact I read 1 Cor. 15: 22: "For as in Adam all die, even so in Christ shall all be made alive."

Now, respected friends, I call your attention to 2 Cor. 4: 16, 17: "For which cause we faint not; but though our outward man perish, yet the inward man is renewed day by day. For our light affliction, which is but for a moment, worketh for us a far more exceeding and eternal weight of glory." Some people talk of the inward man and the outward man, just as if they thought there were two men in one, that one man was dwelling in the other man. According to that idea, man lived four thousand years and did not know that he had an inward man till Paul told them. My friends, the inner man that Paul speaks of in this passage of scripture is Christ. Christ in you, the hope of glory, is the inner man. Let us read Col. 1: 26, 27: "Even the mystery which hath been hid from ages and from generations, but now is made manifest to his saints; to whom God would make known what is the riches of the glory of this mystery among the Gentiles; which is Christ in you, the hope of glory." Again, we read Col. 3: 16: "And let the peace of God rule in your hearts, the which also ye are called in one body: and be ye thankful. Let the word of Christ dwell in you richly in all wisdom; teaching and admonishing one another in psalms and hymns and spiritual songs, singing with grace in your hearts to the Lord." Now I read Rom. 6: 6: "Knowing this, that our old man is crucified with him, that the body of sin might be destroyed, that henceforth we should not serve sin." The old man is the old life of sin according to the lust of the flesh. Let us read Eph. 4: 22-24: "That ye put off concerning the former conversation the old man, which is corrupt according to the deceitful lusts; and be renewed in the spirit of your mind; and that ye put on the new man, which after God is created in righteousness and true holiness." Paul but speaks of

7 p. 18"

the life before and after conversion to Christ. This idea that is in the world that there are two men in one and that the inner man is immortal is not in accordance with the word of the Lord, and it seems to me that you can see that it is not true if you would but think for a moment. Let us examine the idea that the inner man that they talk about is immortal. Hear Paul on the subject, for he says that the inner man is renewed day by day. Yes, sir; renewed day by day. Now let my opponent tell how the inner man can be renewed if it is immortal. Yes, sir; tell us how you will go about renewing immortality. My friends, Christ in you, the hope of glory, is the inner man that there is so much talk about.

Now, respected friends, I call your attention to another passage of scripture which is relied on to prove contrary to the truth of the position that I am contending for this debate. Let us read it (Phil. 1:21-23): "For me to live is Christ, and to die is gain. But if I live in the flesh, this is the fruit of my labor: yet what I shall choose I wot not. For I am a strait betwixt two, having a desire to depart, and to be with Christ; which is for better: nevertheless to abide in the flesh is more needful for you." Paul says that he had a desire to depart and be with Christ. When was Paul to be with Christ? Let us read Col. 3:1-4: "If ye then be risen with Christ, seek those things which are above, where Christ sitteth on the right hand of God. Set your affection on things above, not on things on the earth. For ye are dead, and your life is hid with Christ in God. When Christ, who is our life, shall appear, then shall we also appear with him in glory." This passage states when Paul will be with Christ. When Christ comes the second time, then he will be with him.

I now call your attention to another passage of scripture which is relied on to prove that man is not wholly mortal, but that there is something immortal about man.

I read I Pet. 3:1-4: "Likewise, ye wives, be in subjection to your own husbands; that, if any obey not the word, they also may without the word be won by the conversation of the wives; while they behold your chaste conversation coupled with fear. Whose adorning let it not be that outward adorning of plaiting the hair, and of wearing of gold, or of putting on of apparel; but let it be the hidden man of the heart, in that which is not corruptible, even the ornament of a meek and quiet spirit, which is in the sight of God of great price." My friends, if Mr. Nichol will put his finger on the passage of scripture that says that any part of a man is immortal, I will give up this proposition. Now in regard to this passage that I have just read. Peter exhorts the disciples to adorn themselves with the Christian life, which is not corruptible. He does not say that the people are immortal, and my opponent knows that he does not; but they are to adorn themselves with a life that is not corruptible.

Now, I want to read I Pet. 3:18: "For Christ also hath once suffered for sins, the just for the unjust, that he might bring us to God, being put to death in the flesh, but quickened by the Spirit." You note, my friends, that it says that Christ was put to death in the flesh. I want my friend to tell us if he believes that Christ died. I want my opponent to notice this passage of scripture. It says that Christ was put to death in the flesh. Christ was in the flesh, and Christ was put to death.

Now let us read Matt. 10:28: "And fear not them which kill the body, but are not able to kill the soul; but rather fear him which is able to destroy both soul and body in hell." I read you this passage to prove to you that the soul can be destroyed; and, therefore, it is not immortal, for that which is immortal cannot be destroyed.

Now let us read another passage that is often relied

on to prove that man is not wholly mortal and to prove that man is conscious after death and before the resurrection. I read Rev. 6:9, 10: "And when he had opened the fifth seal, I saw under the altar the souls of them that were slain for the word of God, and for the testimony which they held; and they cried with a loud voice, saying, How long, O Lord, holy and true, dost thou not judge and avenge our blood on them that dwell on the earth?" Let me read you the scripture that teaches that the soul can be destroyed, and then we will know that it is not immortal, but that it is mortal, and that my contention on this matter is right. I read to you from Lev. 23:29, 30: "For whatsoever soul it be that shall not be afflicted in that same day, he shall be cut off from among his people. And whatsoever soul it be that doeth any work in that same day, the same soul will I destroy from among his people." Thus we learn that the soul can be destroyed. Then it is not immortal. Now, how about the souls under the altar crying? They cried just as the blood of Abel cried. Let us read Gen. 4:10: "And he said, What hast thou done? The voice of thy brother's blood crieth unto me from the ground." Thus you see that the blood of Abel cried from the ground; but it was not conscious, nor was it immortal. [Time expired.]

NICHOL'S FIRST REPLY.

Gentlemen Moderators, Ladies and Gentlemen:

After having had some more of the good things of this life, we have met here to investigate another subject—eschatology.

At one time I thought that the doctrine of materialists on the nature of man and the state of the dead was of no vital importance. I find some now that entertain that view. Circumstances became such that it was necessary for me to give the subject a careful study. I am now fully persuaded that the system advocated by my opponent strikes a death blow at the remedial system—destroys the hope of eternal life.

I would have you appreciate, my friends, that there is a marked difference between simple "existence" and "life" as Bible terms. Religiously or biblically speaking, "life" means union with God and his Anointed. The term "existence" does not convey such an idea. Men exist, whether reconciled to or alienated from God. "That believing you might have life"—i. e., be reconciled or enter union with God. Man is only alive to that with which he is united or in correspondence. We are dead to that from which we are separated. Death always results from the separation. "He that is dead is freed from sin." (Rom. 6:7.) "Dead to sin, but alive to God." (Rom. 6:11.) You hath he quickened who were dead in sin. (Eph. 2:1.)

Do men hope for union unending with their friends here on this earth—in this life? Certainly not, for they do not expect to remain here. We are not capacitated for unending existence on this earth. We are fully cognizant that death will soon come and put an end to our existence

here below. Being conscious of this, we do not expect unending existence "here below"—on this earth; but hope is composed of forecast, expectation, and desire. Not expecting to remain on this earth through all time, we cannot hope to remain on this earth with our friends. We cannot hope for that which we do not expect.

Can he who knows that his optic nerve has been destroyed hope to see the beauties of nature in this life? No; he does not expect to see them. Not expecting it, he cannot hope for it. Can he who knows that his auditory nerves have been destroyed hope to hear the voices of loved ones here? Such characters have not the capacity for hearing or seeing. If man has not the capacity for unending existence, how in reason's name can he hope for eternal life? If man is wholly mortal, as my opponent affirms, and knows that at death, when the body returns to the dust, he ceases to exist, how can he hope for eternal life, since he does not expect unending union with God? Materialists admit that the converted man is in union with God now, but at death that union must end, for they say that at death man ceases to exist. Per the theory of Mr. Bradley, man, though converted, does not expect, and for that reason cannot hope for, unending union with God. It is certainly true that when man's capacity for existence ceases he comes to an end. If at death, as materialists teach, man "becomes as though he had never been," since before the creation of man there was not a man, so there will be no man of you when you "return to the dust." If at death all that goes to constitute you goes to dust—"returns to the dust"—then that must be the utter end of you. Before creation the omnipotent eye of God could not find a man to till the ground, for the very simple reason that there was not a man in existence, and he was put to the necessity of creating man. If, as Bradley teaches, man at death becomes as though he had never been, man will not exist; and if he doesn't exist, God can't find a man to resurrect;

and there will, therefore, be no resurrection. Unless man can hope for that which can never be (and that is impossible), this infidel doctrine of Mr. Bradley destroys the hope of the resurrection. But union with God in the glory world is contingent on a resurrection, and the resurrection on continued existence, both of which the materialist's system denies. I am persuaded that you see that all the joy of the glory world and the hope, the anchor to the soul, are called in question, logically, by this system of Sadduceeism. For this reason I hail with delight the opportunity to discuss this question and show you the heinousness of the system advocated by my opponent. Hear me patiently.

Your attention now to the proposition, please: "Man is wholly mortal and unconscious from death till the resurrection." Certainly my oponent has undertaken a Herculean task to defend this modern system of Sadduceeism. He defines "man:" "The creature that God created—formed out of the dust of the earth. That is the man of my proposition." Indeed! I presume we had as well close the discussion; for I readily admit that that which was created out of the dust will return to the dust, and that it will not only then, but is now, unconscious as well as mortal. Does Mr. Bradley expect to contend that all that goes to constitute man was formed of the dust? So he defines, and so he shall not contend; for I will force him to discuss the issue, and not play the part of a coward. He well knows that we all contend that the body is mortal, for so Paul declares in Rom. 8: 11: "Your mortal bodies."

He defines "wholly mortal:" "All that goes to constitute man is subject to death." This you will please remember. His definition of "death" is a new one to me. Hear him: "'Death:' When God takes away the breath by which we are animated." I had thought that death followed as a result of the breath being taken a-

way, and was not taking away the breath, *PER SE*. Will you please give us more light at this juncture?

With these definitions, he begins to introduce scripture quotations, though I confess that I am unable to see any connection between his proposition and the passages he quotes. I shall notice every passage that he introduces. "God formed man of the dust of the ground, and breathed into his nostrils the breath of life; and man became a living soul." (Gen. 2:7.) I wonder what he wants to get out of this passage? Certainly we know that the body was formed of the dust of the ground; so was the body of the dog. Man breathes the air; so does the dog. You shall see before the close of this proposition that, according to Bradley, the man of his proposition, as he defines and contends, is logically no more than a dog; and when he dies, he dies like the little dog Rover—"all over." He says that the man of his proposition was created out of the dust of the ground and at death will return to the dust. We will see about this very point later. The second passage by the opposition introduced was: "Thou hidest thy face, they are troubled: thou takest away their breath, they die, and return to their dust." (Ps. 104:29.) What is it that was formed out of the dust? The *body*. "Then shall the dust return to the earth as it was: and the spirit shall return unto God who gave it." (Eccles. 12:7.)

Mr. Bradley, please tell us in your next address if the spirit in man is any part of man. Was the spirit formed of the dust of the ground, and does it return to dust at death? "I pray God your whole spirit and soul and body be preserved blameless unto the coming of our Lord Jesus Christ." (1 Thess. 5:23.) Tell us: Does it take the spirit, soul, and body to make the man of your proposition?

Our attention is next invited to the scriptures from which he tries to prove that man is unconscious from death till the resurrection. He reads: "For the living

know that they shall die: but the dead know not anything." (Eccles. 9: 5.) Why did you not have the fairness to read all the passage? For the simple reason, it appears to me, that you know that when the entire passage is read it militates against the position for which you are contending. You stopped reading at a comma, and you should know that you did not present the thought in the passage. I shall note this in a moment. Let us note some other passages that are similar to the one that you introduce. "For we are but of yesterday, and know nothing, because our days upon earth are a shadow." (Job 8:9.) Regarding the confederates of Absalom it is said: "And with Absalom went two hundred men out of Jerusalem, that were called; and they went in their simplicity, and they knew not anything." (2 Sam. 15:11.) I submit that the expression, "For we are but of yesterday, and know nothing," is an accommodated expression, and means that these people had not lived long enough to learn much. If my opponent should live to a ripe old age and apply himself as he should, I am fully persuaded that he will become sufficiently informed to declare of his present acquisitions that he "knows not anything" about the state of the dead and the nature of man as he should. Of the two hundred men that went with Absalom it is said: "They knew not anything." Is it true that because these two hundred men "knew not anything" they were unconscious? Certainly there were some things that these two hundred men did not know; so are there some things that my distinguished opponent, with his wonderful store of information, does not know; but does it follow that he is unconscious because there are some things that he does not know? Indeed, he is very conscious of the fact that he does not "know anything" about how to make an argument to sustain his proposition nor where to find a passage of scripture that even remotely favors his contention.

Let us now subject the passage he introduced to a closer scrutiny: "For the living know that they shall

die: but the dead know not anything, neither have they any more a reward; for the memory of them is forgotten." (Eccles. 9:5.) This passage is the very gospel of materialism. With them this is the radiating passage—the center to which all other passages in God's book must be subordinate. Take this passage from them, and they flounder and fall in every sermon they try to preach on the nature of man. Their doctrine is so foreign to the Bible that they can't name a passage that remotely favors their contention when viewed in the light of complete revelation. They always suppress some of the truth. Why did not my opponent read all of the passage he introduced? It would not serve his purpose to so do. "The dead know not anything." This passage must be taken without any qualifications, or it must be restricted in its import. But hear the passage: "For the living know that they shall die, but the dead know not anything, neither have they any more a reward; for the memory of them is forgotten. Also their love, and their hatred, and their envy, is now perished; neither have they any more a portion forever in anything that is done under the sun." "The dead know not anything." Whatever rule of interpretation you apply to one part of the passage you must apply to the entire passage, for the different phases are inseparably connected. If "the dead know not anything" be taken without any qualifications, so must the following phrase in the same passage: "Neither have they any more a reward." This passage, taken without any qualifications—unrestricted—not only denies the resurrection, but rewards after the resurrection also for the righteous and punishment for the wicked. Abraham, Isaac, and Jacob are dead; "neither have they any more a reward." Take this passage unqualified, and Abraham, Isaac, and Jacob—indeed, all the righteous dead—are cut off from any rewards. Shucks! If the phrase, "the dead know not anything," proves that the dead are unconscious, then the two hundred men that went with

Absalom were unconscious, for they "knew not anything." Certainly there were some things that the two hundred men did not know—they "knew not anything." Just so there are some things that the dead do not know. What is it? It is certainly evident to this audience that Bradley must qualify this passage before it will serve him, or deny the resurrection, rewards and punishment. He has not yet denied the resurrection, but (mark my words) he will before this debate closes; but certainly he will not deny that there will be rewards for the Christians. Hear the passage again: "For the living know that they shall die: but the dead know not anything, neither have they any more a reward; for the memory of them is forgotten. Also their love, and their hatred, and their envy, is now perished; neither have they any more a portion forever in anything that is done under the sun." It must be apparent to all, even to my opponent, that the phrases, "the dead know not anything" and "neither have they any more a reward," are qualified by "under the sun"—"the dead know not anything" "under the sun," "neither have they any more a reward" "under the sun."

The next passage that he calls our attention to is: "Then shall the dust return to the earth as it was: and the spirit shall return to God who gave it." (Eccles. 12: 7.) Commenting on this passage, he says: "God formed the man of the dust of the ground (Gen. 2:7), and then put the spirit in the man; but the spirit is no part of the man." You will please remember the statement that "the spirit in man is no part of the man," for I shall have use for it later in this discussion. True, I read, "I Daniel was grieved in my spirit in the midst of my body;" but Mr. Bradley declares that the spirit was no part of Daniel. We will have some rich things after a time along these lines.

At this juncture the gentleman attempted to throw me in the lead by introducing several passages that he

thinks I will use in combating his position. Right clever trick, Mr. Bradley; but I shall occupy my place in this debate and serve my brethren as they desire and prosecute your position. He introduces the account of the transfiguration: "And, behold, there appeared unto them Moses and Elias talking to them." (Matt. 17:3.) My opponent says that this was a *vision*. Certainly this was a vision; it was not a hallucination. "Horama: Vision—that which is seen; a sight; spectacle; a sight divinely granted in an ecstasy or in sleep; a vision." (Thayer.) Yes, indeed, Peter, James, and John saw Moses and Elias on the mount talking to Jesus. They did not see him in their sleep, either, but were wide awake. "And when they were awake, they saw his glory, and the two men that stood with him." (Luke 9:32.) Thus you note that though Moses had died and had not been resurrected, he appeared on the mount of transfiguration, retaining his identity and individuality, and talked with Jesus; and the apostles mentioned saw him—yes, they were awake and saw him. Mr. Bradley, was Moses on the mount? Did the apostles see them? Did Moses talk with Jesus? Did a voice really say to Jesus, "This is my beloved Son: hear ye him?" As certain as Christ was on the mount, just that certain did Moses and Elias appear there and were seen by Peter, James, and John.

The next passage our attention is called to is: "Now that the dead are raised, even Moses showed at the bush, when he calleth the Lord the God of Abraham, and the God of Isaac, and the God of Jacob. For he is not the God of the dead, but of the living: for all live unto him." (Luke 20:37, 38.) Mr. Bradley attempted to anticipate an argument that he thought I would make on this passage, and says that Christ is proving the resurrection by this passage. Certainly, I most freely grant that very thing; but how does he prove the resurrection? Having refuted the objection of the Sadducees, Jesus next furnishes a proof of the resurrection. The major proof of his

argument is that "God is not the God of the dead, but of the living." Here the term "dead" is used in the sense attached to it by the Sadducees. If he had been disputing with the Pharisees, they could have answered, "He is the God of the dead;" for Abraham, Isaac, and Jacob were dead when he said, "I am their God." But to the Sadducees a dead man was *non est*—he had ceased to exist; he was nothing; and to say, in their sense of the term, that God is the God of the dead is to say that he is the God of nothing. It would be nonsense. But God did say hundreds of years after the death of the three patriarchs: "I am the God of Abraham, and the God of Isaac, and the God of Jacob." (Ex. 3:6.) The conclusion follows that these patriarchs were not dead in the Sadducean sense of the term; and as the conclusion applies only to their spirits, it proves that spirits continue to be alive after the bodies which they inhabited are dead.

"The thoughtful reader may have observed that the conclusion of this argument falls short in its terms of the demands of the subject. The subject is the resurrection of the dead, while the conclusion affects only the question whether the spirits of the dead are still alive. We cannot escape the difficulty by supposing, as some have done, that the resurrection spoken of is that of the spirit. The spirit does not die; and, therefore, it does not rise from the dead. It leaves the body as the latter dies. Its departure is the immediate cause of death, and it departs on the full possession of life. Resurrection is also spoken of in the Scriptures with reference to the body. How, then, does the Savior's proof that spirits continue to live apart from he body include proof of the resurrection? It seems quite certain that the argument appeared conclusive to the Sadducees, for Jesus assumed that it was so, and they tacitly admitted the fact; while the bystanders, who knew the views of the parties, were 'astonished at his doctrine.' (Verse 23.) In other words, the Sadducees admitted that if the exist-

ence of human spirits apart from the body were proved, the necessity of a resurrection would follow. The continued existence of spirits after the death of the body created a demand for the resurrection of the body, and the Sadducees were philosophical enough to see this." (McGarvey.) Certainly the bodies of Abraham, Isaac, and Jacob are dead, but their spirits live.

1. God is not the God of the dead.
2. God is the God of Abraham, Isaac, and Jacob.
3. Therefore Abraham, Isaac, and Jacob live unto God.

He introduces Sister Dorcas next. I will notice her in due time.

His wonderful dissertation on "for which cause we faint not; but though our outward man perish, yet the inward man is renewed day by day," is, to say the least of it, very amusing. He concludes the argument (?) by saying, with much confidence: "Christ in you is this inward man." Straited the condition and hard pressed for argument must be the man that takes such an untenable position. I regret that it is necessary to subject Mr. Bradley to the humiliation of exposing such a false contention. Hear Paul: "That he would grant you, according to the riches of his glory, to be strengthened with might by his Spirit in the inner man; that Christ may dwell in your hearts by faith." (Eph. 3: 16, 17.) Paul expresses his desire that the brethren might be strengthened by might in the "inner man" that Christ might dwell in their hearts. When one thing is to be done that another may take place, it is not possible for them to be the same thing. The "inner man" was to be strengthened that Christ might dwell in them. Mr. Bradley says that Christ is the "inner man." Then Paul desired that Christ should be strengthened that he might dwell in the hearts of the Christians by faith. The Christ

of materialism is like the doctrine of materialism—weak, needs to be strengthened. Pshaw!

Our attention is next called to: "For me to live is Christ, and to die is gain. But if I live in the flesh, this is the fruit of my labor: yet what I shall choose I wot not. For I am in a strait betwixt two, having a desire to depart, and to be with Christ, which is far better: nevertheless to abide in the flesh is more needful for you." (Phil. 1:21-24.) My opponent says that Paul was not to be with Christ till the second coming of Christ, and cites Col. 1 as proof. Indeed, the passage does not intimate that Paul would not be with Christ till the second coming of Christ, but simply states that when Christ comes the saints will be with him in a glorified form. Let us examine the quotation: "For me to live is Christ, and to die is gain. But if I live in the flesh, this is the fruit of my labor: yet what I shall choose I wot not. For I am in a strait betwixt two, having a desire to depart, and to be with Christ; which is far better: nevertheless to abide in the flesh is needful for you." In this passage we find a quandary in the mind of Paul, which placed him in an indecisive mood, peculiar to his time and education. It is not a doubt in his mind that it would be "better" for *him* to depart and be with Christ, nor does he doubt that it would be "better" for the Philipians for him *not* to depart. Which of the "betters" should he choose? is the question in his mind. He meant by "to depart" to die. (See 2 Tim. 4:8.) He knew it was better for him to die, so far as he individually was concerned.

If death means extinction of life—absolute unconsciousness, ceasing to exist—as Bradley teaches, it amounts to "nothingness." Then Paul was in a strait as to whether it was best to be nothing or to live and declare he gospel message. While living, he was in the constant joy of the Christian religion growing out of the hope of the gospel; but, according to Bradley, Paul was

in doubt whether it was best to live and enjoy this religion or die—become unconscious, nothing. This is about the lowest degradation of the gospel hope the devil has ever invented. Paul thought and said that for him to depart was to be with Christ; but if when he died he became unconscious, the dead apostle would have been with Christ; but if unconscious of the fact that he was with Christ, how could it be "far better?"

If Paul was with Christ, but unconscious of the fact till the resurrection, then the wicked that go to hell, per the theory of Bradley, are unconscious till the resurrection; and so far as the happiness of the righteous and the punishment of the wicked is concerned between death and the resurrection, it is the same. As respects happiness or punishment between death and the resurrection, being with the devil and being with God is the same. The ones with Christ are no happier than the ones with the devil. This is the system of Mr. Bradley boiled down; but let us stew it a little lower. If when Paul died all that went to constitute him went to the grave (and Bradley says that it did), and remains there till the resurrection; if Paul was not mistaken about being with Christ at his departure—his death—then he found Christ in the grave, and Peter lied when he said of Christ: "His soul was not left in hell, neither his flesh did see corruption." (Acts 2: 31.) If Paul had enjoyed the inspiration of my good-humored friend, Mr. Bradley, who is ashamed of having met me in debate, he would have known that all that constituted him would have gone to the grave; and since Christ was at the right hand of God when he wrote, the departure would have been a failure, regarding the end in view—viz., being with Christ—unless Christ was at the right hand of the Father in the grave. Paul, having been taught after the most perfect manner of the law, and having received the highest measure of inspiration, was led by the information he had received to believe that when he died he

would be with Christ. This cannot be doubted, except by infidels. To be with Christ is "far better." Why? During life he had the hope of the gospel, but his steadfastness and zeal fastened the fetters on him. To be with Christ is "far better," as the realization of hope is better than the hope; and to this is added the absence of persecution. The presence of Christ could not be enjoyed in the absence of consciousness; and hence Paul believed that his departure would result, culminate, in his continued existence, conscious, in the presence of Christ.

I am asked by Mr. Bradley if Christ died. Yes, sir; but he did not cease to exist, nor did he become unconscious. Sinners are dead in sins, but they are not unconscious.

My attention is invited to 1 Pet. 3:18: "For Christ also hath once suffered for sins, the just for the unjust, that he might bring us to God, being put to death in the flesh, but quickened by the Spirit." From this passage he argued that Christ died; that all that went to constitute Christ died; that he was put to death in the flesh. Certainly. He was with the Father before the world was. He was at that time, and till he appeared among men, in the spirit state, and could not die. God gave him a body. "A body hast thou prepared me." (Heb. 10:5.) It was necessary for him to be clothed with flesh before such a thing as death could be predicated of him. "Put to death in the flesh"—clothed with flesh that there might be a death. For this reason Christ was in the flesh. He took our nature, was clothed with humanity. He was not wholly human, but the divine was clothed with the human that there might be a death. While he was with the Father—before his advent into the world—he did not have a physical body. This proves that a physical organism is not necessary to spiritual existence. Christ had a spiritual existence before he had a physical organism, but the spiritual was not subject to death; so God gave him a body—flesh—that was. He was put to death

in the flesh. Does Mr. Bradley mean to contend that the divine died?

1 Pet. 3:1-4 will have my attention in my next address.

Mr. Bradley calls on me to put my finger on the passage that says there is anything immortal about man. He challenges me to find the passage. My dear sir, in negating your proposition I am under no obligation to do such; but I will so do in due time. But now, while on this "finger-putting" business, since it seems to be rather a mania with him to call on me to put my "finger" on passages, suppose you, Mr. Bradley, put your finger on the passage that says that man is "wholly mortal." "Where is the passage that says so in so many words?" Pardon me, friends. That is babyish, and not necessary to the establishment of a proposition. A passage, the collation of passages, or a logical deduction from the scriptures is sufficient. Remember, Mr. Bradley says that "the spirit in man is no part of the man." [Time expired.]

BRADLEY'S SECOND AFFIRMATIVE

Gentlemen Moderators, Ladies and Gentlemen:

I am still happy to come before you to continue the investigation of the word of God as respects the proposition that I am affirming, for I know that my proposition is the truth of God's word. I am somewhat surprised that my opponent did not produce a single argument on the question, and, therefore, leaves the question untouched. I am surprised at the way that he treated the scriptures that I have introduced in this debate and the arguments that I have made. He seems to think that all he has to say is to declare what I say to be far from the truth, and then make fun of something that I have said, and then say "Shucks!" or "Pshaw!" and you all have his answer to my arguments. I am ashamed that I have met this man in debate. Let us remember that the questions that we are here to investigate are sacred, and we should not think that we are here to have a big time.

Respected friends, the proposition that I am affirming is according to the word of God. Man is wholly mortal and unconscious from death till the resurrection. That is the question, and I am thankful that I am on the affirmative side of the question; and you will ever find me on that side of the question, for I believe it to be the truth, and I expect to show you that it is before this debate closes.

Mr. Nichol asks the question as to how there can be a resurrection, according to the position that I am contending for. I wonder, according to the position that he is contending for, what will be the use of a resurrection. Will you tell us, please?

I am still certain that my proposition is the truth of the book of God; but I am somewhat surprised that my opponent did not bring up something in the negative, for you know that he is a great logician and debater, and I am somewhat surprised that he has absolutely failed to bring up anything on the side that he is on in this question. We will see what he will do in the future. But, so far as the book of God is concerned, I know that he can't prove anything contrary to the proposition that I am affirming. That man is wholly mortal and unconscious from death till the resurrection is abundantly taught in the word of God, as I will show before this debate is closed.

When man dies, he ceases to exist as a conscious being; and being unconscious in death, he can't hope for anything while he is dead.

If my opponent and the rest of you people will lay aside your prejudice and look at this question in an unbiased manner, I am certain that I can prove to you that some of you do not know as much about this question as you think you do. It is hard to teach the people the truth when they have their hearts full of prejudice, and it seems that my opponent wants to raise all the prejudice against me that he can; but I thank God that some of the people are seeing the truth, and I am satisfied that some of them will see it in this debate and be honest enough to acknowledge it.

I am at a loss to know where to begin in this speech, for my friend has not produced anything for me to reply to. Perhaps this speech will not be as interesting as some others, for I have nothing to reply to, and all the arguments that I produced were from the Bible. I would like for my friend to come up with some argument on this question, that we may have some debating and make this matter interesting to the people; but it seems that he is not going to do it, and, therefore, we will have to do the

very best that we can and be patient in this matter. I will do the best that I can to show you that I am advocating the truth of God on the question. I am certain that my friend knows that he is wrong on this question, and that there are no arguments for him to bring up.

Respected friends, you note that my friend, Mr. Nichol, tried to take points that I made in my speech and turn them round and make them look his way; but he made a failure, and so he lost clear out on that speech. All that he said in his last speech amounted to less than nothing (and he knows it, too), so far as the proposition is concerned; but he had to put in his time, so he had to say something. He knows that he has no arguments that he can make on this subject, and the proposition is lost, so far as he is concerned. I can see that in Charlie's look. You can see by the way that he looks that he thinks that he is gone up.

Now, respected friends, I want to say a few things in reply to what he said in his speech. It seems that he is bent on misrepresenting me every time he speaks of what I say. He just twists what I say a little. I did not say that "Christ in us is the inner man," and he knows that I did not say any such thing, too. But I am not surprised that he misrepresents me that way. He can't reply to what I say; so he just twists what I say a little, and then he replies to that. Now you just watch him, and you will see that he does just as I tell you that he does. No, sir; I did not say that "Christ in you" is the inner man. I said that "Christ in you, the hope of glory," is the inner man. Not only do I say this, but it is the teaching of the book of God. Mr. Nichol, if the inner man is the spirit in man and the spirit is immortal, will you please tell us how it can be renewed? Can you renew immortality? Will you please tell us about this matter? p. 16

Mr. Nichol insists that I was not as explicit as I should have been in defining my proposition. I am sorry that he

did not fully understand me. I believe that it takes body, soul, and spirit to make the living man. The spirit of man, the "pneuma," is the wind, breath, mind, intellect. "Spirit" is from the Greek word "pneuma," and has three different meanings. The word "soul" is from the Greek word "psuche," and means the animal life. "Pneuma"—the mind, or spirit. Man has a body, mind, and soul. This is the living man. It takes the body, soul, and the spirit to make the living man. You will remember that God created man out of the dust of the ground and breathed into his nostrils the breath of life. The spirit is no part of the man, but is something that God gave, or placed in the man after he had created, or formed, man out of the dust of the ground.

Paul says: "I pray God that your whole spirit and soul and body be preserved until the coming of our Lord Jesus Christ." My friends, if there was an immortal spirit about man, it would be preserved till the Lord comes. If there is an immortal spirit in man, it cannot be destroyed; it must be preserved. The spirit in man lives, but it is mortal, for man is wholly mortal.

My friends, God created man out of the dust of the ground, as he declared in Gen. 2:7, and then gave him that which made him live. He breathed into the man the breath of life, that which caused him to become a living soul; but man was created out of the dust of the ground and at death returns to the dust, as the book of God says.

Now let us look at the scriptures that go to confirm the position that I am contending for. I read you first, respected friends, Job 34:14, 15: "If he set his heart upon man, if he gather unto himself his spirit and his breath; all flesh shall perish together, and man shall return again unto dust." What can be plainer, my friends, when you note the connections? God created man out of the dust of the ground; and when he dies, when God takes the breath of life away from him, he returns to

the dust. What can be plainer than the fact that man is wholly mortal?

Now, respected friends, I invite your attention to the scripture that plainly teaches that when a man dies he is unconscious. Let us read Ps. 146:3, 4: "Put not your trust in princes, nor in the son of man, in whom there is no help. His breath goeth forth, he returneth to his earth; in that very day his thoughts perish." The passage is so plain that it does not need comment. The plain statement of the word of God is that man dies, and that very day his thoughts perish. I wonder if Elder Nichol will take the position that a man is conscious when his thoughts have perished? The book of God says that the very day that a man dies his thoughts perish; therefore I contend that he is unconscious from death till the resurrection, and I contend correctly in so doing. Mr. Nichol, will you please come up and grapple with this question, or will you lack the courage, like you did this morning, to deal with the question? Man's breath goes forth; he returns to the dust; and that very day his thoughts perish. He is most certainly unconscious till the resurrection, as my proposition says.

Let us read Ps. 90:10: "The days of our years are threescore years and ten; and if by reason of strength they be fourscore years, yet is their strength labor and sorrow; for it is soon cut off, and we fly away." No matter what the length of a man's days may be, sooner or later he must die; and when death comes for man, David says that he flies away. Now let us read from the book of God where he flies to. I read, respected friends, from Job 20:8-11: "He shall fly away as a dream, and shall not be found: yea, he shall be chased away as a vision of the night. The eye also which saw him shall see him no more; neither shall his place any more behold him. His children shall seek to please the poor, and his hands shall restore their goods. His bones are full of the sin of his youth, which shall lie down with

him in the dust." Thus we see that man flies away to the dust when he dies. My friend would have you believe that man flies away to heaven when he dies, and that he is not then dead, but that he continues to live; but the word of God says that when man dies he flies away to the dust. I tell you, my friends, there is a question between us as to whether man dies or whether he still lives, when the book of God says that he is dead. I am contending that when the Bible says that a man is dead, he is dead, and not still alive, and has flown away to heaven, but that he has returned to the dust, as the book of God says. It is really a question as to whether the Bible is true and whether you will believe what the Bible says, or will you believe what Elder Nichol says? Some of you may believe him on this subject, but I am satisfied that the most of you will take what the word of God says in preference to what he says.

Let us now read 1 Pet. 1:24: "For all flesh is as grass, and all the glory of man as the flower of grass. The grass withered, and the flower thereof falleth away." Thus you see, respected friends, that all the way through the word of God everything goes to show that man is wholly mortal. Hear James 1:9-11: "Let the brother of low degree rejoice in that he is exalted: but the rich, in that he is made low: because as the flower of the grass he shall pass away. For the sun is no sooner risen with a burning heat, but it withereth the grass, and the flower thereof falleth, and the grace of the fashion of it perisheth: so also shall the rich man fade away in his ways." I don't know how anything can be plainer. As the grass passes away, just so man dies. But hear James in the fourth chapter and the fourteenth verse: "For what is your life? It is even a vapor that appeareth for a little time, and then vanisheth away." Does that look like there is anything immortal about you, my friends? I tell you that the teaching of the book of God is that man is wholly mortal, and that when a man dies he is

unconscious till the resurrection of the dead? You will see this plainer as the debate goes on and we have the time to put all the truth before you on this subject and examine the passages that are relied on to prove to the contrary.

Let us now read 2 Cor. 5:1-9: "For we know that if our earthly house of this tabernacle were dissolved, we have a building of God, a house not made with hands, eternal in the heavens. For in this we groan, earnestly desiring to be clothed upon with our house which is from heaven; if so be that being clothed we shall not be found naked. For we that are in this tabernacle do groan, being burdened; not that we would be unclothed, but clothed upon, that mortality might be swallowed up of life. Now he that hath wrought us for the selfsame thing is God, who also hath given us the earnest of the Spirit. Therefore we are always confident, knowing that, while we are at home in the body, we are absent from the Lord: (for we walk by faith, not by sight:) we are confident, I say, and willing rather to be absent from the body, and to be present with the Lord. Wherefore we labor, that, whether present or absent, we may be accepted of him." In this scripture Paul speaks of the time when he will be present with the Lord, and that will not be till we are resurrected, at which time we will be immortalized, as Paul says in 1 Cor. 15: 54, 55: "So when this corruptible shall have put on incorruption, and the mortal shall have put on immortality, then shall be brought to pass the saying that is written, Death is swallowed up in victory. O death, where is thy sting? O grave, where is thy victory?" Yes, sir; when we come forth from the grave, we will then be immortalized, and not before; we will then be with the Lord; and that is the time that Paul speaks of in the scripture that I read about being absent from the body and present with the Lord. That which is immortal cannot die. Man does die; therefore man is not immortal; but, on the other hand, man is mortal, as

the Scriptures plainly declare. "Shall mortal man be more just than God?"

Respected friends, my opponent says that I teach that when a man dies he dies like the little dog Rover. Now he just makes that comparison to try to create prejudice against me in this discussion. He knows that I don't compare man to a dog. I am sorry that he has to resort to such things to try to carry his points in this debate; but he has to do something, for he knows that there is nothing in the Bible for his side of this question. My friends, I do not want you all to think that I teach that man is no more than a dog, for I do not teach any such; and it seems to me that my opponent should know that I don't believe that stuff, and I think that he does know it; but that is his way of treating an opponent in debate. This is not the first time that I have had to deal with him in debate.

Now, my friends, let us again note some of the plain scriptures. Gen. 2:7: "And the Lord God formed man of the dust of the ground, and breathed into his nostrils the breath of life; and man became a living soul." I want to impress on your mind the fact, respected friends, that God formed man out of the dust of the ground and breathed the breath of life into the man; that the breath of life is something that was given to the man. Now when man dies, what becomes of him? Let us read from the book of God and see what the divine truth of inspiration says becomes of man when he dies. I now invite your attention to Gen. 2:15-17: "And the Lord God took the man, and put him in the garden of Eden to dress and to keep it. And the Lord God commanded the man, saying, Of every tree of the garden thou mayest freely eat: but of the tree of the knowledge of good and evil, thou shalt not eat of it: for in the day that thou eatest thereof thou shalt surely die." Now, my friends, from this passage we learn that God created man out of the dust of the ground, and placed the man

that he created in the garden of Eden, and said unto him—the man that he had created—that he could freely eat of all the fruits of the garden except the fruit of the tree of knowledge of good and evil; but if he ate of that fruit, he was to surely die. Who was it that would surely die? “Thou”—the man that God created, the man that God placed in the garden of Eden, the very man of my proposition. Now when he died, was it the man, or just part of the man? Let us read Gen. 3:19-23: “In the sweat of the face shalt thou eat bread, till thou return unto the ground; for out of it wast thou taken: for dust thou art, and unto dust shall thou return. And Adam called his wife’s name Eve; because she was the mother of all living. Unto Adam also and to his wife did the Lord God make coats of skins, and clothed them. And the Lord God said, Behold, the man is become as one of us, to know good and evil: and now, lest he put forth his hand, and take also of the tree of life, and eat, and live forever: therefore the Lord God sent him forth from the garden of Eden, to till the ground from whence he was taken.” What can be plainer, respected friends? God says that he created man out of the dust of the ground, and says plainly that he shall return to the ground from whence he was taken. God says of the first man that he created out of the dust of the ground that his name was Adam. Now let us read and see what became of this man Adam that was created out of the dust of the ground and that God said was to return to the ground from whence he was taken. I read Gen. 5:5: “And all the days that Adam lived were nine hundred and thirty years; and he died.” Who was it that died? The book of God says that Adam was created out of the dust of the ground, and that he (Adam) lived nine hundred and thirty years, and he (Adam) died—returned to the ground from whence he was taken. My friends, all the book of God goes to show that man is wholly mortal, and that when man is dead, he is dead,

and not alive. My friends, we must all die; and when we die, we will return to the ground from whence we have been taken.

I have not time in this speech to offer other arguments in support of my affirmation, but I want you to note what I have said and see how my opponent treats the arguments that I have made on this question. I want to say again that if he will find a passage that says that man is immortal I want to see it, and I will give up the debate when he finds the scripture that says that man is not unconscious when he dies.

Listen to the book of God: "Shall mortal man be more just than God?" There is the plain statement that man is mortal. And then listen again to the passage in Ps. 146:4: "His breath goeth forth, he returneth to his earth; in that very day his thoughts perish." If there was not another passage in all the book of God on this subject, this is enough to convince you all, it seems to me. [Time expired.]

NICHOL'S SECOND NEGATIVE.

Gentlemen Moderators, Ladies and Gentlemen:

My opponent complains about my method of following him. I am not one bit surprised. I knew he would get sore, but I hardly expected him to complain so much in his second speech. He evidently expected me to take the lead in my speech, but he reckoned without his host. He tells us that he does not know how to proceed. Indeed, we all knew that he was checkmated; but admitting the fact is not one of the peculiarities of Mr. Bradley.

The contention of the gentleman is a very depressing doctrine—quite cheerless. According to the carnal doctrine he advocates, man can't hope for a life of happiness in another world. At most he can no more than hope that there will be, at the time we call the resurrection, beings created that will be happy in the unending world. Mr. Bradley says that when man dies he ceases to exist as a being; that everything that goes to constitute man dies; he ceases to exist—becomes as though he had never been. If that be true, none that die will enjoy the glory world. Those, if there are any in glory, will be the ones that are created at the resurrection. So far as another world is concerned, the humans of this life are without hope, according to the doctrine of Bradley. His theory insists that man at death ceases to exist, and that is before the inauguration of the glory world. If true, then man is necessarily without hope as respects it; for hope has to do only with things that we hope to enjoy while we exist. With the materialist, hope does not see a star nor hear the rustle of a wing. No cheering ray of promise of that better land and saint's bright home greets his vision. Amid all the disappointments, trials, vexa-

tions, tribulations, and cares of this life, he looks to death to end it all; for his theory assures him that at death he will cease to exist. There awaits him darkness, night unending, with the pall of oblivion for a winding sheet.

My opponent objects that I assure you that he teaches that when man dies he ceases to exist. I am prepared to prove my statement. Mr. Bradley, did you write this letter? [Nichol displays a letter.] Did you write it, sir? [Bradley: "Yes; but where did you get it?" Nichol: "That doesn't matter; you see that I have it, with your autograph to it, too."]

Now for the truth of my statement that you do teach that man ceases to exist at death. I read the question submitted to Mr. Bradley and his answer, as I have it here in his own handwriting:

"Question: 'Since man is wholly mortal, when he dies, doesn't he cease to exist?' Answer: 'As a conscious being, he does. But the material of which he is composed still exists. God formed *man* of the *dust* of the *ground* and breathed into his nostrils the breath of life, and *man* became a living soul. That breath goes forth, *he* dies, and that very day his thoughts perish. Now he has ceased to exist as a conscious being. But the body returns to the earth as it was, and spirit (breath, 'ruach') has returned to God who gave it. So we see the material still exists, hence can be resurrected.'" (A. S. Bradley, December 7, 1905.)

Now you have it. Mr. Bradley, when I make a statement, I am prepared to prove it. Sir, you teach that when man dies he ceases to exist. But he says that the material of which his body was composed still exists. Certainly; but the material out of which God created Adam existed before God created him, but Adam did not exist before he was created. According to the gentleman, when man dies there is no more man than there was before God created Adam, the first man.

Again, I predict that he will deny the resurrection before this debate closes and contend for a recreation, which his doctrine logically demands.

He is no little incensed, though I think it is feigned, because I said that he taught that man died like the little dog Rover—"all over." Well, in this letter you have the proof. Of man Bradley says: When he dies, "the body returns to the earth as it was." Well, doesn't the body of little dog Rover return to the earth as it was? Of man he says: "That breath goes forth, *he* dies." True, but doesn't the breath of little dog Rover go forth, too? Of man he says: "But the material of which he is composed still exists." True, most certainly; but doesn't the material of which little dog Rover is composed still exist when he dies? But of man he says: When he dies, "he has ceased to exist as a conscious being." Not true; but grant it for the argument. When little dog Rover dies, does he not cease to exist as a conscious dog? Don't, don't, friends; don't laugh at the poor fellow. Some one asks: How about the spirit in man? Bradley says in this letter that the spirit is the breath; and since the dog and the man breathe the same air, they have the same breath, the same spirit, according to my opponent.

Mr. Bradley says again that he is ashamed that he met me in debate. You became ashamed too late, sir. Your failure this time is no greater than in the two preceding debates in which you have engaged.

He now changes position on the "inner man," and says that "Christ in you the hope of glory is the inner man." This does not help him out of the difficulty. If "Christ in you the hope of glory" is the inner man, then Paul desired that "Christ in you the hope of glory" should be strengthened, that Christ might dwell in their hearts by faith. Try again, Bradley.

Mr. Bradley inquires: "If the inner man is immortal, how can it be renewed?" "'Renewed:' 'Anakainoo' (pres. pass. 'anakainoumai')—a word peculiar to the

apostle Paul; prop., to *cause* to grow up ('ana') new, to make new; pass., new strength and vigor is given to me; 2 Cor. 4:16, to change into a new kind of life, opposed to the former corrupt state, Col. 3:10." (Thayer.)

The gentleman says that it takes body, soul, and spirit to make the living man. Very well. But don't forget he says that the spirit is no part of the man of his proposition; that the man of his proposition was formed out of the dust of the ground, and the spirit is no part of man.

He defines "spirit:" "'Pneuma'—wind, breath, mind, intellect." Mr. Bradley, does the "wind, breath, mind, intellect" live? Next he says that the "spirit of man is mortal." Don't forget; does the wind, breath, mind, or intellect live? God is the Father of spirits (Heb. 12:9)—i. e., God is the Father of wind, breath, mind, intellect. "When Jesus had thus said, he was troubled in spirit"—i. e., troubled in breath; had the asthma, eh? We must "cleanse ourselves from all filthiness of the flesh and spirit" (2 Cor. 7:1)—i. e., cleanse ourselves from filthiness of the flesh and breath—use perfumed tooth soap. We must have a "meek and quiet spirit" (1 Pet. 3:4)—i. e., we must have a quiet breath—must not snore. Brother Moderator, you are a goner, for you snore in a high key; but you are unconscious of the fact; and since you are unconscious, possibly there is some hope for you. How about it, Mr. Bradley?

Mr. Bradley, what do "breath" and "spirit" mean in this passage? "If he set his heart upon man, if he gather unto himself his spirit and his breath." (Job 34:14.)

I am glad to note some improvement in my opponent. In my former debates with him he contended that the spirit in man was neither mortal nor immortal; that it did not live; therefore could not die. Now he says that the spirit in man lives, but is mortal, though it is no part

of man. Possibly by the time I meet him again he will be ready to accept the truth.

The gentleman invites our attention to Gen. 2:7: "And the Lord God formed man of the dust of the ground, and breathed into his nostrils the breath of life; and man became a living soul." Commenting on this passage, he says the breath caused the man to live, produced the life. But hear him in the Word of Work of March, 1906. [Nichol reads from the paper named.] I have here in this paper a list of six questions presented to Mr. Bradley by Mr. J. J. Holt. The second question is: "'Gen. 2: 7: Does not breath of life mean that the breath caused or produced the life?' Answer: 'Yes'." (A. S. Bradley, in Word of Work.)

Wonderful information that! If he be correct, a novice in logic can easily see that if "breath of life" means that the breath produced the life, the preposition "of" denotes causation. The same tyro can apply the same method of argumentation to the expression "man of God" (2 Tim. 3:17), and what will he have? If "breath of life" means, as Bradley says, that the breath caused or produced the life, then the expression "man of God" means that man produced God; that all the God there is, is the product of man—the work of man's hands. Here, as in many other places, this infidel system denies God. The whole system is a root of atheism. You need only follow any one of its peculiar tenets to reach the tree. The advocates of this system have thrown over them the cloak of religion to hide their infidelity; and when the cloak is thrown aside, they cry: "Persecution, misrepresentation!" The greatest misrepresentation that you can make respecting the things peculiar to Bradley is to say that such things are taught in the Bible.

Mr. Bradley asked me in his last speech this morning if I taught that people who do not believe as I do would be lost. I did not answer, for he was making his last speech on that proposition, and I would have had no

reply to what he might have said, as I had made my last speech on that proposition. In his last speech he repeats the question. I answer: Sir, I preach the gospel; and only those who believe and obey the same will be saved.

He is very anxious that I pay my respects to Ps. 146: 3, 4. From this passage the gentleman seems to think that he has made an argument that cannot be answered. It is a pleasure to me to give him the information that he so badly needs. The passage: "Put not your trust in princes, nor in the son of man, in whom there is no help. His breath goeth forth, he returneth to his earth; in that very day his thoughts perish." The opposition contends that if man is conscious after death he has "thoughts;" but since this passage says that man's thoughts perish the day of his death, he concludes that the man that is in death is unconscious. This is a passage from the twilight of the old dispensation, before life and immortality were brought to light through the gospel. In the passage the "thoughts" are said to perish. Is this true literally? Is it not true that the thoughts of Franklin, Bacon, et al., are still in existence and will ever be passed from generation to generation? "Let the wicked forsake his way, and the unrighteous man his thoughts." (Isa. 55:7.) Must the wicked man quit thinking? I submit that the word "thoughts" in the passage by my opponent introduced is the "purposes of the man." "My days are past, my purposes are broken off, even the thoughts of my heart." (Job 17:11.) Note, "my purposes are broken off, even the thoughts of my heart." In that very day his thoughts—purposes—perish. Again: "The counsel of the Lord standeth forever, the thoughts of his heart to all generations." (Ps. 33:11.) The thoughts—purposes—of his heart. Put not your trust in princes, for they die, and that very day their thoughts—unaccomplished purposes—perish.

My attention is again invited to the number of

passages which state that man dies—viz., Gen. 2:7, 15, 17; 3:19-23. Certainly there is not the disposition on the part of any man to deny these passages. They do not remotely resemble the proof that Mr. Bradley needs. Man is a triune being, composed of body, soul, and spirit. Of man it is said: We are the offspring of God. (Acts 17:28.) God is the "Father of spirits." The spirit of man is the part of man that knows and at death returns to God. The body, the body *only*, returns to dust. (Eccles. 12:7.) The spirit is not of the dust, and does not return to the dust. When Christ died, his body was laid in the sepulcher of Joseph; but his spirit he commended into the hands of God, and it to paradise went.

The gentleman read the account of Dorcas, and asked me if there were two "Dorcases." Let us read the passage: "Now there was at Joppa a certain disciple named Tabitha, which by interpretation is called Dorcas: this woman was full of good works and almsdeeds which she did. And it came to pass in those days, that she was sick, and died: whom when they had washed, they laid her in an upper chamber. And forasmuch as Lydda was nigh to Joppa, and the disciples had heard that Peter was there, they sent unto him two men, desiring him that he would not delay to come to them. Then Peter arose and went with them. When he was come, they brought him into the upper chamber: and all the widows stood by him weeping, and showing the coats and garments which Dorcas made, while she was with them. But Peter put them all forth, and kneeled down, and prayed; and turning him to the body said, Tabitha, arise. And she opened her eyes: and when she saw Peter, she sat up." (Acts 9:36-40.) Dorcas died. Mr. Bradley says that all the Dorcas there was was what was there in the upper room. Then all the Dorcas there was was the *body*, for Peter turned to the "body." The woman showed Peter the garments Dorcas made "while she was with them." What was it that was gone—not

with them? The spirit. The spirit returned to God, who gave it. (Eccles. 12:7.) "And it came to pass, as her soul was in departing, (for she died)." (Gen. 35:18.) "And he stretched himself upon the child three times, and cried unto the Lord, and said, O Lord my God, I pray thee, let this child's soul come into him again. And the Lord heard the voice of Elijah; and the soul of the child came into him again, and he revived." (1 Kings 17:21, 22.) The spirit had left the body of Dorcas. She had ceased to abide in the house of clay—the body. "Yea, I think it meet, as long as I am in this tabernacle, to stir you up, by putting you in remembrance; knowing that shortly I must put off this my tabernacle, even as our Lord Jesus Christ hath showed me." (2 Pet. 1:13, 14.) Mr. Bradley talks about the life of Dorcas dying. Pshaw! Bradley, what will you say next? Do you not know that such an expression is a contradiction of terms? Dead life, eh?

Mr. Bradley defines "soul" to mean "life." Let us try his definition, substituting "life" for "soul:" "And man became a living soul"—i. e., living life. Sir?

[Mr. Bradley: "I said that the soul was the animal life." Mr. Nichol: "Very well. And man became a 'living animal life.' Is that any better? Do you think there can be a dead life? Do you not know that to say 'living animal life' is absurd?"]

Mr. Bradley defines "death" thus: "When God takes away the breath by which we are animated." In his last speech he says "death is the separation of the breath from the body;" and the breath, he says, is the spirit. Wrong again, as usual. Mr. Bradley, death is not separation, nor is separation death. James says: "The body without the spirit is dead." The separation causes the body to be without the spirit, and is the cause of the death, but is not death itself. Separation is the cause of the death of the body, but is it the cause of the death of anything else? By what acceptable

authority has it been said that the spirit without the body is dead? Who knows, and how does he know, that the separation of the spirit from the body affects the spirit as it does the body? When the spirit and the body separate, does the spirit take away anything essential to the body, or does the body retain anything essential to the spirit? If it is either one way or the other, the separation is not complete. When the separation takes place, the body goes to the grave, with all its essential elements, and the spirit to God, with all of its essential properties. The body goes to the grave and is unconscious, for consciousness is not a property of the body; the spirit goes to God with its consciousness, because consciousness is the intellectual quality of the spirit. The body lost nothing in the separation essential to its being the body; the spirit lost nothing in the separation essential to its being the spirit. Did God give man an unconscious spirit? If "Yes," then consciousness is of the dust and must return to the dust after the separation; for if the spirit is unconscious, then consciousness is of the dust. Bosh! If God gave man a conscious spirit, and he did (2 Cor. 2:11), then consciousness is the nature of the spirit, and that nature was pleasing to God; and hence God will not change it, and the devil cannot; still some of his preachers are trying to convince the people that he has.

The doctrine taught by my opponent is Sadduceism revamped. The Sadducees had no use in their life nor place in their vocabulary for the word "eternal" as respected man. With them everything was bounded by this life. "Eternal" by them was a word applied to God or his attributes. In their estimation, man was wholly mortal—material. When his body returned to the dust, that was the last of him. With this idea they could not think of a resurrection, and with such an idea they asked Christ: "Whose wife will she be in the resurrection?" With the Sadducees there were neither angels nor

spirits; hence the difference in the speech of the Sadducees and the Pharisees. The Sadducees needed no term to describe anything of unending duration belonging to or connected with man. With them there was no bliss eternal beyond this lapsed state for man. They measured everything by time, long or short. Mr. Bradley's doctrine is the same as that of the ancient Sadducees, slightly changed, though he is not as logical as they were. Mr. Bradley declares that man is wholly mortal—that he ceases to exist at death. If such be true, there can't be a resurrection, unless you can resurrect something that doesn't exist; and this the Sadducees were logical enough to know. But grant for the argument that his doctrine admits of a resurrection, which it doesn't; that the righteous of this life will be resurrected and given eternal life in the other world; I insist that it will only last one thousand years, if Mr. Bradley is right in his contention. He says that the word "eternal," from the word "aionion," should be rendered "age lasting." Then what? The righteous are to receive "age-lasting" life. When? At the resurrection, says Mr. Bradley. Then it is at the beginning of another age that they are to receive the "age-lasting" life. Again, Mr. Bradley says that Christ is coming in the clouds and great glory and establish his kingdom at the beginning, or the inauguration, of the millennium age, and the saints are to be resurrected, given "age-lasting" life, and reign with him. How long will this life last that they receive at the resurrection? "Age lasting." But how long is this "millennium age?" Only one thousand years. Then the saints will have life for only one thousand years. According to your doctrine, granting that it admits of a resurrection which it doesn't, saints and sinners will cease to exist at the end of the millennium. The hope of eternal life, per your doctrine, is all a farce.

IN THE IMAGE OF GOD.

Everything, animate and inanimate, can scripturally claim God as its Creator. Mankind only is the offspring of God. "Forasmuch then as we are the offspring of God." (Acts 17:29.) The word in the original language of the New Testament that expresses the relationship between father and son also expresses the relationship between man and God. God is not the Father of animals, is not the Father of man as to flesh, because the father of flesh and Father of spirits are contrasted. "Furthermore we have had fathers of our flesh who corrected us, and we gave them reverence: shall we not much rather be in subjection to the Father of spirits, and live?" (Heb. 12:9.) This suggests the inward and outward man spoken of in 2 Cor. 4:16. This view of man is unique, and peculiarly relates to man. No one from any authoritative source has heard of an inward and outward horse or dog. The outward man—flesh—is produced by procreative law; but God alone is the Father of the inward man—the spirit. Here we have God, who is wholly a spirit being ("for God is a Spirit"), revealed to us as the Father of the inward man, who is also a spirit being. The outward man is the offspring of the man of flesh, but the inward man is the offspring of God. Thus it is seen that the body and spirit are from different sources. The outward man, invested with procreative powers, produces the outward man only; but God, independent of the powers of the outward man, produces the inward man—the spirit being. Body and soul are common to man and the lower order of animals, but these features in common to man and beast do not contain the *image* of God; for if they do, God created beasts in his image. The elements of "body and soul" cannot give the title of "offspring of God," for then beasts are his offspring. God, scripturally speaking, is not the Father of the outward man, but the Creator of the body. Through

birth, or procreative law, power with which the primitive pair were invested, bodies are today brought into existence. God is the Father of the inward man, and that without the assistance of the flesh. The inward man, therefore, is more closely related than the animal qualities of the body. The inward man, then, sustains the closest relationship to God and no essential relationship to the flesh. Being without any relationship to the flesh, the inward man is not subject to the destiny of the flesh. The inward man is absolutely a spirit being, fathered by God, in the image of God, and not subject to decomposition or mortality.

I have time in this address to pay my respects to 1 Pet. 3:1-4: "Likewise, ye wives, be in subjection to your own husbands; that, if any obey not the word, they may also without the word be won by the conversation of the wives; while they behold your chaste conversation coupled with fear. Whose adorning let it not be that outward adorning of plaiting the hair, and wearing of gold, or putting on of apparel; but let it be the hidden man of the heart, in that which is not corruptible, even the ornament of a meek and quiet spirit, which is in the sight of God of great price." Please note: (1) Outward adorning is not the only thing mentioned in this passage. (2) The contrast is between the outer adorning and the *inner* adorning. (3) The contrast is between the "apparel"—braided hair—and "meek and quiet spirit." Both are represented as ornaments for the man. (4) The spirit is within; but for it to be an ornament it must show itself, and it does so in the person. In the one case you see the display of apparel and braided hair—adornment; and by the gaudy, ostentatious display you know the character of the person. This, says Peter, is not the adornment which Christians should have. On the other hand, you notice such chastity of words and uprightness of actions that they indicate a different character—a Christian—of which the "meek and quiet

spirit" is the adornment. (5) In the one instance the "kosmos," ornament, is the braiding of the hair—the display of dress; in the other, the "kosmos," ornament, is the "kruptos tes kardias"—the hidden man of the heart. Believers and disbelievers each have an inner man; and for that reason "kruptos anthropos" is not here that which is to be adorned, but is itself the adornment, and consists in the incorruptible (ornament) of a "meek and quiet spirit." In this passage Peter affirms that man has an incorruptible spirit, but please note that the word "incorruptible" is from the Greek word "apthartos;" and the same word is used in 1 Tim. 1:17: "Now unto the King eternal, immortal ["apthartos"], invisible, the only wise God, be honor and glory for ever and ever." In this passage note the word rendered "immortal." Peter says we have an immortal spirit. There is my finger on the passage, Mr. Bradley. I will give you others if you need them.

Now let us take the passage just as it reads in the King James translation and study it for a moment. In the passage there are at least four things mentioned: (1) Outward adorning and outward man; (2) inward adorning and inner man—hidden man of the heart; (3) the outward adorning was to be put ON the outward man; (4) the inward adorning was not to be put on, but IN, something, and that something is called the hidden man of the heart—the inner man. The ornament that was to be put IN the inner man, or *hidden man of the heart*, is indicated by "meek and quiet." This ornament is to be put IN that which is not corruptible. But the word "incorruptible" is from the Greek word "apthartos," and is rendered "immortal" in 1 Tim. 1:17. Then the ornament was to be in that which is not corruptible, in that which is immortal; but the ornament was to be in the hidden man of the heart—the inner man, the spirit. Therefore the spirit of man is immortal.

"In the way of righteousness is life; and in the path-

way thereof there is no death." (Prov. 12:28.) And again: "Your heart shall live forever."

Thank you, ladies and gentlemen. [Time expired.]

BRADLEY'S THIRD AFFIRMATIVE.

Gentlemen Moderators, Ladies and Gentlemen:

I am happy to come before you this morning to resume the investigation of the word of God. Many of you present this morning were not here yesterday, and for that reason I will state the question again. I am affirming that man is wholly mortal and unconscious from death till the resurrection. That the Scriptures teach this I am certain, and certain that I am able to show you all that this is the truth of the word of God. Those of you present yesterday afternoon know that there was nothing in the last speech of my opponent that contributed to the proof of the contention that he makes or that goes to disprove the position that I am making on this question. He leaves the real question untouched, and the arguments that I have made on the question have not been touched, much less answered. I was in hopes that my friend would grapple with the position and the arguments that I produce, and that we would have some real debating on this question: but he seems disposed to raise some side issue and talk about that all the time. The trouble is, the points that I make do not fit the speeches that he has prepared for this occasion; and he must say his speeches, whether they fit or not. Respected friends, the things that I say in this debate come direct from the word of God, are the truth of inspiration, and cannot be overthrown. I am very careful to present only what is revealed in the book of God, for I know that I will be held accountable for what I say; therefore I cannot afford to teach that which is not true on this or any other subject.

My opponent wants me to say what the soul of man

is. I think I have made that matter plain to you all before, but I will again state it. The soul is the animal life.

Now, respected friends, I wish to continue to call your attention to the scriptures that confirm the position that I am contending for in this debate, for I know that the only way to prove my proposition is to appeal to the divine truth of God. I say that the Bible is the only proof that we have on this matter, and by the truth of God I am going to show you that I am right in the contention that I make on this proposition. I want you to continually note that my opponent leaves the arguments that I make unnoticed, and it is because he has no points to meet them with. It is not because he is not able to meet all the arguments that I make, if he only had any truth on his side of the question.

Now let us read Job 4:17: "Shall mortal man be more just than God? shall a man be more pure than his maker?" My opponent has been asking me for a passage that says that man is wholly mortal or that teaches that man is wholly mortal. In this passage you find the plain statement "mortal man." You remember that the Bible says that God created man out of the dust of the ground, and in this passage it says that man is "mortal;" therefore my proposition is true.

But let us read further on this very point. I invite your attention to 1 Tim. 6:14-16. I read from the Twentieth Century New Testament, which I think expresses the truth of the matter clearer than the King James translation. Hear the reading: "I urge you to keep his command, free from stain or reproach, until the appearance of Jesus Christ, our Lord. This will be brought about in his own time by the one ever blessed Potentate, the King of all kings and Lord of all lords, who alone is possessed of immortality and dwells in unapproachable light, whom no mortal has ever seen or ever can see, and to whom be ascribed honor and power forever. Amen." This passage plainly says that man

is wholly mortal by saying that God alone has immortality. Certainly we now have the proof of my proposition. Job says that man is mortal, and Paul says that God alone has immortality. If this is true of God, man does not have immortality.

I now read a passage that Mr. Nichol reads in nearly every speech that he makes. Eccles. 12:7: "Then shall the dust return to the earth as it was: and the spirit shall return to God who gave it." I believe that the spirit returns to God, who gave it. No, sir; the spirit was not created out of the dust of the ground. God created the man out of the dust of the ground, and placed the spirit in that man after he was created. Zech 12:1: "The burden of the word of the Lord for Israel, saith the Lord, which stretcheth forth the heavens, and layeth the foundation of the earth, and formeth the spirit of man within him." Thus you see that the spirit was placed in the man; and when man dies, he returns to the dust, and the spirit returns to God that gave it.

Now, Mr. Nichol, I want to ask you this question, rather these questions: (1) Is the spirit in man a creature? (2) Is the spirit of man in man at the beginning of man's existence? (3) If it is, how does it get there? (4) Does the soul die? Now, please notice these questions in your next speech and tell these people about them. Answer them clearly, so that we can tell just what you mean, and don't squirm around and try to get out of it and not answer them. My friend knows that he can't answer these questions satisfactorily before he undertakes it. Ain't that so, Charlie? My friend says that I do not produce any argument on the question; but that is for you, and not for him, to decide. He knows that I am producing the argument on the question that he can't answer, and he only said that to try to make you all believe that he has nothing to reply to. I have the word of God on my side of this question, and I am giving Charlie some trouble on this question, and you can see

it from the way he does. He is uneasy because he has no arguments, and he has sense enough to know it; for he has to go up against the Scriptures, and going up against the word of God is no small thing, for he knows that he can't refute what the Lord says about this matter; and I want you to know, friends, that it is hurting Charlie, and if you will watch, you can see it for yourselves. My friend comes up with this thing and that thing that has no connection with the subject, and gets off on that thing and this thing; but there is no debating about that, respected friends, and we don't have time for that. We came here to debate; and if we are not going to do it, I say let's quit. But let us get to the point and do some debating on this subject, for soon the time will be out that we have to give to this proposition (that is my ticket), and quit the foolishness.

My friend says: "When I was a schoolboy, about twelve years old, I took the notion to debate with my school-teacher; and he whipped me so badly that I have been ashamed of myself ever since for trying to debate with him." That was for you to understand that I am the twelve-year-old schoolboy and he is the teacher. I admit that I am illiterate, and I frequently make mistakes; but you can see that I am giving my friend much trouble in this matter. It shows on him plainly. But it is not me, however; it is the word of God that is hitting Charlie so hard, and that hurts him; and therefore he is uneasy, and you can see that for yourselves. I thank God that if I am weak in putting this question, I can rely on the strength of the Lord God Almighty to help me; and because I have the truth I am able to carry out my work successfully and to the winning point. You know that if I am as the twelve-year-old schoolboy and had to rely on myself, my friend could clean me up too quick; but I am thankful, as I say, that I have the word of God behind me, and I am going to stay with it to the end, for it is what proves the question; and we can rely on what the

Bible says, for it is the truth. Charlie is afraid of the arguments and the scriptures that I produce, and you can see it in him. I can, and I am certain that you all can. He is much better prepared than I am, for he has the advantage of an education, which I have not; but you see how much trouble I am giving him, and that he is not able to answer the arguments that I produce. As for a comparison of me with him, it is like a grain of sand compared with a mountain. I know this. But we will pass on, as this is not debating.

Well, I said that I had proved to you that man is wholly mortal, and I believe that I have, for there has been nothing brought against me to show that I have not, and I believe that you all, as intelligent people, can see this to be a fact.

Now, respected friends, let me continue to advance in proving my proposition. Let us read Gen. 2:7: "And the Lord God formed man of the dust of the ground, and breathed into his nostrils the breath of life; and man became a living soul." My friends, you cannot fail to see that the scripture declares that the man is created out of the dust of the ground, and that the spirit—the breath—is something given to the man after he was created, and is, therefore, no part of the man. My opponent, according to his position, has two men in one. He has an inner and an outer Adam. Now let me read Gen. 2:15-17: "And the Lord God took the man, and put him into the garden of Eden to dress it and to keep it. And the Lord God commanded the man, saying, Of every tree of the garden thou mayest freely eat: but of the tree of the knowledge of good and evil, thou shalt not eat of it: for in the day that thou eatest thereof thou shalt surely die." "Thou shalt surely die." Elder Nichol, since you say that there is an inner and an outer Adam, will you please tell which one died? For the book of God says that Adam did eat of the forbidden fruit. Respected friends, the man Adam was to die; it was the

man that God created, the man of my proposition. As proof that Adam died, that he was a mortal being, we read Gen. 3:22: "And the Lord God said, Behold, the man is become as one of us, to know good and evil: and now, lest he put forth his hand, and take also of the tree of life, and eat, and live forever." Thus you see, my friends, that Adam was not immortal; for God drives him forth from the garden, lest he should eat of the tree of life and live forever. The life was in the tree, and not in Adam. If Adam had been an immortal being, he would not have died, he could not have died; for that which is immortal cannot die.

But it is the inner Adam that could not die, according to the contention of my opponent. Let us see what it was that died. I read Gen. 5:5: "And all the days that Adam lived were nine hundred and thirty years: and he died." Who died? Adam, the man that God created—the man of my proposition. Yes, sir, Adam died; and so do all men since Adam sinned die just as Adam did; and in proof of this I read you Rom. 5:12: "Wherefore as by one man sin entered into the world, and death by sin; and so death passed upon all men, for that all have sinned." Just as Adam died, so all men must die. But what became of Adam when he died? Let the word of God answer. I read Gen. 3:19-23: "In the sweat of thy face shalt thou eat bread, till thou return unto the ground; for out of it wast thou taken: for dust thou art, and unto dust shalt thou return. And Adam called his wife's name Eve: because she was the mother of all living. Unto Adam also and to his wife did the Lord God make coats of skins, and clothed them. And the Lord God said, Behold, the man is become as one of us, to know good and evil: and now, lest he put forth his hand, and take also of the tree of life, and eat, and live forever: therefore the Lord God sent him forth from the garden of Eden, to till the ground from whence he was taken." This is the man of my proposition.

Respected friends, we will continue to read the scriptures that prove that we are dust, that man is wholly mortal, as I am affirming. Let us now read Ps. 103: 14: "For he knoweth our frame; he remembereth that we are dust." And, again (Isa. 64:8): "But now, O Lord, thou art our Father; we are the clay, and thou our potter; and we are all the work of thy hands." Thus you see that the same thing is taught all through the book of God. We are formed out of the dust; and, of course, we are dust; and so David says we are dust, we are clay, and when we die we return to the dust.

Listen, respected friends, while I read to you from Job. 34: 14, 15: "If he set his heart upon man, if he gather unto himself his spirit and his breath; all flesh shall perish together, and man shall turn again unto dust." Respected friends, I can continue to read you just such passages of scripture as this. If man returns to the dust, as the Bible says that he does, of course he don't know anything when he has returned to dust, and is, therefore, unconscious. Job 33:4: "The Spirit of God hath made me, and the breath of the Almighty hath given me life." God made man of the dust of the earth, and then he put the spirit in the man. The spirit in the man is no part of the man. The man is of the dust, and the spirit in man comes from God; and when man dies, the spirit returns to God, who gave it, and the man returns to the dust, from whence he was taken. Certainly man knows nothing when he has returned to the dust, and the Scriptures plainly say that he doesn't. "His breath goeth forth, he returneth to his earth, in that very day his thoughts perish." (Ps. 146:4). Will you all say that man is conscious when he has returned to the dust and his thoughts perished?

Now let us look at some other things in this connection. I read Isa. 38:1: "In those days was Hezekiah sick unto death. And Isaiah the prophet the son of Amoz came unto him, and said unto him, Thus saith the Lord,

Set thine house in order; for thou shalt die, and not live." I want to say, respected friends, that, according to Nichol, Isaiah is a back number; for, according to Nichol, man, when he dies, is dead and alive at the same time. He says that a man has hope after death and before the resurrection; and if that be true, he must be alive to hope; but the word of God says that the dead know not anything. Mr. Nichol says that the dead have hope. Then they are dead and alive at the same time. Just think of any such! What do you think of it, respected friends? The book of God says that man shall die and shall not live, and Mr. Nichol says that man dies and lives at the same time. Which do you believe, respected friends—the book of God or friend Nichol? Mr. Nichol teaches you that man can be dead and alive at the same time; but I want to tell you, respected friends, that he doesn't get that from the word of God, for such is not taught in the book of inspiration. According to the contention of my opponent, respected friends, I want to tell you that there are two men in one; but I want to tell you that the book of God does not teach that, and I trust that you all will accept what the book of God says instead of the things that my opponent tells you about these things, for he has not one word in the Bible to prove his statements by.

All men have sinned, as we have proven to you before from Rom. 5:12; and all men will return to the dust, or go to the grave, which is "Sheol," or hell.

We now invite your attention to 1 Cor. 15:22, 23: "For as in Adam all die, even so in Christ shall all be made alive. But every man in his own order: Christ the first fruits; afterwards they that are Christ's at his coming." Now we have it. We die, and will be made alive in Christ when he comes. Mr. Nichol says that we are alive all the time, but Paul teaches that we will be made alive in Christ when he comes.

I read to you Eccles. 12:7: "Then shall the dust re-

turn to the earth as it was: and the spirit shall return to God who gave it." Now if the spirit that returns to God is the man, as Mr. Nichol contends, then the spirit of all men returns to God when man dies; and that will make universal salvation. Now, I wonder how he will get out of that. Yes, sir; if the spirit is the man, since the spirit returns to God at death, and the spirit of all men returns to God, that will be universal salvation.

I tell you that that man is wrong. The idea of man being dead and alive at the same time! Paul says that all die in Adam, and that all will be made alive in Christ, and that will be in the resurrection; but, according to that man, all are dead and alive at the same time. I wonder what he will study up to get out of that. There is nothing in the Bible that teaches that man can be dead and alive at the same time, and I defy any man to show a passage of scripture that says that he can. It is not there, respected friends, and it cannot be proved.

That the dead know not anything I have proven, but I will again invite your attention to Eccles. 9:5-10: "For the living know that they shall die: but the dead know not anything, neither have they any more a reward; for the memory of them is forgotten. Also their love, and their hatred, and their envy, is now perished; neither have they any more a portion forever in anything that is done under the sun. Go thy way, eat thy bread with joy, and drink thy wine with a merry heart; for God now accepteth thy works. Let thy garments be always white; and let thy head lack no ointment. Live joyfully with thy wife whom thou lovest all the days of the life of thy vanity, which he hath given thee under the sun, all the days of thy vanity: for that is thy portion in this life, and in thy labor which thou takest under the sun. Whatsoever thy hand findeth to do, do it with all thy might; for there is no work, nor device, nor knowledge, nor wisdom, in the grave, whither thou goest." What can be plainer than this passage of scripture? It plainly says

that the dead know not anything. Then I insist that they must be unconscious. But you note that the passage goes further than that, for it says that there is no knowledge in the grave, where man goes when he dies. Then if the man in the grave does not know anything, has no knowledge while he is in the grave, don't you know that he is unconscious?

My friends, you remember that God drove Adam out of the garden of Eden, lest he should eat of the tree of life and live forever. If he had been immortal, he would have lived, whether he had eaten of the tree or not; but the very fact that he had to eat of the tree to live and the fact that he died proves that he was mortal.

That man is not immortal is proven by the fact that he does not have eternal life in this world. Let us read 1 John 1:1-3: "That which was from the beginning, which we have heard, which we have seen with our eyes which we have looked upon, and our hands have handled, of the Word of life; (for the life was manifested, and we have seen it, and bear witness, and show unto you that eternal life, which was with the Father, and was manifested unto us;) that which we have seen and heard declare we unto you, that ye may also have fellowship with us: and truly our fellowship is with the Father, and with his Son Jesus Christ." And in the same connection let me read Col 3:1-4: "If ye then be risen with Christ, seek those things that are above, where Christ sitteth on the right hand of God. Set your affection on things above, not on things on the earth. For ye are dead, and your life is hid with Christ in God. When Christ, who is our life, shall appear, then shall ye also appear with him in glory." When Christ appears, it will be at the resurrection, and then we will be with him; we will then be resurrected and have life that will not end; it will be eternal life. It will be the resurrection day, and we will then be immortal.

I have time in this speech for one more passage of

scripture. Listen to Rom. 2:6, 7: "Who will render to every man according to his deeds: to them who by patient continuance in well-doing seek for glory and honor and immortality, eternal life." This passage plainly says that we seek for immortality. We do not seek for that that we have, but Paul says that we seek for immortality. Therefore we do not have immortality; and if we do not have immortality, we most certainly are mortal, and wholly mortal, just as I am affirming. Certainly every one can see that I am right in the contention that I am making in the debate.

NICHOL'S THIRD NEGATIVE.

Gentlemen Moderators, Ladies and Gentlemen:

I am grateful that, after having had a splendid night's rest, we are permitted to meet so many smiling and intelligent faces this morning to hear the discussion. Your presence and the perfect attention you gave Mr. Bradley indicate the interest you have in the question we are supposed to discuss. From the speech of the gentleman you would not dream of the subject he has engaged to prove. He has engaged to prove that "man is wholly mortal and unconscious from death till the resurrection." The major part of the address he has delivered this morning was given to complaining about my speech last afternoon. He compliments my effort by not attempting to reply to one single argument that I made.

Since Mr. Bradley does not state his position, I feel that it is due you that I state it, that you may fully appreciate my expose of the doctrine, for he does not present arguments for me to reply to. He affirms: "Man is wholly mortal and unconscious from death till the resurrection." The living man, he says, is composed of body, soul, and spirit. The soul, he says, is the animal life; the spirit is the breath, but is no part of the man; the body is of the dust, was created out of the dust, and at death returns to the dust. He says that the man of his proposition returns to the dust.

With these thoughts in your mind, I am ready to note some of the statements of the gentleman's opening address this morning. The first passage he introduced was: "Shall mortal man be more just than God?" (Job 4:17.) Certainly not; but what is the "mortal" part of man? "Let not sin therefore reign in your mortal bodies."

(Rom. 6:12.) "Shall also quicken your mortal bodies."
(Rom. 8:11.) The body is mortal, but such is never spoken of the spirit.

My opponent, with a blast of trumpets, turns to 1 Tim. 6:15, 16, and says: "Here is the passage that certainly teaches that there is nothing immortal about man." Let us see: "Which in his time 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." Commenting on this passage, he said: "God is the only one possessing immortality." You said entirely too much, my dear sir, and you will take it back. If God is the only one possessing *immortality*, then Christ does not possess it; he is mortal. But more, Christ says that the angels cannot die. (Luke 20:36.) You said more than you intended. In short, the passage testifies just contrary to what Mr. Bradley tries to get out of it. The passage says that God "only hath immortality"—i. e., there is nothing "*mortal*" about him. Man has a "*mortal*" body; God has not; he "only hath immortality"—not one thing "*mortal*" about him. If I tell you that I "only have fifty cents," you know that I don't have one dollar. God "only hath immortality"—nothing mortal about him. See?

Mr. Bradley says that I am a very intelligent man, and that he in comparison is but a grain of sand to a mountain. Bradley, be a man! Don't whine around and beg for sympathy that way. If you have just now found that you can't defend your position successfully in debate with me, say so and quit.

Our attention is again called to Gen. 2:7, 15-17, which speaks of man being created out of the dust of the ground—that he dies and returns to the dust. Certainly. I believe all that is said in these passages; but please remember that Mr. Bradley says it takes the body, soul,

and spirit to make the living man; and so says Paul. Mr. Bradley says correctly that the spirit is not of the dust and does not go to the dust at death. Then what is there in these passages for the man in trying to prove his proposition? The spirit is the knowing, the conscious, part of man. "For what man knoweth the things of a man, save the spirit of man which is in him?" (I Cor. 2:11.) Where did the spirit of man come from? At death, where does the spirit go? "Then shall the dust return to the earth as it was: and the spirit shall return to God who gave it." (Eccles. 12:7.) The spirit—the conscious, knowing, part of man—is not of the dust, but came from God and returns to God, who gave it. Why the man continues to introduce such passages I am at a loss to know. I freely admit that the body is of the dust and returns to the dust, and will be unconscious. Let me follow him. "We are dust." (Ps. 103:14.) "We are clay." (Isa. 64:8.) To be sure, the body is; but you say the spirit is not. Then, what are you after in these passages?

Mr. Bradley says that he can tell by looking at me that I am uneasy. I am told that the drunk man always thinks the other fellow is intoxicated.

He says that, according to what I say, man is dead and alive at the same time, and that such a thing is not possible. I guess he has failed to read the passage in the word of God which says: "But she that liveth in pleasure is dead while she liveth." (I Tim. 5:6.) In truth, the body is only the house in which we dwell; and only by metonymy is the body called the man. The body without the spirit is dead; but where is the intimation that the spirit without the body is dead?

Mr. Bradley flies off at a tangent, and says that "Sheol" means "grave," "hell." Not a word of truth in the statement. Give us something more than your *ipse dixit* on this matter.

Mr. Bradley says: "Nichol says that the spirit of man

returns to God at death. Then the spirit of all men return to God at death, and Mr. Nichol is a Universalist." I said no such thing. The Bible says: "The spirit shall return to God who gave it." Such is not Universalism, either. The spirits of the wicked are reserved to be punished.

Man is a triune being, composed of body, soul, and spirit. "And I pray God your whole spirit, and soul, and body be preserved blameless." (1 Thess. 5:23.) The body is mortal, created of dust. Then at death shall the body return to dust. (Eccles. 12:7.) The spirit is in the body—the house of clay. "I Daniel was grieved in my spirit in the midst of my body." (Dan. 7:15.) The spirit is placed in man by God. "The burden of the word of the Lord for Israel, saith the Lord, which stretcheth forth the heavens, and layeth the foundation of the earth, and formeth the spirit of man within him." (Zech. 12:1.) The spirit of man is the knowing part of man. "For what man knoweth the things of a man, save the spirit of man that is in him?" (1 Cor. 2:1.) Mr. Bradley has repeatedly said that the spirit in man is no part of the man. Listen! He says: "The man was created out of the dust of the ground, and the spirit—the breath," he says, "is something that is given to the man, but is no part of the man." If that be true, then the spirit in the man Bradley is no part of Bradley and not necessary to his being Mr. Bradley—a man. I am sorry to hear him say such things; and if I believed him, I would not be here. If he is correct, A. S. Bradley is a man for whom we should have the greatest commiseration. If he speaks correctly when he says that the spirit in him is no part of him, then he is not a monomaniac nor a "non compos mentis," but a blooming idiot. Why is this true? Paul says: "I serve God with my spirit." (Rom. 1:9.) Again, he says: "I serve God with my mind." (Rom. 7:25.) Thus you note that Paul says that the spirit is the mind; and if my opponent is correct when he says that the

spirit in him is no part of him, then it must follow that Mr. Bradley has no mind—he is an idiot. Poor Bradley! Again, we know with our spirits. (I Cor. 2:11.) But Bradley says that the spirit in him is no part of him. Then the man Bradley don't know anything. Pshaw! Shucks, Bradley, is that the best you can do?

NO IDENTITY—NO PUNISHMENT.

If I am not very obtuse, I contend correctly when I insist that the theory advocated by my opponent, if true, must result in the destruction of identity, personality, and consciousness; and if this be true, there is no such thing as punishment, more than may be inflicted in this life, at the death of the body.

It is well known to physiologists that every particle of matter composing the body of man is thrown off in about every seven years and supplied by new matter—material. If man is wholly mortal—material—as Mr. Bradley contends, and every particle of material composing him today is thrown off and supplied by new matter—material—every seven years, then I submit that the new material constituting the man is not the same old material; and if man is nothing but matter, he is not the same man; and thus his identity is destroyed, so also his personality.

Some eight years ago, it seems to me, I heard Mr. Bradley and Brother Trott in a discussion at Oakton, which I enjoyed very much; but if I am wholly mortal and my body changes every seven years, I am not the man that heard that discussion. The man Bradley with whom I am now debating is not the man Bradley that engaged in that debate. My power of memory—consciousness—tells me that I am one of the persons that heard that discussion (part of it). I can't help but believing that I am the same Nichol and that my opponent is the same Bradley. But admitting that the false contention which my opponent makes is true, and that I did not hear that debate, nor did the man we call Bradley

that is here present engage in that debate, though my powers are so constituted that I can't help but believing that I attended that discussion (and my powers of believing are so constituted by the Creator), if Bradley's doctrine be true, God created my believing faculties a lying machine, and I can't help believing the lie. Mr. Bradley, are you, in fact, the man that debated with Dr. Trott? If the carnal doctrine you teach is true, no one is culpable for a crime committed ten years ago. Why, do you ask? According to his contention, man is wholly mortal—matter; and if it is a fact that the matter composing the body of man is thrown off and replaced by new matter every seven years, it follows that a man that committed a crime ten years ago is not in existence now, and for that reason can't be punished. The man now in existence is certainly not responsible for crimes committed before his existence as a man. According to this foolish materialistic doctrine, a man only lives about seven years; and should a man be sent to the penitentiary for life, it would only mean for seven years, and the men that have been incarcerated there more than that long are not the men convicted. If Mr. Bradley can establish his doctrine, intelligent men will never sentence a man to prison for more than seven years. This body is only the house in which the "ego" dwells.

Mr. Bradley, how long since you married? I guess twenty-five years. But if your doctrine be true, if you are wholly mortal—all flesh, dust, material—if all the man there is of you was taken out of the dust, since this dust—the material of this body—is thrown off every seven years, you are not the man that married at that time, and the woman that you married then does not now exist, save, as you say, in the material that composed the bodies at that time, and it has been thrown off, and is unconscious, and is all matter. According to you, then, there must be a marriage every seven years for those who would live as man and wife, unless you

propose for them to do as your doctrine has them doing in the kingdom after the resurrection.

In a former speech I told you that, per the doctrine of the gentleman, men are no more than the little dog Rover; that he dies as the dog dies, and after death no more exists than the dog does after it dies. You remember that I read from Mr. Bradley's letter. Don't forget to tell us about that, my dear sir. In his last speech he evidently attempted to prove what I predicted. He introduced Eccles. 3:19-22: "For that which befalleth the sons of men befalleth beasts; even one thing befalleth them: as the one dieth, so dieth the other; yea, they have all one breath; so that a man hath no preeminence above a beast: for all is vanity. All go unto one place; all are of the dust, and all turn to dust again." If Mr. Bradley did not seize this passage to attempt to prove that man and beast are equal, I am at a loss to know why he introduced it. We speak of man as possessing mind, consciousness, responsibility, and moral qualities. I am forced to conclude, per the dissertation of my opponent, that man does not possess these qualities, or the beast does, too. It would be amusing to hear him attempt to tell why, according to his doctrine, it is not as much a sin to kill a cow as it is a man. In the Bible men are called "dogs" (Isa. 56:10), "vipers" (Matt. 23:23), "lions" (Zeph. 3:3). Are we to take these passages literally? If men and beasts are the same in every respect, what hope has man more than the ox? There is no difficulty in understanding the passage. Solomon's dissertation on man is that man and beast breathe the same air; they both die; the body returns to the dust; the spirit of man goes upward—returns to God, who gave it.

I insist that man is not "wholly mortal," and that even when the body dies the spirit continues to be conscious. In addition to the proof already offered, let us look again into the library of heaven.

NOTHING CAN SEPARATE US.

“Who shall separate us from the love of Christ? shall tribulation, or distress, or persecution, or famine, or nakedness, or peril, or sword? As it is written, For thy sakes we are killed all the day long; we are accounted as sheep for the slaughter. Nay, in all these things we are more than conquerors through him that loved us. For I am persuaded, that neither death, nor life, nor angels, nor principalities, nor powers, nor things present, nor things to come, nor height, nor depth, nor any other creature, shall be able to separate us from the love of God, which is in Christ Jesus our Lord.” (Rom. 8:35-39.) In this excerpt of scripture Paul dissertates of his persuasion, and his persuasion was from Him who called him. The persuasion of Paul was from the fountain of all truth—the throne of God. What was the persuasion of Paul? That none of the things mentioned in this scripture could separate us from the love of God which is in Christ Jesus our Lord. Note the things designated—tribulation, distress, persecution, famine, nakedness, peril, sword, life, angels, principalities, powers, things present, things to come. Paul declares that none of these things—yea, that all of them cannot separate us from the love of God which is in Christ Jesus our Lord. Certainly the things named contemplate and include everything that man can experience in this life—on earth. But this great teacher does not stop with mentioning these things only; he does not contemplate this life only, for he says “death” (verse 38) cannot separate us from that love. The blind man at noonday is as much separated from light as though he were surrounded by midnight darkness. With and for him there is no light. He lacks the capacity to enjoy it; in him the optic nerve is destroyed. The deaf man is separated from sound. He can’t hear the kind voice of a mother’s love. The father’s voice in words of counsel and advice can never by him be

known by sound. There is an impassable barrier; the auditory nerve has been destroyed. Should the angels again bend low from heaven's dome and carol the sweet song, "Peace on earth, to all men good will," he could not hear the song of the angelic host. The deaf man has no capacity to seize and appropriate the sound. If it be true that death is the extinction of being, if at death man ceases to be, as per Mr. Bradley's doctrine, logically, then, death does separate us from the love of God. But Paul says that "death" does not, cannot, separate us from the love of God, and by said statement places his eternal veto on the carnal doctrine taught by my opponent. I am told, though, that it is not our love for God, but God's love for us, that Paul contemplates in this passage. Grant it, certainly; what then? Does man at death go to nothing—cease to exist? Mr. Bradley says in answer to the question: "Since man is wholly mortal, when he dies, doesn't he cease to exist?" Answer: "As a conscious being, he does; but the material of which he is composed still exists." (A. S. Bradley.) Grant that this is true; did not this material exist before it entered into the composition of man's body? Certainly. But it was not man then; indeed, it was no part of man then. Just so when it returns to dust it is not man nor any part of man. Did, could, this material, before it entered into the body of man, love? Was the love of God which is in Christ Jesus our Lord for this material then? Is this material, resolved to its native elements, the "us" that death cannot separate from the "love of God which is in Christ Jesus our Lord?" In short, Mr. Bradley, you teach that when man dies he does not exist any more than Adam did before he was created. Then please tell us how, according to your doctrine, man can love after death, or God can love him, any more than Adam could love before he was created, or God could love Adam before there was an Adam to love. Paul says that "death" cannot separate us from the "love of God which

is in Christ Jesus our Lord." If Mr. Bradley says that this is our love for God, then we must exist, consciously, to love; but if you say it means God's love for us, then we must exist for God to love us.

Paul says that in all these things—tribulation, distress, persecution, famine, peril, even in death—we are more than conquerors through the love of God. To be conquerors we must be active, even in death as in tribulation and persecution. Cheering fact that though I fall under the stroke of death, though the death angel kiss my eyes to sleep, Death, you cannot hold me. Your dominion over me shall not last. In thy own domain, through the love of God, I will conquer; and in the gladness of my heart I will cry: "O death, where is thy sting? O grave, where is thy victory?" David declares correctly: "Your heart shall love forever."

1. Death cannot separate us from the love of God. (Rom. 8:35-39.)
2. Love of God is shed abroad in our hearts by the Holy Spirit.
3. The heart lives forever. *Ps. 22:26*
4. If love of God is in our hearts, we are conscious of it.
5. Therefore death does not destroy our consciousness.

In my last speech my time was called while I was quoting: "Your heart shall live forever." (Ps. 22:26.) Mr. Bradley, hear the quotation, and by all means don't forget to pay your respects to it: "Your heart shall live forever." How long will the heart live? "Forever"—eternally. "Your heart shall live forever." "Eis aiona aionos"—the word is duplicated, and is equivalent to "forever and forever." Your hearts shall live "eis aiona aionos"—forever and forever—never cease its existence.

The gentleman asks me again if I believe Christ died. Yes, sir; he died on the cross. "And when Jesus had cried with a loud voice, he said, Father, into thy hands I

commend my spirit." (Luke 23:46.) The spirit returns to God. Mr. Bradley, if the spirit is the breath, as you say, why was Christ so solicitous about his breath? Since the spirit knows, I guess you think Christ had a very intelligent breath. The spirit of Christ went to God, but what became of the body? "This man went unto Pilate and begged the body of Jesus. And he took it down, and wrapped it in linen, and laid it in a sepulcher that was hewn in stone, wherein never man before was laid." (Luke 23:52, 53.) The body of Jesus was laid in the sepulcher, but the spirit returned to God. The body is mortal. When they stoned Stephen, he cried: "Lord Jesus, receive my spirit." (Acts 7:59.) Yes, I believe that Christ died, but not as my opponent does; for, according to him,

THE GODHEAD IS SUBJECT TO ANNIHILATION.

According to Mr. Bradley, the Godhead is subject to death; and death with him is ceasing to exist as a conscious being—indeed, as any kind of being. Before Christ came to the earth he existed as one of the Godhead. The world was made by him, as the Scriptures plainly declare. (John 1:1-3; Heb. 1:2; Col. 1:15, 16.) But you declare that Christ ceased to exist at the cross—the crucifixion. If that be true, then it follows with overwhelming force that it is not only possible, but that men did actually destroy their Creator. Such infidelity makes it possible, if he is correct, for some great calamity to destroy the Godhead; for if one person of the Godhead may be destroyed—cease to exist—so also may the others. Such doctrine is ranker infidelity than the Sadducees ever dreamed of. But Mr. Bradley may reply that I do him an injustice; that I misquote him in saying that he teaches that at death man "ceases to exist;" that he teaches that man ceases to exist as a "conscious being." Well, what then? As a result of wicked men, Christ died; men killed Christ—caused him to "cease to exist

as a conscious being." His body still existed, but the consciousness was destroyed by the act, or as the result of men's actions. Then all the Christ left was the body, and it was as inanimate, as devoid of consciousness or power, as the goddess Diana or any other idol of the heathens. But Christ was one of the Godhead—was equal to God; and if one person of the Godhead could by men be rendered but the equal in power and consciousness with the goddess Diana—idols—so also may the entire Godhead. Bradley, Bradley, aren't you ashamed of your doctrine?

Mr. Bradley tells us that when man is dead he is often spoken of as being "asleep." Correct; but it is always spoken of the body, and not one time, so far as I know, is the spirit of man said to be "asleep." If there is such a passage, I will be pleased to hear the gentleman read it to this people. I repeat: I don't know of a passage that intimates that the spirit of man is ever "asleep." I read: "Many bodies of the saints which slept arose." (Matt. 27: 62.) Stephen "fell asleep," and devout men buried him—i. e., his body.

I could very easily spend much time presenting arguments showing that the spirit survives the death of the body, and I will note some of them later; but at the present I desire that you see some of the absurdities of the doctrine of the opposition. He says that if man possesses an immortal spirit, then man has eternal life. You are mistaken, my dear sir. Immortality and eternal life are very different. Eternal life is a reward given to man. Again, he says: "According to Nichol, the life was in Adam, and not in the tree. God drove Adam out of the garden, lest he should eat of the fruit of the tree and live forever. The life was in the tree." No, Mr. Bradley; the life was not in the tree, but the power to perpetuate the life was in the tree. If Adam could have had access to the tree, he would have lived—his body would not have returned to the dust.

The gentleman introduces Rom. 2:5-7; and I presume from his manner that he thinks he has made an argument that is "ungetoverable." Let us note the passage: "Who will render to every man according to his deeds: to them who by patient continuance in well-doing seek for glory and honor and immortality, eternal life." Let me state the contention of Mr. Bradley more logically than he does: (1) We do not seek for that which we have; (2) we seek for immortality; (3) therefore we do not have immortality. Again, the same passage says "seek for glory." (1) We do not seek for that which we have; (2) we seek for glory and honor; (3) therefore Bradley does not have glory or honor. Listen: (1) The people of God have glory; (2) Bradley, per his argument, has no glory; (3) therefore Bradley is not one of the Lord's people. I know that my hearers appreciate that if because we are to seek for immortality we do not have it, since man is said to seek for "glory and honor," he does not possess that, either. There is no escape from such a conclusion. God's people do possess glory (2 Cor. 3:18); yet they seek for glory (2 Cor. 4:17).

In the Revised Version we have the word "incorruption" instead of the word "immortal" in Rom. 2:7, and is used in reference to the body. At the time of the resurrection it—the body—is raised incorruptible. We, the people of God, are "seeking" exemption from moral corruption now and will attain it in heaven. This passage does not touch man's immortality at all.

Before my time expires I have time to call your attention briefly to a falsehood, but true, per the doctrine of Mr. Bradley.

UNCONDITIONAL SALVATION.

Mr. Bradley says that man is "wholly mortal;" that all that goes to constitute man is mortal; that at death the whole man returns to the dust; *that the spirit is no part of man.* Let us remember, Christ came to save *man*.

If the gentleman is correct in his contention, it must follow that man can't be saved, unless the part created out of the dust is saved; for this, says Bradley, is the man. The spirit, he says, is no part of the man. Then I insist that if man is ever saved, if the man is that part which is created out of the dust and the spirit is no part of the man, then the man will be saved because that which is no part of the man—the spirit—obeys for the man; and if it is that way, man only obeys by proxy. God declares that disbelievers shall be damned. Now if man must believe to be saved, and we admit that the spirit is no part of the man, as Bradley says, not one man will ever be saved, and that will mean universal damnation. The Bible declares that the "heart" believes, and the heart is the spirit; but Bradley says that the spirit is no part of the man. Then since it is the spirit that believes, and he says that the spirit is no part of the man, then it is not the man that believes. But man must believe to be saved; and, according to your contention, man never believes, and will, therefore, be damned. Will you say that the heart—the spirit—which you say is no part of the man, believes for the man; that man believes by proxy?

Again, the spirit "knows" (1 Cor. 2:11), "prays and sings" (1 Cor. 14:14, 15), "worships" (John 4:24), and "confesses" (1 John 4:2); but Bradley says that the spirit of man is no part of man. Then it is not the man that does these things, according to Bradley. Sure, according to this man Bradley, man does not worship, sing, or pray. Mr. Bradley, is the salvation of man conditioned on any act of the man? If "Yes," please tell us what it is. Per your doctrine, sir, salvation is not conditioned on any act of man; and if he is saved, it will be because the spirit, which you say is no part of man, obeys for him. Pshaw! Shucks, Bradley, what is the matter with you? [Time expired.]

BRADLEY'S FOURTH AFFIRMATIVE

Gentlemen Moderators, Ladies and Gentlemen:

I trust that it is with grateful hearts that we are still assembled to continue the investigation of the word of God on the proposition under consideration and that I am affirming. I am still contending that man is wholly mortal and unconscious from death till the resurrection.

There are just a few things in the last speech of my opponent that I want to call your attention to. He continually talks about the spirit of man, and wants me to look after the things that he presents, which, I guess, appear to many of you to be logical deductions. My friends, I propose to prove my proposition by the word of God. I have read to you from that source faithfully, and will continue to so do in this debate.

But now in reference to the spirit of man. I have said that it takes the body, soul, and the spirit to make the living man. "God created the man out of the dust of the ground, and breathed into his nostrils the breath of life; and man became a living soul." (Gen. 2:7.) The soul is, as I have said before, the animal life; the spirit is the mind, wind, disposition, character, principle, power. The word has all these meanings, and it depends on the connection which word you use.

Yes, that is the way that some people treat the word of God. I see one back there licking out his tongue at me like a black snake.

[Nichol: "Skin him, Bradley!"]

You may lick out your tongue some day; but let me tell you, respected friends, that this subject is too sacred for me to treat that way. I am here for the truth of Almighty God, and I can't afford to treat it that way.

I want at all times to act as becometh a man professing godliness. It seems, though, that some people have very little regard for the word of the Lord or how they act and treat other men.

My friends, I propose to continue the investigation of the word of God, and I am satisfied that you all will see this question in the right light before this debate is brought to a close; and I want to tell you that I am not here for a victory, but I am here for the truth, and I am content to believe what the word of God says on this subject, and I am satisfied that you all will be willing to accept just what it says.

We wish now, respected friends, to call your attention to Job 4:17: "Shall mortal man be more just than God? shall a man be more pure than his maker?" Now, I want you all to get the right conception of this passage of scripture. This passage says that man is mortal, but my friend calls on me to produce the passage that says that man is wholly mortal. I rather think that he would try to find some objection to the passage if I should find it in just that many words. Now let us see if we can't very easily show you that man is wholly mortal. Respected friends, I read to you that God is immortal, and no one calls on me to show that God is wholly immortal. Now, since the Bible says God is immortal, and all of you accept the statement and admit that God is wholly immortal, when I read the passage that says that man is mortal, why do you call on me to show that he is wholly mortal? I read that God is immortal, and we all know that God is wholly immortal; just so when I read that man is mortal, I conclude that he is just as mortal as God is immortal. It seems to me that any one can see this. When it says that God is immortal, we all know that it means that God is wholly immortal; then why do we not know that when it says that man is mortal he is wholly mortal? I tell you, my friends, that the reason is that some of us have a theory to defend, and some of us have

been taught differently; but I am glad that some of you are seeing the truth, and some of you will see it in this debate. My opponent says that if I will read the passage of scripture that says that man is wholly mortal he will give up the debate. Well, my friends, I want to say that when he reads the passage of scripture that says that man is immortal I will give up the debate. I have found and read to you the passage that says that man is mortal. Can he find the passage that says that man is immortal? You know that he can't, or he would have produced the passage before now, and he knows that he can't produce the passage; but he can talk and make fun of me and what I say and misrepresent what I say—yes sir, he can do that if he can't prove his position.

My opponent has had much to say about the inner man. He says that he believes that the body of man is mortal, and that it will return to the dust and be unconscious; but he is contending that it will be the inner man that will survive the death of the body; that the spirit is the inner man, and that it is immortal. Now, then, just think of that. He has man part mortal and part immortal—the body mortal, and the inner man, the spirit, immortal. Just any such logic! Did you ever hear of any such thing before? I don't think that you ever did; I am sure that you did not. The very idea of man being part mortal and part immortal! I wonder what he will have to say next about this matter.

We invite your attention, respected friends, to Eccles. 12:7: "Then shall the dust return to the earth as it was; and the spirit shall return to God who gave it." The man, as we have learned, was created out of the dust of the ground, and at death he returns to the dust, from which he was taken, and the spirit returns to God, who gave it. Now, Mr. Nichol has had much to say about man having hopes after he is dead. I wonder what hope a man can have after he has returned to the dust. Man has not one bit of hope after he is dead, according to the

book of God and according to reason. How in the world can a man hope when he is dead? Can that which has not life hope? I want to know that.

My friend says that, according to the teaching of Bradley, man is *no more than a dog* when he is dead. I want you people to know that that is not the truth, and Mr. Nichol knows that it is not the truth. I have not, will not, and never will say any such thing; for it is not in the Bible, and I don't want to be found saying anything that is not in the book of God in this connection. It is not right that I should contend for anything that is not taught in the Bible; therefore I will not. Listen: I say I don't want you all to think that I have ever said any such thing as that man is no more than a dog when he is dead. It would be absurd to say any such thing; for it is not in accord with the teaching of the word of God, or with human reason, either, or with human nature, to think that man, when he is dead, is no more than a dog when he dies. Respected friends, that man knows that I do not believe or teach any such thing; but he is *doing* all that he can to create prejudice against me, for he thinks that he can win the debate that way. I am glad that these people are intelligent and can see that he twists what I say to make it sound so that he can get up some kind of a reply to it, and thus he has treated me all the way through this debate. I thank the Lord that I don't have to misrepresent him to establish my proposition and accuse my opponent of comparing man to a dog to create prejudice against him. I don't do that way, respected friends.

My friend has tried faithfully to find the passage of scripture that says that man is not wholly mortal, but I want to say that you all know that he has failed to find it to the present time; and I am of the opinion that if any man can prove that man is not wholly mortal he could do it, for he knows what is in the Bible, and he is logical, and he is a debater. I tell you, respected friends,

that the passage is not in the Bible that teaches that man is not wholly mortal. I say to you, respected friends, that the passage cannot be found in the Bible that teaches contrary to the contention that I am making in this debate—that is, that man is wholly mortal. I tell you that neither that man nor any other man can prove that man is immortal.

If man is two men in one, as is the contention of my friend Nichol (for you know that he talks about the inner and the outer man)—I say if there are two men in one, and one of them dies and the other one does not then man is part mortal and part immortal. Such stuff for a man to teach to intelligent people! But, according to the teaching of my opponent, a man is part mortal and part immortal: and there is no getting around it, according to what he has had to say on the subject, and he can't get out of it now. I say that, according to the teaching of my friend Nichol, there are two men in one; bound to be, for he says that there is an inner man and an outer man, and he says that man is conscious from death till the resurrection, and the book of God says that the dead know not anything; so, therefore, according to the contention of my opponent, there must be two men in one—one man to die and the other man to live and be conscious. Now that is the truth, according to the contention of the gentleman, and he can't get around it, and he will have to submit to it, or else withdraw his own contention in this matter.

Respected friends, I want you all to remember that I do not teach nor do I believe that man, when he dies, is no more than a dog when he dies, and my opponent knows that I do not believe any such; but his way of debating is to continually misrepresent me, and then reply to what he says that I have said. Now the point that I want to impress on our minds is that man is more than a dog after he dies, from the fact that God has said that he will resurrect man, and he has not said anything

about remembering or resurrecting the dog. Now, can't you all see man is more than a dog? Do you see any relationship between a man and a dog? No, sir, you do not; and neither does my opponent, but with him it is anything to bring out something to carry his point and to create prejudice against me in this debate. He is right in for that. God has said that he will remember the dead, and that there will be a hereafter with men—that they shall live again; and if they have served the Lord faithfully in this life, they will share the riches of the glory world as heirs and joint heirs with the Lord Jesus Christ. But I want to tell you that he has not promised these things to the dog, nor to anything but man; and you can see that I have too much sense to say that man is no more than a dog when he is dead; but I tell you, respected friends, that that is all brought into this debate to create prejudice against me by that man, for he knows that he can't gain the question in any other way, for there is no man that can go around the truth of God. You watch my statements and see if they are not true. He is bound to meet with the word of God sooner or later; but if he can create prejudice against me and make you people believe that Bradley believes and teaches that man is no more than a dog when he dies, he thinks that he will gain this debate. That is what he is after now, and you all can see it, too; I know that you can.

Let us deal with the facts in the case and have some debating that is worth something (that is the thing to do), and I assure you that we will have accomplished more good at the end of the debate at this place if we will do this way. So I want my friend Nichol to come up and grapple with the things that I lay before him and bring out something that will be interesting and benefit these people, and not sidetrack from the subject and spend his time on something that is not in the subject. I

say let us have some debating here; let us look right into the real question.

You will note, respected friends, that my opponent has failed to pay any attention to the questions that I have asked him. He did not answer them, and that is the way that he will do the next time. He is afraid to come up and grapple with these things in the right manner, for he is afraid that he will have to give up the proposition; in fact, he knows that if he comes out in the right way he will have to surrender the question, and Charlie can't afford to do that. Will you please answer those questions in your next speech? Note it down. You have the questions in writing, and I want you to answer them. Now, don't forget them.

Now, my friends, let me invite your attention to other passages of scripture that go to prove the proposition that I am affirming. I ask your attention to Eccles. 3:18-22: "I said in mine heart concerning the estate of the sons of men, that God might manifest them, and that they might see that they themselves are beasts. For that which befalleth the sons of men befalleth beasts; even one thing befalleth them: as the one dieth, so dieth the other; yea, they all have one breath; so that a man hath no preeminence above a beast; for all is vanity. All go unto one place; all are of the dust, and all turn to dust again. Who knoweth the spirit of man that goeth upward, and the spirit of the beast that goeth downward to the earth?" I contend, respected friends, that when man dies he is dead; that he dies just as the animals die; that when man dies, he is no more conscious than the animals when they die; and that as the animals die, so does man die. Now if man was immortal, he would not die as the animals die. When they die, they all turn to dust, for out of the dust were they taken; and when they die, they will return to the dust. The Scriptures plainly say that the man has no preeminence over the beasts. Now, since the animals return to the dust when they die and

man returns to the dust when he dies, just as the animals do, if man is conscious and immortal, why are not the beasts conscious and immortal, too?

My friends, the scholarship of the world says that "Sheol" is the grave. [Mr. Bradley read from Mr. Campbell.—Stenographer.] According to the position and the contention of my opponent, when a man dies he goes two ways at once. He says that he believes the Bible, and the Bible says that when a man dies he returns to the dust, from whence he was taken. Now, then, if Mr. Nichol believes the Bible, he most certainly believes that man returns to the dust when he dies; and at the same time Mr. Nichol says that he believes that when man dies he flies away to God—goes to heaven, and is conscious. Thus you see that he has man going two ways at once. Just think of such—one man going two ways at the same time! Do you not know that such a thing is not possible? It seems to me that every one ought to know that one man can't go two ways at the same time.

Now, then, respected friends, I invite your attention to some scriptures that go to show that man is not immortal in this life. It seems to me that any one should be able to see that if man is immortal he cannot die; that if he is immortal he cannot lie, and, therefore, has eternal life. But man does not have eternal life in this world. True, we find in the Bible passages that speak of man as if he possessed eternal life now; but when we take all the teachings on the subject, we see that he has it in promise and by hope. Let me read John 4:46: "He that believeth in the Son hath everlasting life, and he that believeth not the Son shall not see life, but the wrath of God abideth on him." Now, then, we all believe on the Son of God—that is, the most of us do—and we have everlasting life; but how do we have it? We only have eternal life by promise now, for God has promised it to us. In proof of this I read to you 1 John 2:25: "And this is the promise that he hath promised us, even eternal

life." That which is promised to us we do not have, but God has promised to us eternal life; therefore we do not have eternal life now only by promise; but if we are immortal, we could not die, and would have eternal life now. But let me read further in this matter (Tit. 1:1, 2): "Paul, a servant of God, and an apostle of Jesus Christ, according to the faith of God's elect, and the acknowledging of the truth which is after godliness; in hope of eternal life, which God, that cannot lie, promised before the world began." Thus you see that man has eternal life by promise now, and not only so, but he lives in hope of eternal life, and that that we hope for we do not possess. So man does not have eternal life now; but if man was immortal, he could not die, and would, therefore, have eternal life now. So, then, since man does not have eternal life now, I contend that he is not immortal now. My friends, I want you to understand my contention in this matter. I teach you that man should live right in this world, and that he should at all times be found trying to do that which he thinks to be his duty, for we see that it is the teaching of the book of God; and, therefore, we should abide by it. But so far as man is concerned, there is no hope for him in the grave—that is, man does not hope when he goes to the grave, for the book of God says that the dead know not anything; and how can a man that don't know anything hope? Will you please tell us? Yes, sir; we must obey the teaching of the word of God if we would have eternal life. Rev. 22:14: "Blessed are they that do his commandments, that they may have right to the tree of life, and may enter in through the gates into the city."

I teach you that when a man dies he is dead. I don't teach mothers that when their babies die the angels come and bear the precious little darlings away to God in heaven, and that they will be there waiting for them till they go to meet them.

Mr. Nichol teaches you that when a man is dead he

is dead and alive at the same time. Who ever heard of such? That man is wholly mortal and unconscious from death till the resurrection has been clearly shown by me in this discussion; and I have not shown it by my arguments and logic, either, but by reading the word of God; and I want you all to look closely into the matter and see for yourselves that such is the truth. I have tried to give you nothing but the book of God, and I have read everything that I have given you from the Bible; and, of course, that is true, and you will remember that my opponent has been trying to prove that it is not true. He has thus far failed to produce an argument on the subject, from the fact that he has not any to produce, and he will have to pass the subject by untouched and let his opponent come out a success in this debate. There is not a passage of scripture in the word of God that says that man is not wholly mortal, and I have tried to get my opponent to show one if it is to be found; but he has failed to do so, and you can see from that that he has not the argument and cannot produce anything that goes to confirm his contention.

God formed man out of the dust of the ground; and when he dies, he returns to the dust, from whence he was taken; and he knows nothing till the resurrection, for God says that the dead know not anything; therefore he is unconscious, and will be till he awakes in the likeness of God. [Time expired.]

NICHOL'S FOURTH NEGATIVE.

Gentlemen Moderators, Ladies and Gentlemen:

I regret very much to see my opponent exhibit so much animus as he did in his last speech. You need not be astonished; it is but the outcroppings of his carnal doctrine. He says that he is all body—flesh; and Paul says that in his flesh dwelt no good thing. Accept this, my apology for him for his bad humor.

I am so constituted that I enjoy the gentleman's discomfiture. He is like a run-down rabbit. Trying to go many ways at once and not knowing which way to go, he makes very poor headway. Let me keep the issue before you. Mr. Bradley is *trying* to prove that man is "wholly mortal and unconscious from death till the resurrection." In his dissertation on man he says: "The man of my proposition returns to the dust at death, for man was created out of the dust." More, he says: "It takes body, soul, and spirit to make the living man; but the spirit is no part of the man." The spirit, he says, was not taken out of the dust, but came from God and returns to God when the man dies. In his last speech he defines "spirit" thus: "'Spirit' ('pneuma')—wind, disposition, character, principle, power." You will remember that he says the spirit lives, but is mortal. Mr. Bradley, does "wind" live? Does "disposition" live? Tut, tut! But if the spirit of man is the "wind, disposition, or character," is the man responsible for it, since God gave it? Some men have very bad characters and "low" principles; but since you say God gave them to them, are they amenable for them?

There was quite a bit of *dog* in the last address of the gentleman—i. e., he had much to say about me show-

ing, per his theory, man is no more than a dog; that the dead man no more exists than the dead dog. He says that he doesn't want you to think that he believes any such, for he says that he doesn't. I am by no means anxious for you to think that he believes it, but it is only the logical deduction from his doctrine. If he doesn't believe it, it is because he doesn't believe his doctrine or can't logically dissect his own contention. Some of you were not here yesterday when I gave the expose along that line. I repeat it for your benefit, but with no hope that the gentleman will do more than say in reply: "I don't want you all to think that I believe any such. My friend Nichol will get up here and twist what I say a little, and then give you some logic. Now you watch and see if he doesn't." Very well; watch. Here is a letter written by Mr. Bradley and his answer to a question. I have it in his own handwriting. "Question: 'Since man is wholly mortal, when he dies, doesn't he cease to exist?' Answer: 'As a conscious being, he does; but the material of which he is composed still exists. God formed *man* of the *dust* of the *ground* and breathed into his nostrils the breath of life, and *man* became a living soul. That breath goes forth, *he* dies, and that very day his thoughts perish. Now he has ceased to exist as a conscious being; but the body returns to the earth as it was, and the spirit (breath, 'ruach') has returned to God, who gave it. So we see the material still exists, hence can be resurrected.'" (A. S. Bradley, December 7, 1905.) This is just what he says without "twisting" it. Mr. Bradley, does everything that goes to constitute man die? Is there anything that survives the death of the body? Doesn't man, per your doctrine and your contention, die "all over?" So you contend. Little dog Rover dies all over. What is the difference? You say of man: "That breath goes forth, *he* dies." Doesn't the breath of little dog Rover go forth and *he* dies? You say of man: "The material of which he was composed still exists." Doesn't

the material of which little dog Rover was composed still exist? But you say of man: "Now he has ceased to exist as a conscious being." Well, when little dog Rover dies, doesn't he cease to exist as a conscious dog? Did not the material of which man is composed exist before man was created—formed? Did not the material out of which little dog Rover was created exist before the dog Rover was formed? Was this material before God created Adam, man? Was the material before God created Rover, dog? Will this material which is man's body to-day be any more man when it returns to the dust than it was before man was created? Will the material of which little dog Rover is composed be any more dog than it was before Rover was created? Is it not true that, according to the theory of my distinguished opponent, man and the dog die just alike? Is there any difference in their death? Does man exist one bit more than the dog after death, per your theory? Mr. Bradley's only reply is: "I don't believe what you say. Man is promised a resurrection, and the dog is not." Grant that; but that does not change the fact that man, when he dies, per your doctrine, does not exist one bit more than a dog does, and dies just as the dog.

IMMORTALITY NOT DESIRABLE,

according to the doctrine of Mr. Bradley. If Mr. Bradley be correct in his contention, when man dies he becomes as though he had never been. If this be true, I insist that you note the following. Before God created man he said: "There was not a man to till the ground." (Gen. 2:5.) Remember, please, that God created man out of the dust of the ground, and the material existed before God created man, but it was not man. Since there was not a man to till the ground till God created him, if man at death becomes as though he had never been, if only the material out of which he was created exists, I will be thankful if my opponent will tell how

God can resurrect man any more than he could have resurrected man before Adam was created. Since not a man could be found to till the ground till God created man, where will the man be found to resurrect? Indeed, God will be put to the necessity of creating beings at the time we call the resurrection to dwell in the new earth; for, according to Bradley, death is certainly the eternal end of us. He says that the whole man is mortal—body, soul, and spirit; but the spirit, he says, is no part of the man. The body is to be resurrected, and at that time is to be immortalized. The body is the only thing that is said to be immortalized at the resurrection; but this is the whole man, according to Bradley, for he says that the spirit is no part of man. Then the spirit which Bradley says “lives, but is mortal,” but is no part of the man, but dies when man dies, remains shrouded in death, with the mantle of oblivion for a winding sheet. According to my opponent, the spirit is not now, and never will be, immortal; for it is no part of the man, he says, and the man is to be immortal in the other world. Consciousness, intellect, and will are attributes of the spirit. But the body—the man, says Bradley, is the body—is to be immortalized in the resurrection; but the spirit, according to him, being no part of the man, will not be resurrected; only the man will be resurrected. Then the new heaven will be filled with immortalized bodies roaming around in blank idiocy over the plains of the new earth. Do you ask me if this is true? Admitting the contention of my opponent, it most certainly is; for the spirit is the thing that knows (1 Cor. 2:11), and he says that the spirit is no part of the man.

It (the body) is sown in corruption, it (the body) is raised in incorruption. (1 Cor. 15:42.) “Let not sin therefore reign in your mortal bodies.” (Rom. 6:12.) “So when this corruptible [body] shall have put on incorruption, and this mortal [body] shall have put on immortality.” (1 Cor. 15:54.) These expressions are

applied to the body; it is to be immortalized; but Bradley says that the spirit is no part of the man. Then if we grant this system to be true, I insist that immortality is not desirable, unless man can be happy without intelligence; for intelligence is a property of the spirit, and the spirit is no part of the man, Bradley declares. Once more. The whole man is mortal, says Bradley, and dies; but at the resurrection the body is immortalized; indeed, the body is all that is promised immortality or a resurrection from the dead. Then at the resurrection we will be given immortalized bodies, without spirits in them; for the body is the man, says Bradley, and the man is to be immortalized—the man is raised. The spirit is no part of the man, says Bradley. Then in the resurrected state we will be immortalized bodies only—no spirit about us. But “the body without the spirit is dead.” (James 2:26.) Then it follows that the new heaven will be filled with dead immortalized bodies. My friends, the spirit is the jewel; the body is only the casket, the tabernacle—house of clay—in which the spirit dwells. To be without a spirit—to be bereft of mind, memory, and reason—is a thought to be dreaded more than death itself. At the resurrection God proposes to present immortal—incorruptible—bodies for our spirits to dwell in. Mr. Bradley’s doctrine calls only for an immortal body, without a spirit in it. Thus he presents a future not to be desired, for immortality of the body is not desired unless there will be a spirit to dwell in it. But Mr. Bradley insists that the spirit is no part of the man. Then, per his theory, the body will be immortal, but not intelligent; for intelligence is a property of the spirit, not of the body. The gospel of Christ presents and promises all that our hearts can ask for—strength for our weakness, riches for our poverty, immortality (incorruption) for our mortality (corruption). These are all promised for our bodies, not for our spirits. The

spirit, by virtue of its nature, is immortal, or God would have made provisions for it, too.

We are next informed by the gentleman that "Sheol"—"Hades," "hell"—is "the grave." Such a statement is false; but let us try it by the Bible for a moment. "The wicked shall be turned into hell, and all the nations that forget God." (Ps. 9:17.) If "hell" means "the grave," as he says, then the wicked and those that forget God will be the only ones that have a "grave." Again: "Withhold not correction from the child: for if thou beatest him with the rod, he shall never die. Thou shalt beat him with the rod, and deliver his soul from hell." (Prov. 23:13, 14.) Then if you give your children correct training, they will never enter "hell"—"grave" if hell is the grave, as Bradley says it is. Shucks! Bradley, can't you see an inch in front of your nose?

Mr. Bradley says that the scholarship of the world teaches that "Sheol," or "Hades," means "the grave." I am sorry that he did not give us some quotations from some of the scholars that he included in that statement. Let us look into some of them. I have here the Revised Version. Hear what is presented in the "Preface:" "The Hebrew *Sheol*, which signifies the abode of departed spirits and corresponds with the Greek *Hades*, or the underworld, is variously rendered in the Authorized Version by 'grave,' 'pit,' and 'hell.' Of these renderings, 'hell,' if it could be taken in its original sense as used in the creeds, would be a fairly adequate equivalent for the word; but it is so commonly understood of the place of torment that to employ it frequently would lead to inevitable misunderstanding. The revisers, therefore, in the historical narratives have left the rendering 'the grave' or 'the pit' in the text, with a marginal note, 'Heb. *Sheol*,' to indicate that it does not mean the place of burial; while in the poetical writings they have put most commonly *Sheol* in the text and 'the grave' in the margin." I now read from Mr. Thayer: "'Hades:' . . . The

common receptacle of disembodied spirits." Indeed, the word "Sheol," or "Hades," does not mean the grave.

The gentleman wants me to tell how the man that goes to the grave can have hope. I am not aware that the body in the grave has any hope. I am certain that I have not intimated that it does. The body only goes to the grave, and the spirit goes to God. It is the spirit that hopes. At this juncture the gentleman says that, according to what I say, man goes two ways at once; that I have two men in one. The body is only the house in which the spirit, the real man, dwells. At death the body returns to the dust, and the spirit returns to God. (Eccles. 12:7.) But he says that, according to the contention that I make, the body is mortal and the spirit is immortal; man is part mortal and part immortal. No, sir; the body is not the man; and when we speak of the body and call it the man, we do so by metonymy.

The gentleman had quite a good deal to say in his last speech about eternal life, making the contention that if man is immortal he has eternal life now and will not receive it in the world to come. The trouble with the man is that he does not evidently understand the difference between eternal life and existence. Eternal life is not existence. The characters that will receive eternal life will exist when they receive it. If they did not exist, they could not receive it. Eternal life will be life with Christ, where we will be happy all the time.

Again are we called on to notice Eccles. 3:21. My opponent lays stress on the clause, "man has no preeminence above the beast." I have made reply to this passage in a preceding speech, but just an additional thought here. If man has no preeminence above the beast, if man is wholly mortal, is all dust, as you say, will you please tell us why it is not as much sin to kill a cow as it is a man?

Mr. Bradley takes time to tell you that he does not tell the mothers when their little babies die that the

angels have borne the precious little darlings to heaven. I shall not insist that he does, but let me assure you that I so teach. Mothers, Mr. Bradley believes that the body of your baby when it dies will continue to exist; that it returns to the dust and will always exist; that not one atom of the matter of which it was created will ever cease to exist; but he does not so believe regarding the spirit of your babe. He believes that God will preserve the matter, though it will be as inanimate as a rock. So far as the babe existing, it no more exists, per the doctrine of Mr. Bradley, after it returns to the dust than it did before it had a being. You may note the difference between us. Mr. Bradley believes that the body, every atom of it, will be preserved through all eternity; that matter cannot be destroyed; that the God that created matter made it so that it cannot be destroyed. Though it may change form, it will still exist. What does Mr. Bradley believe about the spirit of your babe? That it ceases to exist. According to my opponent, the great God is blotting out spirits at the rate of about forty-eight per minute, while at the same time he preserves every atom of matter throughout all eternity. Can you believe this? Think of a human being acting thus. What if you possessed the costliest jewel in this world—a jewel worth several thousand dollars? Place this jewel in a small earthen case, made of ordinary clay by the potter. Now go to the cliff and break the clay case, take the jewel and hurl it into the depth of the sea, where it is forever lost to man, where it will never be seen again, then gather up the broken case and preserve it with the greatest care. What would you think of such a man? Would we not regard such a man as a subject of unsound mind? Such a man would be wiser than the God my opponent presents, per his theory; for it contends that God blots the spirits out of existence and preserves the body—the case—which is only the casket in which the spirit, the jewel, is placed for a time. At death the

spirit goes to God. Your child has met a violent death. You behold the body when it is brought to you. Its form is still as perfect as when last you saw it; its eye, ear, and tongue are also; but it does not see, hear nor lisp the mother's name. Why? The spirit has gone to God.

Let me ask you farmers a question: Is it not a fact that when you plant seed in the spring there is a germ that we call the germ of life in the seed? Is it not true that in the death—decay—of that seed the germ springs forth in the plant that comes therefrom? Hear the teaching of Christ at this very point: "I say unto you, Except a corn of wheat fall into the ground and die, it abideth alone: but if it die, it bringeth forth much fruit." (John 12:24.) Again, on the same point, hear Paul: "That which thou sowest is not quickened except it die." (1 Cor. 15:36.) The teaching of Christ and Paul is that as the grain must die or it will not produce fruit, so man must die for there to be a resurrection. My opponent teaches that man dies—body, soul, and spirit. Such an idea is not in the word of God, nor is it in the mind of those who think correctly. Christ teaches that man dies, and that the grain of wheat must die or it will never vegetate. But tell me, farmers, if the life of the grain die, will it ever vegetate? True, the body of the grain dies; but in the death of the grain the life springs forth in the form of the plant. As the life of the grain springs forth in the new plant in the death of the grain, just so when this body of ours dies the spirit springs forth—the spirit returns to God that gave it.

"I knew a man in Christ above fourteen years ago, (whether in the body, I cannot tell: or whether out of the body, I cannot tell: God knoweth:) such an one caught up to the third heaven. And I knew such a man, (whether in the body, or out of the body, I cannot tell: God knoweth)." (2 Cor. 12:2, 3.) If the body is all there is of man, then Paul did not know whether the man was in or out of himself. Paul plainly teaches

from this passage that a man can be out of, separate from, the body—the house of clay.

POWER TO TAKE LIFE AGAIN.

“Destroy this temple, and in three days I will raise it up.” (John 2:19.) “I lay down my life, that I might take it again. No man taketh it from me, but I lay it down of myself. I have power to lay it down, and I have power to take it again. This commandment have I received of my Father.” (John 10:17, 18.) You note that Christ said he had power to lay down his life; but more, he said he had the power to take it again. Now, I will be much pleased to hear my opponent tell us how Christ had the power to take his life again if when he died he was dead, as the materialists teach. If Christ was dead—body, soul, and spirit—how could he exercise any power? In death the body is incapacitated for any action. If the spirit is thus dead, and the soul, how can there be the exercise of power to take life? Again, if Christ was unconscious when dead, how did he know when the three days had passed that he was to be in the heart of the earth? Sir, will you please tell us about these things?

“Since by man came death, by man came also the resurrection of the dead.” (1 Cor. 15:21.) Death is said to have come by Adam. Because of his own volition he ate of the forbidden fruit. He could have refrained from partaking and continued to have lived—remained in union with God. He was under no necessity of eating. For this reason death is said to have come by him. If Christ in death was without volition, perfectly passive, unconscious, existed only in the material out of which his body was created, I insist that he was without power, and the resurrection did not come by him, but by the power of him that raised Christ from the dead. “Christ both died, and rose, and revived, that he might be Lord both of the dead and the living.” (Rom. 14:9.) The form of language implies, of necessity, volition, power of action

to raise himself. If in death he became powerless, I submit that he did not have the power to take his life again; some one else raised him. If he was unconscious, I am curious to know how he knew when the three days that he was to be in the heart of the earth had passed, that he might raise himself at the proper time?

Again, Christ died and rose—laid down his life and took it again—that he might be the Lord of the dead and of the living. As my opponent contends that when man dies he exists only in the material that composed his body, and this material was in existence before man was, he does not, in fact, exist after death; man becomes nothing, and those that live are soon to be the same; then Christ died and rose that he might be the Lord of nothing. Pshaw!

The gentleman again insists that, according to the contention that I make, man is dead and alive at the same time. Indeed, such is the case with the Christian in this life. He is dead to sin and alive to God. But I would not for a moment have you think that I want to evade the very point that the gentleman is after. I am contending that the body without the spirit is dead (James 2:26), but I deny that the spirit without the body is dead. The spirit survives the death of the body.

HAPPY ARE THE DEAD.

“Write, Blessed are the dead which die in the Lord.” (Rev. 14:13.) “Blessed” is from the Greek word “makarios,” which Thayer defines: “Blessed, happy.” My opponent says that the dead are unconscious, and the Bible says that those that die in the Lord are happy. To think of a man being happy in the absence of consciousness is ridiculously absurd. But the righteous dead are happy, and must, therefore, be conscious. You could with as much sense speak of a happy rock or a jolly pot as a happy unconscious man. Mr. Bradley, will you please tell us, since you say that when man dies he only exists

in the material out of which his body was formed, how can the ones that die in the Lord be happy?

HOPE IN DEATH.

"The wicked is driven away in his wickedness: but the righteous hath hope in his death." (Prov. 14:32.) Note the language: "Hope in his death." I presume that no man will deny that when a man is in his death he is dead. The Scriptures declare that the righteous man in his death possesses hope. But "hope" is composed of forecast, expectation, and desire. If man in death is unconscious, as my opponent claims, I am anxious to know how he can expect or desire. "If in this life only we have hope in Christ, we are of all men most miserable." (1 Cor. 15:19.) Their hope extended beyond this life. They carried hope with them and possessed it even in death.

Your attention to this chart, please. I am certain that the mistake has been made by many in claiming that man is only a dual being. I am certain that the Scriptures teach that man is a triune being, composed of body, soul, and spirit. That the soul is not the spirit is plainly taught in the word of the Lord. The soul and the spirit may be separated; so may the soul and the body. But I have not the time to look into this matter at this juncture, and I am under no obligations to do. Let us rapidly note the passages I have tabulated on this chart: (1) "But there is a spirit in man." (Job 32:8.) This passage does not state what the spirit is or where it comes from. My opponent agrees that there is a spirit in man, and that the spirit is necessary to man being a living man, though he says that the spirit is no part of man. (2) "I Daniel was grieved in my spirit in the midst of my body, and the vision of my head troubled me." (Dan. 7:15.) Note the expressions, "my spirit," "my body," and "my head." If you are right, Mr. Bradley, when you say that the spirit is no part of man, since Daniel

says "my spirit," "my head," and "my body," will you please tell us if the "head" is any part of the man? Is the body any part of the man? If "Yes," how does it happen that the spirit is not part of the man? Do you reply that the spirit is part of the living man? You cannot so contend, for you have gone to record that it takes "body, soul, and spirit" to make the living man; but you said: "The spirit is no part of the man." (3) "Furthermore 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 passage you note that you have the father of the flesh and the Father of the spirit contrasted. God is the Father of the Spirit. It is not of the earth. (4) "We are the offspring of God." (Acts 17:29.) We are not the offspring of God as to our flesh, for the flesh is of the earth. Mr. Bradley says that the spirit is not of the earth. Now, tell us, Mr. Bradley, is that which is the offspring of God mortal? (5) "The Lord forms the spirit of man within him." (Zech. 12:1.) (6) "The days of our years are threescore years and ten; and if by reason of strength they be fourscore years, yet is their strength labor and sorrow; for it is soon cut off, and we fly away." (Ps. 90:10.) What is it that flies away? (7) "Then shall the dust return to the earth as it was: and the spirit shall return to God who gave it." (Prov. 12:7.) The spirit is the part that knows. It returns to God. (8) "I am in a straight betwixt two, having a desire to depart, and to be with Christ." (Phil. 1: 23.) (9) "We are confident, I say, and willing rather to be absent from the body, and to be present with the Lord." (2 Cor. 5: 8.) What is the "we" that is to be absent from the body and present with the Lord? (10) While Stephen was being stoned, he cried: "Lord Jesus, receive my spirit." (Acts 7:59.) (11) "Your heart shall live forever." (Ps. 22:26.) The heart, mind, and spirit are the same; and David says that the heart shall live forever. In the

Greek it is "eis aiona aionos"—forever and forever. The heart—spirit—is to live forever and forever. (12) "In the way of righteousness is life; and in the pathway thereof there is no death." (Prov. 12:28.) That there is death for the man that serves the Lord we all know, so far as his body is considered; but the statement is very plain that there is no death for the man that is in the "pathway" of righteousness. The body dies, but the spirit does not. Wonder if my opponent wants to ask again about dead and alive at the same time?

PREACHED TO SPIRITS.

You will please remember that my opponent says that the spirit is no part of man. If this be true, I am very anxious for him to give his attention to the following, and by all means let this people hear your reply: "For Christ also hath once suffered for sins, the just for the unjust, that he might bring us to God, being put to death in the flesh, but quickened by the Spirit: by which he also went and preached unto the spirits in prison." (1 Peter 3:18, 19.) I shall not stop at this time to argue when this preaching was done; it does not matter, so far as the argument that I desire your attention to just now. You will please note that the preaching was done to the "spirits." Now, Mr. Bradley, since you say that the spirit is no part of the man, will you please make an assault or an attempt to tell what benefit the people did or could receive from the preaching? Remember, the preaching was done to the "spirits," and you say that the spirit is no part of the man. Then the preaching was not done to men. Shucks! What next? [Time expired.]

BRADLEY'S FIFTH AFFIRMATIVE.

Gentlemen Moderators, Ladies and Gentlemen:

I must say that I am glad to be before you to continue the investigation of the word of God on this proposition, especially when it is going the way that it is now. We are now beginning the last session of this debate, and I want to ask you to follow me closely and note the connection and the arguments that are produced on the question. You will see the great difference in the way that I conduct my part of the debate and the way that my opponent conducts his. I want to say to you that I am relying on the word of God to prove the proposition that I am affirming in this debate; for if it is not taught in the Bible, then it is no good, and you should not accept it as the divine truth of God.

You remember that I am affirming that man is wholly mortal and unconscious from death till the resurrection. I am very certain that I have fully established my proposition, but there are many other things that can be said on the proposition.

There was really nothing in the last speech of my opponent that is worthy of attention, for he produced no arguments that prove contrary to the position that I am contending for. Time is too short for me to spend in noting the things that my friend said that do not bear on the subject; so I will ask your attention to scriptures that prove the proposition. Let us again read Rom. 2: 6, 7: "Who will render to every man according to his deeds: to them who by patient continuance in well-doing seek for glory and honor and immortality, eternal life." In this you note that it is said that we seek for immortality. We do not seek for that which we have, but Paul

says that we seek for immortality; therefore we are not immortal. If we are not immortal, we are mortal, and Job says that we are mortal; and certainly since we are seeking for immortality, we are not immortal, and my proposition is true that man is wholly mortal.

I have said that it takes the body, soul, and spirit to make the living man; for Paul says: "I pray God that your whole spirit and soul and body be preserved till the coming of the Lord Jesus Christ." (1 Thess. 5:23.) Now, I contend that if the spirit is immortal, or if there is anything immortal about man, it will be preserved; for that which is immortal cannot be destroyed. The soul of man is the animal life, as I have said before.

You will now give me your attention as I present some of the passages that bear on the question, and that, to my mind, show that I am right in the affirmation that I am making in this debate.

I invite your attention to Isa. 57:16: "For I will not contend forever, neither will I be always wroth: for the spirit should fail before me, and the souls that I have made."

My opponent has asked me if the spirit in man lives. I read Isa. 38:16: "O Lord, by these things men live, and in all these things is the life of my spirit." Yes, the spirit in man lives; but it is mortal.

We beg to invite your attention now to 1 Tim. 4:8: "For bodily exercise profiteth little: but godliness is profitable unto all things, having the promise of the life that now is, and that which is to come." Thus you see, respected friends, that there is a life to come. I want to impress the fact on your minds that if man is immortal he cannot die; he must live all the time; and, therefore, there is no life to come. But since we have life now, and all of us are to die, and then there is the life which is to come, it proves my proposition that man is mortal—that he dies. If we don't die, there is no life to come for us. If we are immortal, we will never die; but the divine

truth of God says that we must all die; therefore we are not immortal.

Now, my friend knows that he misrepresents my statement when he says that I teach that when a man dies he is no more than a dog when it dies. I have not said anything of the kind, and he knows very well that I have not. Such is not my teaching, and he knows it; but that is the best that he can do. He can't reply to the things that I say; so he misrepresents me, twists my position just a little, and then displays some logic and his misrepresentation of me, and some of you, no doubt, think that is the very thing; but I want to tell you, respected friends, that is not debating. I trust that I will not have to speak of this matter again. It would be much pleasanter to meet a man that would deal with the arguments that I present, and not misstate me, than it is to meet that man. The truth is, he knows that the position that I hold is not a popular position, and he knows that he can easily create prejudice against me; and, therefore, he does not fail to try to do it, for he hopes in that way to gain the debate; but I want to tell you that these people are getting their eyes open to the truth, and you will have to present some argument in this matter if you expect to make a showing in this debate.

I read Gen. 2:7: "And the Lord God formed man of the dust of the ground, and breathed into his nostrils the breath of life; and man became a living soul." I want to impress the fact on your minds, respected friends, that God formed the man out of the dust of the ground. It was the man that God formed, or created, out of the dust. After God created man, he then breathed into his nostrils, and that made him live; therefore man was dead till God gave him that breath of life. Mr. Nichol says that if "breath of life" means that the breath produced or caused the life, then the preposition "of" denotes causation. I guess it has never occurred to him that the preposition has the meaning of "by the aid of." Are you

willing to go down in this debate that man does not live by the aid of breath of life? If you are, just say so, and it will go down that way. Now, since God formed man of the dust of the ground and man was man before he breathed the breath of life into him, before he gave him that breath that made him live, I contend that he was dead, and that when that breath of life leaves man he will be dead, and will return to the dust, from whence he was taken.

My opponent has had a great deal to say about the inner and the outer man. Thus he has two men in one—the inner man and the outer man. He teaches that the spirit is the inner man and that the body is the outer man. He teaches that the spirit is a man; that it is the inner man. Now let us try his logic. According to Nichol, the spirit of man is a man. If that is true, then the spirit of God is a God. Thus you see he has two Gods—an inner God and an outer God. The Spirit of Christ is a Christ; then he has two Christs—an inner Christ and an outer Christ. Again, the spirit of the devil is a devil; then he has two devils—an inner devil and an outer devil. Thus you see how foolish his arguments become when they are examined. Two men in one—an inner man and an outer man; two Gods, then two Christs and two devils. What next will he try to get up to try to defend his position? Now, how do you like your logic? I tell you, my friends, that is a sample of the logic that he has been offering you all through this debate; and it needs to be but examined that you may see that it is sophistry. Mr. Nichol, since you say that there is an inner man and an outer man, two men in one—an inner Nichol and an outer Nichol—I want you to tell these people which one of these men did Mrs. Nichol marry—the inner Nichol, that invisible Nichol, or the outer Nichol?

My opponent tries every way to get up something with which to disprove the proposition that I am affirming. He says that the body of man changes completely

every seven years, and that if the man is wholly mortal, then the man changes every seven years; that there is a new man every seven years; that the material composing the body is thrown off and replaced by new material every seven years. If that be true, I guess that Mrs. Nichol is living with her third husband.

It was necessary for Christ to die that he might destroy death. As long as we are in this life we are subject to death. The devil has not been destroyed. Heb. 2:14: "Forasmuch then as the children are partakers of flesh and blood, he also himself likewise took part of the same; that through death he might destroy him that had the power of death, that is, the devil." This will not be done till we have passed from this life unto death and into life again. That will be at the resurrection.

My opponent has made an argument on John 16: 17, 18: "Therefore doth my Father love me, because I lay down my life, that I might take it again. No man taketh it from me, but I lay it down of myself. I have power to lay it down, and I have power to take it again. This commandment have I received of my Father." My opponent contends that since Christ had the power to take his life again, and that he came forth from the dead at the time that the prophets said that he should, that he must, therefore, have been conscious. You will note, respected friends, that the passage says that this commandment—the commandment to lay down his life and take it again—he had received from the Father. This is why he came forth from the grave. My friends, Christ was dead when he was placed in the grave; and as proof of it I read to you from Rev. 1:18: "I am he that liveth, and was dead; and, behold, I am alive for evermore, Amen; and have the keys of hell and death." He was dead. Yes, sir; Christ was dead; but he will never die again. The death that belongs to this life has passed upon him, but he is alive now for evermore. He passed through death to life that never ends. He is immortal.

He was raised from the dead, and that is the time that we are to be made immortal. If Christ had been immortal, he could never have died; for you know that that which is immortal cannot die.

Man is wholly mortal, for the book of God says that he is; and it is strange to me that men will try to prove something else.

My friend reads to you John 12:24: "Verily, verily, I say unto you, Except a corn of wheat fall into the ground and die, it abideth alone: but if it die, it bringeth forth much fruit." From this he argued that as the grain of corn died, the new life, stalk, springs forth; that the germ of life in the grain of corn does not die. But you will remember that, according to the position that my opponent is contending for, when a man dies, the germ, the spirit, is taken out of the body and flies away to God and is in paradise. Then, since the germ is gone, there will be no resurrection.

I want to tell you that I believe and teach, according to the word of God, that God is able to re-create and bring man forth at the resurrection. Now let us read 1 Tim. 6:14-16: "That thou keep this commandment without spot, unrebukable, 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." This is of Christ that Paul is speaking. Now let me read to you the same passage from the Twentieth Century translation, which I think makes it some clearer: "I urge you to keep his command, free from stain or reproach, until the appearance of Jesus Christ, our Lord. This will be brought about in his own time by the ever-blessed Potentate, the King of all kings and Lord of all lords, who alone is possessed of immortality and dwells in unapproachable light, who no mortal has

ever seen or ever can see, and, to whom be ascribed honor and power forever. Amen." How does that suit you, friend Nichol? I think that this translation makes it plainer. Christ alone has immortality. The word of God says that Christ is the only one that has immortality; and this being true, I know that man does not. Then man must be wholly mortal. This is the word of God for it, and I am going to stay by the word of God through all this debate.

My friends, I defined "immortality" to mean that which cannot die; that the one that is immortal is not subject to death; and my opponent has not called in question the definition that I gave. I contend (and you all know that I am right) that man does die; and, therefore, man is not immortal. Again, that man is not immortal is proven by the fact that man does not have eternal life in this world. In proof of this I invite your attention to John 10:27, 28: "My sheep hear my voice, and I know them, and they follow me: and I give unto them eternal life; and they shall never perish." Thus you see that when they get eternal life they will never perish—that is, they will never die. But when do we get this eternal life? Jesus says in Mark 10:28-30 that we get eternal life in the world to come. Thus you see that man does not have eternal life in this world now, but he is to die; then he is not immortal, for that which is immortal cannot die.

Now let me read more in confirmation of the fact that man is wholly mortal. I now read from Rom. 2:6, 7: "Who will render to every man according to his deeds: to them who by patient continuance in well-doing seek for glory and honor and immortality, eternal life." Now, what can be plainer than that? This passage says very plainly that we seek for immortality, and you all know that we do not seek for that which we have. The fact that we seek for immortality shows that we are not immortal; and if we are not immortal, we are mortal, and

wholly mortal, as my proposition says. I am surprised that any man would call in question the fact that man is wholly mortal when the word of the Lord says that man is mortal, and then it says that man seeks for immortality.

Now, I will read some passages that prove that man is unconscious from death till the resurrection. I invite your attention to Eccles. 9:5-10: "For the living know that they shall die: but the dead know not anything, neither have they any more a reward; for the memory of them is forgotten. Also their love, and their hatred, and their envy, is now perished; neither have they any more a portion forever in anything that is done under the sun. Go thy way, eat thy bread with joy, and drink thy wine with a merry heart; for God now accepteth thy works. Let thy garments be always white, and let thy head lack no ointment. Live joyfully with the wife whom thou lovest all the days of the life of thy vanity, which he hath given you under the sun, all the days of thy vanity; for that is thy portion in this life, and in thy labor which thou takest under the sun. Whatsoever thy hand findeth to do, do it with thy might; for there is no work, nor device, nor knowledge, nor wisdom, in the grave, whither thou goest." You can see, respected friends, that the contention that I am making is in accordance with the word of the Lord. When man dies, he returns to the dust; he goes to the grave, and the Lord says that there is no knowledge in the grave. Then, since there is no knowledge in the grave, where man goes when he dies, how can we say that he is conscious? Can a man be conscious and not know it? Man goes to the grave, and in the grave there is no knowledge; therefore man is not conscious in the grave. It seems to me that every one can see this plain proposition.

I have asked my opponent on one occasion after another to answer questions, but he positively refuses to answer them by his actions, and that goes to show that he cannot answer them according to the word of God

and the position that he holds; therefore he leaves them untouched. He has some questions now that I gave him in writing this morning that he has not answered, nor has he attempted to answer them. He has not referred to them. Now you watch and see if he ever answers them. He knows that he cannot and hold his position, and for that reason he will not say anything about them. I don't do him that way, and you all know that I don't.

I am still contending as I did when I began this debate, and I will ever contend as I do now, that man is wholly mortal and unconscious from death till the resurrection; for I have the divine truth of God on my side. I say that when a man dies, he is dead; and when he is dead, he is most certainly unconscious, for the dead know not anything. Now if man was not wholly mortal, there would be no use of his returning to the dust, but he could go to heaven as he is here on earth. But the Bible says that we all die. Rom. 5:12: "Wherefore as by one man sin entered into the world, and death by sin; and so death passed upon all men, for that all have sinned." Yes, all have sinned and come short of the glory of God. 1 Cor. 15:22: "For as in Adam all die, even so in Christ shall all be made alive." Thus you see that all men are to die, and then all men will be made alive; so you see that they do not have life all the time; and, therefore, they are not immortal, as my opponent contends.

Respected friends, my friend Nichol will tell you this and that, and will make all manner of fun of the teachings that I set before you, and this thing and that thing will he bring up; but I tell you, respected friends, that that is not meeting the arguments that I bring before you, and I am giving friend Nichol some trouble. You can all see it, too. I have told you this before, but it shows so plainly on him that I am compelled to speak of it again. I asked my friend this question: Is the spirit of man dead at death? And you see that he has not an-

swered, not only this question, but I have asked him other questions that he has passed by untouched and unanswered. Why? Because he knows very well that he cannot answer them, and he is too honest to make up something and tell you that it is the word of God. Therefore he just says nothing about the many questions that I have asked him. Think for yourselves a moment, and see how many questions you can think of that he has not answered. I know that he has not forgotten them, because I asked him to note them down. I tell you, respected friends, that I am presenting to you the truth of God; and, therefore, the position that my opponent is contending for cannot be right. I have read to you faithfully from the word of God the scriptures that go to prove the position that I affirm.

I wish that my friend would come up with some argument on this question and let us have some real debating. I am somewhat surprised that he has not done better. He has absolutely failed to bring up one single thing in confirmation of the position that he is contending for. I am still waiting for him to bring up something, and he has only one more speech in which to bring up any proof. I don't think that I would agree to debate a question if I did not have something to offer in support of it.

My friends, you know that if a man is conscious he knows it. The word of God says that the dead know not anything. Then, how can the dead be conscious? It seems strange to me that a man would contend against such plain statements.

My friend Nichol tells you the things that I present are not true. He insinuated that I don't tell the truth about these matters; but let me tell you, respected friends, the things that I tell you come from the word of God, and must be true. The reason that he tells you that is that he has no arguments to produce himself; therefore this is all that he can do, and he thinks that that

is better than nothing. But let me tell you, respected friends, don't you let him hypnotize you with his seemingly logical points, for I tell you that there is nothing in them. [Time expired.]

NICHOL'S FIFTH NEGATIVE.

Gentlemen Moderators, Ladies and Gentlemen:

The gentleman continues to amuse me in his efforts to prove his proposition. Possibly it would not be so funny to me if I did not know that there is not one word in the entire Bible that remotely favors the contention that he has undertaken to establish in this debate. Since we are now in the last session of the debate, I thought that he would attempt at least one clear-cut argument in an effort to establish his affirmation. Possibly his entire strength is consumed in the digestion and assimilation of the noon meal. At any rate, there is little in the last speech of the gentleman that has not been reviewed more than once in the debate. I shall note what he says carefully, and then offer some matter that I trust he will have the time and disposition to attempt to answer. Hear me closely, for I shall speak rapidly in this speech. If I speak too rapidly to the stenographer, he will call me.

Our attention is again called to Eccles. 9:5-10: "For the living know that they shall die: but the dead know not anything, neither have they any more a reward; for the memory of them is forgotten. Also their love, and their hatred, and their envy, is now perished; neither have they any more a portion forever in anything that is done under the sun." I have replied to this passage fully once, but my opponent offered not one word of reply. I shall briefly notice it again for the benefit of those that were not here. If all would secure a copy of the book when published, I would not reply again. Let us note some other passages that contain the same kind of expression. "For we are but of yesterday, and know nothing, because our days upon earth are a shadow."

(Job 8:9.) Again: "And with Absalom went two hundred men out of Jerusalem, that were called; and they went in their simplicity, and they knew not anything." (2 Sam. 15:11.) Is it literally true that the ones that went with Absalom "knew not anything?" Is this not an accommodated expression and true that they did not know anything about what the prophet had reference to? Now the passage that my opponent introduces from Ecclesiastes: "The dead know not anything." This is the passage that all of his brethren regard as positive proof that the dead are unconscious. They think that it coruscates with proof for them. As usual, they are wrong. "The dead know not anything." Shall this passage be taken in an unqualified sense? If "Yes," then so must all the clauses in the passage be so construed. In the same passage we find: "Neither have they any more a reward." If the phrase, "the dead know not anything," is to be taken without any qualifications, so must the phrase, "neither have they any more a reward." Do you mean to contend that those who are dead will not have a reward; that there will not be a reward for those that die in the Lord; that there is no reward for us after death? Such must be your claim, or you must qualify the phrases. Now hear the passage again: "For the living know that they shall die: but the dead know not anything, neither have they any more a reward; for the memory of them is forgotten. Also their love, and their hatred, and their envy, is now perished; neither have they any more a portion forever in anything that is done under the sun." It must be apparent to every one that both passages are qualified by "under the sun." "The dead know not anything," under the sun; "neither have they any more a reward," under the sun.

There is certainly no hope in the grave. But you will please remember that it is the body that goes to the grave; the spirit returns to God in the full possession of

life and hope, as I have shown and will show again presently.

My friend now says that the soul of man is the "animal life." Indeed, he is reckless. I am beginning to think that he will soon contend that the animals are immortal, while man is, he says, mortal. Let us see about the soul being the "animal life." "And the Lord God formed man of the dust of the ground, and breathed into his nostrils the breath of life; and man became a living soul." (Gen. 2:7.) That is, if soul means "animal life," man becomes a living animal life. Think of it—a living animal life! Living life! Wonder if the gentleman thinks there can be a dead "animal life?" I was of the impression that the opposition contended that the soul could be destroyed; that men could kill animals; but if the soul is the "animal life," as he says, I know that man cannot affect it. Listen: "And fear not them that kill the body, but are not able to kill the soul." That is, according to Mr. Bradley, men can kill the body; but don't fear them, for they are not able to kill the soul, "the animal life." Try again, my dear sir.

Isa. 57:16 is read without a comment. I believe all that is said in the Bible. Isa. 38:16 is next introduced: "In all these things is the life of my spirit." Of this passage he says: "I know that the spirit lives, but it is mortal." Your *ipse dixit* is not accepted. The proof is the thing that we want. You will please not assume the very thing that the proof is wanted on. You are coming some. When I met you before, you claimed that the spirit did not live, and, therefore, could not die. Now you say that it lives. You may accept the truth later in life. You have been claiming that, according to the contention that I make, there are two men in one. Tell us now, since you say that the spirit is no part of the man, but since the spirit is in man and lives and the man lives, what relationship the life of the spirit bears to the life of the man, if any.

The next passage: "For bodily exercise profiteth little; but godliness is profitable unto all things, having promise of the life that now is, and of that which is to come." (1 Tim. 4:8.) From this it is argued that we are living one life now, and that in the other world we are to live another life. We live now where we are subject to temptations, trouble, pain, toil, and vexations; but for the faithful ones there is a home in which they will live where they will not be subjected to the pain and turmoils incident to this life. It is the life to come.

Job 14:1, 2, 10, 14, is next introduced: "Man that is born of woman is of few days, and full of trouble. He cometh forth like a flower, and is cut down: he fleeth also as a shadow, and continueth not." Verse 10: "But man dieth, and wasteth away: yea, man giveth up the ghost, and where is he?" Verse 14: "If a man die, shall he live again? all the days of my appointed time will I wait till my change come." If there is one thing in these passages that remotely resembles proof that man is wholly mortal or unconscious from death till the resurrection, I fail to see it. The passage is just as we speak. We speak of man being consigned to the grave and remaining there till the resurrection, but we do not mean that the spirit is ever placed in the grave.

Gen. 2:7 is again introduced, and this time we are told that God formed man out of the dust of the ground and then gave the man that which made him live. I have paid my respects to that thought, and you will hear it again in my next speech.

The gentleman says that if the body changes every seven years, as I have contended, he guesses that my wife, Mrs. Nichol, is living with her third husband. My, my! Do I look that old? He then inquires: "Which man did Mrs. Nichol marry?" Pshaw! She married the man Nichol—not the old house in which Nichol lives.

The reply that is made to the argument that I offered from John 10:17, 18, where it is said that Christ laid down

his life and took it again, amuses me, and falls far short of being a reply. The only reply that is made is that Christ received the command from the Father to take his life again. Grant that, certainly. But it does not affect the argument that I made that he had the power, though dead, to take his life, and was conscious and came forth at the very time the Scriptures said that he should.

In reply to the argument I made from the grain of seed he says: "Your doctrine takes the germ out of man and places it in paradise. Then there will be no resurrection." True, the spirit goes to God when man dies, and will not be resurrected. The body goes to the grave, and it will be resurrected.

As I predicted, the gentleman has in his last speech denied the resurrection. He says: "I believe that God can re-create and bring man forth in the resurrection." That is the position that he is driven to by his doctrine. As has been shown in my preceding speeches, according to the gentleman, when man dies he no more exists than Adam did before he was created. Thus the gentleman admitted that argument by saying that he believes God will re-create man.

The man again introduces 1 Tim. 6:16: "Who only hath immortality." Commenting on the passage, he says: "God is the only one possessing immortality." He says much more than he means to say; for if God is the only one who has immortality, then Christ does not possess it, and is mortal. Again: "Christ says the angels cannot die; they are immortal." It seems that the man has forgotten all that he has read in the Bible, or is so badly excited that he does not know what he is saying. I am satisfied that the speeches that he is making will be a revelation to him when they come from the stenographer for him to correct. Indeed, the passage that he reads is in my favor, as is the entire Bible. Instead of the passage testifying in your favor, it is clearly against you, and declares that man is not wholly mortal. Paul

says that God "only hath immortality." In that he affirms that there is not one thing about God that is mortal. Man has that about him that is mortal as well as immortal. God only hath immortality—nothing about him that is mortal.

The gentleman then has much to say about eternal life. Let me again say to him that eternal life and immortality are very different. He contends that man has not eternal life now; and, therefore, he has nothing about him that is immortal. I am certain that such does not follow. The people of God, the Christian man, has life now, is alive in Christ, is now in the possession of life; and the life that the Christian man has, which is spiritual life, will never cease if he is faithful to the commands of the Lord. The life that we have will be possessed by us through all of our days on this earth; and then when the death of the body comes, the life that we have as a result of being born into the kingdom of God will not cease, but will continue through the death state and through all eternity. Let me repeat the statement: The man that is in Christ is alive, has life; and if these Christians will obey the law of the Lord, that life will never come to an end. It will be theirs through all their days on this earth; and then when death for the body comes, the spirit will continue to have the life in Christ. The life of the faithful man of God never ends. Through our days on this earth, through the death state, and through the glory world the spirit will continue to have that life. Let me say, though, that simply existence is not eternal life; eternal life is the life of perfect happiness that we will enjoy in the world to come.

I am asked the following questions: (1) "Is the spirit of man a creature?" Answer: If you mean by "creature" the real person, the "ego," the man, Yes. (2) "Is the spirit of man in man at the beginning of man's existence?" Yes. (3) "If it is, how does it get there?" Answer: Zech. 12:1. (4) "Does the soul die?" Yes; but

not in the sense that you use the word "die."

While in the question business, will you please answer the following? (1) Does it take body, soul, and spirit to make man? (2) Is the spirit any part of man? (3) Was the spirit created out of the dust? (4) Since the spirit of man knows (1 Cor. 2:11), does it lose its knowledge when it returns to God? (5) What is the difference in "angel" and "spirit" in Acts 23:8?

This more than compliments the speech of Mr. Bradley, and I now ask your attention to a chart and some counter arguments.

2 Cor. 4:16-18: "For which cause we faint not: but though our outward man perish, yet the inward man is renewed day by day. For our light affliction, which is but for a moment, worketh for us a far more exceeding and eternal weight of glory; while we look not at things that are seen, but at things which are not seen: for the things which are seen are temporal; but the things which are not seen are eternal." The outward man is seen; it is temporal; it perishes. The inward man—the spirit—is not seen; it is eternal. See how plain the contrast is between the body and the spirit. The body—the outward man—is seen, and perishes; it is temporal; it is mortal. The spirit—the inward man—is not seen; it is eternal; it is immortal. 2 Cor. 5:1: "For we know that if our earthly house of this tabernacle were dissolved, we have a building of God, a house not made with hands, eternal in the heavens." Verse 6: "Therefore we are always confident, knowing that, whilst we are at home in the body, we are absent from the Lord." Verse 8: "We are confident, I say, and willing rather to be absent from the body, and to be present with the Lord." Does the passage need a comment? Is it not plain enough that even my opponent can appreciate the truth of it? Paul says that while we are at home in the body, we are absent from the Lord; while, on the other hand, when we are absent from the body, we are to be

present with the Lord. What is this "we" that he speaks of? It is the thing that is present with the Lord when absent from the body. When the spirit leaves the body, the body is without the spirit; the body is dead, and the spirit goes to God. This spirit is the "we" that Paul speaks of as being present with the Lord when it is absent from the body. You note also that Paul speaks of the "we" being at home in the body. The body is only the house in which the "we"—the spirit—dwells.

In Matthew, chapter 10, Christ assures his disciples that they will be as sheep among wolves; that bitter persecution will be theirs—yea, that even death awaited them. He admonishes them to be unfaltering in their loyalty to him. Fear not, said he, those who kill the body, but after that can do you no more harm; but rather fear him that can destroy body and soul. He insists on their constancy, consoling them thus: "He that findeth [preserveth] his life shall lose it: and he that loseth his life for my sake shall find it." The lesson of Christ is very plain in this passage—viz.: When persecutions come, as they certainly will, he who preserves his life—i. e., he who denies me, recants—will not be put to death; you will preserve your life, continue to live in this world; and Mr. Bradley will admit that they would have continued while here in a conscious state. On the other hand, "he who loses his life on my account shall find [preserve] it"—that is, those of my disciples who refuse to deny me when persecutions come, even though the enemies may kill your body, by your faithfulness you will preserve your life. In the first instance, those who preserved their lives by denying Christ continued in a "conscious state." I am solicitous to know why it is that in the second place those who preserved their lives were not conscious also. If it be true that in one instance "findeth his life" means that they continued in a conscious state, so also must "find life" in the second clause mean to continue in a conscious state. If not, why not?

LOVE NEVER FAILS

"Charity (love) never faileth: but whether there be prophecies, they shall fail; whether there be tongues, they shall cease." (1 Cor.13:8.) Love never *faileth*. "Faileth" is from "pipto," and means: "To fall, to fall down. (Metaph.) To perish, to come to an end, disappear, cease." It is certainly used metaphorically in this passage. "Love *never* faileth." "Never" is from "oudepote," a strong negative adverb, and means: "Never, not ever, not at any time," Paul declares that love perishes not at any time, never comes to an end, never ceases. The Corinthians were elated over spiritual gifts; they coveted them. Paul informs them that they were to be desired, but they would cease, while love would not. Since love does not cease, then the one that loves will not cease; and if he continues loving, certainly he is conscious.

PRECIOUS IS THE DEATH OF SAINTS.

"Precious in the sight of the Lord is the death of his saints." Mr. Bradley teaches that when man dies he ceases to exist; at least that the dead man doesn't exist one bit more than Adam did before he was created. Only the material out of which the body was formed exists. A saint is a man. Then this passage means, in the light of the contention of my opponent: Precious in the sight of the Lord is the ceasing to be of his saints. Is the sight of a saint so repugnant to the Lord that he desires saints to cease to exist? If Mr. Bradley is correct in his contention, this must be true. Again, "As I live, saith the Lord God, I have no pleasure in the death of the wicked." (Ezek. 33:11)—i. e., according to the doctrine of my opponent, God does not desire the ceasing to be of the wicked, but desires the ceasing to be of the saints, or God delights, desires his saints, good men, to cease to be, but does not desire the wicked, bad men, to cease to be. This is the God my friend presents, per the doctrine he advocates.

A God that desires the good to cease to be and does not desire the bad men to cease to be is a God that I have no respect for. In truth, gentlemen, the Lord does not take pleasure in the ceasing to be of the saints. Death does not mean "ceasing to be." Saints are the children of the Lord. His eyes are ever over them, and his ears open to their prayers. They are his friends. As we find much pleasure when our friends are near us, delight when they are free from all pain and care and sorrow, even so the Lord delights in his saints, friends being with him, free from this body of dull mortality and existing in a state where sorrow and pain, disappointment and care, are unknown.

It is insisted that I show some of the wicked who exist after death. I am willing to do so for the sake of the truth, and trust that you will note the reply that is made to the scriptures. I am frank to confess that I am much disappointed in my opponent. When I met him before, he made an effort to reply to my arguments; but this time he lets them pass without a word. This debate has been pending for a year or more, and there is no excuse for not being prepared. Possibly he is doing as well as can be done for the cause he has espoused. Now let us look for some who have died and still exist in a conscious state. "And the angels which kept not their first estate, but left their own habitation, he hath reserved in everlasting chains under darkness unto the judgment of the great day." (Jude 6.) Peter says (2 Pet. 3:6) that "reserved" means "kept in store." These angels that sinned, "kept not their first estate," are "kept in store." But mark you, that which does not exist cannot be kept in store. Then these angels continued to exist. This is certain. Listen to the next verse of Jude: "Even as Sodom and Gomorrah, and the cities about them in like manner, giving themselves over to fornication, and going after strange flesh, are set forth as an example, suffering the vengeance of eternal fire." And the next verse—

listen: "Likewise also these filthy dreamers defile the flesh, despise dominion, and speak evil of dignities." Note: (1) The angels that sinned are reserved, "kept in store," to be punished. They continued to exist. (2) What must be the force of the words "even as" in the next verse in reference to the Sodomites? Certainly it declares, as the angels which sinned are "kept in store" to be punished, "even so" are these sinners from among men "kept in store" for the same time of punishment. (3) The next verse says: "Likewise also these filthy dreamers." "Likewise"—i. e., just as those angels that sinned are "kept in store" to be punished, so also these filthy dreamers are "kept in store" to be punished. But that cannot be "kept in store" which does not exist. But the angels that sinned are kept in store; therefore they exist. "Likewise" filthy dreamers are kept in store; therefore they exist. But Mr. Bradley says that when man dies, only the material of which his body was formed exists but the material of which Adam was formed existed before Adam was formed. Then it would have been as easy to have kept the material of Adam in store, before it was Adam, as it will to keep in store the filthy dreamers. But before Adam was formed, Adam did not exist; though the material out of which he was created did exist, it was not Adam. Just so, though the gentleman is right that only the material of these filthy dreamers does exist and is "kept in store," it is no more the filthy dreamers than the material out of which Adam was formed was Adam before he was formed.

Mr. Bradley says that if I will read a passage that speaks of any that died being conscious he will give up the debate. I have heard him talk that way before, and know just how to take his promises; but I shall present the passage, just the same; hear it, Mr. Bradley: "I saw under the altar the souls of them that were slain for the word of God, and for the testimony which they held: and they cried with a loud voice, saying, How

long, O Lord, holy and true, dost thou not judge and avenge our blood on them that dwell on the earth?" (Rev. 6:9, 10.) So certain as the Bible is true, just that certain did John see under the altar the souls of those that were slain for the word of God. Not only did he see these souls, but he heard them cry. But these souls were conscious, and remembered that they had been slain by those that dwelt on the earth. I wonder if my opponent will say that they cried, but were unconscious? Here, sir, are some that are conscious after death and before the resurrection. Were you only jesting about quitting the debate, or did you mean that if I would make you believe the Bible you would quit the debate?

MAN DOES NOT WORSHIP.

According to the position that Mr. Bradley has taken in this debate, man does not worship. In all ages and climes men have worshiped what they recognized as God. The civilized, semicivilized, and barbarians, all worship what they call God. Much of the worship flowing from the heart of man has not by him been accepted, for it was not as he directed. God demands that we "worship in spirit and in truth." Mr. Bradley says that the spirit in man is no part of the man. It follows, then, that if it is the spirit in man that worships, it is not the man that worships; for, according to Mr. Bradley, "the spirit in man is no part of the man." The Bible plainly says that it is the spirit that worships, but the spirit in man is no part of man, says Bradley. Then it is not the man that worships, but a thing that is no part of man. Shucks! But again Bradley says "the spirit in man is no part of the man." But the Scriptures say: "What man knoweth the things of a man, save the spirit of man which is in him?" Thus it is seen that the spirit knows; but if the spirit is no part of the man, as my opponent says, then men don't know a thing. If you are right, sir, men are certainly in a bad fix. But the spirit

“prays and sings;” but if it is no part of the man, then the man doesn’t do these things. Will you please tell us one thing that the man does in the service of God, if, as you say, the spirit is no part of the man? What will men teach next and claim that it is found in the Bible? Shucks!

MAN IN GOD’S IMAGE.

“Let us make man in our image, after our likeness: and let them have dominion over the fish of the sea, and over the fowl of the air, and over the cattle, and over all the earth.” (Gen. 1:26.) Was man created in a physical image of God? May there not be a spiritual—mental—image? Man in the image of God was created and given dominion over the things of the earth. To my mind, the idea is: God created man in his mental image—the image that enabled him to exercise dominion, rule, control.

When we consider man’s physique, he is inferior to most animals in strength, speed and agility, and grace of movement. If his dominion, ruling, over the animals is to be found in his physical powers, I submit that a failure has been made. In muscular combat man is not able to subdue and chain the lion nor curb the tiger. He is not sufficiently fleet of foot in the chase to catch the gazelle, antelope, or horse, and exercise dominion over them. In truth, the image is a mental one, by which man does exercise dominion. Man is in the image of God; but God is a Spirit, and a spirit has not flesh and blood. Woman is in the image of man, is the image and glory of man; yet there is quite a difference in their forms. It is a mental image. We often declare a child to be like its father because of its mental temperament. Mr. Bradley, is the body of man in the image of God; if not, what is?

CONQUER DEATH.

Jesus took on him flesh and blood, “that through death he might destroy him that had the power of death,

that is, the devil." (Heb. 2:14.) Christ conquered him that had the power of death—the devil. To my mind, it certainly required action to conquer. The conquest must certainly be made in the domain of the one conquered. But the field is death, for death is always in death. For that reason it was necessary that Christ should have power and exercise it in death. Bradley says that Christ became unconscious in death; that only the material out of which he was created existed. If that be true, the devil conquered him. But Christ entered the strong man's house, bound him, and spoiled his goods.

OBEDIENT UNTO DEATH.

Christ "became obedient unto death, even the death of the cross." (Phil. 2:8.) Again: "I lay down my life, that I might take it again. No man taketh it from me, but I lay it down of myself. I have power to lay it down, and I have power to take it again. This commandment have I received of my Father." Paul says that Christ became obedient unto death, and Christ says that the commandment he obeyed he received of the Father. But the commandment that he obeyed was to lay down his life and take it again. Mr. Bradley declares that when Christ died he became unconscious. Then in death Christ could not have obeyed the command to "take his life again," for no one can obey a command that he can't remember. But in obeying there must be power of will. But Mr. Bradley says that when man dies he can't even think; hence the idea of obeying is absurd. In death he says there is no power of action; then to think of Christ obeying the command to "take his life again" is foolish.

TO DIE IS GAIN.

"For me to live is Christ, and to die is gain." (Phil. 1:21.) Is it not true that where there is no capacity to enjoy a benefit or to receive one, there can't be a gain?

It so appears to me. If in death man is unconscious, he is incapacitated to receive or enjoy a benefit, and could not gain anything by death. Your position makes Paul's language foolishness.

SPIRIT OF MAN.

The Scriptures speak of the spirit of man which is in him; also of "the spirits of men." Note, it is not the "spirit of men," but "the spirit of man." My opponent seems to think that there is one common spirit for man and beast, like the air we breathe. If such be the case, we might as well speak of the breaths of men as of the "spirits of men." We say the "breath of men," because it is one common breath. When speaking of men, we say "the spirits of men," because it is not one common spirit, but each man has his own spirit.

TRANSFIGURATION.

"And it came to pass about an eight days after these sayings, he took Peter and John and James, and went up into a mountain to pray. And as he prayed, the fashion of his countenance was altered, and his raiment was white and glistening. And, behold, there talked with him two men, which were Moses and Elias: who appeared in glory, and spake of his decease which he should accomplish at Jerusalem. But Peter and they that were with him were heavy with sleep: and when they were awake, they saw his glory, and the two men that stood with him." (Luke 9:28-32.) Indeed, this was no mere vision. The thing was there before they saw it. They were awakened that they might behold it. "Moses and Elias" talking with Jesus—a real transaction. "Two men, which were Moses and Elias." They had retained their personality and identity. One of these men had been caught up into glory centuries before, the other had departed still longer and his body buried; yet they are still men, neither extinct nor unconscious, but in the full

possession of consciousness. They had not been raised from the dead, for Christ was the first fruits of them that slept. Still, in the face of the plain statement that the Bible says that Moses and Elias appeared on the mount, and that they talked with Jesus, and Peter, James, and John saw and heard them, my distinguished opponent says that they were not there. Are you surprised that men are found that do not give credence to the word of God when men that pose as preachers thus talk?

SHALL NEVER DIE.

“And whosoever liveth and believeth in me shall never die. Believest thou this?” (John 11:26.) It is a fact that none question that the body of saint and sinner alike returns to the dust, from whence it came; but Jesus very plainly says that those who believe in him shall never die. Mr. Bradley, “believest thou this?” If you do, will you tell us how you can contend that when man dies, the body, soul, and spirit die?

SEEK FOR IMMORTALITY.

The gentleman tries his hand again on Rom. 2:7. He but repeats the argument that he made from this scripture before, and does not have one word to say in reply to the contention that I made on the passage. I will note it again. The passage reads: “Seek for glory and honor and immortality.” From this it is argued: (1) We do not seek for that that we possess; (2) Paul says that we do seek for immortality; (3) therefore we do not have immortality. In the same passage you note that it says that we seek for “glory and honor.” Now, shall we apply his method of reasoning? (1) We do not seek for that which we possess; (2) Paul says that we seek for “glory and honor;” (3) therefore we do not have “glory and honor.” I am fully persuaded that this audience fully appreciates that if the contention made by Mr. Bradley is correct, then the one that I make is equally

correct. I must insist that the construction that Mr. Bradley places on the passage is far from the truth. God's people do possess glory; yet they are said to seek for glory. The word "immortality" in this passage is rendered "incorruption" in the Revised Version. The word is used in reference to the body. (1 Cor. 15:42-54.) The Greek word here used is not "athanasia" ("immortality"), but "aphtharsia" ("incorruption"), and points to that state in heaven where we will be freed from the moral corruption that we are subject to here. Corruptibility is not affirmed of the spirit. This passage does not touch the subject of man's immortality. The people of the Lord have glory now (2 Cor. 3:18); yet they seek for glory. When the Lord comes, we will appear with him in glory. Our Lord "shall change our vile body, that it may be fashioned like unto his glorious body." (Phil. 3:21.)

HOPE IN DEATH.

"If in this life only we have hope in Christ, we are of all men most miserable." (1 Cor. 15:19.) In this passage hope in this life is contrasted with hope in death; not in dying, but in death. "For if the dead rise not, then is Christ not raised." (1 Cor. 15:16.) Paul's contention is that for one to say that man perishes in death is to deny the resurrection of Christ. The contention of Paul is that if Christ rose from the dead, our hope is not through our earthly pilgrimage only, but through death also—not in this life only. But Paul proves that Christ did rise from the dead. Then man does hope in death, and such is the teaching of the Old Bible. Hear Solomon: "The wicked is driven away in his wickedness: but the righteous hath hope in his death." (Prov. 14:32.) Paul and Solomon do not agree with my friend. But hope can't exist in the absence of consciousness; therefore the dead are conscious.

“TO BE OR NOT TO BE—THAT’S THE QUESTION.”

“To be or not to be”—this is the real question. If, as my opponent says, when man dies he exists only in the material that composed his body, which material existed before the man was created and was not man, then when man dies he ceases to exist—ceases to be. Truly, according to this absurd position, when man dies he becomes as though he had never been. The material out of which he was created is as the material out of which Adam was created before Adam was. This being true, when man dies, even God could not find him to resurrect him; there can be no resurrection, and man is not to be. Indeed, my opponent admits that he does not believe in the resurrection by saying that he believes God can “re-create man and bring him forth in the resurrection.” Mr. Bradley teaches that the unending existence of man—of the righteous only—begins at the resurrection, but it cannot be the unending existence of the men who were on this earth and died; for when man dies, Bradley says, he exists only as Adam did before he was created. Then the unending existence of man from the resurrection on will be that of those that God creates (and I am not apprised that he will create any) at that time to dwell on the new earth. According to this man, we are not to be. [Time expired.]

BRADLEY'S SIXTH AFFIRMATIVE.

Gentlemen Moderators, Ladies and Gentlemen:

I appear before you to make the last speech on the affirmative side of the proposition in this debate. I must confess that I am at a loss to know just how to proceed, for my opponent has not made a single argument in the last speech he made that bears on the subject that we are discussing. He, of course, said many things; but they were not on the subject. He is a good talker, and you may always count on him talking when he gets up. He will have a great deal to say, whether he can say anything about the subject or not. He grows very eloquent at times, but that is not the way to prove a proposition. Since he made no argument for me to reply to, I will enter to the best of my ability into the teaching of the word of God on the subject that we have under consideration. I shall continue the proof reading of the proposition that man is wholly mortal and unconscious from death till the resurrection. Why do I teach that man is wholly mortal? Because the word of God says so, and there has been no argument made by my opponent to make me believe otherwise.

We will now make a little review of the things that have been presented, and then leave the question for you to decide. The question before us is: Does man die? I contend that man does die, and that when he dies, he is dead, and not alive. According to the contention of my opponent, when man is dead he is dead and alive at the same time. In fact, it is a question in my mind whether he believes man dies at all or not. Let us see what the word of God says about the matter. Rom. 5:12: "Wherefore, as by one man sin entered into the world, and death

by sin; and so death passed upon all men, for that all have sinned." There is no getting around the fact that all have sinned and that all must die, for death has passed upon all men. In the same connection we call your attention to 1 Cor. 15:22: "For as in Adam all die, even so in Christ shall all be made alive." Thus you see from that that all men must die in Adam. Now if man was not mortal, he could not die; in other words, if man is immortal, he could not die, for that which is immortal cannot die. So, then, when we find that man dies, we find at the same time that he is mortal. God cannot die, and that fact proves that he is immortal. Again, I read 1 Tim. 6:14-16: "I urge you to keep his command, free from stain or reproach, until the appearance of Jesus Christ, our Lord. This will be brought about in his own time by the one ever-blessed Potentate, the King of all kings and Lord of all lords, who alone is possessed of immortality and dwells in unapproachable light, whom no mortal has ever seen or ever can see, and to whom be ascribed honor and power forever. Amen." This is speaking of the Lord. If he alone has immortality, then no one but him has immortality, no one but him is immortal. This is the word of the Lord, and it must be true.

My friend tries to leave the impression on you that I do not tell you the truth about these things. He intimates that what I say is not the truth of God; but I want to tell you, respected friends, that that is all done for a purpose, and not because he really thinks so. I know that this is the word of God; and if you don't know what I present is the word of God, I advise you to take up your Bibles and read it. Let me say to you that I advise you, one and all, to read your Bibles, and not take what I say or what Elder Nichol says about these matters; and then you will not be misled in this question, and then there will not be so much complaint among us. If all will attend to reading the Scriptures for themselves, and not leave so much of it for some

one else to do for them, we will get along much better. One of the great troubles in the world now is that the people do not read the Bible, but just take what some one else says about it. Indeed, it is hard to get us to reject that which has been taught to us for a long time. I have read to you the Bible in this debate; and if you will read your Bibles, you will see that I am right in this contention. Don't take what I say or what Elder Nichol says, but read your Bibles and take what it says, and you will be right.

My opponent tells you that the contention that I make in this debate is not the truth; but that is all that he knows about the matter, and you will see it, too, when this debate is over. I tell you, my friends, that I am glad of this opportunity to meet him and have this debate go to the world in a book, for then the people will have the book and can refer to the arguments and the scriptures that I have introduced in this debate.

Let me now answer the questions that he has asked me.

1. "Does it take body, soul, and spirit to make man?" Answer: Yes, to make the living man.

2. "Is the spirit any part of man?" Answer: Yes; breath, mind, principle.

3. "Was the spirit created out of the dust?" Answer: No; the spirit is not of the ground.

4. "Since the spirit in man knows (1 Cor. 2:11), does it lose its knowledge when it returns to God?" Answer: The spirit that returns to God did not know while here and does not know when it returns to God.

5. "What is the difference in 'angel' and 'spirit' in Acts 23:8?" Answer: I don't know.

My friend says that, according to the position that I hold, man goes out of existence when he dies. I don't teach any such, nor do I believe such. Man does not cease to exist at death only as a conscious being.

My opponent says that I have changed position since I met him in the other two debates; that when I met him before I contended that the spirit was neither mortal nor immortal; that it did not live, and, therefore, could not die. Well, yes, I have; and I am not ashamed of it. When I met him before, I did say the spirit did not live, and that it was neither mortal nor immortal; but I have learned that the book of God says that the spirit lives, and I am always ready to accept what the word of God says. While the divine truth of God says that the spirit lives, it teaches that it is mortal. Yes, I have changed on that point; and I am not ashamed to confess it. I think that there are others here that have changed their views; but they know that the position that I hold is not popular, and they will not confess it.

Now, I want to say that if my opponent will find the scripture that says that man is not wholly mortal, or that there is anything about man that is immortal, I will accept that and contend for that. Now let him produce the passage that teaches that man is immortal. Respected friends, it is not in the divine truth of God; and he knows it, too.

Now, then, respected friends, we will begin to call your attention to a few things that will go to show you that I am right in the affirmative that I have made in this debate; and I hope that you will follow me closely, for I know that I am right. The question, in my opinion, is already settled in your minds. I believe that you, as honest people, will look at this question without prejudice, for it is the truth that we are after.

The Scriptures teach that man is wholly mortal and unconscious from death till the resurrection. Now let me begin my recapitulation and for a short time review what we have learned in this debate, so far as I have the time.

Gen. 2:7: "And the Lord God formed man of the dust of the ground, and breathed into his nostrils the

breath of life; and man became a living soul." You will note that man was formed of the dust of the ground—that is, the man of my proposition; and after man was formed, God breathed into him the breath of life, gave him that that made him live; but this something that was breathed into him was not of the man himself, for the man was first formed, and then the breath of life was breathed into him. So I say that man was dead till the breath of life was given to him—the thing that made him live; for this passage, you cannot fail to note, says that the man was formed out of the dust of the ground; and after the man was made, the breath of life was given to him. Then the breath of life is not the man, but something that was given to the man. Now when man dies, the spirit returns to God, who gave it. Eccles. 12: 7: "Then shall the dust return to the earth as it was: and the spirit shall return unto God who gave it." Listen to Zech. 12:1: "The burden of the word of the Lord for Israel, saith the Lord, which stretcheth forth the heavens, and layeth the foundation of the earth, and formeth the spirit of man within him." From this you see that the spirit is something that is formed in man, and is not the man, nor is it any part of the man. It seems to me that any one can see that the man was formed out of the dust of the ground, and that the spirit is something that is given to the man, and is not the man, nor any part of the man. Now when God had formed man out of the dust of the ground and breathed into his nostrils the breath of life, he placed him in the garden of Eden and told him that he might partake of all of the fruit in the garden except the fruit of the tree of knowledge of good and evil. I read the passage. Gen. 2:15-17: "And the Lord God took the man, and put him into the garden of Eden to dress it and to keep it. And the Lord God commanded the man, saying, Of every tree of the garden thou mayest freely eat: but of the tree of the knowledge of good and evil, thou shalt not eat of it: for in the day that

thou eatest thereof thou shalt surely die." "Thou shalt surely die." Now, what did God mean by that? When man dies, what becomes of him? Where does the man go to when he dies? Let us read. Gen. 3:19, 23: "In the sweat of thy face shalt thou eat bread till thou return unto the ground: for out of it wast thou taken; for dust thou art, and unto dust thou shalt return." Verse 23: "Therefore the Lord God sent him forth from the garden of Eden to till the ground from whence he was taken." Thus you see that man was formed of the dust of the ground, and that when he dies he is to return to the dust of the ground, from whence he was taken. Gen. 5:5: "And all the days that Adam lived was nine hundred and thirty years: and he died." Adam died. Who died? Adam lived nine hundred and thirty years, and he died. It was Adam that died. It was Adam that God created out of the dust of the ground. And now I read to you the scripture where it says Adam died; and now when Adam died, the book of God says that he returned to the ground, from whence he was taken. In confirmation of this I read to you other scriptures. Ps. 104:29: "Thou hidest thy face, they are troubled: thou takest away their breath, they die, and return to their dust." Thus you see that when man dies he returns to dust. Isa. 64:8: "But now, O Lord, thou art our Father; we are the clay, and thou our potter; and we all are the work of thy hand." From these passages we see that when a man dies he returns to the dust, from whence he was taken.

My friends, there is not one word said in the book of God about there being two men in one—one to die and one to live. The book of God says that Adam died; and when he died, he returned to the dust. Job 34:14, 15: "If he set his heart upon man, if he gather unto himself his spirit and his breath; all flesh shall perish together, and man shall turn again unto dust." Thus you see that all through the book of God the same thing is taught—that when man dies he returns to the dust, from whence

he was taken. The book of God says that man is mortal.

Job 4:17: "Shall mortal man be more just than God? shall a man be more pure than his maker?" Here it is plainly said that man is mortal.

Mr. Nichol calls on me for the passage that says that man is wholly mortal. Respected friends, we read where it says that God is immortal; and we all know that it means that God is wholly immortal; that there is not one thing about him that is mortal, for he is immortal. So when it says that man is mortal, we know that there is nothing immortal about him; that since it says that God is immortal and that man is mortal, we know that man is just as mortal as God is immortal; but since God is wholly immortal, then man is wholly mortal.

Now let us note a few of the passages that teach that man is unconscious from death till the resurrection. Ps. 146:3, 4: "Put not your trust in princes, nor in the son of man, in whom there is no help. His breath goeth forth, he returneth to his earth; in that very day his thoughts perish." This passage shows that man is wholly mortal, for it says that man returns to the dust. It also shows that man is unconscious from death till the resurrection. Listen. His breath goeth forth; he dies; that very day his thoughts perish. Thus you see that the very day man dies his thoughts perish. Now if a man's thoughts perish, most certainly he is not conscious. A conscious man is a man that has thoughts; but when a man dies, his thoughts perish; therefore the dead are not conscious. This passage of itself is enough to convince any one that the dead are not conscious; but Mr. Nichol gets up here and makes a great ado over the things that I say and the scriptures that I introduce, and says that what I say is not true; but I want to tell you, respected friends, that he does that way because he is hurting, and he don't know how else to get around the matter; and, of course, he has to do something to make the people think that he is not uneasy; but he is, for if he were not, he

would not do as he does in this debate. He knows that he is on the wrong side in this debate, but he is ashamed to confess it; therefore, to make a showing and not appear so ridiculous, he tries to make you think that Bradley is wrong. O, I tell you it hurts! Don't it, Charlie? My friends, he don't try to answer my arguments; but he will make fun of me and what I have to say in this debate. He can say "Shucks!" and "Pshaw!" if he can't answer what I have to say on the question in debate; but he understands that if he can get the people to forget what I say he can make a showing in this debate. I tell you, he understands his business and knows all the tricks of the debaters.

Rev. 6:9-11: "And when he had opened the fifth seal, I saw under the altar the souls of them that were slain for the word of God, and for the testimony which they held: and they cried with a loud voice, saying, How long, O Lord, holy and true, dost thou not judge and avenge our blood on them that dwell on the earth? And white robes were given unto every one of them; and it was said unto them, that they should rest yet for a little season, until their fellow-servants also and their brethren, that should be killed as they were, should be fulfilled." This passage is relied on to show that man is conscious after death. You will note that it says that the souls of these people were killed; that it is the souls of them that had been slain. Yes, they cried; I am not disposed to deny that; but how did they cry? Just as the blood of Abel cried, just so did the souls of the people mentioned in this passage cry. Gen. 4:9, 10: "And the Lord God said unto Cain, Where is Abel thy brother? And he said, I know not: am I my brother's keeper? And he said, What hast thou done? the voice of thy brother's blood crieth unto me from the ground." No one will claim that the blood of Abel was conscious; yet it is said to cry from the ground. Just so the souls under the altar that had been slain. They cried just as the blood

of Abel cried. And so there is no proof in this that the souls spoken of in that passage of scripture were conscious. The fact is, my friends, that a passage cannot be found that teaches that a man is conscious after death; for the book of God teaches that man is unconscious from death till the resurrection, as I have shown you, and the book of God is not contradictory.

Eccles. 9:4-10: "For to him that is joined to all the living there is hope: for a living dog is better than a dead lion. For the living know that they shall die: but the dead know not anything, neither have they any more a reward; for the memory of them is forgotten. Also their love, and their hatred, and their envy is now perished; neither have they any more a portion forever in anything that is done under the sun. Go thy way, eat thy bread with joy, and drink thy wine with a merry heart; for God now accepteth thy works. Let thy garments be always white; and let thy head lack no ointment. Live joyfully with the wife whom thou lovest all the days of the life of thy vanity, which he hath given thee under the sun, and the days of thy vanity: for that is thy portion in this life, and in thy labor which thou takest under the sun. Whatsoever thy hand findeth to do, do it with thy might: for there is no work, nor device, nor knowledge, nor wisdom, in the grave, whither thou goest." Respected friends, we are conscious in this life, for the living know. You note that in the passage of scripture that I have just read it is plainly said that the dead know not anything, and you know that if the dead know not anything they cannot be conscious.

Respected friends, there are any number of passages of scripture and arguments that can be presented that show that man is wholly mortal and unconscious from death till the resurrection, and I think that I have read them to you.

You will remember that I believe that when the book of God says that man dies, I believe it; and that we have

failed to find that there are two men in one—one man to live and one man to die—and that man is part mortal and part immortal, as my opponent contends, according to the theory that he has here presented.

Now, respected friends, this is my last speech in this debate; and I want you to watch my opponent in his last speech and see if he don't misrepresent me and twist what I said just a little in order to have something to say.

I teach you that man must die, and that when he dies he is dead. I don't tell you that there are two men in one, and that one of them lives when the other one dies. "For as in Adam all die, even so in Christ shall all be made alive." Thus you see that all men die; and if they did not die, there would be no need for a resurrection; and if man is immortal, I have asked my friend to tell us the necessity for the resurrection; and I have asked him if man is immortal, how he can die, since that which is immortal cannot die. I am glad of the opportunity to say and have it go to the world that when literal death is spoken of in the Bible it is the penalty for wrongdoing.

My friends, all the words of God are in my favor in this proposition, and I am going to stay with them. Now this is my last speech in this debate. I have tried faithfully to present the teachings of the word of God on this question, and I am certain that everything that I have presented is true. I have tried faithfully not to misrepresent the word of God, for I feel that I will be held accountable for what I have said in this debate; therefore I have tried to present nothing but the word of God, and you will always find me doing that. If you should be with me in another debate, and I trust that you will, you will find me contending for the same things that I contend for in his debate, and I hope to grow stronger in this faith. If what I have said is not the truth and in accordance with the word of God, then I am mistaken; but I am willing for what I have said to go before the world, for I am honest in the contention that I have made, and

I shall always be found teaching you what I believe to be the truth of the word of God.

Now, my friends, my time is about up; and as I come to close my part of this debate, let me beg you all to read your Bibles, and be certain to accept what it says, regardless of what either of us may have said in this debate. As honest people, we should want to know the truth and accept it wherever we may find it. [Time expired.]

NICHOL'S SIXTH NEGATIVE.

Gentlemen Moderators, Ladies and Gentlemen:

I am before you to make the last speech in this debate, and I assure you that I can speak the thirty minutes in as short time as any man. You will continue to hear me patiently. I am pleased with the marked attention that you all have ever given each of us throughout the entire debate. The matters we have been discussing are of great moment, and your attention but shows the interest that you have in the word of God as to what it teaches on the points that we have met here to consider, though you would never have concluded from the last speech of the man, that circumstances force me to call my opponent on this occasion, that he was in a debate. I regret very much that he is not disposed to spend his time in at least an attempt to prove the affirmation that he has made in this discussion. He complains a great deal about my method of conducting my part of the debate. I am not one bit surprised at that. About the first thing he said was that he did not know just how to proceed. I have seen men in just such a predicament before. I shall leave the audience to draw their own conclusions as to why the gentleman is confused.

I shall spend a few moments in replying to the things that he said and then spend the remainder of my time in recapitulating. He tells you that he has the thing going his way. It is kind of you to tell the audience so; for, of course, they would not know it without your information. You are very complimentary. Bradley, these people know that you are only whistling to keep up courage. We are not in the graveyard yet. Wait till the last friend views the end of the debate, and then you may

go. He tells you that many things could be said in proof of his proposition; that many things can be produced to prove that man is "wholly mortal" and unconscious from death to the resurrection. It seems that he at this late hour realizes that he has failed to produce them and wants you to think that they can be produced. His statement is simply his assertion. There may be many things produced as proof of the proposition that he has obligated himself to prove, but the proof of the proposition will not be found in the word of God, nor from any other authoritative source. Nature and revelation alike attest the falsity of the claim that he has made before you.

We are again informed by the gentleman that all men must die. True, most certainly, that all men may die; but the question before us is: Does man die—body, soul, and spirit—and become unconscious till the resurrection? We each agree that the man dies. Mr. Bradley says that the body is mortal, and so I say, for Paul declares it to be; but the passage that is being called for is one that says that the spirit is mortal. At death the body returns to the dust, from whence it was taken, and the spirit returns to God, who gave it. Mr. Bradley correctly says that the spirit lives. James says that the body without the spirit is dead. But by what acceptable authority has it been said that the spirit without the body is dead? The body without the spirit is dead. When the spirit leaves the body, does it take with it anything essential to the body being the body? If it does, the separation is not complete. Does the body retain anything essential to the spirit being the spirit? If "Yes," the separation is not perfect. When the separation takes place, the body goes to the grave, with everything necessary to it being the body, and is unconscious, for consciousness is not a property of the body. The spirit goes to God, with its life and consciousness, for consciousness is a property of the spirit. In the separation the body lost nothing essential to it being the body, and the spirit lost nothing

essential to it being the spirit. God gave man a conscious spirit. It is the very nature of the spirit to be conscious; and since it pleased God for the spirit to be conscious, he will not change it, and the devil cannot.

1 Tim. 6:16 is again introduced, and this time he reads from the Twentieth Century translation. No assistance for you to be found in that translation. The fact is, my friends, Paul declares that God only hath immortality—there is nothing mortal about him. I wonder why the gentleman doesn't notice my reply. He contends that God is the only one that has immortality, when, in truth, he does not believe his own contention on that point, for he believes that the angels and Christ are immortal. He says that I insinuate that he does not tell you the truth in his contention. I am sorry that I insinuated so much. I assure you that I did not intend to so do. My desire was to tell you plainly, without insinuation, that the claims he makes are far from the truth.

His advice that the people should read their Bibles is good, and I heartily indorse it.

Hear! Of all the absurd and wild statements that I have ever heard a man make, it was the statement of the gentleman in his last speech. I was wholly unprepared for it, and I am surprised that a man that proposes to stand before the people as the exponent of a doctrine that they claim is taught in the Bible would make, especially when they declare the Bible to be true. By the statement of the gentleman, Christ, the perfect character, is branded as a sinner. He says that he is glad to have the opportunity of going to record and allowing the world to see what he says, and then he says: "Literal death in the Bible is always the penalty for wrongdoing—for sin committed." But Christ literally died. Why? Bradley says that it was for "wrongdoing—for sin committed." Shame on you! Let my tongue cleave to the roof of my mouth, let my right arm fail in its work, let my eyes be closed by the cold finger of death before I

will make the charge that the Christ was a sinner. What is the matter with the man?

The gentleman then gives us his closing remarks and introduces Gen. 2:7 again: "God formed man out of the dust of the ground, and breathed into his nostrils the breath of life: and man became a living soul." He tells us that man was dead till God gave him that that made him live, and that that which made the man live is no part of the man. Such a wonderful dissertation! Indeed, I was not aware that we could predicate death of a thing that never lived. I did not know that we could predicate death of inanimate clay. If all the man there is is that that was created out of the dust and was man before it lived, I am a dull student. You will appreciate, I know, that all the man there is, according to my friend, is dust; and whatever the spirit does is not the man, nor is it any part of the man; for the man, the whole man, was created out of the dust; and the spirit, he says, is not of the dust. Christ came to save man, but all the man there is is the dust. Then Christ came to save the dust. But the man was formed and was the man before the thing that made him live was breathed into his nostrils, says my opponent, and that breathed into him is no part of the man. When the spirit leaves the body, we have the man left; and what is he? A lump of inanimate, unconscious clay, without intellect, sensibilities, or will? This, then, is what Christ came to earth to save. Shucks! The idea of intelligent people teaching such stuff! But look a little further into this matter. All the man there is, says my opponent, is that formed out of the dust of the ground—is the body. This body is clay. This clay was the man—is the man. But the man was not alive when God made him, and that which made the man live is no part of the man. When that which made the man live leaves the man, the man dies, and we have the man left—the man that God formed out of the dust of the ground. My opponent says that this man

is wholly mortal, and at the resurrection God is to immortalize the man—the clay. But clay is unconscious. Pshaw!

Mr. Bradley says that “breath of life” means that the breath produced the life. If that be true, then the preposition “of” denotes causation. Then, what does “man of God” mean? If “breath of life” means that breath produced the life, I insist that the same kind of logic will prove that “man of God” means that man produced God; that God is the product of man’s hands. See where the man’s arguments lead?

My opponent says that the spirit in man is no part of the man. If that be true, then the spirit is not essential to man being man. The spirit in the man Bradley is no part of Bradley, and is not necessary to his being Bradley. I regret very much to hear him make such statements; and if I did not know that he is incorrect in the statement, I would not be here. The people know better. If he appreciates what he says when he says that the spirit in him is no part of him and understands what that statement means, he but declares that he is a man without intelligence. Do you ask me why? Paul says: “With the mind I myself serve the law of God.” Again: “I serve” God “with my spirit.” From this you see that Paul teaches that the spirit and the mind are the same. If the spirit in the man Bradley is no part of him, then the mind is not, and the man Bradley is in a bad fix—without a mind. But look again: “For what man knoweth the things of a man, save the spirit of man which is in him?” But Bradley says that the spirit in him is no part of him. If that be true, since it is the spirit that knows, then the man Bradley doesn’t know a thing. That’s near the truth, too, as regards his contention about man, if we are to judge of his knowledge by what he says.

This, I think, more than complements the last speech of the gentleman; and I will now briefly call your at-

tention to some of the arguments that I have offered for the cause of truth—the honor of man and the glory of God.

Man is declared to be made in the image of God—to be the offspring of God. Man is composed of body, soul, and spirit. The body of man was created out of the dust of the earth, and the spirit of man came from God. The spirit is the knowing—the part of man that worships. The question before us is: Is man wholly mortal; and when death comes for him, is he unconscious from that time till the resurrection? Please remember that there is no resurrection for the spirit of man, for it goes to God at death. The body only goes to the grave and will be resurrected. My opponent says that he believes in a resurrection, but I insist that, per his doctrine, there will not be a resurrection; and finally he declared that he believed in a re-creation. You appreciate that a re-creation will not be a resurrection. Indeed, according to the position that he contends for, when man dies, he goes out of existence and can't be resurrected. Let us see, though, if when man dies, all that goes to constitute him comes to an end. Let us see if he does not exist in a conscious state between death and the resurrection.

NOTHING CAN SEPARATE US.

“Who shall separate us from the love of Christ? shall tribulation, or distress, or persecution, or famine, or nakedness, or peril, or sword? As it is written, For thy sake we are killed all the day long; we are accounted as sheep for the slaughter. Nay, in all these things we are more than conquerors through him that loved us. For I am persuaded, that neither death, nor life, nor angels, nor principalities, nor powers, nor things present, nor things to come, nor height, nor depth, nor any other creature, shall be able to separate us from the love of God, which is in Christ Jesus our Lord.” Paul enjoyed

the highest measure of inspiration, and in this passage speaks of his persuasion, and declares that none of the things named could separate us from the love of God which is in Christ the Lord. What are the things that he names? Hear them: Tribulation, distress, persecution, famine, peril, sword, nakedness, life, angels, principalities, powers, things present, things to come. Not one, nor all these things combined, can separate us from the love of God which is in Christ Jesus our Lord. Do not these things contemplate all the things that a man can possibly experience in this life—here on earth? But you will note that this man of God does not contemplate this life only, for he plainly declares that “death” can’t separate us from that love.

When the sun is in his meridian splendor, flooding the earth with his golden glory, the blind man is as much separated from light as though surrounded by the midnight darkness. To him there is not one ray of light. He lacks the capacity to enjoy it. The deaf man cannot hear for the same reason. If in death man is unconscious, I declare to you that he is separated from the love of God, though Paul says that death cannot separate us from that love. By this statement Paul records his eternal veto against the doctrine of my opponent. Just as certain as the blind and deaf man is separated from light and sound because they have not the capacity to appropriate it, just that certain is man separated from the love of God, if when he dies he becomes unconscious. But Paul says that death cannot separate us from the love of God. Then man is not unconscious in death. Do you tell me that Paul has reference in this passage to God’s love for us, and not our love for him? Grant it, most certainly. Now tell me, if at death man exists only in the material that his body was composed of, exists only as Adam did before he was created, he does not, in fact, exist as a man; so far as man is concerned, he is nothing. Will you please tell me then, how God can love man when

there is no man for him to love? Paul says that through all these things—tribulation, distress, persecution, famine, nakedness, peril, . . . even in death—we are more than conquerors through the love of God. To be *conquerors* we must be *active*, even in death as in tribulation and persecution. Christians, take courage. Though you must fall under the stroke of death, death cannot hold dominion over you. You will conquer through the love of God, and, in the rapture of a heart filled with love, cry aloud: "O death, where is thy sting? O grave, where is thy victory?" Nothing in life, and not even death, can separate us from the love of God.

LOVE NEVER FAILS.

"Charity [love] never faileth: but whether there be prophecies, they shall fail; whether there be tongues, they shall cease." Love never faileth. "Faileth" is from the Greek word "pipto," and means: "To fall, to fall down. (Metaph.) To perish, to come to an end, disappear, cease." No one will question that it is used metaphorically in this passage. "Love *never* faileth." "Never" is from the Greek word "oudepote," a strong negative adverb, and means: "Never, not ever, not at any time." In this passage it is declared that love perishes not at any time—love never ceases. Even in death we are not separated from the love of God; love never ceases, not even in death. The church at Corinth was boastful over their supernatural gifts. Paul tells them that such gifts were to be desired, but they would cease; "whether there be prophecies, they shall fail: whether there be tongues, they shall cease;" but love will never fail—never ceases. Since love never ceases, even death cannot separate us from the love of God. Then the one who loves must continue; and if he continues to love, certainly he is conscious.

NO HOPE.

I am certain that three things are necessary to constitute hope—viz., forecast, expectation, and desire. Hope always looks forward; she never engages in retrospection. Of the things that she beholds in the days unborn from the fecund wound of futurity, some are dreaded and some are desired. Only the things that we desire do we hope for. Though we behold things that we will experience that we do not desire, we do not hope for them. We hope only for the things that we expect and desire. Indeed, the things that we hope for are the things that we expect to enjoy while we have a being. We do not hope for and cannot enjoy things after we have ceased to exist. According to the position that my friend contends for, we cease to exist at death. Do you say that I misrepresent him by that statement? I insist that I do not; and when you think of the position that he has taken for a moment, you will see that I but place his contention before you as it is in fact. He says that when man dies he exists only in the material that his body was composed of. This material, he correctly says, returns to the dust. This material is all the man there is, he says; for he says that the spirit is no part of the man; that the whole man was created out of the dust of the ground. I submit, then, that when man dies there is nothing of him; that he does not exist one bit more than Adam existed before God created him; or, more correctly stated, since man was not in existence till God created Adam, though the material out of which God created Adam was in existence, it was not man. Just so, when the body of man returns to the dust, is dissolved into its native elements—state—if the body is all there is of man, then man certainly does not exist, unless man existed before God created Adam. According to the doctrine of this opponent of mine, I know that we can't hope for a life of happiness nor anything else in what we call the glory

world. Why? Do you ask me why? For the simple reason that he teaches that when we die, that is the end of us; all that goes to make you man comes to an end then; you cease to exist at that time, and you hope only for the things that you may enjoy while you have an existence. You hope only for the things that you expect; and if you are to come to an end, cease to exist, at death, you cannot expect a life in glory. Indeed, Mr. Bradley is frank enough one time in this debate to admit what I say; for he said that he believed God was able to re-create and bring man forth at the resurrection. Then the ones that are created at the time we call the resurrection will not be us, but some other creatures. When God created Adam, Adam was a man that never existed before. Per the doctrine of my opponent, there is no cheering ray of promise of a better land and home where sorrows are not to come for us. His doctrine says that death ends it all for us. He teaches us that when death comes, man ceases to exist. Christians, go with me to the days of the prophets, beyond the Jordan; see Elisha, that man of God, as he mounts to God in a chariot of fire drawn by steeds of flame. He sweeps to the glory world without the pain of death. So may translation come for us at any moment. See the Lord as he ascends. He passed through the gateway—death—to the home of the soul. He entered the strong man's house and conquered; death could not hold dominion over him. He is the first fruits of them that died, the first fruits of the harvest that is being gathered home to God. What Christ is today is only the pledge of what his followers shall be in the future. The hope of the Christian embraces victory over death.

THE DEAD KNOW NOT ANYTHING.

I replied to this matter in my first negative reply, and do not feel that a reply again is necessary. The passage states that the dead know nothing of what is going on here on earth after they die. That is all.

THOUGHTS PERISH.

This had my attention in my second reply. I shall not ask your time to the argument again. We should not put our trust in man; for when men die, their thoughts—purposes—perish. The word “thoughts” in this passage is used for the word “purposes.” (See Job 17:11.)

The doctrine of my opponent is, in a very large measure, the same thing that was taught by the Sadducees. With them everything that applied to man was bounded by time. They had no place in their vocabulary for the word “eternal” as applied to man; it was a word that was always applied to God or his attributes, as they used it. Like my friend, they believed that man was wholly mortal; that when the body returned to the dust, that was the end of him. Holding this idea, they could not think of a resurrection. They were logical enough to know that such a thing would not be possible; so they inquired of Christ: “Whose wife will she be in the resurrection?” The doctrine of Mr. Bradley on the nature of man is the same as that of the Sadducees, and does not admit of a resurrection. But grant for the sake of the argument that it does (which it doesn't); grant that your doctrine has place in it for a resurrection, and that at the resurrection the righteous will be given “eternal life;” I submit that the life will only last one thousand years. You say that the word “eternal,” from the Greek word “aionos,” should be translated “age lasting.” You teach that when Christ comes again, the saints will then be resurrected, given “eternal life,” and reign with Christ through the millennial age, and at the end of that age the kingdom will be given to God. Thus you make the “eternal life” last through the millennium, which is only one thousand years. Then, to grant all that you claim for your doctrine, the saints will have life for only one thousand years after the resurrection. To say that your

doctrine has place in it for a life that never ends is to say more than the truth. To say the most for your doctrine, it is not far from the position that Colonel Ingersoll held.

Will you please remember that the spirit is the intelligence—the thing that “knows,” “sings,” “prays,” “worships?” But Mr. Bradley says that the spirit is no part of the man. Then if the man should be immortalized, per the doctrine of the gentleman, since the intelligence is not of the man, according to him, they will be unintelligent, immortalized bodies. Pshaw! If the spirit is no part of man, since the spirit is that which knows, then man is not an intelligent creature. Wonder if Mr. Bradley is considering only himself when he talks that way?

THE INNER MAN.

“I was grieved in my spirit in the midst of my body.” (Dan. 7:15.) “But there is a spirit in man: and the inspiration of the Almighty giveth them understanding.” (Job 32:8.) “Yea, I think it meet, as long as I am in this tabernacle, to stir you up by putting you in remembrance; knowing that shortly I must put off this my tabernacle, even as our Lord Jesus Christ hath showed me.” (2 Pet. 1:13, 14.) “Then shall the dust return to the earth as it was: and the spirit shall return unto God who gave it.” (Eccles. 12:7.) “For what man knoweth the things of a man, save the spirit of man which is in him?” (1 Cor. 2:11.) “And they stoned Stephen, calling upon God, and saying, Lord Jesus, receive my spirit.” (Acts 7:59.) “The days of our years are threescore years and ten; and if by reason of strength they be fourscore years, yet is their strength labor and sorrow; for it is soon cut off, and we fly away.” (Ps. 90:10.) From these quotations I am certain that you all learn that the spirit in man is from God, and that the body is only the house in which the man dwells. At death we put off this “tabernacle;” we cease to abide in

this body; we "fly away;" the spirit returns to God. Hear Paul on this matter: "For which cause we faint not; but though our outward man perish, yet the inward man is renewed day by day. For our light affliction, which is but for a moment, worketh for us a far more exceeding and eternal weight of glory; while we look not at the things that are seen, but at the things which are not seen: for the things which are seen are temporal; but the things which are not seen are eternal. For we know that, if our earthly house of this tabernacle were dissolved, we have a building of God, a house not made with hands, eternal in the heavens. For in this we groan, earnestly desiring to be clothed upon with our house which is from heaven. . . . Therefore we are always confident, knowing that, whilst we are at home in the body, we are absent from the Lord. . . . We are confident, I say, and willing rather to be absent from the body, and to be present with the Lord." The inner man is that that dwells in the body; it is the spirit. Paul says that to be absent from the body was for him to be present with the Lord. When we die, the spirit leaves the body—is absent from the body, returns to God that gave it, flies away. The spirit is the part of man that knows. Then the spirit, with its intelligence, goes to God. Is it eternal? We see the body, and Paul says that that which we see is temporal; while the spirit, which we cannot see, is eternal. With this agree the words of David when he says that "your heart shall live forever." How long will the heart live? "Forever." In the Greek of this passage it is: "Your heart shall live eis aiona aionos." This is equivalent to our word "eternally" or "forever and forever." The heart and the spirit of man are the same; it is the inner man, and at death it returns to God and is to live forever. Indeed, it is too plain to admit of argument. To this agree the words of Peter: "Likewise, ye wives, be in subjection to your own husbands; that, if any obey not the word, they also may without the word be

won by the conversation of the wives; while they behold your chaste conversation coupled with fear. Whose adorning let it not be that outward adorning of plaiting the hair, and of wearing of gold, or of putting on of apparel; but let it be the hidden man of the heart, in that which is not corruptible, even the ornament of a meek and quiet spirit, which is in the sight of God of great price." In my second negative speech I gave a full reply to this passage, taking up the Greek and giving what I am certain is the truth on the passage, and then I looked into the passage just as it appears in the King James translation. Please hear it. (1) The outward adorning is not the only thing that is mentioned in this passage. (2) There is a contrast drawn between the outer adorning and the inner adorning. (3) The contrast is between "apparel and braided hair" and "meek and quiet spirit." Both are called ornaments for the man. (4) The spirit is *within*; but for it to be an ornament or adornment it must show itself, and this it does in the person. In one case you see the ostentatious display of apparel and braided hair, and by that judge of the character of the person. This, Peter says, is not the adornment that Christians should have. On the other hand, you note such chastity of words and uprightness of actions that they indicate a different character—a Christian—of which the "meek and quiet spirit" is the adornment. (5) In the one instance the "kosmos"—ornament—is the braiding of the hair, the display of dress; in the other, the "kosmos"—ornament—is the "kruptos tes kardias," the hidden man of the heart. Believers and unbelievers both have an inner man, and for that reason "kruptos anthropos" is not here that which is adorned, but is itself the adornment, and consists in the incorruptible (ornament) of a "meek and quiet spirit." In this passage Peter affirms that man has an incorruptible, imperishable spirit. The word "incorruptible" is from the Greek word "aphthartos," and is used in 1 Tim. 1:17: "Now

unto the King eternal, immortal ["aphthartos"], invisible, the only wise God." In this passage you note that the word "aphthartos" is rendered "immortal." Peter says that we have an immortal spirit. This, I am certain, is the truth of the passage, and the contention of my friend fails. But some of you may think that I should look at the passage as it appears in the King James translation. I am perfectly willing to do so. I examined it in my second speech, and it has been severely let alone by Mr. Bradley. Let us note it again. (1) Outward adorning and outward man. (2) Inward adorning and inner man—hidden man of the heart. (3) Outward adorning was put *on* the outward man. (4) The inward adorning was not to be put on, but *in*, something; and that something is called the "hidden man of the heart"—the inner man. (5) The ornament that was to be put *in* the inner, or hidden, man of the heart is indicated by "meek and quiet." (6) This ornament is to be put in that which is not corruptible. But the word "incorruptible" is from the Greek "aphthartos," and is rendered "immortal" in 1 Tim. 1:17. Then the ornament was to be in that which is not corruptible—in that which is immortal. But the ornament was to be put in the "hidden man of the heart"—the inner man, the spirit. Therefore the spirit of man is immortal.

"In the way of righteousness is life; and in the pathway there is no death." "Your heart shall live forever."

Men, you are the "offspring of God." God is the Father of your spirits, and that spirit in you is immortal. You are more than a mere animal that dies, as my friend claims. He teaches, per the logical conclusions of his contention, that when man dies, that is the last of him. Begone with your heathen Sadducaic idea of death! When Death, with his keen sickle, enters the family circle, and with the icy finger kisses the eye to sleep of some of our loved ones, and bears them from us, we bow our heads like the ripened grain; we array ourselves in

mourning; the heart is sore and the voice is broken; smiles are banished from our faces and joy from our homes. I sympathize with all such, but let us be philosophers. That which we commit to the tomb is not the one so dear to you, is not the loved friend; it is only the house your loved one lived in. The loved one, with all that constituted the personality and individuality, still lives. To a Christian death is not a calamity, but the gateway and vestibule to the eternal home, where pain, sorrow, and disappointments incident to this life are wholly unknown. Death but breaks the little dark prison house in which the man dwells and allows the spirit to unfold its golden pinions, and we "fly away" to those celestial mansions that the Lord has prepared for the ones that love him—absent from the body and present with the Lord. Let us, then, not think of the departed ones as the infidel when he tells us that it is all of life to live and all of death to die, nor as the modern Sadducees that teach that man ceases to exist when death comes, but rather, as the apostle of the Lord, that to be absent from the body is to be present with the Lord. Your heart shall live forever. [Time expired.]