REXEXT Page 10, par. 2, line 1 is the specification of error. It reads, "The different pieces of armor described in Ephesians are just other names for Christ. 'But put ye on the Lord Jesus Christ,' Romans **tex**xxx tells us. (Rom. 13:14)."

Opinion: The sentence in question gives a **BERENNEE** misleading impression in my judgment. Yet since every benefit which we have comes to us through Christ and is comprehended in Christ's finished work and the application thereof, I think that this sentence in this context is not a pernicious error. I think that it will cause no **BREXEEXX** real damage. I suggest, however, that the words "are just other names for" be crossed out and the words "come to us through" be inserted. This could **BASEX** easily be done either by hand or by a rubber stamp. **The line is in orrow** Whough the sentence ever, cd do not see Aufficiant putflication for a charge that any doctrine of Addantion That has been confused with a Mattime of **BASE**. Item 4: Specification H (sic): It is charged that page 23, par. 3, line 2 presents a "false view of assurance." Chap. XVIII, sec. 3, is noted as a reference.

Opinion: The line in question reads, "It is absolutely essential for the Christian warrier to have the assurance of salvation." Here the context of the next line should be noted, "If he does not, he cannot go to battle for the Lord to win souls to Christ nor can he meet Satan and have the victory."

In my judgment the booklet is correct and the charge must be dismissed. The context of the statement on page 23 unmistakably shows that the assurance of salvation is maxxxx the requisite for the Christian to win others to Christ and to have victory over Satan. I find the Confession of Faith, Chap. XVIII, sec. 3(the section cited as a "proof section" for the charges), to be in harmony with this.

Had the book, The Holy War, said that assurance was necessary for salvation itself, it would greatly err. But it does not say this. I would dismiss this charge.

Conclusion

I would dismiss charge: 2. Yet I recognize an element of truth underlying it; but the charge is too strong. I would dismiss charges: 39, 38,4A; 4B; 4D; 4E; and 4H (though charge 3A has an element of truth but I would sustain charges: 4C and 4G. These, however, can be remedied by the easily made inked in corrections which I have suggested.

(Note that the statement of charges omitted specification 4F.) I would dismiss charge: 1. This is a <u>causative factor</u> if the charge is <u>correct and</u> (I have discussed it above); yet since it is not an <u>causative</u> of an error <u>per se</u> it must be dismissed as a "charge." It calls for a policy decision from the Board, rather than an evaluation from myself as a charge of error within the book.

Further, I see no reason as far as I have examined the specifications above to retract the book if the suggested corrections are made. Let those, I suggest, who wish to use it do so. It will not lead **astry**x astray anyone in my judgment; but rather it will bless many.

I suggest that such hyper-theological scrutiny of this type of material as offered in the charges of error which I udged worthy of disnissal can only end up with no material being written unless pasters right write it. Even then, it must be recalled that Sunday evening programs need not be classes in dogmatics.