

Jones-Ballard Debate

A Written Scriptural Discussion Between

Eld. G. E. Jones of Morrilton, Ark., P. O. Box 314 and Eld. P. D.
Ballard of 2412 Maplecrest Dr, Nashville 14, Tenn.

PROPOSITIONS FOR DISCUSSION:

1. The Bible teaches there is one future judgment of all men, saved and unsaved, for all will be judged in the judgment.

Affirmative: P. P. Ballard

Negative: G. E. Jones

2. I affirm that the Bible teaches that there will be two distinct events in the second advent of Christ, first when he comes in the air to raise the dead in Christ, those sleeping in their graves at that time, and to translate the living saints, and, second, He shall come all the way back to this earth for the purpose of reigning on this earth 1000 years with His glorified saints, at which time Israel will be reestablished in Canaan land.

Affirmative: G. E. Jones

Negative: P. D. Ballard

BALLARD'S FIRST AFFIRMATIVE

Proposition: THE BIBLE TEACHES THERE IS ONE FUTURE JUDGEMENT OF ALL MEN, SAVED AND UNSAVED, FOR ALL WILL BE JUDGED IN THE JUDGEMENT.

Before defining my proposition I would like to remind you that I am affirming a doctrine that can be found in Baptist confessions and articles of faith previous to 1941. The plural judgements theory entered Baptist articles of faith in 1941. The idea had been held by a few previous to that date, but it entered Baptist articles of faith, for its first time, in 1941. Before that date, you can't find it listed as an article of faith among Baptists. Jones will offer texts that speak of JUDGEMENTS, but you will find the texts referring to other judgements other than that comes after death. There may be many JUDGEMENTS, but only one after death, and that is the future and final judgement that I shall affirm. Baptists that claim to go by the Bible, that claim it as their rule of faith and practice, have always, as long as they have had confession., of faith and articles of faith, adopted the one future judgement doctrine as an article of faith. The Waldenses adopted it. The oldest Baptist Association in America adopted it. But since 1941, twenty years ago, Baptists come up with a NEW MANUAL FOR BAPTIST CHURCHES that contained the PLURAL judgements doctrine. There are mules in Arkansas that are older than their newly adopted doctrine, that is, their adoption of it. Now would you say their doctrine is a MODERN doctrine? It has been adopted twenty long year. ANCIENT! ANTIQUE!

DEFINITION OF PROPOSITION:

1. By the "Bible," I mean the Old and New Testaments. 2. By "teaches," I mean it declares. 3. By "one future judgement," I mean one at His coming, when all the dead, saved and lost, are resurrected and judged, along with those that are living at the time of His advent. 4. By "all men," I mean the saved and lost,

not excluding the fallen angels. 5. By "in the judgement," I mean the future and final judgement, which comes on the LAST DAY. John 12:48. The day the Christ rejectors are judged. The day the saints are raised. John 6:54. The FINAL (last) day, with none following it. The "LAST DAY" means the FINAL DAY. Therefore, there can be no years, centuries or millenniums after it, for the judgement will occur on THE LAST DAY. This is the JUDGEMENT that is spoken of in Heb. 9:27, which is after death. Jones will introduce passages that speak of JUDGEMENTS (plural), but they will not speak of the future and final judgement that takes place after death, at the return of Christ to resurrect, for only one judgement will occur after this life. This I will now endeavor to prove by the Bible. I will prove there is only one future judgement and that of the saved and lost. Check the proof:

Hebrews 9:27

"And as it is appointed unto men once to die, but after this THE JUDGEMENT" Paul, speaking of the sentence of death that is on all men (mankind), claims there is only one judgement following death. To say there are more than one is to make Paul a falsifier. He says "the judgement" comes after death, which is appointed unto ALL men, because of Adam's transgression. Rom. 5:12; I Cor. 15:22. To claim THE JUDGEMENT is plural in number is to make language meaningless. In order for Jones to prove there is more than one judgement after death, he will have to first show that "THE JUDGEMENT" is plural in number. Will he argue "the judgement" is plural? He MUST prove "the judgement" is plural to successfully deny my proposition. Can he do it? We shall wait and see. I can hardly wait for his reply.

SYLLOGISM:

1. Anyone that teaches a plurality of judgements after death contradicts Heb. 9:27.
2. G. E. Jones teaches a plurality of judgements after death.

3. Therefore, Jones contradicts Heb. 9:27.

Matthew 25:31-33

"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." Surely Jones will not claim "all" means only a portion or part, when there is no influence or qualifying remark that would lead one to believe Tic only meant a PART or portion of all nations.

Neither do the verses imply ALL the saved are meant. Instead, the verses tell us very plainly that ALL of mankind (all nations) will be judged at His coming. The idea of Him separating them one from another reveals a judgement. Then in the following verse, Jesus tells us that mankind will go to two different places after this judgement: Those on the right hand enter happiness and those on the left are cast into everlasting fire. See verses 34, 41. This all takes place among ALL NATIONS when Jesus comes. Languages couldn't be plainer. It takes a man with a workable system on numbers and a twenty year old article of faith to overlook the plain and simple truth that is set forth by our Savior in the above verses.

SYLLOGISM:

1. A man that denies ALL NATIONS will appear before Jesus, at His return, denies the words of Jesus.
2. Jones denies ALL NATIONS (sheep and goats) will appear before Jesus at His second advent.
3. Therefore, Brother G. E. Jones denies the words of Jesus.

Acts 24:25

"And as he reasoned of righteousness, temperance, and JUDGEMENT TO COME; Felix trembled, and answered, Go thy

way for this time; when I have a convenient season, I will call for thee."

The apostle to the Gentiles taught there is a JUDGEMENT TO COME. But many in this day and age claim and teach there is more than one JUDGEMENT TO COME. Who is correct: Paul or the Pre's? As for me, I will just cling to the doctrine that Paul advocated, his inspired writings. Paul said there is a "judgement to come." Felix trembled when he heard it. However, Jones and other Pre's, which includes Adventists, Russelites and most other man-made churches, will not cause wicked men to tremble by preaching .1 "judgement to come." Instead, Jones will tell them they can be saved after the Lord returns, provided they are living at His return. Jones won't teach a "judgement to come." He denies such doctrine. His millennial idea will not allow him to teach it. Bless his heart! He will know better someday.

SYLLOGISM:

1. A person that teaches there are JUDGEMENTS to come contradict the apostle Paul.
2. Jones teaches there are judgements to come.
3. Therefore, Jones contradicts the apostle Paul.

Acts 17:31

"Because he hath appointed A DAY in which he will judge THE WORLD in righteousness by that man whom he hath ordained; whereof he hath given assurance unto all men, in that he hath raised him from the dead."

Paul definitely states two facts in the above: 1. He says the judgement will be on "a day," which is the LAST DAY. John 12:48. The only way Jones can dodge this is by saying "a day" doesn't mean A DAY. 2. Further, Paul claims "the world" will be judged in that appointed DAY, the GREAT DAY. "The world" means those that inhabit the earth or land. Jones may try to

escape the force of this by saving Paul meant the earth and not the dwellers of the earth. If he takes such a course, Remember: Has the earth sinned? Will the earth be charged for the sins of its inhabitants? I agree with Paul: the inhabitants of the earth shall be judged on God's appointed day, and the inhabitants are the saved and the lost. Therefore the saved and the lost will appear at the same appointed judgement. To deny this is to deny the inspired words of Paul.

SYLLOGISM:

1. A man that says God has appointed more than one DAY to judge the WORLD adds to God's word.
2. Jones says God has appointed more than one day to judge the world.
3. Therefore, Jones adds to God's word.

WALDENSE CONFESSION:

"In like manner, we firmly hold, that there is no other Mediator and Advocate with God the Father, save only Jesus Christ. And as for the Virgin Mary, that she was holy, humble, and full of grace: and in like manner do we believe concerning all the other Saints, Viz: that being in Heaven, they wait for THE RESURRECTION of their Bodies AT THE DAY OF JUDGEMENT." (Art. 8)

This article of faith was adopted by the Waldenses along in A. D. 1120, just about 821 short years before the plural judgements article appeared in a Baptist article of faith. I was just thinking: Do you suppose brother Jones claims these Waldense folk were true churches of Christ? Were they, Brother Jones? Are the Waldenses our predecessors? Were they Baptists in belief? J. W. Kesner Sr. says these folk were BAPTISTS IN BELIEF (Campbellism Exposed, P. 95). Do you agree with Kesner? These people say there is "the day of judgement." Do you agree with the Waldenses? PHILADELPHIA CONFESSION OF FAITH: (Article 34)

"1. God hath appointed a day wherein he will judge the world in righteousness by Jesus Christ.... in which day not only the apostate angels shall be judged, but likewise all persons that have lived upon the earth shall appear before the tribunal of Christ__"

This article was adopted in 1742, just 199 years before the plural judgement idea appeared in the NEW MANUAL FOR BAPTIST CHURCHES. I believe in contending for the faith that was once delivered to the saints. Therefore, I reject the NEW MANUAL doctrine of more than one future judgement. For which will you contend?

THE NEW HAMPSHIRE DECLARATION OF FAITH

"We believe that the end of this world is approaching; that at the last day, Christ will descend from heaven, and raise the dead from the grave to final retribution; that a solemn separation will then take place; that the wicked will be adjudged to endless punishment, and the righteous to endless joy; and that this JUDGEMENT will fix forever the final state of men in heaven or hell, on principles of righteousness." (Art. 18).

Readers, this very article is found in Pendleton's Manual. Some would have you believe this article didn't exist before the days of J. M. Pendleton. Some will do most any thing, it seems, to cloud the issue. Oh yes, what about the Churches that have adopted this article of faith, which involves His coming, the resurrection, the judgement, and the final separation at the LAST DAY? Are churches scriptural churches that adopt such? Should all churches that have adopted such be reorganized and adopt Cobb's added articles? Have you ever pastored or belonged to a church that adopted the 18th article in Pendleton's Manual? Would you pastor a church that has adopted the 18th article? Can a congregation be a New Testament church and not adopt the articles found in Cobb's Manual?

BENJAMIN KEACH:

"7. That there will be an eternal JUDGEMENT, or that all shall be brought to the tribunal of Jesus Christ in the great DAY, and give an account for all things clone in the body——" (Travels of True Godliness, P. 8).

This great Baptist preacher was born in 16-10, only 301 years before Cobb's NEW MANUAL FOR BAPTIST CHURCHES appeared with the plurality of judgements. Do you suppose these brethren of the 12th century, the 17th century and the 18th were all confused on the doctrine of the judgement? Did Baptists have to wait until 1941 to find a man smart enough to set forth what Baptists should adopt? If Jones could have lived in their day! What a change there would have been!

JOHN BUNYAN:

"20. I believe that, being there, he shall so continue till the restitution of all things; and then he shall come again in glory, and shall sit in JUDGEMENT UPON ALL FLESH; and I believe that according to his sentence, so shall their JUDGEMENT be." (John Bunyan's Complete Works, P. 819).

This greatest of all dreamers was rom about a mile from Bedford England, where he was later imprisoned for about 12 years for preaching the gospel. This great man was introduced by Brother Jones. Jones claimed Bunyan was a Pre. Formerly I showed he believed in a general resurrection of the dead and now I have just quoted him as saying there is a JUDGEMENT of ALL FLESH. That is far from taking the Premillennial position of a plurality of judgements. Bunyan was rom only 313 years before the idea of JUDGEMENTS TO COME appeared in Cobb's NEW MANUAL FOR BAPTIST CHURCHES. I guess Jones will call Bunyan a modernist, as he has called me, for believe the same as Bunyan, Keach and the Waldenses. He can say that easier than he can answer the arguments.

J. N. HALL:

"I say that THE ENTIRE HUMAN FAMILY WILL BE PRESENT. I believe, like John did when he looked forward and saw THE JUDGEMENT seat, AND ALL THE DEAD, small and great, were present." (Mem. of J. N. Hall, P. 285).

Brother Jones, do you claim to be in fellowship with the principles that Hall stood for? was he your kind of Baptist? Didn't Hall know as much about sentence construction as you? Wasn't he an English scholar? Wasn't he the greatest debater that has been among Baptists in the last 100 years? Why do you write as if Ballard was the only debater that denies your ideas? Are you going to disagree with the greatest Baptist debater and dreamer? Are you going to deny the Waldense Confession and sever your succession from them? Don't try to hold them as your predecessors and at the same time reject their doctrine. You had better tread lightly along this line. You had better get your Greek alphabet and start counting, for you can't meet the forgoing arguments. They are the principles our forefathers loved.

Now I will give my opponent a few numbered questions to worry about. I know he will do his BEST to answer them, for he said he could do his BEST in a written debate.

QUESTIONS FOR JONES:

1. Does "THE JUDGEMENT" (Heb. 9:27) mean one judgement?
2. Was the doctrine of a plurality of future judgements in a Baptist Confession or church manual before 1941?
3. Is the judgement in Mat. 25:31-33 a judgement of the saved and lost?
4. If, as Paul says, there is a "judgement to come," then does that mean a plurality of future judgements to come?
5. How many judgements are there after death?
6. Were the pure stock of Waldenses true churches?

7. Does "a day" mean more than one day?
8. Do you claim these Waldenses as your predecessors?
9. Were the churches composing the Philadelphia Association true and scriptural churches?

10.

Is an Association of churches scriptural that claim (and adopt) Pendleton's Manual and claim it to be scriptural and Baptist?

11. Have you ever held membership in a Baptist church that had adopted the 18 articles found in Pendleton's Manual?

12. Have you ever pastored a Baptist church that adopted Pendleton's Manual?

13. If you have pastored such a church, was it a scriptural church?

14. If you were physically able to do so, would you pastor a church that had adopted the 18 articles found in Pendleton's Manual?

I believe this is enough to hold him for awhile. I am anxious to read his BEST answers to these questions. I can hardly wait, but I must. Good day!

P. D. Ballard

G. E. JONES' FIRST NEGATIVE

It is a pleasure to refute the idea of just one future judgment, in which both saved and unsaved will be judged. It is easy to see where Bro. Ballard goes for his proof. If I counted correctly he had 230 lines, or portions of lines in his article. He used 47 in quoting scripture, and commenting on these same. He used 121 telling what men said, and about manuals and articles of faith. There were 17 in syllogisms and the rest in questions and defining of his proposition. I will ask him some questions, and then answer his 14 questions.

MY QUESTIONS

1. What is the final basis of appeal on doctrine, church manuals, confessions of faith or the BIBLE?

No. 2. How long have Baptist churches had church manuals?

3. You introduced Bro. Duggar on the resurrection. He says you misapplied his words. Will you take him as a witness on the judgment question?

4. If not, then why use him on one thing and reject him on the other since the subjects are connected?

5. Were there scriptural (Baptist) churches in the first 3 centuries?

6. Does a church have to adopt any manual to be scriptural?

7. Do the Baptist churches in Germany and Russia have church manuals or have they adopted either of the two declarations of faith you mention?

8. Did all Baptist churches in America adopt either of these manuals or statements of faith?

9. Were the men who wrote those articles of faith infallible? 10. Which is safer to stand by, the Bible, or those confessions of faith? Will you answer these.

NEW HAMPSHIRE CONFESSION OF FAITH

Bro. Ballard quoted the 18th article of this confession of faith as saying, "This judgment will fix forever the final state of men in heaven and hell." Now I call upon him to prove with the Bible, a judgment that will fix our final state. That is fixed before we leave this world. Our destiny is fixed when we believe in Christ. The works we do will fix the rewards we shall get. That time will only declare what our reward will be. You brought this up, and you are duty bound to prove with the Bible that it is so. It sounds like a Campbellite's prayer, "If we have been faithful save us in heaven at last." You will get sick of this before I am through with it.

HIS 14 QUESTIONS ANSWERED

1 — The Greek word "Krisis" in Heb. 9:27 refers to one judgment. The Greek word "Bema" in II Cor. 5:10 refers to another, "He that heareth my word, and believeth on him that sent me hath eternal life, and cometh not into (KRISIS) judgment," R. V. Goodspeed translates it "Will not come to (krisis) judgment." Worrell's translation reads, "Conies not into JUDGMENT." Dr. Berry translates it, "Cometh not into judgment." On p-1 of his introduction Dr. Berry says 8 different Greek words are rendered judgment in King James Translation.

2 — In 1660 in England 20,000 Baptist declared themselves as standing for what the Premillennialists teach.

3 — It is a judgment of NATIONS, not people who have died and have been raised. It is people who have never died who compose nations, not the dead. You are supposed to be proving one future judgment for the saved and the unsaved dead.

4 — On p. 860 of his Lexicon Thayer said the word Paul used in Acts, 24:25 means PENAL judgment, and refers to the last or final judgment. This shows that only the lost will be in the last judgment. This and the above answers both Matt. 25:31 to 33 and Acts 24:25 which you comment on later on. I thank you for

this one. The thing that Paul preached to Felix was a PENAL JUDGEMENT. The saved will not be in a PENAL judgment.

5 — There will be a "Bema" judgment for the saints, and a "Krisis" judgment for the lost. That would make two future judgments for the dead.

6 — So far as I know the pure ones were Baptists.

SEVENTH QUESTION

Since this involves a lot of scriptural argument I separate it from the others. A day of 24 hours means one day of 24 hours. But if one is speaking of a day consisting of a period of years it means not a day of 24 hours, but a day consisting of a period of years. Now let us debate whether or not the word DAY is used in the Bible as meaning a period of years, not go on assumptions. So here I go. "Harden not your hearts, as in the provocation, in the day of temptation in the wilderness: when your fathers ... saw my works FORTY YEARS." Heb. 3:8-9. Here we see of a DAY that consisted of 40 years. In John 9:4 Jesus said "I must work the works of him that sent me while it is DAY." Here is a DAY consisting of at least 21 years. Challenge this if you will. In Rom. 13:11-12, Paul said, "Now is our salvation nearer than when we believed, the NIGHT is far spent, the DAY is at hand." Here we find both NIGHT and DAY used as meaning a period of years. The years of the first presence of Jesus was called DAY. The time of His absence is called NIGHT. Then why should not His second presence also be a DAY, which consists of a period of years? It does. Here is the proof. "Sing ... O daughter of Zion: for lo, I come, and I will DWELL in the midst of thee, saith the Lord, And many nations shall be JOINED to the Lord in THAT DAY, and shall be my people; and I will DWELL in the midst of thee, and thou shalt know that the Lord of hosts hath sent me unto thee. And the Lord shall yet inherit JUDAH his portion in the HOLY LAND, and shall choose JERUSALEM AGAIN." Please notice the words "IN THAT DAY." This shows that the period of years in which Christ shall dwell

in Judah after He comes again is spoken of as a DAY. This proves that the DAY OF THE LORD and THE LAST DAY refer to a period of years after Christ returns to reign on the earth. This answers John 6:54 and 12:48. At the beginning of the LAST DAY (a period of many years) Christ will raise the saved dead. At the end of the LAST DAY He will raise the lost and judge them. Question: In which of these passages John 9:4; Rom. 13:11-12; Heb. 3:8-9 and Zech. 2:10 to 12 (the last one quoted) does the word DAY mean 24 hours? Now I have argued my point with scripture and I call upon you to take the Bible and prove THE LAST DAY and THE DAY OF THE LORD will be a period of time of only 24 hours. On page 51 of your book "Gold Tried in the Fire" you say, "All know words have a literal use and a figurative use, at least, most words do." Now you are duty bound since you have made this statement to make some attempt with the Bible to prove the word DAY is not used in the sense of meaning a period of years when connected with the DAY OF THE LORD, and the LAST DAY. We want proof, not assumption. I challenge you to bring the proof that the word in these places does not mean a period of years.

OTHER QUESTIONS

8 — I suppose the true ones were. 9 — I would say that many were in most respects. I doubt that all of them were. 10 — Some are, and some are not. There is not a thing in the articles of faith as set for by Pendleton which forbids the receiving alien immersion or open communion. 11—Yes. 12 —Yes. 13 — Largely speaking, and most of the members were Premillennialists. 14 — Not if any large number were Nonmillennialists. Not long ago I refused to hold a meeting for such a church.

This answers all his questions, and in answering them I have replied to him on Matt. 25:31-33; Acts 24:25; John 12:48 and 6:56.

WALDENIAN CONFESSIOIN OF FAITH

Bro. Ballard quoted it as saying, "We do believe concerning all other saints, Viz: that Christ being in heaven, they wait for the resurrection of their, bodies AT THE DAY OF JUDGMENT." Now it is up to Bro. Ballard to prove they used the word DAY in this place in a literal way. Nothing is said in this connection either about the resurrection of the lost.

KEACH AND HALL

Bro. Ballard quotes Keach as saying, "All shall be brought to the tribunal of Jesus Christ in the GREAT DAY." Bro. Ballard says most words are used both in a literal way, and also a figurative way. He is assuming Keach used it in a literal way. Let him prove it. He says that

J. N. Hall said, "The ENTIRE HUMAN FAMILY will be present. And like John when he looked forward and saw the judgment seat, and all the dead were present." I believe too that the whole human family will be present at the final judgment, the lost to be judged, and the saved, not to be judged, but to take part in the work of judging the lost. Paul said, "Do ye not know that the saints shall judge the world? ... Know ye not that we shall judge angels?" I Cor. 6:2-3. If we judge the world and angels we will not be judged with them. When criminals are tried and judged, the judge, jury and witnesses are present, not to be judged themselves, but to take part in judging the criminals.

BUNYAN

He quotes Bunyan as saying, "I believe that, being there, he shall so continue till the restitution of ALL (my caps) things; and then shall be again in glory, and shall sit in judgment UPON ALL FLESH; and I believe that according to his sentence, so shall their judgment be." This is Premillennial doctrine pure and simple, and in no wise teaches both the saved and unsaved dead will be judged at the same time. He says that Christ will continue in heaven till the RESTITUTION OF ALL THINGS, not

part of the things, or the remainder, but of ALL things. He had in mind Acts 3:20-21. So ALL THINGS the prophets said would be restored awaits the return of Christ from heaven according to Bunyan and Peter in Acts 3:20-21. One of the ALL things that is to be restored is the tabernacle of David. "After this I will return, and will build again (ONCE MORE) the tabernacle of David, which is fallen down." Bunyan's statement puts this after the coining of Christ in His glory, and so do Peter and James. Bro. Ballard says it has already been done and it is the church. Instead of putting the restoration of the tabernacle of David, and Israel's judges (Isa. 1:26), Bro. Ballard says that has already been done, and, at the coming of Christ all the dead, saved and unsaved, will be raised and judged and the earth will pass away in a 24 hour clay. Now Bro. Ballard answer this question. WHAT WILL BE RESTORED IN THE JUDGMENT OF THE GREAT WHITE THRONE in Rev. 20:11-15, or what will be restored after that? Bunyan's statement shows he did not expect the dissolution of this earth at the Lord's coming.

Matt. 25:31-33; Acts 24:25; Heb. 9:27 and Acts 17:31

He quotes these and follows with some of his syllogisms. I have already shown that Matt. 25:31 does not refer to the judgment of people who had been dead. I do not deny that all nations will be gathered before Him, but they will be living nations, so his first premise in that syllogism goes down. I have shown that other translations show that the definite article "The" is not found in Heb. 9:27. So it does not teach his one judgment idea. That destroys his first premise in the syllogism that follows his use of Heb. 9:27. I have shown with Thayer that Paul was preaching to Felix in Acts 24:26 on a PENAL judgment, which he said will be the final and last judgment. So down goes his first premise on his next syllogism. In Acts 17:31 Paul said that God had appointed a DAY in the which He would judge the WORLD in righteousness. First this is talking about judging the WORLD. Jesus said of His people, "They are NOT OF THE WORLD, even as I am not of the world," John

17:16. Next Bro. Ballard must prove that the word DAY in this place means 24 hours, instead of a period of years called a DAY in the Bible.

I am going to predict that he will not even try to prove with the Bible that the word DAY in these places mean just 24 hours. He will just go on assuming. It is a lot easier to make an assertion than it is to prove one. In his book he has admitted that most words have a figurative use. I have him backed up in a corner, and I am going to demand that he bring some scriptural proof that the word DAY, when it speaks of "THE LAST DAY," "THE DAY OF THE LORD," and "THE DAY of judgment" must be taken literally and not in a figurative sense. Reader watch him fail. He claims he makes the fur fly from the Premillennial doctrine. Whose fur is flying now?

TERMS OF AGREEMENT

He sent me some terms of agreement to sign, and I signed them. One is that we must conduct ourselves as Christians. Fine. Then let him do that. In our last discussion he misrepresented me grossly two or three times. I said he was crooked. If he does not want me to use such words let him quit misrepresenting. That certainly is not a Christian act. I saw Eld. R. P. Mitchell a few days ago and he said Eld. Ballard misrepresented him about that debate in Missouri. I have a letter from Bro. Duggar from Carthage Texas, dated May 2nd. It reads, "In answer to your questions I would like to say that (1) I believe the resurrection of Rev. 20:5-6 to refer to a bodily resurrection and not the new birth; (2) I believe that the saved dead shall be raised in a bodily resurrection 1000 years before the unsaved dead are raised, and that these are the first and second resurrections; and (3) I believe that there are several judgments: one of the nations at the time of Christ's coming; one for the saints or saved for rewards after the rapture and during the tribulation week; one of the fallen angels; and one of the wicked dead at the close of the thousand years reign of

Christ on the earth." He introduced Bro. Duggar in answer to my question on page 65 of our debate book, "When did the doctrine that the new birth is the first resurrection start"? In answer to this he brought in Bro. Duggar. He tried to have him teach that the new birth is the first resurrection. Above Bro. Duggar said that he believes that Rev. 20:5-6 refers to the bodily resurrection of the saved dead, and not to the new birth. I told him all the time he was misconstruing Bro. Duggar's words and trying to put him in a false light to carry his point. So if he wants us to act as Christians should let him quit distorting the words of men, and get down to debating the scriptures.

THE RESURRECTION FROM THE DEAD

The doctrine of the resurrection FROM the dead in Luke 20:35-36 and other places refutes Bro. Ballard's position on one future judgment. When Jesus came from the mount of transfiguration He said to His disciples, "Tell the vision to no man until the Son of man be RISEN AGAIN FROM THE DEAD," Matt. 17:9. When the women came to the grave to anoint the body of Jesus the morning after his resurrection the angels said to them, "Why seek ye the living AMONG THE DEAD?" Luke 24:5. For 3 days and nights the body of Jesus had been in that cemetery among other dead. But this morning He was no longer among the dead. His resurrection which was a resurrection FROM the dead had brought Him out from the other dead leaving them behind. In defining his proposition on the resurrection Bro. Ballard said, "By the dead I mean all that have left the walk of this life by means of physical death." Fine. Let him stay with this definition, and he is ruined world without end.

In speaking of the resurrection FROM (Gr. Ek-FROM AMONG) the dead Jesus said, "They that shall be accounted worthy to obtain that world (Gr. age) neither marry, nor are given in marriage: neither can they die any more: for they are equal

unto angels; and ARE CHILDREN OF GOD." Luke 20:35-36. Here we have:

FIRST: A resurrection FROM the dead. Our Lord's resurrection FROM the dead brought Him out from other dead leaving them behind to be raised later. So will this resurrection FROM the dead bring some out from among other dead leaving them behind to be raised later.

SECOND: To be in this resurrection FROM '1 HE DEAD one must be accounted worthy. Those not accounted worthy will have no part in the resurrection FROM the dead.

THIRD: Jesus said those who shall be accounted worthy to obtain this resurrection FROM THE DEAD are CHILDREN OF GOD (v. 36). So those who will not be accounted worthy to be in it will not be children of God, but the lost dead.

FOURTH: So the unsaved dead will be those from whom the saved shall be raised when they are raised FROM AMONG THE DEAD. Keep in mind Bro. Ballard said "The dead" are those "that have left the walk of this life by means of physical death."

FIFTH: So when the children of God are raised from among the dead, the dead from whom they will be raised will be the unsaved part of the dead who have left the walk of this life by means of physical death.

SIXTH: So here is a bodily resurrection in which there will be none but saved people. When it is said they are raised FROM THE DEAD, it means they have been raised from among the unsaved dead.

SEVENTH: This will leave the unsaved dead behind to be raised at another time.

EIGHTH: This puts an interval of time between the resurrection of the CHILDREN OF GOD, and the unsaved. This forever ruins the idea of all the dead being raised at the same time, and judged at the same time. A resurrection FROM the dead (dead

persons) rules out the idea of a simultaneous resurrection for all, and thus of a general judgment for all.

NINTH: Luke 20:35-36 puts an interval of time between the resurrection of the saved dead and the unsaved dead. Rev. 20:4-5 puts an interval of time of 1000 years between those who will be raised in the first resurrection and the rest of the dead. "But the rest of the dead lived not again until the thousand years were finished," Rev. 20:5. So the RESURRECTION FROM THE DEAD in Luke 20:35-36, and the first resurrection, are one and the same.

JOHN EXPLAINS

Bro. Ballard accuses us of interpreting the first resurrection. It was John who explained it. In Rev. 20:4 and the first part of the 5th verse John used the past tense. In the last part of

v. 5 he changes to present tense and tells us what the things above mean. Then in v. 6 he goes on to future tense showing that the fulfillment of the prophecy in v. 4 was in the future. So it is an inspired interpretation which we have. Ballard puts his private interpretation up against John's inspired interpretation, when he says the new birth is the first resurrection.

BALLARD'S SECOND AFFIRMATIVE

Readers, from reading Jones' reply one would think we are discussing the resurrection or millennium. Be patient with him. He is trying to patch a few holes he left. He is not pleased with his former effort. Also, he would have you think confessions of faith and church manuals are sinful and useless. I wonder why Cobb published his manual, if they are not any good. I wonder why the N. A. B. A. has articles of faith. I wonder why the N.A. B. A. demands a church to adopt their articles of faith in order to represent in their annual sessions. I wonder why Jones, Flippo, Duggar and others were so interested in entering the premillennial idea into the N. A. B. A. articles of faith, if articles of faith spell nothing. And, I wonder why the Missouri brethren, as well as others, have changed their articles of faith by putting the Pre idea in their articles of faith. Maybe Jones will tell us WHY.

Readers, the battle is not whether Ballard is right or wrong. The issue is: WERE BAPTIST ARTICLES OF FAITH WRONG UNTIL 1941? I am contending for the old articles of faith while Jones holds to the 1941 formulation. And his playing on the emotions of his pre brethren, by quoting Duggar, will not suffice for argument.

OFF THE SUBJECT MATTERS:

Jones, with all his might, tries to get into the affirmative and debate the resurrection. Again he goes over his ideas on Lk. 20, but to no avail. The text deals only (directly) with the saved. But where you find BOTH elements discussed, you will find them coming forth "together. Dan. 12:2; Acts 24:15.

FROM AMONG THE DEAD: Jones says Christ was raised FROM AMONG the dead. Jesus said His resurrection would be like that of Jonah's. Mat. 12:39-40. Did Jonah rise from among the (lend, leaving others in the fish?

THE FIRST RESURRECTION: When did Baptists adopt the idea of the 'first Resurrection' being the new birth? Ans. When they adopted one future bodily resurrection. If there is another besides the bodily, then it must be that of the soul, for man is a two-fold being: spirit and body.

CONFESSIONS OF FAITH:

NEW HAMPSHIRE CONFESSION: Jones denies what this confession states by claiming it teaches man's destiny is determined by the judgement. Jones knows this **FIXING** in judgement has reference to **REWARDS** and not to determine **WHERE** they will spend eternity. For the brethren of New Hampshire believed in a present salvation just like we do today: "We believe that the salvation of sinners is wholly of grace;..." (Art. IV). Does that sound like a "Campbellite's prayer"? Salvation **"IS"** **"WHOLLY"** of grace. Does that sound like Campbellism? That was Jones' way of denying the article of faith. He had to accuse them of being Campbellite to do it, but he did it just the same. Jones will deny most anything, it appears, to uphold premillennialism.

WALDENSE CONFESSION: Jones denied this twelfth century confession by asking if they used the word "day" literally. I accept what they said. If there is "the day of judgement," as they taught, then the lost must be there or go unjudged. Jones continues to take the word "day," where it is used to represent a period of time, and makes it apply to all passages that mention the word "day." Why doesn't he take the passages that I quote and show that the word "day" doesn't refer to a literal day. That is his task. I will remind him of a thousand years being used figurative when we enter the next proposition, then you will hear from him.

John Bunyan:

Bunyan claimed "all flesh" will be judged when Christ comes in His glory. Jones says, "this is premillennial doctrine." Bunyan

claimed Christ will remain in heaven "till the restitution of ALL things." Jones do you believe this doctrine?

Then Jones tries to have Bunyan teaching the restoration of David's tabernacle at His second coming. Bunyan said no such. He said Jesus would remain in heaven "till the restitution of ALL THINGS."

KEACH:

Jones replied to what Keach said by asking a question: Did Keach mean a literal "day?" If he hadn't, then he would have said something else. Can't Jones accept what a man says? Oh yes, Brother Jones, WHERE IS THE WORD "DAY" used in a literal sense? Is it ever used literally in connection with His second advent? please tell us!

J. N. HALL:

My opponent claims he agrees with Hall: that "the entire human family will be present" at the judgement. However, Jones qualifies it a little. He says the righteous will be there to judge the lost. I thought Christ would be the Judge. Acts 17:31. God has APPOINTED Him. Do you suppose God has changed His mind and decided to use Jones and his workable system? I agree with Hall and disagree with Jones. Therefore, Jones and Hall don't agree.

BALLARD'S QUESTIONS & JONES' ANSWERS:

1. Does "the judgement mean one judgement? Answer: "Krisis in Heb. 9:27 refers to one judgement." Thanks! So there is ONE JUDGEMENT "after" death.

2. Was the plural judgements doctrine in a Baptist Confession or Manual before 1941? Answer: 20,000 Baptists DECLARED themselves premillennialists in 1660. Jones, did they teach a PLURALITY of future judgements? Did they teach more than one judgement AFTER death? Were there only 20,000 pre's then? If Baptists were already Pre's WHY DID 20,000 DECLARE

THEMSELVES? I thought you weren't very high on declarations and confessions. He seems to love them if they will go beyond 1941.

3. Is the judgement in Mat. 25 a judgement of the saved and lost? Answer: "It is a judgement of nations." You have asked me if I agreed with Duggar on the judgement. Now I will ask you if you agree with D. N. Jackson on Mat. 25. Jackson says it is not a judgement of literal nations. Do you agree with him? Why agree in part and not in the whole? Oh yes, what nations will be the sheep nations and what will be the goat nations? Please tell us!

4. Does "judgement to come" mean a plurality of judgements? Answer: This is a "penal judgement," and the saved will not be judged in a PENAL judgement." The Bible says they will "suffer loss." I Cor. 3:14-15. Sounds like PENAL JUDGEMENT to me.

5. How many judgements after death? Answer: "TWO future Judgements for the dead." Duggar said there would be "several." He numerates 1*OUR. He mentioned a separate judgement for the fallen angels. Jones, could you tell us when the angels will be judged?

6. Were the pure stock of Waldenses true churches? Answer: They were. So Baptists believed in "a day of judgement" in the twelfth century. Thanks!

7. Does a "day" mean more than one day? Answer: A "day" means a period of years. Does "day" always mean a period of years? Now why claim the "last day" is the last period of years? The term "last day" (eschatos) means LAST, UTTERMOST, LOWEST. There is nothing beyond the superlative. "Lowest" is the superlative. The day of the resurrection and judgement (John 6:54, 12:48) is the 'last' or superlative. Therefore, no "days" shall be BEYOND it. Remember, I didn't say the "last day" is used figurative. I said the word "day" is sometimes used figurative. So his scripture quoting about the word being used

figurative is to no avail, except to ruin him on the next proposition.

8. Were the Waldenses your predecessors? Answer: "I suppose the true ones were." He would like to disown them, but he might meet a Campbellite on the church question and need them to prove church continuity. Actually, he would like to discard them since they believed in "a day of judgement." If they were true churches, then why can't churches be the same and be true churches?

9. Were the churches of the Philadelphia Ass'n. true and Scriptural? Answer: "Many were in most respects." So none were in all respects. I guess they needed Cobb's Manual and Jones' "ONLY WORKABLE SYSTEM." They needed some help to definitely prove the doctrines so they could draw up some articles like those in Cobb's Manual, then they could have done like some in Missouri: adopt premillennialism and demand one to teach it if he goes on the mission field. I am still wondering why they put their ideas in articles of faith and demand their adoption, if articles of faith and declarations of faith mean nothing. Will they accept a church that claims to believe the Bible? Will they scat a church in their annual sessions that believes the Bible? Or, do they insist they adopt the articles of faith? Why adopt the articles of faith if they are useless?

10. Is an Ass'n. of churches scriptural that adopt Pendleton's Manual and claim it is scriptural and Baptist? Answer: "Some are, and some are not." So churches can adopt nonmillennial doctrines and be scriptural. If some can, why can't all adopt the same and be scriptural? Thanks, brother Jones! Then why did the Missouri Pre's pull away from the Non's? Did they pull away from some that were scriptural?

Now, does Pendleton's Manual deny open communion and alien baptism? Jones says it doesn't forbid either. Read article XIV. It declares baptism to be a "prerequisite to the privileges of a church relation; and to the Lord's Supper, in which THE

MEMBERS OF THE CHURCH ... are to commemorate...." If this isn't scripturally baptized church members taking the Lord's Supper, then I can't discern my right hand from my left. But Jones' man, Bunyan, believed in open communion, therefore, he must have believed any immersion was scriptural. Jones, did those of the 20,000 agree with Bunyan on baptism and communion? or, did true Baptists of that century tolerate alien baptism and open communion? If those 20,000 tolerated it, then why don't you, if you are their offspring? Jones will tread lightly here. He may forget to answer.

11. Jones, have you held membership in a church that adopted the articles found in Pendleton's Manual? Answer: "Yes." I wonder if the church was a scriptural church. Jones, was it a true church? Jones, were you a genuine Baptist while in such a church? Or, were you in error? Would you belong to one now? I can hardly wait for his reply. You can be assured he will give us his BEST, for he said he could do his best in a written debate.

12. Have you ever pastored a church that adopted Pendleton's Manual? Answer: "Yes." Then were they New Testament churches? Were they scriptural in doctrine and practice? Or, were you pastoring heretical churches? Please give us your BEST on this. Tell us whether or not they were scriptural churches. If they were, can't one believing and practicing the same and be a scriptural church? Has time changed doctrine and practice?

13. Was the church you pastored scriptural? Answer: "Largely speaking and most of the members were Premillennialists." Well, a premillennial church with Nonmillennial articles of faith! What compatibility! The articles of faith should have sued for divorce. Some mixture! And yet Jones pastored it. Now he refuses to preach for such. Numerics have changed the brother. He has learned better by his travels and journeys in the Greek alphabet. I wish he could have lived in the Apostle's ministry. He could have helped them considerably. And think, many of our

forefathers could ONLY translate four or five languages, They must have needed Jones' numerics. Oh, if Jones could have lived in their times!

H. Would you now pastor a church that adopts Pendleton's articles? Answer: "Not if any large number were Nonmillennialists." According to Jones, it does not matter what they adopt just so they are pre's. Why does the N. A. B. A. demand churches to adopt their articles of faith in order to represent in their annual sessions? Doesn't the adopting have anything to do with the doctrines and practices? Besides, a church that adopts and abides by the 18 articles in Pendleton's Manual will not call "workable system" Jones for a meeting. He can accuse them of adopting something that tolerates alien baptism and open communion, but they will not tolerate his modern articles (1941) and his numeric system.

Jones's Questions and Ballard's Answers:

1. The Bible is the final basis of appeal. However, Jones would add numerics, which proves things of the Bible beyond doubt. Although, Confessions and Manuals, that are scriptural, are reliable. If not, then get ready to receive the Campbellite that you have condemned, along with many others that believe and practice alien immersion and open communion, for they all claim to believe the Bible.

2. Baptist churches had Manuals previous to 1941 and confessions of faith (in print) that bear the date, 1120 A. D. How much further back, I know not; for their writings were destroyed by the enemy. Jones would give his right arm to locate a confession beyond 1941 that contains his millennialism (plural judgements).

3. No, I don't agree with Duggar on the judgement issue. Do you agree with brother D. N. Jackson on Mat. 25:31-33? He claims it is not a judgement of literal nations.

4. I disagree with Duggar for the same reason you disagree with Jackson: I don't agree with him. I believe he is wrong.

5. Yes, there were scriptural Baptist churches in the third century, or first three centuries. They were the predecessors to the Waldenses that believed in "the day of judgement" to come. Remembering, they didn't have Cobb's Manual, for it wasn't printed until 1941, about 16 hundred years later.

6. A congregation must adopt what the Bible declares, fundamentally, in order to be a New Testament church. These doctrines are listed in Pendleton's Manual.

7. I don't know what the Russians and Germans have adopted. They adopted the Equivalent to Pendleton's (fundamentally) if they are scriptural. They didn't adopt Cobb's did they?

8. They adopted the equivalent, if not the confessions mentioned. For the New Manual for Baptist Churches didn't appear until 1941.

9. The men that formulated articles of faith (what the church believed) were as infallible as J. E. COBB and G. E. JONES. Cobb wrote the NEW manual and Jones invented a system to prove its contents.

10. It is safe to follow the scriptures. What is the difference in saying I follow the scriptures and saying I follow what the Bible declares?

Hebrews 9:27:

Paul claims one judgement AFTER death. Jones tries to deny it by going to the Greek. The fact still remains: AFTER DEATH, "THE JUDGEMENT." Jones says this means ONE judgement. Thanks!

Acts 24:15:

Paul says there is a "judgement to come." I believe and teach that very same thing, but Jones is to the contrary, not withstanding.

Acts 17:31:

God has appointed "a day" to judge the WORLD. Jones says we won't be in it, for we are not of the WORLD. John 17:16. You mean to say we are not of them that inhabit the earth? This word "world" comes from two different Greek words (in the above passages): KOSMOS and OIKOUMENE. Come again!

Philadelphia Confession:

Brother Jones, please reply to what I quoted from the above.

QUESTIONS FOR JONES:

1. Is abiding by what the Bible declares the same as saying we go by the Bible?
2. Does the N. A. B. A. go by a declaration of faith?
3. If it does, then is it going by the Bible?
4. Must a church adopt the N. A. B. A. articles of faith to represent in it? Why?
5. Will the N. A. B. A. scat a church in its deliberations that claims to believe the Bible, without adopting their articles of faith?
6. If articles of faith mean nothing, why does the N.A.B.A. have such?
7. If articles of faith mean nothing, why did you say you wanted your views on the millennium in the N.A.B.A. articles when it was organized? Now don't deny saying you wanted your view in the articles. I will embarrass you.
8. On what basis will Christ determine who is GOAT nations? if it means nations as such.

Readers, bear with me. I am in a comer. Jones ran to the corner and as long as he is in there I will remain also. I am going to counter punch his millennial idea with what Baptists have believed, THE BIBLE. Stand by!

P. D. Ballard

JONES' SECOND NEGATIVE

WHO IS OFF THE SUBJECT?

Bro. Ballard says I am off the subject. The subjects of the resurrections and judgments are so connected that one cannot debate the one without bringing in the other. It is he that is off the subject. His proposition reads, "The Bible teaches there is one future judgment of all men saved and unsaved." In his first article he barely gave 4 or 5 Bible references and spent most of his time giving his garbled version of what this man said and that man said, church manuals, articles of faith, ridicule and sarcasm. He stays as far off the Bible as he can. In his last article of about 3000 words, if I counted right, he only had 34 words from the Bible. Where he used one word from the Bible he used about 90 of his own garbled quotations from men, and ridicule, and sarcasm. Those are infidel's tactics.

He accuses me of trying to get in the lead. I answered everything he had in his first and then I went to teaching the Bible. He gave less than a dozen Bible references, quoting none. About 4 or 5 he had already given, but not quoted. I give 3 Bible references to his one, and quote most of mine. He quotes none, but just brings a word or two here and there from the Bible. In 2 places he brought 6 words from Acts 3:21, leaving out 3 important words each time. The words he gave were "Till the restoration of all things," while the quotation is "Until THE TIMES OF restitution of all things." He will neither quote men correctly, nor the Bible. By leaving out the words "THE TIMES OF" he seeks to show that Christ will stay in heaven until all things are restored, when the passage is teaching that He will stay in heaven until the period of times comes for the restoring of those things. I quoted Acts 15:16 to sustain my point which he ignored. "After this I WILL RETURN and build again the tabernacle of David, which is fallen down." If we debate the scriptures it is up to me to bring the Bible, for he uses 50 to 90 times as much space on other things as on the Bible. When a

man does that it is easy to see he cannot sustain his proposition with the Bible.

I asked him if the men who drew up articles of faith were infallible. He said they were as infallible as Cobb and Jones. A sly dodge. He puts 50 times as much emphasis on the words of fallible men, as he does on the infallible words of God. I was calling attention to that.

He accuses me of thinking articles of faith are wicked. If they are used to promote fellowship they are not wicked, but when they become a substitute for the WORD OF GOD, as he is doing, and to pervert the truth, they are wicked. Yes, I wanted the Premillennial clause put in the NABA articles, because I felt that it was necessary to promote harmony. But a man is weak when he has to leave the Bible and take refuge under different articles of faith, as Ballard has done.

Then he has the audacity to ask me why I do not take the passages he gives and bring scriptural proof that the word "DAY" means a period of years. I have done that very thing. He pays no attention to my proof texts. In my first article I gave Heb. 3:8-9; John 9:4; Rom. 13:11-12 and Zech. 2:10-12, and I quoted those passages, to show that the word "DAY" means a period of years when used in connection with our Lord's coming. I asked him in which of those passages does the word "DAY" mean 24 hours. He did not answer. I also asked him what would be restored at the great white throne of Judgment. He ignored this also, as well as all my scriptural quotations. Because I asked him to prove the 18th article of the New Hampshire statement of faith, he says I deny most anything to prove Premillennial doctrine. That is a false accusation. I do not deny the Bible. I deny the statements of men when they are contrary to the Bible. But I do not leave out words in the Bible, nor misrepresent men and the Bible, to carry my point as he has done. He accuses me of bringing Bro. Duggar to play on the sentiments of my brethren, when he was the man to bring in

Duggar. He brought him in 3 times while on the resurrection. I brought ii. Duggar's letter, which I have since received, to show that he was misrepresenting him. He will neither accept Bro. Duggar on the resurrection or the judgment. In his letter to me dated May 2, Bro. Duggar said, "I believe the resurrection of Rev. 20:5-6 to refer to a bodily resurrection and not the new birth." Bro. Ballard do you agree with this? He said I believe that the saved dead shall be raised in bodily resurrection 1000 years before the unsaved dead are raised." Bro. Ballard do you agree? He said he believed in several judgements...." One of the saved for rewards after the rapture and during the Tribulation week; ... and one for the wicked dead at the close of the thousand years reign of Christ on the earth." Bro. Ballard do you agree? If not then Bro. Duggar does you no good either on the resurrection or the judgments. It was only by garbling his words that you tried to use him as a witness on the resurrection. You well knew at the time that you were putting him in a false light. But it is only by misrepresentation, and by garbling the word of God, and men's words, and ridicule that you can make a fair show before some.

MY PREDICTION

I predicted that he would go on assuming that the word "DAY" in such expressions as "The Last Day" and "The Day of the Lord" refer to 24 hours and would make no effort to sustain this assumption. All through the other discussion I asked him to give us Bible proof that 24 hours is under consideration. He kept on assuming, and made no effort to give us scriptural proof. You quoted no Bible to prove this in your last article. I predict you will go on assuming, and will not quote one passage to prove that 24 hours is under consideration. It is easier for you to assume and infer, than it is to come up with the Bible proof. He knows this. Neither will he pay any attention to the Bible proof I bring that a period of years is under consideration in these places. I will give him some more proof that the expression "The Day of the Lord" means a period

of years. In Zech. 14:1 we read "Behold, the day of the Lord COMETH." The 2nd verse tells about all nations gathering against Jerusalem to battle. The 3rd verse says, "Then shall the Lord go forth and fight against those nations." The 4th verse says "His feet shall stand IN THAT DAY (The Day of the Lord in v. 1) upon the mount of Olives, and the mount of Olives shall cleave in the midst thereof." It says in the 7th verse, "It will be one long day then, neither cold, nor hot, A DAY OF DAYS (plural), the Eternal knows it." Moffett's Trans. The 9th verse says, "And the Lord shall be king over all the earth: IN THAT DAY (the day mentioned in v. 1): shall there be one Lord, and his name one." Bro. Ballard is a 24 hour day under consideration in these verses? I predict he will not answer. In Zech. 2:10-12 "Rejoice O daughter of Zion: for, lo, I come, and I will dwell in the midst of thee, saith the Lord. And many nations shall be joined to the Lord IN THAT DAY, and I will dwell in the midst of thee and thou shalt know that the Lord of hosts hath sent me unto thee. And the Lord shall inherit Judah his portion in the holy land and will choose Jerusalem again. He says that in that DAY many nations shall be joined unto HIM. Bro. Ballard will you explain this passage? I ask you again does the word "DAY" in this place refer to 24 hours or a period of years? Will you please answer.

His Unfair Way of Dealing with My Answers to His Questions

He asked, "Does the word judgment mean one judgment?" I said the word "Krisis in Heb. 9:27 refers to one judgment. He says, "Thanks! So there is one judgment after death." But that was only a part of my answer. I said "The Greek word Bema in II Cor. 5:10 refers to another." To prove that I quoted John 5:24 in the R. V. "He that heareth my word, and believeth on him that sent me hath eternal life, and cometh not into (KRISIS) judgment." Dr. Berry translates it "Cometh not into judgment." He took only the first part of my answer, ignored the rest, and paid no attention to my proof text. I ask him is that fair play and acting as a Christian should act? Why did he just consider a

part, which he could twist to suit his theory, and ignore the rest of my answer to his question? Reader, you can guess why.

In answer to his quotation from Hall I said I agreed that the whole human family would be present at the final judgment. Then he says, "Jones qualified that a little. He said the righteous would be there to judge the lost." Again he garbled my answer. Here it is. "I believe too that the whole human family will be present at the final judgment, the lost to be judged, and the saved, not to be judged, but to take part in the work of judging the lost." To prove that I quoted I Cor. 6:2-3. "Do ye not know that we shall judge the world? ... Know ye not that we shall judge angels." He left out my words "To take part in the judging," and he ignored my scriptural proof. Not only did he garble my answer, but he ignored my scriptural proof and tried to offset the quotation from I Cor. 6:2-3 with ridicule and sophistry by saying, "I thought Christ would be the judge. (Acts 17:31) God has appointed Him. Do you suppose God has changed his mind and decided to use Jones and his system." So he meets I Cor. 6:2-3 with ridicule and contempt while leaving out a part of my answer. Yet he wants us to act as a Christian should. Then let him try and see if he can debate without misquoting and ridicule.

THE NEW HAMPSHIRE CONFESSION OF FAITH

I asked him to defend with the scripture the 18th article of faith in this confession. Instead of trying to defend that he jumped to the 4th article which I did not say sounded like the Campbellite, and did not ask him to defend. Why did he jump from the one I asked him to defend, the one he leans so strongly on, and jump to one I did not ask him to defend? He could defend the 4th, and could not defend the 18th. Not only is our salvation fixed when we believe, but our rewards will be fixed before we go to the judgment seat of rewards. The reward of the 12 apostles is already fixed. Jesus said to them, "Ye also shall sit upon twelve thrones, judging the twelve tribes of Israel," Matt. 19:28. The

judgment of rewards will only manifest or declare our works. "Every man's work shall be MADE MANIFEST, for the day shall declare it," I Cor. 3:13.

I did not deny the Waldensian statement of faith. Since I have proved with Scripture that the word "DAY" when connected with such words as "Day of the Lord," and "Last Day," mean a period of years, and he has not proved that they will just be 24 hours, then I have a more, scriptural reason for saying the Waldenses meant a period of years when they speak of THE DAY OF JUDGMENT, than he has for assuming they meant just 24 hours. I asked him for the proof that they meant just 24 hours. He dare not try to bring the proof. He just assumes it. In this connection he again misrepresents me. He said, "Jones continues to take the word day, where it is used to represent a period of time, and makes it apply to all passages that mention the word day." THAT IS NOT SO. I have never said the Passover day, the Day of Pentecost, the 4 days in John 11:39 and the 6 days in Matt. 17:1 and other such passages mean other than 24 hour days. But I have shown with Zech. 2:10-12 and 14:1-9 and other places that the word DAY, when connected with our Lord's coming, represents a period of years. If you want to act as a Christian should, as you signed to do, quit misrepresenting me and others.

OIKUMENE ACTS 17:31

Thanks for bringing in the word OIKUMENE in Acts 17:31. This is the Greek word for "inhabited earth." Here you surrender Acts 17:31 as a proof text on the judgment of the resurrected dead. Thayer says on P. 441 that this word means, "The whole inhabited earth." So the judging of the whole inhabited earth in Acts 17:31 has no reference to the judgment of resurrected people, but of the inhabitants of the earth in a future age. "Let the earth be glad; let the sea roar, and the fullness thereof, ... before the Lord; for he COMETH, for he COMETH to judge the earth: he shall judge the world with righteousness, and the

people with his truth." Ps. 96:11-13. "O let the nations be glad, and sing for joy: for thou shalt judge the people righteously, AND GOVERN (Rule) the nations upon earth," 1's. 67:4. "He comes to rule the world, to rule the world with justice, and the nations with equity," Ps. 98:9, Moffett's Trans. So Acts 17:31 is answered. So is Acts 24:25. The word translated JUDGMENT in this verse refers to a penal judgment according to Thayer, P. 360. It is the word found in Luke 24:20. "The chief priests and rulers delivered him (Christ) to the JUDGMENT of death," Berry's Trans. This word carries the idea of being condemned to punishment. So all the proof texts you advanced are answered.

LUKE 20

Thanks for saying "The text deals only (directly) with the saved." Sure, for it is speaking of the RESURRECTION FROM AMONG the dead in which there will be none but the saved. This leaves the unsaved behind to be raised and judged at another time. Tregelles translates Dan. 12:2 "Many FROM AMONG the sleepers shall arise, ... these shall be unto everlasting life; but those (the ones left behind) shall be to shame." Here we find the first part will be in a resurrection FROM AMONG THE DEAD." Acts 24:15 must harmonize with these passages.

THE PARABLE OF THE TARES—The parable of the tares which Bro. Ballard thinks teaches his position forever ruins him. In Matt. 13:30 we read, "Gather ye together FIRST the lares, and bind them into bundles to be burned." If we make this parable apply to the resurrection and judgment of all the dead, then we will put the resurrection and judgment of the lost, represented by the tares, to come before the resurrection and judgment of the saved dead. This would ruin Bio. Ballard's position on the saved and lost being raised at the same time. No where does the Bible hint at the lost being raised before the saved. Jesus said the field is the world. The world is on this earth. He said

the tares are the children of the wicked one, and the good seed are the children of the kingdom. In Mt. 13:40-41 we read, "As therefore the tares are gathered out and burned in the fire: so shall it be in the end of this world (Gr. age). The Son of Man shall send forth his angels and they shall gather OUT OF HIS (CHRIST'S) KINGDOM all things that offend, and them that do iniquity." They could not gather the lost, represented by the tares, OUT OF THE LORD'S KINGDOM unless they shall be in THE LORD'S kingdom at the harvest time. Ballard says the church is the Lord's kingdom, and it is composed of Baptist churches only. Then, the tares will be gathered out of the LORD's kingdom, composed of Baptist churches only, if Ballard is right. If the tares here refer to all the lost dead being raised and judged them all the lost who have ever lived would have to be raised and brought back and put into the Baptist churches to be in HIS KINGDOM. They could not be gathered out of HIS KINGDOM unless they will be in His kingdom. What is the explanation? The lost and saved are living on this earth, in the field, the world, which is on this earth. It is so now. At the harvest time the same condition will prevail. But when that time comes the world kingdoms shall have become the Lord's kingdom. "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 His Christ; and he shall reign for ever and ever." Since the Lord will take over the kingdoms of the world at that time, that will put the wicked who are still living in their natural bodies in the Lord's kingdom. They are the tares who must be gathered out at that time. The passage applies to the living wicked who shall still be living on the earth when the 7th trumpet sounds. Prov. 2:21-22 teaches the same thing. "The upright shall dwell in the land, and the perfect SHALL REMAIN in it. But the wicked shall be cut off FROM THE EARTH, and the transgressors shall be rooted out of it." Here are the tares, who represent the wicked, being gathered out of the earth. But the same passage declares that the perfect shall REMAIN in it. This shows that the earth will still be remaining

when the tares are gathered out, and will not be dissolved at the time as Bro. Ballard teaches. Now let us read Matt. 13:43 "Then shall the righteous shine forth as the sun in the kingdom of their Father." The same is taught in Ps. 37:9-11. "Evildoers shall be cut off: but those that wait upon the Lord, they shall inherit the earth. For yet a little while and the wicked shall not be: ... but the meek shall inherit the earth: and shall delight themselves in the abundance of peace."

HIS NEW QUESTIONS ANSWERED

No. 1. —Not necessarily so.

No, 2.— Yes.

No. 3.— In so far .is those statements go. No.

4. — For the sake of harmony. No. 5. — I do not know of it being done. No. 6. — Articles of faith are useful in letting people know what we believe. But they were never meant as .1 substitute for the Bible as you use them. No. 7. — I Believed it would save trouble. No. 8.— The sheep and goat nations will be determined by the treatment of the remnant (saved) of Israel in the tribulation period. The sheep will be composed of those who will treat them kindly. The goat nations will be those who have been unkind to them. "For that nation and kingdom that will not serve thee shall utterly perish," Isa. 60:12.

THE LORD'S REIGN BEGINS, NOT ENDS AT HIS RETURN

"The seventh angel blew; and loud voices followed in heaven, axing, THE RULE OF THIS WORLD HAS PASSED TO OUR LORD AND HIS CHRIST, and he shall reign for ever and ever. ... the four and twenty Presbyters (ciders) ... fell before God on their faces and worshiped God saying, We give thanks, ... that thou has assumed thy great power and BEGUN TO REIGN." Moffett's Trans. "Because thou hast exerted thy power, thy great power and hast become king," Weymouth's Trans. "We thank thee for assuming thy high and sovereign power that are yours

and BEGINNING TO REIGN." Amplified N. T. "And hast BEGUN TO REIGN." Williams' Trans. Since Christ begins his reign on earth at that time the unsaved dead will not be raised and judged until after that.

CLOSING REMARKS

If I have over looked anything of importance I want Bro. Ballard to remind me. I remind him that he did not consider II Cor. 5:10; John 5:24 (R. V.); Heb. 3:8-9; John 9:4; Rom. 3:11-12; Zech. 2:10-12; Acts 15:16; Isa. 1:26; I Cor. 6:2-3; Matt. 17:9 & Luke 24:7 which I advanced in my first article. In my next I wish to consider further his answers to my questions. For lack of space I could not take up all of them this time. I wanted to advance some scripture for him and the reader to consider.

BALLARD'S THIRD AFFIRMATIVE

Proposition: THE BIBLE TEACHES THERE IS ONE FUTURE JUDGEMENT OF ALL MEN. SAVED AND UNSAVED, FOR ALL WILL BE JUDGED IN THE JUDGEMENT.

Readers, again I ask that you remember what our difference is. We differ on the 18th article of the Baptist faith. I accept it while Jones rejects it. This is not just a mere personal conflict between us. The issue is, WERE BAPTIST ARTICLES OF FAITH BIBLICAL PREVIOUS TO 1941? I answer in the affirmative while Jones replies in the negative. Now, who is on the Baptist side of this issue?

With a few plain passages of scripture, I have proven the dead, lost and saved, will be judged AT THE LAST DAY. However, Jones complains because I don't quote more Bible texts for him to grapple with. Let him step forward and refute the ones I have already offered. Quoting scripture doesn't mean one's view is Biblical. If so, the Campbellite are right, for they can quote much scripture, whether it proves their contention or not. They try to make folk believe they teach the Bible by quoting the Bible. Jones is trying the same route. He quotes and misapplies many texts, but that doesn't prove his plural judgements doctrine. Oh yes, why has not Jones used his number system on this proposition, for he claims it will prove things beyond doubt and verify doctrines? Echo answers!

WHO IS ON THE SUBJECT?

The Proposition is relative to the JUDGEMENT. Jones still persists in discussing the resurrection and REIGN. Bless his heart, he must make an effort to reply! The Pre's are expecting great things from him. He is doing his BEST, as he promised. He is doing his BEST to drag me from the proposition.

Oh yes, Brother Jones, in a letter to me, you promised to use your numeric system through out the debate. Why aren't you using it? Has our debate discouraged you about the growth of

your baby that Cooksey and Meyer named: THE ONLY WORKABLE SYSTEM? Somehow I doubt that the baby will ever be very well loved, for its "daddy" doesn't accept the modern tithing theory.

JONES FORGETS:

1. He forgot about the argument I offered on Jonah's deliverance being a type of Christ's resurrection from the dead. Did Jonah rise from among the dead?
2. Jones forgot (?) that I introduced the Philadelphia Confession of faith.
3. Jones forgot that I asked when will the angels be judged? Now I ask: WHERE?

Now if Jones would stay with the subject he would have more space to discuss my questions and his answers. Instead, he discusses the REIGN and accuses me of misrepresentation and sarcasm. Me seems to think such rambling is debating the issue. Perk up, Jones!

ARTICLES OF FAITH:

Jones claims a man is WEAK when he has to leave the Bible and take refuge under DIFFERENT ARTICLES OF FAITH. Jones, "thou art the man." You left our old articles and took refuge in those found in Cobb's Manual, first published in 1941, DIFFERENT ARTICLES OF FAITH. So Jones is the WEAK MAN!

Wait a minute! Jones said the N. A. B. A. hadn't seated any churches that refused to adopt their articles of faith, though they may have adopted the Bible. Would that be called leaving the Bible and taking refuge under articles of faith? People that believe the Bible as a whole, believe old time Baptist articles.

New Hampshire Confession: I emoted the 4th article to show they didn't mean the FIXING at the judgement was a determining of one's destiny. Come again, Jones! Just keep calling them Campbellites. Rave on! You are sticking your foot

in your own mouth when you do, for we came from such churches.

Waldensian Confession: They believed in "the day of judgement." Jones assumes they meant a period of years. I accept what they said. Now who is assuming?

"DAY"

I asked Jones to prove, by the passages I offered (Acts 17:31, etc.), that "day" is used figurative in them. Don't go to other passages where it is used figurative for your proof. Use the ones I introduce and discuss. It is your task to show that the passage I offer uses the word "day" figuratively, [t]hat is the duty of the Negative. Now perform it!

Oh yes, the word "day," in Acts 17:31, comes from the same Greek word, "HEMERA," that the word "day," in Acts 2:1, comes from. Remember, you said the DAY of Pentecost was 24 hours long. If so, then the "day" of judgement (Acts 17:31) is the same. Thanks!

Duggar's Position:

I introduced Duggar as a witness to prove regeneration is a resurrection. Jones do you agree with Duggar? Jones doesn't agree with Duggar and he knows it. I suppose they both know it, but they will join hands to try to floor a Non. And DO YOU AGREE WITH D. N. JACKSON THAT CLAIMS MATT. 25:31-33 DOESN'T SPEAK OF NATIONS, AS SUCH, BEING JUDGED? With whom do you agree?

JONES' PREDICTION AND BALLARD'S PREDICTION:

Jones predicts that Ballard will not reply to his effort on the word "day." I have already admitted that the word is sometimes used in a figurative way, but not always. Show us that it is used figurative in Acts 17:31. That is your task. NOW, I PREDICT JONES WILL NOT PROVE THE WORD "DAY," IN ACTS 17:31, IS

USED FIGURATIVELY. Take the passage, Acts 17:31, and show us it is used figuratively.

SAINTS JUDGING:

Jones says the saints will have a "PART" in the judgement. What will be their part? The saints will judge the world like they have overcome the world, THROUGH CHRIST or by Christ, our representative. John 16:33.

JONES IS FOREVER CAUGHT ON "DAY":

He claims the DAY of Pentecost was 24 hours long. If so, the day of Christ's revelation will be 24 hours in length, for the same Luke uses the same language relative to both: "The same clay," Acts 2:41. "The same day," Lk. 17:28-29. Good-bye, Jones!

Oikumene, World, Acts 17:31

I showed that "world" (Oikumene) in this passage is not the same Greek word found in John 17:14, 16, which speaks of us not being of the "world" (Kosmos). I did this to prove we are to be judged when he judges the world (Oikumene, inhabitants of the earth) in righteousness. The saints are a portion of the Oikumene, inhabitants of the earth, though we are not of the world (Kosmos).

PARABLE OF THE TARES

I don't recall introducing this parable, but I will deal with it as a proof text anyway. It reveals God will sever the wicked from the righteous at Christ's return to gather His own. Mat. 13:49. Those severed shall be cast into a FURNACE of fire. Is that eternal fire, Bro. Jones? Or, is that temporal destruction of nations? Is it just material destruction of literal nations? Or, is it physical destruction of those that fail to be KIND to the Jews?

Jones says this parable, rather Ballard's position on this parable, places all the wicked in the kingdom to be cast out. I hardly think so! Matthew 13:41-42 tells us the OFFENDING (not necessarily individuals) in the kingdom shall be cast out

and destroyed by fire. Paul speaks of us having things to be burned, yet saved so as by fire. I Cor. 3:11-14. But the OFFENDING is not ALL that is to be destroyed. "Them which do iniquity" shall be destroyed also. That is someone in addition to the OFFENDING. Could "things" that offend refer to people? If the Lord meant people then why didn't He use a personal pronoun such as, THEY, THEM, etc? So Ballard's position doesn't place all the wicked in the church. Come again!

Wicked enter God's kingdom without the new birth?

That is what Jones said: "Since the Lord will take over the kingdom of the world at that time, that will put the wicked who are still living in their natural bodies in the Lord's kingdom." Such wild statements would blush the face of Bob Ingersoll if he was living. I thought Jesus said one MUST be born again in order to enter the kingdom. John 3:3, 5. Now Jones has wicked men, in 35 their natural bodies, entering the kingdom after Christ comes again. Great Caesar!

Jones on the judgements:

Jones takes the position, in answering one of my questions, there is "two future judgements of the dead." BEMA and KRISIS. Both of these refer to A TRIBUNAL, A JUDGEMENT SEAT. See Strong's Concordance. But, wait a minute! What about those resurrected after your tribulation period? Will they be judged after the other saved are judged? If so, then you believe in three future judgements: one at Christ's coming, one after the trial and one for the lost. That is THREE instead of TWO.

Ballard's Questions and Jones' Answers:

1. Is abiding by what the Bible declares the same as saying we go by the Bible? Maybe I should clarify this by asking: Is abiding by the Bible the same as going by what it declares?
2. Does the N.A. B. A. go by a declaration of faith? Answer: "Yes." Are they substituting it for the Bible?

3. If so, then is it going by the Bible? Answer: "In so far as those statements go." Then do the statements go far enough to be Biblical or do they need amending? Watch out, Jones!

4. Must representing churches adopt their articles of faith? Why? Answer: "For the sake of harmony." You mean you couldn't have harmony without them? If they are for the sake of harmony, then why have you Pre's introduced others to bring discord? Jones, get your foot out of your mouth! You have convicted yourself of trouble making, a brawler. Who said so? Jones. The man that counted the Confessions as useless and the Bible our final basis of appeal in doctrines is now contending articles of faith are for harmony. How would they serve to bring HARMONY if they are never appealed to? If they are no basis of appeal, then how do they serve to bring HARMONY? Now you can get your other foot out of your mouth. Dodging the old Confessions to avoid the one future judgement doctrine got you in deep, did it not?

5. Will the N. A. B. A. scold a church that doesn't adopt their articles of faith? Answer: "I don't know of it being done." If a church claims to believe the Bible, then are you going to bring articles of faith and refuse them a scold? Why? I thought you claimed the Bible as the "final basis of appeal on doctrines." Jones, which is safer to stand by: the Bible or Confessions of faith? The chickens are coming home to roost!

6. Why does the N. A. B. A. have articles of faith? Answer: To let people know what we believe. Formerly he said the articles were for harmony, now he says they are used to let people know what we believe. Thanks! Then what did Baptist let people know about their faith before 19-11? What did they declare to believe on the JUDGEMENT previous to 1941? What did they declare to believe on the JUDGEMENT previous to 1941? Their declarations declared a GENERAL JUDGEMENT previous to 1941. Their Manuals declared the same. Will Jones deny it? No. Yes, they declared what they believed. They

declared the general judgement doctrine. Therefore they believed in a general judgement. See the New Hampshire declaration, the Philadelphia Confession and the Waldensian Confession of A. D. 1120.

7. Jones, why did you want your millennial views in the N. A. B. A. articles of faith? Answer: "I believed it would save trouble." Just your effort to enter your views caused trouble. What would have happened if they would have entered? You wanted your Pre idea placed in the articles so you could use your articles of faith to weed out every Bible loving Nonmillennialist and church that disagrees with your 1941 model doctrine. You wanted to get situated and use your articles of faith as the final basis of appeal on doctrines. Now don't deny it.

8. On what basis will Christ determine GOAT nations and SHEEP nations? Answer: By how nations treat the remnant of jews during Jones' supposed 7 years tribulation period. People compose nations and can you imagine a nation of people ALL being kind to a certain people that have hoarded the wealth of the country and broken every law in the land in defrauding poor and unaware people? Oh yes, where is the text that says such will be the basis? Isa. 60:12 sure doesn't, for it speaks of SERVICE, not KINDNESS. A people can be kind and not serve or they can serve and not be kind. You stand in need of a text to verify your contention. Find one and place it in your next reply. Jones, the nations that are in this judgement are the ones that we are to try to disciple and baptize. Mat. 28:19. Did you ever disciple a "nation"? If so, did you baptize the disciplined nation? Was it a literal nation or not? Jesus told His flock to disciple "nations." Jesus told us to baptize the disciplined. Why? For they must some day be judged.

Heb. 9:27

This text says it is appointed unto man once to die and after this the judgement. So if a man is subject to death he is subject to this JUDGEMENT. Are the saved subject to death? Is it

appointed unto us to die? If so, we will be summoned to the JUDGEMENT (KR1SIS). Have any lost people died? Is death appointed for the lost? If so, they must appear at the JUDGEMENT (KRISIS). Jones' running to and fro in the Greek will not change this passage. It is all that is necessary to defeat the plural judgements doctrine. I said in the outset that I was affirming one judgement after this life. The above text proves it in no uncertain terms. I think Jones needs to call in his "only workable system" to combat this text.

KRISIS and BEMA

Both refer to "the tribunal." See Strong's Concordance. But Jones tries to use them to teach two separate judgements. If they do, then what Greek word is used relative to those you will have raised after the tribulation period. Surely they will be judged, for Paul claims ALL will be judged (BEMA). If there is a judgement of some redeemed after your tribulation period, then do you not believe in THREE future judgements of the dead instead of TWO? Please tell us!

NEW ARGUMENTS:

II Cor. 5:10-11: "For we must all appear before the judgement seat of Christ;... Knowing therefore the TERROR of the Lord, we persuade men;..."

Paul claims there will be TERROR in the judgement where we shall give an account for the things done in the body, whether good or bad. If the BEMA (judgement) is for the saved and the lost, and the KRISIS (judgement) is for the lost, then the lost will have to appear in TWO judgements: BEMA and KRISIS. However, Jones doesn't mind putting them in TWO, just so he proves (?) his millennialism.

II 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:"

John Gill, a Premillennialist and the only Baptist Commentator that has lived and written a Commentary on the whole Bible and lived to see it printed, says: "It is certain there will be a general judgement; the day is appointed,..."

Mat. 12:41:42: "The men of Nineveh shall rise in judgement with this generation, and shall condemn it: because they repented at the preaching of Jonas; and, behold a greater than Jonas is here.

The queen of the south shall rise up in THE JUDGEMENT with this generation, and shall condemn it:..."

So the penitent and the impenitent shall appear in THE JUDGEMENT-"WITH." How could language be plainer? Jones will dodge this by assuming the saints will be there to judge. II Tim. -1:1 says Jesus will be the judge, he has been appointed by the Father. It said nothing about Jones and his numeric system assisting in the event.

Rev. 20:12-15; 11:18. These texts tell us the "small and great" judgement will be at the rewarding of the saints and the destruction of the corruptors. Then the great white throne judgement will be composed of the saved and lost, and all who's names are not found in the book of life will be cast into the lake of fire. And the scriptures say nothing about a restoration at the great white throne judgement, that I can recall reading. But language couldn't be plainer relative to saints and sinners appearing in the great white throne judgement, one to be rewarded and the other to be destroyed.

QUESTIONS FOR JONES:

1. Since you rely much on Dr. Berry and Dr. Alford, will you please tell us what they were religiously? What church did they hold membership in?
2. Do you believe America is treating the Jews in such a way that God will allow America to exist during the millennium, which you say is future?

3. Is "judgement to come" singular or plural in number? Acts 24:25.

4. Is death appointed unto the saved and lost? Heb. 9:27.

5. John Gill, a pre, says the judgement mentioned in Heb. 9:27 is a "general judgement, which will reach all men, quick and dead, righteous and wicked——" Do you agree with Gill?

6. If you don't agree with Gill, Jackson and Duggar, then with whom do you agree? Readers, I believe that is enough to hold him for awhile. Stand by for more!

P. D. Ballard

JONES' THIRD NEGATIVE

MY PREDICTION came true. I said that Bro. Ballard would not attempt to show with the Bible that the word "DAY" in expressions like "Last Day," "The Day of the Lord," and "Day of Judgment" has reference to 24 hours, but would just go on assuming it. If he could prove it he would do so. So he has to try to get by with his assertions, bluster, misrepresentation and ridicule. I make the same prediction again.

MY PROOF TEXTS - In my first 2 articles I advanced John 9:4; Rom. 13:11-12; Heb. 3:8-9; Zech. 2:10-12; John 5:24 (R. V.); Acts 15:16; Isa. 1:26; Mt. 19:28; Ps. 96:11-13; 67:4; Matt. 13:30; 13:40-43; Ps. 98:9; Prov. 2:21-22; Ps. 37:9-11; Rev. 11:15-18; Matt. 17:9 and Luke 24:7. Not a one of these 18 passages did he notice. I asked him to say in which of these passages (John 9:4; Rom. 13:11-13; Heb. 3:8 and Zech. 2:10-12) did the word DAY mean just 24 hours. He did not answer. The passage in Zech. connects the words "IN THAT DAY" with the Lord's coming to dwell in the midst of Jerusalem. He says I quote a lot of scripture and misapply them. Why does he not take them up and give their meaning, and show how I misapply them. He is the one that debates like the Campbellite, not me. I have had over 20 debates with them. They quote just a few passages over and over, quote garbled statements from 20 or more men, and use ridicule, just like Ballard. He debates exactly like Campbellite. He stays as far off the Bible as he can. Ballard, thou art the man.

HIS PROOF TEXTS:

He has advanced Matt. 12:41-42; Luke 17:28-29; I Tim. 4:1; Rev. 20:11-15 and II Cor. 5:10 as new proof texts. I can quickly answer them. I Cor. 6:2-3 says we shall judge the world and angels. If the Ninevites condemn the Pharisees who did not repent that proves they will take part in the judging, and not be judged themselves. The judgment in Luke 17:27-29 did not

come on any one but living individuals, and is in no wise applicable to the judgment of the raised lost. It was a local judgment and came on a CITY. It foreshadowed the judgment that will come to the great city Babylon in Rev. 18:1-10. Let us read II Tim. 4:1 in Dr. Williams' translation. "I solemnly charge you, before God and Christ Jesus who is to judge the living and the dead, and BY HIS APPEARING and His kingdom, preach the word," Williams' Trans. The passage is not teaching He shall judge the living dead at 11 is appearing, but Paul is charging Timothy BY HIS APPEARING AND HIS KINGDOM to preach the word. Please notice he puts His appearing before His kingdom. The passage ruins your position. I showed with Zech. 2:10-12 that Christ is coming back to dwell in the midst of Jerusalem, and inherit Judah as His portion, and that IN THAT DAY, which is a period of years, many nations shall be joined unto the Lord. I showed with Matt. 13:43 and Prov. 2:21-22 that after the tares are gathered out of the Lord's kingdom, or off the earth, that the upright will still remain in the earth. I showed with Ps. 37:9-11 that when the evildoers are cut off from the earth that the meek will inherit this earth and have abundant peace. This proves the earth does not pass away when Christ returns, so Rev. 20:11-15 has to be after that. In II Cor. 4:11 to 5:10 the word WE is used 14 times. The pronoun "US" is found 5 times. The whole passage has under consideration the saints of God. The "We" who must stand before the judgment seat in V. 10, is the WE who have the building of God not made with hands in V. 1. It is the US who have been given the earnest of the spirit in V. 5. Because Paul knew the terror of the Lord he warned men. This was that he might be free from the blood of all men (Acts 20:26) and might be well approved when He stands before the judgment seat of Christ. While on this point I will say I hat the tribulation martyrs will be judged at the Bema judgment. There is no proof that the raised saints before the tribulation period will be judged immediately after being caught up. That judgment will not be completed until the tribulation dead are also judged.

Heb. 9:27-28

As it is appointed unto men once to die, but after that the judgment." Dr. Williams and others read, "After that be judged." So Christ was once offered to bear the sins of many; and unto them that look for him shall he appear the second time without sin unto salvation! The first verse applies to man in his natural state. The next applies to those ONLY who will receive the salvation of the body. We are not to look for death or the KRISIS judgment, but for His coming. Paul said "We shall not all sleep." Taking in the millennial age more believers will escape physical death than will ever go through it. So it is man in his natural state who is appointed to die once, and go to the KRISIS judgment.

DUGGAR AND JACKSON

Now Duggar says he believes the first resurrection will be the bodily resurrection of the saved, and not the new birth. He also stated that he believed the unsaved would be judged after the 1000 years reign of Christ. I do not know what Jackson says on the judgment in Matt. 25:31-46, but I know he told me last December in Temple Church that all the early Christians were Premillennialists. So I agree with Duggar and Jackson on what I know they said. Now about Dr. Gill, you have misrepresented me so many times and have garbled the statements of so many, I cannot take your word as to what Gill said. I would have to read for myself. This answers some of your questions.

HIS OTHER QUESTIONS

No. 1 — Yes. 3 — No. They prove by the Bible what they contend for. 4 — They do not cover enough? I do not know what Dr. Berry and Alford are denominationally. I only use Dr. Berry as authority on Greek. I use Alford as a historian, not an interpreter. I believe America will be one of the sheep nations. Enough people will be saved both spiritually and in their natural bodies to reconstruct the faithful nations. I have

answered Heb. 9:27. The judgment in Acts 24:25 is singular, but a different judgment to what the child of God goes to. See John 5:24 (R. V.). Yes the fire into which the tares will be cast is eternal fire. In Dan. 7:10-12 we find a judgment, and the beast destroyed and his body given to the burning flame, but other beasts will have their dominion taken away, but their lives will be prolonged for a season and a time. This answers Matt. 25:31-46. We read of no fallen angels being judged in Matt. 25:31-46. They will probably be judged when the Devil is judged in Rev. 20:10.

CONFUSION OVER MILLENNIAL DOCTRINE

If you want to know who has made trouble and confusion in Missouri on this subject write to Eld. Clifford Hopper of Quitman, Arkansas, John L. Britton of Potosi, and Eld. Freeman Gibson, editor of Missouri paper. A few years back a certain Non would be asked to hold meetings for churches. He would go behind the back of the pastor if he was a Pre, and try to turn his church against him. The Non's have been undermining there and elsewhere.

THE NEW HAMPSHIRE CONFESSION: You made no attempt to prove with the Bible what will be fixed at our judgment. Our salvation is FIXED when saved. The works we do in this life FIX our rewards. They will only be declared at that time. You failed to prove this 18th article with the Bible, and switched off on the 4th to hide your inability to defend the 18th article. Why? Echo answers.

ACTS 17:31

Ps. 67:4 shows the Lord will judge the inhabited earth (Oikumene), when He rules the nations on the EARTH. That will be in the last day. In Heb. 2:5 we read, "Not unto the angels did he subject the FUTURE, inhabited earth (Oikumene)," Worrell's Trans. "It was not to angels that he gave authority over that world (Oikumene) to be," Williams' Trans. So Acts

17:31 is speaking about the Lord judging, or ruling over the inhabited earth in a future age. Eph. 2:7 speaks of AGES (plural) to come. So there is another age for this earth after Christ returns. In Isa. 2:4 we read, "He shall judge among the NATIONS, and shall rebuke (Arbitrate, Goodspeed's Trans.) and they shall beat their swords into plowshares, and their spears into pruning hooks." Here is Christ judging (Acts 17:31) the (Oikumene) the future inhabited earth in the Day of the Lord, a period of years.

KINGDOM OF HEAVEN AND KINGDOM OF GOD

The word in John 3:3 is KINGDOM OF GOD, and the word in Mt. 13:24 is kingdom of heaven. The parable of the tares is mm here connected with the words "KINGDOM OF GOD." The kingdom of heaven, or from heaven, will be set up on this earth when Christ returns to govern the nations. This is how the tares get into the kingdom when Christ comes back and takes over the nations on this earth.

THE SPIRIT OF HAMAN AND HITLER

Ballard shows the same spirit of hatred toward the Jews as did Hainan and Hitler and he takes sides with the enemies of God against the Jews. (Ps. 83:1-5). Ps. 106:10 and Esther 9:2 and Obadiah show the Jews have ever been a hated people. Obadiah shows that the nation of Esau will be entirely wiped out because of their treatment of Israel, and Joel 3:1-16 shows that God will judge the nations for the way they have treated them. Beware God has warned in Gen. 12:2-3 and Rom. 11:18 to 21. We are to pray for them, not hate them. Ps. 122:6. Beware.

I will now consider a few things I did not have space to bring in in my last reply.

THE CHURCHES I HAVE PASTORED

Bro. Ballard made a big splurge about me pastoring churches where there were some people in error on the resurrection. Paul called the church at Corinth "The church of God which is

at Corinth," I Cor. 1:2. Yet there were some in that church unsound on the resurrection." How say some among you that there is no resurrection of the dead?" I Cor. 15:12. If Paul could call this a church of God, then what is there so inconsistent about me pastoring a church where some are unsound on the resurrection? That bubble is bursted.

JONAH AND THE RESURRECTION OF CHRIST

The time clement of 3 days is the main thing of comparison between the stay of Jonah in the whale and the resurrection of Christ. Bro. Ballard said when Jonah came out there were none left to come out after him. Neither did any man go into that whale before Jonah or after him, and many went into the grave before Jesus did, and after Jesus. That bubble is also bursted.

HIS ANSWERS TO MY FIRST QUESTIONS

In answer to No. 1 he said, "The Bible is the final basis of appeal. However Jones would add numerics." I only use such numbers as are found in the Bible and they are part of the infallible word of God. II Tim. 3:16. In answer to No. 2 He says I don't agree with Duggar on the judgment issue. I ask him again if he agrees with Duggar on the resurrection issue. In his letter to me on May 2nd, 1961 Bro. Duggar said, "I believe the resurrection of Rev. 20:5-6 to refer to a bodily resurrection and not to the new birth." Bro. Ballard will you agree with Bro. Duggar on that? I have taken Duggar away from him as a witness and he would like for us to forget him. You know when he introduced Duggar he said I would tread lightly here. Who is treading lightly now?

In answer to No. 7 he said, "I don't know what the Russians and Germans have adopted." Well I do. I have pastored a church where Adolph Drachenberg, a Russian born German, was a member, He was baptized in Russia. He was an out and out Premillennialist, and said the Baptist churches over there were also.

In answer to my question "Were there Baptist churches in the first 3 centuries," he answered, "Yes, there were scriptural churches in the third, or first three centuries." Thanks for this admission.

Speaking of the 2 resurrections in Rev. 20:4-6 Dr. Henry Alford said, "Those who lived next to the apostles and the whole primitive church for 300 years understood this in a plain literal sense." He said, "If the second is literal, so is the first, which is common with the WHOLE PRIMITIVE church, and many of the best of modern expositors, I do maintain." See Dr. Alford's Notes on N. T., pages 1928-29. Those early churches had no church manuals, nor written articles of faith, approved by all, yet their writings show what they believed. So Premillennialists are right on the resurrection issue, and consequently on the judgment issue. Those early Christians, believing in a 1000 years between the resurrection of the saved dead and lost certainly did not believe they would be judged together. In all the annals of time there can be found no one who believes that the saved and unsaved dead will be raised 1000 years apart, but who also believes in separate judgments for them.

MORE QUESTIONS FOR BRO. BALLARD

Since Bro. Ballard seems to like questions so well I will now give him a list to answer in his last affirmative.

No. 1 — In Mt. 13:30 did not Jesus say the tares would FIRST be gathered to be burned?

No. 2 — If this parable is to be applied to the resurrection and judgment of all the dead, would not this teach that the lost would be raised and judged before the saved dead?

No. 3 — Where is the scripture which even infers such a thing?

No. 1 — In the parable does not Jesus say the tares represent the children of the WICKED one? No, 5 - Did not Jesus say in Mt. 13:41 "The Son of man shall send forth his angels, and they

shall gather out of his KINGDOM ALL THINGS which offend, and them that do iniquity"? No. 6 — Could the angels gather out of the Lord's kingdom ALL that offend and them that do iniquity, unless such persons will be in the Lord's kingdom at that time? No. 7 — If this applies to all the lost who have ever lived, please explain how all the lost who have ever lived will get into the Lord's KINGDOM at the harvest time? No. 8 — In your book "Gold tried in the Fire" you say the CHURCH is the LORD'S kingdom. Is the kingdom in Matt. 13:41 the CHURCH? No. 9-If not what kingdom is it? No. 10 — If the church is a kingdom of the Lord's and the kingdom in Matt. 13:41 is another kingdom, would not that be 2 kingdoms of the Lord? No. 11 — Did you not say on page 63 of your book "Gold Tried in the Fire" that the prophets foretold only one? No. 12-Is the KINGDOM of the Lord in Matt. 13:41 the one the prophets foretold? If so, and it is the church please explain how all the lost will get into the church, the Lord's KINGDOM, when Mt. 13:41 is fulfilled? No. 13-If all the lost have not been in the church in this age, nor the Old Testament times, then how will it happen that they will all be in HIS KINGDOM in Mt. 13:41, if that is the church, and if the parable is applicable to the resurrection and judgment of all the dead at the time Mt. 13:41 is fulfilled? No. 14- Could ALL THAT OFFEND and do iniquity be gathered out of the LORD'S KINGDOM (Matt. 13:41) unless they shall be in HIS KINGDOM at that time? No. 15-If not, explain how they could be gathered out of His kingdom if they will not be in that kingdom at that time? No. 16 — Please explain how this could in any wise be applicable to the resurrection and judgment of the lost dead? No. 17— Is the parable rather not applicable to those wicked characters who shall still be alive in their natural bodies when Matt. 13:14 is fulfilled? No. 18 — If so, how can the parable of the tares be a proof passage for your position on the resurrection and judgment? No. 19 — On page 36 in your book do you not use this parable as one of your proof passages? No. 20 — Does not Prov. 2:21-22 show that the upright shall dwell in the land after

the wicked are cut off from the EARTH? '[t]hat passage reads, 'The upright shall dwell in the land, and the perfect SHALL REMAIN IN IT. But the wicked shall be cut off FROM THE EARTH and the transgressors shall be rooted out of it.'" No. 21 — Does not Ps. 37:9-11 and 37-34 teach that the meek shall inherit the earth after the evil doers are cut off? No. 22 — If so, will not the earth still remain at that time? No. 23 — Since no unsaved dead were involved in the judgment in Noe's day, or the one in Lot's time, how can those passages be made to teach that the saved and unsaved dead will all be raised and judged at the same time? No. 24— Do these judgments not rather picture a judgment on the ungodly living on earth at the time of Christ's coming? No, 25 — Since you think that all the dead, saved and unsaved, and fallen angels will all be judged in the same judgment, and you give Matt. 25:31 to 46 as a proof text on one future judgment, where do you find any fallen angels judged in Matt. 25:31-45. No. 26 —If there will be no fallen angels judged in Matt. 25:31-46, will they not have to have a separate judgment, which would be two future judgments? Now come on with the proof.

CHRIST WILL RESTORE THE TRIBES AND THEIR JUDGES In Acts 15:14 to 16 James said, "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." What does the word RETURN mean? It means to come back. Who is going to return, or come back? The Lord. From where will He return? He will return from heaven when the TIMES OF THE RESTITUTION of all things the prophets foretold has come. Acts 3:20-21. What will he do when He returns? He will build again (a second time) the tabernacle of David which is fallen down. What else will He do? He will restore the tribes of Jacob. "And now, saith the Lord that formed me in the womb to be his servant to bring JACOB AGAIN UNTO HIM, though Israel be not gathered, yet I shall be

glorious in the eyes of the Lord.... It is a light thing that thou should be my servant TO RAISE UP THE TRIBES OF JACOB, and to RESTORE the preserved of Israel: I will also give thee for a light to the Gentiles that thou mayest be my salvation to the ends of the earth," Isa. 49:5-6 In connection with the restoration of the 12 tribes will come the restoration of their judges. "I will RESTORE thy judges as at the first, ...afterwards thou shalt be called, the city of righteousness, the faithful city," Isa. 1:26. This will be when the 12 apostles sit on their 12 thrones judging those restored tribes. This will all be done when Christ returns and builds again the tabernacle of David. The earth will still remain, so the resurrection and judgment of the lost must come after this.

NOT TOLD TO DISCIPLE AND BAPTIZE NATIONS: We are not told to disciple and baptize nations, but to make disciples OF ALL NATIONS, and baptize those disciples, not those nations. Sec Matt. 28:19-20. Come again that is a poor dodge.

BALLARD'S FOURTH AFFIRMATIVE

PROPOSITION: THE BIBLE TEACHES THERE IS ONE FUTURE JUDGEMENT OF ALL MEN, SAVED AND UNSAVED, FOR ALL WILL BE JUDGED IN THE JUDGEMENT.

Readers. I come before you once more to set forth the above proposition. Jones is still inclined to discuss the millennial issue. He is trying to get a long run at the next proposition, for he knows he will need it. While he is debating the coming issue, I will further discuss my proposition. Again, I remind you that our difference is on the 18th article of faith, which our fathers believed and taught. Jones denies it and I believe it. That is how and where we differ. Now to my proof texts:

Heb. 9:27: "And as it is appointed unto men once to die, but after this the judgement:" Is death appointed for the lost? If so, they must appear at this judgement. Is death appointed for the saved? If so, they must be at this judgement.

What is meant by "MEN" in the above verse? It means all that are in Adam — I Cor. 15:22. It means the posterity of Adam -Rom. 5:12.

Now what is to be understood by "the judgement"? To illustrate: What do Baptists mean by "the Bride"? Do we mean a plurality of Brides? If not, then why say "the judgement" means a plurality of judgements after death?

Matt. 25:31-33: This narrative teaches Christ will divide, which implies judgement, the sheep from the goats when he comes; that they will enter their eternal places at such time. See Vs. 34, 41. But Jones says they will slay here together for another thousand years, provided they have treated the Jews kindly. Scripture, please? Acts 24:25: Here Paul speaks of a "judgement to come." In Heb. 9:27 he speaks of it being "after" death. So there is a coining judgement and it will happen AFTER death. So my proposition is sustained.

Acts 17:31: Read verse 30, also. It claims God has commanded "all men every where to repent." These are the ones that must face Him on a certain day, the DAY God has appointed. Did God command you to repent? If so, you will be at the stated judgement. "A day" has been appointed for judgement, not DAYS. God would have "all men to be saved." I Tim. 2:4. WHY? God's grace that brings salvation "hath appeared to all men." Tit. 2:11. WHY? Because ALL must meet Him in the judgement on "A DAY" He has appointed. The world (Oikumene, earth's inhabitants) will be judged on A DAY. If you are an inhabiter, then you will be there. This is the "great day" the angels will be judged. Jude 6. It is "GREAT" because it has been appointed by God. So all those that were commanded to repent must be there, also. II Cor. 5:10-11: This text contends there will be "TERROR" in the judgement (BEMA). Therefore, the lost must be present. Selah! II Tim. 4:1 declares a general judgement. Dr. John Gill, a pre and a Baptist, scholar, says this is a "GENERAL JUDGEMENT." Jones, do you agree?

Matthew 12:41-42: The penitent and impenitent rise WITH each other in the judgement (Krisis). Does "judgement," in this place, mean CONDEMNATION? If so, the penitent shall rise in CONDEMNATION, for they shall rise in judgement (KRISIS) WITH this generation. There is your penitent rising in judgement with the impenitent. But Jones' idea has the lost appearing in two judgements: BEMA and KRISIS, when they both refer to the tribunal of Christ, not TRIBUNALS.

Rev. 20:12-15; 11:18: This is an argument Jones did not attempt to answer, and it is too late now. The "small and great" judgement is to be that of the saints and those that destroy: saved and lost. This is the great white throne judgement. Jones didn't try to refute the argument and he is not allowed a try in his last speech, for I have no other opportunity to reply. He thought he would list all of my proof texts together and say a few words and all would take for granted he answered them all. I looked for an answer, but found none. But he is doing his BEST.

A FEW REMINDERS

1. Was the doctrine of plural judgements found in Baptist articles of faith previous to 1941? Please answer this! Do your BEST!

2. Where is a passage that uses the words "last day" to mean .in indefinite length of time? Since the saved are to rise on the LAST DAY, (John 12:48) please show us where the Bible says "last day" means an indefinite time. If it ever means an indefinite length of time, then show us it means such in the above passages. You formerly said the last 24 hour day would be when the lost are judged (Rev. 20:11). Jesus said the lost would be judged at the LAST DAY. John 12:48. Therefore the "last day" is the last twenty four hour day, on which the lost will be judged. Good-bye, Jones!

3. Did those 20,00 premillennialists of 1660 tolerate Bunyan's views on baptism and open communion? You say Bunyan was one of them. Did the Pre's of that century believe and tolerate open communion in their congregations? If you are their offspring, as you try to claim, do you believe and tolerate open communion? You say Bunyan was one of them. Did the Pre's of that century believe and tolerate open communion in their congregations? If you are their offspring, as you try to claim, do you believe and tolerate open communion? You have contended the Pendleton Manual doesn't forbid open communion and now you are linking yourself with folk that tolerated open communion. I believe the "old" rooster has come home to roost!

4. Does the N.A. B. A. ever appeal to their articles of faith to determine the soundness of churches? Do they appeal to them after the church claims to believe the Bible and take it as their rule of faith and practice? If they do, aren't they making their articles their FINAL BASIS OF APPEAL? Jones got in trouble by trying to dodge articles of faith, intimating they were useless.

5. If a church, that has adopted God's word in their organization, desires to work with the N. A. B. A., why do you demand their adoption of your articles, if the Bible is the FINAL BASIS OF APPEAL? If your articles needs amending, then you are making such articles a final basis of appeal, which are not completely scriptural. Talk about BURSTING BUBBLES!

6. Where is that text that says literal nations will enter the Lord's kingdom after He comes? Where does it say they can enter by treating the Jews kindly? Wouldn't that be entering the kingdom by WORKS? And where does the Bible declare the wicked will enter the Lord's kingdom in their natural bodies after He comes?

7. Where does the Bible mention America as one of the nations that will exist in your future millennium? Now who is ASSUMING? Who is GUESSING?

8. Jones, is death appointed unto you? If so, you are a subject of "the judgement." Heb. 9:27. Are sinners subjects, also? If so, they will be there with you.

9. Jones, is all the Adamic family subject to the appointed physical death? Heb. 9:27 If it is, then all the Adamic race will be at "THE JUDGEMENT." For after this appointed death is the judgement.

10. Where is Jones' numeric arguments on the judgement? He claims his system on numbers proves things beyond doubt. Why hasn't he used such in this proposition? Why didn't he use his number 11, judgement? Echo answers! Oh yes, Jones recently discovered 700 stands for the fulfillment of God's word. We should rejoice with him over his recent discovery. Oh, if he could have lived in the apostles' time!

11. Where is Jones' reply to the Philadelphia Confession of faith? He has had three articles in which to reply. He failed to do so and he is not supposed to now.

JONES' PREDICTION

He still predicts I will not prove "last day" means a 24 hour day. It is a matter of whether or not you take what the Bible says. I take it to mean what it says. The last day, with no days to follow, the final day. Check your Creek. It is the DAY the .saints rise and the sinners are judged. John 6:54; 12:48. You said in our former debate that the last 24 hour day would be when the sinners are judged —Rev. 20:11. So the sinners will be judged on the LAST DAY and the LAST 24 hour day is when it happens, says Jones. Thanks, Champ!

Again I say, the word "day" is sometimes used figuratively. The use is usually easily detected. However, the passages I referred to didn't indicate a figurative use. Jones listed some that use the word in a figurative way, but let him prove the ones I used are to be understood in a figurative way. That is his task. I predict, again, he will not do so. Sec if he does!

Luke 17:27-29

This judgement, says Jones, came on the living, not the dead. If men are resurrected before the judgement, will they not be living? And besides, where does the Bible say this judgment "foreshadowed the judgement that will come on the great city Babylon in Rev. 18:1-10"? Who said so? Jones? Yes! And who is the Babylon?

THE MEEK AND THE EARTH:

Jones seems to think the meek are yet to inherit the earth. The Bible claims "all things" are ours. I Cor. 3:22-23. In Mat. 5 He promised the earth to the "meek" (mild, easy). In Matthew 28:19 20 He gave it to the meek that He sent forth to be harmless as doves and wise as serpents. They inherited it as a field to work in, so it is now ours. The commission is in effect, therefore, the promise is in effect. Are all the "SHALLS" of the Bible still to be fulfilled?

SEVEN YEARS OF JUDGEMENT

My opponent says the Lord will be 7 years completing I he judgement (BEMA) of the saints. The Bible teaches He will judge all on the LAST DAY or "A DAY." John 12:48; Acts 17:31. Jones took his route to avoid two judgements for the saints. Cobb's manual says Jones' 7 years is only 3 years. (Art. 18). These two great Greek scholars seem to be 3 years apart. Do you suppose they are close enough to kiss each other? as it is sometimes said. Readers, if it takes all the tribulation time, whether it be 3 or 7 years, for the judgement, then when will the marriage take place? Jones says it is future.

Does Jones and Duggar Agree?

Duggar said: "Salvation is the spiritual resurrection of the soul,..." Jones, do you agree with Duggar? I challenge you to answer, for you have said the resurrection can only apply to the body. And you don't agree with D. N. Jackson on the judgement of nations. Mat. 25:31-33. Jackson will tell you it is not literal

nations. Write and ask him and then print what he says. You wrote Duggar and printed his letter, do the same with Brother Jackson.

Drs. Alford and Berry:

Jones has, for some reason (?), selected one of them for his authority on Greek and the other one for his authority on church history. Vet, he uses his Historian, Dr. Alford, as his Commentator on Rev. 20:4-6. Jones says he doesn't know what they were religiously, or to what church they belonged. Evidently, Jones doesn't care about their religious standing. He will call them orthodox as long as they preach and leach premillennialism They are his main witnesses, remember?

JUDGEMENT OF ANGELS:

Numeric Jones says "they will probably be judged when the Devil is judged in Rev. 20: 10." Jones doesn't seem to want to bark treed. "PROBABLY!" Is that as definite as you can get? Jones, when will they be judged? The passage (?) that says they will have a judgement apart from the rest will tell you when it will take place.

PREMILLENNIALISM AND CONFUSION

What clement has been tossing the others out in state meetings? What element, on the millennial issue, tried to make it a test of fellowship in the N.A. B. A.? What clement has pressed the issue in annual meetings? You know who! Who has preached their views loud and long in our gatherings? You know! What clement has endeavored to reform the churches to new articles of faith? What happens if the church fails to rally to their new articles? You know! Talk about underhanded! Talk about confusion! Talk about Dictators!

And when it comes to confusion, you can't find two Pre's that agree. Yet they want the millennium to be a test of fellowship. Scott's alive!

KINGDOM OF HEAVEN AND KINGDOM OF GOD

These are one and the same. Luke renders it one way (6:20) and Matthew renders it the other way (5:2). It is two ways of saying the same thing. If it is of HEAVEN, then it is of GOD. If it is of God then it is of HEAVEN. But Jones claims the kingdom of heaven "will be set up on this earth when Christ returns——" I could tell him what Jesus told the Pharisees: THE KINGDOM IS AMONG YOU. However, Jones, like the Pharisees, fails to see it. Premillennialism veils his eyes until he fails to be able to see the kingdom. Bless his heart!

BALLARD'S SPIRIT

Ballard has the spirit of Haman and Hitler, says Jones. I wouldn't say it was that ugly. I haven't planned or sought the death of any Jew as yet. However, I do despise their way of getting gain. They violate the law much more than anyone. They are outright crooked and you know it. I hate such in anyone. Do you? I don't hate them, but I dislike their crooked ways and so does the Lord. It is not a matter of how we are going to treat the Jew in this country. It is a matter of how they are going to treat us. They have the money rule of this country. But TREATMENT doesn't get one into the kingdom of Christ. The new birth is the first essential to that. John 3:3,5.

BURSTING BUBBLES:

My opponent says the Corinth church had unsound members and Paul called it a "church of God." Did Paul pastor it? Did Paul allow the church to continue in such error? Did Paul present them some new articles of faith to adopt to correct the error? Did Paul present them some new articles of faith to adopt to correct the error? Did Paul tell them they needed Jones' only workable system to prove, beyond doubt, the resurrection? BURSTING BUBBLES!

Jones further claims the resurrection of Christ is MAINLY, on the time clement part, typified by the deliverance of Jonah.

Jonah was three days and three nights in the whale's belly and he came forth. Jesus was three days and three nights in the heart of the earth and came forth. In Jonah's coming forth, DID HE COME FROM AMONG THE DEAD, LEAVING OTHERS BEHIND? Jones, meet the issue! Stop shying off like a one eyed ox! Do your BEST!

RUSSIAN AND GERMAN CHURCHES

Jones didn't for some reason, tell what they adopted. He only said they were Pre's. To hear some report in religious papers, one would think 98 percent of Landmark Baptists are Pre's, when a greater part of the churches have adopted Pendleton's manual, or 18 articles. They call their churches pre's when they know they have adopted Nonmillennial doctrine. The Russian rom German may have made the same mistake.

THE CHURCH IN THE FIRST 3 CENTURIES

I said such churches were scriptural. I also said they were the predecessors to the Waldenses that believed in "THE DAY OF JUDGEMENT." I guess Jones forgot to quote all that I said??? I know he wouldn't misrepresent or misconstrue what I say? ? ? only Non's do such things? ? ?

BAPTIZING NATIONS

I asked Jones if he ever baptized a nation. He said we were not told to disciple and baptize nations. Jesus said make disciples of all nations (make Christians of all nations), baptize them and teach them. Sec the marginal rendering on Mat. 28:19-20. ALL NATIONS are told to be disciplined, baptized and taught. Does this mean literal nations or the people of the nations If it means the people that compose all nations, then that is what Jesus was speaking of in Mat. 25:31-33, the judgement of nations, that is, the people of all nations. If Jesus meant literal nations, then tell me how you could ever baptize a NATION. Jones, have you obeyed the Lord in discipling a nation and baptizing it? You are caught and no one knows it better than you.

JONES' 26 QUESTIONS:

I wonder why he waited till my last speech to ask all these? He did it to make a show. He is trying to make you think he has me wrapped up. I will answer them all in a few words: The Lord has one kingdom, it has always had some offensive things in it (but not all the workers of iniquity), it is eternal (Eph. 3:21), And it will be separated from the tares, THE WICKED, when the harvest comes. But Jones says they will continue to grow together for a thousand years. That is the difference in Jones and Jesus.

In my other reply, I pointed out the fact that "things" in the kingdom will be cast out and them which do iniquity. Jones ignored this and asked a group of questions in order to cover up his miserable failure. He shot a blank and no one knows it better than Jones.

Readers, I will answer his RESTORING THE TRIBES AND JUDGES in his coming proposition, provided he will introduce such. That is where it belongs. We are supposed to be discussing the JUDGEMENT at the present. However, his 26 questions were mainly on the KINGDOM questions, which will be discussed next.

QUESTIONS:

1. When did a plurality of future judgements first appear in Baptist articles of faith?
2. Did 20,000 Pre's (in 1660) tolerate open communion?

G. E. JONES' FOURTH NEGATIVE

Ballard has dismally failed. His proposition reads "The Bible leaches one future judgment for all men, saved and unsaved." Most of the time he was off the subject discussing church manuals, Cobb, the N. A. B. A. and the Missouri brethren, and misquoting from this man and that man. In his second article he had 34 words from the Bible and about 3000 on what this

man says, his quibbles, articles of faith, and the N. A. B. A. In my answer to this article I used about 670 Bible words. I gave Bible reference, some of them several times, and quoted most of them, He barely noticed 4 or 5 and quibbled on them. Reader, judge who depends on the Bible, and who does not. Some of his proof texts belong in the millennial reign, and when I placed them rightly and explained them he accused me of getting off the subject. I was only giving a true scriptural answer to his proof texts.

MY PREDICTION

He has relied upon such expressions as "The last Day," the "Day of the Lord" in such places as John 6:54; 11: 24; 12 48 and II Peter 3:10. He assumed that I he word "DAY" in these places refer to 24 hours. Yet on p. 51 in his book "Gold Tried in the Fire," he said most words have a literal and a figurative use. All through the last 2 propositions I have called upon him to prove with the Bible that the word "DAY" means 24 hours of time in the above places. I predicted over and over that he would not undertake to prove it with the Bible, but would keep on assuming it. Not one time has he tried to take the Bible and prove it. On the other hand I brought John 9:4; Rom. 13:11-22; I Pet. 1:5; Heb. 3:8-9; Zech. 14:1-14 and Zech. 2:10-12 to show that the word DAY is used in the Bible to mean a period of years. Not a one of these did he ever notice. I asked him again and again in which of these passages did the word DAY mean 24 hours. He never once tried to answer. Then to cap it all he falsely accused me of saying "The last 24 hour day would be when sinners are judged." I DID NOT SAY ANY SUCH A THING. Here is what I said, "The last 24 hour day will come when the earth is destroyed," Rev. 20:12. Sec p. 98 in our first debate. This man cannot be depended on to quote any man or the Bible right. Yet he signed to conduct himself as a Christian. What does the Bible say about bearing false witness. A man is hard pushed when he has to DELIBERATELY misquote men and the

Bible. That is evidence of a false teacher, and throws suspicion on his doctrine.

ZECH. 2:10-12

This is one passage I quoted 3 times to prove that the word "DAY," when connected with Christ's return, means a period of years and not just 24 hours. "Sing, and rejoice, O daughter of Zion: for lo, I COME, and I will dwell in the midst of thee, saith the Lord. And many nations shall be joined unto the Lord IN THAT DAY, and shall be my people: and I will DWELL in the midst of thee, and thou shalt know that the Lord of hosts hath sent me unto thee. And the Lord shall inherit Judah his portion IN THE HOLY LAND, and shall choose Jerusalem AGAIN." Here the period of time in which Christ says He is coming to DWELL IN THE MIDST of Israel, and inherit Judah, His portion in the HOLY LAND, is called a day. It says "IN THAT DAY," the day when He DWELLS in Jerusalem among the people and chooses Jerusalem again, that many nations will be joined unto him. Why did Ballard not notice this? This is further confirmed with Jer. 3:17. "At that time they shall call Jerusalem, the throne of the Lord." It is further confirmed with Zech. 14:1 to 11 where we find that in the DAY of the Lord He is coming back to overthrow Israel's enemies, bring His saints with Him, reign as King over all the earth, and Jerusalem shall be safely established and there should be no more utter destruction. Why didn't he notice these passages which prove that the expression "DAY of the Lord" refers to a long period of years? He knew better than to try to answer. He has to ignore the proof.

HE MUTILATES THE BIBLE

Three times in this debate he has misquoted Acts 3:21. He quoted it "Until the restitution of all things." The quotation is "Until THE TIMES OF the restitution of all things to be restored. By leaving out the words "THE TIMES OF" he tries to change the meaning of the passage, Talk about Ingersoll blushing!

What about this? It is a deliberate attempt to deceive and carry his point by leaving out 3 main words in a passage. Yet he signed up to act as a Christian. Is it a Christian act to try to deceive by leaving out those words?

But this is not the only place he seeks to mislead by mutilating the word of God. In his last article he seeks to prove that we are now inheriting the earth by quoting just 4 words out of I Cor. 3:21-22. Those words were "All things are yours." But let us have the whole quotation, "All things are yours, whether Paul, or Apollos, or Cephas, or the world, or life, or death, or things present, or THINGS TO COME; all are yours." Why did he just quote 4 words? He did not want to quote all of it for THINGS TO COME (future) things are included in the passage. This is one of his reasons for wanting to quote only a word or two from the Bible.

Now Ps. 37:9-11 & 37:34 tells us exactly when the meek shall inherit the earth." Evildoers shall be cut off: but those that wait upon the Lord shall inherit THE EARTH. For yet a little while, and the wicked shall not be: yea, thou shalt diligently consider his place and it shall not be. BUT THE MEEK SHALL INHERIT the earth and delight themselves in the abundance of peace." "Wait on the Lord, and keep his way, and he shall exalt thee to inherit the LAND: WHEN THE WICKED ARE cut off thou shalt see it." This tells us that it is when the wicked are cut off that the meek shall inherit the earth." He rejects the Bible answer for a get up of his own.

As further proof that Christ will stay in heaven until the times of the restitution have come I quoted Acts 15:16 "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." The word "RETURN" means to come back to a place where one has been before. The Lord says that it is when He RETURNS, or comes back, that He will restore, or build again, or once more, the tabernacle of David. Isa. 1:26 says "I will restore thy

JUDGES as at the first." Isa. 49:5-6 says The Lord is God's servant "To raise up the tribes of Jacob, and to RESTORE the preserved of Israel." All these things show that the time for restoring the things the prophets foretold will not come until Christ returns from heaven. I should how Ballard tried to deceive, and mislead by leaving the words "THE TIMES OF," out of the quotation, "Whom the heaven must receive until THE TIMES OF restitution of all things, which God hath spoken by the mouth of all his holy prophets." Ballard left out the. words "THE TIMES OF" 3 times. Reader, this shows that Non-millennialism is a deceptive system, and that the brethren do well to take right measures against such corruptive influence and deceptive methods from false brethren.

BUNYAN

In his first article on this proposition he sought to bring in Bunyan as a star witness for him on the judgment question. He brought him in to try to prove that he (Ballard) was in line with true Baptists. He called him a great man, and the greatest of all dreamers, and told how he spent 12 years in prison for preaching. Now that I have taken Bunyan away from him he tells us he was an open communionist, and asks me if I am his descendant. If he was an open communionist, why did Ballard try to use him as an example of true Baptists? That one backfired. That does not harmonize. Why would others even want to commune with a man they hated like they did Bunyan. Some one has perverted the truth.

ALFORD AND BERRY

He tries to get on me for quoting from Alford and Berry, when I do not know if they are Baptists. In his other proposition Ballard quoted the Emphatic Diaglot which is a work of the Watchtower Company. That one backfired too.

HE HAS NOT RUN ME FROM BIBLE NUMBERS

He thinks he has run me from Bible numbers. I have not had the space to use them in this proposition. I have had to take up my space following Ballard all over the realm of false statements and delusions. He shall have them in the next proposition.

HIS QUESTIONS

He likes to ask questions, but he will not answer them. He asks if I am appointed to die. I may die, but will not if Christ comes first. As to Adam's posterity, naturally they are appointed to die, but this does not necessarily apply to such as are in Christ. Paul said, "Behold, I show you a mystery; we shall not ALL (Christians) die." In Gen. 6:7 the Lord said, "I will destroy man whom I have created from the face of the earth." That statement did not apply to Noah's family who were children of God, but only to man in his unsaved state. Even so Heb. 9:27 can only apply to man in his natural state. For Jesus declares that the believer will not go to the "KRISIS" judgment. "He that heareth my word, and believeth on him that sent me, hath eternal life and cometh not INTO JUDGMENT (Gr. Krisis)." John 5:24 R. V. This is another passage I quoted which Ballard did not notice.

He asks if Matt. 25:31-46 refers to a judgment of nations, would that not be entering the kingdom by works? If that passage teaches entering the kingdom by works, it would teach that either kingdoms would enter by works or individuals would enter by works. Since Ballard has it as a judgment of individuals who have been raised from the dead, he would have individuals entering the kingdom by works. That one backfired also. Nations, as nations, cannot exercise faith in Christ. But individuals can. Since Ballard teaches this is a judgment of individuals then he would have individuals saved on the basis of their works. Come and get him, Campbellite. And he did not find where any fallen angels will be judged in one future judgment. If no fallen angels are judged in Matt. 25:31-46, and

he did not find them as I asked him to do, then the fallen angels will have to be judged in another judgment. If they are judged along with resurrected lost people, as he insists, then the lost dead will not be judged in Matt. 25:31-46. Now let us read Joel 3:1-2. "Behold, in those days, and in that time, when I shall bring again the captivity of Judah and Jerusalem. I will also GATHER ALL NATIONS, and will bring them down into the valley of Jehoshaphat, and will plead with them there for my people and for my heritage Israel, whom they have scattered among the nations." J. Powis Smith in Goodspeed's translation translates this "I will gather all nations, and will bring them down into the valley of Jehoshaphat and I will enter into JUDGMENT with them THERE, on account of my people, and heritage Israel, whom they have scattered among the nations." Here, jr. in Mr. 25:31-46, we see ALL NATIONS gathered before the Lord

FOR JUDGMENT. It tells us when it shall be. It will be when the Lord brings again the captivity of Israel. It tells us where the JUDGMENT shall be. The nations will be gathered into the valley of Jehoshaphat, which runs through Jerusalem. It tells us the basis of judgment. He says He will enter into judgment with those nations on account of His people Israel. This is the same judgment found in Mt. 25:31-46. I gave this reference in my third article but Ballard ignored it.

MATT. 12:41-42 & ACTS 17:31

The Greek word for CONDEMN in vs. 41-42 is "Katakrito," and Thayer says it means "To give judgment against," showing that the Ninevites and Queen of Sheba will be taking part in rendering judgment on the lost, and not being judged themselves. In vain does Bro. Ballard try to prove his point.

Eph. 2:7 speaks of AGES (plural) to come, and Heb. 2:5 about the future (Oikumene) inhabited earth. Ps 67:4 says, "thou shalt judge the people righteously, and govern the nations upon earth."

In Isa. 24 we read, "And he shall judge among the nations, and shall rebuke many people, and they shall beat their swords into plowshares, and their spears into pruning hooks nations shall not lift up sword against nation, neither shall they learn war any more."

These passages show that Christ will judge the future inhabited earth in a future age, and His judging will bring peace to the earth to have any part in that blessed time one must repent. This answers Acts 17:31 He ignored these passages also.

II COR. 5:10,11

The word for judgment in this place is "Bema," not "Krisis," the word in Heb. 9:27. What if both do refer to a tribunal, that does not show they are the same judgment. To apply the WE in vs. 10-11 to both saved and lost would have the WE in v. 1 applied to both saved and lost. We would have to have both saved and lost desiring to be clothed upon with their house from heaven. It would have both saved and lost being given the earnest of the Spirit in v. 5, and walking by faith in v. 7. It would have both saved and lost having confidence in v. 6. It would have the WE in v. 8, being both saved and unsaved, desiring to be with the Lord. It would have the WE in v. 9, saved and lost, laboring to be well pleasing to the Lord. It would have the WE in v. 11 persuading men. The pronoun WE refers to the saved all the way through the passage. When Paul spoke about the terror of the Lord he knew he must warn men of their danger, if he was free from the blood of all men, and well pleasing when he stands before the judgment seat of Christ.

THE PARABLE OF THE TARES AND MY 26 QUESTIONS

Ballard said I fired a blank shot when I brought these. If so, it left him so shellshocked he could not answer even one of the 26 questions. He says they refer to the millennium. A poor excuse. They all apply to the judgment which just precedes, or ushers in the millennium. Why did he not answer them now?

For one good reason. He cannot answer them and stay with his position He promises to answer later. He will never answer them. The parable is plain. The tares are to be GATHERED FIRST. To apply this to a resurrection and judgment would have the lost raised and judged before the saved. Jesus said the field is the world, the wheat the children of the kingdom, and the tares the children of the wicked one. The world exists on this earth today, and is composed of kingdoms. On this earth, in these kingdoms, both saved and lost are living. It will be so at the time the 7th trumpet sounds and the kingdoms of this world will become our Lord's. Rev. 11:15-17. The tares, or lost, who are then living in these world kingdoms, will be in the Lord's kingdom. But they have to be gathered out, and will not be carried over into the kingdom age as he falsely accuses us of leaching It distinctly says "He shall send forth his angels and they shall gather OUT OF HIS KINGDOM all things that offend, and them that do iniquity. They could not be gathered out unless they will be in the kingdom, that is the only explanation that can be made. Ballard tries to squirm out of a tight by a play on the pronouns in v. 40. Moffett's translation will answer that "Then shall gather out of His realm all WHO are hindrances and WHO practice iniquity." Here is the personal pronoun he calls for in both places. The same thing is taught in Prov. 2:21 22 "the upright shall dwell in the land, and the perfect shall REMAIN IN IT. But the wicked shall be cut off from the earth, and the transgressors shall be rooted out of it." The wicked who shall be cut off from the earth are the tares who shall be gathered out of the Lord's kingdom, which shall then be on the earth. The upright and perfect who remain in the land, or on the earth are the righteous who shall shine forth in the kingdom when the wicked (tares) are cut off from the earth. Matt. 13:43. He also ignored these passages.

BALLARD LOSES OUT ON EVERYTHING

He loses on the tares. He loses on Matt. 12:41-42; Acts 25:26; Heb. 9:27; Acts 17:31; on Rev. 20:11-15, on Bro. Duggar whom I

took away from him as a witness, on Bunyan whom he denounced after introducing him as a star witness, accusing Bunyan of practicing open communion. He lost out on the 18th article of faith for he never found in the Bible where either our destiny or rewards would be FIXED at a judgment. It has already been fixed that the apostles are to judge the 12 tribes, Matt. 19:28, and I Cor. 3:13 says that day shall declare our works, not FIX anything. He loses on Luke 17:28-29 for no one was resurrected and made alive in, or before, that judgment and it can in no wise be applied to a judgment which follows a resurrection, but only to the great city Babylon in Rev. 18:1-10.

MY BIBLE NUMBERS

Since he brought this subject up again in his last article I will give him a shot now, and promise more on the next proposition. Ishmael was said to be born after the flesh, and 4 things were foretold of him. See Gal. 4:23 and Gen. 16:12. The words "THE DEAD" are found 4 times in Rev. 20:11 to 15, showing that the judgment, of the lost is under consideration.

THE CONFUSION OVER THE MILLENNIUM

I did not want to bring this in, but since Ballard has falsely accuses me and the Missouri Premillennialists of sowing discord I will bring it. A Freewill in Missouri put out a book several years ago (1 have one), denouncing both Premillennial doctrine and the security of the believer. Ballard's Non Buddies in Missouri helped to circulate that book. I have plenty of evidence on that. I had rather stand with Bro. Duggar against Nonmillennialism as to stand with the Freewills, Catholics Campbellite, and Modernists against Premillennial truth. Bro. Ballard's doctrine makes strange bedfellows. Let me say here that I was a Premillennialist before I ever knew Cobb, or of Pendleton, and a long time before Ballard was born. I have taken refuge nowhere except in the word of God.

Rev. 11:18

see it. I was anxious to show how easy it is to answer, and I regret more than he, that I did not see it. I would have sunk Ballard's doctrine still deeper. But he said nothing about over 30 of my quotations, some quoted as much as 3 times, which he steadfastly refused to even consider. This will show up on him when the debate is read. The reader will see who used the Bible and who did not, who was deceptive, and mutilated the Bible, and misquoted men over and over. They will see that Ballard has failed.

G. E. JONES' FIRST AFFIRMATIVE

FOURTH PROPOSITION

I affirm that the Bible teaches that there will be two distinct events in the second advent of Christ, first when He comes in the air to raise the dead in Christ, those sleeping in their graves at that time, and to translate the living saints, and, second. He shall come all the way back to this earth for the purpose of reigning on this earth 1000 years with His glorified saints, at which time Israel will be re-established in Canaan land.

This proposition is somewhat lengthy, but I tried to incorporate in it as much as possible of the things Eld. Ballard wants me to affirm. Our space is too limited to take in every thing connected with Christ's return and earthly reign.

EXPLANATION OF PROPOSITION

By the Bible I mean the Old and New Testaments, what all true believers accept as the word of God. By teaching I mean that the scriptures convey the ideas set forth in the proposition. By two separate events I mean there are to be two separate manifestations of Christ at His return. His coming in the air, as set forth in 1 Thess. 1:13-17, will be the first of these manifestations. At this time He will raise the sleeping saints, and translate the saints who remain alive at that time, but in this event He will only come in the air above the earth. After this He will come all the way to the earth, as set forth in Zech. 2:10-12 and other places, to dwell among the people of Israel, and re-establish that nation's dominion, and reign on earth with His glorified saints for 1000 years. By reigning with His glorified saints I mean that He and His glorified saints will be the rulers. A distinction must be made between the glorified saints who shall rule with Christ, and other saints, not glorified, who shall be taken into the kingdom for the purpose of repopling the earth again in that age. In this time Israel shall be safely established in Canaan land again. I propose to prove

this proposition with such an array of Scripture as to be unanswerable.

TWO PROMISES

It is necessary for us to notice two promises Christ made. In John 14:3 He promised His church that He would come again and receive her unto Himself. At that time all the saved who have ever lived will be gathered into the presence of the Lord. In his book, "Gold Tried in the Fire," Ballard refers to this passage and says "Christ did not say here that He is coming again and again." Certainly not in this place, nor does He need to come again and again to receive His Church. But before He ever made this promise to His church He made a promise to come back to this earth and dwell in Judah at Jerusalem, among the people of Israel. His promise to His church cannot cancel or make void His promise to Israel. The error of Ballard, and those like him, is that they consider one promise to the exclusion of the other. This always brings misunderstanding and confusion.

ZECH. 2:10-12

"Sing and rejoice. O daughter of Zion: for lo, I come, and I will dwell in the midst of thee, saith the Lord. And many nations shall be joined unto the Lord IN THAT DAY, and shall be my people: and I will dwell in the midst of thee, and THOU SHALT KNOW THAT THE LORD OF HOSTS HATH SENT ME UNTO THEE. And the Lord shall inherit JUDAH HIS PORTION in the holy land and shall choose Jerusalem again."

In our previous discussions I quoted this passage over and over to prove that the word DAY, when connected with our Lord's return, refers to a period of years. Not one time did Ballard ever notice the passage. Will he do any better this time?

This cannot be applied to His first coming, for many nations were not joined to Him when He was on earth the first time. Neither did the nation of Israel know that God had sent Him unto them, but when He returns they will know it. When

weeping over Jerusalem He said, "Behold, your house is left into you desolate. For I say unto you, ye shall see me no more henceforth, TILL YE SHALL SAY, BLESSED IS HE THAT COMETH IN THE NAME OF THE LORD," Matt. 23:38-39. This shows that in a future time He shall return to Jerusalem, and they shall receive Him with joy, even as foretold in Zech. 2:10-12. At this time He says He shall dwell in the midst of these people, and that He shall choose Jerusalem AGAIN, or once more, and shall inherit Judah, His portion in the holy land. These words are too plain to be misunderstood. This will bring Him back to the earth again, not just into the air.

Many other passages set forth the same truth. "When the Lord shall build up Zion, he shall appear IN HIS GLORY," Ps. 102:16. "I will return to Zion, and will DWELL IN THE MIDST OF JERUSALEM; and Jerusalem shall be called the faithful city, and the mountain of the Lord of hosts, the holy mountain_If it seem incredible in the sight of the remnant of this people in those days, in my sight will it seem incredible." Zech. 8:3-6, Goodspeed's Trans. Jer. 3:17 tells us that Jerusalem and Israel, all the nation, shall be gathered to the land which God gave to their fathers for an inheritance. Jer. 23:5-6 tells us that the Lord shall reign and execute judgment and justice on the earth, and in that time Judah shall be saved and Israel shall dwell safely. This will put Him on earth at that time. In Ps. 67:4 we read, "O let the nations be glad and sing for joy: for thou shall judge the people righteously, and GOVERN the nations UPON EARTH."

BRO. BALLARD'S TESTIMONY

I shall now bring Ballard as a witness on the two separate events in Christ's second advent. On page 10 in his book, "Gold Tried in the Eire," he says, "We now turn to 1 Thes. 4:13-17. The Pre's believe this passage teaches a secret coming of Christ, but Paul said it would be with A SHOUT. That doesn't sound so secret does it: Paul said it would be with the VOICE OF AN ARCHANGEL. That doesn't even seem to infer that it will be a

secret coming. A thief secretly slipping in to take something would not SHOUT." He has put it in print, now let him stay with it. Here he takes the position that in I Thes. 4:13-17 Christ will not come AS A THIEF. But in Rev. 16:15 Christ tells us that HI". WILL COME AS A THIEF. "And I saw three unclean spirits like frogs come out of the mouth of the dragon, and out of the mouth of the beast, and out of the mouth of the false prophet. I*'or they are spirits of devils, working miracles, which go forth unto the kings of the earth and of the whole world, to gather them to the battle of that GREAT DAY OF GOD ALMIGHTY. Behold, I come AS A THIEF," Rev. 16:13 15. So, in I Thes. 4:13-17 we have Christ coming to raise His people from the dead, but NOT COMING AS A THIEF, Bro. Ballard being a witness to the same.

But in Rev. 16:13-15 we do have HIM coming AS A THIEF." Here are 2 separate events, both connected with the Lord's coming. In one He does not come as a thief, and in the other He does. In the second place He will come in the midst of a battle called "THE BATTLE OF THAT GREAT DAY OF GOD ALMIGHTY." I ask Bro. Ballard some questions in this connection.

QUESTIONS

1. What will take place on this earth between the time Christ comes to raise His saints and when He comes as a thief in the midst of the battle of the great DAY OF GOD ALMIGHTY?
2. If He does not come as a thief in I Thes. 4:13-17, and does come AS A THIEF in the midst of that battle, will they be the same event?
3. Is there anything in I Thes. 4:13-17 to indicate that that event will take place in the midst of a great battle?
4. Is the 1000 years reign in Rev. 20:6 past, present, or future?
5. If it is past, when did it begin, when did it end, and what event started it, and what brought it to an end?

6. If it is taking place now when did it begin. what event ushered it in, and when will it close?
7. If it is yet future, what event will usher it in, and how can we tell when we are in it?
8. When will Christ make wars to cease to the ends of the earth? Ps. 46:9.
9. When will the nations beat their swords into plowshares, and their spears into pruning hooks? Micah 4:3.

ZECH. 14:1-11

In Rev. 16:13 to 15 we found that Christ will come back in the midst of the BATTLE OF THE GREAT DAY OF GOD ALMIGHTY. This same battle was foretold by Zechariah in the 14th chapter. The first verse opens by saying, ""BEHOLD, THE DAY OF THE LORD COMETH." (Question: What is the difference in the DAY OF THE LORD, and the GREAT DAY OF GOD ALMIGHTY? Bro. Ballard please tell us. We want to get your opinion on this.) The second verse tells us all nations will be gathered against Jerusalem to battle. These are the nations of the whole world in Rev. 16:13-15 gathered to the battle of the great day of God Almighty. The third verse tells us that the Lord shall go forth and fight against those nations. Rev. 16:15 tells us He is coming in the midst of a battle. The fourth verse tells us His feet shall stand in THAT DAY (The DAY OF THE LORD) on the mount of Olives and that mountain will split asunder. So when He comes as a thief He is coming all the way back to the earth. In the fifth verse we learn that His saints are coming with Him. So here He is coming, not to raise His saints, as in I Thes. 4:13-17, but He is coming back with His saints to reign. In the ninth verse we learn "The Lord shall be king over all the earth, in that day, (The DAY OF THE LORD) there shall be one Lord, and His name one." In vs. 10-11 we find that "The land shall be turned as a plain from Geba to Rimmon south of Jerusalem: and it shall be lifted up and inhabited in her place." We also find that "there

shall be no more utter destruction: but Jerusalem shall be SAFELY INHABITED." The fulfillment of this has to be this side of A. D. 70 for Jerusalem was destroyed by Titus on that date. It is yet in the future for the country is not yet safely inhabited. So Christ is not yet reigning as king over all the earth, but will after He returns to earth.

REV. 19:11-21

This passage bears the same testimony as the ones considered above. "I saw heaven opened, and behold a white horse; and he that sat upon him was called FAITHFUL AND TRUE, and in righteousness he doth judge and make WAR." Here we behold Christ coming back to make WAR, even as in Rev. 16:13-15 and Zech. 14:1-11. In Rev. 3:14 Christ is called THE FAITHFUL AND TRUE witness. In Rev. 19:11 we see Him, the FAITHFUL AND TRUE witness, coming to make war. In Prov. 21:31 we read "The HORSE is prepared against the clay of BATTLE." Because Christ is coming back to do battle against the beast and his followers He is symbolized coming back on a HORSE. In Rev. 19:12 it is said, "His (the white horse rider) eyes were as a flame of fire." This is part of the description of Christ in Rev. 1:14 as John saw Him in the midst of the candlesticks. In Rev. 19:13 this white horse rider is called THE WORD OF GOD. This is what John called Christ in John 1:1-2 & 1:14. In Rev. 19:14 John sees the armies from heaven coming with Him. They are also on horses, and those armies are clothed in fine linen, clean and white. In Rev. 19:8 we are told that the fine linen is the righteousness of saints. So the armies which come with Him out of heaven will be the saints of God. This is in perfect keeping with what we read in Zech. 14:5 "The Lord my God shall COME, and all the saints with thee." In both places the coming of Christ with His saints is connected with a battle. So the same battle, and the same event, is under consideration. In Rev. 19:15 we read that the white horse rider "Shall RULE THEM (the nations) with a rod (or scepter) of iron." In Rev. 19:16 he is called "KING OF KINGS, AND LORD OF LORDS."

These things definitely identify the white horse rider of Rev. 19:11 as Christ, and connects these events with His COMING. In I Tim. 6:14-15 Paul said to Timothy, "Keep this commandment without spot, unrebukeable, until THE APPEARING OF OUR LORD JESUS CHRIST: which in his times he shall shew, who is the blessed and only Potentate, the King of kings, and Lord of Lords." And in Rev. 19:16 we see Him coming as KING OF KINGS, AND LORD OF LORDS." Since in 1 Tim. 6:13-14 Paul connects His manifestation as KING OF KINGS, AND LORD OF LORDS with His coming, then in Rev. 19:11-16 we have a vision of Christ's coming to manifest Himself as KING OF KINGS, AND LORD OF LORDS." I challenge Bro. Ballard to find the words KING OF KINGS, AND LORD OF LORDS in any place except 1 Tim. 6:14 & 19:16. This has to be the place where He comes to show that He is KING OF KINGS, AND LORD OF LORDS. The same expression is found in Rev. 17:14 in connection with the 10 kings associated with the beast making war with the LAMB. "The ten horns which thou sawest are ten kings," Rev. 17:12. "These (10 kings) 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. I challenge Bro. Ballard to find in any other place where he comes to manifest Himself is KING OF KINGS, AND LORD OF LORDS," So the passage in Rev. 19:11-21 has to refer to His return to earth, even as Zech. 14:1-11 does. But I was about to forget. In Rev. 19:12 we read "ON HIS HEAD ARE MANY DIADEMS" Moffett's Trans. Here for the first time we find Christ wearing His crowns of royalty.

In Rev. 19:19 we see the beast and the kings of the earth gathered to make war against the ONE (Christ) on the white horse, and against His army. The next 2 verses tell us about the beast and the false prophet being taken and east alive into a lake of fire and brimstone, and the rest of the armies of the beast and kings of the earth slain with the sword of the mouth of Christ.

REV. 20:1 to 6

Following his account of the destruction of the beast and the 10 kings and their armies at the coming of Christ in Rev. 19:11 to 21 John moves on to tell us about the thousand years reign which shall follow Christ's return and the overthrow of the beast. "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 bottomless 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 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 (1), neither his image (2), neither had received his mark (3) in 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 until the thousand years were finished. THIS IS THE FIRST RESURRECTION." (This is indicated by the number 3 found above. Three things the ones in the first resurrection, or some of them did not do, show the resurrection of the bodies of the saved is under consideration). "Blessed and holy is he that hath part in the first resurrection: on such the second death hath no power, but they shall be PRIESTS of God and of Christ, and shall reign with him a thousand years." The word PRIESTS is found in Revelation only in Rev. 1:6; 5:10 and 20:6. The third time it is connected with the FIRST RESURRECTION and the 1000 years reign. Since the number 3 is the Bible number for the resurrection of the body, as has been shown in the first and second propositions, this shows that the bodily resurrection of the saved and the coming of the Lord (both phases) come before the 1000 years reign, even as we have found.

In Rev. 20:5 we find two complete sentences. Dr. Berry's Interlinear shows 50 Greek letters in the first sentence, and 20

in the last. "But the rest of the dead lived not again until the thousand years were finished. This is the first resurrection." The numerical arrangement in this passage shows definitely that an exact 1000 years is under consideration. In the passage we have the number 1000. In the first verse we have 50 Greek letters, and 20 in the second. By taking the numbers 50 and 20 and multiplying them we get the number 1000, expressed in a word in the passage. This is no accidental arrangement. There are no accidents in God's word, and every arrangement of words, letters, and numbers in the Bible was for some definite purpose. By this means God is setting the question as to whether or not we are to take the number 1000 as meaning an actual 1000 years. Of course Ballard will not want to take it, but he cannot answer this arrangement.

QUESTIONS: Why did God have John to put 50 Greek letters in one sentence, and 20 in the next, right in the very place we have the 1000 years mentioned? Bro. Ballard was this an accident? Will you say yes or no? I predict that he will not say either yes or no. If he says yes, then he takes the position that some things in God's word are accidental. If he says NO, then he admits the force of the argument. We await his answer on this.

ISRAEL AND HER TRIBES ARE TO BE RESTORED

In Isa. 14:1 "For the Lord will have mercy on Jacob, and will YET CHOOSE ISRAEL and set them into their own land." He will also restore Israel's judges. "And I will restore thy judges as at the first, and thy counsellors as at the beginning: afterward (after her judges are restored) thou shalt be called, the city of righteousness, the faithful city." Isa. 1:26. The judges over the 12 tribes will be the apostles. Jesus said to them, "When the Son of man shall sit in the throne of his glory, ye also shall sit upon twelve thrones, judging the twelve tribes of Israel, Matt. 19:28. This will make necessary the restoration of those 12 tribes. This is foretold in Isa. 49:5-6. "And now, saith the Lord that formed me in the womb to be his servant, to bring Jacob

AGAIN unto him. Though Israel be not gathered, yet I shall be glorious in the eyes of the Lord, and my God shall be my strength. And he said, It is a light thing that thou shouldest be my servant TO RAISE UP THE TRIBES OF JACOB, and to restore the preserved of Israel: I will also give thee for a light unto the Gentiles, that thou mayest be my salvation unto the ends of the earth." "Jerusalem is builded as a city that is compact together: whither the tribes go up, the tribes of the Lord, unto the testimony of Israel, to give thanks unto the name of the Lord. For there are thrones of judgment, the thrones of the house of David. Pray for the peace of Jerusalem: they shall prosper that love thee," Ps. 122:3-6. This will also necessitate another land division among those 12 tribes. In Ezek. 47:13 we read, "This shall be the border, whereby ye shall inherit the land according to the tribes of Israel."

The next 8 verses give the boundaries of the land. There has never been as yet but one division of the land according to tribes. So the fulfillment of Ezekiel's prophecy is in the future after the restoration of the 12 tribes, and after the restoration of Israel to her own land. By reading the passage we see that the land will extend northward of Damascus, and south to the river which goes into the great sea, which is the river called THE RIVER OF EGYPT in Gen. 15:18. None but Premillennialists believe this.

BALLARD'S FIRST NEGATIVE

Readers, before entering a refutation of Jones' present proposition, I will remind you of a few things he said in his last speech on the judgement issue.

1. He claimed I misquoted Acts 3:21. If my memory serves me right, I quoted what Bunyan, his witness, said on the verse. Bunyan was a noted man, but he was an open communionist. That is the kind of men that declared themselves Pre's in the 17th century, according to Jones. Jones, are you an open communionist? Are you like your former brethren?

2. My opponent claims I am one of the "false brethren" that RIGHT MEASURES should be taken AGAINST. What do you call RIGHT MEASURES? What should be done with us more than you have done? Dr. Ben M. Bogard says my position is the Baptist way. See "Baptist Way Book," p. 49," art. XVIII. Has the Baptist WAY changed?

3. Jones misrepresents my position on Mat. 13. I didn't say individuals entered the kingdom by being good to the Jews. Instead, [ones says worldly kingdoms will enter the Lord's kingdom by being good to the Jews. Such is an entrance by works.

4. My friend claims the fallen angels will not be judged with men, for Mat. 25:31-46 doesn't mention such. Gal. 3:26 doesn't mention REPENTANCE being necessary to salvation but it is. Why doesn't Jones tell the Campbellite repentance is not essential to Salvation, since Gal. 3:26 doesn't mention it? Be patient with him, brethren, He is doing his BEST. COME AND GET HIM???

5. If "judgement," in Mat. 12:41, means "condemnation," then read it that way: "The men of Nineveh shall rise in CONDEMNATION...." Will the Ninevites rise in CONDEMNATION?

6. The SHALLS Jones presents. He would say I was ignorant if I pointed to these SHALLS after we get to heaven and say, WE SHALL REIGN, A VIRGIN SHALL CONCEIVE, etc. Jones would say the virgin HAS and the reign HAS. But his position now is: ALL SHALLS ARE YET TO BE FULFILLED.

7. Ballard's "strange bedfellows." Doesn't Jones know that MANY Freewills and Campbellite are Pre's plus Adventists, Russellites and many other modern denominations. I could say I had rather sleep with a Campbellite or Freewill as to sleep with a Russellite, but I am not going to deal in such tactics. Talk about MODERNISTS! What about your 1941 model articles of faith? A modernist teaches people don't have to be rom again to enter the Lord's kingdom. Modernists are the ones that refuse to walk in the old paths.

8. Jones says the "we" in II Cor. 5 is the saved. Who denies it? But wait a minute! Paul speaks of the WE persuading MEN. Who are the "MEN" "we" are to persuade? Jones knows the "WE" are the saved and the "MEN" are the lost. That being so, the saved and lost will be in the judgement (BEMA) at the same time.

9. Berry and Alford. One is his Greek authority and the other is his historian. He staked his part of the discussion on them. And when I asked what they were religiously, Jones said he didn't know. He may have quoted a heretic as far as he knows.

The Emphatic Diaglott: Jones says I introduced a Russellite publication. He mar have done the same, since he doesn't know what Alford and Berry were. If I introduced a heretical witness (Emphatic Diaglott) then why do Baptist book stores sell such? Do they sell literature to spread the truth? Or, do they deal in literature just for the gain? Oh yes, why are your brethren and you so fond of Scofield's Bible? He was a Presbyterian. You talk about SHELL-SHOCKED! Jones is on the causality list. The great champ is fallen in battle.

Now to his speech. His proposition contains at least 4 things: a two phase coming of Christ, a 1000 years reign of Christ on this earth, the re-establishment of Israel in Canaan plus a period of time between the two phases of His coming. Brother Jones, how long will it be between the two phases? READERS, you will notice he failed to put up an argument on the TWO PHASE part. He went immediately to discussing the millennium. He must first prove there is a two phase coming, then the millennium. Come on. Jones!

TWO PROMISES???

The Old Testament foretold of His coming. Jones forgets there was a FIRST COMING. Scriptures that apply to the FIRST, Jones applies them to the SECOND. Jones takes figurative statements that apply to His FIRST coming and literalize it and apply it to His SECOND advent. You watch and see if he doesn't.

John 14:1-3 speaks of CHRIST COMING AGAIN. Is that two phases? If so, the new birth comes in two phases, for we are "born again." I Pet. 1:23. Is the new birth in two phases? Is the two phases separated by a 7 years tribulation?

Zech. 2:10-12

Brother Jones, the Jews have already been shown that Jesus is the Christ. Jesus revealed it by His miracles — John 11:42. It was proven at His baptism. The Spirit descended on Him in the form of a dove. The Father spoke from heaven and declared the same. Mat. 3. And Christ has already chosen Jerusalem, the place where His church was first located. Acts 1:8; Lk. 24:47.

"DAY"

My contestant says "day" is a period of years and Ballard won't reply. I have replied already. Again I reply by saying, Dr. Hoyt Chastain, a Greek student (Baptist) that I met in debate, Sept. 8-10, 1961, claims HOUR and DAY are to be taken literally if such is specified, such as: sixth hour, seventh day, etc. The word "LAST" specifies day on more than one occasion. Saints will rise

the LAST HAY. Wicked will be judged on the LAST DAY. See John 6:54; 12:48. Thanks to Dr. Chastain that tells us this "last day" is only 24 hours long. Will Jones agree with Dr. Chastain or will he stand off and say he is the only Pre that is right? He doesn't agree with Duggar, Jackson, Cobb and Gill. With whom does he agree?

JEREMIAH 3:17

When was the throne of the Lord to be Jerusalem? It was to happen, according to verse 14, when the Lord took one of a city and two of family. This Christ did in His preparation to establish His church. He called the fishermen, Levi, which was at the scat of custom, etc. Moreover Christ puts PASTORS over His sheep. Acts 20:28. Remember, the church was first located at JERUSALEM. Above all, remember this passage says nothing about a 1000 years reign on David's throne. Jones reads between the lines.

This passage speaks of ISRAEL. Paul speaks of TWO ISRAELS: national and spiritual—Rom 2:28-29; 9:6. To which Israel is Jeremiah alluding?

Psa. 67:4

Jones claims this proves Christ will govern the nations at a future date. Isa. 9:6 claims He was to be born a GOVERNOR. Mat. 2:5 claims the fulfillment of this at Christ's birth. The GOVERNOR came out of Bethlehem. He came to RULE "my people." Rev. 1:5 says Christ is "the ruler of the kings of the earth" (R. V.) Paul says Christ is reigning (I Cor. 15:25-26) and must continue reigning until He destroys death and DELIVERS up the kingdom. So. Ps. 67:4 must apply to His first advent, if either.

BALLARD'S TESTIMONY

Ballard did not say Christ was not coming as a thief in I Thes. 4. I was contending, and Jones knows it. He wouldn't come SECRETLY as the Pre's teach. Pre's think the lost will not even

know when He comes after His saints. The Bible says "every eye shall see him, and they also which pierced him: and ALL kindreds of the earth..." Rev. 1:7. This is what I was contending for in my book. When He comes (not two phases) WITH CLOUDS it will be AS a thief in the night. Pre's think He will appear and steal His saints like a thief stealing a bushel of corn. Christ is coining visibly (in a cloud) and it will be unexpected by the world ... as a thief. When Christ comes as a thief, the earth and all therein shall be burned up — II Pet. 3:10. Away goes David's literal throne that hasn't been in existence since B. C. 587.

JONES' QUESTIONS - BALLARD'S ANSWERS

1. The resurrection and His coming are on the LAST DAY — John 6:54; II Pet. 3:10. Therefore no time, or days, between.
2. Christ is coming again — John 14:1-3. Every place that mentions His coming doesn't necessarily mean His second coming or bodily coming. Sec Rev. 2:5. 16; 3:3. Was Christ threatening to come bodily and personally to these three churches?
3. I Thes. 4:13-17 discusses the fact of His coming and the resurrection.
4. The 1000 years reign of those mentioned in Rev. 20 is before the second advent. Sec verse 9 "fire comes down" and II Thes. 1:8 says Christ is coming in flaming fire. This answers questions 4-7.
8. God takes WAR out of men when they are saved. Paul is a good example. That is what Isa. 2:1-5 is speaking of. And wars among actual nations will cease when Christ comes again. (Ps. 9:17) However, the Pre's would have us believe a war will take place after the millennium is over, which they claim is after Christ's coming. 9. Nations (individuals, Mat. 28:19) quit warring against right and use their weapons (bodies, Rom. 12:1) of war to work for God when they are converted. When

the soldier is converted his weapons are converted, channeled in a different direction.

Zech. 14:1-11

This passage was to be fulfilled when Christ stood on Mount Olivet — . 4. Christ stood on Mount Olivet during His personal ministry — Mat. 24:3. Christ ascended from Mount Olivet — Acts 1:12. Please find where He will AGAIN stand on Mount Olivet. You can't do it to save your life. Also, this narrative was to be fulfilled when LIVING WATERS went out from Jerusalem. Living waters went out from Jerusalem during Christ's personal ministry on earth. John 4:10. Therefore, the passage must be fulfilled already.

The 12 Apostles and 12 Thrones

Jones says this is future and literal. Then Paul, the greatest of the apostles, will not have a throne, for he was not one of the twelve. Wait a minute! Did you not claim judging meant condemning; in our former proposition? If so, then the 12 apostles were to CONDEMN the 12 tribes. Matt. 19:28. This is Dr. Gill's position. Didn't Peter condemn the Jews, representatives from every nation under heaven, on the day of Pentecost? Acts 2:23. Hence it is fulfilled.

Eze. 47:13

This was fulfilled when the Lord restored Israel and Judah in the days of Zerrububal, Ezra and Nehemiah. Chapters 37-48 is a vision of this restoration. God gave the vision to Ezekiel and asked him to give it to Israel. Why? So they would have the blueprint by which to build the, or a, restored temple. If Ezekiel's vision doesn't contain the blueprint for such, then where in God's word do you find the blueprint? God is His own Architect. He told how the Ark was to be built. He gave orders on how to build the tabernacle. He led in the building of the first temple. Hence, I am led to believe He instructed Ezekiel on how to build the restored temple.

Rev. 19:11-21

This event is in connection with Rev. 6 where it tells us what Christ and His saints must encounter in this life. They must overcome martyrdom, the sword and death. Vs. 1-8. This the church has done (and is doing) in her ministry.

Now Jones says Christ's coming is "SYMBOLIZED" by a person on a HORSE. Why doesn't Jones interpret this literal like he does Rev. 20? If the 1000 years is literal, then why isn't the horse literal? Is His coming SYMBOLIZED and the results of His coming literal?

CHRIST IS RULING AND REIGNING

Jones says I can't prove it. Paul said He must reign till death is put down — I Cor. 15:25-26. Are people still dying? If so, Christ is still reigning. I Tim. 6:15 tells us He is KING OF KINGS, etc., and this will be revealed later. So He is NOW king of kings. He couldn't REVEAL something that didn't exist. Rev. 1:5 claims He is "the ruler of the kings of the earth." Therefore He is king of kings. Christ is now "crowned (past tense) with glory and honor." Heb. 2:9. A man that denies such denies the word of God. Jones denies it. Therefore, Jones denies the word of God.

JONES' NUMERIC SYSTEM

If THREE means resurrection or Trinity, then how do you know it is referring to the resurrection? Doesn't the TRINITY do the raising?

Now, why did God use 50 letters in one sentence and 20 in another? Because that was all that was needed. If God had used more Jones would have subtracted, divided or added to get a number that suited him. Oh yes, how did you know to multiply instead of subtract, divide or add? Why didn't you add the two and get the age of David at death — 70? By adding you could get the number of years Israel was in Babylonian captivity — 70. Selah! A great system(?)! The only WORKABLE SYSTEM!

ORIGIN OF PREMILLENNIALISM in "The Disputation," attributed to him, writes thus respecting him: BUT CERINTHUS, BY MEANS OF REVELATIONS, WHICH HE PRETENDED WERE WRITTEN BY A GREAT APOSTLE, ALSO FALSELY PRETENDED 'I'D WONDERFUL THINGS, AS IF THEY WERE SHOWED HIM BY ANGELS, ASSERTING, THAT AFTER THE RESURRECTION THERE WOULD BE AN EARTHLY KINGDOM OF CHRIST, AND THAT THE FLESH, i. e., MEN, AGAIN INHABITING JERUSALEM, WOULD BE SUBJECT TO DESIRES AND PLEASURES. BEING ALSO AN ENEMY TO THE DIVINE SCRIPTURES, WITH A VIEW TO DECEIVE MEN, HE SAID THAT THERE WOULD BE A SPACE OF A THOUSAND YEARS FOR CELEBRATING NUPTIAL FESTIVALS." (Caps mine) Eusebius's II., P. 97.

Now here is what John, the apostle, the author of the Book of Revelation, has to say about this CERINTHUS:

John in coming to Ephesus found Cerinthus in a bath. On receiving tins news, John ran out of the bath exclaiming: "Let us flee lest the bath should fall in, as long as Cerinthus, that enemy of truth, is within." (Eusebius's II. P. 124.)

The above shows what John the Revelator thought of Premillennialists. He was fearful to be in the same building with one. Now Pre's tell us John was a teacher of Premillennialism. Scott's alive!

I guess the Pre's will treat these facts like they treat other facts, shed it like water falling on a duck's back. Jones is an experienced hand at this.

Mark my word, Jones will not refute these historical facts. Watch him! "

FIRST NEGATIVE QUESTIONS FOR JONES

1. If the offending and workers of iniquity are taken out of the Lord's kingdom before the 1000 years reign, then will that not only leave the saved?

2. If the saved are those that are like the angels, neither marry or given in marriage, then who will bear children during the millennium?
3. Will the changed saints, which you claim is not of the FIRST RESURRECTION, be in the millennium?
4. Will there be saints on this earth during the millennium which have not changed bodies?
5. Will there be saints in the millennium which are not in the FIRST RESURRECTION?
6. Do you teach the tares will be destroyed when the wheat is gleaned? Mat. 13.
7. Is a specified day or hour to be taken literally? If not, then when are they to be taken literally?
8. What will happen after the millennium and the resurrection and judgement of the lost?
9. Will the Jews ever go to heaven?
10. Where is David's literal throne?
11. Is a THOUSAND YEARS ever used figuratively in the Bible?
12. Does II Thes. 1:8-10 refer to His first phase coming?
13. Does Mat. 25:31-33 allude to the first phase of His coming?
14. Is the thousand years an indefinite period of time?
15. Since Peter speaks of a day being as a thousand years and a thousand years as a day, will you prove to us that John isn't speaking of just a DAY in Rev. 20?
16. Dr. J. E. Cobb contends there is a 3 1/2 years tribulation between the two phases. Do you agree with Cobb? Which one of you is right?
17. Dr. Hoyt Chastain claims the tribulation between the two phases is a few days less than seven years. Do you agree with Chastain. With whom do you agree?

Readers, when these are answered, and not dodged, we will be getting to the bottom of our differences. Check his answers.

P. D. Ballard

JONES' SECOND AFFIRMATIVE

FOURTH PROPOSITION

Ballard is the most inconsistent contradictory person I ever saw. He used Bunyan to try to prove himself in line with Old Baptists, and then repudiates him by saying he was an open communionist. Did he know that when he introduced Bunyan? If so, why try to use him? Now he can answer his own question. Is he the Bunyan type of a Baptists? He objects to me having a literal fulfillment out of a figure. The words "LAMB OF GOD" are figurative, but Christ died a literal death. I did not refer to Mt. 13, but Mt. 25, when I said he had individuals saved by works. Can't he read?

ZECH. 2:10-12: He well knows he did not answer this passage. It says many nations would be joined unto the Lord IN THAT DAY. He can't show where that took place at His first coming.

He can't show where Christ dwelt in Zion when He was first here, nor where He inherited Judah. He is long on assertions, but short on proof.

I have shown with Zech. 2:10-12 and 14:1-11 that the word DAY means a period of years when associated with Christ's coming. The Encly. Britt. Vol. 2, p. 100 states that as early as 180 it was taught that the DAY OF THE LORD would be 1000 years. Ballard said in his book on page 33 "It took Mede to discover that." It is him versus the Encyclopedia. We will just let him answer his own quotation from Eusebius. On p. 89 in his book, Ballard, in speaking of the origin of the doctrine of the millennium, quoted Waddington as saying, "To Papias then we may attribute the ORIGIN of the doctrine." Now in replying to me he has Eusebius saying Cerinthus was the originator of the doctrine. He said he was giving historical facts. If so, he did not give us facts in his article. Consistency, thou art a jewel! Ballard, what are we to believe, what you had in your book, or what you had in your article? Which do you believe? Did Papias start the

doctrine as you said in your book, or Cerinthus, as you now say? We believe you are in a hot spot, trying to find a gap to get out. If you can't get out by using Papias, you will try Cerinthus. Dr. Newman, in his history, p. 198 said the Alogoi, a Nonmillennialist party, said Cerinthus wrote the Gospel of John, and Revelation. He said they also rejected the eternal existence of Christ. Bro. Ballard do you believe Cerinthus or John wrote these books? Cerinthus has been used by Nonmillennialist as a cloak to cover their weakness in Bible proof. Bro. Ballard, are you going to base your belief on unfounded rumors about a man who has been so lied about? Premillennialists have something better than rumors. We have the Bible.

JER. 23:5-6 & 3:14-17

In reply to these he said Paul speaks of two Israels, national and spiritual Israel. In what verse do we find the words "SPIRITUAL ISRAEL"? Show us Bro. Ballard, we have not seen it. Paul taught an elect REMNANT within that race, both in his day, and at the last of the age. But if he ever used the words "Spiritual Israel," I have never seen the place. You Nonmillennialist try to delude the people by taking refuge behind unscriptural terms you create like "Spiritual Israel," "The New Birth of the soul," "The 10 lost tribes," etc. The prophets were speaking of the remnant of the last days. "And it shall come to pass in THAT DAY, that the Lord shall set his hand the SECOND TIME to recover the remnant of his people, which shall be left from Assyria, and from Egypt, Pathos, and from Gush, and from Elam, and from Shinar, and from Hamath, and from the islands of the sea. ...and shall assemble the outcasts of Israel, and gather the dispersed of Judah FROM THE FOUR CORNERS OF THE EARTH," Isa. 11:11-12. This did not take place in the time of Ezra and Zerubbabel.

CHRIST IS NOT REIGNING NOW

He says Christ is reigning now. I Cor. 15:25 says "He MUST reign," not is reigning and Paul was speaking of the future in

that place. All the shalls in Luke were future when the angel was speaking to Mary (Lk. 1:31-33), and some are yet future, "The seventh angel blew his trumpet, and loud voices were heard in heaven, saying the sovereignty of the world has come into possession of our Lord and His Christ, and He shall reign for ever and ever. 'I hen the twenty-four elders... worshiped God saying, we give thee thanks, Lord God Almighty, who are and were because thou have assumed thy great power and BEGUN TO REIGN," Rev. 11:15-17 Williams' Trans. Goodspeed and Moffett translate this "BEGUN TO REIGN," The Amplified N. T. gives it "BEGINNING TO REIGN." This is in perfect harmony with Matt. 25:31. "When the Son of man shall come in his glory, with all his holy angels, then shall he sit upon the throne of his glory."

Luke also puts the reign of Christ after His return. "There shall be signs in the sun, and in the moon, and in the stars: and upon the earth distress of nations, men's hearts failing them for fear, ... for the powers of heaven shall be shaken. And then shall they see the Son of man coming in a cloud with power and great glory. And when these things BEGIN to come to pass, then look up, ... for your redemption draweth NIGH. Behold the fig tree, and all the trees: when they shoot forth, ye sec and know of your own selves that summer is now nigh at hand. So LIKEWISE ye, when ye see these things come to pass, know that the kingdom of God is NIGH AT HAND." Moffett translates it "THE REIGN OF GOO IS NIGH AT HAND." This puts the reign of Christ nigh at hand when His coming is NIGH AT HAND. See Luke 21:25-31. Read it and believe it. Strange you have never noticed this passage. You had your mind closed when yon read that didn't you? It is true that Jesus was born a king (Isa. 9:6-7), but He was not reigning as a king when a babe in the manger, if so He abdicated His throne between that time and Mt. 19:28 when He put His sitting on His throne in the future. He is the appointed ruler of the kings of the earth, but He will not assume His power until the 7th trumpet Bounds. (Rev. 11:15)

Heb. 2:9 does not have reference to His crown of royalty. The Greek word there is "Estephanomemom." Thayer says it signifies a crown of victory, while the word "Diadema" in Rev. 19:12 denotes crowns of royalty. So it is not until we reach Rev. 19:12 where we see Him coming as King of Kings to rule the nations (V. 15) that He is wearing His royal crowns. You should not jump to conclusions, but study a little closer. So. Jer. 3:17-18 & 23:5-6 & Ps. 67:4 will not be fulfilled until He returns to earth. You have not made one dent in my proof. I give the word of God. You give your assumptions.

BALLARD IS FOREVER CAUGHT

There is no use for you to try to squirm out of what you said in your book on p. 10 about I Thes. 4:13-17. You said, "A thief secretly slipping in to take something would not SHOUT." You were trying to catch us, and got caught in your own net. The one that digs a pit shall fall in it. There is no way to get around the fact that you argued that Christ WOULD NOT come as a thief in I Thes. 4:13-17. I know it hurts but hold your nose and take your own medicine. So Christ is not coming as a thief in I Thes. 4:13-17, you being witness. But He will come as a thief in Rev. 16:13-15. Question: Bro. Ballard, will Christ come as a thief in I Thes. 4:13-17? Yes or no. Does a thief come secretly?

Now I will give you more proof of 2 separate events in His second coming, and that both Rev. 16:13-15 & 19:11-21 are prophecies of His second coming to earth. In Mt. 24:27-28 we read, "As the lightning cometh out of the east, and shineth even unto the west; so shall the coming of the Son of man be. FOR wheresoever the carcass is, there will the eagles (VULTURES, Moffett's Trans.) be gathered together." In connection with the Lord's coming in Rev. 19:11-21 we read where an angel says to the fowls of heaven, "Conic and gather yourselves unto the supper of the great God that ye may eat the flesh of kings, and the flesh of captains, ... and of horses and of them that sit upon them." "And the remnant were slain with the sword of him that

sat upon the horse (Christ, v. 11-12)), which sword proceedeth out of his mouth, and all the fowls were filled with their flesh." So both Mt. 24:27-28 & Rev. 19:11-21 associate dead bodies and vultures with this event in our Lord's coming. Try to make Mt. 24:27-28 and 1 Thes. 4:13-17 the same event if you can. Make Mt. 24:27-28 and Rev. 19:11-21 the same and you have harmony and sense. Now come on and answer this. But before I close this I quote Ps. 110:5-6. "The Lord at thy right hand shall strike through kings in the day of his wrath. He shall judge among the heathen (Nations), he shall fill the places with dead bodies. He shall wound the heads over many countries." Here is the return of Christ to earth, as foretold in Mt. 24:27-28 & Rev. 19:11-21. The beast of Revelation is the same as the man of sin in 11 Thes. 2:3-10. He is to be destroyed at our Lord's coming. The beast will be destroyed in Rev. 19:20 a thousand years before the event of Rev. 20:9 takes place. And the Lord will destroy the Devil and his forces before they have time to fight in Rev. 20:8-9.

ZECH. 14:1-11

Your answer to this is the weakest thing I ever read. Doesn't your conscience hurt you for trying to offset the truth in such a way? Mt. 24:3 says "He SAT upon the mount of Olives." Zech. 14:4 says "His feet shall stand in that day upon the mount of Olives." You are dumber than I thought if you do not know the difference in SITTING and STANDING. Read the context. When will His feet stand upon the mount of Olives? When He comes back in the midst of a battle to fight against the nations that shall be gathered against Jerusalem to battle. Now find a battle in the context of Mt. 24:3. Find where the mountain split open when Christ sat upon it in Mt. 24:3. You are not satisfied with your answer, but it was the best you could do, and you had to bring it, even though you knew it is not right.

MY QUESTIONS

Why did you not tell us whether the 1000 years reign was past, present, or future as I asked you. You say it will come before the coming of Christ. How long before His coming? Is it already over, or is it yet to be, and what event will bring it? And while you are answering these I ask some more. Did not Jesus teach, (1) That the tares are to first be gathered out. (2) That the tares are the children of the wicked one, and (3) That the tares are to be gathered out of His kingdom? Explain how the tares could be gathered out of His kingdom, unless the}- will be in it, and explain how those tares will get into His kingdom.

The definite article for "The" is used two times in "This is the first resurrection." Unless that article had been repeated there would not have been 20 Greek letters in that sentence. It took this repetition to make it where it would multiply to get 1000. Try again on that one. As to the 1000 years being literal, everywhere a prophecy has been fulfilled the same number of years is in the fulfillment as found in the prophecy. It was so with the 7 years of plenty and 7 of famine in Joseph's time. It was the same with Israel's 40 years in the wilderness. It was the same with Judah's 70 years in Babylon, and the 7 years Nebuchadnezzar ate grass. Now I call on you to bring an example where it was different.

Your answer on Ps. 46:9 and Micah 4:3 was pitiful, and you know it does not answer my questions as to when He would make wars to cease to the ends of the earth. You said, "God takes war out of men when they are saved." If so, what did James mean when he asked, "From whence come wars and fightings among you," Jas. 4:1. Why have Christians been fussing and churches splitting from then until now? It does not look like wars have stopped even among God's people. Try again.

THE 12 APOSTLES AND THE 12 THRONES

Dr. Berry says .8 different words are translated judgment. They do not all have the same meaning. Thayer says the word

"KRINONTES" in Mt. 19:28 means to rule or govern. "In the REGENERATION when the Son of man shall sit in the throne of his glory, ye also shall sit on twelve thrones, judging the twelve tribes of Israel."

On pages 474-75 Thayer says this word REGENERATION in Mt. 19:28 refers to "That restoration to the primal condition of things which existed before the fall, and which primitive Christians expected in connection with the visible return of Jesus from heaven: Mt. 19:28." In Ezek. 36:35 we find that Israel's land will become like the garden of Eden. In Gen. 1:30 all animals ate herbs, and they will do so again. (Isa. 11:6-9 & 65:25) The thorns which came as a result of the fall (Gen. 3:17), will be taken away. "Instead of the thorn shall come up the fir tree, and instead of the brier shall come up the myrtle tree," Isa. 55:13. On page 23 in your book you said if the 12 reign on thrones during a future millennium Judas would be enthroned in it, for he was one of the 12 addressed. On the next page you quote Gill as saying they judged the 12 tribes for crucifying Christ, and you say you agree with Gill. Judas was dead (Mt. 27:3-5) before Christ was crucified. Please tell us how a dead man could condemn the tribes for crucifying Christ? Now get out of that contradiction if you can. Error just cannot be consistent. It crosses here what it says there.

QUESTIONS

1 — Does the word REGENERATION in Mt. 19:28 mean the new birth? 2 — If so, and Judas was one of those addressed did he have the new birth? 3 — If not, does it not mean a restoration of things to their primal condition, as Thayer says, and as the early Christians expected, according to Thayer?

HIS QUESTIONS

1 — Yes, at that time. 2 — It is the resurrected (Lk. 20) who will be like angels. 3 — All changed saints (I Cor. 15:50-51) will be there. 4 — Yes. 5 — Saints in natural bodies will bear

children. (Isa. 65:23 & 11:8-9) 6 —Yes. 7 —If a numeral is connected with it. 8 —The new heaven and earth will come. 9 — As individuals yes, as a nation, no. 10 —It does not exist now. 11—No. Nos. 12 & 13 —Second. 14—No. 15-Zech. 2:10-12; Zech. 14:1-11 & I Pet. 1:5 prove that. Nos. 16 & 17-1 agree with Dr. Cobb.

Zech. 14:1 to 9 shows the day of the Lord will be a period of years. II Pet. 3:10 will take place at the end of the day of the Lord. Now answer this for me. Does the word DAY in the expression "In THAT DAY" in Zech. 2:11 mean just 24 hours?

THE TABERNACLE OF DAVID RESTORED WHEN CHRIST COMES

"In that day will raise up the tabernacle of David that is fallen, and will close up its breaches, and I will raise up his ruins, and I will build it AS IN THE DAYS OF OLD: that they may possess the remnant of EDOM," Amos 9:11. In the DAYS OF OLD David ruled over EDOM. "And he put garrisons in EDOM:... and they of EDOM became David's servants," II Sam. 8:14. When it was built again as in the days of old it must possess Edom again. Amos says God "Will build it as in the days OF OLD: THAT they possess the remnant of Edom." This will be done when Christ has RETURNED TO EARTH. "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, ... that the residue of men might seek after the Lord, and the Gentiles upon whom my name is called, saith THE LORD, who doeth all these things," Acts 15:14-17. In this place the name of David occurs for the 50th time in the New Testament. The numerical value of the Greek letters in his name is 20. 50 x 20 equals 1000.

DAVID

Delta 4th Greek letter
 Alpha 1st Greek letter
 Beta.....2nd Greek letter
 Iota9th Greek letter
 Delta 4th Greek letter
 Sum: 20, DAVID

In other words God had the N. T. so arranged that the numerical value of all the Greek letters in David's name from Matt. 1:1 to Acts 15:16 would be an exact 1000, pointing to the 1000 years of Rev. 20:6 as the time the tabernacle of David is restored. Since the Lord says He will RETURN, or come back, and do this, then that puts the 1000 years reign of Rev.

20:6 after Christ returns, and as the time He will build again the tabernacle of David. Ballard can say what he pleases but things do not just happen that way. Had this been the 49th of the 51st time David's name occurs in the N. T. it would not have worked. God knew how to bring his name in to where it is needed the 50th time, to multiply 50 and 20, and get an exact 1000. And the number 70 is connected over and over with Israel. Study and sec.

The 1000 years reign will be limited in its duration. The reign mentioned in I Cor. 15:25 will be limited in its duration. The words "He must reign TILL" limits it in its duration. In Ps. 72:7-8 we find the earthly reign of Christ limited in its duration. "In his days the righteous shall flourish; and abundance of PEACE SO LONG as the moon ENDURETH. He shall have dominion from sea to sea, and from the river to the ENDS OF THE EARTH." Since the moon will not endure eternally, then this earthy reign of Christ is limited in its duration. So in Rev. 20:6; I Cor. 15:25 & Ps. 72:7-8 we have the earthly phase of the everlasting reign.

GOD'S PROMISE TO ISRAEL IN II SAM. 7:10 & 23-24

"Moreover I will appoint a place for my people Israel, and will plant them, that they may dwell in a place of their own, and move no more: neither shall the children of wickedness afflict them any more, as beforetime." "What one nation in the earth is like thy people, even like Israel. ... which thou redeemest from Egypt, from the nations and their gods? For thou hast confirmed for thyself thy people Israel to be a people unto thee forever." They are to be planted and moved no more, and afflicted no more. So this has not yet been fulfilled. The land was not divided among the tribes in the days of Ezra and Zerubbabel. In the days of Christ there was Judaea, Samaria, Galilee, Perea, Ithuria, and Decapolis, but no division by tribes as Ezekiel foretold. Try again Ballard. Your assertions do not go.

ISA. 33:20-24 & OBADIAH 17-21

"Thine eyes shall see Jerusalem a quiet habitation, a tabernacle that shall not be taken down; not one of the stakes thereof shall ever be removed, neither shall any cords be removed. ... For the Lord is our judge, the Lord is our lawgiver, the Lord is our king. ... The inhabitant shall not say, I AM SICK." Here is the time when no righteous person shall die. Now let us read Obadiah. "They of the south shall possess the mount of ESAU," (who is EDOM Gen 36:1). This is when the tabernacle of David will be built again as in days of old, and they shall possess Edom. "And the hosts of the children of Israel shall possess that of the Canaanites even unto Zarephath. ... and the kingdom shall be the Lord's." Obadiah 19-21. On p. 47 in his book Ballard says, "Israel has no promise of a restoration to Canaan." So he contradicts Obadiah in v. 20. His system is a false one. Why don't he give up?

BALLARD'S SECOND NEGATIVE

Readers, Bro. Jones, for some reason or the other, is failing to notice my reply. He should stop misconstruing my book and answer my replies. He has already written one book trying to reply to my book. We are now engaged in a written debate. Maybe he doesn't know that.

Readers, Jones failed to tell us what "right measures" should be taken "against" brethren that believe as I do. He failed to mention Bogard's BAPTIST WAY BOOK that sets forth my contention as the BAPTIST WAY. Jones, also, FORGOT (?) to reply to my reference to Mat. 25:31-16. Somehow (?) he neglected to say anything about my reply on Mat. 12:41. For some cause unknown (?), he didn't say anymore about "Ballard's strange bedfellows." And for obvious reasons, Jones remained silent as a tomb on II Cor. 5 (the "we" and the "men"), the Emphatic Diaglott, Berry and Alford and Scofield's Bible. I don't think his age has affected his memory that bad. He is the champ of the Pre's. He knows when he is beat.

Now to some other things he failed to notice: 1. He never told us how much time there will be between the two phases of His coming, if there is two phases. 2. If COMING AGAIN is in two phases, then is being "born again" in two phases? Jones didn't answer and he won't.

3. Was Christ threatening to come bodily and personally to the three churches I referred to in Rev. 2:5, 16; 3:3 and 4? Why didn't Jones say whether or not he agreed with Dr. Chastain on the length of the tribulation period? Chastain says it is a few days less than 7 years. Cobb says it is 3 years. What does Jones believe? ? ? Talk about CAUGHT!

Right here I will inform my opponent that misconstruing a book is not debating the issue. A reference to a book is in order in a debate, but leaving the proposition and misconstruing an opponent's book is not. Moreover, I have not, knowingly,

quoted one of his books. He accused me of it, but I challenge him to produce the evidence. But he must use his space saying something. Bless his heart! He is doing his BEST.

BUNYAN

Jones claimed Bunyan and about 20,000 other Baptists declared themselves Premillennialists in the 17th century. Bunyan was an open communist. I asked Jones if the 20,000 pre's tolerated open communion. So far he hasn't answered. I, also, asked him if he tolerated open communion like those 20,000. Jones fails to answer. Again, JONES, WILL YOU FELLOWSHIP PREMILLENNIALISTS THAT BELIEVE IN OPEN COMMUNION? I challenge him to answer. Jones, if you are in a succession from those 20,000 pre's, then why don't you fellowship open communionists like they did? Talk about FOREVER CAUGHT! Jones is baffled and subdued.

Zech. 2:10-12

I proved this was fulfilled in the first coming of Christ. I used John 11:42; Acts 1:8; Lk. 24:47 to prove it. I also used Mat. 3 to show that Christ was revealed as the Christ at His baptism and He chose Jerusalem (Lk. 24:47) as the first place to locate His church, which was organized on a mountain during His personal ministry. Lk. 6:13-16; Mk. 3:14-19. The church's mission (worldwide) began in Jerusalem. Acts 1:8. Jones can't answer my reply and his feeble effort reveals it. Quoting the Ency. Britt. will not suffice for an answer on this.

EUSEBIUS'S HISTORY

Eusebius doesn't disagree with Waddington, Guericke, Moshier and Neander. When all are considered together and compared, you will find that Papias took the forged writings of Cerinthus, plus oral traditions, and diffused many STRANGE ideas. Yes, Papias was the one that really got the thing going, but he used the forged writings of Cerinthus to do so. See pages 38-39 in my book, "Gold Tried in the Fire." There is no

contradiction here. Jones is too eager to DOWN a brother and fails to compare the historians' statements. As much as he has read, surely he has read all these statements before now. Jones was a Pre before Ballard was born. Surely he is acquainted with the above facts.

ISRAEL: Spiritual and National

Paul says there is an OUTWARD Jew and an INWARD Jew. Rom. 2:28-29. Isn't that the equivalent of SPIRITUAL and NATIONAL? The same Paul speaks of an OUTWARD MAN and an INWARD MAN. II Cor. 4:16. Isn't that the same as saying fleshly and spiritual? If so, isn't that equal to saying: SPIRITUAL AND NATIONAL? And the same apostle spoke of the churches of Galatia being THE ISRAEL OF GOD. Gal. 6:16. Were they national Israel? If not, then in what way were they the Israel of God? I challenge my experienced opponent to answer.

Jer. 3:17

Jones didn't attempt to answer my argument on the above text. He raised questions and went on. Reply to my arguments, Elder. Count Greek letters or quote man. Call your opponent a "dumber" or something and tell us you replied. Do something. Make folk think you split a big one whether urn do or not. Maybe you should start calling your opponent a "slanderer," "Blasphemer" or "crooked as a snake," like you have resorted to in the past. Come on! Do your BEST.

Isaiah 11:11-12

Readers, I didn't say this text was fulfilled when the temple was restored under Zerubbabel, Ezra and Nehemiah. I referred to Eze. 37—48 when I mentioned such. Perk up, Jones! Isa. 11 was fulfilled when the BRANCH came—Isa. 1:1. The BRANCH is none other than Jesus Christ. If He has come, then Isa. 11 has been fulfilled. If the BRANCH hasn't arrived, then we are without a Savior. Christ came and redeemed the REMNANT spoken of in verse 11. See Rom. 11:5: "There is a remnant

according to the election of grace." Previously Paul said: "at this PRESENT TIME — THERE IS A REMNANT...." Jones says it is yet future. That is the difference in Paul and Jones.

IS CHRIST REIGNING?

Jones says: "Christ is not reigning now." If He isn't, then how is He "The ruler of the kings of the earth"? Rev. 1:5 (R. V.) What is the difference in RULING and REIGNING? Can a person RULE and not REIGN? Can a person REIGN without RULING?

Further, Jones has Christ reigning on a glorified throne in the millennium. He is on His Father's throne now. Rev. 3:21. Isn't it a glorified throne? Christ endured the cross for the joy that was to come. Heb. 12:2. He was CROWNED with GLORY and HONOR. Heb. 2:7. But Jones says He has not the DIADEM crown. Is not the Father's throne a ROYAL one? Is not Christ on it?

Luke 21:2501

This passage is far from saving THE 1000 years reign on this earth IS AT HAND. That is what it needs to say in order to brace Jones' theory, but it fails to say what he wants it to say.

THE CROWN

I have already showed that Christ is on a ROYAL throne now. He is on His Father's throne. The Father gave it to Him. John 3:35. He is now a VICTOR. Heb. 2:7, 9. He is now a PRINCE and a KING and that is what Webster says ROYAL means. So Christ is crowned and reigning and must reign till all enemies are put under His feet. I Cor. 15:25-26. The last enemy, death, will be put down at the resurrection. I Cor. 15:54-56. Are people still dying? If so, Christ is still reigning, and must reign, according to Paul, until all enemies are put down and the last one will be death.

IS BALLARD FOREVER CAUGHT?

I said Christ, according to I Thes. 4:13-18, was not coming SECRETLY, as the Pre's teach. Pre's think He will slip in and steal the Saints like a thief stealing a bushel of corn. I claim He will come as a thief — unexpected by the world. Jones claims Christ will STEAL His saints. That makes Christ a THIEF. From whom is He going to steal them, brother Jones? To STEAL is to take something that doesn't belong to you. Will Christ STEAL His saints? Sounds like Jones is the one FOREVER CAUGHT.

Oh yes, before I forget it, Dr. Chastain contended the thief phase was the first phase. Jones claims the thief phase is when the Lord comes to the EARTH, the second phase. Which Pre is correct, IF either?

Mat. 24:27-28; Rev. 19:11-21

My opponent claims these verses refer to the second phase. who said so? Jones of Morrilton, Arkansas. You should believe it because he said it. It is so, for Jones was a Pre before Billiard was born. This is the same Jones, that great Genius, that invented the ONLY workable system in Bible numbers. This is the same fellow that called his opponent, or described him, as "dumber." Selah!

Wait a minute! If Rev. 19:11-12 is speaking of a LITERAL war. then is the SWORD that proceeds out of His mouth a literal sword? If the sword is not literal why literalize the war? If the HORSE is symbolic, as you formerly said, then why not say the FOWLS and FLESH are symbolic? If all of this is symbolic, away goes your premillennial idea. Are you going to symbolize a part of it and literalize the rest in order to sustain your position? Readers, are the SWORD and HORSE symbolic and the WAR literal?

Zech. 14:1-11

Jesus SAT on Olivet in His personal ministry on earth. Mat. 24:3. Jones says He will STAND on Olivet in the future. Doesn't Jones know Jesus was STANDING on Olivet before He SAT

down. Jones is doing just exactly what Paul said not do: "Strive not about words to no profit...." The champ made a poor "stab" at my argument on this text. Check my first negative.

QUESTIONS ANSWERED

I do not know when Christ is coming, but I do know it will be after the 1000 years and the LITTLE SEASON. Rev. 20:9; II Thes. 1:7-10. According to these verses, He is coming in flaming fire to destroy the wicked and to be glorified in His saints. Read the two references and see if that isn't so.

OTHER QUESTIONS ANSWERED

1. The tares (the wicked, v. 38) will be gathered out of the field (world, V. 38) and burned in the end of this world. V. 40, of Mat 13.
2. Yes, the tares are the wicked and they shall be gathered out of the FIELD, THE WORLD (V. 38) and burned at His coming.
3. The tares will be taken out of the field and the things that CAUSE sin and iniquity shall be removed from the kingdom, also. Mat. 13:41. The trouble with Jones is, he tries to make the KINGDOM and the FIELD mean the same.

James 4:1

Jones knows this text is not speaking of wars where SWORDS and SPEARS are used. Jones knows the difference in a battle with SWORDS and conflicts that arise among God's people. But he must make some kind of a "jab" or "stab."

Now Jones asks "why have Christians been fussing and church-is splitting," if they are to war no more? Because men like you and Cerinthus come among the flocks with your new inventions and try to palm them off on Baptists, saying your discoveries are inspired of God. But still our battle against such is not with SWORDS and SPEARS.

12 THRONES and 12 APOSTLES

I say if Pre's are correct on Mat. 19:28, then Judas will be on a throne during the millennium, for he was one of the 12 addressed by Jesus when He said: "ye also shall sit upon twelve thrones, judging the twelve tribes of Israel." Lk. 22:30. If only twelve of the apostles reign on thrones during the millennium, then what will Paul do? Wasn't he an apostle? Was not he the greatest of the apostles? What will he do during the millennium? Check my former reply.

MORE QUESTIONS

1. "Regeneration" (Mat. 19:28) means a RECREATION, which Dr. Gill rightfully claims is the bringing in of the new and better way, the new covenant.

2. Number two is answered in number one.

3. No, it is not a restoration of things to their position before the fall. It was exactly what Dr. Gill, a pre, said about it: THE BRINGING IN OF THE NEW AND BETTER COVENANT. MY QUESTIONS AND JONES' ANSWERS

1. Only the saved in the millennium at the start, says Jones. So it will begin with all the saved and end up with lost sinners in it. 1000 years of PEACE!

2. Jones says all the saved will not be like the angels. If not, then a part of the saints will not "OBTAIN THAT WORLD." Lk. 20:35.

3. All changed saints will be in the millennium, says Jones. Then how will they bear children? On number 2 you claimed all wouldn't be changed.

4. Then he says, on question 4, there will be some saints here unchanged during the millennium, He is in and then he is out, and leaves us in doubt.

5. On this question he says saints in natural bodies will be in I he millennium. On question 3, he claims all changed saints will be there. Rev. 20 says those of the FIRST RESURRECTION reign.

If that is the resurrected saved, bodily raised at His coining, then all others are forbidden. Therefore, according to that interpretation, those living at His coming will not be in the millennium. Also, it would exclude Enoch and Elijah that didn't die. If they didn't die, then they can't be resurrected.

6. On this one, he confesses the lost will be destroyed when Jesus gathers His own. A noble confession!

7. Jones admits a numbered day or hour to be taken literally. What would be the difference in saying the LAST DAY of the week and the SEVENTH DAY of the week? The seventh would be the last. Thanks for confessing the LAST DAY will be a literal day. On the LAST DAY the saints will rise.... John 6:54. On the LAST DAY the wicked will be judged.... John 12:48. So they must all rise on the LAST DAY.

8. Well, well, Jones says the new heaven and new earth will COME after the millennium and the judgement of the lost. I thought we were GOING to heaven. I really didn't know it was coming to us.

9. Jones says the Jews as a nation are not going to heaven. They can't, for the Pre's claim they will be restored to Palestine PERMANENTLY, never to be removed. I guess that is the reason the new heaven and new earth must COME.

10. David's throne does not exist, says Jones. How will God give it to Christ, if it does not exist? Lk. 1:32. Christ was raised from the dead to sit on David's throne. Acts 2:28-30. I low can He, if it does not exist? Psa. 89:36-37 claims David's throne is established FOREVER as a faithful witness in HEAVEN. So David's throne does exist and it is in heaven. Away went the literal throne idea. Away goes a 1000 years reign in Palestine. Christ is reigning in heaven on David's throne. Christ has the sure mercies (holy things) of David. Acts 13:34.

11. A 1000 years is not used figuratively, says Jones. II Pet. 3:8 reveals that God counts a day, as far as He is concerned, as a

1000 years. Oh, a DAY may mean an indefinite period of years but 1000 years mentioned in a prophetic, figurative book is to be taken literally. Scott's alive!

12-13. If Mat. 25:31-33; II Thes. 1:8-10 refers to the second phase of his coming, then the wicked will be destroyed when Christ comes to be glorified in His saints. Jones, do you mean to say Christ will not be glorified in His saints until the second phase of His coming?

14. 1000 years is not indefinite, says Jones. Will Jones prove it is not. Show us it is not an indefinite period of time. You asked me to prove DAY meant DAY. Now you prove a 1000 years means a 1000 years. Come on, Jones!

15. Jones lists a group of texts to answer this question. A Mormon or Campbellite could do the same, but proving a thing is quite different.

16-17. Jones agrees with Cobb, but fails to say whether or not he agrees with Chastain. Besides, Jones does not agree with Cobb. Cobb claims there are 3 years between the two phases while Jones teaches there are 7 years. Now, in your own words, tell us how many years will be between your supposed two phase coming. I predict you had better not answer.

QUESTION'S FOR JONES

1. Which phase of His coming is the coming "with clouds"?
2. What will happen between the two phases?
3. Who will declare the gospel during the tribulation period, if it is declared?
4. When did premillennialism first appear in Baptist articles of faith?
5. If the first phase is 7 years previous to the second, (then do you not claim to know HALF of the time when the Lord shall appear" God said no man knows the DAY nor the hour. If the

last phase is 7 years after the first, then we know HALF of what the Lord said we didn't know. KNOWLEDGE IS INCREASING!

6. Jones, give us one text that teaches Christ will AGAIN stand on Olivet.

7. Is the "living waters" of Zech. 14 literal water? 8. Will literal water cleanse sin?

9. Do you suppose Roy Flippo might be mayor of Amarillo, Texas in the 1000 years reign?

10. Will water melons grow as big as pianos during the millennium, as some of our brethren teach?

11. Jones, what do you expect to do during the millennium?

JONES' THIRD AFFIRMATIVE

REMINDERS

Ballard did not say if the 1000 years is present, past, or future. He doesn't know. So he will not answer. He said the 1000 years came before Rev. 20:8. I asked him how long before, and how we could know we are in it. He is silent, and will be silent on this. Neither did he answer my questions "Will Christ come as a thief in I Thes. 4.13-17." No answer. I asked does a thief come secretly? No answer. He got caught on what he said on this in his book. He knows he said that Christ will not come as a thief in 1 Thes. 4. He used that to try to show that He will not come secretly. He can't get out of that and it is hurting him. Has he answered me on the examples I gave showing the same number of years is a fulfillment of a prophecy as found in the prophecy? Has he given an example to show differently? No and he will not. I answered Mt. 12:41, but he did not notice it. Berry says there are 8 different words translated judgment. They do not all mean the same. Thayer says the word "Judge" in Alt. 19:28 means to rule or govern. The word in Mt. 12:41 means to pronounce sentence against. It is a different word. It Matt. 25:31-46 teaches salvation by works, as Ballard claims, it is either the salvation of nations or individuals. Since he denies it applies to nations, then it would be individuals, and he has them saved by works. The nations cannot believe, and would have to be blessed by works. That is answered. Rom 16 17 shows what measures should be taken against those who teach error. I answered I Cor. 5:10. The same we that is found in I Cor. 5:1-9 is the we in that verse. It is the saved. I said I agreed with Cobb, not Chastain, if you quoted Chastain right. I find you do not quote me right. There is to be a 3 year period when the 2 witnesses of Rev. 11:3-12 will prophesy, and they will preach the gospel. After the beast kills them there will be a 42 months cruel reign under him. Rev. 13:1-18.

Ballard did not notice Rev. 11.1-17; Zech. 8:3-6; Prov. 21:31, John 1:1-2 & 14; Isa. 14:1; 126; Jer. 3.18, 49.5-6; Ps. 102:16; Rev 3:14, which I connected with Rev. 19:11, nor did he notice Rev 19:17-21 and at least 20 more passages I brought.

INWARD AND OUTWARD MAN

I have an inward and outward man, but that doesn't make me someone else. I, the same individual, have both the inward and outward man. So the Jew, who is one both outwardly and inwardly, is not a saved Gentile. He is still the same individual Jew, only now he is a Jew, outwardly and inwardly, not a converted Gentile, but a saved Jew. That is what Paul was talking about in Rom. 2:17-3:3. Outward circumcision will not profit without circumcision of the heart. In Rom. 9:1-8 he is showing that in the nation of Israel there was an elect remnant. You sure missed it on Gal. 6:16. Paul was referring to the Israel of God in addition to those Galatian churches. The Israel of God is, and will be, the converted part of national Israel. On page 20 in your book you say SPIRITUAL ISRAEL IS THE CHURCH. If what you call spiritual Israel are all who have that inward work of the heart, then you have all the saved in the church. Come and get him universal church people. Also you teach church salvation. Question: How would you classify a saved person not in the church? Or is there such? If so, and the church is Spiritual Israel, you have a saved person, who is not a SPIRITUAL ISRAELITE. He will tread lightly here.

HIS QUESTIONS:

1 — Both.

2 — The 2 witnesses will preach and be killed by the beast, who will reign 42 months.

3 — Answered in No. 2.

4 — So far as I know in 1660. Moshlem, whom you quoted in your book, said long before the 3rd century an opinion prevailed (was predominant) that Christ was to come and reign

on earth 1000 years among men. This put Premillennial doctrine as the prevailing one in the apostles' time. Many other historians agree. So does the Encyclopedia.

5 — No man knows the time of the first phase.

7 — Literal.

8 — No. 9 — How should I know?

10 —Who makes such a claim? 11 —Reign with Christ.

REV. 3:21

"To him that overcometh will I grant (future tense) to sit with me in MY throne, even as I also overcame, and am set down with my Father in HIS THRONE." The words MY THRONE and HIS THRONE in this verse show 2 different thrones. Christ will sit on His throne when He comes again. Sec Mt. 25:31 & 19:28. If the fact that people die today proves Christ is reigning today, then He reigned on David's throne in the Old Testament, even before the flood, for people died back there. He will begin to reign when the 7th trumpet sounds. Why did you not notice my proof on that?

ZECH: 14:1-11

"Now comes a day for the Eternal (Day of the Lord) for I will gather all nations to battle against Jerusalem, and the city will be captured, the horses rifled, and the women ravished,... then the Eternal will sally forth TO FIGHT AGAINST those nations, as once he fought upon the day of battle. ON THAT DAY he shall set HIS FEET on the mount of Olives (which fronts Jerusalem on the east), and the mount of Olives shall split in two, from east to west, by a huge gorge, till half of the mountain slides northward and half southward; the valley of Hinnom shall be stopped up. (by the sliding of the divided mountain) blocked as far as Azel, and ye shall flee as you fled from the earthquake in the reign of Uzziah,... and on that day FRESH WATER shall flow out of Jerusalem, half of them to the sea on the east, and half to

the sea on the west, flowing on through summer and winter alike," Moffett's trans.

This answers his question about the Lord's feet standing on Mt. Olive, and about the water being literal. It also shows that there will be summer and winter IN THAT DAY, showing the DAY of the Lord will be a period of years. It shows that Ballard hasn't touched the passage. To have this prophecy fulfilled in Mt. 24:3 he will have to show that when Jesus sat on Mt. Olive in Mt. 24:3 that all nations were gathered against Jerusalem to battle, he will have to show where they were destroying that city at that time, that the women were being ravished and that the Lord came to Mt. Olive in Mt. 24:3 to fight against those nations, and that Mt. Olive split at that time. On Dec. 31, 1959, Ronnie Watson, a Morrilton boy, in school at Shawnee, wrote me that the geologists of Columbia University had found a crevice in Mt. Olive running east and west, the very way Zech. 14:4 says the mountain will split. The context shows that the water in v. 8 will be literal, Jerusalem is between the Dead and the Mediterranean seas. Into these 2 seas this literal water will run. So you have utterly failed to answer Zech. 14:1-11. The 9th verse tells us Christ will be king over all the earth, and the 10-11 vs. tells us Jerusalem shall be safely inhabited and destroyed no more. It was destroyed after Matt. 24:3. You did not come in a 1000 miles of this passage, and you well know it. Why do you try to pervert the truth? If you do not want to be called crooked then quit trying to deceive.

ZECH. 2:10-11

Neither did you answer this. This passage says the Lord is COMING TO DWELL IN Zion and Jerusalem. You said this took place when he was first here. Bethlehem, Nazareth and Capernaum were His dwelling places when first here, and not ZION. Why did you not prove where He dwelt in Zion when first here, instead of assuming it? Luke 24:47; Acts 1:8 & Jn. 11:42 say not a word about Christ dwelling in Zion, nor Him

inheriting Judah, nor many nations being joined unto Him as Zech. 2:10-12 foretells. Not one Jew out of 100 believed in Christ when He was first here. But in Jer. 31:34 the Lord says a time is coming when "They shall ALL KNOW ME, from the least of them to the greatest of them." That did not happen when He came first. But it will when Zech. 2:10-11 comes to pass. You failed, try again.

JER 3:14-18

I answered Ballard's quibbles, but he did not answer me on this. In v. 14 God calls on backsliding Israel to turn unto Him, for He is married unto them. Israel is the leather's wife. The church will (in the future) be married to Christ. God says He will take them one of a city, and two of a family and bring them to ZION, not the church. Moffett translates V 15 "I will give you RULERS after my own heart." The 16th verse says they shall be increased and multiplied in the land. Shortly after Christ was here the first time they were driven out of the land, not increased and multiplied." The 17th verse says Jerusalem shall be called the throne of the Lord. It was not when He was first here. The 18th verse says that the houses of Judah and Israel will come together out of the land of the north IN THOSE DAYS to the land God gave for an inheritance to their fathers. Why do you continually ignore this verse? Here are the one of a city, and two of a family, who are to be brought to Zion, when Jerusalem is the Lord's throne. In Mt. 19:28 Jesus said. "In the regeneration, when the Son of man SHALL SIT (future) in the throne of His glory, ye also shall sit on twelve thrones judging (ruling, as Thayer says), the twelve tribes of Israel." Isa. 49:5-6, which I have quoted twice, and you have ignored twice, says the tribes are to be raised up. The 12 tribes composed the houses of Judah and Israel which are to come together (Jer. 3:17-18) when Jerusalem is the Lord's throne. This will put Christ on His throne as He foretold in Mt. 19:28. It will restore the 12 tribes whom Jesus said the 12 apostles should judge or rule when He sits on His throne. As to Paul, he will also reign (II

Tim. 2:12), but the place he will occupy is not revealed. Acts 2:30-31 says nothing of the time when Christ should sit on David's throne, but only states the purpose of His resurrection as related to that throne.

In Acts 13:34 Paul was preaching to Jews, not Gentiles, when he preached to them the sure mercies of David. I challenge Ballard to find when Paul ever said anything to the Gentiles about the sure mercies of David. See Acts 13:16-34. The sure mercies of David are connected with God's promise to restore Israel.

On page 23 in your book you have Judas sitting on one of those 12 thrones. On page 24 you and Gill have the 12 apostles judging the tribes for crucifying Jesus. Judas hung himself and was dead before Christ was crucified. Matt. 27:3-5- A dead man could not sit on a throne condemning the 12 tribes for crucifying Jesus. IF you were right on p. 23, you were wrong on p. 24. When were you right, Ballard? On page 23 when you have Judas on one of the thrones, or on p. 2-1 when you have the 12 on their thrones condemning the tribes for crucifying Christ? You contradict on one page what you say on another. If you didn't want me to use that book you should not have put it out. It has come back to haunt you. Ballard says I am baffled and subdued. Readers, that is all for effect. He knows he is the one that is baffled. If not, why does he not make some effort to clear up his contradictions on pages 23 & 2-4 of his book? Why did he not notice Isa. 49:5-6 on the restoration of the tribes? Why did he not notice Rev. 11:15-17 which shows Christ will BEGIN TO REIGN WHEN the 7th trumpet sounds? Ballard is the baffled man. Watch him show it.

SPEAKING TO THE CHURCHES AND ISRAEL

In Rev. 2:5; 16:3:3 and 4 He was speaking to His churches. In Zech. 2:10-12 & 14:1-11 He was speaking of coming to overthrow Israel's enemies, and dwell in the midst of Israel. Let us read Zeph. 3: 13-15 "The remnant shall not do iniquity nor speak lies:... sing O daughter of Zion; shout O Israel; be glad and

rejoice with all your heart, O daughter of Jerusalem. The Lord hath taken away thy judgments, he hath cast out thine enemy; the king of Israel, even the Lord, is in the MIDST OF THEE: thou shalt see evil NO MORE." Here the Lord is seen DWELLING IN ISRAEL after He has cast out her enemy, and when they shall see EVIL NO MORE. Am one who knows anything and wants the truth can easily see this is all future. Sure there was a remnant in Paul's day. There will also be a REMNANT in the future (Rom. 9:27-29; Isa. 65:19-25), in the age when they shall have offspring, and the wolf shall feed with the lamb, and the lion shall eat straw like the bullock.

WHO WILL BE IN THE 1000 YEARS REIGN

I will now answer his quibbles on this. Yes, I said all the changed (glorified) saints would be in the 1000 years reign. But I did not say they would be the only saved in that time. And Luke 20:35-39 is speaking of such as worthy to obtain that world (Gr. Age) (One thing) and the resurrection FROM THE DEAD (two things). And Rev. 20:4-6 states that those in the first resurrection shall reign with Him 1000 years, but it does not exclude the saints who are changed without dying. In speaking of the resurrection of the saved Paul said, "Flesh and blood CANNOT INHERIT (be a ruler) the kingdom of God. ... we shall not all sleep (die), but we shall all be changed." I Cor. 15:50-51. So all who are changed from mortal to immortal bodies, will INHERIT THE KINGDOM, and reign with Christ, as recorded in Rev. 20:6. But the saved who are taken into that reign in natural bodies will enter it, but will not do the reigning. In Isa. 11:6-9 we read, "The wolf also shall feed with the lamb, and the leopard shall lie down with the kid:... and the cow and the bear shall feed; and their young ones shall lie down together; and the lion shall cat straw like the ox. And the sucking child shall play on the hole of the asp, and the weaned child shall put his hand in the cockatrice' den. They shall not hurt nor destroy in all my holy mountain: for the earth shall be full of the knowledge of the Lord, as waters cover the sea." In Gen. 1:30

we find that before the fall all animals ate herbs, and not flesh. Here in Isa. 11:6-9 we see a future age for this earth when they will do so again. And in this age we find weaned and sucking children who will play with snakes and not be harmed. They must have fathers and mothers in natural bodies. As God spared a remnant (righteous) in Noah's day to repeople the earth, so will He do at the end of this age. In that age there will be no infant death. "No babe shall die there anymore in infancy," Isa. 65:20, Moffett's trans. "They shall not work in vain, nor rear their children to die suddenly," V. 23 Moffett's trans.

These show a future age for this earth different from any it has seen since the fall. And what did Ballard do with Ezek. 36:35 which shows Israel's land will be like the garden of Eden, and Isa. 55:13 which shows thorns and briers shall be taken away. He ignored them like he does 4 fifths of my scripture.

REV. 19:11-21

What did he do with Rev. 3:14 & John 1:1-2 with which I showed the white horse rider in Rev. 19:11 is Christ. What if the horse here is a symbol? The symbol of 4 beasts in Dan. 7:3 had a literal fulfillment in 4 kings which arose out of the earth. Dan. 7:15-17. The symbols of the ram and he-goat in Dan. 8:1-8 were literally fulfilled in the literal kingdoms of Persia, and Greece. The 2 sticks of Ezek. 37:15-17 were used as signs or symbols, but the Lord told Ezekiel to tell the people of Israel that it would have a (literal) fulfillment in the restoration of Judah and Israel into one nation again, never to be divided again, and that they should dwell in the land where Jacob dwelt. V. 25. Since symbolic prophecies have literal fulfillment then Rev. 19:11-20:6 will be literally fulfilled. The horses on which the vultures will feed in Rev. 19:17-21 will be literal. The vultures will be literal, and they are connected with the return of Christ (second event) even as the carcass and vultures are connected with His coming in Mt. 24:27-28. Now it cannot be

denied that the rider of the white horse represents Christ. It says he will judge and make war. He comes to make war in Zech. 14:1-4, and in Rev. 16:1-3-15 He is coming as a thief in the BATTLE OF THE GREAT DAY OF GOD ALMIGHTY. These all concern the same event. (Zech. 14:1-5; Matt. 24:27-28; Rev. 16:13-15 & 19:11-21).

This prophecy means something. If I have given the wrong application then it is up to Ballard to give the people the right application!. Will he make the effort? I showed with II Thes. 2:3-8 that the man of sin will be destroyed at the return of Christ. The 4th verse says he will be worshiped. Rev. 13:4 says the beast will be worshiped. II Thes 2:9 tells the man of sin will come in the power of the devil. Rev. 13:1-2 says the beast will get his power from the DRAGON, who is the devil In II Thes. 2:8 we are told the man of sin will be destroyed by the brightness of the Lord's coming. In Rev. 11:19-20 we find that when the white horse rider comes the beast will be cast into the lake of fire. This is still further proof that Rev. 19:11-21 is a prophecy of the return of Christ. The argument cannot be answered.

ISA. 11:11-12

This passage speaks of a SECOND restoring for Israel, which will come from all the ends of the earth, the isles of the sea. This was not so in the days of Zerubbabel. The next time they will return in ships and airplanes. Isa. 60:8-9. They did not in Zerubbabel's day. I did not accuse him of saying Isa. 11:11 was fulfilled in the days of Zerubbabel. Ballard is lost and does not know where he is in the debate. He can't keep up. In my last article I gave Ezek. 47:13 which teaches a future division of Israel's land among the tribes. It was to this he was trying to reply, when he brought in Zerubbabel and his days, not Isa. 11:11-12, and he is just wrong in accusing me of misrepresenting him on Isa. 11:11. He is a bewildered man that is so far back in this debate he does not know where he is. Rub your eyes, Ballard. Wake up. You are too far behind to get in

sight. And I remind you that you did not reply to me on Amos 9:11-12; II Sam. 8:14; Acts 15:14-17 & Obad. 17-20, nor II Sam. 7:10 & 7:23-24 which say that God will plant Israel in a place of their own, and that He has confirmed the nation which He brought out of Egypt to be a people unto Him forever. Come on, Ballard, you are a way behind.

HEAVEN COMING DOWN

Ballard said he did not know that heaven was coming down. "And I John, saw the holy city, new Jerusalem, COMING DOWN from God OUT OF HEAVEN," Rev. 21:2. Bro. Ballard, are you going to dwell in that holy city after it has come down out of heaven, or are you going to leave this holy city after it has come down, and go back to heaven. It is a downright shame that you cannot see how far off you are.

ISRAEL'S JUBILEE YEAR

"And ye shall hallow the fiftieth years and proclaim liberty throughout all the land to all inhabitants thereof, it shall be a jubilee unto you: and ye shall return every man unto his possession,... and every man to his people." Lev. 25:10. The 41st verse says he shall return unto the possessions of his fathers. Here we find that Israel had a jubilee year every 50 years. Where we read the words "FIFTIETH YEAR." the word year comes the 20th time in Leviticus. Here we have the numbers 50 and 20 and years together. 20×50 years equals 1000 years. This points to the 1000 years of Rev. 20:4-6 as the time Israel shall return to the land and possessions as we read in Obad. 17:21; Jer. 3:17-18; Ezek. 37:15-25; Jer. 23:5-7; Isa. 11:10-14; 31:27-28; Amos 9:14-15; Ezek. 39:25-29. The last mentioned passage tells us God will not leave a one of them in the Gentile countries, but gather them back to their own land. Ezek. 36:6-12 says God will do better for them than in the beginning. Ezek. 36:26-38 says God will give them a new heart, will put them in their own land, multiply the increase of their fields, and they

shall have no more famine, and their cities shall be rebuilt,
and the land will be like the garden of Eden.

BALLARD'S THIRD NEGATIVE

two phase-coming, a 1000 years reign of Christ on THIS EARTH and a restoration of national Israel (which God's wrath has come on to the UTTERMOST, I Thes. 2:16) to the land of Canaan. I must say that he has failed to sustain this proposition. He has not proved a TWO PHASE coming. He has not proved a 1000 years reign of Christ on THIS earth, following the church age and the resurrection. He has not shown where Israel will be restored to Canaan. He only has used texts that have been fulfilled or speak of spiritual Israel. He forgets that there is a spiritual Jerusalem. Gal. 4:26. And he ends up concluding there must be a literal fulfillment to fulfill these passages.

Readers, has Jones answered my replies?

1. What about the 20,000 pre's in Bunyan's days? Were they doctrinally like Bunyan? Bunyan believed in open communion. Do pre's today believe such? Are you a pre like the 20,000? If the pre idea has been the Baptist position down through the years, then why did Bunyan and the 20,000 have to declare themselves pre's?

2. What about the statement from Eusebius, which said Cerinthus, who claimed revelations and wonderful things were revealed to him advocated Christ would have an EARTHLY KINGDOM. It is a surprise God didn't reveal the numeric system to Cerinthus or Papias.

3. If coming again means two phases, then what does "born again" (I Pet. 1:23) mean? Is the new birth in TWO PHASES? This goes unanswered. Jones fails to answer. Why?

4. Is Christ reigning? Rev. 1:5 (II. V.) says He is. Jones says, "Christ is not reigning." Who will you believe: Jones or John the Revelator?

5. Jones says Christ is not on the throne of ROYALTY. I showed He is on the throne the Father gave to Him. John 3:35. Isn't it a royal one?

6. Since Christ established His kingdom and began to reign people have died as before and He must reign until DEATH is put down. I Cor. 15:25-26. Are people dying? If so, Christ is reigning.

Jones' reminders examined:

1. Is the 1000 years present, past or future? Answer: I do not know.

2. How long will the 1000 years precede Rev. 20:9? Answer: A "little season" is between the 1000 years and the second coming of Christ. Rev. 20:3, 9; II Thes. 1:7-10. He comes in flaming fire after the 1000 years and the little season.

3. Will Christ come as a THIEF in I Thes. 4:13-17? Yes, but not secretly as the Pre's teach. There is only one future coming of Christ and it will be as a thief (unknown: "If the good man of the house had KNOWN in what watch the thief would come...." Mat. 24:43) and "with clouds." Rev. 1:7. But Jones says it is in TWO PHASES. He claims the FIRST phase will be when He comes in the AIR. I Thes. 4:17 teaches His coming in the AIR. But Jones has already said the PHASE in I Thes. 4 is the second phase, claiming I agreed with him on it. His proposition claims it is the FIRST phase. And what I said in this debate does not contradict what I teach in my book. Jones just can't understand. He is spending too much time in discovering numbers and not enough time in reading and trying to understand what his opponent has to say.

4. Do the same number of years in prophecy appear in the fulfillment? Answer: If so, will the, or has the, 70 weeks of Daniel 9 been fulfilled in 70 weeks? I will allow you the honor of taking the medicine you prescribe for others.

5. Does JUDGEMENT in Mat. 12:41 mean "pronounce sentence against"? Answer: Two words appear in this text: KRISIS and KATAKRINO. Krisis means judgement and Katakrito means to judge down. The men of Nineveh shall rise in judgement (KRISIS) with this generation. Does that mean Nineveh shall rise in condemnation? KRISIS appears 49 times and is translated 41 times: JUDGEMENT. So I feel sure it means JUDGEMENT in this case. It is translated CONDEMNATION 3 times.

6. Does Mat. 25:31-46 teach salvation by works? Answer: No. But pre's teach it does. They say the judgement is of literal nations and the good nations that shall enter the LORD'S kingdom will be those that have been good to the Jews. If that is not entering the Lord's kingdom by works, then I don't know anything.

ROM. 16:17

Jones gave this passage to show what should be done with Baptists that agree with me, the ones that go by the old articles of faith. The text says "MARK THEM" and "AVOID THEM," which means to turn from or bend from. Jones, the Pre's tinned FROM alright. They TURNED FROM THE OLD ARTICLES OF FAITH. They don't need to turn from, they need to turn to, that is, turn to the old articles of faith from which they have turned. I have already noticed in Associational meetings that the Pro's AVOID Non's (no millennium after Jesus comes.) I have felt their cold shoulder more times than one.

COBB AND JONES AGREES? ? ?

Does Jones agree with Cobb? Cobb says: "Christ and His saints will remain in the air for three and one half years, during which time the wedding of the Lamb and the bride will take place, and the great battle of Armageddon will be fought which will be the Great Tribulation period," etc. (Cobb's Manual, Art. 18) Jones teaches a 7 years tribulation period. Jones versus Cobb.

According to Jones, RIGHT MEASURES should be taken against Cobb for teaching error.

ISRAEL and ISRAELITES

According to Rom. 2:28-29 and the Montgomery Translation of Gal. 6:16, all the saved are Israelites and the church is the Israel of God, which Goodspeed says is the TRUE ISRAEL OF GOD.

Montgomery translation of Gal. 6:16: "On all who will govern their lives by this rule and on the Israel of God may peace and mercy rest." No I don't teach all the saved are in the church, neither do I teach one has to belong to the church to be saved. And I sure don't teach wicked men can enter the Lord's kingdom, as my opponent teaches; neither do I believe and teach literal nations can enter the Lord's kingdom by being good to the Jews. That would be teaching salvation by works.

MY QUESTIONS AND JONES' ANSWERS

1. Jones says BOTH phases are WITH CLOUDS. If so, the wicked will be raised with the saints at His coming, for they shall see Him when He comes in clouds, even those that pierced Him shall look upon Him. Rev. 1:7.

2. Two witnesses will preach and be killed between the two phases, says Jones. If so, then who are the two witnesses?

4. Premillennialism FIRST appeared in Baptist articles of faith in 1660, says my opponent. That is just a little over 1600 years this side of the establishment of the church. Just think the church existed OVER 1600 years without such in her articles of faith! Now Jones says Baptists should AVOID those that reject the pre idea. Oh yes, if Baptists were Pre's in the 3rd century and in 180 A. D., then why didn't the Pre idea appear in their articles of faith before 1660? If they had been Pre's like Jones, they would have adopted premillennialism in their first get together. Jones wanted premillennialism to appear in the N. A. B. A. articles when the N. A. B. A. was formed in 1950.

5. No man knows the time of Christ's return, but Jones claims that means only the FIRST phase. So men will know half of it, but not all. KNOWLEDGE IS INCREASING!

6. Jones skipped this question. Jones, give us a Bible text that says Christ will AGAIN stand on Mount Olivet? I challenge you to do it.

7. Jones says the living waters in Zech. are LITERAL.

8. Jones says LITERAL water will not cleanse sin. Zech. 13:1, speaking of the FOUNTAIN, says it will CLEANSE sin. Take him, Campbellite!

9. Jones doesn't seem to know whether Roy Flippo will be Mayor of Amarillo in the millennium or not. If Flippo fails to be, according to his sermon at Jackson, Mississippi, he will be greatly disappointed. He is expecting it.

10. Now Jones wants to know of one of his pre brethren that teach water melons will be as large as pianos in the millennium. Eld. E. C. Endicott is one, and others do and you know it. You teach the land will have great productive ability.

11. Jones says he is going to reign with Christ during the millennium. Jones, what will you do in the reign with Christ? Of what does this consist?

Rev. 3:21

This text admonishes a church to repent (v. 19) and allow Jesus to come in and reign with and over them as He had been doing. They had shut Him out V. 20. The passage says nothing about a 1000 years reign. The church had something to overcome before Christ would come in and reign in their midst.

Zech. 14:1-11

Ronnie Watson told Jones Olivet was cracked and so that proves it will literally split at Christ's coming. "In that day" there will be ONE LORD. V. 9.

Paul says there is ONE LORD. Eph. 4:5. "In that day" the shepherd shall be smitten and the sheep scattered. 13:7. This was fulfilled when Christ was crucified. Mat. 26:31. Verses 14, 16, 18, 19 speak of "the feasts of tabernacles" that shall be "in that day." Will the old tabernacle worship be restored? Will the TYPE take precedence of the thing typified or ANTITYPE? Will the shadow take precedence of the substance?

Amos 9:11; Acts 15:14-17

James, in a discussion about the bringing in of the Gentiles, quotes Amos to prove the bringing in or the salvation of the Gentiles is scriptural. He was not discussing the millennium at all. The millennium is mentioned in one chapter of the Bible — Rev. 20.

Jeremiah 31:34

This passage was fulfilled when the new covenant was made. Heb. 8:7-13.

Jeremiah 3:14-18

Jones fails to understand there is a JERUSALEM above (Gal. 4:26). This is the JERUSALEM that contains the throne of David. Psa. 89:36-37. From this throne Jesus reigns. Then he says Israel is the Father's wife and Christ WILL be married to the church. Paul claims they are already married — "espoused." Folk espoused in those days were recognized as married. The church is called the BRIDE and Christ is called a BRIDEGROOM. How could such be so, if they are not married? Are single people referred to as BRIDES and BRIDEGROOMS?

Wait a minute! Wait a minute! How is the Father married to Israel, if Israel is yet to be restored? Have they been divorced? Are they divorced? Watch out!

ACTS 2:30-31

This passage or reference does tell us when Christ was to reign on David's throne. Verse 29, along with the above verses,

plainly tells us Christ was to reign while David is in his sepulcher. This puts the reign before the resurrection of David, which forever kills Jones' idea on Rev. 20.

Acts 13:34

Jones claims Paul was speaking to the Jews in the above verse. It doesn't matter who he was speaking to, as far as my point is concerned. My contention is, Paul said Christ has the SURE MERCIES OF DAVID, which means the holy things of David. That includes David's throne, if his throne is holy. Was David's throne holy or one of his holy things? If so, Christ possesses it, for He has the HOLY THINGS OF DAVID.

12 THRONES and 12 APOSTLES

I claim the Pre's position on Mat. 19:28 puts Judas Iscariot on a throne in their supposed millennium. I teach no such. Therefore I don't contradict Gill's position on the passage. Gill claims the "regeneration" has reference to the bringing in of the new order or new covenant. That is what I believe. But Jones has Judas on a throne in the millennium to rule over those wicked people that shall enter the Lord's kingdom, which he claims will enter in their natural bodies at Christ's coming. Besides, if the saved must contend with lost people, depraved sinners, during a future millennium; then how will that reign differ from what we have now?

Isaiah 11

Jones claims to accept this literally. The wolf and bear will be changed during the millennial reign, but children shall continue to be born depraved and need the gospel preached to them. If God changes the wild animals and doesn't change children from being born depraved, then He must think more of wild animals than He does the human family. Selah!

A REMNANT

Paul, in his ministry, says: "Even so AT THIS PRESENT TIME also THERE IS A REMNANT according to the election of grace." Rom. 11:5. Rom. 9:27 speaks of the very same remnant. This REMNANT was to be saved as a result of the Lord's SHORT WORK upon the earth— His personal ministry (V. 28). It must refer to His first coming for He will not touch this earth at His second coming. I challenge the champ of the Pre's to show us one passage that teaches His feet will touch earth when He comes again. Zech. 14; Acts I don't teach it. Where is the proof?

CHRIST COMES TO MAKE WAR

He had some pretty good battles with the Pharisees and Sadducees while here. It was a spiritual conflict, and is now. Rev. 12. He has fought through the efforts of the church for over 19 centuries. Through the BLOOD of the Lamb and by the word of their testimony, the gospel has come to us. Yet Jones can't see that there has been any battle. Bless his heart!

No, Jesus wasn't riding a real horse or a "SYMBOLIC" horse during this battle. He was warring through the efforts of his little flock. If the church had not fought for continuity, by the help of Jesus Christ, there would be no such in the world today. There would be no church, if she had not fought. How can you read Revelation without seeing the battle between the church and the apostate church — the mother of Harlots? Rev. 17.

HEAVEN IS COMING TO EARTH???

What will the brother teach next? The very idea! HEAVEN IS COMING TO EARTH! Paul said we would be caught up to meet the Lord in the air and so shall we ever be with the Lord. I Thes. 4:17. Jesus said, while on this earth, I will go and prepare a place for you. This place is in the Father's house. John 14:1-3. John saw the HOLY CITY, not heaven, coming down. If we have a gathering and I say, Muskogee is here, do you expect to see the bank buildings and grocery stores present? No. You look for the representatives from Muskogee. The inhabitants of heaven,

representatives, angels and the departed saved, will come with Christ at His return. II Thes. 1:7; Mat. 25:31; I Thes. 4:13-17. Jones is trying to get heaven to come to earth so the Jews can be in it, for he claims the Jews will be restored to Canaan never to be removed again. If they are never removed, then heaven must come for them to ever enjoy it. Therefore, Jones is trying to get heaven to come so the Jews can enter it. Pshaw! What next?

20X50 Equals 1000

Why didn't Jones add, subtract or divide these numbers? How did he know to multiply? If he would have added he would have 70, the number for the restoration of Israel. By subtracting, he could have come up with the number 30, which he says is the number for BLOOD; and he could have contended that only the blood redeemed will be in the millennium. Instead he has lost sinners in the 1000 years period. But to divide he would come up with 2. 2 is his number for separation and one is his number for unity, so it would be, if divided, SEPARATION (2) and UNITY (one). What a system! It is the "ONLY WORKABLE SYSTEM IN NUMBERS," says Cooksey and Meyer. They are poor judges of SYSTEMS or else they are trying to make Jones feel good over his GREAT DISCOVERY. Either way they are bad off.

You readers might like to know that Jones has recently DISCOVERED that 700 is the number for the fulfillment of the word of God. Knowledge is still increasing! It is odd to see Jones jump from 666 to 700. Doesn't the numbers in between mean anything? And, why do you jump from 144 to 600? Doesn't the numbers in between have any significance? Pardon me! you do list 300. But what about the rest in between? You jump from "King of kings"

(144) to "Warfare" (600). You jump from "the number of the beast" (666) to the "fulfillment of the word of God" (700). Is this the way you get your exercise? Maybe if he keeps jumping he will jump back to the old articles of faith.

Readers, remember, Jones admitted a specified day or hour is to be taken literally. If so, the LAST DAY is to be taken literally. On the LAST DAY (24 hours, according to Jones and Chastain) the saints will rise. John 6:54. On the LAST DAY the rejections of Christ shall be judged. John 12:48. How will the lost be judged on that day (last day) the saints are raised, if they are not raised at the same time? Talk about caught! Pre's will not hear the last of this. Jones and Dr. Hoyt Chastain, the best representatives among the A. B. A. and N. A. B. A., say a specified day is literal. Thanks very much.

Now you that read this judge whether or not Ballard is FAR OFF and needs to wipe his eyes. I am willing for every man to read and decide for himself. It is not Jones' duty to say who has lost and who has won the debate. It is his duty to prove his proposition.

P. D. Ballard

JONES' FOURTH AFFIRMATIVE

Despite Ballard's pretense I have affirmed and proven my proposition, only he ignores my Bible proof. You can't prove to a blind man what he does riot want to know. I have proven with Ob. 17-21; Isa. 14:1; Isa. 1:26; Isa. 33:20-24; Zep. 3:14-15; Zech. 8:3-7; II Sam. 7:10; Isa. 49:5-6; II Sam. 7:23-24 that Israel will be restored to their own (Ob. 20 says Canaan) land, but not one time has he ever noticed these passages. Neither has he noticed Isa. 11:11-12, nor Zech. 14:10-11; Jer. 3:18; Jer. 23:7-8, all of which show that Israel will be restored to their land, and established safely when the Lord reigns among them. I have proven with Zech. 14:1-5; Rev. 16:13-15; Rev. 19:11-21 and Mt. 24:27-28 & Ps. 110:4-5 that there is a phase of our Lord's return in which He will return in the midst of a battle, and that it is associated with vultures eating the carcasses of dead men and horses. Nothing like this will take place when He comes for His bride. Who would associate war, dead carcasses, and buzzards feeding on the same with a Bridegroom coming for His Bride? So I have proved a phase of the Lord's coming after that in I Thes. 4:13-17. I proved with Ballard's book that he argues Christ is not coming as a thief in I Thes. 4:13-17. He tries in vain to squirm out of that by saying he was teaching that His coming would not be in secret, and not as a thief. Then why did he not answer my question "DOES A THIEF COME SECRETLY"? If he had answered that question he would have proven that he was arguing that Christ would not come as a thief in I Thes. 4. And Ballard knows well that in I Thes. 2:16 Paul was only speaking of the Jews of that day, who were opposing him, and not the Israelites of the end of this age. In Ezek. 37:21-25 God tells that He will gather Israel out of all nations, put them in their own land and make them ONE NATION ON THE MOUNTAINS OF ISRAEL, and they shall not be divided any more, nor defile themselves any more. And according to Ballard the Jews of today are about the most wicked people in existence. So the time when they shall defile

themselves no more (Ez. 37:21-25) and their establishment is yet future. In Micah 4:7-8 God says He will make of her that HALTETH a REMNANT, and her that was CAST OFF a STRONG NATION, and reign over them in Mt. Zion. The REMNANT here is the REMNANT of Rom. 9:27, and her that was cast off here are the ones mentioned in Rom. 11:15. "If the casting away of them (Israel) be the reconciling of the world, what shall the RECEIVING OF THEM (Israel) be but life from the dead." This is plain as can be that ISRAEL, the one cast off, will be the one RECEIVED in the future, and made a strong NATION. Micah 4:6-7.

BUNYAN AND CERINTHUS

Ballard has already repudiated Bunyan as one he brought in as a star witness. If he knew he was an open communionist why did he bring him in to try to prove he (Ballard) is an old time Baptist? I do not know that he was an open communionist. I only have Ballard's word, and I find it cannot be relied on. I proved with Bro. Duggar's letter that he perverted his words. Now he comes up saying Bro. Flippo said in the millennium he would be mayor of Amarillo. I have a letter from Bro. Flippo, dated 9-28-61. He denies saying that. He says he said, "I IX) NOT KNOW WHAT POSITION I SHALL OCCUPY IN THE MILLENNIUM. IF I COULD CHOOSE MY POSITION, I wish the Lord would let me be mayor of Amarillo." So Ballard perverts the words of Bro. Flippo. In his last he accused me of saying I Thes. 4:13-17 would be the second phase of the Lord's coming. I DID NOT SAY IT. He asked, "Which phase of His coming is with clouds?" I answered BOTH. But that is not saying 1 Thes. 4 is the second phase. Clouds are a manifestation of the divine presence. Sec Ex. 13:21; 40:34: Acts 1:9; Rev. 1:7 & I Thes. -1:16-17.

Now he comes up with a tale about Bro. Endicott and watermelons as big as pianos. How does he know that Endicott said that? Ballard, did you hear him say it, or did Endicott put it

in print? With such idle talcs and rumors, and unfounded .statements he seeks to cover his inability to meet my scriptural proof. A man is in a desperate plight when he has to resort to rumors, and hearsay, to cover his defeat. All this savors of the spirit of darkness, and betrays a mind shut to the truth, and a desire, not for the truth, but to carry his point by any means, fair or foul.

He has already disqualified Waddington and Eusebius as historical witnesses. In his book p. 39 he has Waddington saying Papias started the millennial doctrine, but in this discussion he has Eusebius saying Cerinthus originated the doctrine. So his witnesses contradict each other and annul any testimony I hey might bring. Why did he have Waddington saying Papias was the originator of the doctrine, and then have Eusebius saying Cerinthus was the originator of it? He is hunting a hole in the fence. Why don't he meet the scripture I bring?

DISQUALIFIES HIMSELF

Now Ballard disqualifies himself to speak on the question of the 1000 years reign. I kept pushing him to tell us if the 1000 years in Rev. 20 is past, present, or future, what event would usher it in, and how we might know we are in it. He answered, "I DON'T KNOW." (My caps.) We knew all the time he knew nothing about that reign, but we wanted him out in the open, and now he has admitted that he does not know. He is not trying to inform the people as to what and when it will be. He is simply trying to hinder the other man from teaching the truth. "God's anger from heaven is uncovered against the impiety and wickedness of the men who in their wickedness are SUPPRESSING THE TRUTH," Rom. 1:18, Williams' trans. He should forever keep his mouth shut on the millennial question. If he does not know anything about it how does he know that he is not teaching men wrong in this line, and will bring on himself the displeasure of God?

ZECH. 14:1-11 & REV. 19:11-21 AGAIN

In Luke 19:41-44 Jesus foretold the coming destruction of Jerusalem, which took place in A. D. 70 by Titus. In Zech. 14:9-11 we read, "Then the Eternal shall be king over all the earth; the Eternal on that day shall be the one God, and His worship THE ONE WORSHIP. The whole land shall be turned into a plain from Geba to Rimmon on the south of JERUSALEM.... and Jerusalem shall dwell SECURE, there shall be NO MORE CURSE OF DESTRUCTION." Moffett's trans. Since Jerusalem will not be destroyed any more after Zech. 14:1-11 is fulfilled then the prophecy looks beyond the days when Jesus foretold the destruction which came in A. D. 70. Otherwise we would have Jesus contradicting Zech. 14:11 ("Jerusalem shall dwell secure, THERE SHALL BE NO MORE CURSE OF DESTRUCTION.") So Zech. 14:1-11 looks to the future for its fulfillment. This answers the question about the Lord's feet standing on Mt. Olives. Since the prophecy is yet to be fulfilled then in the future He will come in the midst of a battle, place His feet on Mt. Olive and it will split open, a thing it has not yet done. This also answers him on Eph. 4:5. As to the feast of the tabernacles in Zech. 14:16, Moffett translates this "The festival of booths (plural)." It, like the feast of Purim in Esther 9:17-32, was only memorial, and has no typical significance to be fulfilled in the death of Christ.

Just a few words will answer his feeble efforts to meet Rev. 19:1-21. I have shown with II Thes. 2:3-9 and Rev. 13:2; 4:11-14 that the man of sin, and the beast of Revelation will be one and the same person, and will be destroyed by the Lord's coming. "And then shall that WICKED be revealed, whom the Lord shall consume with the spirit of his mouth, and SHALL DESTROY WITH THE BRIGHTNESS OF HIS COMING," II Thes. 2:8. In Rev. 19:20 we find at the coming of the rider of the white horse from heaven (Vs. 11-21) the beast will be cast into the lake of fire, never to get out. So to have Rev. 20:8 being the Lord's return he will have to get the beast out of the lake of fire

after being there 1000 years. Question: Ballard, will the beast get out of the lake of fire when the Devil is loosed from the pit? Answer this please, and show from the Bible that he does get out of the lake of fire. And while on this point I REMIND you that you did not notice John 1:1-2 & Rev. 3:14 I gave to show that the white horse rider in Rev. 19 is Christ. Neither did you notice Prov. 21:31 I gave to show that horses are connected with WAR, which we have in Rev. 11 & Zech. 14. You sure have a very convenient forgetter when it comes to ignoring my scriptural proof. If you do not know whether the 1000 years in Rev. 20:1-7 is past, present or future, neither do you know anything about the next 2 verses. So you are just making a blind stab when you say Christ is coming after the 1000 years.

CHRIST DOES NOT REIGN NOW

Rev. 1:5 does not teach Christ is reigning now. Rev. 1:3 shows John is speaking prophetically (THE WORDS OF THIS PROPHECY V. 3). So when John called Christ the prince of the kings of the EARTH he did not mean He was the prince of such kings as Tito, Franco, Krushchev, Kaiser Bill, Nero, wicked rulers, but that He is the prince of the kings of the earth in v. 6. "And hath made us kings and priests unto GOD." Rev. 20:6 tells us when Christ, the prince of the kings of THE EARTH, will reign with those KINGS OF THE EARTH." Blessed and holy is he that hath part in the first resurrection: on such the second death hath no power, but they shall BE PRIESTS OF GOD (Same priest and kings we have in Rev. 1:6) and of Christ, and SHALL REIGN (Future) with him a thousand years." So here are your KINGS OF THE EARTH of whom Christ is PRINCE (Rev. 1:5), and here He is reigning with those priests and kings (Rev. 1:6) on earth 1000 years. And the reign is future. Christ does not begin to reign until the 7th trumpet shall sound. And you have never said one thing about my quotation from Dr. Williams on Rev. 11:15-17. I quote it again. "Then the seventh angel blew his trumpet, and loud voices were heard in heaven, saying, The sovereignty of the world has come into the possession of our

Lord and His Christ, and He shall reign forever and ever, Then the twenty-four elders... worshiped God, saying, we give you thanks. Lord God Almighty, who are and wert, because you have assumed your great power and **BEGUN TO REIGN.**" Here is where He will **BEGIN TO REIGN.** Moffett translates it "**HAVE BEGUN TO REIGN.**" So does Goodspeed. The Amplified N. T. translates it "**BEGINNING TO REIGN.**" This is in perfect harmony with Mt. 25:31 which tells us that Christ will sit upon His throne when He comes. And while on this point I will answer your quib on Mt. 25th chapter. In that chapter we have either a judgment of nations, or individuals. You say it is not a judgment of nations, so it will be one of individuals, according to your position, and if there is any salvation by works in the passage you have individuals saved by works. Which is the most unscriptural having nations saved, or spared physically by works, or having individuals saved by works. That backfires on Ballard.

I will answer him on the tares and individuals getting into the Lord's Kingdom, without the new birth. The field is the world, which exists on this earth, and it consists of kingdoms. The tares are the lost now living in the kingdoms of this world, and on this earth. So when the 7th trump sounds, and Christ takes over those kingdoms as His (Rev. 11:15) that will put the wicked, represented by the tares, in His kingdom, until they are gathered out of it. You never touched my argument on this. And over and over I brought Prov. 2:21-22 which tells of the upright remaining in the land (On the earth) after the wicked are cut off from the earth. Your forgetter caused you to ignore this again and again. And you never answered Ps. 37:9-11 & 37:34 which state that the meek shall inherit the earth **WHEN THE WICKED ARE CUT OFF.** You ignore these also, but we could not expect you to consider them for you have told us you don't know about the 1000 years reign. **BALLARD DON'T KNOW.** That is the explanation of why lie will not consider my Bible proof. That is why He blunders so. And he has never cleared

himself on his contradiction about the 12 apostles judging the 12 tribes of Israel. On page 23 of his book "Gold Tried in the Fire" he said Judas was one of those addressed when Christ promised the 12 the)' should sit on 12 thrones judging the 12 tribes.. On the very next page (24) he has those 12 apostles judging those tribes by condemning them for crucifying Christ. Judas was dead before Christ was crucified. (Mt. 27:3-5) So he has a dead man, one who betrayed Christ to be crucified, condemning the 12 tribes for crucifying Christ, after that man is dead. He has never, and can never clear that up. Truly BALLARD DOESN'T KNOW. Men who do not know (and he said he didn't know about the 1000 years) only make a display of their ignorance when they try to talk on what they DON'T KNOW. He need not criticize me for calling him ignorant. He confessed it when he said about the 1000 years "I DON'T KNOW."

SPIRITUAL ISRAEL AND THE CHURCH

in his book, p. 20, he says SPIRITUAL ISRAEL is the chinch. In this debate he makes those with an inward work spiritual Israel. That would put all the saved in the church, and teach church salvation, and the universal church. Ballard just did NOT KNOW, when he put that in his book where it was leading. Now he tries to get out by saying he does not believe in church salvation. I am talking of what you have in print. I can't help it if what you believe does not harmonize with what you have in print. But we can't expect anything better of a man who confesses "I DON'T KNOW." And I asked him to classify the saved who are not in the chinch, if there were such. His forgetter served him well again. Why? That was loaded at both ends, and he knew to leave it alone. If he said they were spiritual Israelites, then down goes his statement that the church is spiritual Israel. If he said there were no spiritual Israelites out of the church, then he took his stand on church salvation. And Goodspeed did not help him one bit on that. He is caught forever.

REV. 2:5 & 2:16

The words I Cor. 15:51-52 & I Thes. 4:16-17 were written to the church at Corinth and the one at Thessalonica, but apply to all who will be living or dead (Saved) and Christ's return. Even so does Rev. 2:5 & 2:16 have a like application.

DAVID'S THRONE IS NOT IN HEAVEN

Ps. 89:35-37 does not teach that David's throne is in heaven, but it is only a comparison of the endurance of his throne to the endurance of the sun and moon. "I will keep my word to David, that for ALL TIME his dynasty should last, his throne shall endure BEFORE ME like the sun, fixed as the moon forevermore, firm as the constant sky," Ps. 89:35-37, Moffett's translation. From this we see that this is only a comparison between the endurance of David's throne and that of the sun and moon. Please notice God said David's throne should ENDURE BEFORE ME. The throne of the Father in heaven, where He sits is not BEFORE HIM. A chair on which I sit is not BEFORE me. But a chair on which another person sits can be before me, and it would be a different chair from the one on which I sit. So the throne in heaven on which the Father sits is a different throne from that of David which shall endure BEFORE Him as the sun and the moon.

This same thought is brought out in Ps. 72:7-8 which makes the endurance of the early reign of Christ like the endurance of the MOON. "In his days the righteous shall flourish; and the abundance of peace SO LONG AS THE MOON ENDURETH. He shall also have dominion from sea to sea, and from the river to the ENDS OF THE EARTH." I have given this but you ignore it. Ps. 2:7-9 confirms the truth that Ps. 72:6-7 is speaking of the earthly reign of Christ. "You are my son; today have I begotten you. Ask of me, and I will make the nations your inheritance, and the ends of the earth your possession, Yon shall break them WITH A ROD OF IRON." Goodspeed's trans. Both Ps. 72 & Ps. 2 speaks of Christ having dominion or possession to the

ENDS OF THE EARTH. In Rev. 19:1-15 we find Christ coming to take over this possession promised and rule the nations with a rod of iron. "And I saw heaven opened, and behold a white horse, and him that sat upon him, was called Faithful and True (This is Christ. Rev. 3:14), and in righteousness he doth judge and make war." "And his name is called the Word of God," v. 13. In John 1:1-2 Christ is called the WORD. So this shows this is a prophecy concerning Christ. "And out of his mouth goeth a sharp sword, that with it he should smite the nations: and he shall RULE (future) them (Nations) with a rod of iron," Rev. 19:15. Here is when He comes to take possession and rule to the ENDS OF THE EARTH, as foretold in Ps. 2 & Ps. 72. When He smites the nations is when He will wound the heads (rulers) over many countries, and fill the places with dead bodies. Ps. 110:5-7; Mt. 24:27-28 & Rev. 19:17-21.

I HAVE SHOWN THE FOLLOWING

I have shown with Zech. 14:1-11; Rev. 16:13-15; Rev. 19:11 to 21; Mt. 24:27-28 that Christ will return to earth in the midst of battle, and that it is a different phase from that found in I Thes. 4. I have shown with Zech. 2:10-12; 8:3-8; Jer. 3:14-18; Zech. 3:13-15; and Isa. 33:20-24, that the Lord will return to earth to dwell among the people of Israel and reign as king. I have shown with Jer. 23:5-8; Zech. 14:9-11 and Ob. 17-21 that Christ will save Israel and establish Jerusalem in safety, and it shall not be destroyed again. I showed with Isa. 49:5-6 that Israel's tribes will be restored. Ballard promised if I would bring this up in this proposition he would answer it. I have used it 3 times, and 3 times he ignored it. I showed again and again with Isa. 1:26 that Israel's judges would be restored. He ignored it. I showed with Prov. 2:2-22 that after the wicked are cut off from the earth the righteous will remain, showing the earth will continue after Christ returns and takes out the tares, He ignored Prov. 2:21-22 three or four times. I showed with Micah 4:7-8, that Israel, cut off in Rom. 11:15, will be regathered and made a STRONG NATION. I showed with Amos 9:11-12 that

when David's tabernacle is restored as in the DAYS of old Israel will once again possess Edom, as David did in II Sam. 8:14. and with Ob. 17-21 that when Israel possesses their possessions again they will once more possess the country of Esau, who is Edom, that they will once again possess the country of the Canaanites which Ballard denies in his book. I showed with Jer. 31:27-28 that as God watched over Israel to tear down and pluck up so will He watch over them to build and plant. And the covenant He promises to make in Jer. 31 with the HOUSE OF ISRAEL AND THE HOUSE of Judah, was promised to people whose fathers God brought out of Egypt, showing this applies to national Israel. It tells when this is accomplished they will not teach any more his brother saying know the Lord, for ALL SHALL KNOW HIM. To say this has been fulfilled would put an end to all personal work. But today we do say to people KNOW the Lord, for ALL DO NOT know Him today. Therefore Jer. 31:31-34 & Heb. 8:8-11, which was written to Hebrew people, looks to the future for its fulfillment. I have shown with Isa. 11:6-9; 55:13; 65:25 & Ezek. 36:35 that the earth will return to Edenic conditions. And I answer his quib on Isa. 11:6-9 by saying just as God will hold in check the evil nature of men, and keep them from killing each other, he will do the same for the animals. I have also shown with Ps. 72; I Cor. 15:25-26 and Rev. 20 a limited earthly reign. Men dying now does not prove Him reigning now more than it did before the flood.

BALLARD'S FOURTH NEGATIVE

Readers, anyone, even a Campbellite or Mormon, can list a group of Bible texts and claim they teach their contention, but proving the texts are applicable to their contention is something else. My opponent does the former. He does so to make it appear he has proven his position by the Bible. Campbellite use the same procedure.

Friends, if people are to wander from the truth in the last days (II Tim. 1-5) then what about these that have left the old articles of faith and gone out after new ones? The religious world has gone wild over the millennial idea. Religious denominations that deny the reality of hell, salvation by grace through faith, the security of the child of God and the Lord's Day (first day of the week) were the first to adopt millennialism as an article of faith — Adventists. Our Baptist brethren in days past and gone opposed the Millennial Dawn theory, but today what do you hear? Readers, think seriously on this.

Readers, with all this evidence before you, that the religious world accepts the premillennial view, Jones claims his idea on the issue is UNPOPULAR. Then in another place he has tried to make it appear that I was wrong because of my YOUTH. If his age makes him right, then Catholicism and many other isms are right and Jones is wrong, for they existed before he was born. This conclusion is the result of his MATURED reasoning.

I Thes. 2:14-16

Here Paul speaks of the WRATH of God coming on the Jews to the UTTERMOST. Does that mean it is impossible for them to be restored? Christ saves to the UTTERMOST — Heb. 7:25. Does that mean He so saves until apostasy is impossible? If the UTTERMOST of Heb. 7:25 makes it impossible for the saved to be back lost again, then the UTTERMOST in I Thes. 2:16 makes it impossible for the Jews to be restored.

Ezekiel 37:21-25

Along with many others, I answered this by showing that it referred to the restoration under Zerubbabel and Ezra, at which time Zerubbabel was made PRINCE. Ezra 1:8.

Rom. 9:27; 11:5; Micah 4:7-8

Paul claimed this REMNANT was "AT THIS PRESENT TIME." Rom. 11:5. Jones says it is future. That is the difference in Jones and Paul.

BUNYAN, DUGGAR, FLIPPO, EUSEBIUS AND WADDINGTON:

John Bunyan: Jones doesn't know whether Bunyan was an open communionist or not. Why does he speak of such people if he knows nothing about what they believed? Jones, haven't you read Bunyan's Complete Works? In it, Bunyan devotes 43 pages to proving "difference about baptism no bar to communion." Jones' MATURED knowledge of Bunyan is the same as that of BERRY and ALFORD. He liberally quoted Berry and Alford and did not know what religious group they worked with.

John Duggar: Brother Duggar said: "Salvation is the spiritual resurrection of the SOUL;..." (1956 Sunday S. Quarterly, 4th Q., p. 7). Jones denies that the "resurrection" is ever used in connection with the SOUL. Duggar versus Jones.

Roy Flippo: "I do not know what position I shall occupy in the millennium...." According to Jones' way of reasoning. Flippo should not speak of the millennium, seeing he does not KNOW what position he will hold in the reign. So Brother Flippo, according to Jones, you had better SHUT YOUR MOUTH until you learn all about the millennium, this includes learning the ONLY WORKABLE SYSTEM.

Now just think about a preacher wishing to be mayor of Amarillo! That is the summit of Christian ambition! Talk about being EARTHLY minded! This takes the cake and hat. Poor fellow! He can just see himself ruling over Amarillo, Texas.

E. C. Endicott: This will be the one that will keep Amarillo supplied in water melons during the millennium. He will grow them as big as pianos. It will not take many like that to supply the town, unless men's bellies are enlarged also. I can just see Endicott climaxing the millennial reign by cutting one of those big melons with a pocket knife, while Hoyt Chastain and G. E. Jones wait with their mouths watering. I hope Endicott doesn't try to cut one on the mountains in Palestine, for it might get a loose. Maybe Cobb will help him hold it.

Eusebius and Waddington: They, when considered together, started the millennial idea. Cerinthus put it in writing and Papias used his writings to get such started in the churches. No contradiction here. Jones just can't understand history.

WHEN IS THE MILLENNIAL REIGN?

I answered this by saying it precedes the "little season" (Rev. 20:7) and the second coming of Christ. Rev. 20:9; II Thes. 1:8. Christ is coming in flaming fire after the millennium and the LITTLE SEASON. Doesn't that answer him on when the millennium was or is to be? He wants me to set dates like the Pre's, but I refuse.

MAN OF SIN will be destroyed by the Lord's coming, says Jones. If so, then he will be destroyed a 1000 or more years before sinners are raised and destroyed, according to premillennialism. Can you imagine the chief of the wicked being destroyed a 1000 years before his cohorts?

THE BEAST AND THE LAKE OF FIRE

Jones made a big to-do about this. Brother Jones, Rev. 20 says nothing about the beast being in a lake of fire 1000 years before the Devil is loosed. I challenge you to find such. You are just trying to recover a former fumble. Verse 4 reveals the beast will be (or was) in existence when the beheaded lived in this life. That would put the beast here before Jones gets the saved resurrected, which he says is the "first resurrection."

CHRIST'S REIGN:

My opponent contends He is not reigning. To hold this position, he claims Rev. 1:3, 6 is prophetic — future. Formerly, Jones claimed Revelation chapter -4-22 is future. Now he includes chapter one. Which time shall we believe him? He seems to still be going TO and FRO.

Friends, if the church is here on earth where Christ left it, then who is reigning over and in it? Is Jesus reigning in it? Jones, does Jesus reign in the church where you hold membership? Is the church of your membership on earth? If so, then Christ is reigning on earth. Is Christ the Head of the church? If so, doesn't HEADSHIP involve or include RULERSHIP? If Christ is Head and ruler of His church here on earth, then is He not ruling on the earth? If the church is here on the earth, then didn't Jesus promise to be with her? Mat. 28:18-20. An unprejudiced Baptist can see that Jesus is reigning NOW in His church.

Matthew 25:31

This text, like many others that Jones presents, does not say Christ BEGINS to sit on His throne at His second coming. To the contrary, John 3:35; Acts 13:34 claim ALL THINGS are now His, even the SURE MERCIES OF DAVID - the holy things of David. Was David's throne HOLY? If so, Christ has it. If not, He wouldn't have it. Besides, Jones, if Mat. 25:31 is the first phase, and Christ begins to reign then, that would make His reign 1007 years long, but you claim it is a millennial reign (1000 years reign). So you are advocating a 1007 years reign.

TARES AND NATIONS:

One time Jones says literal nations (Mat. 25:31-33) will be judged at His coming, then he turns to Mat. 13 and claims the wicked dead will be raised later and judged. GREAT THEOLOGY! Oh yes, what will happen to saints that happen to be in nations that are not good to the Jews? And what about

this nation, which takes these big gambling Jews and puts them in prison? Should this nation visit the imprisoned, as Chastain teaches, in order to get in the millennium? What about the Jews that are imprisoned for income tax evasion? Must we treat them good in order to be in the millennium as a nation? Which Jews must we visit to qualify as a nation? You said you thought America would qualify. Tell us!

Psalm 37:9-11, 34

I answered these by proving the meek have inherited the earth as a mission field. Matthew 5:5 makes the promise and Matthew 28:19-20 fulfills it.

12 APOSTLES and 12 THRONES

If the 12 addressed in Mat. 19:28 reign in a future millennium, then Judas will reign during the millennium, for he was one of the 12 addressed. That idea leaves Paul, the greatest of the apostles, without a throne.

"I DON'T KNOW"

Jones seems to think it is awful to claim you don't know everything. Does he claim to KNOW ALL about the millennial reign? If so, then we may rightfully call him a KNOW-ALL. What about Flippo that said he did not know what his position would be during the millennium, but wished to be mayor of Amarillo. According to Jones' reasoning, Flippo should SHUT his mouth and not teach anything about the millennium until he learns all about it.

ISRAEL AND ISRAELITES

Readers, in my third reply you will find I classified the saved. I quoted Gal. 6:16 to sustain my position. Jones is the one that is caught on this part of the discussion, as well as the rest of the debate; for he claimed God is married to Israel (national Israel), and Israel is yet to be established, yet to be born. This is another blunder I will not forget. Mark my word, Pre's.

DAVID'S THRONE

Jones says it is not in heaven. Psalm 89:36-37 says it is "a faithful witness in heaven." Jones says these verses only compare the duration of David's throne with the sun and moon. Isn't the sun and moon still in existence? Didn't you say David's throne "Does not exist now"? Where is the comparison, if the sun and moon exist and the throne of David doesn't? This is another one I will not forget.

CHRIST'S DOMINION

He claims ALL THINGS. John 3:35. THE FATHER LOVETH THE SON, AND HATH GIVEN ALL THINGS INTO HIS HANDS. He has the SURE MERCIES OF DAVID. Acts

13:34. Surely that includes his throne. David's throne is in heaven. Psa. 89:36-37. Christ is in heaven on a throne. Rev. 3:21. Therefore, Christ is on David's throne in heaven. This answers such quibs as Psa. 2; 72.

According to Jones, Israel will not have to be restored, for he says God is married to her now. Besides, if Rev. 7 speaks of a future restoration, Dan will not be restored; for it does not mention him. Moreover, most of the texts that Jones gave applied to the restoration under Zerubbabel and Ezra, at which time Zerubbabel became prince. Ezra 1:8. Isaiah 49:5-6 was applied to this gospel age, according to Paul. Acts 13:47: "For so hath the Lord commanded us, saying, I have set thee to be a light of the Gentiles, that thou shouldest be for salvation unto the ends of the earth."

Then Jones says Israel's JUDGES will be restored. They were restored when Israel and Judah were delivered from Babylonian captivity. Ezra 7:25.

Next my opponent teaches Pr. 2:21-22 advocates the righteous will remain on earth during the millennium. Solomon said nothing about the millennium. If these verses speak of a future millennium, then transgressors (sinners) will not be in it, for

only the PERFECT REMAIN. That proves too much for you and therefore it proves nothing for you.

ACTS 15:13-17; AMOS 9:11

Apostle James applied Amos 9:11 to the establishment of the church (Heb. 8:2), and the bringing in of the Gentiles at the house of Cornelius. Jones says Amos is yet to be fulfilled. James versus Jones. Which will you believe?

Then Jones concludes his last speech by saying the second covenant (Heb. 8:8-11) is yet to be made. If the first one has been fulfilled (Col. 2:14) and the second has not been established, then we are without a covenant. Great Caesar! What will the man say next? Oh yes, I would like to have the text that says the earth will return to its Edenic nature in the future. Paul said the earth would wax old as doth a garment and God would fold it up like a vesture. Heb. 1:11-12. Jones contends the earth will become more fertile. That is the difference in Paul and Jones.

A FEW REMINDERS

1. If Christ reigns in Palestine during the millennium, then why does Flippo wish to be in Amarillo, Texas during that lime? He wishes to be away from Christ.
2. The Jews rejected God's counsel (purpose) against themselves. Lk. 7:30. Therefore God is not obligated to them.
3. God's wrath has come on the Jews to the UTTERMOST — 1 Thes. 2:14-16. Therefore it is impossible to restore them nationally. Heb. 7:25.
4. The LAST DAY is 24 hours long, according to Jones and Chastain, for it is a specified clay — LAST. The lost will be judged on that day and the righteous will be raised. John 6:5-1; 12:48. Therefore they rise on the same day.

5. God said no man knows the time of Christ's coming. Jones says he knows half of it. Jones says the first phase is the only unknown time.
6. What will happen to saved people that are in nations that are destroyed for not treating the Jews kindly? Jones failed to answer.
7. John Bunyan, one of the 20,000 that declared themselves Pre's (according to Jones), believed in open communion. If they are Jones' predecessors, then does Jones fellowship and tolerate open communion? If not, why not?
8. The Bible says Christ is COMING AGAIN. John 14:1-3. The Bible says we should be BORN AGAIN. I Pet. 1:23. If His coming AGAIN means two phases, then is the new birth in two phases? Jones remained silent as a tomb.
9. Jesus is reigning. Rev. 1:5 (R. V.). He is reigning in or over His church. Mat. 28:19-20. He continues to do such until the end, (ill death is destroyed. I Cor. 15:25-26.
10. Jesus has the SURE MERCIES (holy things) of David. That includes his throne that is in heaven. Psalms 89:36-37. "A faithful witness in heaven."
11. Christ is to reign while David is in his sepulcher. Acts 2:29-31. That puts His reign before the resurrection.
12. Christ is reigning in heaven on a throne. Rev. 3:21. David's throne is in heaven. Psalms 89:36-37. Therefore Christ is reigning on David's throne.
13. Did Jones give us a text that says Christ will AGAIN stand on Olivet? No, he forgot the request I made. Bless his heart! He has done his BEST.
14. Jones claims the number of years stated in a prophecy appear in the fulfillment of the prophecy. I asked: IF SO, DID THE 70 WEEKS IN DANIEL FULFILL IN 70 LITERAL WEEKS? My opponent didn't answer. He is a quiet turned fellow!

15. Jones contends that I should be MARKED and AVOIDED for not believing as he does. Then Cobb, Duggar, Jackson, Hall and many others should be AVOIDED, for they disagree with Jones on many of his millennial ideas.

16. Remember, J. E. Cobb and G. E. Jones disagree on the duration of the GREAT TRIBULATION. So Cobb should be AVOIDED.

17. I"or sonic reason Jones forgot to loll us who the TWO WITNESSES are.

18. My MATURED opponent says the "living waters" (Zech. 14) is literal water. If so, then it will cleanse sin. Zech. 13:1. That is Campbellism died-in-the-wool.

19. If you recall, Jones forgot to tell us what position he will hold in the Millennium.

20. I showed an espousal was recognized as a marriage in New Testament times. Paul said the church is espoused to Christ. Jones says the Bride and Groom are not married. If they are not, then why call them BRIDE and BRIDEGROOM?

21. If Israel is yet to be restored, then why do you say God is married to something that does not exist? I will try to remember this one.

22. In what way will the millennium differ from the present? Jones has depraved sinners being born in both. Is changing the animals the only difference? If God changes the wild beasts and still allows sinners to be born depraved, then does that not say He thinks more of wild beasts than he does the human family?

23. What became of Dr. Berry and Alford that Jones once quoted?

24. Again I ask: how does Jones know when to multiply in his number SYSTEM?

25. What did Jones say about my position being in the BAPTIST WAY BOOK?

26. Why does Jones jump from 300 to 600 in his number SYSTEM? Doesn't the numbers in between have any significance? He must get his exercise by jumping.

27. I asked if the SWORD (Rev. 19:17-21) is a literal sword. Jones failed to answer.

28. While Jones classes the Jews as "brethren," his pie brethren oppose integration of the colored people. Just think of a theory that recognizes the slayers of Christ as brethren, while refusing to associate with saved Negroes.

29. Remember, Jones' millennial idea first appears in Baptist articles of faith in 1941. It is a 1941 model, not old enough to have whiskers.

In conclusion I will mention an incident that happened in Missouri not very long ago. A Pre preached that he looked forward to the millennium, for he had always desired to be a great athlete. He could just see himself playing full back on America's team as they play Palestine. He could just see himself speeding across a football field with about a half a dozen long nosed Jews after him. What a game it will be! Jones will likely be one of the coaches for America. But if the team uses his ONLY workable system, they will not know which goal' post to head toward. But the news goes out: A PRE BAPTIST PREACHER SHOOK OFF 3 WOULD-BE TACKLERS AND OUT RAN THE REST TO DOWN PALESTINE 7 to 0. My what a victory!

P. D. Ballard