

VOL. 1, NO. 1

JULY 1950

TO THE OLD BIBLE BANNER READERS

Dear Friends,

To let all of my friends know about this new monthly publication TORCH is being sent to my old BIBLE BANNER subscription list. I have maintained this list since 1935, and have preserved it. It is a precious list to me for on it are the names of a host of genuine friends, many of them personally known to me, others from whom I have had letters through the years. It is my desire to re-establish and reactivate this old list. I earnestly request all of you to return your subscriptions to me in the self-addressed envelope which is inclosed with TORCH. And, while inclosing your own, why not include a list? I want to come to see all of you in person once-a-month through TORCH.

Waiting to hear from you, I am,

Faithfully and fervently yours,

Foy E. Wallace, Jr.

INTRODUCTION

This will serve to introduce TORCH, a purely personal pamphlet, which will seek admission to your home and your heart monthly by way of the mail box, with a visitor's card from the editor.

The new *Gospel Guardian* has had bon voyage on the high seas of journalism, to a recognized place as a sixteen-page weekly periodical among the large publications, backed by an already successful and growing business.

It is not my temperament to be associated with business interests where commercial considerations are necessarily involved. I prefer to be free of all such connections with their resultant direct and indirect responsibilities—entirely free to always write in my own way, in my own time and in my own space without fear or feeling of concern for any effect on the interests and involvements of others, to just commit to print my own personal script—what I want to write, as I want it written, and printed as I write it. For many years I have so written, publishing first the original *Gospel Guardian*, and later for ten years the *Bible Banner*. I have been too long free to be subjected to editorial restraints, or governed by the restrictions of a publishing business, or made responsible for acts and editorial policies and conduct of business in which I have no voice and over which I exercise no control. I desire to be unobligated, uncontrolled—and free.

Since the passing of my father a *torch* has burned anew within me. Truly with Solomon I can say that I have “mused while the fire burned.” My father was a magnificent man, majestic in death as he had been in life; a defender of the faith who never had fear of any foe nor felt the cringing cowardice of compromise. Standing by his body in the mortuary parlors, viewing his faded form, the pallor of death seemed to embolden rather than diminish the

rugged etchings of character in his firm face. There the visions of the past and the voices of yesterday enthralled me. Through childhood I sat at his feet when he preached, and by his own hands I was baptized. Sixty years he preached the gospel, at seventy-eight laid down his armour.

In our youth we saw him in the thick of the fight against digression, joining with R. L. Whiteside, C. R. Nichol, Joe S. Warlick, J. W. Chism, George W. Savage, F. L. Young, T. W. Phillips, J. W. Crumley, and a long list of whom “time would fail me to tell,” in the gigantic effort to stem the tide of departure and stay the flood of apostasy. Two men of giant stature (intellectually and spiritually), A. G. Freed and F. W. Smith, came over from Tennessee to reenforce the fight at Denton, Texas, to help hold the line against the leaders of digression who brought the Texas Christian University into being. The breach widened; digression prevailed; the numerically large, socially prominent and financially prosperous elements went with the digressive surge that swept the state, leaving in its wake weakened churches, diminished and impoverished. I saw my father turn to secular work to provide for a family in which children were numerous—but with indomitable determination carrying on the contest. My feelings ran deep at the sight of all this, though the sentiments surging in my youthful soul could not be phrased. What I then felt is what I can now say: *I hoped to live to help hold the torch when released from the hand of those men.*

Outside the church the issues then were the dogmas of the old denominations, with the current theories of materialism and millennialism of the then recent cults of Adventists, Russellites and Christadelphians. Inside the church the controversies were the same in principle as now: unscriptural innovations, human organizations, secular institutions, local autonomy, pseudo-unity, false fellowship, denominational baptism, and worldly activities within the church. Brethren who had the audacity to dispute the right to invade the church with such secularism, and who pos-

sessed the courage to challenge those who did so, were stigmatized with ugly epithets. They were accused of being *fossilized*, a word I well remember, but it was slung by digressive preachers at the faithful preachers who stood in the way of their invasions. Strange, indeed, that we should now be similarly accused of having “petrified brains” because we are still insisting on sticking to the “stipulated conditions of the New Testament.” Men who talked that way then went on over to the digressive side, as all of the apologists and neutrals eventually did; and those men among us today who are speaking that shibboleth, while they ridicule the “stipulated conditions” of God’s Word, had as well go on over to the digressives now, for they contribute nothing to the defense of the truth nor the strength of the church.

The influence of some of these men of prominence, extended by an apparently unlimited and unrestrained access to the columns of several major journals as their mediums, can result only in producing a condition of asthenia on the part of the preachers particularly and an inevitable cession among the brethren generally.

History is definitely repeating in the church today. The issues are unchanged. Periodically repulsed the invaders retreat only to await favorable conditions to renew assaults, or else they take their movements under ground to work clandestinely, insidiously and subversively, as was done by the premillennarians within the church. Now the issues that besiege the church are in the open field, with their advocates appearing boldly as aggressors in the attacks, defying opposition and challenging counter action, which they shall surely receive, and their offensives will be repulsed, as often as they come, for there is a mighty host who are one in the resolution not to let them pass.

The Spirit of Torch—It is not an organization; it is not a business; and not being in business, it is not competitive with anything anybody else is doing. It is rather a medium—the personal medium of its editor, who publishes it from month to month in the same spirit and on the same principle that he preachers from place to place. If he were able to circulate it at his own expense there would be no subscription rate. But ONE DOLLAR for ONE YEAR is necessary. He hopes his friends and their friends will be in his monthly audience.

MARKS OF MODERNISM

The movement toward modernism in our own ranks the past decade is cause for a note of alarm. Among the preachers of certain schools or groups, of class or caste, the modernistic tendency is more than a trend—it is an organized development. Twenty-five years ago a fine-toothed comb could not curry a modernist out of the church of Christ; but today we can take a hayrack and bale them up. One of the first indications is a general looseness in regard to essentials. Modernism has definite and unmistakable marks.

Philosophy. In the Corinthian epistle Paul unhesitatingly pits faith against philosophy. There are some men among us now who are unsatisfied with their doctorates from the University of Chicago, who are going abroad for post-doctorate distinction at Oxford. They are putting more trust in the wisdom of men than in the word of God. It does not seem to jibe with 1 Cor. 2. Paul predicates faith on the power of God, which means *revelation*, and not on the wisdom of men, but these men among us now have reversed it. Their faith (what little they possess) is resting on the wisdom of men and not in the power of God. This is evidenced

by the fact that they do not accept the historicity of the Bible without judging it by the standards of men. They place so much emphasis on modern scholarship as to allow no confidence in revelation if the former does not confirm the latter.

Not long ago one of the “moderns” was bold to assert that men in the church of undergraduate levels are not qualified to decide matters of religious teaching and belief. So what? One must be a graduate to know the truth and understand the gospel, or else must let one who is a graduate decide it for him. But that still will not resolve the doubts and difficulties for the doctorates will regard those of under-doctorate levels as the graduate regards the under-graduate; for now the emphasis is being put on post-doctorate research. It is not necessary to graduate in hog raising to know when a ham is rotten, or to have a post-graduate course in animal husbandry to learn when a beefsteak is spoiled, if we can smell or taste just one whiff or pinch would be sufficient. Physiology is a good study, but it is not necessary to graduate in pathology to ascertain whether one has the measles or the mumps. We can discern that by the way he looks; and another surface irritation of the dermis can be discovered by the way he acts! On the same principle, it is not necessary to graduate in philosophy to know that the Bible is right; but the one who knows the Bible can tell when philosophy is wrong. The capacity of the *under-graduate* to discern the truth and diagnose error has been *under-rated* by these modernists among us. The average man in the church will sense their fallacies and will stand in their way, “steadfast and immovable.”

Terminology. The nomenclature of some thought-to-be intellectuals among us marks them as modernists. Their speech betrays them. Their writings abound in such phrases as, “these ancient beliefs”—“these fundamental faiths” (is there *one* faith, or more?)—“as Paul viewed it”—“as James understood it”—these and many more such expressions have been common in the writings and orations of this class in the church recently. It does not

represent the kind of inspiration Paul claimed in 1 Cor. 2, when he declared, “we speak these things not in words which man’s wisdom teacheth, but which the Holy Spirit teacheth,” nor in 1 Thess. 2:13, “not as the word of men, but as it is in truth, the word of God;” nor in 1 Cor. 14:37, “the things that I write unto you are the commandments of the Lord.” When these men talk in such terms as how Paul *viewed* it, and how James *understood* it, they should be forced into a definition of inspiration. The *degree* of inspiration is the heart of the issue, and it must be met. There is as much difference between the kind of inspiration modernists teach and the kind that Paul taught as there is between the modernist view of the divinity of Jesus and the New Testament doctrine of the deity of the Christ.

The late model modernists among us are the pitiable products of this loose attitude toward the inspiration and infallibility of the Oracles of God. They in the church; they are in the schools; and while these professors are more cautious than Reedy and Etter, who “went out from us,” they are nevertheless as loose, and so far as any value to the church is concerned, they are as useless. Some of their fellows in the “School of Religion” suffix to the curriculum stand in danger, according to some of their deeply concerned friends, if not already in doubt. To them the words of the Psalmist assuredly apply: “Blessed is the man what walketh not in the counsel of the ungodly, nor standeth in the way of sinners, nor sitteth in the seat of the scornful.” Reputation and influence cannot escape the effects and the odor in consequence of the company they keep.

We have been urged to wait until these men have acknowledged their modernism and voluntarily sever their connections before judgment is passed upon them. So it was urged in behalf of the premillennialists that infested our ranks—but if we had waited for the direct admissions from many of them, where would the church be now in reference to the millennial heresy? While we wait for modernists to admit their modernism and sever

their own fellowship, students are being made the prey of their propagandism, young preachers the victims of their faith-paralyzing pedagogy, and the whole church being honeycombed with their skepticism. To confirm this fear we have but to cast some casual glances at the pattern of preachers imposed on some churches now on the approval of these college professors.

Inspiration. The dubious and indefinite attitude toward the question of inspiration is another mark of modernism. Again speech becomes a sign. Such parlance as the scriptures being inspired in *sense* but not in *sentence* is the language of destructive criticism. Exception to the claims of verbal inspiration is an ill omen. We are told that careful writers and clear thinkers do not employ that phraseology. That is quite an imputation against some men of prominence both past and present as credible scholars. For instance, the unimpeachable McGarvey. In the “Missouri Christian Lectures” (1893) is found a brisk argument between Isaac Errett and J. W. McGarvey on the subject of inspiration. Errett was brilliant, but loose; McGarvey was scholarly, and exact. A few quotations will serve to indicate how “clear” and “careful” McGarvey was in his writings and thinking.

I was pained to hear from Brother Errett the concession that the Scriptures are not infallible. In arguing the necessity of this concession, he really argued a totally different question. His mind seemed unconsciously to drift from the question whether the original record is infallible, to the question whether the thoughts contained in it are conveyed infallibly to our minds. He discussed the fallibility of translations, of copied manuscripts, and of interpretations; and he insisted upon a variety of meanings belonging to certain words; but he said nothing at all, that I remember, on the infallibility of the original autographs...

The objections which the lecturer urged against the verbal inspiration are, to my mind, equally invalid with those urged against the doctrine of infallibility. That God had not seen fit to grant verbal inspiration to copyists, translators, and interpreters is no proof that he did not grant it to the original writers. Nei-

ther does the fact that interpreters, translators and copyists are left without such aid, render the verbal inspiration of the original writers useless, as Brother Errett has argued...

If the sacred writers were left to their own choice of words, and their own construction of sentences, we know that some uncertainty attaches to their writings, and, what is worse, we know not how to locate this uncertainty in any given place, but are compelled to let it spread like a mist over the whole Bible. This conception robs us of certainty in regard to anything. It takes away certainty even from the apostolic commission, for, if this theory be true, who can affirm with entire confidence that Jesus ever said, "He that believeth and is baptized shall be saved..."

What the lecturer said about Hebrew words possessing a great variety of meanings undoubtedly presents an obstacle in the way of the translator and interpreter; but I cannot see that it presents any in the way of verbal inspiration, or of infallibility in the original writer...

If I had to believe that in such instances the Bible writers were left entirely to their own construction of sentences, I would feel a degree of uncertainty as to the result; but if I can be sure that they were divinely guided in both the choice and location of words, I can rely implicitly upon the exact truthfulness of all they have written...

Thus the eminent McGarvey, of undisputed claims to scholarship, not only employed the term *verbal inspiration*, but defended its use and its meaning. It seems rather presumptuous for some lesser lights today, who *think* they are scholars but who really are not, to cast reflections on scholars of J. W. McGarvey's caliber for the use of that term. At least, it does seem rather *careless* for one to say that *careful* writers do not employ verbal inspiration phraseology in view of the fact that one of the most exact scholars ever known in the church, and recognized in all circles of scholarship outside the church, defended with vigor the verbal inspiration of the sacred scriptures. But that is that caliber of some men in our schools today, to whom the training of our fu-

ture preachers has been intrusted. We may well ask ourselves with deep concern, what shall the harvest be?

Continuing his comments on verbal inspiration, McGarvey gives several examples which afford no explanation on any other basis.

First, the example of the apostles when brought before the governors and kings.

When brought before the governors and kings they should not premeditate either the matter or the manner of their speeches. The reason given is, "it is not ye that speak, but the Spirit of your Father that speaketh in you" ... it is absolutely certain that in all they said the Spirit bore a part, guiding and directing them how to speak and what to speak.

Second, the example of Paul's answer before Agrippa and Festus.

It was a most singular thing to prohibit men, when about to answer for their lives, from premeditating what they should say. Were I required to answer as Paul did before Agrippa and Festus, I would be extremely solicitous as to what I should say, and I would select with utmost care every word I was about to speak. The wording of my thoughts would give me no less solicitude than the thoughts themselves. But Paul was forbidden to bestow any forethought on either, because of the promise that it should be given him what he should say, because it was the Holy Spirit who should speak in him. This promise includes verbal inspiration in all its fullness.

What need had he of the Holy Spirit's aid in order to make such a speech as this? I can see absolutely none, unless it be to guide him in selecting out of the multitude of well remembered facts in his past life the few which he mentions, and in choosing the inimitable wording in which these facts are presented. The whole, however, is so perfectly natural to the man, that no one would think that he had divine aid at all, were it not for the promise of Jesus, which could not fail. If it be said that he had

no need of the Spirit's aid to choose the words he uttered, I answer that he had still less need of its aid to choose the thoughts; and if there is any evidence here against verbal inspiration there is the same evidence against any inspiration at all...

Third, the example of the twelve apostles on Pentecost, speaking in tongues, is in the strictest sense a verbal inspiration.

When the apostles on the day of Pentecost spoke in languages which they had never learned, what kind of inspiration was this? Did the Spirit given them the thoughts, and allow them to choose the words? ...

Fourth, an answer to objections on the ground that verbal inspiration is mechanical and makes machines out of the men who wrote the Bible.

We have heard verbal inspiration spoken of under the opprobrious title of *mechanical* inspiration, as though it contemplated the inspired man as a mere machine. But you cannot make a mere machine out of a living man. He is made of heart and mind as well as flesh and blood, and when he is inspired, his whole being, with all his varied faculties and powers, is awakened into activity ... yet, if the Saviour's promise is true, he speaks not a word without the guidance of the Holy Spirit. This is a profound mystery, which no one who has not experienced it can understand. It is like the union of the divine and human in the person of Jesus. ... They were themselves in every respect, in their modes of thinking and reasoning, in their emotional nature, in their style and diction, in their tastes and habits; and yet in all that they said, without being led out of themselves they were miraculously guided by the Spirit of God...

Finally, on this point, I call attention to a declaration made by Paul which Brother Errett has totally overlooked. ... It is a declaration in which, if Paul had intended to affirm the fact of verbal inspiration so explicitly that it would be impossible to misunderstand him, he could not have expressed himself more clearly than he has. Speaking of the things which God prepared for them that love Him, things which eye saw not, and ear

heard not, and which entered not into the heart of man, he says: "God revealed them unto us through the Spirit." This shows how the apostles obtained knowledge of these things. But that which was revealed to them they spoke to others. Paul adds: "Which things also we speak, not in words which man's wisdom teacheth, but which the Holy Spirit teacheth." Now here is a clear distinction made between the things revealed, the facts and thoughts which make up the matter of revelation, and the words in which those facts and thoughts were communicated by inspired men. These words, it is expressly declared, were taught by the Spirit and not by the wisdom of man. In view of such a declaration, I dare not doubt the absolute verbal inspiration of the apostles...

This view of the subject justifies the prodigious labors of such men as Griesbach, Tischendorf, Tregelles, Westcott, and Hort, in eradicating from the sacred text every change made by human hands, and restoring to the world every syllable of the inspired original; it justifies the patient toil of the great host of translators and interpreters who have helped us to understand the original documents; and it enables us to rest with implicit faith upon all the precious words of our blessed Bible; but no other hypothesis enables me to find solid ground on which to place my feet.

Thus the scholarly and careful McGarvey replied to the loose and liberal Errett, in defense of *Verbal Inspiration*, who withstood in the field of Biblical Criticism the phalanx and Higher Critics who sought in his day to destroy the integrity of the Word of God, and became known and recognized by scholars throughout the whole world for his contributions in the field of Evidences. Compare with his superb essays the shallow sayings of some of "our" small scholars today—and they are not all in California! Through them these errors have now invaded the church, and in them an issue is posed which presages a conflict that may determine the doctrinal purity and integrity of the church of Christ in this generation.

QUOTES

The quotation of the following article by Moses E. Lard on *Instrumental Music In Churches* is made seasonable by the growing number of large churches of increasingly popularity and pride, with beautiful buildings, planned for recreational centers as auxiliary projects adjunctive to congregational activity, which have brought demands for the use of instrumental music in services of the church not regarded as belonging to “the worship service”—a very strange term, indeed, but now common parlance. So reports are current that some of these churches have already annexed music rooms, under another name, of course, where the instruments of music are kept on the premises for “non-worship” services and “social uses.” All of this makes good reading of the article here quoted, as particularly *apropos*.

Instrumental Music In The Churches. In settling any question, whether theoretical or practical, the first thing to be agreed upon is the standard of final appeal. Without this our discussions are mere endless wrangling, and arguments little else than mere circular talk. Neither error in thought nor error in practice is corrected. Strife is engendered and issue joined, but neither that nor this ever finds an end. Positions are taken which are untenable, and replies are made which are illogical and gratuitous; while parties are formed seemingly without hope of remedy; and all this for the want of some standard to which appeal can be at once and decisively made. Now that we as a people have agreed to accept the New Testament as that standard is a fact too notorious to admit of question. To this we have consented to bring the smallest point of doctrine, and the most trivial feature in practice. And furthermore, we have solemnly covenanted that whatever cannot be clearly shown to have the *sanction* of this standard shall be held as not doctrine, and shall not be practiced. We say shown to have the *sanction*; for it is not enough to warrant a practice that this standard does not sanction it. No practice can be defended on this ground. To warrant the holding of a doctrine or practice it must be shown that it has the affirmative or positive sanction of this standard, and not

merely that it is not condemned by it. Either it must be actually asserted or necessarily implied, or it must be positively backed by some divinely approved precedent, otherwise it is not even an item in Christianity, and is therefore, when it is attempted to be made a part of it, criminal and wrong. Right in itself, and when standing apart from Christianity it may be, but when the effort is made to constitute it either a part of the Christian doctrine or of the Christian worship then both the act to do so and the thing itself become marked with the deepest stains of sin. In itself and as a mere act we think it perfectly innocent to sprinkle water on the face of an infant; but when the attempt is made to foist into and incorporate it with Christianity, then the frown and anathema of Heaven lie on it. To all of which we as members of the body of Christ have bound ourselves in solemn acts and covenants. The simple fact that we claim to hold a place in the family of God is proof of this. As a people we have from the first and continually to the present proclaimed that the New Testament and that alone is our only full and perfect rule of faith and practice. We have declared a thousand times and more that whatever it does not teach we must not hold, and whatever it does not sanction we must not practice. He who ignores or repudiates these principles, whether he be preacher or layman, has by the act become an apostate from our ranks; and the sooner he lifts his hand high, avows the fact, and goes out from amongst us the better, yes, verily, the better for us.

Now in the light of the foregoing principles what defense can be urged for the introduction into some of our congregations of *instrumental music*? The answer which thunders in my ear from every page of the New Testament is, none. Did Christ ever appoint it? did the apostles ever sanction it? or did any one in the primitive churches ever use it? Never. In what light then must we view him who attempts to introduce it into the churches of Christ of the present day? I answer, as an insulter of the authority of Christ, and as a defiant and impious innovator on the simplicity and purity of the ancient worship. In no other light can we view him, in no other light should he be viewed. But we are told that there is no harm in instrumental music, and that therefore it may be innocently introduced into the churches of Christ. I shall certainly attempt no grave reply to this shallow thing; for argument I will not call it. Grant, then, for a moment that there is no harm in instrumental music. The question arises what kind of instrument shall be used? An *organ*

shouts the sickly puling of Rome. An organ indeed! And shall we have only an organ? That is arbitrary and tyrannical. But what signify arbitrariness and tyranny in a church which has consented to be disgraced by an organ. Simply nothing. These are now its spirit and its law, and of course are no offense to it. But despite of even these, for now we care nothing for strife, nothing for the feelings of brethren, we shall insist on the right both for self and others to introduce each for himself the instrument with which he can best conduct his worship. For the son of Mars, then, we claim the right to introduce the fife and the drum; and for self the right to introduce, for I could never make music on anything else, but am capital on these, the Jewsharp, the tinpan and barrel-head. I even go farther, and with all the pluck of a Lacedemonian contend for the right of the Caledonian to have his bagpipes, and the ancient Israelite his ram's horns. To all of which let us still add a few fiddles, a tamborine, and a gong. *Vive la* music made on instruments! This is about as like pandemonium as anything we can well imagine, and about as near that place as we can get unless we could get between that place and the church that has adopted instrumental music, and we think there is left a little room between the two on which to stand. Soberly and candidly we are pained at these symptoms of degeneracy in a few of our churches. The day on which a church sets up an organ in its house, is the day on which it reaches the first station on the road to apostasy. From this it will soon proceed to other innovations; and the work of innovating once fairly commenced, no stop can be put to it till ruin ensues. And then the spirit which precedes and fosters these innovations is a most dangerous spirit—dangerous because cruel, intractable, and unreasonable. It is cruel because it is ready to immolate everything that in the least stands in the way of its wicked work; intractable, because it will not yield on even one tittle of its innovations; and unreasonable, because it will heed neither the voice of God nor that of man. Indeed, when a church has once introduced an organ, we believe it to be true, as a general rule, of those members who take the lead in the work, that they will suffer its Bible to be torn into shreds before they will part from their pet. No matter how unanimous or how kind the voice of remonstrance may be, the spirit of innovation never retraces its steps. When once it sets in to accomplish a certain object, accomplish that object it will, though ruin marks every step in its advance. Church history teems with proofs of what is here said. Let now, as further evidence of this,

any set of brethren, no matter how pious and true, set about inducing a church which has introduced an organ, to put it away, and these brethren will soon fall under its proscriptions and it will absolutely go the lengths of putting them away before it will put away its organ. It will part from everything and anything rather than its infamous box.

But what shall be done with such churches? Of course nothing. If they see fit to mortify the feelings of their brethren, to forsake the example of the primitive churches, to condemn the authority of Christ by resorting to will worship, to excite dissension, and give rise to general scandal, they must do it. As a body we can do nothing. Still we have three partial remedies left us to which we should at once resort. 1. Let every preacher in our ranks resolve at once that he will never under any circumstances or on any account, enter a meeting house belonging to our brethren in which the organ stands. We beg and entreat our preaching brethren to adopt this as an unalterable rule of conduct. This and like evils must be checked, and the very speediest way to effect it is the one here suggested. 2. Let no brother who takes a letter from one church ever unite with another using an organ. Rather let him live out of a church than go into such a den. 3. Let those brethren who oppose the introduction of an organ remonstrate in gentle, kind, but decided terms. If their remonstrance is unheeded, and the organ is brought in, then let them at once, and without the formality of asking for a letter, abandon the church so acting; and let all such members unite elsewhere. Thus these organ-grinding churches will in the lapse of time be broken down, or wholly apostatize, and the sooner they are in fragments the better for the cause of Christ. I have no sympathy with them, no fellowship with them, and so help me God never intend knowingly to put my foot into one of them. As a people we claim to be engaged in an effort to return to the purity, simplicity, freedom from ostentation and pride, of the ancient apostolic churches. Let us, then, neither wink at anything standing in the way, nor compromise aught essential to this end. The moment we do so our unity is at an end, and our hopes are in the dust.

This ancient treatment of a modern trouble should cause an element in the church now promoting similar movements to pause and ponder. But it likely will not now for the same reason

that it did not do it then. Innovators do not hear warnings nor heed admonitions. If the preachers in Lard's day had adopted the remedies he recommended, and had persuaded loyal brethren to enforce the measures he entreated, the tide of digression could have been stemmed and the flow of deviation stopped. We are facing similar situations now in the multiform projections in the churches of heterogeneous variety—young people's programmes, recreational promotions, social festivities, wedding nuptials—all sponsored as multifarious functions of the church of Christ, and always demanding deviations of some description. What Moses E. Lard said in 1864 in reference to organs in the meeting-houses of the churches, I wholeheartedly repeat now with reference to pianos on the premises, and "so help me God" I never intend to participate in or function at an affair that requires me to "under any circumstances or on any account enter a meeting house belonging to our brethren in which an organ stands," whether it be a so-called "church wedding" or some other so-called "non-worship service," and all gospel preachers today should "adopt this as an unalterable rule."

COMMENT

Church Institutions. "Central college is not, strictly speaking, a church school. It is not under the direction of any church board. It is not directly responsible to any church. The board of directors is composed of individual members of the Church of Christ." These were not the words of the reporter, but of the head of the school. Everything said could also be said of a missionary society—so why say "strictly speaking" it is not a *church* school? It is not a church school *any way of speaking*, and should be made a secular institution and an individual enterprise *altogether*. How long will it be until it will be advocated that the college be put un-

der the eldership of some local sponsoring church? According to the prevailing sponsoring church idea, the only thing necessary to make a missionary society scriptural would be to put that organization under the eldership of a local church somewhere.

Minimized. “I deeply resent the papers’ referring to both Freed-Hardeman and Harding College as the ‘little Church of Christ College’ at Henderson, Tenn., and at Searcy, Ark. There is no occasion for such except downright prejudice against the church Christ died to establish.” It is not clear whether the resentment was felt over the offense of affixing the adjective “little” to the college or to the church. But as “Church of Christ” is made to modify “College” in the sentence, so does “little,” and to call these colleges *little* stirs resentment. Also, perhaps some need to be reminded, and should remember, that the church, not the college, being the institution that Jesus Christ died to establish, why have its character, name and reputation so dependent on the fortunes of a human organizations?

Affiliation. “We have had serious trouble, which, with the paper reports, have hurt both the college and the church.” That is another good reason why the colleges and all other secular institutions should be kept completely separated from the church, a good argument, indeed, against their affiliation. No secular organization or human institution should be allowed to assume the place or position where its success or failure could *hurt* the church of the Lord. How much the church has been hurt in this case, however, may be imaginary. Where has the church been actually *hurt* by what has happened? Not in a single place that I have visited or observed, and I have been about quite a bit. What has happened may *help* instead of *hurt* the church, by enabling the brethren to see the importance of keeping the church free of and unshackled by human organization. Concrete examples convince some whom arguments do not, and help them to make discriminations. The only way the church of Christ can be hurt by the affairs of a human institution is for them to be linked and tied

together in the public eye. And that should never be done. Let the secular institution stand on its own feet, stay in its place, and succeed or fail on its own merit, sustaining no more connection with the church than any other business enterprise, and the church will not be hurt by anything that happens to it.

Boards and Budgets. “This school has a board of directors, composed of fifteen fine businessmen. Through three meetings of long duration they have had various ones to appear and air their grievances. At their last session they reached the point where they were deadlocked and could not decide what to do.” And this is what churches are asked to put in their budgets and support from their treasuries! Waiving the discussion here of *what* is *not* the work of the church, the question of *how* to do whatever *is* the work looms large. Here is a human organization, governed and controlled (except that it went out of control) by a fifteen-member board. Can the church scripturally work through such boards? If so, and that part of its work can be done through that board, why not do all of its other work through other boards? This fifteen-member board could not decide what to do, but any church of Christ should have no difficulty in deciding that the church cannot work through such boards. No human board can stand between the church and the work of the church. So even if operating a college for secular education were the work of the church (which it is not), the *organization* would bar the church from working through it. A fifteen-member secular board in the budget—consider it, think it over.

Literature: A literature syndicate for the churches of Christ appears to be in the making. It is known as the *Gospel Treasure Series*, with a tie-up of several publishers as sponsors and distributors. Off to a bad start, they have encountered serious setbacks due to inexcusable blunders in the content of the series of gross-est sort of false teaching. Attention has been called to the teach-

ing of the form of evolution known as the nebular hypothesis, appearing in the series in an apparently sly manner, or else the result of just plain ignorance on the part of the writer. Advanced in it also was the tenet of outright modernism concerning the authorship of John's gospel—claiming it to be of second century origin, which if true would be after the death of John, hence, could not have been written by John. This has been one of the battlegrounds on which the integrity of the New Testament has been defended, and this Gospel (?) Treasure (?) series takes sides with the modernists! Also taught in this series is the fundamental erroneous idea that final authority rests in the church, which is out-and-out Roman Catholicism. My honest opinion is that the particular writer did not know any better and had no conception of what was being taught on the point. But the editors and publishers are men who *should* know, and it has come to light that after these errors were called to their attention, instead of recalling the series for correction, they continued to advertise and sell them to the churches. Such a thing is not only a sin against the church, but a crime against the innocent souls of all the boys and girls in all the churches among whom these lessons were circulated and taught.

Another serious slip is made in this misnamed *Gospel Treasure Series* in their teaching that the days of creation in Genesis were periods, long ages of time, rather than a day which Moses defined as “evening and morning.” Just how could the expression “evening and morning” define a *period*, rather than a day?

Besides, since the record of Genesis represents herbs as being created before light, if the day is a 500,000 or 1,000,000 year period, then the scientist theory has plant life thriving a million (or half-million) years without light, which is impossible according to the scientist himself, therefore unscientific! In the effort to stretch the days of creation into periods to harmonize with “science” they have run smack into a scientific contradiction! Moses said the days were days of “evening and morning”—just why should

teachers of classes in our churches feel obligated to favor the theories of evolution by teaching it some other way than the way Moses said it.

My attention has been called to the fact that in the sentence, “the earth was without form and void,” the verb “was” is the original word *ginomai* which may be translated “became” or “came to be”—that is, “became (or came to be) without form and void,” before God brought order out of chaos in the creation days of “evening and morning.” That makes all the allowance necessary for the geological upheavals the scientist thinks he *proves*. It is amazing how little proof (?) is necessary to convince some people that something the Bible says could not have been that way.

In addition to the foregoing items, I observed that in an illustration on Noah’s ark, in one of these booklets, the author fell into the old fallacy that has furnished the skeptics a point for scorn. It is the old time-worn objection that *two of every animal* could not have been housed in the ark. The reply, of course, is that the Bible does not say *two of every animal*—but two of each *kind*. There are only a few *kinds*, but different varieties come from *one kind*. The Bible does not say *varieties*, it says *kind*. But this *Gospel Treasure* literature represents in illustration varieties of the kind streaming out of the ark, across a two-page opening of the book, hence conceding to the infidel the point of his objection. Again, I frankly say that I do not think the writer knew what she was doing, in which case the writer of it is disqualified; but in the other case, if the writer did know all of these things, and still wrote them, the writer of it is a modernist, and what do you think of that?

Besides all this, a personal objection I have to what I have seen in the way of the art (?) in these books is that it is simply horrible! Noah’s ark—what a tub they draw of it. God was its designer, and that picture of it certainly reflects on divinity’s architecture. The dimensions of that ark were perfect according to

modern standards—Noah therefore could not have planned it; God did. I resent the reflection of God which that bulky tub presents. And the pictures of the patriarchs—they are made to look more like old ALLY OOP in the comic strip than like anything I read about in the Bible.

All this but reminds us, and should warn us, that in the midst of the clamor for humanisms, we are losing sight of the important thing—the Bible itself. In all of this promotion of commercialized literature for money-making purposes, the selfish ambitions and business interests of men have victimized the church. What can we do about it? This is a task for the elders of the churches. Either *know* the literature, or do not use it. When one deeply concerned member asked me recently, “What literature *can you* recommend?” I replied: the New Testament is a fairly good text-book for *any* class. But the answer did not satisfy. We have a few women writers who have learned a little, and think they know a lot, and they want to write the commentaries for the churches.

It is a pity that after we have made the fight against the cranks, anti-class, anti-literature, anti-college and anti-everything, that liberalists and extremists are now running away with things, disarm us, and all but make us wish we had not made the fight against the hobbyists, for between the two their cranky notions are less harmful.

I am not anti-Sunday school (when it is a Bible class on Sunday); nor anti-literature (when it is the right kind); nor anti-college (when it is not made a church school); nor anti-missionary (when the New Testament way is observed)—*but I am anti what is going on.*

MENTION

Chicagoland: It was my recent experience to preach in the great metropolis, Chicago, in a one-week series. Engagements were distributed over the area with four congregations: two nights with Washington Heights church; one night with Northwest church; three nights with California Avenue church; and two services on Sunday with the Downtown church. For the Sunday services the Downtown church engaged the larger Y.M.C.A. auditorium, which was filled with an attendance larger, I was told, than any ever assembled by the churches in Chicagoland, singly or collectively. The theme, as might be expected, though by direct request, was on the issues involved in Premillennialism, and the after-effects of this work already appear to have fully justified the decision to hold such a service for such a discussion. It is generally known that for years the cause of sound doctrine in Chicagoland has been impaired by a leadership of premillennialists and their sympathizers, with all of the by-products of sectarian softness and modernism. But many of the members of the church in Chicago (though altogether the known number would not make very many) do not hold the millennial views, and they welcomed the preaching of the pure word. I have never had a more enthusiastic reception from those who do love the plain truths of the glorious gospel, and I was asked by scores: Why have you not come here sooner? It is my purpose to return once a quarter this year to devote one week (every three months) to an extended effort to more firmly establish a few small churches and help put them on solid ground. For a long time I have wanted to have part in such an effort in Chicagoland. The opportunity has been presented. I opine there will be opposition, but in the midst of it there will be strong help from loyal people in several small congregations in the metropolitan area of Chicagoland.

A Personal Disavowal. In reference to the notice of withdrawal in a recent issue of the *Gospel Guardian* from eighty-three year old

Brother J. E. Williams, I wish to inform the readers, (1) that I had no knowledge of any intention to publish such a notice: (2) that I do not indorse the statement made; (3) that I do not approve the publication of it. This statement is made because my connection with the *Gospel Guardian* in the public mind as owner attached responsibility to me for a statement which I would not have published, nor knowingly permitted to be published.

POSTMARKS

TO MY FELLOW-PREACHERS

Dear Fellows:

This number of TORCH goes to every gospel preacher in the U.S.A., Canada, and in all English speaking countries, whose names and addresses are known. I want to make it possible for every gospel preacher in the world to receive TORCH regularly. There are grave issues before us; bold advances are being made against the church from within as well as from without. Preachers of the gospel have the potential influence to stem these invasions and stop the innovators. Some editors, schoolmen and preachers who should be expected to stand against these departures are not helping in this struggle against overwhelming odds and powerful influences. Consider the effect if all of us who hold common convictions on the issues would rise up in arms and form a solid line of defense. I am neither a Gideon nor a Paul Revere but I do call upon the host of preachers everywhere, in name of the God of Gideon, to rally to the call of battle before it is too late. Here is my request, and offer: Ask brethren where you are to subscribe to TORCH, preferably elders of the church, and send me their names, whether one or several—*yours will be free*. I want all gospel

preachers to receive TORCH on this small consideration—just *one* paid subscriber from somebody else.

Hoping to hear from you now, I am,

Your friend and fellow,

Foy E. Wallace, Jr.

EVIDENCE OF INTEREST

In three recent meetings announcement of “God’s Prophetic Word” and “Certified Gospel” brought requests for two hundred books. It was explained that I am author but not owner of the books, and hold no copyright interests in them, which proves the interest was in the books rather than any motive to help the author. Orders should be sent to Roy E. Cogdill, owner and publisher of the books, Box 980, Lufkin, Texas. The second edition of both books are moving steadily at the regular price of \$3.00 each.

This is a sample of the material contained in
Torch
by Foy E. Wallace, Jr.

To order single copies, visit:
store.gospelarmory.com/product/torch/

To place a bulk order (10 or more copies)
at a discounted price, visit:
www.gospelarmory.com/bulk/

Thank you!

