

A-MILLENNIALISM REFUTED- REFUTED

By Jarrel Huffman

Introduction

An "unknown" author had his "a-mil" view published recently in the April, 1995, issue of The Baptist Challenge. The paper is associated with the Central Baptist Church of Little Rock, Arkansas. Elder M. L. Moser is the editor; Elder Larry Jones is pastor of the church. Both of these men I consider friends, so this response is not aimed at these men in particular.

Although the author of this article is purportedly "unknown" by men, we can be sure that he (or she) is "known of God." As far as I know, most articles written by a nondescript author are refused by the editors of publications. Be that as it may, charges are made in this article which are false, misleading, and prejudicial.

In the article referred to, the following headings are given: (1) Why Post- Millennialism Died; (2) Amillennialism Has Come in the Place of Post- Millennialism; (3) The Source of A-Millennialism; (4) The Early Church Pre-Millennial; (5) Why the Early Church Was Pre-Millennial; (6) A-Millennialism and Arminianism; (7) A-Millennialism and Modernism; (8) The Meaning of the Term "A-Millennialism"; (9) A-Millennialism Denies God's Word Concerning Christ's Throne; (10) A-Millennialism Denies God's Word Concerning the Binding of Satan; (11) A-Millennialism Denies God's Word about the Kingdom of the Beast; (12) A-Millennialism Denies the Teaching of God's Word that the Beast Is a Man; (13) A-Millennialism Must Distinguish between Beast and Man of Sin; (14) A-Millennialism Rejects God's Place for the Second Coming of Christ; (15) A-Millennialism Nullifies the Imminency of Christ's Coming; (16) A-Millennialism Flagrantly Contradicts God's Word by Teaching a General Resurrection; (17) A- Millennialism Accuses God of Repenting; (18) A-Millennialists Accuse Jesus and the Prophets of Falsifying.

Whew! Quite a mouthful for an "unknown" writer! I think if I had written some of these things I would want to remain "unknown" also. Anyone who refuses to sign his "John Henry" to an article of such a disparaging tone is quite suspect in the first place. File "13" would be a good suggestion for its place.

Also, in this diatribe by the "unknown" brother or sister, we have certain charges laid against those of the "A-mil" persuasion, namely: (1) A scourge (p. 4); (2) Vain deceit (pp. 4, 17); (3) Allegorizing (p. 16); (4) Like modernism (p. 16); (5) Ruthless and arbitrary (p. 16); (6) Presumptuous (p. 16); (7) Twin with modernism (p. 16); (8) Dishonest (p. 16); (9) Like atheism (p. 16); (10) Plain, outright denial of the Word of God (p. 16, 3 times); (11) Pious and hypocritical (p. 16); (12) Employs mental gymnastics (p. 16); (13) Denies the Imminency of Christ's return (p. 17); (14) Claims to know more than the inspired writers (p. 17); (15) Perverts God's Word to suit itself (p. 17); (16) Accuses God of repenting (p. 17); (17) Denies the iramutability of God (p. 17); (18) Ignorant (p. 17); (19) Wholly and absolutely false (p. 17); (20) Originated from the pit. Here are twenty reckless charges designed to prejudice anyone who might want to seriously study the millennial question.

Personally, I have tried to take the position among Baptists that eschatology should not be an acid test & fellowship among the brethren. History has shown us, if we have our eyes and ears open, that Baptists have differed in eschatology without breaking fellowship. Anyone who denies this statement is either blind to history or willfully ignorant of the facts.

Some brethren might take the position that such an article is needful. Others might assume that all Baptists agree with the statements by the "unknown" writer. Still others enjoy gouging the brethren who have the courage to oppose their eschatological stance.

I. POST-MILLENNIALISM.

Personally, I am not a "post-millennialist." Whether such has completely died off, as this "unknown" expert asserts, I cannot testify. I do hear now and then that some still hold to this position. Perhaps by now they have died too. I do know, for a fact, that some Godly Baptists of the past were in the post-mil camp. We need look no further than B. H. Carroll, a leading light among Baptists in the preceding century. I am not saying that he was correct on this position; I am simply pointing out that some "Godly" men have taught this idea.

H. A-MILLENNIALISM.

A number of false charges and innuendoes are levelled at this theological stance. I shall attempt to give an answer to these charges. I don't know to whom this is addressed since the good author is "unknown," but perhaps God will find a way to get these statements before the good brother (or sister).

First, a-millennialism is supposed to have "come in the place of post-millennialism." This most assuredly is facetious reasoning. Does this "unknown" author suggest that he knows the hearts of all men, the motives of all men, the study habits of all men? It is always refreshing to have other men tell you what you believe! As far as I can personally testify, my present position has come by careful study and prayer. I cannot speak for others.

Second, the good author (man or woman) informs us that "a-millennialism" lay dormant for some 200 years until "post-millennialism" died. Men such as Carroll, Boyce, Pendleton and Mullins somehow "smothered" the "a-mil" idea. That's good to know!

Third, the "source" of the "a-mil" position is reported to be " ... the philosophy of vain deceit," against which Paul warned in Col. 2:8. Plato, it is said, set out to blend Hebrew and Greek thought. By the so-called "allegorical" method of interpretation, Plato has explained away everything in the O.T. not in harmony with his philosophy. Then, it is reported, this "allegorical" method of Bible interpretation was established in Alexandria, mainly under Origen's influence.

Now, there you have it! Everybody roll over, play dead, and get back on the "pre-mil" bandwagon. Origen started "amillennialism." No wonder this author didn't sign his name to the article! This argument is one of the oldest employed in ridiculing an opposing position. Make some outlandish charge, and hope that no one seeks for the facts. The careful student of the Bible is forewarned by such tactics. How do we know that Paul was warning against "A-millennialism" in Col. 2:8?

Fourth, this good author tells us, without blushing, that "the early church was pre-millennial." And so we have quotes by Fienberg, Harnack, Mosheim, etc. Just for good measure, the names of Montanus, Justin Martyr, Polycarp, Papias, and Irenaeus are thrown in. So, again, just roll over and play dead. The issue is settled by these statements. Now, if men want to be honest with history, they should read all the Ante-Nicene and Post-Nicene Fathers have declared. But, what if these so-called "fathers" did univocally embrace "pre-millennialism." Would that prove its validity? If so, we need also to check out other subjects on which they agreed. This argument will

not hold water, and those who espouse such statements should be honest with their readers.

Fifth, the author tells us that "a-millennialism" should be rejected because it holds to the allegorical method of Bible interpretation and denies the "literal" method of interpreting the Word of God. Origen, of course, is blamed as the originator of the "allegorical" method. From him this, it is said, was passed on to certain church "fathers," then to the scholastic theologians and onto the Protestant dogmatists. So, here in one short paragraph by the "unknown" author, we have hundreds of years of history summed up. Now you know the truth!

In the first place, the charge that "a-millennialists" do not interpret the Bible LITERALLY, is false, and most of the accusers know it is false. But why throw away a "flagword," when it is doing a good job of confusing the issue? Notice here that the opponents of "a-millennialism" are prone to contrast the words "literal" and "spiritual." That is, the implication is that you cannot be "literal," if you make it "spiritual." The contrast in hermeneutics (interpretation) is not between "literal" and "spiritual," but between SPIRITUAL and PHYSICAL. "Spiritual" interpretation is just as "literal" as the "physical." After all, those who cry the loudest against "spiritual" interpretation of the Scriptures do the same thing when it suits their position. If brethren would just take the time to see this one point, many problems would be solved: the spiritual interpretation of the Word of God is "literal."

Sixth, this good author tells his readers that all "a-millennialists" should be "Arminians," if they are consistent. Now, there's an argument I hadn't heard before. But it must be true, because this "unknown" brother (or sister) says it is. If I didn't have any more ammunition in my arsenal to defend my eschatological position than that, I would want to be "unknown."

Seventh, the author compares the "a-millennialist" with the "modernist." Both, it is asserted, practice the allegorization method of Scripture interpretation. A-millennialism is said to be "like modernism... in that it undertakes to say in a ruthless and arbitrary way what can be true and what can't be true. It arbitrarily decides that God is through with the Jews as a nation. It decides that the sacrificial system of the Jews could not in any wise be restored without abrogating the new covenant. It decides that Christ and the glorified saints could not rule on this earth over men in natural bodies. It makes these decisions, not on the basis of a careful examination of all the Scriptures, but presumptively; and then proceeds to twist the Scripture wherever necessary in order to make it agree. O.K. Now let's see what this good brother is actually saying in these outlandish charges: (1) The a-millennialist interprets the Scriptures in a "ruthless and arbitrary" way. Who says so? Well, the pre-millennialist, of course. Doesn't that settle it? Tragically, for many it does. Again, charges are thrown out without any proof whatever, and statements are made to inflame the reader; (2) The author points out that "a-mills" decide that certain things are true and certain things untrue. I was of the opinion that careful Bible study (2 Timothy 2: 15) was the basis for theological decisions. I suppose that is only true if you are "pre-mil" to start with; (3) A-mills say that God is through with the nation Israel. But it is not only the "a-mills" who hold this truth; the Bible itself teaches the same; (4) The O.T. sacrifices could be re-established without harming the terms of the New Covenant. Wait just a minute! Did I read this "unknown" brother correctly? No wonder he wants to write incognito! The whole N.T. affirms that Jesus was the OBJECT of all the O.T. sacrifices, etc. The Book of Hebrews is careful to point out that the "old" was set aside by Jesus Christ, BECAUSE HE FULFILLED THE OLD! How dare anyone cast reflection on the PERFECT, COMPLETE, AND FINISHED WORK OF THE LORD! Yet, dispensational pre-millennialism believes in a "re-establishing of the sacrificial system of worship" in the coming age (or ages). Surely anyone who would bring in again "sacrifices," WHEN THE ONE SACRIFICE HAS BEEN MADE BY JESUS CHRIST, is

wanting in Scriptural understanding! (5) The "a-mil" is then accused of "twisting" the Scriptures to make everything agree with his position. This charge, of course, is false. If I held the "pre-mil" position at the present, and had to identify myself with men like this "unknown" writer, I would question my own stance. The one who here makes the charge of "twisting" against someone else has done a little "twisting" himself, (6) The modernist Southern Baptist Seminary is charged with being a "hotbed of a- millennialism." Modernism and a-millennialism are labeled as "Siamese twins." How's that for lumping all your opponents into one basket! Call your opponent a "modernist." If that doesn't work, call him an "a-millennialist." And infer strongly that they are "one and the same." Now that should satisfy the brethren. That should prevent anyone from studying eschatology for himself. That should rid the air of heretics. The good author identifies the "meaning" of the word "A- millennialism." He says it is "Non-millennialism" Now that settles it for sure! These modernists don't even believe in a "millennium." In the first place, this charge is without foundation. All who hold to the "a-mil" stance on eschatology, BELIEVE IN A MILLENNIUM. They do not believe it is a "physical" reign which occurs after Jesus returns. They believe that the "reign of Christ, is NOW--from His ascension till His return. Then the author exudes more wisdom, and asserts that the "a-mills" wish the Bible had said nothing about the "binding of Satan," "the reign of Christ and the saints for one thousand years." In fact, the author declares that the "a-mil" would have been happy had the Book of Revelation had not been written. The book is said to be a "thorn in the side" of the A- millennialist. Anyone who makes such non-sensical statements as these hardly deserves an answer. No "a-mil" that I know hates the Book of Revelation. None of them shun the book, anymore than the "pre-mills" do. Then, for good measure, (Oust in case anyone missed his erudition) the author says: "Thus we have non-millennialists telling us about the millcranium. That is like having an atheist write on the attributes' of God." Is this author for real? Are the readers supposed to be some kind of "clones," who are supposed to parrot forth the same kind of unfounded charges? Again, if I were a pre-mil, I would want to distance myself as far as possible from these ridiculous charges.

Ninth, the charge is made that "a-mills" deny God's Word concerning Christ's throne. What this author means is that the "a-mil" disagrees with the "pre-mil." And since the author is "pre-mil," the "a-mil" position is wrong (whatever the point happens to be). Suffice it to be said at this point, that the "a-mil" believes that Christ is on His throne, that is, on David's throne, as Peter describes in Acts 2. As King, He will always have a throne.

Tenth, the "unknown" author charges that "A-millennialism believes about as much in the binding of Satan as Arminians believe in the sovereignty of God. God's Word pictures in Revelation 20 the complete restraint of Satan during the millennium, but a-millennialists say the restraint is only partial. In answer to this charge, let the Scriptures themselves speak: "And cast him (Satan) into the bottomless pit, and shut him up, and set a seal upon him, that he should not deceive the nations no more, till the thousand years be fulfilled." (Rev. 20:3). The Bible itself limits the extent of Satan's binding.

Eleventh, this good and pious author says of A-millennialists: "This is just a plain, outright, blatant denial of the Word of God. A -millennialists need to be stripped of their pious and hypocritical pretenses and made to stand with all other deniers of the Word of God." Yes, our brother is really getting worked up now. First, the a- mil does not deny what the Word has said, as just quoted in Rev. 20:3. Thus, the a-mil position is not a "plain, outright, blatant denial" of the Word of God. Those who throw these kinds of theological stones should be careful since they live in glass houses themselves! Second, the author wants to "strip" the a-mil of his pious and hypocritical pretenses. I realize that Jesus had the wisdom to label His opponents as "hypocrites" (Matt. 23). But I seriously doubt that this good "unknown" brother has the wisdom and insight

to do so. Third, the author says that all "a-mills" are to be categorized with all "deniers of the Word of God." As pointed out previously, no "a-mil" denies the Word of God; rather, he denies the interpretation which "pre-mil" advocates attach to the Word. And since I am not the final "judge," in these matters, I will leave the final say up to God.

Twelfth, the "a-mil" is said to deny God's Word about the kingdom of the Beast (Rev. 17: 10, 11). Who says so? This author? On this point few commentators are in complete agreement. It is my position that the term "beast" refers to a system that is anti-God, anti-Christ, and anti-truth. Systems are headed up by men, of course. Yet, if the "a-mil" dares oppose the position of the "pre-mil" on this point, he is labeled as a "denier" of the Word of God. Rubbish! This goes also for the charge that "a-mills" distinguish between the Beast and Man of Sin (2 Thes. 2:3-8).

Thirteenth, the "unknown" author of this highly-critical article, says, "A-millennialism rejects God's place for the second coming of Christ and then substitutes its own. This is typical of a-millennialism as a whole. It says that we have not the coming of Christ in Revelation 19, where that coming is plainly pictured to all except those who have blinded their eyes by becoming victims of the philosophy of vain deceit," and then places the second coming in the latter part of Revelation 20, where God makes no mention of it." This is a new one on me, I confess. Again, it is good when others take it upon themselves to tell you what you believe. Talk about setting up "straw men," and then knocking them down! There is no contradiction between the events in chapters 19 and 20 of Revelation. The "a-mil" does not, by any stretch of the imagination, reject God's place for the second coming. Christ comes at the end of this present age. Chapter 19 describes this coming; chapter 20:11 - 15 describes the judgment that follows. The author makes a final charge in this regard, by saying, "How pitiable it is when one a-millennialist says of Zechariah 14:4 'Some one's feet are to stand upon the mount of Olives; but it is not certain who the person is.'" This brother is better informed than I am, for I do not know of anyone who denies that Zech. 14:4 speaks of Christ. Oh! well, if you are on a roll, keep knocking the heads off the "a-mills." The brethren will like this deep reasoning.

Fourteenth, the "a-mil" is derided as denying the imminent coming of Christ. He mentions the statements, "I come quickly," "at hand," "draweth nigh," etc. This charge is often laid at the feet of those who reject "pre-millennialism." I, for one, do not deny the imminent coming of Christ. However, as we view time in a historical aspect, we now understand that certain things did have to occur, else they would not have occurred (Acts 15: 18). The amazing thing on this point is that those of the "pre-mil" persuasion believe that the Jews, for the most part, will be gathered back to Jerusalem and will rebuild the Temple before the Lord's return, and that the beast (antichrist) must be in power. The Scriptures teach that the Lord will destroy "the man of sin" with the brightness of His coming (2 Thes. 2:8). It is the "pre-mil" that denies the imminency of Christ's return, not those of the "a-mil" persuasion.

Fifteenth, the charge is made by the "unknown" brother that "A-millennialism flagrantly contradicts God's Word by teaching a general resurrection." The author says, "But the a-millennialists think they know more than the inspired writers did about this matter, so they put the mo (resurrections;) together. The Word of God is not final to a-millennialists. Their pet theory is final, so they presumptively rearrange God's Word to suit that." First, God's Word is clear that both the just and the unjust shall be raised (Acts 24:15). Jesus described these as "sheep" and "goats;" "wheat" and "chaff," etc. Some passages do describe the "righteous" and their resurrection (1 Thes. 4:15, 16), and other passages speak of the "unrighteous" standing to be judged (Psalm 1:3). Other Scriptures simply speak of a "resurrection" which includes all men--saved and unsaved alike. But pre-millennialists say that there are "two" separate

resurrections, separated by at least one thousand years, plus either three-and-one half years or seven years (however long the tribulation period happens to be). The "a-rail" position is simply stated: Christ comes once at the end of this age--not in two phases; hence, the judgment of all men follows His return. If this is "rearranging God's Word," it is strange that all reliable Baptist Confessions of Faith so stated (First London, Second London, Philadelphia, New Hampshire). Sixteenth, the brother (unknown to all but God) says, "A-millennialism accuses God of repenting." He cites Romans 11:2 as proof (should be Romans 11:29, JEH). He raises the charge again that an "a-millennialist" is an "Arminian" (or should be). His argument is that the "a-mil" denies the immutability of God. He charges that the "a-mil" denies God's promises to the nation Israel. This is foolish reasoning, of course, as the "a-rail" believes God's promises to Israel are fulfilled in the "spiritual seed" of Abraham, not the natural seed. This brother must be scraping the bottom of the barrel for arguments to insist that a-millennialists ought to be Arminians. Well, everyone to his own opinion. State some far-fetched idea like this, and someone will jump on the bandwagon.

Seventeenth, the good author says that the a-mills accuse Jesus and the prophets of lying. Now this is interesting logic. If one is at odds with someone, accuse that opponent of being against Jesus and the prophets. On this kind of reasoning, the "a-rail" could throw the same charge back in the face of this "unknown" writer. Mere semantics prove nothing. As one brother has noted of such reasoning, "We all cast about cursrags and throw mud. Generally, when we don't have any argument and want to rid ourselves of thinking."

The specific charge here against the "a-mills" is that they say that Jesus "will not re-establish the Jewish nation in earthly Jerusalem." Matthew 19:28 is quoted to prove, according the "pre-mil" view, that Jesus has yet to establish His throne. This reasoning, of course, disagrees with Peter's assessment in Acts 2. The nation was restored after the 70-year captivity in Babylon, under the leadership of Ezra and Nehemiah. Here are a few questions regarding the "physical" restoration of the Jews to their homeland before Christ's second coming: First, what will they be restored to? Second, will they have a restored priesthood? If so, who will be the high priest? What kind of sacrifices will they offer? Will they be placed back under the Mosaic Law? Will the Old Covenant be in force at that time? Third, will every Jew then living be saved? If so, what about the millions of Jews who died previous to this point?

The truth of the matter is given in the correct interpretation of Romans 1 I. God has not cast away His people whom He foreknew (vs. 2). This agrees with Romans 8:29. God has His elect in every kindred, tribe, tongue, and nation (Rev. 5:9). These constitute the people of God who were eternally foreknown, elected, predestinated, redeemed, called and justified. The Gospel of Jesus Christ is the great leveler, in that, it places all men (Jews and Gentiles) on the same footing. Hence, the only hope any "Jew" has relative to salvation and eternal life is the same hope any "Gentile" has--the Lord Jesus Christ.

But to give the charge a deeper bite, the "unknown" brother says, "Now let any a-millem~ialist expose his ignorance by saying that the 'regeneration' here is the triumph of Christianity over paganism in the first three cemuries or at any other time. The apostles have not yet sat on thrones judging the twelve tribes of Israel." In the first place, not all "a-mills" speak of this "regeneration" as the triumph of Christianity over paganism; what they do say is that this is a prophecy of the spread of the gospel through all nations, accomplishing what God has purposed. In the second place, Jesus is not predicting some future event some 2000 years away in which the apostles, in their fleshly bodies, would be ruling over the twelve tribes of Israel. The rule here is through the Lord's churches in this age, as the apostles were the first spiritual gift placed in the

churches (1 Cor. 12:28). In the third place, is accusing Jesus and the prophets of being liars. The "unknown" author then proceeds to describe this so-called "blissful state," to which Matt. 19:28 is supposed to refer (according to the dispensationalists). He says, "... we have described a state of affairs in Jerusalem that could exist only in earthly Jerusalem. It is a state that will involve death, sinners, building houses, planting, laboring, and prayer." Note here that the "pre-mil" insists that the Scriptures teach a restoration of physical, national Israel to Palestine. Note also that the "pre-mil" describes the millennium as a time which consists in death, sin, building, planting, working, and praying.

Now all of this flies in the face of what Paul declares in 1 Cor. 15:25,26: "For he must reign, till he hath put all enemies under his feet. The last enemy that shall be destroyed is death." The pre-mil denies that Christ is now reigning; the reign to the pre-mil is "after" He comes back to earth. The Scriptures here declare that He is now reigning, and that this reign will consummate with His return from Heaven, having defeated every enemy.

What the pre-mil believes about the millennium is stated clearly by this "unknown" writer: (1) Jesus and the saints will be here in glorified, resurrected bodies; all others will be here in their unglorified, fleshly bodies; (2) The glorified ones will not die, but those in the fleshly bodies will; (3) The glorified are free from all sin; those in the flesh are still under the bondage of sin; (4) The glorified will need to do no building, as they have a building of God; those in the fleshly bodies continue to work, labor, build houses, and plant; (5) The glorified will have no need of prayer, as they are in the Savior's presence; those in the fleshly bodies will still need to pray. If this is not a hodge-podge mixture of confusion, determined by mere speculation! But such is the pre-mil scheme concerning the millennial reign, as it makes the issues far more complex than do the Scriptures.

The writer of this "unknown" treatise closes his diatribe by these mushy words: "The reader is beginning to feel that I have no patience with a-millennialism or time for it. That is exactly right. I regard it as being wholly and absolutely false and as just another system of deception that has emerged from the bottomless pit to be used of the devil in blighting the lives of individuals and disturbing the peace of churches. I am truly sorry for those who have been duped by it. I urge them to repent and return to their first love." Signed: Unknown writer.

Pardon me a moment while I retch. If that is the best argument a pre-mil has against another position in eschatology, something is greatly wanting (such as a Christian spirit, charitableness, and truthful representation of the position of others).

First, note the unmitigated gall of this "unknown" brother (or sister) who feels that all his (or her) readers feel exactly as he (or she) does. He has no "patience" or "time" for the a-mil position.

Since he has purposely set up a "straw man" that resembles no one or no position correctly, he may have a right to be impatient (possibly with his own rantings).

Second, this person finds the a-mil position to be "... wholly and absolutely false and just another system of deception that has emerged from the bottomless pit to be used of the devil for blighting the lives of individuals and disturbing the peace of churches." As far as I am concerned, every man has as right to his own opinion. If this is the opinion of the "unknown" brother, so be it. But to put one's own position for truth exemplified is another matter. This brother writes as though

he has discovered orthodoxy, and that any deviation from him or his position is downward. It appears that there is one thing this brother did not discover in his excavations, and that is humility.i Personally, if I were of the pre-mil stance, I would want to run and hide from such statements as these. Does this brother claim omniscience, so that he can know without doubt that the a-mil position is from the bottomless pit, used of the Devil to blight lives and disturb peace among the churches. What we have here again is the "overstating" of a position to gain the sympathy of his readers. It is always easy in debating an issue to tell one's opponent that he is "of the devil." Jesus said this (John 8:44), but He was omniscient.

Third, the good, anyone has been they (the duped)

humble brother (unknown for humility's sake, I presume) is deeply sorry that "duped" by it (the a-mil position). He then, displaying omniscience, prays that will return to their first love (pre-millennialism).

Summary

Let me summarize this diatribe (hardly to be categorized as objective) with the following statements:

1. Such an article should never be printed in any paper, periodical, or elsewhere, if the author is truly unknown. I can pick trash out of my garbage can any time of the day, if that is all 'that is involved in editorial honesty.
2. Such an article is printed to inflame brethren against the careful study of eschatology. The idea is the following: the pre-mil position is right, is of God, is historically substantiated, and anything to the contrary is suspect and an outright lie.
3. Such an article is a misrepresentation of what a-millennialism teaches. The writer has inserted what "he thinks" the a-millennialist believes. Having erected a "straw-man," the author (whoever he is, God knows), proceeds to knock it down with pre-millennial rocks. The only trouble here is that those who live in glass houses should know better than to throw rocks, especially when most of them are "mud."
4. Such an article has attempted to link a-millennialism with Arminianism, modernism, falsification, and misrepresentation. Of course this brother is safe because he has hidden behind the "unknown" something. If this characterizes honest debating of an issue, then may God deliver me from such men (or women).
5. Such an article has accused the a-mills of purposely lying, deceiving, and duping their followers. Of course, according to brother "unknown," anyone with a varying position is suspect, and should not be listened to.
6. Such an article is designed to prevent anyone from studying the subject of eschatology with an open mind. Pre-millennialism is right, so everything else has got to be wrong--period This idea reminds me of my seminary days. Once a year a certain instructor would stand before the student body, and speak of the evils of "hardshellism." We were never told what "hard-shellism" was (except his own idea). If the subject of the millennium ever came up (and it seldom did, as the school was of the dispensational premillennial stance), the students were informed that there were three schools of eschatology--pre-millennialism, a-millennialism, and post- millennialism. The first is right, and the second two are wrong. Subject closed.
7. Such an article should be below the dignity of any editor or church to print. If the author is truly "unknown," as the article is signed, then the following things could be true:
 - a. The author could be a woman. If so, this violates a clear, Scriptural warning that the woman is not to teach a man.
 - b. The author could be a Catholic or Protestant. Who knows?
 - c. The author could be a

modernist, liberal, or even a reprobate. d. The author could have written this early in his life, and then later changed his mind, and become an a-millennialist (as did A.W. Pink). e. The author might be trying to hide himself, fearing that brethren would not listen if they knew who penned these words.

In any respect, such an article, appearing in a well-known Baptist Publication, needs to be answered, whether it is signed or not. Whoever wrote this article did not do so with an open mind, a kind heart, or a humble spirit.

**Jarrel E. Huffman
616 South 9th St.
Duncan, Oklahoma 73533**

Comment

Bro Huffman wrote this article while he was still alive, he is now with his Lord in heaven. If you would like a copy of the article that he is answering I will be glad to furnish you with a copy. I fully intended to put the article on this page, but the scanner did not do a good enough job, I will do that later if I can get it to work better. I feel to long A-mil or I prefer to call it gospel mil people have not been treated fairly in the papers that do not allow a response. I am not ashamed of what I believe to be the word of God. I hope whoever reads this will read it with an open heart and your Bible.

Pastor Jack Duplechain