



---

Volume III Number 6  
Devoted to the Defense of Christ and the Church  
Summer 1986

Part of the  
**Jimmie Beller Memorial eLibrary**  
[www.TheCobbSix.com](http://www.TheCobbSix.com)

## **OUR LIBERTY IN CHRIST & THE SILENCE OF SCRIPTURE**

***Richard E. Black***

“So speak ye, and so do, as they that shall be judged by the *law of liberty*” (James 2:12).

The sects, long saturated with philosophy, deny the inspiration of the Bible. Their downhill course has been brought on by disregard for authority. A grassroots element, realizing it has been deceived, is searching. The disillusioned are leaving the sects, forcing party spirited leaders to clamor for merger. Unity talks between Christian Churches and churches of Christ fit this scenario. *The church is unique. We hold truths for which the honorable seek.* But we are derelict. Many chant the errors that caused sectarians to leave

sectarianism, and proposals hinting compromise with digressive elements for the sake of unity abets the objectives of sectarianism. Such closes the door of opportunity, shutting up the kingdom from seekers.

While enlightened sectarians abandon the policies of factional leaders we are busy gathering in cast off theologies. Only folly parrots. What causes denominational demise will cause Christianity's death if taken up.

The orchestrated effort to relegate the New Testament as sole authority in Christianity is at a peak. A West Coast preacher advises us that "As long as a specific commandment has not been violated, the act is permissible!! It turns out that the commandment to sing with 'all the heart' (RSV) is not violated with the playing of an instrument. One can sing with the instrument and find himself obeying the words 'sing with the heart' if, indeed, his worship is heart felt. Conversely, one can find himself in violation of the command even though he has in his possession nothing but a book of verses. Thus, we see that the command of Eph. 5:19 concerns itself with inwardness and says nothing about the outward expression. We are free to express ourselves as we wish. We are not free to press our views on others."

Suddenly, Christianity has become a system controlled by inner feelings - a Calvinistic slant. Consequently, we address the theme, "Our Liberty In Christ And the Silence Of Scripture."

### ***Inspiration And Authority***

The crux of the matter concerning authority in faith is inspiration. A single authority is essential to unity in Christ; only the Bible qualifies on that point. When James states "so speak ye, and so do," he means *every* matter of faith and practice, word and work. When he declares that all will be judged by the "law of liberty" we understand every effort to equate liberty with license to be false.

Permissiveness is not included in liberty. James' word puts liberty under law and judgment. Permissiveness unseats judgment and enthrones respect of persons; absolute freedom requires absence of law. Since no determination of fault is possible where law is subject to many interpretations only a sophist would argue the possibility of justice without law. "Where there is no law there is no transgression."

No law is lawlessness. Liberty carried to license is lawlessness,

and lawlessness is sin. "Sin is the transgression of the law." The gospel, the law of liberty, is *freedom from* rather than *unrestricted permission to* act. It is freedom from sin, and from the law of Moses. "Even so we . . . were in bondage under the elements of the world: But when the fulness of the time was come, God sent forth his Son, made of a woman, made under the law, To redeem them that were under the law" (Galatians 4:3-5).

The *elements* of the text are the fundamentals of Christ as found in the law and prophets. The *world* of the passage is Judaism. The gospel liberates those under *the* law, the Mosaic covenant. Liberty does not free from law generically, but delivers from sin and the Mosaic law specifically while ratifying the *law* of liberty, the gospel. "He taketh away the first that he might establish the second."

The emphasis set on inspiration is now apparent for the law of liberty, to be the single standard of judgment, must be inspired of God. If I entertained the notion of human authorship I would not accept the Bible any more as my guide in religion than any other book except where my own judgment considered it superior to all others. This is what is being done by higher critics. Once one abandons inspiration there is no end to the irreverence manifest toward the written word. Human intelligence then takes precedence over God. The revival of rationalism must be exposed. The relationship between inspiration and authority is an essential bond.

### ***The Role of Opinion***

Opinion is a nondescript - it belongs to no order. *Opinion* is not found in the New Testament, and only mentioned in isolated texts in the Old. Elihu's "I was afraid, and durst not shew you mine opinion" of Job 32:6 is translated my own *knowledge* by the Septuagint. It means intelligent experience providing an area of expertise. That Elihu refers to *my* knowledge opens the matter to consideration by others, but as well removes it from simple opinion. The Septuagint translates the phrase "Why stand ye halt between two opinions?" of 1 Kings 18:21 by "How long wilt ye halt on both feet?" Opinion goes nowhere. Opinion has no pertinent role - both faith and practice stem from revealed knowledge. These principles are more significant in light of the Unity Meetings' emphases on opinion.

Opinion is an impression formed in the absence of sufficient evidence to constitute it knowledge. Faith in an opinion is a contradiction. Current elevation of opinion to doctrine is a misfire in

logic and scripture. Wisdom and like values have a definite place in the operation of the local congregation, but opinion cannot be bound. Opinion is silent - it cannot argue for or against.

Man indulges opinion; faith has substance. We *believe the facts* of the gospel, *obey the commands* legislated, *rejoice in the hope* of spiritual rewards promised, *tremble at the doom* pronounced on those that know not God, but it is ridiculous to propose faith in opinion. "Faith cometh by hearing . . . the word of God."

### ***Where The Bible Is Silent***

"Look to yourselves, that we lose not those things which we have wrought, but that we receive a full reward. Whosoever goeth onward and abideth not in the doctrine of Christ, hath not God" (2 John 8-9).

Who would forecast a paradox within the churches as has formed lately? We are told by *somewhats* that any faith and practice is permissible when "the Bible doesn't say don't." A coalition of revisionists and weak members are convinced they have sufficiently brainwashed the body and a takeover is imminent. Timed to an age of skepticism, the promoters think the "Bible doesn't forbid it" theory will be generally accepted. It is time for men to stand in the gap. Warnings issued a decade ago went unheard - error advocated so openly today will possibly rally the grassroots.

Silence neither authorizes nor sanctions, and Christians are forbidden to go beyond what has been written. "Keep the ordinances, *as I delivered them to you*" (1 Corinthians 11:2). "Whosoever transgresseth (goeth onward), and abideth not in the doctrine of Christ, hath not God" (2 John 9). Such stands in the path of all who would speak where scripture is silent.

The procedure when silence prevails is seen in the controversy at Antioch over whether Gentile Christians must keep the law of Moses and circumcision. James, referring to the apostles, said: "We gave no such commandment" (Acts 15:24). Liberty did not permit Jewish zealots to bind the Mosaic law on Gentile converts. Silence did not give license. The quietness of God did not, and could not, permit human legislation. Since silence cannot legislate, it cannot sanction. Men who speak when God does not are usurpers.

Pioneers regarded silence indifferently - fellowship was not decided by matters of indifference. Zeal in opinion is the major cause disrupting fellowship. Paul corrected the Romans: "The

kingdom of God is not meat and drink; but righteousness, and peace, and joy in the Holy Ghost" (Romans 14:17). Kingdom matters have been revealed. We neither propose nor oppose a matter of indifference for such affects only the personal lives of brethren rather than the corporate spiritual body. Personal opinion poses no problem unless forced upon the church - it then threatens unity.

Consider circumcision. "For in Jesus Christ neither circumcision availeth anything, nor uncircumcision; but faith which worketh by love" (Galatians 5:6). Circumcision, a matter of indifference in Christ, poses neither a moral or doctrinal question. Matters of indifference are regulated by discretion, not revelation. No moral or ethical issue arises over unenforceable matters, and the fact that one cannot be disciplined for not observing a human rite does not encourage binding opinion. "Hast thou faith? have it to thyself before God."

Pertinent to this study is the principle that all things in the spiritual realm are to be positively commanded. "Teaching them to *observe* all things *whatsoever I have commanded you*" (Matthew 28:20). Faith cannot exist in the absence of revelation, consequently no practice is bound by silence.

Man cannot justify reversing the "We are silent where the Bible is silent" motto to "We speak where the scriptures are silent." When approaching God's word one would do well to remember that "The Lord is in his holy temple: let all the earth keep silence before him" (Habakkuk 2:20).

### ***Generic And Specific Precepts***

Logic respects the distinction between definite and indefinite ordinances. God's commands have been given generically and specifically. No vagueness plagues the Bible.

Generic commands allow an expedient without usurping authority. Specific command includes a particular and excludes all else in that category. When a text names a particular it is impossible to remain faithful while ignoring the specification. Truth is lost when we generalize a specific.

Generics and specifics deal with coordinates. Coordinates state the specifics within a generic, the varieties making up a kind. When divine revelation authorizes a specific within the generic all other coordinates are thereby refused authorization, and man has no option but that of obedience versus disobedience.

Sacrifice was commanded under the Old Covenant. “The firstling of the flock.” Animal sacrifice (generic) was not the command - the animal was named, the firstling (specific). The fact that “God did not say don’t sacrifice a hog” did not authorize, sanction, permit or tolerate the sacrifice of swine under a so-called liberty of silence.

This principle applies to worship, in its music. Two coordinates exist in music: vocal and instrumental. Had the Lord generically ordered the church to *make music* Christians would have been at liberty to use either vocal or instrumental music, or both. Any combination would not have breached a generic, but when the Lord specified *singing*, His inclusion of a specific, vocal music, excluded instrumental.

The self styled intelligentsia stamp these illustrations and arguments as trite, hoary with age, no longer viable, unacceptable to the Christian Church people, therefore, ill-advised, *ad nauseam*. Regardless the ridicule, it remains that sectarians have not been able to tear asunder these arguments either from scripture or logic. Pragmatists, advocates of opinion within the church, can do no better.

Liberals are the real Legalists. In advocating “We can practice anything the Bible does not specifically forbid” he *legalizes* non-enforceable practices. And he indicts conservative thinkers, those unwilling to usurp the silence of Scripture, as being legalists? “Happy is he that condemneth not himself in that thing which he alloweth.”

## **MRS. FOY E. WALLACE JR. PASSES**

Virgie Brightwell Wallace, 89, widow of Foy E. Wallace Jr., was born in Bell County, Texas, on January 2, 1896, and passed away in Fort Smith, Arkansas, on January 5, 1987, even as various mediums announced her impending birthday.

She married Foy E. Wallace Jr. on November 29, 1914, while both were yet in their teens, and they celebrated their 65th wedding anniversary in Hereford, Texas, only a few days before his death on December 18, 1979.

The affections prompted by the noble spirit of this stately and extraordinary lady, and the dedication inspired through observing her conquer life, drew the best from all who knew her. No more

illustrious eulogy to a virtuous woman can be expressed than that of her children calling her blessed and praise issuing from a husband who knew that she excelled them all. His Inscription for the *Commentary on Revelation* reads:

“To Virgie Brightwell Wallace, who entered my life when we were young and who through the fifty years since has been, and still is, my constant and steadfast companion; who mothered our children, and who though in the later years has been physically impaired by persistent paralysis has nevertheless continued with me in the travels of widespread preaching with interest and optimism; always characterized by patience in trial, cheerfulness in varied surroundings, radiant in happiness with her family, and loyalty to her husband; and who has been near me in long and silent interest through the tedious preparation of this book — to her, without whom I would not want to remain in this world, this volume for which she has sat in wait for so long is now devotedly dedicated.”

Sister Wallace is survived by two daughters, Lee Ella Wallace of Yucca Valley, California, and Martha Jane, Mrs. Richard E. Black, of Fort Smith, Arkansas; three sons, Austin Taylor Wallace of Casper, Wyoming, Wilson Wallace of McEwen, Tennessee, and, William Wallace of Newport, North Carolina; three daughters-in-law and one son-in-law; fifteen grandchildren and four great-grandchildren.

The family met at the grave site, West Park Cemetery, Hereford, Texas, on January 8, 1987, where William Wallace recalled memories precious to the family and Wilson Wallace read Proverbs 31. Prayer accompanied the serenity, privacy, and sanctity of the moment as Sister Wallace was placed, once more and forever, at the side of Brother Wallace, in eternal life. Their epitaphs read, “Soldier of the Cross” and “His Faithful Companion of Sixty-five Years.” We covet their peace.

## **AN ENLARGED SPECIAL EDITION**

This issue of *Torch Of Truth* is an enlarged edition. The subject matter lent itself to such an expansion, and we are making a deliberate effort to put *Torch* on a precise schedule. June, July and August have been combined in this “Summer Quarter” issue in hand.

We are gradually, but positively moving toward a monthly

publication schedule. Circumstances, as further outlined in our editorial, demand it. Your continued support by prompt renewals and rallying of new club subscriptions will hasten the pace of success. Thank You. - REB.

## **LET THE CHURCH BE THE CHURCH**

*George W. DeHoff*

The business of the church is to preach the gospel of Christ. It exists for this purpose. Without the gospel men are lost. The gospel is God's power unto salvation. (Rom. 1:16) There is nothing else which the church does, that is not secondary to preaching the gospel. There is nothing else the church does but what some other organization is doing the same thing, and sometimes doing it better. If the church is not going to conduct a militant campaign of preaching the gospel it might as well go out of existence, and that is what it will do unless it preaches the gospel.

It is not the business of the church to operate colleges, soup kitchens, relief- kitchens, summer camps, youth centers, entertainment bureaus, ball teams, and such like. The church must preach the gospel, and "visit the fatherless and the widows in their afflictions." If the church goes into the entertainment business in an attempt to reach the people (reach them with what?) men of the world will say, "That is real Christianity." If the church opens a soup kitchen, worldly people (who believe men are saved out of the church as well as in it and do not know what it is all about anyway!) will say, "That's real Christianity." But if the church preaches the gospel, men of the world will become displeased — that is the purpose of gospel preaching: to cause them to become displeased with their condition and to become Christians.

Every inch of the ground which we now occupy has been gained by gospel preaching, by a campaign of teaching the facts to be believed, commands to be obeyed, and promises to be enjoyed. Every Christian should teach, preach, dispute, confute, rebuke, exhort and whatever else is necessary to get men to see the Truth, and to know the difference between the Truth and error. This is the work of the church. - 749 N. W. Broad St., Murfreesboro, TN 37130.

## CRIMES UNDER COVER

**Hugo McCord**

*Foy E. Wallace Jr. featured the following manuscript on the back cover of the March 1939 issue of The Bible Banner. Its up-to-dateness is apparent - only the names of persons and publications need changing. Feel free to pick any speculative controversy in today's church, pinpoint its human source, connect it to his publications, and the lesson strikes home. - REB.*

The *Congressional Record* of January 13 carries this statement: "Madame Roland is said to have exclaimed, shortly before she was guillotined during the French Revolution: 'Oh, liberty, what crimes are committed in thy name!' If she lived today she could well say: 'Oh peace, what crimes are committed in thy name!'" Representative Shannon had those words inserted in his speech against war. If that miserable condition exists in the realm of politics, we should not be surprised to find it in other fields too. And certainly every calm Christian today is sadly aware that the above political deceit has pushed its ugly head into (of all places!) the holy sanctuary of religion. The tactics of axe-grinding politicians and selfish warmongers in the hands of religion! Crimes they are in politics, but sins they are in religion when men use high and noble names to cover wrongdoings.

***Liberty***

In the pure and attractive name of liberty premillennialists among us defend their teachings. Bro. Boll says he quit a pope once for all when leaving the Catholics, and that now he is at liberty under God to teach as he interprets the Bible. Thus under the good name of *emancipation from controlled thought* he says he has liberty to teach his theories. All of us readily applaud any man with courage enough to throw away a papal yoke, or any other human yoke. But am I not going too far with my "liberty" when I persist in teaching a doctrine that *divides the body of my Lord* and that / *admit is unnecessary* to salvation? Why, of course, I have freedom to hold to the idea if I conscientiously think it the truth, but if I admit it is unnecessary to salvation, why should I waste time with it? Especially when it causes confusion? Then when I go ahead to justify my course on the basis of "my liberty in Christ," I am using a high name for a low purpose; I am putting my crime in holy clothes.

Nobody is trying to get Bro. Boll and his coadjutors to bow to any other “interpretation” of Revelations 20. Nobody is withdrawing fellowship because Bro. Boll believes in premillennialism. Nobody is even trying to put a yoke on him. If he would only agree not to teach his interpretation, all would be well. For him to say such an agreement deprives him of his liberty is for him to use the same argument of the “wets”. Liquor drinkers objected that prohibition laws took away their liberties. A drunk staggering down the street has no liberty to bump everybody else off the walk. And it is crime in the name of liberty when alcoholics and speculators cry for freedom.

### ***Peace***

The same high crime and sin has been committed in the lovely name of peace. Sympathizers toward Bro. Boll and some who do not know what the theory means cry, “Peace, peace! It is a harmless theory. Let him teach it. Don’t fight about it. Peace!” All of us want peace, but some things are more valuable. “First pure, then peaceable,” is the way our God ordains. And premillennialism is false doctrine, impure teaching with dangerous consequences. Let a doctrine alone for peace when it gives false hopes to few? That kind of peace is not honorable. That kind of peace Paul could have had with Hymenaeus and Philetus - men who had erred in doctrine; but Paul, a lover of peace, would have it only on the ground of purity. He was determined their doctrine would not be taught in the churches. In like manner, Jesus could have had “peace” in Pergamum and in Ephesus, but he said, Clean out that doctrine, I hate it; that is the way the Prince of Peace felt about it. And so, brethren, surely the Bible teaches you and I are not to sit still when private interpretations and false doctrines are taught.

### ***Piety***

If high crimes are committed in the noble names of liberty and of peace, the same thing is true with the godly name of piety. So pious is Bro. Boll, so spiritual and prayerful is the *Word and Work* that many have said: “They are so good and godly and pious, they cannot be the bad actors as reported.” But those for pretense making long prayers in the Savior’s time seemed just as “good and godly and pious.” Outside piety is never carried on the shirt sleeves. If it is on the outside it is for somebody other than the Lord to see. Obvious piety is pageantry, and has its own reward. No doubt the *Word and*

*Work* contingent do pray much, and no doubt they are sincere; so are many Catholics, Mohammedans, and others. No doubt the *Word and Work* group, from all outward appearances, earns the title of piety. But I cannot appreciate any man's piety much that will lead him to persist in teaching an admittedly unnecessary theory, and that when it causes division! I don't want the kind of piety that leads me to act so. And when brethren today, even preachers, justify the Louisville Schism, saying, "They are pious and sweet-spirited," those brethren are committing a crime under holy names.

Oh, liberty, oh, peace, oh, piety, what crimes are committed in thy names! - *The Bible Banner, March 1939.*

## **A QUOTE FROM AN UNKNOWN SOURCE**

The man who refuses to give honest consideration to teaching on any subject, must (1) believe that he is incapable of learning, or (2) think that he knows all there is to know on the subject, or (3) knows that he is wrong and does not intend to change.

In our search for truth, may we be free from: (1) the cowardice that shrinks from new truth, that is, new to us; (2) the laziness that is content with half-truths; and (3) the arrogance that thinks that it knows all truth already.

"I wish I were big enough to honestly admit all my shortcomings; broad enough to accept flattery without it making me arrogant; tall enough to tower above deceit; strong enough to treasure love; brave enough to welcome criticism; compassionate enough to understand frailties; wise enough to recognize my mistakes; humble enough to appreciate greatness; staunch and righteous enough to be devoted to the laws of God." - *G.H. Taggart, Wall Street Journal*

## **TRIBUTE FOY E. WALLACE JR. - THE BATTLE CRY REVIVED**

***Richard E. Black***

The recent death of my wife's mother, Mrs. Foy E. Wallace Jr., urges that a tribute to my *inlaw* father, buried in my files for seven years while deferring to others to publish eulogies, should now be

circulated *in memoriam*.

Personal reference to the extraordinary is often mistaken for the immodesty associated with name dropping; however, when one happens to enjoy kinship with a notable it is dishonorable to deny kinship and sheer disrespect to conceal it. Being aware of the extremes employed by men when they become occupied with judging others, and being in total disregard for those malignant spirits, we, by reason of time and circumstances, are compelled to publish the following long concealed tribute to my *inlaw Dad*, as he uniquely termed our relationship, lest silence be further construed by dissidents for discord.

The following tribute was penned a few hours after a long, solitary walk, in the wintry night air of the Texas high plains shortly after arriving at the side of our mother-in-law on that December 18, 1979 evening. This wise, strong character, a comely constituted, faithful lady, object of our comfort, in turn, consoled her children. Her being with us in her last months has even been a fountain of solace. Impassioned moments ordinarily churn mental energies enabling those who wisely channel such powers to speak their heart without reservation and with an oratory otherwise unknown. So, to the tribute.

The severity of death's inevitability is only surpassed by its reality. Recent hours, fraught with musings, memories and decisions, have incited a sudden maturity expected of agelessness. Meditations born of solitude, mixed with a sobriety produced only by death, have dealt with resolve. A deliberate look at the future is required for the one-by-one ascent into glory of noble and gallant men, men who bridged the gap between the pioneers and our generation, marks "The End Of An Era."

It is time to emerge from the shadow. The demand is that a new generation unfurl an old banner. With an undaunted spirit a sense of venturesomeness in facing faith's foes will now be launched vigorously and courageously. "Moses my servant is dead; now therefore arise, go over this Jordan, thou, and all this people, unto the land which I do give to them."

*The dust of Caesar is no greater than that of Lazarus, but what a difference in their souls!*

Foy E. Wallace Jr., September 30, 1896 - December 18, 1979, valiant soldier of Christ. His exceptional reasoning and polemic skills

were far reaching. Enemies of truth found his arguments unanswerable. Opponents in debate desired no second engagement. His voice, empowered by the authority of a magnificent comprehension and recall of divine revelation provided a courage of conviction only possessed by those confident in knowledge. "I know whom I have believed, and am persuaded, that he is able to keep that which I have delivered unto him against that day."

Defection in worship, doctrinal speculations, party-spirited attempts to sectarianize the church, corruption of the Biblical text, as seen in the instrumental music question, the millennial theory, the indistinctness with which many view the church, and the modern speech perversions countenanced and abetted by many preachers and professors, were solemn matters vigorously addressed. The scheme of redemption did not suffer at his hands. Enemies of truth assailed with the vindictiveness of personalities. Time will uphold truth and exonerate its advocate. I can adopt no superior mission, for "The Lord will be with the good."

Advancing age deterred not a whit; rather, such provided a careless fearlessness outstripping former moments of bravery. He knew that in just a little while - he intimately forewarned, "It won't be very long now" - he would touch eternity's shore. Dedication to the superiority of truth developed a ruggedly individualistic eloquence. He touched young and old, saint and sinner, friend and foe. Dad Wallace personified the awesome responsibility of an evangelist. "Let a man so account of us, as of the ministers of Christ, and stewards of the mysteries of God." "Whether we live or die, we are the Lord's."

Public forums, pulpits, conceal the individual. Leaders must emphasize principles and axioms that curry the public good - the demand is for sobriety, and frequently, sternness. Privacy and personal contact discover the real man. Tenderheartedly he could weep for others, never himself. He was a total giver, never accepting the role of receiver. Need could only be answered with supply - no decision had to be made, the need was sufficient cause. In identical manner, when truth was at stake, regardless the circumstance, the relationship, or the celebrity, there was no retreat, no surrender. This man could not fly in the face of rectitude. Fidelity, he counselled, reaches its highest and perfected form when directed to Christ. "It is required in stewards that a man be found faithful."

As for me, relationship begat deference; association required maturity; attentiveness educated; observation revealed the secret of logic; affection instilled esteem; intimacy stimulated devotedness; confidence provoked courage; and, example motivated. Never should one imitate another, but all should foster the spirit of Elijah within the framework of their own individuality. “And Moses went out to meet his father in law, and did obeisance, and kissed him; and they asked each other of their welfare.”

Leaders are born in a crucible, not a cradle. Leaders develop through tribulation, not in ease. Leaders hone their abilities in fighting the good fight of faith, not in irresponsible conduct. Leaders temper their passions in tragedy, not by wallowing in tears of self-pity and cynicism. Leaders resurrect when faults die. Leaders come to the fore when their champions die in battle. “The flaming flame shall not be quenched.”

The flight of a cherished one carries part of us with them. Something in us dies, too, to be reborn in greater resourcefulness and usefulness. Weakness dies to strength, timidity succumbs to courage, hesitancy gives way to diligence, intimidation is slaughtered. “But his word was in mine heart as a burning fire shut up in my bones, and I was weary with forbearing, and I could not stay.”

We covet the peace known by the redeemed who resonantly sing the “song of Moses, the servant of God, and the song of the Lamb, saying, Great and marvelous are thy works, Lord God Almighty; just and true are thy ways, thou King of saints.”

Our generation must rise in that integrity of faith seen in the pioneers that they may rest in the assurance that although we exercise our gift in a different style, and can never fill their office, we shall, in their noble spirit, do what we are capable of accomplishing. We shall confront error in the strength of truth and in the boldness of confidence that is uniquely our own, with the objective being that sons and sons’ sons will follow suit in their day. “I will sing of the mercies of the Lord for ever: with my mouth will I make known thy faithfulness to all generations.”

Let the denizens of error, aware of my peculiar right to his battle cry, know assuredly that it has been revived: *They Shall Not Pass!*

## **A MAN'S ENEMIES**

*Cled E. Wallace*

I do not want any enemies. I will not deliberately and with malice aforethought make any. It is the craving of my heart to “follow after peace with all men, and sanctification, without which no man shall see the Lord.” (Heb. 12:14) Nevertheless, a man’s enemies can be a standing monument to his power and integrity. It was so with Paul. Theodore Roosevelt said a man who has no enemies is the man who does nothing. Christ said, “A man’s foes shall be they of his own household.” (Mt. 10:35)

If I must have a few enemies, or many, here are the kind I want; I want to make them “for the truth of the gospel.” I want them to be among men who have winced from the sharp point of the sword of the Spirit. . . There are inactive eruptions, both in and out of the church, bold advocates of a false doctrine. Some of them are unscrupulous. Chattering enthusiasts threaten to eclipse the present glory of the church and power of the gospel with theories. The gospel must fit the mold of their theories or they will have none of it. If I must make a few enemies, I want them to be false teachers, church destroyers and their sympathizers and apologists. And if they must be my enemies, I want them to be so because I have told them the truth; and on principles involved I will ask them no quarter, nor will offer them any. Christ did not; neither did Paul.

## **SHOULD and SHALL**

*Graham Cain*

Two passages of scripture are under consideration. Philippians 2:10-11 and Romans 14:10-11. In these verses the freewill agency of man is seen, the great attributes of God’s love, long-suffering and mercy are emphasized, and His severity is stressed.

The beautiful picture of our Saviour’s compassion and concern for fallen man is nowhere more tenderly drawn than in these words from the apostle Paul: “Let this mind be in you, which was also in Christ Jesus: Who, being in the form of God, thought it not robbery to be equal with God: But made himself of no reputation, and took upon him the form of a servant, and was made in the likeness of men: And being found in fashion as a man, he humbled himself, and

became obedient unto death, even the death of the cross” (Phil. 2:5-8). The high, exalted position that was given to Him as a result is shown in verse 9: “Wherefore God also hath highly exalted him, and given him a name which is above every name”. Continuing in verse 10 and 11, the logical, obvious response that should immediately follow this amazing narrative of Heaven’s grace is stated: “That at the name of Jesus every knee *should* bow, of things in heaven, and things in earth, and things under the earth; And that every tongue *should* confess that Jesus Christ is Lord, to the glory of God the Father” (emphasis added).

This word “should” is a verb in the subjective mood which allows a choice. This is an appeal to intellect; to reason. It calls for action that is proper, needful and wise. This is shown to be the case in verse 12 where the appeal is referenced to obedience.

The passage in Romans 14:10-11 is not a parallel reading, although there is a similarity. The latter part of verse 10 unequivocally states, that “we shall all stand before the judgment seat of Christ”. Placing emphasis upon the word “shall” shows this verb to be not a matter of choice but of certainty, just as stated in Heb. 9:27, “. . . it is appointed unto men once to die, but after this cometh judgment”. Verse 11 continues, “For it is written, As I live, saith the Lord, every knee shall bow to me, and every tongue shall confess to God”.

We see, therefore, that the message of Phil. 2:10-11 is completely different to the similar wording of Rom. 14:11. The gentle exhortation of “should” is changed to the harsh, unbending certainty of “shall”. The “should” of reasonableness and justification becomes the “shall” of responsibility and judgment. The “should” of Phil. 2 emphasizes the long-suffering of God and alludes to His extended mercy for all who obey. The “shall” of Rom. 14 warns of the severity of God to all who scorn and refuse the opportunities of His grace and mercy.

The prominent point is, however, that every knee *is* going to bow and every tongue *is* going to confess His high and Holy name. It just becomes a matter of when. And the matter of when becomes the pivot upon which the destiny of every soul is hinged. The wise choice is to obey the “should” of opportunity. The long-suffering and mercy of God will only extend to the “shall” of judgment. - 2244 Mountain View Dr., Hurst, TX 76054.

# HUMANISM IN THE PUBLIC SCHOOL SYSTEM

*Richard E. Black*

In the fall of 1973 a young lady was subjected to daily humanistic sessions through her high school World History class. The instructor's philosophical approach to the course had established a track record over several years in which he instilled rebellion in the minds of his students to the degree that several church families suffered the consequences. Sons and daughters began taunting parents. Some eventually abandoned the fireside. Frequent campus revolts necessarily reverted to the humanistic teachings advanced by the teacher who referred to his own intelligence as god.

The student in question, a senior, had transferred from another state at the beginning of the school year, and was more mature than the sophomores ordinarily enrolled in that required History course. Her close relationship with her parents prompted her to consult them as confusions created by the teacher began to build, and had she never confided in them an overthrow of faith was dangerously possible. With many teens, even those reared in the church, such an assault had proven successful in destroying faith. She requested and received transfer from the class. Knowing she was the only student of Spanish in his class, the teacher sarcastically retorted in Spanish as she was leaving, "Go with God!" He hoped his use of Spanish would keep her classmates, who had not studied the language, from being influenced by her departure.

Copious notes had been taken, and I preserved them for more than a decade with this article in mind. The subtlety in which the Humanistic-Christianity confrontation is waged by falsifiers is effectively exposed herein. Observations will be made that draw your attention to the various sections of *Humanist Manifesto I* and *Humanist Manifesto II* demonstrating our proposition that humanism is being both subtly and openly taught in many public school systems. It will appear in various classes. Some teachers of humanism are open advocates and are deliberately sowing its deceit. Others are naively involved having been, to a degree, brainwashed by the modern methods of teacher preparation in secular institutions. I have known teachers within the church who have used various humanist techniques, such as values judgments, thinking such to be an advanced educational tool, while being ignorant of either the source or

the intent of that practice. Parents should remain vigilant, and watch for humanism in various classes. History, philosophy, and science classes are especially susceptible to humanism, and easily adapted to its objectives.

That our readers make no mistake as to who is speaking in the following exposures, the *teacher's notes will be numbered and placed in quotation marks.*

[1] “Cultural changes can be: irrational, retrogressive or destructive.”

Respected advisors to *Torch* have cautioned concerning unusual terms occasionally employed. We recognize the necessity of writing so as to effect communication, and have made adjustments in light of such wise counsel, but another matter is brought to our attention by the high school teacher's quote. Read it once more. Our youngsters are being taught on highly sophisticated levels nowadays. The language used by this instructor to a room full of sophomores - sixteen year olds - who were expected to not only comprehend his instruction, but give it back on examinations to the degree they could muster an “A” in the course. If we are going to assist our teens in difficult situations we must be prepared to cope with the attitudes and terminology involved. This is no time for parents to become indifferent to the enormous responsibility required of successful parents! Parents who do not make the effort to aid and abet their children will rue the day of their sloth.

The lack of commitment apparent in today's marriages on the part of the young is necessarily an extension of the lack of commitment provided them by their parents. Society's unwillingness, at every level, to accept responsibility is *the* major flaw of modern times. Responsibility is a fundamental essential to social success.

Back to his statement. Cultural changes are changes in society's development in the realms of education, discipline and/or training. Why did he only list negative types of changes? “Irrational, retrogressive or destructive.” No positive or constructive development of society is mentioned. Irrational changes result from conduct based on mere emotion. They are unreasonable or directly in conflict with reason. Retrogressive changes move backward rather than forward. Destructive changes erase.

Thoughtful men recognize these words as revolutionary in kind. They call for a return to barbaric, uncivilized conduct. They wreak

with rebellion for no principle of progress is mentioned.

[2] “As historians we do not judge whether something is good/bad, but if it is right/wrong.”

Here is the pattern being set for the introduction of situation ethics. A constant flow of lengthy quotations from such authors as Quigley, Fromm and Maslow was supplied in handouts to the students to verify his standard of judgment. To deny that values should be judged by the good/bad standard is to rebel at the moral code revealed in the Word of God. This procedure prompts those caught up with such valueless ways to severely ridicule and bitterly assault youthful Christians for their faith. “What kind of a church is it that won’t allow you to . . . .?” The consequence of this statement is that no absolute standard of morality exists. Conduct must not be judged either as good or bad within itself, but whatever is right for the moment and the people involved is judged right. No wrong can be committed except when the parties themselves condemn it as wrong, so making themselves, through rationalization, god. This is the impact of the earlier reference to the instructor’s ongoing remarks that his intelligence is god.

[3] “Method of teaching was Factual, now it is Conceptions.” This follow-up quote reveals a new attitude on the part of humanist teachers which is the primary cause of their success. It is a conceptual or philosophical approach to the subject rather than a discussion of facts or principles.

This procedure is a mutilation of the teaching principle. In a positive manner the argument is made that the objective is to teach the student to think for himself; however, turning from principles of merit to personalities, concepts and muckraking in any arena is to fail in understanding truth. Abandonment of the facts of history to wallow in philosophical concepts amounts to nothing less than feeble men of the 20th century attempting to psychoanalyze the dead. Historians are legitimate only when they record the data of a bygone era for oncoming generations to study in the quest of founding themselves in their own moment of history. The very idea of moderns looking back several generations to assess the motives and attitudes, concepts, of our forefathers through remote control is farfetched. Such is not history, it is fantasy.

[4] “If criteria is internal it is good or bad. If criteria is external it is right or wrong.”

This is more situation ethics. Internal criteria, standards of judgment found within the individual, determine whether things are good or bad. Humanism's standard of morality centers in what the person himself desires or determines. External criteria, standards of judgment from without, above the individual, determine whether conduct is right or wrong, but does not determine good or bad. Readers should note that God and the written Word, the Bible, is external criteria. By the humanist's definition, God cannot reveal or authorize a moral code superior to the desires of the individual!

It is at this point that many will recognize the fullness of the truth found in Paul's statement that fornication is a sin against one's own body. The humanistic criteria would permit fornication as a moral act if the person instigating fornication determines within himself that it is good and convinces himself that it is consequently right for the partner. Biblical pronouncement that fornication is wrong, sin, has no bearing on the matter to the situation ethics devotee. How decent individuals can even begin to so argue is beyond reason.

[5] "In a true state of nature self discipline alone exists. When man has to be disciplined from outside he is no longer in a state of nature."

Nature, in educational circles, is man's essential character by reason of physical birth. Humanism's true state of nature is a complete or full presence of being in this world. He does not consider the spiritual or inner man. The inner man is eventually denied by the humanist. Such is a necessary conclusion to his belief in the degenerating theory of evolution. See the references under *Religion* in the *Manifestos*.

The teacher's statement demonstrates our proposition or accusation for us when he says "When man has to be disciplined from outside he is no longer in a state of nature." He argues that man is no longer man when he submits to God and His disciplinary (educational) authority. Every word of this instructor was conceived for the purpose of making each man an entity sovereign to self, so rooting out God.

[6] "This is the goal of man. For everyone to self-discipline himself. A democracy and all governments are disciplines because they interfere."

If that is not a seed statement for revolution, what would it take to make one? Anarchy results when every man does whatever seems

right in his own estimation. Revolution calls for the violent overthrow of government. Since he previously catalogued only irrationality, retrogression and destruction as possibilities in cultural change, revolution answers the need. Students so taught are quite apt to rebel on campus. They did at that school.

[7] “Democracy is the best possible discipline, but bad because it is discipline.”

Discipline is an evil to humanists. It is a contradiction of the first class for the teacher to so station himself since discipline is instruction, training that corrects, molds, strengthens and perfects. Unthinking folk might think discipline is only to be defined as a woodshed experience, but we have a teacher bad-mouthing discipline as though he was not disciplining, training, while conducting his affairs in the classroom.

[8] “About the tenth grade you begin to understand about abstractions or abstract ideas. Example: In the Bible it talks about the Trinity and this is an abstract idea.”

Abstract means expression of a quality apart from any object. Trinity is ordinarily defined to mean that all three members of the Godhead (God, Christ, Holy Spirit) are united as one God. Theologically speaking, Trinity is an unhappy term as it is not Biblically accurate in its definition of the Godhead. I am quite satisfied with Godhead for that word simplifies the entire matter. It describes three beings functioning as one God who is sovereign. Therefore, no distinction authoritatively prevails between them, and no divisiveness is possible within the Godhead. To declare the Godhead abstract is to sever the actuality of being from God, Christ and the Holy Spirit. The teacher’s judgment that the Godhead is an abstraction concludes that the idea of an eternal God is just that, an idea, not an actual being. An idea does not have being, is not an object that is either visible or tangible. Now, we would not claim God to be humanly visible, but who save an infidel would declare Him nonexistent?

[9] “Authority that comes from strength is absolute. Authority that comes from position is never absolute.”

Sounds like might makes right to me. The statement is an apparent denial of divine sovereign authority for he is placing absolute authority in the hand of strength rather than office. It is true that a weak man in a supposedly strong office is incompetent. Shall we so state

the case regarding God?

[10] “The source of the father’s authority is basically his responsibility he received by strength. He is the leader because of his strength.”

In one small statement he has erased all truths pertaining to patriarchal responsibility. The father controls through brute force, not by respect, according to the philosopher humanist. He denies that man has been created in the image of God and was so created before woman. He denies therein that the woman is of the man, and submissive to him as head. He denies the beginnings of sin in the transgression of the woman. We obey our fathers, he alleges, only because they will whip us if we do not. Do you know a more effective manner of instilling hatred for the father on the part of the son? or bitterness toward a mother by the daughter? These errors are psychologically worded to effect a change in the subconscious mind whereby authority is held in contempt. They work especially well in rooting out faith in God.

[11] “Doctrine of the Twofold Nature of Truth and Dual Nature of Man. There are two ways of looking at what you believe as truth.”

He diagrammed his hypothesis contrasting “Christ is Lord” as a matter of *faith* with “Today is October 12, 1973” as a matter of *fact*. A fact, he related, is undeniable, but a matter of faith must be either proven or refuted.

It is an ancient agnostic ploy to argue that faith cannot be proven, and that was the position of the World History teacher. Consequently, “Christ is Lord”, being a matter of faith, not fact, cannot be proven. No *physical* evidence of God exists; hence, God does not exist. It is easy to see how wily instructors can derail young students if they are of mind to do so. Evolution has been apparently so implanted by these procedures in the minds of some Christian College students by our own professors. The students are not even aware they have become evolutionists! Parents must keep vigilance on their children’s studies through the entire educational process, not merely in the formative years.

[12] “The majority of the people are ignorant. They are easily convinced of anything. When the political maturity of the minority equals or exceeds that of their political control, revolution will result.”

Humanism’s order of natural systems were set down by this

teacher as: (1) Intellectual, (2) Religious, (3) Social, (4) Economic, (5) Political, (6) Military.

Emphasis that the masses are ignorant equally emphasizes that the minority is intellectual. The assumption is that intelligence is god, and the more intelligent an individual becomes the greater his role as god. When he and his cohorts gain “political maturity”; that is, sufficient clout to be willing to assert themselves against greater numbers, “revolution will result”. Whether he proposes that the revolution be peaceful or not is not under consideration for revolution is within itself a violent term. Peaceful cultural change occurs through resolution, not revolution. We have in these notes a code book for social rebellion if I ever saw one. We have in this instructor’s indoctrination of teen students the building of a revolutionary movement against the establishment or any symbol of authority other than itself.

[13] “Minority defined as the elite or select, while majority is the masses.” “Don’t judge by what he does, but his intent.”

This continued insistence that an intellectually elite band will assume the office of God is woven into every definition dealing with the relationships of man to man. That Humanism intends to root God out of man’s mind is an inescapable conclusion. Here is a classic use of the aged Catholic originated clergy/laity caste system in religion applied to the political or civil state.

Situation ethics involving arbitrary conduct are urged to be accepted without judgment in his “Don’t judge by what he does, but his intent.” Such humanistic philosophy conflicts with the ideals of Christianity for his notion assaults the “Judge not” passages. The impugning of motives is precisely the act condemned by the language of Jesus in “Judge not”. Judging intent is assessment of motives, a searching of the heart, for which man has no equipment.

[14] “When political maturity of minority equals or exceeds that of their political control revolution results. Whoever understands the structure and function of a social body rules that social body. After you understand this you are no longer ruled, but part of the ruling.”

How is that for a concisely stated formula for revolt? Submission to established authority executed by duly elected officials is to be ignored by that body of intellectually elite who understand so perfectly that they are no longer the ruled, but the ruling.

The Republic in which we live provides for regular changes among officials through the election process. Rebellion to governorship because one deems self a part of that group that understands more greatly is not the procedure prescribing peace.

[15] “The Communist, Democratic, Fascist - these are the only three ideologies in the world for any state that has a belief. Communism started in 1917, Democracy in 1688 and Fascism in 1923 in Italy and in 1933 in Germany. Each of these ideologies have a best. If you don’t know what the best is you can’t work toward it. All Communist states have the same best, all Democratic states have the same best. In order for any one of these to reach it’s best the other will have to be destroyed. The Communist and Democratic states can’t run down the same road together. It’s part of each ideology to destroy the others.”

Finding the “best” in either Communism or Fascism, any socialistic or totalitarian form of government, would be an impossible thing for me. On the other hand, totalitarianism and freedom, Communism and Democracy, cannot run down the same road, and we do see effort of each to destroy the other.

His comparison of the three ideologies currently used to control state business is a broader statement pertaining to all conduct: “Premise: Anything that is not prohibited is assumed.”

Gospel ministers and godly elders have continued to expose the fallacy of the sectarian idea that “Anything not specifically prohibited by the Bible is allowed.” Humanism finds this notion not only quite palatable, but so desirable that it is one of its foundation stones. In a strictly legal consideration anything not prohibited is assumed: but, when one crosses the line from legality to morality he must determine conduct on the basis of what is right and good in contrast to things wrong and evil regardless the stance of the law on the matter.

Studious readers have already accurately concluded that the maze of sectarian denominationalism as well as the liberal influences and movements within the churches of Christ are a result of Humanistic philosophy whether the advocates thereof wish to recognize and admit it or not.

## TREMBLING AT GOD S WORD

*P. W. Stonestreet*

“Thus saith Jehovah, Heaven is my throne, and the earth is my footstool: what manner of house will ye build unto me? and what place shall be my rest? For all these things hath my hand made, and so all these things came to be, saith Jehovah: but to this man will I look, even to him that is poor and of a contrite spirit, and that trembleth at my word” (Isaiah 66:1, 2).

Scholars tell us in substance that the original word translated “look,” in the above text, means to have regard for; to esteem worthy of consideration; and that the word translated “trembleth” means to stand in awe of; to have fear concerning. What a gracious and precious promise! Jehovah, whose throne is heaven and whose footstool is the earth, *esteems worthy of consideration those who have fear concerning his word.* Think of it! What more could be desired?

Since God’s “look” means innumerable blessings, including salvation, but is conditional upon “trembleth at his word,” it behooves us, then, to carefully observe the principle of trembling at God’s word that we may share in its benefits. What is it? It is inseparable from a “poor” and “contrite spirit.” It is not a mere sentiment to be imagined and expressed only in words; but it is an active principle *course of reasoning and action respectful to God’s word.*

This principle did not change with dispensations, but is binding as long as man is responsible to, and sustains an attitude toward, God’s word. Commands changed with dispensations, according to God’s will, but the principle of trembling at his word remains the same from the beginning.

We are given many Old Testament instances of the principle, which it is not necessary to mention particularly, but every case of obedience is one, and every case of disobedience is a warning. They “were written for our learning, that through patience and comfort of the Scriptures we might have hope” (Romans 15:4).

Under God’s providence, we are thus given an opportunity to profit by the experience of others. A timely statement accredited to Senator Gore of Oklahoma is in point here: “Wise men profit by the experience of others; ordinary men profit by their own experience;

and fools profit by neither.” That statement is not *Scripture* but it is *scriptural*. Both human experience and divine revelation testify to its truth. The Bible anticipates all three of the characters thus mentioned and every responsible person is identified with one or another of the three classes. Under the principle we should have no difficulty in placing ourselves.

Every case of conversion and obedience in the New Testament is an example of trembling at God’s word. The following is selected because of its commendation of an important distinction between man’s word and God’s word in harmony with trembling at God’s word.

“For this cause also thank we God without ceasing, because, when ye received the word of God which ye heard of us, ye received it not as the word of men, but as it is in truth, the word of God, which effectually worketh also in you that believe” (1 Thessalonians 2:13). Note the word “received” occurs twice in the above text, on which we observe the following scholarly comment: “The *Greek* for the first ‘received,’ implies simply the hearing of it; the *Greek* of the second is ‘accepted,’ or ‘welcomed’ it. The proper object of faith, it hence appears, is *the word of God*, at first oral, then for security against error, written (John 20:30, 31; Romans 15:4; Galatians 4:20)”. (Commentary on the Bible, Jamieson, Faussett and Brown).

True, the “American Standard Version” renders the second “received” of the text “accepted” in harmony with the above comment. Hence, to receive God’s word with no more reverence and confidence than the word of men, is to fall short of trembling at God’s word, and consequently, to fall short of God’s *esteem* (Isaiah 66:2) and the inspired commendation (1 Thessalonians 2:13). Of course, to accept the word of men, their doctrines and commandments, in religion, in preference to God’s word, is even more lamentable. Yet, Christ anticipates religious people doing this very thing.

## MISUNDERSTOOD

### *R.L. Whiteside*

To misunderstand a person is to fail to understand his purposes and aims. We may know exactly what he is doing, but we fail to understand his reasons for so doing. Because of this we often criticize

when we should praise, and thereby cause many heartaches. Children are sometimes misunderstood, and so are parents, and such misunderstanding may cause wounds that never heal. Offense is often taken where none is intended, because we do not understand. Serious troubles have come up in churches because no honest effort was made to understand one another. When we know that our own purposes are good and true, we do not like for others to misunderstand and criticize. To put all we have and are into an unselfish effort to do good, and then to be misunderstood and criticized, and sometimes abused, by our friends and those we would help, causes indescribable sorrow to any unselfish soul.

Both enemies and friends misunderstood Jesus, and for a time even his brothers and his mother. His enemies said he was a law-breaker and a blasphemer and possessed of a demon. His friends said he was mentally unbalanced, crazy (Mark 3:21); and his brethren seemed to think so, too “for even his brethren did not believe on him” (John 7:5). But little men cannot even understand great men; much less can the finite understand the Infinite. A few years ago a man wrote a book about Jesus, and the title of the book was, “The Man Nobody Knows.” There is more in the title of his book than even its author would recognize. “No man knoweth the Son, save the Father,” said Jesus. (Mt. 11:27) Nothing less than Deity could fully understand Deity.

But these people could have known and recognized his mission and the purity of his life and motives. They, for a time at least, rejected the only key to the wonders of his life and works. They tried to account for him as a man. On these grounds no one can account for him. Had they seen in him God manifest in the flesh, all else could have been easily accounted for; for this great truth that he was the God-man is the only explanation of his marvelous life and works. The world’s greatest tragedy is its failure to understand Jesus.

## **HUMANISM’S CLASSROOM ASSAULT ON THE CHURCH**

*Richard E. Black*

Reference to *Humanism in the Public School System* as found

immediately preceding in this issue of *Torch of Truth*, should be consulted and reviewed in introduction to this inquiry into Humanism's public effort to sabotage Christianity. Such review will serve as a reminder that a young Christian girl was subjected to the concepts of Humanistic Religion through the teacher's philosophical approach to World History during her senior year in an Austin, Texas, high school.

Approximately two hundred pages of handwritten notes were taken from his lectures in the one semester that she attended class. Challenges put to the instructor resulted in a concentrated effort to destroy that student's faith in God. A personal vendetta developed overnight. Immediate request for transfer upon learning his direction and intent was only honored when parental insistence was made through the principal's office. The teacher smarted as she departed class, "Go with God!"

We follow the earlier format of presenting the instructor's remarks in numerical order and in quotation marks that no confusion surfaces between his assertions and our responses.

[1] "Join church; an organization. Get religion; what you believe. The feelings you have; what you accept or believe in. Sect; group of people who have the same religion. Denomination; religious group of sect church."

Here we have an agnostic's view of religion. He stereotypes all believers with the general and familiar slogans of Protestant Denominationalism.

Denominational errors, errors held by those claiming faith in Jesus Christ, stand as the most formidable foes of pure religion. Inconsistencies among so-called believers provide enemies of truth with an arsenal that becomes quite bombastic. Humanists see through some of the more popular phrases used by sectarians to justify sectarianism. Their "join a church," more accurately worded "join a church of your choice," urgings result from the conclusion that all who believe in Jesus as Christ are automatically, by faith only, justified as Christians. Consequently, "joining a church" is merely being connected with a religious organization, much in the spirit of joining a civic order or social club.

"Get religion" is miserably equated with "what you believe." *Get* is a word describing the reception of something. *Getting religion* is an impossibility unless the direct Spiritual regeneration no-

tion is true. Faith, we are taught in the Bible, comes by hearing the Word of God. Religion, the divine system of restraint within moral and ethical bounds, is an effect achieved when faith is applied. Religion is, therefore, not gotten, but developed; hence, growing in that grace is aptly termed spiritual maturity.

“The feelings you have” are considered by the worldlings as parallel what you “accept or believe.” Here is a mis-definition of the first order. His earlier contrast of faith and reason minimized faith while elevating reason. See the previous article entitle *Humanism in the Public School System*. It is apparent that this mis- definition pertaining to feelings is designed to further ridicule faith. Faith is neither blind nor gullible, and is not founded on emotions, feelings. Hebrews 11:1 speaks to the fact that faith is evidenced, based on undeniable testimony. Such includes the necessary power of reason to found faith within specific individuals. Divisiveness in religion is both accepted and encouraged by this definition, for whatever any man believes becomes a matter of faith solely based on his personal feelings.

These definitions relate attitudes that must be overcome if conversion is to be accomplished. We learn barriers to truth by investigating these assertions.

[2] “It’s in me; and, it represents all common or like things . . . there is a spirit who is the spirit of all trees, spirit of all horses.”

Students of idolatry are aware that his definition of man’s spirit is born of a pagan attitude that reduces the spirit to a mere representation of trees, horses, cattle, flies, lice, birds, etc. The *representation* of a thing in visible forms is idolatry, specifically Pantheistic Naturalism. Humanism does not recognize the immortality of man’s soul. Humanism centers all things in the man himself - the human elements, not the spiritual.

[3] “Does the State resist giving up church duties? When church first starts the State doesn’t resist the church doing duties. State doesn’t care what you worship or where you go or about church things.”

This stilted assessment of the attitude of the State toward the Church is a bit premature. Every humanist in the country with an ACLU (American Civil Liberties Union) lawyer on hand has made attempts to rid this nation of every vestige of religion over the past forty years. To tell our students that the

State has never and will never; yea, does not care what you do in religion is a misrepresentation of facts designed to create acceptance of State restrictions on religion without question. Naming of Constitutional ideals as to the Church/State relationship is one thing. Actual conduct is another.

[4] “Does the Church resist giving up State duties? Wants to continue to do both things.”

Humanists, swallowing the historical blunder that Christianity and Roman Catholicism are one and the same institute, do not understand the fundamentals of religion. The Church, as a corporate *spiritual* body, never possessed or exercised State power. Roman Catholicism, an apostasy from Christianity, has long argued for its right to control the State. Modern political movements disguised as religious bodies (Moral Majority for an example) have taken the identical tack - they do not find satisfaction in influencing civil matters by spiritual principles, but want to control the State. History teachers who mix these apostasies with pure Christianity, assuming identity, are ignorant of the very history they propose to teach.

The concept that when a worldling becomes a Christian he forfeits all individual right to State involvement is ridiculous. Furthermore, the individual exercise of civil or political talent on the part of an individual Christian does not constitute Church control of the State. Peter did not order Cornelius to quit the army upon his baptism, and Cornelius, as a Christian, did not exercise Church or corporate power when he used his authority as a civil servant, a soldier. Seems that men could keep these offices and duties properly catalogued and divided. I am convinced they can. The problem, however, is that Humanists wish to stop religionists from influencing the moral aspect of new legislation; hence, their insistence that *no* involvement in the State affairs by Christians is to be permitted. These attitudes shape the court system as well else such flagrant miscarriages of justice as witnessed in the Collinsville, Oklahoma case would not occur.

### ***Pinpointing Situation Ethics***

[5] “No human is superior to me. Everyone has thousands of seniors. All like things are alike.”

The equality of man in opportunity, as provided Constitutionally, is not to be taken lightly. In that spirit, no human is superior to me; however, all men are not equal in ability or office, responsibility

or station. Properly, a teacher is superior to the student else the entire scheme of instruction is defaulted. Identically, elders of local churches are superior in position to the flock else the concept of pastoral shepherding is nullified. Similarly, the father and the mother are superior to the children else the responsibility attendant parenthood is negated. Politically, the President is superior to the Congress else his power of veto is useless.

“No human is superior to me” is a contrived setting of the stage for ethics to be based entirely on my rational or irrational conclusions. Such a notion manifests design, and its purpose is to dethrone God in the realm of moral definition and ethical conduct. It is anti-authority, anti-establishment.

[6] “Intent causes the system to be rational. A rational act is one which agrees with the intent of the system. Anything done which is intended to result in the intent of the system is good. (Intrinsically). Example: If a teacher does something not intended to equalize he is acting irrationally. As to extrinsic, consider a desk. It can be whatever we call it. We could turn it up-side-down and say it is a coat hanger, then it is no longer a desk.”

When we decide that no human is superior to ourselves, and that intent is the determining factor of rational conduct, and that anything resulting in the fulfillment of the intent of the system (self) is good, then whatever I want is right, according to the foregoing. On the other hand, anything you want, should it conflict with my want, is wrong. We are getting a powerful dose of situation ethics in these World History class notes.

Concerning things extrinsic, outside self, meaning other persons, I can be and do whatever I determine. We can *use* them as we will and please since no other human is superior to me. This is the upshot of his silly illustration that a desk is a desk till we turn it up-side-down and call it a coat hanger - then it is no longer a desk. By designating other people with some unwarranted term we are thereby permitted to use them at will according to these preachments. Do you detect the groundwork for redefinition of immoral conduct so as to give that conduct the semblance of morality; that is, a morality traditionally accepted? Here is the principle that gives rise to euphemisms - morally acceptable terms for immoral deeds.

Redefinition and rewriting are two favorite tactics of falsifiers to make their cause sound feasible - we see this practice employed in

every controversy facing Christianity.

Further, the foregoing quote provides acceptance and condonation of all acts committed by man, regardless the degree of decency, as long as it is performed by consenting individuals. These germs of indecency are being sown in classroom after classroom - no humanist has abandoned his philosophy, and every one of them will ply their ideology wherever a platform is provided. Can we not see that these notions are the very founding concepts of permissiveness? A person terms fornication and adultery as extensions of love; another calls homosexuality and lesbianism an alternative life style; and, abortion or murder of the unborn child is performed to provide a better quality of life.

[7] "If a Greek master exploited a slave by killing him he would be acting irrationally because they are both human. But if U. S. master exploited slave by killing him he would be acting rationally because they are both unequal in that the slave is considered as an animal. Good/Bad, qualities that are intrinsic. Right/Wrong, qualities that are extrinsic. Good/Bad and Right/Wrong are *value judgments*."

How do you like that? Greek *social attitudes*, although committed to slavery, consider the slave as an equal human to the master; therefore, it would be irrational to murder the slave. Conversely, United States social attitudes, per this teacher's statement, consider slaves unequal to man, but equal to animal life; therefore, it would be rational to murder him.

"Value judgments" is the key phrase, and a pet form of terminology used by situational ethics advocates. Here, the History teacher's illustration of *value judgment* sanctions murder as rational, acceptable conduct, if the social attitude considers the slave to be an animal rather than a man. Can you believe it? Yet, this is exactly the sort of reasoning being advocated and employed by the Supreme Court of the United States of America concerning the definition of pornographic material - each social unit has to make a definition of what constitutes obscenity, therefore, no overall definition of terms is possible.

By diversity of education, social standing and attitude many differing descriptions as to the relationship of morality to obscene matters are developed. One would have to be extremely dull of mind who fails to see that we are already reaping the confusions such a

procedure curries.

There is hardly a classroom in the country that does not have an overexposed dose of these nonsensical notions. Rapid rise in immoral conduct, disrespect to fellow man, dishonoring of parents, murder, and suicide are natural consequents of men accepting the errors attendant the godless theories of evolution and humanism.

We have long been convinced, and have stated time and again, that evolution reduces man's image of man to the animal level, and that the instant a man believes himself to be equal to the animal he commences to act and react as an animal. We see no immoral or irrational conduct in slaying an animal; therefore, men who deem other men to be mere animals find no reason not to murder them if self interest requires it. Remember, situation ethics permits man to be his own god, and whatever the individual desires becomes rational conduct since there is to be no extrinsic, outside, authority restricting him. Is this what upcoming generations are being taught? Indeed!

A sidelight question: What business does a World History teacher have in discussing value judgments? Advocacy of Biblical morals is forbidden in the classroom. Humanists have seen to that through their influencing of legislation so forbidding the introduction of such study into the public classroom. How is it that humanistic errors responsible for indecent conduct can be pressed in *any* class? Assuredly, that old adage - It depends on whose ox is being gored - applies just here.

*Conclusively*

These notes, captured from a designing teacher, when exposed by logical rather than Biblical quotes illustrates the need of meeting non-believers with evidences outside the Bible. 'Tis fruitless to address an unbeliever with the Word, but one can easily conquer Humanistic philosophers in their own world of philosophy inasmuch as they contradict themselves over and again. These notes as well instill an awareness in Christians motivating us toward action. No longer will we stand idly by while some instructors fail to live up to the public trust of classrooms stocked with our children. Not only do we serve notice on the public school system, but upon educational facilities operated by our brethren.

We would not stereotype the teaching profession, either within the public sector or our own private institutions, by insinuating that

all are spiritual kinsmen with the sophist quoted in these essays on Humanism, but we would let them know that we expect competency, quality, integrity, and uprightness from every one of them.

Parents, do you know what goes on at school? Keep the line of communication between yourself and your children open. Build a relationship thriving on confidence, so instruct them in the way of truth that error will shock their senses so much as to cause them to hurry home and tell all. Then, deal with it.

## **THE GOSPEL**

*Richard E. Black*

The past two decades has seen scores of attempts to minimize the authority of the written word. Bold assertions of direct communications from the Holy Spirit in a mystical manner, along with a direct indwelling to facilitate such communication, are yet heard in many sectors.

Faith, by divine definition, is both substantive and evidential. "Faith is the substance of things hoped for, the evidence of things not seen" (Hebrews 11:1).

Faith is not gullible, blind. It is not subjective, experiential, emotional, existential or sensual. It is based on divine testimony having been witnessed by divinely certified apostles. "We have not followed cunningly devised fables ... but were eyewitnesses of his majesty" (2 Peter 1:16).

Faith is knowledge revealed. "For flesh and blood hath not revealed this unto thee but my Father which is in heaven" (Matthew 16:17). "Neither knoweth any man the Father save the Son, and he to whomsoever the Son will reveal him" (Matthew 11:27). As ever, "faith comes by hearing ... the word of God" (Romans 10:17). Truth changes not.

## **MAN WITHOUT GOD**

*Billy W. Blakeney*

Man without God is described in several very interesting and extremely penetrating ways in the New Testament. Expressions like "sinners", "enemies," "without strength", "ungodly", "strangers",

and “aliens” are a few of the terms in the New Testament describing *man without God* (Rom. 5:6-10; Col. 1:22; Eph. 2:11-22). The apostle Paul employed some of these very words in describing the human dilemma:

“For when we were yet *without strength*, in due time Christ died for the *ungodly*. . . But God commendeth his love toward us, in that, while we were yet *sinners*, Christ died for us . . . For if, when we were *enemies*, we were reconciled to God by the death of his Son, much more, being reconciled, we shall be saved by his life” (Rom. 5:6-10).

We notice the terms “without strength”, “ungodly”, “sinners”, “enemies”. They point to man who does not understand himself. They describe a man without God. They tell us the real reason why Christ died on the cross: Man was too far gone to be saved by any other means.

Paul explains the “why” of a sacrifice like Christ’s:

“And you, that were sometime alienated and enemies in your mind by wicked works, yet now has he reconciled In the body of his flesh through death, to present you holy and un- blameable and unproveable in his sight” (Col. 1:21-22).

God’s love, forgiveness, acceptance and companionship are ours in the reconciling life, death, and resurrection of Jesus Christ. -  
*Drawer 639, DeKalb, TX 75559.*

## **THE COTTON PATCH VERSION AND EGGHEADS**

***Glenn L. Wallace***

A new version of Paul’s letters has come on the market. It just had to happen. After all, these one man Bibles have been coming out at the rate of about one a week for some time, so why not a Cotton Patch version?

This new Cotton Patch version, put out by Clarence Jordan, like most of the others of its type, is a one man version, slanted, and makes no effort to be true to the original Greek text of the Bible. Its author is a Southern Baptist preacher and my opinion of some of the noble stands taken by these fellows has been lowered to a bit by this ridiculous cotton “pickin” version. He says of his work: “most of the

versions leave us stranded in some far away land in the long distant past.” He wants to update Paul’s letters and goes all out with modern words, near “cussing”, substituting present day names and places for the Bible records. It is an “attempt to translate not only the words but the events” the author says. He wants to take the Bible out of the stained glass atmosphere and give it a low down, turnip greens and grits flavor. Believe me, he has done just that with a southern accent. Now, may be we have a version(?) that some of our hippie elements will dig.

The Cotton Patch version is crude, vulgar, perverted, improvised, changed and made to look downright silly in places. It treats God’s Word with sarcasm, silly humor, and cheap sectarian comment. No attempt was made to follow the original language and the author writes: “the same Greek word may be translated one way in one passage and in a different way in another.” Well, there is really not much difference in the way this man treats the Word of God and the way some of the dignified Ph.D’s have handled the New English Bible along with several others of the latter day versions. The authors of the New English Bible say that if a good commentary is a good translation then every translation is a paraphrase. They then proceed to paraphrase most of the New Testament. They say that the New English Bible is to “elucidate the meaning *which is there* it can be said that we have taken the liberty of introducing into a passage something *which is not there*. — it can be said that we have taken the liberty with extreme caution.” Our Cotton Patch version has simply thrown all caution to the wind and that is about the main difference in this funny book and some of the more modern scholarly(?) versions.

This Cotton Patch version is filled with street talk, gutter language and just plain “you all” nonsense. Very little of it could be recommended to devout people. It may have a special interest to some of the pseudo-intellectuals who have been trying for years with sarcastic humor to destroy the influence of the Bible and downgrade the church. Likely the political minded mission brethren with their social gospel philosophy and their involvement in civil rights and Resurrection City, will find some joy in this far out version. If they must read it, I would suggest the First Letter to Atlanta, (1 Corinthians), chapter 1:18-20.

I will not be at all surprised to hear of some one reading the

morning text on some Sunday from this version. The above verses would be appropriate in some places. They read:

“To the so-called practical people, the idea of the noose (cross) is a lot of silly talk, but to those of us who have been let in on its meaning, it is the source of divine power. It is just like the Scriptures say:

“I will tear to bits the *dissertations of the Ph.D's*: I will pull the rug from under those who have all the answers. Then what becomes of the “bright” boy? What does this do to the “egghead”? Where does the *worldly wise professor* wind up? Hasn't God made human reasoning appear utterly ridiculous?”

Now this will make a fine text for some congregations and we think there will be a lot of very relevant dialogue about this “egg-head” statement. Like to try it? - *First Century Christian, August 1968.*

## COMMENDATIONS of THE TORCH

*Douglas Miller, Ohio* “I just received the most recent issue of *The Torch of Truth* this past week and so very glad for it. One of the reasons that I am a happy and satisfied subscriber is because I have seldom seen a repetition of articles from other brotherhood periodicals - and I would have every reason to know because I presently subscribe to some 22 other brotherhood periodicals.”

*Editor's Note:* This report pleases - it pinpoints our aim in publishing *The Torch of Truth* - fresh material. His awareness that much time is involved in starting a journal - that it faces more obstacles than a cur has fleas - enables him to stand by in these early years. We appreciate it. Publishing expenses are high and gaining support by subscription, in a day when many are not interested in reading, is hard. Further, several overzealous churches show misdirection - they have gone into the publishing business. Circulating bulletins pertinent to local work is one thing; owning publications with brotherhood saturation is an attempt to control the whole church through their papers, and is a party-spirited tactic. Church-owned papers addressing the entire church are position papers in a denominational sense. *The Torch of Truth is not a church paper.* While we remain a private enterprise we retain the freedom to investigate the Word of God independently, searching for fresh in-

sights on all points. There can be no possible assumption, save by the naive, that we speak for the church as a corporate body. I am encouraged by our brother's assessment - may his tribe increase for without such a spirit there can be no profitable inquiry into controversial matters without shredding the church. There must be a stop put to contention. There has to be a medium through which differences can be challenged to the point of resolution without uninformed zealots screaming *heresy* every time a thought is published that he did not think. We look to your assistance in further circulating *The Torch*.

*Adron Doran, Kentucky* "Thank you for reprinting the article by Brother Guy N. Woods in your April issue of *The Torch of Truth*. Though the article was written and published in *The Bible Banner* over 45 years ago it is probably more significant today than it was then. Best Wishes."

*Editor's Note:* The purpose of *any* reprint in *The Torch of Truth* is determined by its value to today's church scene, and will be lifted from an earlier generation to avoid repetition. Writers of an era prior to our day spent more time on their efforts than today's top-of-the-head types.

*G.K. Wallace, Florida* "You are doing a good job with your *Torch of Truth*. You are right about the motives for all these so called translations of the Bible. *It is money*. You watch - they will bring out a new one every few years to drain money from people. It is like new and improved Duz - same Duz with a new label. Except they change the Bible to get new sales."

*Editor's Note:* My recent request that G.K., one of the writers on the staff of the old *Bible Banner*, join me in publishing *Torch*, was met with a hearty insistence that I use any material authored by him that was available, and indicated in a telephone call to my wife where some fresh-by-reason-of- agedness articles unknown to our generation could be found. He commented: "May the Lord bless you in your work is my prayer." May the Lord bless you, G.K., with comfort and recovery, is the prayer woven so deeply in our souls that it qualifies as an "unutterable groaning". We need men of his talent and influence. I stand in honor of his life and work, and to have his support is more meaningful than I can fully express. Write him at: 203-A Glendale Dr., Brandon, FL 33511.

*Fred D. Whitelaw, Arkansas* "The church has a terrible time

coping with today's society. The pull of that society has 'changed our way' drastically. In a time such as this we need those who are capable of restoring some semblance of order to troubled minds."

*Roger E. Carter, Oklahoma* "After having the back issues for a while I must say that I am impressed with the material. *The Torch of Truth* opens my eyes and provokes me into engaging in *real* thinking and study."

## IMPLICIT FAITH

"Implicit Faith has been sometimes ludicrously styled *fides carbonaria*, from the noted story of one who, examining an ignorant collier on his religious principles, asked him what it was he believed. He answered, "I believe what the church believes." The other rejoined, "What, then, does the church believe?" He replied readily, "The church believes what I believe." The other, desirous if possible to bring him to particulars, once more resumes his inquiry: "Tell me, then, I pray you, what it is that you and the church both believe?" The only answer the collier could give was, "Why truly, sir, the church and I both believe the same thing." This is implicit faith in perfection, and, in the estimation of some celebrated Doctors, the sum of necessary and saving knowledge in a Christian." - *Campbells Lectures*.