

Jeans, January 5, 1934.

HUNTER #839 Judy

Dear Brother Ray:

I just received your letter of December 27th last night, when Bro. Fisher brot me the mail that had come to his place. I am staying out at Jeans this week, since returning from Salem.

I hasten to explain the apparent contradiction between what appeared in the last B.A. and my letter to you. I do not have the copy of my letter to Bro. Dodd, from which this was quoted, here, as it is home in Salem, so cannot quote it exactly until I have it forwarded to me, but in some manner an error got into the quoting of my letter, putting a different implication on it than that intended. The words "Believe me we will be solidly with you with our four churches in Oregon" are not as I wrote them to Bro. Dodd at all. As I remember it I stated that I BELIEVED that we WOULD line up solidly with them, and in this part of my letter I was merely reporting the gist of expressions from those of our people whom I had heard express themselves. In other words, I found that all our people with whom I talked were with the new movement 100%. I saw no reason why I should not pass on this news to Bro. Dodd, knowing it would encourage them, but never giving thought to the possibility it might be published.

In the second place, you entirely misunderstood and misjudged my attitude toward the new organization from my letter to you. You say "In my letter you have taken a definite stand against the new church." I most certainly never for one moment intended to convey to you nor anyone else that I was taking any definite stand against the new church. I was taking no stand relative to it at all, and intended to convey to you that I was merely trying to consider all the FACTS, to be SURE before I went in, all the time hoping with all my heart that the facts would prove it to be what it claimed. I had received some charges and accusations, and also a few questions came into my own mind I wished settled before taking a definite stand. Surely you will not condemn this attitude. The Bible tells us to TRY the spirits, whether they be of God, to PROVE ALL THINGS, and to wait on the Lord. I was trying to take time to investigate, get at the real truth, and to pray until I could be SURE about it. If you will refer again to my letter of the 9th, the fourth paragraph, you will notice I am taking no stand against this organization, but merely stating I have received information, accusations, etc., and have written for their PROOF. I was not for one moment accepting or believing these accusations, but was willing to see their proof if they had it. At the same time I wrote direct to Bro. Dodd and one of the "13" involved stating these things frankly and asking for their explanation, and Now, Bro. Ray, will you be kind enough to notice, in the 5th paragraph of my letter to you I said: "I have not yet signed my acceptance as one of the "70." Does not the expression "not yet" convey to you that I at least considered so doing, if not actually intending to do it? That is what I had in mind, anyway---that I HOPED I would be able to, after thorough investigation, as my next sentence plainly says: "I sincerely hope, with all my heart, I shall be able to do so." That statement is plain. How, then, can you accuse me of having taken a "definite stand against the new organization?" Are you not doing me an injustice here? I sincerely hope you will not give others the impression that I have ever taken any stand AGAINST the new organization, for I never have done so, at any time. The rest of that 5th paragraph

NOT ADVOCATED
LATER IN THE
WCCG

clearly explained to you what stand I was taking. That, while HOPEING with all my heart I should be able to sign my acceptance as one of the "70", while hoping and praying that this new movement might ~~prove~~ prove, despite the accusations I had received, to be of God, yet I wanted to wait on the Lord, to PROVE all things, to try the spirits and to get ALL the facts, and to pray a great deal over it, "and be assured it is right before I jump into it."

Next I stated, in the 8th paragraph, "As to their 40 points of doctrine, as I understand it, I am in perfect harmony with it, except I am not just sure what they mean on about 5 points, and have written Bro. Dodd to be sure." Then I stated that IF certain of those points were intended a certain way, I could not go along with them ON THAT POINT. Again, I was merely withholding the taking of any definite stand until I was sure on these points. Then, in the last paragraph, I mentioned to you some points that had come up to my own mind I wanted to study carefully into and be sure about. It is my nature, Bro. Ray, to be absolutely frank and open, and to say fully just what I think, and I have often been told I am too free in expressing myself. But I was just trying to be fully frank and honest with you and tell you fully just exactly how I did regard the new movement at that time, in answer to your request. If we could thus be free and frank with one another, there would be a more harmonious unity among us. But let us not misunderstand and misjudge one another's motives, intentions, and meaning.

Now again back to my letter to Bro. Dodd. The letter this quotation in the B.A. was taken from was the very letter in which I frankly stated to Bro. Dodd that I wanted to BE SURE on these points of doctrine, and about the accusations against them, before I signed as one of the "70". That letter, instead of being a contradiction of the one I wrote you, was of exactly the same tone. I frankly put up to him every charge and accusation, and asked his explanation. I frankly asked the exact meaning of those points of doctrine I was not sure about. I told him, as I remember it, as I did you, that I hoped I would be able to go along with them. I also told him of the sentiment of those of our people here whom I had heard express themselves, and of their enthusiasm for the new movement, and expressed the hope or belief that our four churches here would be solidly with them. Bro. Dodd took only that part of the letter stating the enthusiasm of our brethren in this state, and my own hope or belief, and that, with a misprint or error, by itself, contrasted with your mistaken and misunderstood view of my letter to you appeared to you to be very contradictory. I hope this will explain it to you fully.

I want to make it plain, that I have never for one moment at any time taken any stand AGAINST the new movement, directly or indirectly. My hopes and my desires have from the very first been just as strongly for it as any could be. I have been inclined to feel really enthusiastic over it, full of thanksgiving and praise to the Lord for it, yet I felt I had to hold this in abeyance until I could PROVE all these things, and BE SURE. I know my wife will tell you this was my attitude, and so will the Fishers, before whom I expressed myself, and with whom I have talked it over and studied it.

Bro. Dodd promptly replied to my letter, completely and fully, and
~~wasing XXXXXIXXXXXX~~
 Bro. Dodd promptly replied,

answered every question in a most frank, straightforward and Christian manner. If you could have known my feelings of emotion, and how I thanked and praised God over what was in his letter, you would have known I had never been against this movement, but, in my heart, 100% with it from the start, hoping it would prove to be what was claimed. Bro. Dodd re-assured me on every point of doctrine. Points 1, 2, and 3 do not do away with the pre-existence of Christ, but the church believes and teaches it according to the plain statements of the Bible. The church has exactly the same view and understanding as I have on the wrath of God being upon sin rather than the sinner. You entirely misunderstood my meaning here, again. God hates sin, but God LOVES sinners. However, sin must be destroyed, because it is man's enemy and God's enemy, and since man is a free moral agent he must decide individually for himself whether he will be destroyed with it or inherit life in righteousness. If you had been attending our meetings here the past 30 days you would have no doubt that I preach that the plagues and the wrath will in fact be poured out upon all men who refuse to surrender their sins. I don't know how I could have told these folks that in any stronger language than I have. I think you and I believe exactly alike on it, only you misunderstood my view. What I have preached is that the sinner will receive the wrath of God UNMIXED, that is, FULL STRENGTH, but that it will not be a manifestation of God's hatred for the sinner, but His hatred for sin, which only manifests His LOVE for the very sinner He punishes for sin is his enemy seeking to destroy him. God is LOVE, and even His anger against sin proves His LOVE for His creatures. God PUNISHES those He LOVES. I know, for He has punished me, and it means He loves me, and I love Him and praise Him for it.

I can say, I think, that in view of Bro. Dodd's explanations of the real meaning of those points about which I wrote him that I am 100% with them on their points of doctrine as there expressed.

Regarding the accusations, Bro. Dodd cleared up every one of them and they all vanished as if by magic. For instance, the letter Elder Negby was said to have written from Palestine asking Bro. Dugger never again to use his name in any connection. A Stanberry man wrote me this. Bro. Dodd replies he did write such a letter, BUT, he wrote it several months ago, before the new movement was started, and it applied to Stanberry and its squabbles. Negby is WITH the new organization, and has sent in an article for publication which will shortly appear. The one of the 12 reported by another man to be opposed to the Baptism with the Holy Spirit today, was expressing himself to one who believes in fanatical "tongue-seeking," and he meant he did not believe this counterfeit was for us to seek. I wrote him personally, and received a splendid letter from him, which seems to reveal him as meek, surrendered to God, having a spirit of love, and his stand on the baptism with the Holy Spirit is exactly mine, and, as I understand you, exactly yours. If his letter reflects his true spirit and is that of the rest of the 12, I am satisfied with the selection of the 12. He flatly says he does believe in the Holy Spirit baptism. He also does believe in the tongues as AN evidence, but not the only evidence. He looks, as we do, to the fruits of the Spirit in the life of the person. He has the same idea you and I have about tarry meetings. He believes in a full surrender to God, not tongue-SEEKING.

Regarding the name of the church, Bro. Dodd instantly accepted my view, saying the Scriptures are so plain on it a child could see it, and it will be presented to the 12 and he believes they will

promptly make the change. This will then be the ONLY organization in the world, so far as I can learn, with the true Bible name, CHURCHES OF GOD. Eight or nine in the U.S. have "Church of God."

Another point re; what was quoted from my letter in the B.A. You have it, "(signed) Evangelist Herbert Armstrong." It probably is not important, but will say in passing that I never in my life signed any such title to my name, but just plain "Herbert Armstrong" The "Evangelist" was designated by them back there. I try not to assume any titles of any kind. You will understand, of course, why they added it, as they added some such designation to every name.

In my letter to you, I stated the question had come to my mind as to whether the twelve apostles were ever carried on past the original 12, and Paul, as a 13th (there were in a sense 13 tribes of Israel, counting both Ephraim and Manasseh). I had never had occasion to study that particular point, but my study has shown me Scriptures for the fact that others besides the original 12 and Paul were, later, after some of the 12 had been martyred, definitely called by the title of apostle in the N.T., establishing definitely that it was God's intention and purpose for the 12 to continue on thru the Gospel age. Bro. Dodd also gave ample Scripture for the position of supervision of the "Overseer," and I now feel that, all these points of the organization are in accord with the original Scriptural pattern.

Now I will try to give you the answers to your 5 definite questions.

1. I believe this letter has surely made plain that I have been, from the very first, in harmony with the new church move, merely having wished to investigate certain accusations, certain points I was not sure I understood correctly, and certain questions that came to my own mind, to assure myself it was a true and correct Bible organization. I am in harmony with it just so far as it is in harmony with the Bible, and it appears now to be so. So my answer is YES.

2. I do not know exactly what you mean by asking whether I expect to QUALIFY as one of the 70. I have been chosen one of the 70, but did not know I had to qualify further to accept. However, I hope with the help of God, thru the merits of my Saviour and not my own, to fully qualify and thus be made worthy to serve.

3. I can never teach or practise anything I KNOW, as clearly and unmistakably revealed by the Holy Spirit, to be contrary to God's Word. Should there be conflict between the plain clear teaching of the Word of God and that of the church organization, I shall always have to obey God rather than man. I could not otherwise feel I did qualify. But it is so there will be no misunderstandings that I am now making every effort to be sure that the teachings of the church and those of the Word of God are in harmony, so that when I do accept service as one of the 70 I can answer YES to your question, that there will be full harmony so far as I am concerned.

4. Regarding when a candidate shall be baptised, there is nothing expressed on this point anywhere in the constitution or doctrine of the new church. This, however, let me assure you, is a point I will try to have thoroughly understood with the leaders of the church before I accept service as one of the 70. I hope God will always give me courage and boldness to follow His instruction and the Bible

True Church Name
X AND HIS PEERS & PROCESSORS

WORD OF GOD AS
HE UNDERSTOOD
IT - NO HUMBLE SUBMISSION TO BODY OF

example on so vitally important a point. I am heartily in accord with your view that we should all be willing to waive our own personal views and hobbies on all minor or unimportant points, and I am more than willing to do so. I think you have always misunderstood my position on this, as indicated in your question, I never have and never will baptise any merely upon "confession, or acceptance of Jesus as his Saviour," without the first condition of REPENTANCE. The Bible says baptise upon REPENTANCE, and BELIEF in Christ. I try to follow that, and to be sure there has been real repentance. It comes to a question of what is repentance, and there, too, I stand firmly upon the Bible teaching. None have a promise of receiving the Holy Spirit until they have been baptised. Without the Spirit the Bible says they cannot understand those spiritual things which are spiritually discerned, but God has revealed them unto us BY HIS SPIRIT. When He, the Spirit of Truth is come, HE shall guide you into all truth, The law in which we find the Sabbath is a SPIRITUAL law. Let us help those who have honestly repented, fully surrendered to God, and accepted Jesus, to receive the Spirit of truth to guide them into the truth on these doctrinal questions. Repentance does not necessarily involve or include full and complete knowledge. Read Jas. 4:17; John 9:41; 15:22. You cannot say that the Sunday observer who honestly never heard of the Sabbath, or whose eyes have never been opened to this truth by the Spirit, and who has never rejected it, and who is obeying God's law as far as he understands it, and so surrendered that he is WILLING to obey ANYTHING God reveals, has not repented. Before I baptised these converts here I asked them if they were WILLING to obey whatever God showed them in the Bible, regardless of the cost in persecution or otherwise. They have lived CHANGED LIVES. They HAVE "died the death," if the fruits of the Spirit in their lives is a testimony. I believe they DID receive the Holy Spirit, and when He, the Spirit of truth did come, He DID, in EVERY CASE, guide them into the truth of the Sabbath question, and EVERY ONE I BAPTISED ACCEPTED IT PROMPTLY AND NOW KEEPS IT. I do not want to cause any dissention or division or trouble or lack of harmony, and if I have any hobbies I am willing to keep them in the background and not try to force them on others against their honest convictions of the teachings of the Scripture. I want only peace, and harmony, and LOVE, and I want to love all the brethren more than my own ideas or hobbies, instead of loving my hobbies more than them and thereby causing dissention and contention and trouble and lack of love. But on a point so clear and plain in the BIBLE as when to baptise, while I am not going to try to force my ideas on others who see it differently, I must, for myself, obey the Word of my God and my Saviour. To fail to follow the plain Bible teaching on this, and to delay baptism, is to get into an argument with an unspiritual mind, cause a great delay in this person's reception of the Holy Spirit and being saved, and run the risk of accident taking this life before the Holy Spirit has been ~~saved~~, when, according to Rom. 8:9, I would be the cause of this person dying unsaved. As I said at Harrisburg, I will be put out of 57 different conferences or organizations before I will go contrary to my Lord's instructions and the Bible teaching on this point. There is a difference, Bro. Ray, between being stubborn and rebellious, and being firm for the truth of the Word of God and willing to suffer, if need be, for it. If our conference, or the new organization after I sign with it, order me to crawl on my hands and knees on upturned nails till I am torn and bleeding, I will be willing to do as instructed. But no one can justly or rightly insist that I disobey God and the plain teachings of the Bible at the command of men under any circumstance.

below: DOCTRINE
 COMES AFTER REPENTANCE

Would you do it? I am sure you would not. I do hope, Bro. Ray, you will realize I am not trying to "drag the standard in the dust" and that such an implication, as was publicly implied against me at the Sunday meeting in Harrisburg, is manifestly unfair and unjust. I am trying to UPHOLD the standard. The BIBLE and the BIBLE ONLY must be our standard, and when we get into man-made creeds or ideas contrary to the Bible, or set them up or try to set them up as a standard, it is a false standard and we should all try to uphold the true Bible standard. I hope you will realize, too, that I am just as honest and sincere in my convictions as you are in yours. I do not for one moment doubt your honesty or motives. But let us all be unprejudiced, open minded, able to go into an earnest, prayerful study to see if it can be honestly PROVED that we are wrong, and willing to give up our positions upon such proof. I know I am able to so study any of these points where you think me wrong, and willing to change my views just as soon as proved wrong. It is the TRUTH, according to God's Word, that I want and rejoice in, not my own way. Now as I said at the beginning of this point, I hope to have a harmonious understanding on this point of when to baptise a candidate with the leaders in the new movement before I begin actively to serve, and to avoid any such unpleasantness as came up here in Oregon over it. I fully believe they will see my point on it and accept it, and if not I believe they will in a spirit of love be able to show me where I am wrong, and in that case I will immediately reverse my stand. In either event, I firmly believe we shall have harmony on the point so far as I am concerned.

5. "If you accept service as a member of the seventy, will you accept the sovereignty of the twelve, in all matters pertaining to church affairs as long as they are being wholly led by the Holy Spirit?" My answer, to this question as a whole, is unqualifiedly YES. Your question states a condition. I am coming to have faith and confidence that the "12" are men who will be wholly led by the Holy Spirit, tho I know personally none of them, and very little about any of them. But their articles in the Advocate and the letter I received from one of them have all impressed me deeply. They seem to have a spirit of MEKNESS and full surrender to God, rather than one of self-importance over their new position. O, if we all could get more of that. I want it and want you to pray that God will help me to remain meek and humble and surrendered.

It is so there will be no misunderstandings later on that I am delaying my acceptance in the 70 long enough to have full and harmonious understanding at the outset. Then I expect to go into it with my whole heart, and to fully accept the sovereignty, as you put it, of the 12. I have been opposed to any man being given power or authority not intended in the Bible. But I want to live by EVERY Word of God, and to the full extent that the Bible puts others in authority over me, and to the full extent that they conform to the Bible in the exercise of that authority, I shall humbly submit to and obey any and everything they impose and instruct. I'm afraid I've given you the impression I am stubborn and unwilling to work with others, or to submit to any authority. That is not true. I have never, as you know, tried to dominate, or assume any authority myself over others, and am always willing to submit fully to whatever is right and according to the Bible. I want, in other words, to be fully surrendered to God and His word, but I cannot be so and surrender to men contrary to it. That is the explanation of what has happened in the past.

7.
You asked me to write you FULLY, and I have tried to take the time and the space to do that. Your main point seems to be that there must be harmony in the new organization. I agree with you, and realize fully the importance of this, and therefore am trying to make sure this full harmony before I go in. I am doing all in MY power to assure harmony so far as my connection with the organization is concerned, and to assure myself and them that I will be in full and perfect harmony. There is perfect harmony now, so far as I can see, but I am now just trying to anticipate one or two points and be assured on them, too. I can do no more.

I hope this makes my stand and position clear. If not, write me again and I will do all I can to make it clear.

Your brother in Christ Jesus,