

CUSTER'S LAST STAND



by Dr. Peter S. Ruckman

OR: THE SCHOLARSHIP OF
THE SWORD OF THE LORD AND
BOB JONES UNIVERSITY!

CUSTER'S LAST STAND



by Dr. Peter S. Ruckman

**OR: THE SCHOLARSHIP OF
THE SWORD OF THE LORD AND
BOB JONES UNIVERSITY!**

CUSTER'S LAST STAND

Dr. Peter S. Ruckman

President, Pensacola Bible Institute

B.A., B.D., M.A., Th.M., Ph.D.

COPYRIGHT © 1981 by Peter S. Ruckman

All Rights Reserved

(PRINT) ISBN 1-58026-215-5

PUBLISHER'S NOTE

The Scripture quotations found herein are from the text of the Authorized *King James* Version of the Bible.
Any deviations therefrom are not intentional.

BB BOOKSTORE

P.O. Box 7135 Pensacola, FL 32534

www.kjv1611.org

[Other works available on Kindle](#)

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Introduction

1. Watching the Professional Liar at Work

2. In Defense of the Alexandrian Cult

3. Treeing the Coon

4. How to Avoid Every Issue You Are Supposed to Deal With

5. Donald Duck in the Bible Department

INTRODUCTION

The shocking pamphlet we are about to examine is what Bob Jones University and the *Sword of the Lord* call a “SCHOLARLY” work or a “SCHOLARLY” treatment of five issues that deal with FINAL AUTHORITY. There has been perhaps no more shameful and disgraceful nomenclature given in the annals of Christian education, at least not in the last 200 years. We have given a title to this analysis that is undoubtedly too serious and too accurate. In view of the disgraceful display of ignorance found in the pamphlet, a more appropriate title for it might be “*The Sword of the Lord and Road Runner*” or “*Donald Duck at Bob Jones University.*” Nevertheless, the *Sword of the Lord* (Jan. 1, 1982) and BJU have both given their unqualified approval to (and recommendation of) this shambles we are about to look at and have called it “SCHOLARLY.” BJU went so far as to say that it dealt in a scholarly manner with the ISSUES regarding the *King James* “controversy.” As we shall see, the writer of the pamphlet adroitly sidestepped EVERY ISSUE *as soon as he approached it.*

The *five issues* that we presented in 1970 that dealt with matters of Final Authority stated that:

1. The Mythological Septuagint (a COMPLETE OLD TESTAMENT in Greek) *had no existence on the face of this earth until the last Apostle had died.* We gave the manuscript evidence for every known reading found in the Septuagint before (or AFTER) the discovery of the impotent “Dead Sea Scrolls” and challenged any faculty member of any school in the world to find ONE GREEK MANUSCRIPT written before the birth of Christ that was quoted by ANY writer in the New Testament. After looking for twelve years, the faculty at BJU was unable to produce *one manuscript.* In the pamphlet by Stewart Custer, which we are about to examine, the only manuscripts he mentioned in connection with quotations were two that were written more than *200 years after the completion of the New Testament.* He spent twelve years banging his head against a stone wall.

2. The *ASV* and the *NASV* are basically Roman Catholic New Testaments (like the Jerusalem and “American” Bibles) from Constantine the Great, coming up from Africa via Eusebius and to America via Jesuit priests in Rheims, France. We have fifty verses to support this contention. After twelve years of study, the faculty at Bob Jones couldn’t even discuss ONE VERSE of the fifty listed in relation to Roman Catholic Bibles. While trying desperately to justify the depraved *NASV*, Custer didn’t even attempt to face THAT issue: Hills, Miller, Burgon, Scrivener, Hoskier, Fuller and Wilkerson *all faced it and dealt with it.*

3. Often the English text of 1611 is able to give advanced revelation on truth which the Greek scholars cannot find in *any Greek text.* After twelve years of study, the faculty and staff of Bob Jones (and the staff and editors of the *Sword of the Lord*) decided that they couldn’t answer ONE SAMPLE which we gave in 1970, and put in print in the very books that they are reading.

In Custer's pamphlet, he just pretended that the evidence had *not* been given. The evidence was given on pages 115-137 of a book that Custer cited more than half a dozen times while he was trying to duck the issues.

4. Alexandrian associations in general and Origenistic associations in particular tend to degeneration and apostasy, especially in connection with the so-called "Alexandrian family" of manuscripts (Vaticanus and Sinaiticus). After twelve years of study, no one at BJU was able to open their mouth about this issue. All Custer did was refuse to discuss *the readings* in the Alexandrian manuscripts; he suggested that because some highly respected men had been fooled by the phony theories of Hort (Robertson, Machen, etc.) that the manuscripts could be counted on as "reliable" and "orthodox" WITHOUT EXAMINING THEM. He subsequently ducked under the issue like it was a bullet aimed at his head and ignored over 3000 pages of documented evidence already in print by Hills, Mosheim, Ray, Neander, Fuller, Orchard, Armitage, Scrivener, Hoskier, Burgon, Waitte and Miller.

5. All members of the Alexandrian Cult and all of its leaders think exactly alike when it comes to *final authority* and freely confess that there is no such thing on this earth as a Book that is infallible and inerrant (and therefore can always be counted on in dealing with ANY issue to be correct, whether these matters be ones of FAITH or PRACTICE). Custer doesn't dare even mention it. After thirty-six pages he would admit that no one on this earth has a BOOK that is so perfect and so holy that it can CORRECT men like himself and the Alexandrian Cult to which he belongs. If you talked with him you would find that he freely admits that anyone as intelligent as he thinks he is (or the men that he thinks are that intelligent) may correct the HOLY Bible wherever and whenever they see fit.

In short, Stewart Custer's pitiful and disgraceful tract was written while turning tail and running from *all five issues* just as fast as his legs would carry him. But by far the most shameful and shocking thing about Stewart's work is not his *lying* (we would expect that) and his *stupidity* (we take that for granted, *but we will document it for the reader*); the most shocking thing was the performance of Robert Sumner (*Sword of the Lord*) and Bob Jones Jr., (BJU) in actually seriously recommending the work as a "scholarly treatment of the Issues."

They weren't even handled. Stewart found them too hot to handle.

Now, unlike Stewart Custer, we will give the reader exact documentation as to our criticisms of his tract. There will be no pious talk about "feeding spiritually on the word" and "God alone being able to judge" and "finding Christ, while leaving textual problems alone for the experts," etc. No, we assume that any honest Bible believer is more of an expert in "textual problems" (see *Problem Texts*, 1980) than any dishonest "expert" who is as stupid as Stewart Custer or the men who taught him.

That two amateurs like Sumner and Jones Jr., could think that such a pamphlet as we are about to examine is "scholarly" is the limit to which modern TV fantasy can be stretched. *Dayton Hobbs* (Santa Rosa Christian Schools), *Mrs. Norton* (Pensacola Christian Schools), *Fink* (Hyles Anderson), *Rodney Bell* (Virginia Beach) and others also recommend this pamphlet to their students. They do it knowing that the author is not only a joke as a "scholar" but that he is a *muckraking liar* and has been documented as a

LIBELER by a *Law Court Decree* (Judge Hubert Hall, 28th Circuit Court, Bay Minnette, Alabama, Feb. 27, 1962). We published this proof in the Bulletin where 26,000 readers could make photostatic copies of it.

Horton, Bell, Hyles, Custer, Jones, Sumner, Hutson, Hudson, Wallace, Hobbs, etc. *have all seen the evidence.*

They simply justify Custer's sins on the grounds of expediency.

The reader of this work can arrive at his own conclusions. Since the works by "Ruckman" are banned on the campuses of Santa Rosa, Pensacola, Tennessee Temple, Bob Jones University and other Alexandrian Cult centers, the reader will not be able to check the twelve lies documented in Custer's work unless he gets hold of the SOURCES which Custer quoted.

We here enter upon a brief, and we trust enlightening, critical review of the bamboozle of the century, a libelous piece of Disneyland scholarship called "THE TRUTH About the King James Version Controversy."

The author of that pamphlet has all of the qualifications to pose in this last church age as a Champion of Apostate Fundamentalism. The "scholarly requirements" for a King of the Cult in this age are as follows:

1. He must be *egotistical* (i.e. smart enough to correct the Book by which he was saved).
2. He must be *innately stupid*, while counting on "degrees" to prove his intelligence.
3. He must be extremely *dishonest* (check the documented evidence which follows).
4. He must appeal to the Adamic nature in saved apostates who want CHRISTIAN EDUCATION TO BE THE FINAL AUTHORITY IN ALL MATTERS OF FAITH AND PRACTICE.

Stewart Custer (BJU) fulfills all four requirements perfectly. It will be seen in what follows that he is fully qualified to represent the Alexandrian Cult in the last half of the twentieth century. One might say that no man on earth today is better qualified; we certainly could not find a greater liar among Fundamentalists or a more ignorant man in a Christian university that sported "earned degrees."

CHAPTER ONE

Watching the Professional Liar at Work

Here is a pamphlet with one of the most pious *professions* of “godly” Christianity that was ever placed on the front of a polemic. It is called “The Truth About the King James Version Controversy” and is published by the Bob Jones University Press. The *cover* on this tract shows a man’s hand in the act of *taking an oath in court* and swearing to tell “the truth, the whole truth, and NOTHING BUT THE TRUTH” (quite a profession!). The man’s hand is not on anyone’s “original autographs” or “plenary, verbally inspired originals.” IT IS ON A “HOLY BIBLE.”

With such a cover you are to believe that “THE TRUTH” is to be found in the pamphlet on the basis of the profession of the author (see p. 36). Further, you are led to believe (by pious implication) that if the author were ever hauled into court for libel that he would solemnly tell “the truth, the whole truth, and NOTHING BUT THE TRUTH.” (*After taking his oath on a Book that he declared was full of errors!*)

If Custer, or any other member of the Alexandrian Cult, took an oath on a King James Holy Bible it would mean nothing; the standards of their own profession of faith, which they teach and practise, state that the King James Holy Bible is not “THE WHOLE TRUTH” nor is it “NOTHING BUT THE TRUTH.” Hypocrites sometimes have a hard time appearing credible.

This pious work opens with a great big whopping lie. Stewart begins by saying that Mr. Ruckman has claimed to know “more than fundamental Bible scholars on any campus” and that Ruckman has claimed to have “absolute authority to teach and preach” (Custer, Introduction). As PROOF (*documented evidence* dealing with “facts” not “dreams”) for this opening statement Stewart cites p. 6 of *The Christian’s Handbook of Manuscript Evidence*, 1970.

Now, any saved or lost sinner in America can obtain a copy of this source reference at the Bible Baptist Bookstore here in Pensacola. He can read page 6. There is nothing on the entire page that matches either clause that Stewart began his pamphlet with. *There is no documented evidence given for one thing that Caster said; he lied about EVIDENCE before he had written one line and he knew he was lying when he wrote because he had the source reference open on his table when he wrote.* He simply concluded that people as stupid as Robert Sumner (*Sword of the Lord*), Bob Jones Jr. (BJU), Dayton Hobbs, Faulkner, Mrs. Horton, Afman, Price, Martin, Rodney Bell, etc. would not look up the reference TO SEE IF HE WAS LYING. He figured his POSITION would guarantee that no one would question his INTEGRITY (Prov. 14:15).

There is nothing in the very first line of Stewart’s tract that is related to ANY truth in his source reference material, let alone “the whole truth and nothing but the truth.” “Scholarship” doesn’t enter the matter anywhere. *Custer couldn’t read.*

Now, this is the most charitable way to look at it. Since there is nothing on page 6 of

the *Handbook* that proves *anything* Stewart said, we are left to speculation as to why he lied:

- a. He was just plain *stupid* and couldn't read English.
- b. He was just plain *crooked* and knew he was lying when he wrote it.
- c. He was *spiritually diseased* with "Ruckmanitis" and was so anxious to slander his opponent that he didn't look up ANYTHING.

Now take your pick. (We couldn't care less. I don't care which one of the three it was. A man as ignorant as Stewart is [see following documented evidence] is not worth analyzing.) With all of his talk about "facts" and "evidence" and with two incredible frauds like Sumner and Jones, III, talking about his "scholarly work" dealing with "the issues," one must face the first fact: *The opening statement in Custer's pamphlet is not a reference to anything that he gave as a reference.* With that for a starter, you are to believe that the rest of the references he is about to give (p. 1-34) are trustworthy!

Custer continues. He says that Ruckman claims that his "life work" is demonstrating that the "AV 1611 is the Word of God." For this remarkable falsehood Stewart cites page ii of the Preface to *The Christian's Handbook of Manuscript Evidence*.

No such statement is found anywhere on the page.

There is no statement about ANYONE'S "life work" on the page. There is no statement about ANYONE "demonstrating that the AV 1611 is the Word of God" on the page.

Stewart evidently is "crippled too high for crutches."

The *Sword of the Lord* and Bob Jones called that type of lying "SCHOLARLY!" As we shall see shortly, Stewart is one professional liar who is pathological as well as chronic; *he cannot quit lying*, for it seems to be his NATURE.

All anyone has to do (who thinks we have judged a little too harshly) is buy a copy of *Manuscript Evidence* (Pensacola Bible Press, 1970) and read page ii of the Preface. No "scholarship" is necessary to spot the liar. Stewart Custer simply lied about REFERENCES three times in a row in the opening five lines of his tract. That is "SCHOLARSHIP" at Bob Jones University and the *Sword of the Lord*. Real godly folks, don't you think?

Now, let us understand exactly what is going on here. No one is "calling names." We are identifying LIARS. Custer is not being called a *liar* because we believe in "name calling" and "downing everyone who doesn't agree with us, etc." No, we are identifying falsehood and the propagator of falsehood and have written and documented it. Both of Stewart's source references are false, yet they followed a cover-picture of a man in the act of *taking an oath to tell the TRUTH on a King James Bible!*

Could anything be more *preposterous*?

Imagine THAT being recommended in the *Sword of the Lord!*

Let us go a little further.

Custer now addresses himself to Fundamentalists and informs them that they "MUST

REMEMBER that the court of last resort in DOCTRINAL MATTERS is not any translation” (Introduction).

And what is the Biblical authority for such a didactic and dogmatic decree?

Nothing.

Stewart couldn't find *one Biblical authority* (not one verse in either Testament) for the fiat he laid down; he laid it down like he thought it was one of the essential Fundamentals of the Faith! Why, the teaching Stu gave is the standard creed of the Alexandrian Cult that they have used for 200 years, without ONE VERSE TO BACK IT UP IN EITHER TESTAMENT. It is pure pagan imagination abetted by traditional hogwash. Here is some egotistical upstart trying to split the local churches by making them think that no member in them can *be* a “Fundamentalist” unless he abides by the Cult Creed which *he* stated above; why, it is nothing but personal opinion, which he arrived at by reading opinions of people like HIMSELF.

Is “the wording of the original Greek and Hebrew texts” the “last resort” in doctrinal matters (Custer, Introduction)? Are any of you deluded souls smart enough to know what a “RESORT” in that sense means? Did you look it up in a dictionary? No man on this earth, saved or lost, could go to ANY “original Greek and Hebrew texts” as a “court of last resort” because they are not here. *Such a “court” doesn't even EXIST.* Custer knew it when he said it. He said it because the leaders of the Alexandrian Cult are going to USE that to prove that even though “we don't have the originals” we are “close to them”; therefore, we “Greek and Hebrew scholars” ARE THE FINAL AND LAST COURT OF RESORT IN DOCTRINE. Custer was just too yellow to carry you that far. We don't shrink from such issues; we face them head-on and deal with them (*in plain language!*).

Custer continues and complains that, “What Mr. Ruckman does not make clear is that there is not a single doctrine found in the *King James Version* that is not also found in the *New American Standard Bible*” (Custer, Introduction). (Observe the sly change of the God-honored text of the Protestant Reformation into a “*version*” and the exaltation of the Roman Catholic Dark Age translation into) “*BIBLE.*”)

Well now, who would “make THAT clear” but an unprincipled liar with no moral conscience? How could any honest man make THAT clear without *adding* that “there is not a single doctrine found in the *New American Standard Bible* that is not found in the *Jehovah's Witness Bible*, the *Living Bible*, *Today's English Version*, the *New English Bible*, the *RSV*, the *NRSV* and the Jesuit *Rheims Bible*”? After all, every apostate “Bible” on earth has the correct doctrines SOMEWHERE in it; why would this stupid child (professor of ancient languages!!) think that anyone should “make it clear that the *NASV*” is an exception when it is *not*? That would be lying again by telling a half truth. (They seem to have a proclivity for it, don't they? It is almost like they were on “automan.”)

Now this is what they call a “scholarly” facing of issues at Bob Jones University. To the *Sword of the Lord* this is FUNDAMENTALIST SCHOLARSHIP of the highest caliber.

As far back as 1960 we pointed out the obvious fact (obvious to anyone but a Greek scholar!) that if you found a ten dollar bill in a sewer, that would not entitle you to call the sewer a BANK (see *Monarch of the Books*, 1970). Of course you can find some orthodox

verses somewhere in any “Bible.” What does THAT mean? Why, there is no one on the Board at BJU or the *Sword* who knows! Somewhere during their education they must have lost their MINDS.

In reference to the grossly polluted Alexandrian Manuscripts, Stu says, “There is no fundamental doctrine that is at stake between these two families” (a reference to Syrian Receptus manuscripts) “of manuscripts” (Custer, Introduction).

Then why doesn't he recommend the *Living Bible* and the *New RSV* as reliable? THEY ARE FROM THE ALEXANDRIAN MANUSCRIPTS, exactly as the *ASV* and *NASV*. Not recommended because of the PROFESSION of the translators? Well, what has that got to do with the TEXT they *translated* and *published*?

What did Stu mean when he said, “There is no fundamental doctrine that *is at stake....*” Is there any scholar who would decipher that God-forsaken blank for us (“at stake”)? What do you mean “at stake”?

He didn't say. *They never do*. They cannot even DEFINE an issue clearly, let alone discuss it. What Stu *meant* was “if you can find a doctrine SOMEWHERE in the Alexandrian Manuscript it is all right if the same doctrine is *attacked* somewhere ELSE in the same manuscripts.” Stu was just too chicken to say what he meant. Members of the Alexandrian Cult have *that* problem also.

Custer (supposedly citing Mr. Ruckman): “Mr. Ruckman does admit that all the early manuscripts belong to the Alexandrian Family.” (!!) He further states that it is Ruckman who believes in “leaving the Syrian text standing like a cold cat in the snow” with nothing but late manuscripts to back it up. (Here Custer is supposedly citing page 89 of the *Handbook*.)

Lied again, didn't he? The old hypocrite!

Sumner and Bob Jones recommended his lying too, didn't they?

What junior high school student who had page 89 of the *Handbook* on his table would have believed THAT lie?

On page 89 of the *Handbook* the text says that it was the German apostate Griesbach (1745-1812) who gave the opinion cited above and the “cold cat” in the snow is the result of *believing what Griesbach said* about the “families” of manuscripts. We may assume that:

- a. Either Custer was too *stupid* to know who Griesbach was.
- b. Or Custer was so *sloppy in his scholarship* that he couldn't read a whole paragraph at one time.
- c. Or he was such a *dishonest liar* that morally he was not fit to write a tract on prayer.

No man, saved or lost, with ANY amount of education would have thought that “Ruckman admitted” anything that Custer *said* he admitted. All a man would have to do is read THE SOURCE CUSTER QUOTED. Fortunately for “Stu baby,” the SOURCE is *banned* on the campuses at Tennessee Temple, Pensacola Christian Schools, Santa Rosa Schools, Bob Jones and Hyles Anderson: this makes LYING easy. Where censorship is

exercised in favor of the LIAR, he “has it made.” This “Christian” censorship is to make people think that the Head of the Bible Department at Bob Jones has *personal integrity*. He has the personal integrity of an *alley cat*: he has lied FOUR TIMES on two pages, and he is only warming up.

Now, what is a real Bible-believing Christian to think about all of this? Or, better still, what crippling disease do you suppose could have infected Bob Jones Jr., and Bob Jones, III, and Robert Sumner (*The Sword of the Lord*) that they would subscribe to (and promote) such libelous trash?

What could this strange Laodicean disease be?

Here is the Head of a “Bible” (!!) Department at a major Christian university that brags about the “militant stands” it takes for the TRUTH (!) and they are recommending a character who has *lied* about his source references FOUR TIMES on two pages and then expects us to believe his source references for the next 33 pages. (Now there is an *optimist* if you ever saw one!)

At the end of his “Introduction,” this fraudulent faker concludes with the statement that “THE EVIDENCE demonstrates that Mr. Ruckman is not a reliable INTERPRETER”!

Isn’t that the limit?

Who is a “reliable interpreter”?

This poor irresponsible child, egged on by opportunists (who know that flattery will make him think he is a scholar), couldn’t be counted on for an *honest TWO pages of written material* even when he professed to be quoting “EVIDENCE,” and now he says “THE EVIDENCE demonstrates....”

The evidence demonstrates that Stewart Custer is a liar.

That is the scholarship of Bob Jones University in 1982.

CHAPTER TWO

In Defense of the Alexandrian Cult

Part II of Stewart Custer's tract has been called "THE CONSERVATIVE POSITION." We are to assume from this that Custer knows *what* the position is and that *he* takes it. (It is rather ludicrous when one thinks about it, for if the "Conservative Position" is anything like Custer's "Introduction," we might safely say that the "Conservative Position" in this age is that of an habitual *liar*. [See documented evidence just given, and be sure to check ALL source material.]

Page 5 is standard Cult material found in all Cult publications. It presents the typical Alexandrian Cult way of putting over standard lies by telling *partial truths* (Gen. 3:1-4). We have already commented on this practice a dozen times in *Problem Texts*, 1980, and in the forty articles on the Alexandrian Cult (1980-1981); but since this tract is now recommended literature at "Christian" schools, we should give it further attention.

Custer: "In about 90% of the manuscripts' readings all the manuscripts are agreed" (p. 5).

Partial truth (Gen. 3:5): Ninety percent of the *Textus Receptus* manuscripts agree. The Alexandrian manuscripts not only disagree with these but have very little agreement between *themselves*: in many cases less than fifty percent. (Not being as "scholarly" as Custer, we are going to LIST the differences and name the manuscripts and *cite the authorities* for them and quote them CORRECTLY. Our "unscholarly" ways should certainly be at least ten times better attested to than the ridiculous work of some jackleg who thinks he is intelligent because he has been puffed up by opportunists who wish to use him.)

Custer tells us that the comparisons of manuscripts led to "the discovery of four different types of texts" and that "all the manuscripts fall into four different patterns of readings" (p. 5).

Desperate lying of the worst sort. The family classification has proved to be a hoax (we will document).

Custer says that the two earliest (texts) are "the Alexandrian and Western texts....The Byzantine text originated in the middle of the fourth century" (p. 6).

Desperate, wicked falsification of fact of the very worst sort (we will document). Custer meant that GRIESBACH and those stupid enough to follow him (Hort, Tischendorf, Lachmann, Nestle, Aland, Metzger and Robertson) couldn't find what THEY called the *Byzantine* "family" before the fourth century. The Byzantine READINGS and TEXTS are all through the second and third centuries (we will document), but they are called "ALEXANDRIAN" on the lying assumption that the ALEXANDRIAN *had* to be earlier even when it read as the BYZANTINE (we will document).

Although Burgon, Scrivener, Miller and Hoskier were well able to see through this

little ploy, ignorant scholars like Robertson, Machen, Warfield and Custer don't have the intelligence to discern the difference between such English words as "READINGS," "TEXTS" and "FAMILIES." For example, notice that Custer used the word "pattern" ("four different PATTERNS," p. 5). This is the term that is used to avoid dealing with the ISSUE: *the issue is what the manuscripts SAY in their text.* But when could Custer ever face an issue?

Custer (p. 6): "The IMPORTANT THING to note is that each of these four types of texts is THEOLOGICALLY CONSERVATIVE."

Not according to Zane Hodges, Donald Waitte, Otis Fuller, Burgon, Miller, Scrivener, Edward Hills, Wilkerson, Pickering, or Hoskier. Custer just gave you his own personal, unscholarly opinion and expected you to think he was talking about FACTS. He dreams up his "facts." He expected you to accept that statement above without questioning it. We say he is a *deceived fool* and we will document *why* we say that.

Custer (p. 6): "Not one of these texts can be called heretical or apostate as Mr. Ruckman alleges."

Flim-flam. *According to two dozen Bible-believing Conservatives*, Custer is an uneducated fool. Any knowledgeable person who has investigated the hundreds of pages of documented evidence on the Alexandrian manuscripts (patterns, family, pattern of texts, "niceties," idiomatic expressions, wording, etc.) knows of the HERETICAL and HETERODOX nature of those manuscripts (*we will document*).

On pages 7 and 8 of this pamphlet is the joke of the age. Here this poor, miserable little liar (see pages i, ii) tried to prove that the *NASV* was "reliable" by comparing it with the *AV* and the *NWT* on SIX verses. If the reader will pick up the *Handbook of Manuscript Evidence* (1970) he will find that the *ASV* has been compared to *fifty verses*, including the *NWT*, and the fifty verses there (1970) are still good for the *NASV* (1982). Not one word about saying *that Elhanan killed Goliath instead of David* (*NASV*, 2 Sam. 21:19). Not one word about saying that *Satan* was a "crocodile" (*NASV*, Job 41). Not one word about the RSV readings in Job 19:26 and Romans 1. Not one word about the Roman Catholic readings in Matthew 1:25 and James 5:7. Not a peep about the attacks on the *Virgin Birth* in Luke 2:33 and Acts 4. Not a murmur or mention of attacks on the *Deity of Christ* in 1 Timothy 3:16 and Luke 23:42. Not a word.

Instead, we are given *six verses* to be compared with TWO translations (we cited twenty-three translations) and one of the verses on two Gods matches the Jehovah's Witness Bible nearly to the letter (only three words vary in John 1:18) for it is the Vatican (ALEXANDRIAN) manuscript that is being used to prove that there *are two Gods*: a begotten God and an unbegotten God. (We discussed this at length in 1970 in "*Satan's Masterpiece, the NASV.*") Custer's booklet doesn't even give the MANUSCRIPT EVIDENCE FOR THE HERETICAL READING.

This is what the *Sword of the Lord* calls a "scholarly" work.

The Arian reading in John 1:18, adopted by the Jehovah's Witnesses and the *NASV*, is from P66 (*Alexandrian*), Vaticanus (*Alexandrian*), Sinaiticus (*Alexandrian*), P75 (*Alexandrian*), and ORIGEN OF ALEXANDRIA, EGYPT. (See Nestle's critical apparatus, p. 231.)

Custer tells us that there is “overwhelming evidence” that the Alexandrian text (see above) was “widely attested and well known in the early second century” (p. 9).

Partial truth (Gen. 3:5): So was the Byzantine text if by “text” you mean THE WORDS FOUND IN THE MANUSCRIPTS. One must remember that in dealing with two-faced liars like the leaders of the Alexandrian Cult that “text” to them can mean “FAMILY PATTERNS OF READINGS.” They switch terminology to suit fantasy. (You may have noticed this already in Custer’s work.)

Custer now appeals to our positivistic humanism and informs us that the “vast majority of conservative scholars for the past century have agreed that the Alexandrian text is the closest to the wording of the original” (p. 9).

Partial truth (Gen. 20:2): 1. So have the vast majority of unsaved Liberals in the National Council of Churches as well as all *Jesuit scholars* in the Roman Catholic Church. 2. The scholars referred to above were not soul-winning pastors or evangelists. 3. Since not one scholar that Custer has in mind ever saw “the wording of the original,” we are dealing with conjectural subjectivism from start to finish. “Agreement” between a bunch of professing Christians in the Laodicean church (2 Tim. 4:1-6) often means *collusion to propagate falsehood*: as, for example, the recommendation of Custer’s work by Hyles Anderson, Midwestern, BIOLA, Santa Rosa Christian, Tennessee Temple, Falwell Schools and Pensacola Christian College. (Sometimes the “vast majority” of Conservative scholars [see Nicea, Trent, etc.] are the majority mentioned in Acts 4:6 and John 7:48.) The “vast majority of conservative scholars” were wrong in 7520 when Luther showed up; they were wrong in 2500 B. C. when Enoch showed up; they were wrong in 590 B.C. when Jeremiah showed up; they were wrong in 30 A.D. when Christ showed up; and they were wrong in 1881 when the *Revised Version* came out in England. Stewart is betting his money on the Cult and taking advantage of your ignorance. You are to believe that because a man is a Conservative or a Fundamentalist that he could not be a member of the Alexandrian Cult: it has some OUTSTANDING Conservatives in it (see documented evidence in *Problem Texts*, 1980).

Custer: “The earliest evidence for the Byzantine text is found in the following: W (IV-V century, Matthew and Luke), A (V century, Gospels), E (VIII century), etc.” (p. 9). He is a liar.

He is paid to lie. (We will not call him “names.” We will *identify him* shortly with documented evidence).

Custer: “It is also CLEAR that the Byzantine text is a DERIVED text” (p. 10). Proof?

Don’t be silly. That was Hort’s *theory* (1880). He called it a “derived” text by making CONFLATED READINGS: the theory was proved to be a joke by Dean Burgon as far back as 1890 (*we will document*) when Hort couldn’t defend one question put to him about the theory.

Custer: “It OBVIOUSLY incorporates into itself the earlier readings found in both the Alexandrian and Western text” (p. 10). Proof?

Are you kidding? When could a man like Stu Custer produce OBVIOUS proof for something that was OBVIOUS (see above)? Did you really think that such an unscholarly

hot air expert, who lied six times in a row, could back up such words as “IT IS CLEAR” and “OBVIOUSLY” with anything but a *blank space*? Stu is quoting the *conflate theory* of Westcott and Hort (we will document) given more than eighty years ago. Custer could only mention one sample of a “conflate reading” out of 31,000 plus verses in the New Testament (Luke 24:53). Hort only found eight and had to stick to the Gospels (so did Custer) to find them (*we will document*). Hort thought that EIGHT VERSES in four Gospels proved that the Receptus was a text “derived” from Western and Alexandrian Texts. (We produced FIFTY-ONE VERSES to show that Hort produced a Roman Catholic text for the ASV and NASV. [*The Christian’s Handbook of Manuscript Evidence*, 1970].)

Now, what is one to think of such “scholarship” if he is HONEST? And what is one to think of the dumbbells who think that such nonsense is *scholarly*? The theories above were called by Dean Burgon “excursions into CLOUDLAND” (see Appendix in *Problem Texts*, 1980). None of them held water. But further! You understand that this “derived-conflated” gas bag is being called “THE CONSERVATIVE POSITION” by the *Sword of the Lord* and Bob Jones University (Jan. 1, 1982, *Faith Magazine*, Dec. 1981).

You see, the title of the chapter where Hort’s deluded theory of conflation was given as “FACT” was called by Custer “THE CONSERVATIVE POSITION.”

This means that Edward Hills, Billy Sunday, Donald Waitte, General William Booth, Pickering, Wilkerson, David Otis Fuller, Bob Jones, Sr., Mordecai Ham, Alex Dunlap, Zane Hodges, J. Frank Norris, and Ian Paisley were *not* “CONSERVATIVES” but Westcott and Origen and Hort *were!*

Could anything be more fantastic?

Custer says that “Ruckman” refers to the Textus Receptus as though “it were the original” (Custer, p. 10, supposedly citing the *Handbook*, pp. 25, 30, etc.).

I have both pages open on the table in front of me.

“*Mr. Ruckman*” referred to nothing of the kind on either page.

HE LIED AGAIN.

That is *seven* lies on *ten* pages. Custer’s lying is just as deliberate and just as consistent as if he were a man who had been hired and paid a salary to LIE FOR A LIVING.

Where does this place THE *SWORD OF THE LORD* and BOB JONES UNIVERSITY?

Where does it place PENSACOLA “CHRISTIAN” COLLEGE and HYLES ANDERSON?

“Birds of a feather....???”

Like Origen, Augustine, Jerome and Hort, Custer is a saved LIAR.

The Laodicean church is filled with them, but few have the gall to put a cover on their writings with a man swearing to tell the TRUTH on a BOOK that HE DOESN’T BELIEVE IN! On pages 10-11, Custer lets us know in no uncertain terms what he thinks about the *AV’s* credibility in 1 John and Revelation. In his spiritual dementia Stu cries out,

“WHAT IS EVEN MORE DEVASTATING” (boy is this going to be important!!) “is the FACT that there is not a single manuscript of the BYZANTINE text that agrees completely with any one of these editions” (p. 10).

You are to think, with Robert Sumner and Bob Jones Jr., that THAT is scholarship.

What student at FBI with a high school education doesn't know that there is not ONE SINGLE MANUSCRIPT of ANY ALEXANDRIAN GREEK TEXT or WESTERN TEXT that completely agrees with ANY edition of ANY Greek text put out by ANYONE?

Who didn't know *that* but the faculty members at Bob Jones University?

Imagine calling such a commonly known thing a “DEVASTATING...FACT”!!

Why, the differences within the Alexandrian family of Greek manuscripts are more than the combined differences found in all four editions of the Receptus as printed by Beza, Erasmus, Stephanus and Elzevir (*we will document*).

In relation to the Book of Revelation, Custer tells us that Erasmus “created some words that are not in any Greek manuscript anywhere” (Custer, p. 11). Promptly he calls these words “SPURIOUS READINGS” (p. 11).

From *what* did Erasmus create them if they are not in Greek manuscripts?

Since when have they been proved to be *spurious*?

Since the “vast majority of scholars” have always believed that Christ and the Apostles quoted an Old Testament “LXX,” without ONE SHRED OF MANUSCRIPT EVIDENCE of any kind, why wouldn't Erasmus be just as accurate as they were in producing a text with NO GREEK MANUSCRIPT of any kind behind it? Since the “vast majority” of Conservative scholars between 1884 and 1940 were duped into believing that the Alexandrian text was “orthodox,” why would Greek manuscripts bother them? *Vaticanus doesn't even have ANY part of the Book of Revelation in it!* (We will document for the reader and show him how “spurious” these “created” words were, and we will list them since Stu doesn't have the scholarship or the ability to tell you what they were.)

After all of these bungling Alexandrian tautologies, without ONE piece of evidence to confirm a word of them, this inimitable liar says, “This involves the question not simply of principles, but also of FACTS” (p. 11)! Stu then accuses champions of the Receptus of often inventing or DREAMING “their facts” and then drawing their “inferences” (p. 12).

Seven lies on twelve pages: Four partial truths and three false theories given to you with the dogmatism of a Jesuit priest and this pious liar has the nerve to talk about “FACTS” and a Bible believer dreaming them up!

And the “*Sword of the Lord*” had the brass to call such a disgraceful performance “scholarly” (*Sword of the Lord*, Jan. 1, 1982)!

On goes this muddled amateur with this brilliant piece of logic. “To say, as Mr. Ruckman does, that the King James is inerrant is to say that God favors the English-speaking peoples of the world” (p. 13). (You wonder sometimes if any one “got out of the cuckoo's nest.” All the cuckoos seem to still be there.) In Stewart Custer's letter to Mr. Wood of Flint, Michigan, we learn that God was so vicious in His discrimination *that he*

gave an inerrant “Bible” to Stewart Custer written in a dead language that less than two percent of the world’s population understands. (We printed this evidence in the Bulletin.)

Is anyone to take such a liar seriously? Look at the “favoritism” that God showed to the Jewish people (1500-400 B.C.), according to Custer’s “logic.” He gave them an inerrant Bible (in the original autographs ONLY, according to the Alexandrian Cult), ignoring the fact that Hebrew was never a universal language BEFORE or AFTER it was written or spoken. God chose to give that inerrant Scripture to a people *who comprised less than two percent of the world’s population*. But who didn’t know all of this except the editors of the *Sword of the Lord* and the faculty members at Tennessee Temple, Hyles Anderson and Bob Jones University? Why, this “logic” was attempted back in 1974 by *John R. Rice* in his correspondence with *Herbert Evans* and was answered so soundly and thoroughly that Rice had to backtrack on everything he said and then had to cut off the correspondence (for a similar case, see *Foxx’s* correspondence with *Pastor Bobby Clark*, which we printed in the *Bulletin*).

But there is no stopping a chronic pathological liar once he gets to making an ass out of himself. Observe: “A few others, like Mr. Ruckman, argue that the ‘A.V. 1611’ is INSPIRED and ASSUME that the Greek text of Erasmus agrees with it” (p. 13).

Proof?

Don’t waste your time, kiddies. These half-baked upstarts just put out dogmatic fiats with the authority of a puffed-up toad full of buckshot, and they put them out without *one* source reference, without *one* verse of scripture and with nothing to back them up but their own CONCEITED OPINIONS. This time Custer didn’t even attempt to lie (see pages i and ii in his Introduction) in giving a false source reference. He just made the statement and expected you to *believe* it. I’ve never thought for five seconds that all of Erasmus’ Greek text matched the *AV* of 1611, or ANY other English translation. Custer knew that when he wrote: He just had to follow his “habit.” (Drug habits are hard to kick—almost as hard as lying habits). He had to lie because it is his NATURE. *Thirteen lies in less than seventeen pages.*

Now, the trite material on pages 13-15 about 1 John 5:7-8 was handled more than twenty years ago in the works of Dr. Edward Hills, who holds three earned degrees from Yale, Harvard and Columbia. We refer the believer to *Believing Bible Study* and *The King James Version Defended* by that author for the rebuttal of this standard Cult position on 1 John 5:7, 8. Custer was not intelligent enough to give a full discussion; *Hills does.*

And now it is time to show our readers the difference between a blatant liar shooting off his mouth about things he knows nothing about (see documented evidence by Judge Hubert Hall, 28th Judicial Court of Alabama, Feb. 27, 1962) and the *documented facts of history* backed up by written evidence, cited in their context *without perversion* or distortion. Basically this now becomes the difference between the “integrity” of the *Sword of the Lord*, Bob Jones, Tennessee Temple, Santa Rosa Schools, Pensacola Christian College, etc., and the factual findings of saved men who do NOT take Custer’s “CONSERVATIVE POSITION.”

CHAPTER THREE

Treeing the Coon

We mentioned Custer's qualification as a leader of the Alexandrian Cult and we mentioned *extreme dishonesty* as an essential qualification. We did not mention this through sarcasm or levity; to the contrary, we meant it in all seriousness. Now that the reader has seen Custer's "CONSERVATIVE POSITION" and has observed that it was the position of Westcott and Hort *back in 1880*, he is in a place to properly evaluate the "QUALIFICATIONS" which we gave, for it is a well-known fact that neither Westcott nor Hort, nor the "vast majority of the Conservative scholars" who believed in them, had any personal integrity when it came to LYING.

Observe: "The committee was instructed to undertake 'A Revision of the *Authorized Version*,' with a view to 'the removal of *plain and clear* errors,' and that the first RULE was 'To introduce as *few alterations* as possible into the text of the Authorized'" (Philip Mauro, cited by Fuller, *True or False*, p. 63). *They promptly made 36,000 alterations* (Ibid.). "No middle course presents itself, since assuredly to construct a NEW GREEK TEXT *formed no part of the Instructions* which the Revisionists received at the hands of the Convocation of the Southern Province" (John Burgon, cited by Fuller, p. 129). "A *limit* was prescribed to the amount of license...which however is now discovered to have BEEN ENTIRELY DISREGARDED BY THE REVISIONISTS" (Ibid., p. 130).

Would an honest scholar support such duplicity even if he were in the "vast majority of Conservative scholars"? Hoskier, Scrivener, Burgon, Miller, Pickering, Toy and Wilkerson didn't. One might say that since the vast majority of Conservative scholars were crooked in Christ's day (Matthew-John), that there were some who did NOT support them: Peter, James, John, Matthew, Paul, etc.

But this is only the tip of the iceberg. Liars like Hort and Custer (Conservative liars of course!) have *Jesuit propensities* you would not believe.

"I traced the mischief home to its true authors—Drs. Westcott and Hort; a copy of whose UNPUBLISHED TEXT OF THE NEW TESTAMENT (the most VICIOUS IN EXISTENCE) has been confidentially, and under PLEDGES OF THE STRICTEST SECRECY, placed in the hands of EVERY MEMBER OF THE REVISING BODY" (Burgon, *The Revision Revised*, p. xi and xii).

"The result was obvious. When the *minority*, headed by Dr. Scrivener, appealed to the chair, they found themselves confronted by a prejudiced ADVOCATE..." (Burgon, Ibid., p. 406). Under pledges of strictest *secrecy*, a copy of the wild performance (marked "CONFIDENTIAL") had been entrusted to every member of the Revision body (Ibid, p. xi). Burgon, who wrote these words, was not allowed to be on the committee because he was "well entitled to rank as an EXPERT, for he was familiar with all varieties of READINGS, and had probably handled and collated very many more MSS's than either Westcott or Hort" (Salmon, *Some Criticism of the Text of the New Testament*, p. 23).

That is, the scholarly expert was kicked OUT because of *the fear of the UNSCHOLARLY amateurs* who couldn't face the issues he might bring up.

“The foregoing extracts are CONCLUSIVE EVIDENCE that ten or eleven of the Company were fully determined to go in for the principle of ‘thorough,’ and to turn out as exact and literal a reproduction of *their adopted Greek text as possible*” (Hemphill, *A History of the Revised Version of the New Testament*, 1906, p. 32).

What did the *Roman Catholic Church* and Catholics think of this replacement of the Receptus Greek Testament with the Greek Text smuggled secretly into the *RV* committee of 1884? “Catholics were quick to see that the Revised New Testament favored THE CATHOLIC VERSION, but seemingly few American Protestant scholars”—AH, THERE ARE THOSE “VAST MAJORITY OF CONSERVATIVE SCHOLARS” THAT CUSTER MENTIONED!!!—”perceived that MANY of the revised readings of the Revised New Testament were simply IMPORTATIONS FROM THE CATHOLIC VERSION” (George Coy, *The Inside Story*, 1973, p. 225).

The CONSERVATIVE POSITION of Custer and the “vast majority” was immediately recommended by a *Catholic bishop* (Tobias Muller, see *The Canon of the Old Testament*, p. 366, cited by Wilkerson, *Our Authorized Bible Vindicated*, p. 227); it was recommended by a *Catholic cardinal* (Wiseman, *Essays*, Vol. i., p. 104); it was recommended by *Catholic magazines* (*Dublin Review*, July 1881); and it was recommended by *Catholic PRIESTS* (Warfield, *Collection of Opinions*, Vol. 2, p. 21, cited by Wilkinson).

Stewart Custer, like Hort, was a liar.

Hort and Westcott went into a committee after agreeing to resolutions that stated that only a few changes were to be made (*they broke the contract*) and that no one intended for them to REPLACE any Greek Testament or Greek edition of the Receptus with a Roman Catholic edition (*they broke the contract*). They produced a nineteenth century *ASV* and *NASV*. They produced the ROMAN CATHOLIC BIBLE recommended in the *Sword of the Lord* and at Bob Jones University, for BOTH of these organizations called Custer's treatment of the KING JAMES CONTROVERSY a “TRUTHFUL” and “SCHOLARLY” work.

These “Conservatives” (1881-1884) pretended they were publishing a Protestant text: they published a *Roman Catholic* text. They pretended they were going to make as few changes as possible; they made changes that were not even necessary. (See *The Revision Revised* [pp. 41-100, 126-183, 399-413] for exact documented evidence on chapter and verse, and observe how the scholarship of Burgon is unlike the “scholarship” of Bob Jones University. Observe that Burgon refers the reader to BOTH Greek texts [Alexandrian and Syrian] and BOTH English versions, citing book, chapter and verse for his comments.)

They pretended to be restoring “the original text” and all they were doing was *reinserting the readings of the Jesuit Rheims' Bible of France* (1582) and taking advantage of the gross ignorance of “THE VAST MAJORITY OF CONSERVATIVE SCHOLARS.” The same may be said for Stewart Custer and all of his “colleagues.”

You have to be *extremely* DISHONEST to be a leader in the Alexandrian Cult.

THE FAMILY CLASSIFICATION HOAX

“We have reconstructed text types and families and sub-families” (the “we” is a reference to the vast majority of Conservative scholars) “but when we have found that a PARTICULAR manuscript would not fit into any of our nicely constructed schemes, we have thrown up our hands and said that it contained a MIXED TEXT” (M. M. Parvis, *The Nature and Task of New Testament Textual Criticism*, 1952, *Journal of Religion*, XXXII). “The major MISTAKE is made in the thinking of the OLD TEXT TYPES as frozen blocks even after ADMITTING that no one manuscript is a perfect witness TO ANY TEXT TYPE...all witnesses are MIXED in ancestry” (A. Wikgren, *Chicago Studies in the Greek Lect. of the New Testament*, cited by Birdsall and R.W. Thomason in *Biblical and Patristic Studies in Memory of R. P. Casey*, 1963, pp. 96-121). “It is still customary to divide manuscripts into the four well known families...this classical division CAN NO LONGER BE MAINTAINED” (Klijn, *A Survey into the Researches into the Western Text of the Gospels*, 1949, p. 64). “Rather than lining up in ‘clear streams’ or ‘text types’ (as objectively defined entities) the EARLIEST MANUSCRIPTS are dotted helter-skelter over a WIDE SPECTRUM OF VARIATION” (Wilbur Pickering, *Identity of the New Testament Text*, 1977, p. 57).

This material is the material that is not sold or handled by the bookstore on the campus of Bob Jones University. This is the kind of material that Custer warns young men and women to leave alone (see Custer, p. 16) in the hopes that none of them will find out what he and Hort and the “vast majority, etc.” are up to. *They are up to Matthew 13:33*.

Observe from the above that Custer was living 100 years behind the times in matters of scholarly research. He wasn’t qualified to comment about “families” and “patterns” of readings because he had not done any studying.

He took his intelligence for granted and his supporters encouraged his opinion of himself as a scholar; it was mutual fraud. He didn’t have *intelligence* OR *scholarship*. His purpose was to protect his readers from LIGHT and TRUTH and to reduce them to his own level of incompetency. To do this he had to reject 200 pages of documented evidence by Dean Burgon, dealing with Greek readings (and many times all of the Patristic and Lectionary evidence), in order to force the reader back 100 YEARS INTO THE CANTERBURY CONCLAVE THAT PRODUCED A JESUIT NEW TESTAMENT, backed by the “vast majority of etc.”

There was no question of *evidence* (see Custer, pp. 6-11). He didn’t *give any evidence* to prove the validity of a “family classification.” He adopted Griesbach’s classification. It was Griesbach who published Vaticanus as the “*Emphatic Diaglott.*” That is the text of the Jehovah’s Witnesses *New World Translation*, as anyone knows.

TEXTUAL READINGS VERSUS “TEXT TYPES”

“Bodmer II shows some ‘Syrian’ readings to be ANTERIOR to corresponding ‘Neutral’ readings around 200 A.D.” (Pickering, *Ibid.*, p. 60). “P66 is also a witness to the EARLY EXISTENCE of many of the readings found in Alpha text type” (Colwell, *The Origin of Text Types*, p. 130-131). “Origen knows of the existence of variant readings which represent *each of the main families of manuscripts* that modern scholars” (Custer?)

“have ISOLATED” (Metzger, cited by Birdsall and Thomason, *Ibid.*, p. 94). “Origen sided with THE TRADITIONAL TEXT’ (this is 200 A.D.!!) “460 times while siding with the ‘Neologian’ text 491 times” (Miller, from Burgon’s *The Traditional Text*, p. 99). (The “Neologian text,” as Miller used the term, includes both “neutral” and “Western” readings.) (See Custer’s misinformation on this on p. 10 of his pamphlet.)

Now do you understand why we said Custer’s statement about the Alexandrian text being “known in the second century” was PARTIAL (Gen. 3:5) TRUTH? *Origen was looking at your King James’ readings in the Greek at the end of the FIRST CENTURY.* When faced with this devastating rebuttal of his phony “scholarship,” how does Stu baby handle it? (He couldn’t justify anything he had said about such matters on pages 9 or 10 with evidence; now that the conflicting evidence appears, what is his reaction?) Why, his reaction is the reaction of a baby crawfish trying to get out of trouble. Look at page 16 of this frightened brat’s work on “The Conservative Position.” Watch him duck out under the back flap with pious talk!!

“It is our *faith*...read his Bible with the *faith*...the *humility* (!) of recognizing that he may not be able to solve every TEXTUAL PROBLEM that may exist...*leave such problems to the discussions of theological and textual ‘EXPERTS’!*”

Come, come, sonny boy! You have sold yourself to Pensacola Christian College, Hyles Anderson, Tennessee Temple, Bob Jones University and *the Sword of the Lord* (see Jan. 1st issue, 1982) as a SCHOLARLY EXPERT.

Are you going to back out now?

Who are these “textual experts” to whom you refer? We just cited *five* of them and none of them agreed with your “conservative position.” Is anyone stupid enough to believe that either Warfield or Machen were “textual experts”? *They couldn’t critique ONE BOOK written by Dean Burgon.*

You are going to tell Bible believers to just “leave such problems” to others? *Which others?* The ones who recommend YOU?

Well bless my soul, child, *we won’t*. You won’t fool us with that pious, holy, sanctified flim-flam that the Pharisees used while engaged in MURDER (Luke 20:21, John 3:2, Matt. 22:16). We know a liar when we see him.

THE SO-CALLED “LATE” READINGS OF THE BYZANTINE RECEPTUS

“The results of this examination are stated by him (Miller) as follows. Taking the Greek and Latin (not the Syriac) fathers who died BEFORE A.D. 400 their quotations are found to support the TRADITIONAL TEXT in 2,630 instances. The ‘neologian’ in 1753...if only the EARLIEST writers are taken, from Clement of Rome to Ireneaus and Hippolytus, the majority in FAVOR OF THE TRADITIONAL TEXT is proportionately even greater: 151-84” (Kenyon, *Handbook*, p. 321). “Now it is clear”— (clear to everyone but BJU and the *Sword of the Lord!*)— “that if these figures are trustworthy there would be an END TO HORPS THEORY, for its premises would be shown to be THOROUGHLY

Y UNSOUND” (Ibid.). “Miller’s figures represent *precisely* what he *claimed* that they represent—the true state of the case’ is that the TRADITIONAL TEXT (‘BYZANTINE’) receives more support from the EARLY Church Fathers than does the critical text (essentially W-H) used by the English Revisers” (Pickering, Ibid., p. 70).

Then on what grounds did Stu reject Miller’s collated evidence?

Was he too *lazy* or too *stupid* (or too *crooked*) not to check them out with Burgon and see if Miller was lying? We’ll check Stu out to see if *he* is lying!!

“Hills claims that the Beatty papyri vindicate 26 Byzantine readings in the Gospels, 8 in Acts and 31 in Paul’s Epistles” (Hills, Introduction to Burgon’s work on the *Revision Revised*, p. 50). “More than 150 ‘DISTINCTIVELY BYZANTINE’ READINGS that have early (before 300 A.D.) papyrus support...170 ‘Byzantine-Western’ readings with early papyrus support...extrapolating from the behaviour of those in hand, if we had at least 3 papyri covering all parts of the New Testament, *almost all the 5,000+ Byzantine readings REJECTED BY THE CRITICAL (eclectic) texts*” (*ASV, RSV, NASV, NRSV*) “WOULD BE VINDICATED BY AN EARLY PAPYRUS” (Wilkerson, Ibid., p. 77, citing H. A. Sturz, *The Byzantine Text Type and New Testament Textual Criticism*, 1972, pp. 108-126, pp. 149-164).

Did Custer know he was lying (p. 9) when he lied or was he just too stupid to know what he was talking about? When he tried to hoodwink you (as Hort and Jesuits) into thinking that the King James Greek Text (Receptus manuscripts) only had “late readings” (fourth century or later, see Custer p. 9), was it due to his lack of PERSONAL MORAL INTEGRITY as a *deceiver* or was it due to his SLOPPY AND SLOVENLY SCHOLARSHIP as a FAKER?

Either way, *both qualifications* are needed to lead the Alexandrian Cult, as we have said (see above).

Custer, Sumner and Bob Jones Jr., evidently have a spiritual dementia which we call “RUCKMANITIS.” It prevents them from *finding* the truth, *documenting* the truth, *expounding* the truth, *discussing* the truth or *propagating* the truth, at least where it would affect their SALES, circulation or enrollment.

THE HERETICAL AND HETERODOX NATURE OF THE SO-CALLED “FAMILY” OF ALEXANDRIAN MANUSCRIPTS

To justify the depraved Catholic text of the *NASV* (along with the *RSV* and *NRSV* and *Living Bible*), Custer has listed some of the witnesses to the Alexandrian text. When he listed them he, however, purposely omitted the two OUTSTANDING REPRESENTATIVES of that text, which were used by the *NASV* translators (and the *RSV* and *NRSV* translators) to correct the Traditional Text in over 3,000 places in the New Testament. These two omissions were Vaticanus (B) and Sinaiticus (Aleph). For some peculiar reason known only to a coward, Custer was afraid to mention VATICANUS and SINAITICUS until page 19 of his work. Here he has our *Lord (in 30 A. D.!)* quoting the

“exact wording” of two manuscripts *that were not written until 200 years after our Lord had gone back to Glory*. (This was Custer’s “proof,” “documented evidence,” “demonstrated FACT,” etc., that the Old Testament was in Greek for Christ to use as a *Septuagint!!*)

Now we may ask ourselves how are these colossal dumbbells (Hort, Custer, Sumner, Jones and the “vast majority of...etc.) able to circumnavigate the following witnesses and documented evidence?

“The *impurity* of the Texts exhibited by Codices B and Aleph is not a matter of *opinion*, but a matter of FACT’ (Burgon, *The Revision Revised*, p. 315). “These are two of the least trustworthy documents in existence...by far the FOULEST TEXT that had ever seen the light” (Ibid., p. 316). “We venture to assure him, without a particle of hesitation, that ALEPH B D are three of the most SCANDALOUSLY COPIES extant:—exhibit the most SHAMEFULLY MUTILATED texts which are anywhere to be met with...the depositories of the largest amount of fabricated readings, ancient blunders, and INTENTIONAL PERVERSIONS OF TRUTH,—which are discoverable in ANY KNOWN COPIES of the WORD OF GOD” (Ibid., p. 16).

That is, Custer believes they are “orthodox” and represent what he and Bob Jones Jr., call “THE CONSERVATIVE POSITION.”

The *Sword of the Lord* calls that kind of nomenclature “scholarly.”

Like your Aunt Sally’s patchwork quilt.

What is the *manuscript evidence* for Burgon’s opinion about the Alexandrian manuscripts? Anyone could look them up for they are all documented and attested to by Burgon’s opponents as well as his friends. The opinions of Burgon on “the Alexandrian Family”—which run completely contrary to the CONSERVATIVE POSITION of Bob Jones, Tennessee Temple, Hyles Anderson and Wheaton—are based on the fact that the Alexandrian forgeries exhibit:

1. The piercing of the Saviour’s side, stuck into Matthew 27:49.
2. The eclipse of the sun when the moon was full (Luke 23:45).
3. A monstrous error regarding Herod’s daughter (Mark 6:22).
4. The substitution of “wine” for “vinegar” in Matthew 27:34.
5. The creation of a begotten God (John 1:18).
6. The geographical blunders of Mark 7:31 and Luke 4:44.
7. The impossible reading of 1 Corinthians 13:3 which we commented on in 1970 in our *Handbook*.
8. Attacks on Christ’s sinlessness (Matthew 5:22).
9. A direct lie in quoting Isaiah (Mark 1:2).
10. Attacks on Christ’s Deity (Luke 2:3 and 1 Timothy 3:16).
11. The omissions in Luke 22:43, 44 of Christ’s agony in Gethsemane.

12. The omission of part of Mark 16 which is testified to by the Old Latin, the Old Syriac, three families of Greek Uncial manuscripts, the Church Fathers from the second to the sixth centuries, and over 90 percent of the Cursive manuscripts.

In their madness to attack Christ's Deity, the Alexandrians removed a crossbar from the *Theta* in Theos (1 Tim. 3:16), although the crossbar was seen in the Greek manuscript in question by Patrick Young (1650), Ussher (1653), Hish (1655), Bishop Pearson (1650), Bishop Fell (1675), Bishop Mill (1677) and Bentley (1716) and after being testified to by *252 out of 254 copies of Paul's Epistle*.

This is not what "Ruckman alleges" at all (Custer, p. 6). It is the MANUSCRIPT EVIDENCE SHOWING THE GREEK READINGS for what Custer says is the orthodox character of manuscripts he adopted for "THE CONSERVATIVE POSITION."

Custer is a deceived fool who cannot read Greek or English if he is *serious* in such a presentation of Westcott and Hort's theories.

The Alexandrian text is "theologically CONSERVATIVE" is it (Custer, p. 6)?

Let's just see if it is.

"Heretical readings in Codex Aleph...Mark 1:1...John 1:34..John 3:13..John 6:69..John 9:35..John 9:38-39" (Hills, *Believing Bible Study*, p. 76). "Gnostic Readings in Papyrus Bodmer III...John 5:33...John 18:37...John 8:34...John 16:8...John 16:10" (Ibid., p. 77-78). "In Papyrus 66 also we find instances of this tendency of the Alexandrian scribes continually to tamper with the New Testament text....There are serious errors also in Papyrus 66. For example, in John 19:5....In John 21:6, however, Papyrus 66 adds the following words to the text: *and they said, we have toiled the whole night through and have taken nothing, but in Thy name we will cast (the nets)*....Papyrus 75" (see Custer, p. 9 "also has its share of false readings...(Luke 16:19)...John 8:57...John 10:7...John 1 1:12..." (Hills, Ibid., p. 48-49).

This is some "BIBLE DEPARTMENT" they have at Bob Jones, isn't it?

Do you suppose that the poor, benighted, ignorant professors there are not even aware of the things listed above? What kind of a "BIBLE DEPARTMENT" is it in any school that doesn't know that the outstanding marks of the Alexandrian "family" of manuscripts is their persistent attacks on the Deity of Christ? Who doesn't know *that* except Robert Sumner, Dayton Hobbs, A.T. Robertson, Cliff Robinson, John Broadus, J. Gresham Machen, Stewart Custer and the "vast majority of educated MEGALOMANIACS" who mistook earned *degrees* for *intelligence*?

Now, along about here we should ask ourselves this question. In 16 pages (the pamphlet is only 36 pages long) *what "ISSUE" has Custer dealt with?* If he had even attempted to DISCUSS an issue how could anyone but a blind fool think that he dealt with it in a "scholarly" fashion? *There is no scholarship in the pamphlet.* There are Alexandrian cliches from the nineteenth century, pointless statements made with no documentation, groundless assertions with the wrong cross references given, and the fatuitous theories of two of the most misguided apostates who ever lived. The fact that they *professed* to believe (Custer, p. 27) what all popes profess to believe is supposed to prove something. What does it prove?

**THE NINETY PERCENT AGREEMENT
BETWEEN “ALL MANUSCRIPTS”
(Custer, p. 5)**

The Textus Receptus is virtually identical to the Traditional text found in the majority of Greek New Testament manuscripts (Hills, *Ibid.*, p. 196). Lake found that “the most popular text in the manuscripts of the tenth to the fourteenth century” (Lake, *Harvard Theological Review*, Vol. 21, 1928, p. 340) “differed from the Textus Receptus only four times” (Hills, *Ibid.*, p. 196). It is highly instructive to notice that Custer’s Alexandrian manuscripts (“for the vast majority of Conservative clowns”) “in this same chapter Aleph, B, and D differ from the Textus Receptus 69, 71 and 95 times respectively,” and yet in that same chapter the Alexandrian manuscripts (only two of them!), compared with over 100 Receptus manuscripts, differ 34 *times among themselves* IN ONE CHAPTER (Hills, *Ibid.*, p. 196). This was the ninety percent agreement of all manuscripts, was it, Stu baby (Custer, p. 5)?

“The five Old Uncials (XABCD),” (four of them classified as *Alexandrian* by Custer) “falsify the Lord’s Prayer as given by St. Luke in no less than forty-five words. But so little do they agree among THEMSELVES,” (see Custer, p. 5!!) “that they throw themselves into *six different combinations*...in the course of those 12 verses...there will be found to be *60 variations of readings*...What would be thought IN A COURT OF LAW,” (see Custer’s cover picture!!) “of five witnesses,” (four *Alexandrian*) “called up 47 times for examination, who should be observed to bear contradictory testimony EVERY TIME?” (Burgon, *The Traditional Text*, p. 84, *The Revision Revised*, p. 30-31).

Why, that’s easy. Custer and Bob Jones Jr., would put their hands on a *King James Bible* (see cover on Custer’s tract) and swear by God that they believed them because they were 90% IN AGREEMENT (Custer, p. 5). There are more disagreements *within the Alexandrian family of manuscripts* in four Gospels than there are in *all* the published editions of twenty-seven Receptus New Testament books as found in Beza, Colinaeus, Erasmus, Elzevir and Stephanas (Hoskier, cited by Pickering, *Ibid.*, p. 120).

Now who didn’t know THAT but the Bible Department at BJU? Custer: “...There is not a single manuscript of the Byzantine text that *agrees completely* with any one of these editions” (Custer, p. 10). Why, sonny boy, there is not one single manuscript in the Alexandrian family that even agrees with any one of twenty Alexandrian manuscripts *in the same family!*

How dumb can a “scholar” get?

**THOSE “SPURIOUS WORDS”
OF ERASMUS (Custer, p. 11)**

The Greek text in this passage contains 135 words, of which Nestle (and Aland and

Metzger) omits 17 words, adds 5 and alters 13, making a total of 35 words affected. Of these 35 words, 26 make no perceptible difference in an English translation, and most of the remaining 9 are of very small significance. *The nine words* (which Custer didn't list because he didn't know what he was talking about) are "them" (vs. 18), "paper" (vs. 19), "tree" (vs. 19), "and" (vs. 19), "even so" (vs. 20), "our" (vs. 20), "Christ" (vs. 21), "you" (vs. 21), and "amen" (vs. 9). (Trinitarian Bible Society, Oct.-Dec., 1964, Vol. 449, p. 14, 15). But this doesn't end matters at all. On each one of those words Erasmus now has been supported by recent editors and translators. The Trinitarian Bible Society wisely noticed that if "Erasmus had consulted certain copies of the Fifth Century Armenian Version he would now read quite **WRONGLY** 'the root and offspring of Adam'" (vs. 16). That is, the **OLDER** manuscript this time was **NOT** the best! Again, if Erasmus had been able to read Sinaiticus, it would not only have confirmed his final "amen" (see above), but it would have "misguided" him in verse 19. // is too often **ASSUMED** (see Custer's exact assumption, p. 12) that when consulting ancient manuscripts of the Bible, the nearer we approach to the date of the original writing (see Custer's exact error, p. 9) the nearer we get to the purest obtainable text. This is **VERY FAR** from being the case (except at Bob Jones University!) as some of the oldest surviving copies contain some of the least defensible variations from the true text...a good **LATE** copy is to be preferred over a *bad early copy*...even when all the manuscripts, versions and "fathers" have been assembled and consulted and the most penetrating textual criticism of the last hundred years has been directed to this passage (as Custer did when he called the words in it "spurious"), the correctness of a very large proportion of the text of Erasmus is **CONFIRMED**, and in the case of the few exceptions it cannot be shown with **CERTAINTY** (even though some dumb nut like Custer believes that it can!) that the modern **CRITICS** (Custer and the "vast majority of, etc.") are **RIGHT** and Erasmus was **WRONG** (Ibid., p. 16). Now what kind of a scholar do you suppose the *Sword of the Lord* is recommending who failed to check on the material given above, when any student at FBI has a copy of it? We are left with the distinct impression that if Stu reads "a book a day" (see Madison Ave. gimmick on the backside of Custer's pamphlet), they must be some books by Tolkien or Earl Stanley Gardner; they certainly couldn't have been anything that a *scholar* worked on.

THE EARLIEST EVIDENCE FOR THE BYZANTINE READINGS

The **EARLIEST** evidence for the Byzantine text is certainly **NOT** found in the fourth-fifth centuries (Custer, p. 9).

Custer is a liar. *That is what he is paid to do.*

Evidence for the Byzantine text being known at the end of the first century was given under Textual Readings Versus "Text Types," which see, and was documented by Metzger, Klijn, Burgon, Colwell, Pickering, Miller, Zuntz and Birdsall. The documented evidence for this is also found in Pickering's work (*The Identity of the New Testament Text*) to the tune of 23 pages (pp. 62-85) and this work was published *two years* before Custer's "last stand." We assume that either he didn't have enough intelligence to read it or else he thought he was so smart that he could ignore the documented evidence found in it and

simply recite Hort's ridiculous Byzantine theories over again (p. 6). The readings in your *King James Bible* are also found in *Tatian's Diatessaron* (170) according to the text printed and published by Eerdmans Publishing Company, Grand Rapids, Michigan, *The Ante-Nicene Fathers*, and are found in many places in P45, P75, P66 and others. For example, check the critical apparatus in Nestle's for 1 Corinthians 9:21; 10:2; 10:4; 2:9; 3:5; 3:16; 4:14; 5:24, Romans 8:21; 8:34; 9:13; 10:5; 10:15; 11:21, Philippians 1:6, 14, 24, 27; 3:13, Colossians 1:22; 3:20; 3:22, 1 Thessalonians 2:7, etc., etc

Now don't take *our* word for it. (Never trust the "leader of a Cult" [!] when he *tells* you something; always *check him out* to see if he is LYING.) For heaven's sake, don't be as stupid and unlearned as the scholars at BJU. That would be a disgrace. Check the references given here that Stu couldn't find. Stu hasn't spent enough time reading Nestle's Greek Testament to even figure out the footnotes. He has falsely made a papyrus *fragment* a Greek "*manuscript*" (Ryland's Papyrus 52) and was so anxious to prove that the Alexandrian family was FIRST that he called P52 an ALEXANDRIAN text. Why, the few words in it match the Byzantine text almost to the letter. The fragment contains less than *half of one chapter* in the New Testament, but that was supposed to be enough to find a "PATTERN" (Custer, p. 5). The man is beyond help.

THAT "DERIVED TEXT" THAT CAME FROM "CONFLATED" READINGS

This chestnut is not only hoary with age but also with *comedy*. *After laborious researches by the vast majority of Conservatives to restore as nearly as possible the divine original*, etc. (Custer, p. 11), these deceived imposters claimed to have found 8 verses (limited to the Gospels), out of 31,000 plus verses, which "proved" Hort's ridiculous theory on a "derived text" (Custer, p. 11). These verses are (Custer didn't know WHAT they were): Mark 6:33; 8:26; 9:38; 9:49; Luke 9:10; 11:54; 12:18 and 24:53. Custer found ONE of them without being aware of the fact that the whole conflate theory had been proved to be a *joke*.

The *Western* family (Custer, p. 10) conflates in John 5:37, and the *Alexandrian* "family" conflates in Colossians 1:12 and 2 Thessalonians 3:4. Who didn't know that the *Western* text again "conflates" neutral and Syrian readings in Matthew 4:13, John 5:37, and Acts 10:48, while Vaticanus "conflates" in Mark 1:28, Mark 1:40, and John 7:38. Sinaiticus (all Alexandrian) "conflates" in John 13:24, Revelation 6:1, 2, 5, 7, 8, and 17:14, and *Aleph* even "conflates" B with a BYZANTINE TEXT in 1 Corinthians 7:34. This would make the Western and Alexandrian texts CONFLATE TEXTS *derived from the Byzantine text*.

Now who didn't know THAT but the faculty members at BJU and the editors of the *Sword of the Lord*?

These incredible dupes (Sumner and Bob Jones, III) have called Custer's pamphlet a *scholarly work* on the grounds of THEIR OWN IGNORANCE OF MANUSCRIPT EVIDENCE. Could anything be more pitiful? *Custer didn't even quote the verses for and*

against the position he took! When he stupidly thrust forth Luke 24:53, was he aware of the fact that there had already been a complete discussion of that in Pickering's work published TWO YEARS before he sat down to write?

Burgon called Custer's theory (in 1880) "A SILLY DREAM" (*Revision Revised*, p. 264).

That is "THE CONSERVATIVE POSITION," IS IT (Custer, p. 5)?

Then it must be the conservative position of an egghead who doesn't have the sense, integrity, honesty, zeal or scholarship of a BRASS MONKEY.

In four of Hort's "Western and Alexandrian confections" (Custer, p. 10), Bousset (1894) found him to be in error and the *King James* Greek Text to be correct (Hills, *The King James Version Defended*, p. 176). Bousset was an unsaved radical.

Stu Custer didn't even know where to find the Biblical references for a *theory* that he cited as a FACT (Custer, p. 9).

"THE BIBLE" is not exactly Custer's strong suit. If a Bible department will tend to take on the character and quality of its strongest teacher, we may predict the next crop that will come from Bob Jones: They will be half-baked blanks who think that *ignorance* is proof of *intelligence*.

We have now examined (and documented) what Bob Jones University and the *Sword of the Lord* call "scholarship." We also noted that they believe the material presented by Custer is "THE CONSERVATIVE POSITION" (Custer, p. 6, 7, 8, 9, 10 and 11). The Conservative Greek scholars were all ignored, as were the Conservative textual critics, and this poor deluded liar (5 times in 9 pages and more than 10 times in 17 pages, *and more to come!!*) thought he would just bluff his way through, quoting Hort's private dreams and hallucinations concocted back in 1880. They had already been proved to be just as rotten as a case of dead shrimp three weeks old.

Hort's theories on conflated texts, Lucian recensions, and "neutral texts" were so grossly false that now, after 100 years, Nestle, in Stuttgart, Germany, has had to backtrack (he was dumb enough in 1890 to follow Hort) and reprint Nestle's Greek Text with two dozen SYRIAN (BYZANTINE) READINGS *slyly stuck back in* that Hort and he had both removed from 1880 to 1970!

So much for Custer and "THE CONSERVATIVE POSITION."

We will now take a look at Custer and "RUCKMAN'S POSITION."

CHAPTER FOUR

How to Avoid Every Issue You Are Supposed to Deal With

Custer starts the section with another beautiful lie (no. 10) to be matched only by the *three* told on page 1 of his Introduction and the *two* recorded on page 35 of his conclusion. This time the slander goes this way:

Custer swears (we suppose in court with his hand on the Bible: see the cover of the tract) that Mr. Ruckman “states bluntly, ‘Neither Luther’s Bible (1532-1545) nor the Authorized Bible (1611) ever included the Apocrypha’.”

To appear convincing after this libel, the slanderous little liar has quoted page 54 of the Handbook as “evidence.”

There is no such statement found on page 54 of any Handbook that “Ruckman” ever wrote on this earth.

Custer is a liar. That is what he is *paid* to do.

His appeal will be to people like himself (confirmed liars). You have to love a lie (Ezek. 14:1-10) to believe a liar (2 Thess. 2:5-12). On page 54 of this book, which is banned at the Bookstores at BJU and Pensacola Christian College, you will find the following “truth, the whole truth and nothing but the truth” (according to Stu’s cute little picture on the bookie-wookie).

“Neither Luther’s Bible (1532-1545) nor the Authorized Bible (1611) ever included the Apocrypha *as part of the inspired Oracles of God.*”

The perverted little shrimp lied again.

Was someone “savagely attacking him and his friends,” or what?

There probably aren’t ten Christian young people in America who would believe that the head of a “Bible” department could lie so continually and so persistently as the head of the “Bible” (!!) department at BJU.

What would ROBERT SUMNER (*Sword of the Lord*) be so elated about that “at last” a “scholarly EYE OPENER” had been written by Custer for Christians to read? *What do you suppose is the affinity between boys like Custer and boys like Robert Sumner?*

Having gotten off on “RUCKMAN’S POSITION” (p. 17) with a typical opener—a great big, fat, juicy LIE, Custer continues. He tells us that there is “excellent evidence” (*not listed or given*) for the existence of the Septuagint “long before the time of the New Testament” (Custer, p. 19). According to Custer, the evidence is in the Dead Sea Scrolls (he didn’t give one reading that showed THERE WAS A SEPTUAGINT AT THAT TIME) because they “have provided a WEALTH of information...” Custer now assures us that this “*wealth* of information COMPLETELY DISCREDITS MR. RUCKMAN’S

OPINIONS” (Custer, p. 19).

Wealth of material about WHAT? An Old Testament LXX in Greek? An Old Testament LXX that the apostles *quoted*? Well for goodness sake, Charlie Brown, tell us what it is! Quickly!

Well, where is it?

Haven't you got one pre-Christian Greek LXX manuscript THEY quoted?

Aren't you going to deal with the issue?

He didn't say. *They never do.*

I have a detailed list of every piece of Biblical manuscript evidence that ANYONE found in the Dead Sea Scrolls. Custer assures that someone *named Patrick Skehan* has listed “scores of manuscripts in Greek that were circulating while the New Testament was being written” (Custer, p. 19).

WERE THEY *BIBLICAL* MANUSCRIPTS'?

After all, who doesn't know that the “Dead Sea Scrolls” contain “The Manual of Discipline,” “The Habakkuk Commentary” (in Hebrew; not in *Greek*), “The War Scroll,” “The Thanksgiving Scroll,” and “the Genesis Apocryphon” (in Hebrew; not in *Greek*). Now Custer knows perfectly well that the term Septuagint that he and all scholars use is supposed to be a reference to a COMPLETE OLD TESTAMENT IN GREEK which was supposed to have been completed BEFORE 150 B.C. The issue we faced these mutts with, back in 1970, was could they find ONE MANUSCRIPT in Greek of an Old Testament book *that was quoted by a New Testament Christian*, with absolute proof that the MANUSCRIPT QUOTED was written *before* the birth of Christ; and finally, could anyone produce any evidence to show that ANYONE had ever seen a Greek Old Testament before 150A.D. Custer's evasive reference to Skehan, in view of his past habit of source references (see p. 1, ii and 17), needs a very close look. We know that Custer has a bad habit of lying when he cites a reference. “The only biblical book not found in the QUMRAN SEPTUAGINT is Esther...” (Custer, p. 19). Why, there was no Greek *Septuagint* in the Qumran community BEFORE the time of Christ! Look how Custer stuck the word “Septuagint” on to “Qumran” to make you think that they HAD A COMPLETE OLD TESTAMENT IN GREEK (MINUS ESTHER) BEFORE THE TIME OF CHRIST. Custer knows perfectly well that no one on God's earth found even ONE GREEK OLD TESTAMENT BOOK anywhere in the Qumran *community written before the time of Christ*. As a matter of fact, all he could cite was a fragment we listed in 1970 (P. Rylands, no. 458) which contained *less than one-tenth* of ONE OLD TESTAMENT book, and it was not written at the date of the supposed writing of the Septuagint (250 B.C.).

Now study this vicious immoral type of writing for a moment. You have been led to believe that the Dead Sea Scrolls contain a COMPLETE OLD TESTAMENT IN GREEK (minus Esther) called “A SEPTUAGINT.”

How do you know Custer was lying when he made that thing up? Simple: He didn't give you ONE piece of documented manuscript evidence for one single verse in Genesis, Exodus, Leviticus, Numbers, Joshua, Judges, 1 and 2 Samuel, 1 and 2 Kings, 1 and 2 Chronicles, Isaiah, Job, Jeremiah, Daniel, the Psalms, Nehemiah, Ezra, etc.

Where was the “WEALTH OF MATERIAL” found in Skehan’s article?

Easy: *There wasn’t any “wealth of material” anywhere.* That is a dead orthodox cliché that Custer read in a book somewhere.

What does this have to do with a Greek Old Testament that Christ and the Apostles *quoted*? Nothing. In his hysteria (due to too much “wealth of material”) the half-baked scholar cries, “What are the IMPLICATIONS of these FACTS?”

Facts?

What facts?

All he did was cite one *fragment* of part of one book which NO ONE had quoted. We documented this fragment in the *Handbook of Manuscript Evidence* in 1970 (*Handbook*, p. 48). In our *Handbook* we listed (for Custer’s benefit) twenty-four “Septuagint” Greek manuscripts with portions of “every book in the Old Testament except Esther” in them (*Handbook*, pp. 40-54). The reason why Custer didn’t dare give his readers the list is because every manuscript in the list, but one, was written AFTER Jesus Christ went back to Glory. As if fearing that this FACT would overthrow his “wealth of evidence,” Custer makes one desperate and vain attempt to fool his readers. He cites Matthew 15:8-9 and Luke 4:18, 19 in hopes that his reader will forget to ask him for *manuscript evidence*. Both citations are said to be “THE EXACT WORDING OF THE VATICANUS AND SINAITICUS MANUSCRIPTS” (Custer, p. 19).

Exactly. That is exactly what we said in 1970.

We said that whoever wrote the LXX wrote it 150-330 years after the death of Christ and deliberately altered the Hebrew Old Testament verses to make them match the New Testament verses which they had on their tables. *Vaticanus and Sinaiticus were both written more than 230 years after the completion of the New Testament canon.* There isn’t a scholar in Europe or America that doesn’t teach that. All Custer did was prove that Ruckman’s “OPINIONS” (Custer, p. 19) and Ruckman’s THEORY (Caster, p. 18) was DOCUMENTED MANUSCRIPT EVIDENCE, WHICH COULD BE PROVED IN A COURT OF LAW. Custer’s *opinions* based on the “wealth of material” (which he didn’t dare list) turned out to be just as fantastic as an opium pipe dream. In 36 pages of “facing the issue” Custer couldn’t even cite ONE GREEK MANUSCRIPT written before the time of *Christ that was quoted by ANYONE before or AFTER the time of Christ.* That is what they call “facing the issues” in a “scholarly” manner at Bob Jones; the *Sword of the Lord* gave its consent.

That is, the *Sword* and BJ U took the fictional position.

Could anything on this earth be more disgraceful than that? Two institutions boasting about being the “foremost evangelistic weekly,” the “bastion of orthodoxy,” the home of the Fundamental Congress, the “twentieth century’s mightiest pen,” “standing without apology for the absolute authority of Aunt Maggie’s apron,” “secondary separation,” “no compromise with Modernism,” etc., and they think that SCHOLARSHIP is avoiding issues, lying about source material, refusing to document statements and then lying about those who disagree with them.

We’ve got the winners, haven’t we?

Custer: “Mr. Ruckman dates the Peshitta (the Syriac translation of the Bible) about 200 A.D.” Here Custer cites the *Handbook of Manuscript Evidence* and then says, “On the contrary, the Peshitta is dated at the beginning of the fifth century” (Custer, p. 21).

Well, it is if you are an *unsaved, naturalistic critic*.

“The Peshitta was long regarded as one of the most ancient New Testament versions,” says Dr. Edward Hills (holder of three earned degrees from Harvard, Yale and Columbia). Hills states the well-known tradition that the Peshitta was always accorded a SECOND CENTURY DATE, and then he says, “in more recent times however, Burkitt (1904) and other NATURALISTIC CRITICS” (Stewart Custer and Bob Jones, III!) “have assigned a 5th-century date to the Peshitta” (Hills, *Ibid.*, p. 42). What should we do with this nice little piece of MODERNISM being taught at Bob Jones University? Well, let us get at the truth: “Burkitt’s hypothesis is CONTRARY TO THE EVIDENCE, and today it is being abandoned even by NATURALISTIC SCHOLARS” (Burkitt, Cambridge, *Evangelion Da Mempharreshe*, 1904, vol. 2 for the material and Metzger, *Text of the New Testament*, pp. 69-70).

Fear not, Burkitt! Be of good cheer ye naturalistic critics! You still have three “Fundamentalists” who will propagate your modernistic trash as FACTS: Stewart Custer, Robert Sumner and Bob Jones Jr. (At BJU, remember, this is “THE CONSERVATIVE POSITION” instead of “RUCKMAN’S POSITION” [Custer, pp. 10-21.]

Custer: “He,” (that dirty dog Ruckman!) “claims again and again that the ‘English readings are superior to the Greek readings’” (Custer, p. 21).

Well, are they?

If *not*, would you mind demonstrating *why* they are not?

Surely Stewsie-woosie wouldn’t accuse another Christian of *lying*, after the way he has been carrying on, without attempting to *prove* that the man was lying! If “Ruckman” said the above and it was *wrong*, then why didn’t Stu baby list the chapter and verses in the Holy Bible that *prove* Ruckman was wrong? Ruckman listed them to prove he was RIGHT (*Handbook*, Chap. 8)! Ruckman gave twelve samples in a book that Custer *professed to be quoting!* Surely Stewart could have picked up ONE OF THEM as an example of Ruckman’s lying “claims” and proved that it didn’t do the job. One? How about *one* out of *twelve*, Stu, buddy? Just ONE?

Not a peep.

All is as quiet as a turkey farm on Thanksgiving afternoon.

With a “wealth of material before him” (this time fourteen more verses than he could drum up to prove that a Book was there that wasn’t there!), Custer is mute. He also overlooked that fact that in the *Bible Believer’s Commentary Series on Acts, Matthew, Revelation, and Galatians-Colossians* we had documented an ADDITIONAL fifteen places where the Greek scholars could not find truths in ANY Greek texts that were perfectly apparent in the AV text of 1611. *Thirty samples documented.* Custer couldn’t even CITE one or mention one, let alone “DEAL with it.”

The slimy little coward was afraid to even FACE the issue, so he went off next into a

devotional (Custer, p. 22) tour through languages and translations pretending that he had never seen *twelve samples put right before his snoot*.

We may well gather by now that Stu simply lacks the intelligence to discuss the samples given. Custer cites Ruckman as saying that, “He would not believe that the Septuagint really existed even if a thousand pieces of papyrus were recovered with Old Testament Greek on them, written before 100 B.C.” (Custer, p. 23). According to Custer, this would be the same thing as saying that Ruckman would not believe “any evidence that contradicted his PERSONAL OPINION” (Custer, p. 23). (Imagine saying *that* after being unable to prove his own personal opinion on the Septuagint after twelve years of trying to find ONE copy of a Greek Old Testament written before the time of Christ! Imagine calling our *documented position*—we listed twenty-four Septuagint manuscripts—a “personal opinion.”)

But all of that is beside the point; the point is that Custer lied AGAIN. *That is eleven in a row in twenty-three pages*. No author on page 51 of any book (Custer cited the *Handbook* again, p. 51) said that he would *not believe anything*. What was said was this: “If a thousand pieces of papyrus were recovered with Old Testament Greek on them, written before 100 B.C., nothing could bolster the sagging testimony of the LXX, for the REAL PROOF that it is a fraud can be found in the Vatican and Sinaitic MANUSCRIPTS,” (the ones Custer cited!!) “*already discovered*.”

You see what that slick, little pious-talking hypocrite did.’ He misrepresented the quotation so you would not investigate what he called “THE REAL PROOF.” The proof was given on page 52 of the same book; Custer dodged it like a ballistic missile aimed at his head. The *proof* was in the mishandling of the numbers given in Acts 7:14 and Genesis 46:26, 27 by the POST-CHRISTIAN ALEXANDRIAN SCRIBES: we also gave Hebrews 11:21 as a sample. Custer didn’t mention *any* of the three passages. We gave BIBLE VERSES FOR PROOF. “Bible” is not Custer’s line. BJU has a “Bible” department where the “head” cannot discuss THE BIBLE on the Septuagint issue. We knew he couldn’t in 1970.

One of the most comical sections in Custer’s pamphlet is a peculiar paragraph in which he is describing Ruckman’s “*Doctrinal Heresy*” (Custer, p. 24). Here Custer cites three comments from the *Bible Believer’s Commentary on Proverbs* that deal with church history. Custer’s remarkable comment (made without any evidence) is that Ruckman is “trying to get help for his odd interpretation of the text” (he doesn’t tell you WHAT the text is) and that Ruckman is “willing to side with some of the worst HERETICS that the CHRISTIAN CHURCH has ever seen” (Custer, p. 24).

Custer evidently is not only short on Biblical knowledge but is also somewhat of a dingbat when it comes to church history. The “worst heretics” that the “Christian” church has ever seen, *according to the Church that professed to be the “Christian Church” from Arius’ time to the time of J. Frank Norris*, were not just Arians; they were Paulicians, Henricians, Novatians, Donatists, Bogomiles, Waldenses, Albigenses, Fundamentalists, Protestants, Huguenots, Lollards and “Manicheans.” Custer is deficient in several fields. The “Christian” church of 325-1000 is a *Roman Catholic* church who called anyone “Arian” who was not *Roman Catholic*. (See Volume One, *Church History*, Ruckman, 1982, or “*A History of the Baptists*,” Armitage, or any standard Roman Catholic history.)

It is *Ulfilas* who backs up the majority of the *King James* readings against Vaticanus. It is *Nestorius* (Custer, p. 24) who refused to call Mary “the Mother of God.” Any freshman in Church History knows that these men were not the “enemies of Christ.” They got that title from *Rome* and people like Custer and Bob Jones, III. It has been a standard position of the Alexandrian Cult for 1800 years; *Bible believers* who don’t accept the official decrees of church councils (called “historic positions”) are “THE ENEMIES OF CHRIST.” The Roman Catholic Church had its foundations in Nicea and its first genuine Roman Catholic was AUGUSTINE. (See *Newman’s Church History*, Vol. 1; *Neander’s Church History*, Vol. 1; *Philip Schaff’s Church History*, Vol., 3; *Williston Walker’s Church History*, etc.)

Custer is evidently not much of a student, let alone a “scholar.”

The second act of the comedy is on pages 26 and 27 of Custer’s tract. Here an effort is made to prove that Hort was a “brilliant scholar” (see his attack on “Ruckman” on p. 25) and that he did know more Bible than any pope (see his statement on p. 26). You are, therefore, given three pages to prove that Westcott and Hort both believed the Bible and were saved men. Here (as anyone would guess by this time), when Custer gives the list, he fails to mention either man saying that they believed in the *verbal inspiration of ANY Bible*. “Hort started by taking the position that the NEW TESTAMENT IS TO BE TREATED LIKE ANY OTHER BOOK” (Pickering, *Ibid.*, p. 32 citing A. F. Hort, I, pp. 419-421 and Westcott and Hort, II, *Introduction*, p. 280-281).

That is what Custer called RUCKMAN’S “BIAS Against Westcott and Hort.”

It would appear that the author of the BIAS is Hort himself, for he stated that in dealing with the text of the New Testament, no new principle whatever is needed for criticism that does not already “hold good for ALL ANCIENT TEXTS preserved in a plurality of documents” (Hort’s own words on page 73 of *his The New Testament in the Original Greek*, in conjunction with Westcott, 2 Vols., London, 1881).

According to the Head of BJU’s Bible Department, *these principles* for drawing up a Greek New Testament are VALID (Custer, p. 29). Custer sides (Custer, p. 29) with those who believed that the approach which Hort confessed above was based on CORRECT PRINCIPLES (Custer, p. 29).

Only if you are a Bible-rejecting *Liberal*.

But let us not rest our case here. After all, Custer at least took time, this time, to do some documenting. We shall do a little ourselves; and, just for fun, let us do it out of the SAME BOOKS which Custer cited and then add the references he didn’t have the courage to mention.

1. “The belief is ‘in Christ,’ and not in any PROPOSITIONS ABOUT CHRIST” (Hort’s Commentary on John, p. 200). That is the modern Charismatic position. You reject the *propositions* about Christ: the propositions ABOUT Christ are found in Romans, Galatians, John, Matthew, Mark, Luke, Ephesians, Hebrews, etc.

2. “That is, Paul speaks of God as enabling him to have an INNER VISION and perception of His son” (Hort on Revelation, p. 3). Acts 9 was NOT an “inner vision.” That is the teaching of the NCCC by every unsaved Liberal whom they pay.

3. “But the book which most engages me is DARWIN...at present my feeling is strong

that the THEORY is unanswerable. If so, it opens up a new period” (Hort’s Life and Letters, Vol. I, p. 416). That is exactly how *Karl Marx* took Darwin, as any student knows.

4. “I have been persuaded for many years that Mary worship and Jesus worship have much in common in their cause and THEIR RESULTS” (Life of Hort, Vol. 2. p. 50).

5. “God is spoken of as THE FATHER and as ‘my Father.’ Generally it may be said that the former title expresses the original relation of God to being and specially to HUMANITY...” (Westcott on John, p. 79-80). Comment by *Donald Waitte* of Dallas Theological Seminary, “This is HERESY of the first dimension” (Heresies of Westcott and Hort, Waitte, p. 9).

I wonder how Stu baby missed Donald Waitte’s “BIAS” against Westcott and Hort!!

6. “The thought...is here traced back to its most absolute form as resting on the essential power of God in his relation of UNIVERSAL FATHERHOOD” (Westcott on John, p. 159). This is Westcott’s Commentary on John that Custer has been citing (Custer, p. 26). How on earth did Custer miss these references unless he himself believes in the “universal fatherhood of God”?

Simple: he was so “scholarly” that he couldn’t read print.

7. “Viewed from another point of sight it is the revelation of the DIVINE IN MEN, realized in and through Christ” (Westcott on John, p. 246).

That is the “brilliant scholarship” is it? “But the last error can hardly be expelled until Protestants unlearn the crazy horror of the idea of THE PRIESTHOOD”(Life and Letters of Hort, Vol. 2, p. 50).

Don’t worry about the *Sword of the Lord* and BJU, Hort, Baby! They don’t have any horror of “THE PRIESTHOOD.” The Alexandrian Cult is a priesthood in itself claiming special knowledge and special privileges that no Christian “layman” has! After all, all we have is the HOLY BIBLE (AV, 1611), they have the “plenary, infallible, verbally inspired original autographs”!

8. “From the very beginning we see A POWER in action hostile to God” (Westcott on John, p. 106). Did you mean “DEVIL,” doctor? Could it have been Satan?” But the visible supremacy of THE POWER of evil inspiring to evil” (Hort on Revelation, p. 27). The references are to *Satan*. Hort and Westcott have reduced him to a “power.” Typical modernistic doctrine of Liberals in the NCCC.

9. “No one now, I suppose holds that the first three chapters of Genesis for example give a literal HISTORY. I could never understand how anyone reading them with open eyes could think they did” (Westcott, Life and Letters, Vol. 2, p. 69). (Hey, Westcott! I know of someone who still thinks you are a saved man and a CONSERVATIVE at that! Hey man, *this character* teaches at BOB JONES UNIVERSITY! Boy, are you ever “in” with the Urgeschichte of the Graf Wellhausen School!!)

Shall we continue? Let’s! I mean, let’s get real “scholar-ly,” okay?

10. “And by his Baptism Christ fulfilled for the humanity which He took to Himself though not for Himself, the CONDITION OF REGENERATION” (Westcott on water baptism using 1 John 5:6, Commentary on John. p. 181).

Was Custer's regeneration conditioned on water baptism?

Do you suppose that he may have THOUGHT that when he got baptized?

11. "I am inclined to think that no such state as EDEN...ever existed, and that Adam's FALL in no degree differs from the FALL OF EACH ONE OF HIS DESCENDANTS as Colderidge JUSTLY argues" (*Life of Hort*, Vol. I., p. 78). And Custer is worried about Ruckman's "DOCTRINAL HERESY" (Custer, p. 24)?

AIN'T THAT SUMPIN!

Why, COLDERIDGE (see above) was an UNSAVED DEIST who didn't believe in Heaven, Hell, the New Birth, the Deity of Christ or the Virgin Birth.

Who didn't know that but the editors of the *Sword of the Lord*?

Now, you understand *that* is what Custer calls a "BIAS AGAINST WESTCOTT AND HORT" as "whipping boys" (Custer, p. 25).

Why, that little lying shrimp in Greenville is so apostate that he dares not even *mention* the false doctrines documented by Westcott and Hort, *let-alone preach against them*. Custer's "whipping boy" is the body of Bible-believing Christians whose researches into the actual scholarship and beliefs of Westcott and Hort have convinced them that if either man was saved (Johnny Cash and Jimmy Carter are "saved"), they were both deceived, apostate LIARS of the worst sort, backslidden wretches in worse spiritual condition than even Bob Jones Jr., and Bob Jones III.

12. "The bosom of the Father (LIKE HEAVEN) is a STATE and NOT a PLACE" (Westcott on John. p. 15). Then Christ was a liar (John 14:1-3). But in case He wasn't, what will happen to Westcott and Custer? Custer was citing the Commentary on John (Custer, p. 26, 27) and couldn't find this remarkable heresy in the FIRST CHAPTER. If *Westcott* was right and *Christ* was wrong, at least we won't have to worry about meeting Custer in Heaven, *because it won't be a PLACE!*

13. "Eternal life is the never ending EFFORT after this knowledge of God" (Westcott on John, p. 196). Is that what they teach at BJ U? Is that "the gift of God" they recite every morning at 10 A.M. in the "creed"? What is Custer doing standing up reciting that creed at BJU after writing two pages to justify a HERETIC who thinks that eternal life is by *self-effort*? Rather two-faced don't you think?

14. In the Revelation of Jesus Christ (1 Peter 1:7), Hort says that there is nothing to show that the Second Advent is a sudden appearance, rather, "It may be a long and VARYING PROCESS" (Hort, 1 Peter, pp. 44, 45). In Westcott's Commentary on John there are eleven references to the Universal Fatherhood of God and the Universal Salvation of mankind as a mass (Commentary, pp. 20, 52, 219, 155, 4, 27, 43, 59, 70 and 140). Custer was so stupid (or so blinded with his BIAS AGAINST RUCKMAN) that he missed all eleven comments. The reader can get Westcott's Commentary and CHECK the pages listed above.

15. The "Arianism" about which Custer made such a fuss (Custer, pp. 24, 25) is found stated by Westcott exactly as Arius stated it at Nicea.

a. There is no definite statement on the "Word" being preexistent (p. 2).

b. If there is a supposed statement to this effect, it would be inconsistent (p. 13).

c. The doctrine is implied although not taught in the Bible (p. 248).

16. “About DARWIN, I have been reading and thinking a good deal”—Oh boy, what a brain!—”and am getting to see my way comparatively clear, and to be also desirous to SAY SOMETHING” (*Life of Hort*, Vol. I., p. 424).

Well, we’ll say something for you, stupid: “BALONEY.” How’s that? *Clear enough?*

17. “The speaker (Rev. 1:8) cannot be OUR LORD” (*Revelation*, Hort, p. 13). Why, the “speaker” said that He was “Alpha and Omega” and the “Almighty.” Who was it if it wasn’t “our LORD”? Was it Robert Sumner? Hort? Custer? Tiny Tim? Perhaps Dr. A.T. Robertson? No? How about J. Gresham Machen?

Now, after all the gas we got on Westcott’s view of Christ’s Blood (Custer, p. 27, lines 14 through 21), what have we HERE?

18. “The scriptural idea of Blood is essentially an idea of life and NOT OF DEATH” (Westcott on Hebrews, p. 293).

19. “Through the offering of the body divinely prepared which offering slowly matured through LIFE...” (Westcott on Hebrews, p. 312). Comment by Dr. Waitte, “This again is pure HERESY” (Ibid., p. 36).

No! No, no no! *Not at Bob Jones University!* This is a scholarly treatment of issues that prove “THE CONSERVATIVE POSITION”!

20. “Redemption, forgiveness, atonement, reconciliation: all these blessings Christ has brought to HUMANITY by his INCARNATION...HIS LIFE...” (Westcott on Hebrews, p. 344). Well, if Hort or Westcott had stuck “HIS PASSION” in after “HIS LIFE” they would have given us one-third of the truth regarding blood propitiation. *Westcott stuck it in.* He came out only two-thirds a liar (Gen. 3:5): about par for Stewart Custer.

21. “The true lesson is that the language which speaks of a RANSOM (1 Peter 1:18) is but FIGURATIVE LANGUAGE” (Hort on 1 Peter, p. 80).

Now, here we can take a breather. We have had time before to see the peculiar *dual nature* of the members of the Alexandrian Cult, and we have commented on it many times before. It always begins with DUAL *authorities* (Rome: tradition and the Bible; Mormons: Joe Smith and the Bible; Christian Science: the Bible and the “Key”; Jews: Old Testament and the Talmud, etc., etc.). This *double-faced duplicity* comes from the Adamic nature; it amounts to a mental reservation on absolute authority with a *future plan to switch authorities to justify SIN*. This is why no Bible teacher at BJU has any absolute and final authority other than *preferences* and *opinions*. This double-faced business is also the thing that prevents any member of the Alexandrian Cult from speaking CLEARLY on any issue. When they finally commit themselves (which is *rarely*) as Custer has finally done, then they are forced to LIE (see the eleven lies documented here on less than twenty-five pages) because they have been operating on a false PREMISE *from the start*.

That premise, as we have documented scores and scores of times in articles in the Bible Believer’s Bulletin (1979-1982), *is that there is no final and absolute infallible authority on this earth that a man must be in subjection to*. The Catholics see this premise

immediately and have exalted a fallen son of Adam to the throne of final authority. The poor apostate Fundamentalists like Custer, Sumner, Afman, Price, Martin, Porter, Bob Jones, etc., and the poor apostate Conservatives like Machen, Warfield, Robertson, etc., eliminate all FINAL authorities leaving their own OPINIONS AND PREFERENCES AS THE “last court of appeal” for deciding issues. That is why Custer, and all members of his Cult, say the “original manuscripts are the court of last resort”: they KNOW THAT YOU CAN’GET AHOLD OF THEM.

From the evidence given above we may conclude that Westcott and Hort were two unstable, unscholarly, deceived, vacillating apostates of the most dangerous sort; they may or may not have been saved, depending upon *which statement of profession* you are to take among several conflicting professions. If they were saved (and we have never said that they were *not*), then they were two of the blindest fools who ever led the unwary into a ditch.

Custer now tells us that the real point on the “Bias” was not his documentation of their orthodoxy but rather “whether the principles on which they drew up their Greek New Testament were valid” (Custer, p. 29). Since these principles have been proved on a dozen occasions to be not only invalid, but UNETHICAL and RIDICULOUS (see Burgon, *The Revision Revised* and *The Traditional Text*; Ira Price, *The Ancestry of Our English Bible*; David Otis Fuller, *Which Bible?*; Hills, *Believing Bible Study*; Pickering, *The Identity of the New Testament Text*; and Hills, *The King James Version Defended*), we can say nothing further about Bob Jones, Robert Sumner and Stewart Custer other than: “IF ANY MAN BE IGNORANT, LET HIM BE IGNORANT.” The fact that two backslidden opportunists (Robertson and Machen, a Southern Baptist and a Presbyterian) believed Hort for purposes of social standing and scholastic image is about as good a reason for believing in their “principles” as believing in the principles of a liar like Custer, who had no moral principles at all when spreading libel on another Christian (documented evidence in the Bulletin for January, 1982: photostatic copies available on request, free).

Such “principles” are not just “invalid.” They are unbridled *hypocrisy*.

Now let us take a look at Bob Jones’ great new sissified Liberal Guru who goes by the name of “Jesus Christ” in Custer’s imagination. “To picture the Lord Jesus Christ as RUDE and UNCOOUTH is a false and unbiblical portrait” (Custer, p. 29, 30).

Scripture?

What, *no scripture* to refute this “UNBIBLICAL” portrait?

Don’t be silly. Custer had just finished citing five scriptural references which *Ruckman* gave: not *Custer*. Custer cited no references. He couldn’t face this issue or even approach it. Upon quoting some “rude and uncouth portrayals of Christ given in the scriptures” (with the verses quoted: *Commentary on Matthew*, pp. 28, 266, 276, 498 and 502) the little sanctified sissy couldn’t muster the manhood to answer one verse of scripture with *any* verse of scripture.

We are to assume that either he had no scriptures to contradict the passages given (which he cited) or that he was unable to read the ones he had. This “bold scholarly facing of the issues” (Fanfare!) amounted simply to this: turning tail and running for his life. You see, when Custer faced Christ as a MAN in the Bible, it must have suddenly occurred to

him that he himself was not much of a MAN, so Custer didn't give ONE VERSE in his references and was afraid to quote the verses that "Ruckman" referred to. Such is the manly scholarship of the *Sword of the Lord* and Bob Jones University!

"There is never a particle of bitterness or unkindness in the words of the Lord Jesus Christ" (Custer, p. 30).

"Ye serpents, ye generation of vipers, how can you escape *the damnation of Hell*? Ye fools and *blind*! I will *mock* when your fear cometh upon you. I will *laugh* at your calamity. Ye are of your father the *devil* and the lusts of your father you will do. Thou blind Pharisee! Come to Bethel and transgress, at Gilgal multiply transgressions! *Go tell that old fox...*! He that is of God heareth God's words, ye hear them not because ye are *not* of God!!"

Custer has suddenly forgotten all about Arianism and the "Deity of Christ." You see, like the apostate Briggs before him, he had become a MODERNIST or LIBERAL in his *thinking* without abandoning his Fundamentalist *profession*. He had forgotten that the "WORDS OF JESUS" (see his quotation given above) *are the words of Jehovah God in the Old Testament*. Custer's sins finally caught up with him when faced with the simple issue of MANHOOD. He had fashioned his theological Christ after the effeminate Christ of A.J. Cronin, Norman Vincent Peale, Harry Emerson Fosdick, Leslie Weatherhead and Fulton Oursler without abandoning his PROFESSION in the Christ of Peter, James, John and Paul: but Peter, James, John, and Paul were not "scholarly" sissies: *they were MEN*.

"There is never a particle of BITTERNESS or UNKINDNESS in the WORDS OF THE LORD JESUS CHRIST" (Custer, p. 30).

There isn't?

"I will tread them in mine *anger*, and trample them in my *fury* and their blood shall be sprinkled upon my garments. I will tread down the people. They are all *dumb dogs*. Let death seize on them and let them go down quickly into HELL. Now consider all this ye that forget God lest I come and *tear you in pieces* that there be none to deliver."

Too lazy to look up the verses?

Any kin to Stewart Custer?

Do you see what happens to these jack rabbits when they slight the *King James Bible* while bragging about studying, teaching and "using" it? *Sin catches up with them*. In his effort to salvage the "nice, sweet, winning testimony" of "kind, good and godly dedicated scholars," Custer invented a Saviour that is not in the Bible. He forgot that Jesus Christ was *GOD manifest in the flesh* (1 Tim. 3:16). (Small wonder, when one remembers that he spent two pages recommending a translation [*NASV*] that didn't have THAT VERSE IN IT.) Custer was caught nakedly reverencing an "historical Jesus" who wasn't in the Bible. The One in the Bible says:

"I will heap mischiefs upon them, they shall be burnt with hunger and devoured with heat. I will also send the teeth of beasts upon them with *the poison of serpents of the dust*. White washed sepulchres! *Ye hypocrites*, ye fools and blind. For I have taken away my peace from this people, saith the Lord, even LOVING KINDNESS AND MERCIES. And ye have done worse than your fathers. Therefore will I cast you out of this land, where I

WILL NOT SHOW YOU FAVOR. Thou shall be LAUGHED TO SCORN and had in derision. In thy *filthiness* is lewdness because I have purged thee and thou wast not purged. I will not go back neither will I spare, neither will I repent. I will execute great vengeance upon them with FURIOUS REBUKES. How can you escape the *damnation of Hell?* DEPART FROM ME YE CURSED INTO EVERLASTING FIRE.”

Of course you don't know where the Biblical references are: neither did Custer. He didn't have a concordance. They don't use concordances at BJU!

“There is never a particle of bitterness or UNKINDNESS in the WORDS of the Lord Jesus Christ (Custer, p. 30).

Well, not if you are so blind and perverted that you can't read a Bible in Braille, *you Bible-rejecting LIBERAL!!*

Imagine such a fraud calling his writing Ruckman's “twisted portrait of the Lord Jesus Christ.” Can you imagine it?

There isn't one man on this earth who has read any English Bible through twice who doesn't know that Custer's portrayal of Jesus Christ is the twentieth century portrayal of PTL, tailor-made for women and little children. That portrait is found nowhere in the Bible. Custer's profession of “orthodoxy” (like Hort's and Westcott's) never affected his ability to pervert the truth and the words of truth. He mastered that operation. The “Christ” that Custer pictures on pages 30 and 31 of his work is a FICTITIOUS GURU who appears on late evening TV shows as the “historical Jesus.”

Look up the references we gave: don't be as unscholarly as Custer.

Now, after lying twelve times in a row and being *unable* to deal intelligently with one single major issue we presented in 1970, you would think that Stu would quit stewing. But, egged on by the opportunists who want young people to think that Christian education is the *final authority* (Mrs. Horton, Robert Sumner, Faulkner, Price, Bob Jones, Fink, MacRae, Newman, Schraeder, Jack Hyles, Dayton Hobbs, etc.), he continues with a treatise on Ruckman's “judging his brethren” and “evil speaking” and his “odd doctrines.” He only quotes three verses of scripture for the next five pages of material that deal with *fifteen matters* so essential that he considers them worth mentioning.

Ruckman “teaches seven different baptisms and five different dispensations in the New Testament...” (Custer, p. 31).

Will he *list* them for us? No. Will he give his readers the *Bible verses* that Ruckman gave for them? No. Will Custer FACE any issue clearly? Of course not. Did he check the passages in the Bible to see if they proved there were seven baptisms? No. Did he tell the reader where to get a sermon on the seven baptisms which has been preached in 400 fundamental churches in the last twenty-five years? No. No, facing BIBLICAL ISSUES is not what anyone at BJU does. How about those five dispensations?

The word “dispensation” or “dispensations” doesn't occur one time on the page of the work that Custer gave (Commentary on Matthew, p. 583). He lied again. Thirteen times in a row. The word used was “DIVISIONS,” not dispensations, and one of the divisions is long after the Church Age is over and is found nowhere in the New Testament as a New Testament “dispensation.” Another one (Exod. 20-Matt. 26) extends back to

Moses, although Custer led you to believe that Ruckman teaches that one was “IN” the New Testament. You see why he didn’t face the issue. He had distorted the truth THREE times before he sat down to write.

Custer finds a “contradiction” in teaching that the Advent may be in 2004 A. D. or that it might be in 2000 A. D. (or, for that matter, it might be in 1996 A.D, depending upon how one reckons the four “off years” which all chronologists reckon in figuring Gregorian time), provided our present calendar is correct. But Custer didn’t tell you that such dates were ADVENT dates, not *Rapture* dates. In his miserable stupidity he concludes that, “Since Mr. Ruckman is a pretribulationist, this is some form of contradictory date-setting” (Custer, p. 31).

Could anything be more pitiful?

What has the date of the *Advent* have to do with a *pre-Tribulation rapture*?

Why, this poor, ignorant, blind child has assumed, *without being able to cite one verse in either Testament*, that the Tribulation has to begin immediately after the Rapture. Where did he get THAT from? He didn’t say. He doesn’t know. He is not a *student* of the Scriptures. There isn’t a major prophetic student in America who is that stupid. You were told nowhere in either Testament that Daniel’s seventieth week had to begin IMMEDIATELY after the Rapture. You would have to be the Head of the Bible Department at BJU to be that naive.

“Mr. Ruckman teaches that tribulation period saints must work to be saved...” (Custer, p. 31).

Well, must they?

Surely you are going to refute such a terrible “heresy” with scripture, are you not, you “scholarly” fellow! Isn’t a Christian supposed to speak “AS THE ORACLES OF GOD” (1 Peter 4:11)?

Scripture?

Why, Custer has never studied the scriptures long enough to even DISCUSS them. We have given *fifty-three verses* to prove that Tribulation saints are under a covenant of Faith and Works (Rev. 12:17; 14:12; 22:14, Matt. 24:13, Heb. 6:1-6; 3:14; 10:26-33 and all of Matthew 25). Do you mean to tell me that in a “scholarly” handling of that ISSUE that this stupid child couldn’t handle ONE VERSE OUT OF FIFTY-THREE VERSES?? His response was absolute silence. He was too deficient to discuss it PRO or CON. “He” (Ruckman) “holds that no Old Testament saint was born again” (Custer, p. 31).

Well, *was* he?

Custer didn’t say.

Do you know WHY? *Because BJU cannot face one BIBLICAL ISSUE that “Ruckman” brings up even when Ruckman goes to the trouble of documenting the doctrine with anywhere from five to fifty references,*

Why, we are not dealing here with the scholarship of Bob Jones, III, and Stewart Custer; we are dealing with the *Wizard of Oz* and the *Cowardly Lion*. At BJU they don’t

teach *the Bible*: they encourage *ignorance* of the Bible.

“He” (Ruckman again!) “thinks that many angels will soon appear as ‘men from outer space’” (Custer, p. 32).

Well, *will* they?

He didn’t say. They never do.

Stu writes as all unsaved Catholic historians write. He makes a statement that is supposed to shock his reader into thinking, “What foolishness!” or “How stupid!” or “Oh, who would be so wicked as to believe THAT?” and then refuses to give out any information pro or con on the statement. This is done in hopes that the IGNORANCE OF THE READER will lead him to agree with the historian’s bias instead of with the TRUTH. We gave Custer fifteen references in the Bible to prove that angels have not only been here before (Ps. 82, Job 38, 2 Peter 2) but will come down again (Rev. 12, Acts 14) and that on both occasions they appear as MEN (Heb. 13, Gen. 19, Jud. 13, etc.). Custer was such a punk student of the Bible that he couldn’t even find the verses or quote any verses to contradict them.

Custer couldn’t face an issue on BIBLICAL AUTHORITY to keep his job.

Neither could Robert Sumner or Bob Jones, III.

“One of his strangest interpretations is that demons like warm, wet places” (Custer, p. 32).

Well, *do* they?

Surely this bluffing fool can find one verse in some Bible that shows that demons *don’t*. After all, he listed this under Ruckman’s “ODD DOCTRINES.” Well, is it a SOUND DOCTRINE? If *not*, why isn’t it refuted? Does Custer know how to refute a CULT LEADER (page 36!!) with Scripture? WE DO. You bet your little booties we do! *We can refute the founder of a cult with Scripture!* Where is the scriptural evidence that proves the above is not sound doctrine?

He didn’t give any: *they never do*.

They cannot discuss the Bible because they are not even STUDENTS of the Bible. Custer is just one more incredible ignoramus (there are 1500 others just like him) who got to be a Professor of Ancient Languages and a Professor of GRADUATE STUDIES (!) at BJU when he didn’t have the Biblical or Spiritual knowledge of a dehydrated hop toad. He cannot summon *up one verse out of 31,000 plus* to refute what he says is the teaching of the founder of a “Cult.” He just turns tail and runs for his life.

We had a word for that kind of a girl scout in the service.

Now Custer finally tries his hand at quoting scripture. After telling his readers that Ruckman is not a reliable “INTERPRETER” (Custer, Introduction), Custer gives us a stupendous example of how to *really* “interpret” the Bible. He cites Romans 14:4 and affirms that that passage had to do with judging anyone’s *eternal destiny*; and in the context (a discussion of Origen) he applies this to what they TAUGHT about Heaven, Hell, Christ, Salvation, the New Birth and Eternal Life. Those are the things that we listed

in *Origen's teaching* when we called him “a first-rate, egotistical, Bible-perverting heretic” (Custer, p. 32). (The word “heretic” in Custer’s mind also has a peculiar connotation; he thinks that a man cannot be a *heretic* unless he is an *unsaved* man! [You talk about “odd doctrines”!].) Now any student of Scripture knows what to think of such a private interpretation of Romans 14:4. Custer is counting on his reader not reading the CONTEXT of Romans 14. The context was judging CHRISTIAN BROTHERS ON THE GROUNDS OF WHAT THEY ATE OR THE DA YS THAT THEY “OBSERVED.”

What did THAT have to do with *Origen*?

You guessed it.

“Yet all his life Origen tried to live in obedience to the BIBLE” (Custer, p. 32). So did Albert Schweitzer and Stewart Custer. So did the Liberal Kagawa and every unsaved Liberal bishop in the NCCC. That is the PROFESSION of every unsaved Modernist in the NCCC. What does *that* mean?

“Origen influenced many people for good in his lifetime” (Custer, p. 32). So did Xavier and Loyola. So did Cardinal Spellman and Jack Kennedy. So did Fulton Sheen and Mahatma Ghandi and so does Pope John Paul II. What does THAT mean!

Why, it means that Bobbie and Stewie (Jones and Custer) have adopted the positive thinking habits of LIBERAL HUMANISTS whose standards for JUDGING SOUND DOCTRINE are in the *personalities of the people they like and don't like*. There is no discussion in Custer’s tract of ANYTHING that Origen taught about Heaven, Hell, or the New Birth. “Many of the later Nicene fathers voice their indebtedness to Origen (Custer, p. 33). Certainly: many of *us* are indebted to Westcott and Hort, Griesbach, Lachmann, Tregelles, Jim Jones, Custer, Bob Jones, John Calvin, Berkhof, Thomas Edison, Martin Luther King, Jr., Lee Oswald, Bloody Mary, John Wilkes Booth and Duns Scotus for all kinds of things. *What then?*

Why can’t Custer discuss SOUND DOCTRINE? He cannot even prove FALSE DOCTRINE *when he thinks it is false*, let alone prove that a real heretic taught SOUND DOCTRINE. Custer doesn’t know what SOUND DOCTRINE IS (1 Tim. 4:1-6).

“The LORD ALONE is capable of judging who is the greater heretic” (Custer, p. 33). Why you old liar you! That is fourteen in a row.

The Holy Spirit said in the New Testament (any edition of any version) that HERETICS would be “MADE MANIFEST AMONG YOU” (1 Cor. 11:19, in *any* translation) and that you not only could spot them (Titus 3:10) but avoid them (Rom. 16:17, 18, in ANY translation).

“The Lord ALONE is capable” eh, Stewart?

Why you old pious-talking hypocrite!!

You old Bible-rejecting rascal you! The very idea of thumbing your nose at the words of the Holy Spirit in *all four families* of manuscripts, in *all fifty-four English translations*, and *800 translations* in foreign languages, and then putting on that super-pious air so that people will think you are SPIRITUAL!

You must work for Bob Jones III!

And let me tell you something, that crew had better thank God daily that there are still some young people on this earth as stupid as *they* are who would think that such talk was an indicator of “godliness.” Boy, if they were left alone with THAT BOOK, wouldn’t they be in trouble!

You, by now, have observed that at every turn in the Interstate when Custer is faced with a Biblical issue he gets off the highway just as quickly as he can. *He cannot answer anything with Scripture*, and when he quotes Scripture *to create an issue* (as above), he misapplies what he quotes. Custer thought that Romans 14:10 had to do with judging a professing Christian for teaching that:

1. Everyone would wind up being saved, including Satan (Origen).

2. Local pastors should be called PRIESTS (Origen).

3. Purgatory was a Bible doctrine (Origen).

4. Salvation was by baptismal regeneration and WORKS (Origen).

5. Genesis 1-3 was not literal (Hort, exactly!) (Origen). The information above is documented from Origen’s writings in the Ante-Nicene Fathers by *Newman* (Church History, Vol. I), *Mosheim’s Church History, Volume One*, and any Baptist Church History by *Orchard, Armitage, or Robinson*.

Custer has a problem with the Bible, doesn’t he? Any Bible.

This problem extends to all versions, all translations in any language and any set of manuscripts used by anyone. No matter what Biblical material he picks up he can’t handle it. If one were to really judge him on the basis of his *Biblical knowledge* and *Biblical scholarship*, one would have a hard time resisting the temptation to classify Stu with the “NATURAL MAN” of 1 Corinthians 1-3 who cannot receive the things of the Spirit because they are “foolishness to him.” Of course, we wouldn’t do that. We believe the pitiful child is saved; so is *Johnny Cash* and *Oral Roberts* and maybe even *Elvis Presley*.

Custer’s last stand is taken on pages 33 through 36, but his final shot wouldn’t give Sitting Bull a headache. Its comical overtones give a sort of hilarious ending to his booklet and seem to epitomize the overall tone of the entire

“scholarly work.” It is called Ruckman’s “EVIL SPEAKING.” Whereupon Custer himself proceeds not merely to *speak evil* of “Ruckman” (p. 36) but *libels* him with two of the biggest lies he wrote during the whole tract (p. 35). Since we have already documented all of this slander with the official Circuit Court Decree of *Judge Hubert Hall* (28th Circuit Court of Bay Minnette, Alabama, Feb. 27, 1962), no further comment is necessary. *According to the law courts of the United States* (remember Stu’s “COURT of last resort” in his Introduction?), Stewart Custer was guilty of libel, *after being exposed to the oral testimony of nearly forty eyewitnesses* who took an oath to tell “THE TRUTH.” (See the cover of his booklet.)

So much for “THE TRUTH about the King James Version Controversy!”

Fifteen lies on thirty-six pages, almost one for every other page.

CHAPTER FIVE

Donald Duck in the Bible Department

We have now finished a very brief, and we trust “eye opening” (to quote Bobbie Sumner), examination of a tract which is recommended by *Mrs. Horton* (Pensacola Christian Schools), *Dayton Hobbs* (Santa Rosa Schools), *Fink* (Hyles Anderson College), *Hindson* (Falwell Schools in Lynchburg), *Afman* (Tennessee Temple Schools in Chattanooga) and *Robert Sumner* (*The Sword of the Lord*). It is a “scholarly work” if we are to believe *Bob Jones Jr.*, (*Faith Magazine*, Dec. 1981) or *Bobbie Sumner* (*Sword*, Jan. 1982). Of course, there is always an excellent chance that the people involved merely recommended the book to save face and it was done for purposes of maintaining circulation, enrollment, membership, or income (1 Tim. 6:10); in which case the recommendation amounts to FRAUD designed to deceive the unscholarly. In the other case—the incredible of the *incredible*—in case the promoters of this trash are sincere and actually think that a “scholar” wrote it, we can only adduce that they are as ignorant as Custer and are unable (as he was) to Biblically handle ONE SINGLE BIBLICAL issue that was presented to them in 1970 (*The Christian’s Handbook of Manuscript Evidence*).

Back in the “old days” when I was a hell-bound sinner, running a circuit from barrooms to beaches, from barracks to ballrooms, and from bottles and babes to bucks and bayonets, I learned some very important lessons that had to do with MANHOOD. Like all veterans of World War II, I came through with their philosophy on life in regards to the services: “I wouldn’t trade nothin for the experience, but I wouldn’t wanta go through it agin fer nothin.” (That is the plenary, verbally inspired “original”!)

In those terrible and lonely days (1938-1949) I learned three great truths that have stuck with me through the years, right on up into my saved life as a new creature in Christ. These three truths will seem very commonplace to our readers I am sure, perhaps even trite. Nevertheless, they have saved me time and time again from being deceived by PIOUS-TALKING CHRISTIANS who mistook *scholarship* for *intelligence* and *professions* for *honesty* and *standards* for SPIRITUALITY. The three sayings that the Dogfaces had (that is a “redleg”; an infantryman) which all turned out to be true were these.

1. *The tough guy is the man who has the “edge.”*
2. *A thing is almost exactly the opposite of the way it appears.*
3. *If it don’t make SENSE, there is a BUCK in it.*

Now those may resemble “Murphy’s Laws,” but you would be amazed what you can do with those “Ruckman Principles” when a man like Stewart Custer—or rather a PERSON like Stewart Custer—shows up. Or, for that matter, when someone like A. T. Robertson or John Calvin or Hort or Bob Jones Jr., or Robert Sumner or Fred Afman or Jerry Falwell or Jack Hyles shows up.

A man is “tough” normally *when he knows he has the advantage*, but a man will not

always have an advantage in different situations. Street fighters would be at a loss as to what to do in a CHESS MATCH. Cassius Clay would have been a dead duck if he had had to fight one of the Drill Instructors (1944) which I had in Fort Benning; Major Bronchorst wouldn't have put on gloves and he wouldn't have followed any "rules" on *where* to deliver punches, or with WHAT. A preacher arrested for speeding is not nearly as evangelistic in his conversation with the Patrolman as when he is preaching in the pulpit. Know what I mean, jelly bean? When you find a man playing "tough," it is because he knows he has an *advantage*. All you have to do is shift the scenery to an environment where he doesn't have the advantage then, nine times out of ten, his TOUGHNESS disappears. For example, since Custer was so bold and so brave as to sashay forth like St. George taking on the dragon, since he was so "fearless" as a champion of the CONSERVATIVE POSITION, we invited him to come to Pensacola with all expenses *paid and we would have given him ninety minutes of free time WITHOUT INTERRUPTION to say anything he wanted to say* from our pulpit. He signed a certified receipt that he had gotten the letter. Did he come?

Don't be silly. Here, he would not have the "edge."

Now here, on the other hand, is this heretic "Ruckman." He acts mighty tough himself sometimes doesn't he, *at least on PAPER*. Why is this? Easy: He knows on PAPER he has the "edge." He might not be able to compete with some of the brethren in building large schools or churches and he certainly could not compete with Billy Graham or Grooms or Carl Hatch when it comes to *soul winning*. However, when it comes to BIBLICAL THEOLOGY and BIBLICAL SCHOLARSHIP that deals with the TEXT OF THE KING JAMES BIBLE, Ruckman isn't worried about keeping up with anyone; that is why he acts "tough." He knows that if he spit on the faculty of Bob Jones University one time he would drown the whole bunch and it wouldn't take much more to drown the ones at Dallas Theological Seminary and Moody Bible Institute. No sweat. They are all THE SAME CREW and they cannot pose ONE NEW PROBLEM on the AV text that couldn't be answered in twenty seconds without consulting five books.

Now let us look at proposition no 3. "If it don't make sense, there is a buck in it." Innocent little epigram isn't it? Now apply that thing to *the foreign policy of the United States*; then apply it to the *Federal Reserve System*; now apply it to the theories of *Westcott and Hort*.

Did you know that that little piece of Dogface philosophy has an amazing width and breadth to it (1 Tim. 6:10). Would a government push integration after seeing it destroy 10,000 schools? Of course, but don't forget, "If it don't make SENSE, there is a buck in it." Is it *sensible* for BJU to publish a pamphlet called "scholarly" where the author couldn't even give the BIBLICAL REFERENCES FOR OR AGAINST HIS OWN POSITION? Is it sensible to recommend a pamphlet that contains out-and-out libel (according to a Court Decree of a United States Court of Law) *to young men and women* in Christian schools? Does it make sense for the president of a Christian school to tell Christian young men and women that a man is "scholarly" and has told "THE TRUTH" about an issue when the coward *ducked five issues in a row* just as fast as he could get around them?

Well, "if it don't make sense, there is a BUCK in it" (1 Tim. 6:10).

That is why 1 Timothy 6:10 was changed in the *NASV* and the *NRSV*.

Dogface theology is sometimes more discerning and truthful than Fundamentalist scholarship. We old foot soldiers quickly learned how to look behind the *uniform* and see the MAN, *if there was a MAN there*. You won't fool us with pious talk about "feeding on the word" (Custer, p. 36) and "God alone" being able to judge a liar (Custer, p. 33). No, that is for jacklegs and greenhorns who think that *pious talk* indicates *piety* and *spiritual talk* indicates *spirituality*. Rule 2. "A thing is almost always EXACTLY THE OPPOSITE from the way it appears."

In short, we have no trouble discerning why Custer's tract is "recommended" by the "VAST MAJORITY OF SELF-EXALTING BACKSLIDDERS." NO problem. We will order several thousand copies in the next few years ourselves, but we intend to use Custer as the perfect illustration of the twentieth century apostasy in the Laodicean church and we want all of our young men and women to read the pamphlet with the SOURCES Custer quoted *laid alongside it*. We will teach our young Christian men and women that the scholarship of BJU has three basic faults.

1. It is *stupid* (see comments and documented evidence we gave under Custer's material on pages 6, 8, 10, 21, 24, 29, 30 and 31).

2. It is *cowardly* (see the ducking of the issues raised on pages 6, 9, 30, 31 and 32).

3. It is a *lying fraud* (see proof given for Introduction and for pages 6, 11, 13, 22, 30 and 35).

On these three counts we will teach the coming generation of young people that Bob Jones University and the *Sword of the Lord* are never to be taken seriously when they recommend a man's work as "scholarly." Such a thing would be sinful wickedness of the very WORST kind.

However, since Stu has taken time out to charitably display these three qualifications for Cult leaders, we are going to do him a great favor. This time we will send to him (free) an *autographed copy* of the first edition (what a collector's item, to have a first edition signed by the "founder of A CULT!!") of Volume One of *The History of the New Testament Church* as soon as it comes off the press. Custer will then have a chance to learn something about the integrity of *the sources* he quotes for Origen's trials (see Custer, p. 33). Custer evidently has a great deal to learn about the personal integrity of "scholars" like HIMSELF. In his zeal to protect the Alexandrian Cult (Custer, p. 32, 33), Custer forgot another great historical truth: i.e. *that martyrs are the greatest material in the world for justifying sin and propagating lies* (Martin Luther King Jr., Jack Kennedy, Abraham Lincoln, etc.). One good suffering liar like *Cyprian* or one good suffering liar like the *Jesuit priests* who were actually crucified in Japan is worth ten *honest Christians* whom God preserved when it comes to spreading FALSEHOOD. Custer is so shallow and naive that he thinks that a "martyr" for Christ is a guarantee of HONESTY and SOUND DOCTRINE from the man. He forgot that a million unsaved Jews *went to HELL* after being tortured to death in Treblinka, Belsen Belson, Buchenwald and Auschwitz (1935-1945). You see, Custer, *as all Modernists*, became Modernist in his THINKING before he abandoned his PROFESSION of fundamentalism. That has happened to scores of faculty members in Moody, Wheaton, Fuller, Union, Colgate, Columbia, Maranatha, BIOLA,

Dallas and Pacific Coast, etc. There is nothing new under the sun. The trick in this age is to scare the Bible believer into accepting falsehood on the grounds that he dare not “judge” *Biblical truth* and *Biblical error* because of the PERSONALITY and *life* of the men connected with the FALSEHOOD.

In modern parlance this religion is called “HUMANISM.”

Custer accepts Humanism as a way of life (see comments on pages 33, 34, 35) without giving up his *profession* of a different way. Of course, being human himself, he eventually reserved for himself the right to judge his own adversaries (Custer, p. 33) and even attempted to prevent them from getting a hearing (see Custer, p. 36), but that is to be expected. Humanists, in actual practice, often turn out to be some of the most intolerant, vicious and effeminate characters on the face of this earth.

How do we feel *personally* about Stewart?

Personally, I am blank. I have no “feelings” at all. To me Custer is not an individual, let alone a *man*. He is only a very small cog in a vast network of wheels and he has only been singled out here on the basis of the extremely low quality of his polemic. There are 1,500 Custers in Christian education and they are carbon copies of each other. You couldn’t possibly pick on such a man as a genuine individual with any personal feelings involved. I don’t have any. To me Custer is a very small cipher in a vast computer system that has been turning out lying Christians for 1900 years. Anything we said about him here might well be said of 1500 other Christian teachers who serve as faculty members in Christian colleges, universities and seminaries. Personally, we are not even interested in Custer as a *man*. (I would walk right by him looking for a man.)

And yet, in spite of 1500 Alexandrian Cult members (and perhaps 400,000 between 200 A.D. and 1900 A.D.), one must always remember that these conceited liars never comprise more than two percent of the body of Bible-believing people in ANY age. They are a staggering “elite” *minority* who fancy they are “leaders” or “champions” of the faith, or some other such tommy rot. Some of them even go so far as to claim to be “scholarly” when they don’t have the sense that God gave to a brass monkey (see *Problem Texts*, 1980). In the narrow confines of his monastic culture, Custer had long ago abandoned belief in any absolute authority but the rules and regulations of his employers (Bob Jones Jr., and Bob Jones III). In the final analysis, his dismal display of Biblical ignorance can only appeal to five kinds of apostates:

1. Bible-rejecting scholars who want the final authority deposited back in their scholarship (*Machen, Hort, and Robertson* are excellent examples).

2. Effeminate young men that no male respects for their MANHOOD and, therefore, have to pretend to be *intellectuals* in order to gain respect.

3. Christian educators (like *Mrs. Norton* and *Dayton Hobbs*) who must go along with compromising churches in their areas to keep their enrollments up.

4. Pastors and teachers who have been stealing the glory from God for anywhere from five to fifty years and secretly hoping, all along, that someone would rise up to save them from the authority and reproach of the King James Bible so they could get the glory themselves for their own education. (*Robert Sumner, Fred Afman, Faulkner, and Fink* are

excellent examples.)

5. Gutless educators and principals of schools who haven't had the devil preached out of their rotten hides for five to fifteen years.

Such people would call Stu's tract "SCHOLARLY." Down here we call it "Donald Duck at BJU." Since not one class listed above is of any importance to the Holy Spirit or to the Biblical purposes of this age as found in the Bible, we are not going to worry about them one way or another. They will stew with Stu in their own juice.

Let us conclude in the proper vein of thought. Disneyland is in Florida. We have had time to go through it several times. Being well acquainted with all of the singing and talking dummies, we know the marks of Disneyland when we see them in Christian colleges and universities. When an article appears in *the Sword of the Lord* (Jan. 1982) calling a muckraking ignoramus a "scholar," we know what to think of it. When Bob Jones Jr., tries to promote his own pocketbook by calling one of his muckraking frauds a "scholar," we know exactly what to make of it: *mud pies*.

We are actually dealing with "RUCKMANITIS"—the most terrible plague that ever swept a college campus. This terrible disease is spread by a "pestilent fellow," a "ringleader" of a SECT (see Acts 24:5) who believes everything in the Bible (Acts 27:25); and, therefore, is teaching "HERESY" (Acts 24:14). Since he believed everything that God had told him exactly as He told it to him (Acts 27:25), he had no trouble spotting a professional liar (Titus 1:12); and although these liars accused him of being RUDE (2 Cor. 11:6) and of speaking words that were CONTEMPTIBLE (2 Cor. 10:10), he couldn't have cared less (Acts 21:13).

"Ruckmanitis" causes delirium and hallucinations, so we have documented fifteen of them in a thirty-six page pamphlet; that is, one for nearly every other page. *That is THE SCHOLARSHIP of Bob Jones University and the Sword of the Lord in the latter quarter of the twentieth century.*

Travel at your own risk.

[Other works available on Kindle](#)

Entire publication list at

www.kjv1611.org