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RECIPIROCATION

Under the cordial caption, "Welcome, Torch," the editor of Gospel Guardian felicitates us:

"It is with feelings of real joy that the Gospel Guardian joins thousands of those who love the truth in welcoming TORCH into the family of gospel journals. . . The pen of Brother Wallace is sorely needed in the present day. . . It is a time when every man who loves the truth will welcome the addition of every pen and every voice to the ranks of those who are seeking to stem the tide of digression."

Though I did not anticipate this, jubilation, the ringing salute is appreciated. The emergence of TORCH represents no break in fraternal and friendly ties. The personal feelings and expressions are reciprocated.
I would very much dislike to be engaged in any undertaking that did not have the sanction and the blessings of my brother Cled, and his words are reassuring:

“Your pen in needed, and you have selected a very effective way to use it. It would be somewhat ridiculous for me to tell you anything so obvious, as that I wish you the fullest success in anything you undertake.”

The affection that I hold for my elder brother is no secret—it is known to all who know us, and to many who do not. There has never been the slightest strain on the family tie. He rates first place in my book as the ace writer, and with R. L. Whiteside, the dean of Bible scholars of our time, and such vigorous younger men on the writing staff as James W. Adams, along with its publisher and editor, the Gospel Guardian is ably manned.

From a generous two-column editorial announcement of TORCH in the Firm Foundation, I am pleased to quote:

“A torch is supposedly used for two purposes, one to apply heat and the other to give light. By having read the first issue in its
entirety, our conclusion is that Brother Wal-
lace is to use this Torch both ways. We shall read with interest what he has to say
in the “Torch” and herewith offer him our congratulations in his venture.”

The first editor I ever knew was Brother Showalter. And I have very often acknowledged that my early preaching, along with others my age, was largely molded by the Firm Foundation.

September 1913 the pale horse and its er crossed the Wallace threshhold, in my first experience with death in our home, and slipped our mother from us. Brother Showalter and Brother Nichol came to comfort us and stood together beside her grave to talk to us about her and about heaven. November 1949, thirty-six years later, the grim rider returned to take our father. On the same spot these two men again stood, and talked to us about him and the hope he had. The shadows of the setting sun silhouetted the patriarchal forms of the two now gray-haired men, standing by the two graves, and that impression shall last-always. It is fit-ting that it should be so; we would have had it no other way.
There are always things that need to be said regardless of who likes it or who does not like it. And there are always good people who will not like it, because they lack discernment and do not sense the seriousness of the issues. Preachers 'need to be situated to say the things that ought to be said and still be able to eat; but whether they do or do not eat-they should say them. Discussion of the means and methods of doing the work of the church is necessary to keep the members of the church sensitive to deviation and alert to ever-present threats to the virtue of the church. A general review of these issues will not be amiss.

Secular Institutions. No one has claimed that these man-made organizations are divine institutions; no one denies that they are
secular enterprises in human affairs; yet they would bed them up in the treasuries of the churches and thereby subsidize the churches to human organization. The argument has been made that the churches depend on the colleges for preachers and leaders, and should therefore support them, which in turn makes the colleges depend on the churches, and that puts the church directly in the school business. If that does not make colleges “suckers” on the stalk, what would or could? One writer has declared that “no one can doubt the contribution the schools have made to the church.” There is a serious doubt on that point, but suppose it were true, it is true of publishing companies and of every successful business enterprise of any Christian, all of which are directly or indirectly a contribution to the church. Shall they all be put into the budgets of the churches? Such lack of discrimination is pitiable. The method of reasoning represents the common mistake of ignoring completely the nature and mission of the church. It ignores also the organization of the church and puts the churches at work through the man-made boards of human institutions. It further ignores the church as the divine
teaching agency in that it assumes that “Christian education” is synonymous with the Christian College, as though the church itself is not engaged in the work of Christian education. If that is the right idea of Christian education, the Bible missed the point. The very definition of Christian education has come to mean a college. But the activities of a college are not the work of the church, so it means that the program of a church apart from that of a college is not Christian education.

Most of the speeches made on Christian education in the lectureships of the schools for the past twenty-five years have been misapplied. These brethren have become so institutionally minded that they do not know what the church is, nor what it is for. They are awed by the size and influence of these institutions, and are reduced to mere pigmies before them. The schools have taken their independence away from them, they will not go against the colleges. They are slaves to institutions, without independence enough to criticise one of them. The schools become all powerful, feared, worshipped, and revered above the church. Schools dominate the preachers who control churches, and the cam-
campaign goes on. periodically defeated in the deliberate plans to get in the budgets of the churches, as in 1935-38 and again in 1945-48, already we are hearing post mortem gasps with threats to try again. And they will try again, and again. Which of the old established schools has made a statement of conviction against churches contributing to the colleges? Some have announced a policy, but only as a resolution that they will not solicit contributions from the churches, but never a word as to whether such contributions will be received and accepted. Until announcements are made that contributions from churches will be rejected and returned, statements of policy can only be regarded as mere diplomacy and cannot be respected. This is why the schools have lost the confidence of so many members of the church, and forfeited the trust of brethren who were able and willing to help them on the right basis. But they will never learn, and in less than a decade it will be necessary to fight the battle all over again, for some are saying already that they will win it in the next campaign. Yet with many there is no cause for alarm. Any threat to the schools alarm them, but a threat to the church does not.
As it now stands, instead of the schools exerting a good influence for the church, it is becoming more and more evident that the church must be saved from the influence of the schools.

**The Rule Of Expediency.** Somewhat has been said of a New Testament law of expediency. Where is any such law found in the New Testament? Expediency is not a law. "All things are lawful for me, but all things are not expedient," is the way it reads in 1 Cor. 10:23. Of course, Paul was not making the blanket affirmation that everything is lawful. Obviously, it means only the things that are lawful can be expedient; but some things that are lawful are not expedient. Therefore, to prove that anything is expedient, it must first be proved to be lawful. The brethren are in reverse, attempting to prove that a thing is lawful by trying to prove that it is expedient, which is an inversion of the New Testament principle. Nothing is expedient that is not lawful. To assume that anything is expedient before proving it to be lawful is simply begging the question at issue. But now when authority is wanted for a practice for which no authority exists-presto!
the "law of expediency" is invoked! If it can be called a law at all, it is a human law altogether, it is not divine. How can anything be permitted if it is not lawful? How can it be lawful if it is not authorized? Why plead expediency if it is authorized? Take some examples:

    Assembly is authorized, the meetinghouse is expedient.
    Teaching is authorized, arrangement in classes, is expedient.
    Giving is authorized, collection baskets are expedient.
    Baptism is authorized, the baptistery is expedient.
    Singing is authorized, hymnbooks are expedient.

But classes could not be expedient if there were no authority for teaching. Collection baskets could not be expedient if there were no law on giving. A baptistery could not be expedient if there were no command for baptism. Hymnbooks could not be expedient if there were no instructions for singing. On the same principle, the employment of mechanized music in the church not being authorized, instruments of music are not ex-
pedients; and cannot be paralleled with songbooks. Mechanical music is not authorized, therefore instruments for that kind of music cannot be classed with expedients. Anyone who can see through a ladder, can see that, and 'can make the application of these principles to the present issue.

Before arguing the "law of expediency" or putting colleges in the budgets of the churches, let the authority be cited for the church, to support human organizations and institutions, working through man-made boards, showing such to be lawful, and it will then be time enough to discuss whether it is expedient or not.

The once famous Henry Ward Beecher said, "infant baptism is like an ox yoke, it works," So it is now argued that a thing is expedient if it works! A missionary society works, therefore it is expedient, on that premise. Instrumental music works, Christian Endeavor Societies work, pie-suppers work, and Methodism works (organically), therefore all of these unscriptural things are expedient! The whole institutional proposition has been predicated on a law that does not exist-the so-called, but non-existent.
“New Testament law of expediency.”

Another miss in the logic of those seeking sanction for unlawful practices is in the assumption that orphan homes furnish a premise without fault or criticism from which to draw the conclusion that any and all other institutions may be included in the budgets of the churches. Some who have drafted propositions for debate did not distinguish, and apparently did not know, the kind of benevolent work a church can scripturally do, and the kind of a school a church can scripturally conduct. Most churches operate their local schools every Lord’s Day, and through the week, and carry on a consistent program of "Christian education" under the direction of the elders of the congregation. But no distinctions are made between these proper activities of the church and the propositions demanding the support of the church for human institutions, ignoring altogether the vital points of organizations and boards through which the church would be compelled to work in order to do the things these brethren are determined to make the churches do. The “stipulated conditions of the New Testament” reveal nothing of that
sort, nor is there any thing like it in the New Testament that is not stipulated, not even a hint at a "law of expediency" (whatever that may be) that will authorize such things.

The astute editor of the Firm Foundation is on record that even a home for orphans must be under the elders of the local church to be scripturally supported by the church. 'What then can be said for the schools, waiving other proper objections, claiming a place in the budget of the church? All of this stress on human institutions, after all, is a misplaced emphasis. Brethren need to learn the place for human organizations and keep them there; and they need to learn all over again what the church is, what the church is for and what the church can do.

The vocalization now being accorded, the schools in many congregations at all their services, including Lord's Day worship, makes us wonder if people who are baptized in some places know they are being added to the church or think they are joining some college.

**Regional Elderships:** A new fallacy has now become prevalent, that the only thing necessary to make a thing scriptural is to...
put whatever it is under the eldership of some church no matter where the church is. So institutions and organizations with their boards, wholly outside the church, are being put under the eldership of some sponsorial church, boards and all. According to that idea all that is necessary to make a missionary society scriptural is to put the society under the sponsorship of some eldership! Comes then the notion that the eldership of a church in the U.S.A. may sponsor an institution under a board in Italy or Germany. It is now advocated that educational and benevolent institutions should first be set up in foreign countries as a beachhead for the church-hence, the establishment of a human institution to spearhead the work of the church, thereby making human organization more effective than the divine.

On what principle can the eldership of a church in America take the oversight of an institution in Europe or Asia, whether that organization be a school or an orphanage? When the eldership of a church becomes a centralized board of benevolence or a general board of foreign missions, it is just as unscriptural as any other board, and the
authority for it may be found on the blank page of your New Testament.

As for establishing institutional orphan homes in Germany, Italy and Japan, to spearhead the missionary work of the church, where is a New Testament example of that procedure? Poverty existed in the days of the apostles in mass form, as much so as in any foreign country today, but where was such a program inaugurated by Paul in various lands where he preached the gospel? This institutional idea is something new. The truth of the matter is, benevolence is the fruit of Christianity, not the means of establishing the church. But as we now have it, vast sums are funneled from the churches all over the nation, concentrated in a "board of elders" of a church somewhere which agrees to "sponsor" an institution in some other distant place at home or abroad! This centralization of authority and concentration of funds in boards have been the main points of difference between the human and divine plan, and now the brethren are practicing it and prominent preachers who ought to know better are defending it. But there is nothing like it in the New Testament nor so much
as a hint in the direction of an intimation of a so-called imaginary law of expediency which could authorize it. Better that we get back to the simplicity of the New Testament church, and let our brains "petrify" on a few of its stipulated conditions. Such phraseology runs parallel to the parlance of a group of digressive "brain trusters" in Tennessee and Texas over forty years ago.

In an effort to compose the opposition the representative of one of provincial elderships announced that individual contributions only would be marked for the support of the educational institutions abroad, and church contributions would be applied on the preaching of the gospel. In that case the allocation of the funds is only on the ledger. The regional board in charge, not the contributors, decides the entry. Furthermore, that system has a local church overseeing a foreign institution to which other churches cannot contribute! That is, according to their ledger. The school is under a board, and both the school and the board are under the regional elders of a local church. That is institutionalism in modern garb.

To justify the establishment of institution-
al orphanages for the churches to sponsor as a means of doing their “pure and unde-
filed religion,” reference is frequently made to Jas. 1:27--"visit the fatherless and the 
widows in their affliction.” But the passage does not limit this visitation to the father-
less. It says, “fatherless and” -and whom? Widows. For comparison: “He that believ-
eth and” -and what? Is baptized. The con-
junction “and” conjoins two things, the "fatherless" and “the widows.” Now, if 
Jas. 1:27 is a command for an institutional orphanage, it is no less a demand for an in-
stitutional widowage. Why is the latter part of the command never emphasized, much less obeyed, by those who insist that the first part of it is the precept for an institutional organization?, The institutional idea is not in the language of James. The fact that Paul puts an age restriction on the widows, that none under sixty could be enrolled as permanent charges of the church, and that the New Testament specifies these benev-
olent interdictions, makes it evident that it is not the will of God for the church to be--en-
cumbered with the permanent programs of material benefactions, as are now being pro-
moted with such assiduity, which undoubt}
ly diminish the temporal means to the spiritual ends of preaching the gospel. The duty of the church in alms-giving is therefore limited to relief emergencies. There is no passage in the New Testament that incorporates the institutional idea as an obligation of the church.

It is even being argued that the healing of diseases by Jesus is precept for a medical program by the church; and the instances of healings by the apostles to confirm the word preached by them are examples for the establishment of benevolent institutions and medical centers in foreign countries by churches over here as a means of starting the church over there. What next? That would make medicine take the place of miracles, if the argument is any good; and medical colleges, with their laboratories for training doctors; and the hospitals where the interns are finished off for medical practice—all that, with everything that goes along with it should be added to the budgets of the churches! If that premise is right, this conclusion is inevitable; and the Great Commission, after all, is limited; for Jesus should have called and sent doctors, as he did.
ties, and, should have included dispensing medicine -along with preaching the gospel. Hard pressed, indeed, are these brethren for any New Testament example for what they are doing. It reminds us all, who know the past, of the grabbing at straws for something to favor instrumental music and society organizations.

If the miraculous ministrations are to be taken as an example for beginning the medical missionary program proposed, then the fact that such ministrations ended is proof that we should quit-before we begin. When Jesus said to his disciples, “greater works than these shall ye do,” he meant that the preaching of the gospel commanded in the commission would be a greater work than all the miracles of his personal ministry, including his ministrations of physical healing. The church does not operate in the field of pathology.

A group of young men from a certain college attended one of my meeting recently, and incidentally told me that they had been attending classes in biology that day; had dissected frogs and performed an experimental operation on a cat. I listened and
learned a little more about the work of the church; since this college had contended for a place in the treasuries of the churches, it is a part of the work of the church to dissect frogs and operate on cats! That is what it means if these secular institutions are to go into the budgets. If medical research and administration are the work of the church, so is surgery, and the church is therefore obligated to all such institutions alike. Who can believe it, who knows anything about the mission of the church?

It is evident that more emphasis is now being put on building a few human institutions in Japan, Germany and Italy than on the preaching of the gospel and the establishment of the church itself. The argument that the church can be better established through these human institutions and more souls saved through their agency only magnifies the fallacy of the procedure. Why is it that Jesus Christ did not order it that way when he gave the Great Commission to his apostles? Such a “program” or “plan” makes the church a divine institution dependent on human organization for existence and success. It does not help the scriptural
status for some centralized, brotherhood eldership to assume the “oversight” of these overseas organizations. Aside and part from the organization feature, what right has a local eldership to become a general eldership and to eldership for all the churches? It appears certain that the fight against organizations and digression made in Texas and Tennessee fifty years ago must be fought all over again. If this sounds like an over-statement of the situation, just take a look at the picture: A central eldership in the United States overseeing institutional boards in foreign countries through which to do the work of the church, with all other churches working through this central eldership of one church, which in turn works through the man-made boards of human organizations somewhere else!

Instead of starting institutions, the plain New Testament plan would be for churches such as these “sponsors” to select for themselves a trustworthy gospel preacher, quietly send him to the field of work, put him to teaching and preaching the gospel in the chosen field, and support him as they do the preacher at home. This would probably
never produce enough notoriety to get into LIFE magazine nor attract the attention of congressmen and senators, but God would see it and know it and make an entry of it in the records of heaven. And while the results, perhaps, would not be so widely publicized, the church would nevertheless be established in all such places in the apostolic way and develop according to the New Testament pattern in every land. There is only one New Testament, and it does not set forth one way to do the work of the church in this country but another way, more expeditious, for another country. It is the one New Testament, the one church, and the one way for every land.

Another matter that has been treated altogether too lightly is the kind of preachers that are being sent into these fields. It is obvious that any preacher, or anybody who is not a preacher, who decides he or she wants to become a “missionary,” can obtain the passport from some central eldership and sail abroad. Experience has taught us nothing. Before the echoes from the Don Carlos Janes and E. L. Jorgenson scoop of missionary money has died away in the distance
brethren are again committing their mission work and trusting their missionary money to weak and wavering, unreliable and untrustworthy men in the foreign fields. After going among the churches for a whole generation, soliciting money for missions, Janes (a premillennialist) left a fortune to Jorgenson (another premillennialist) with the proviso that the bequest should be used to promote premillennialism. Now the churches are again blindly supporting O. D. Bixler (one more premillennialist), a self-confessed Boll sympathizer, caught and convicted in his premillennial teaching (which evidence we hold in documentary form), and he is in control of much of the work in Japan today. Under his influence also are other men in charge of other parts of the work there who have acknowledged their ignorance of the premillennial issue, and who, to compose the situation, pledge themselves not to oppose the introduction of the premillennial issue. How then can they teach the truth on the kingdom of Christ, the reign of Christ, the throne of David, the second coming of Christ, the resurrection, the judgment, the Great Commission itself, which premillennialism nullifies, without introducing the issue? And
since the denominational preachers in Japan will be teaching all of the millennial theories, how can they answer the denominationalists, or oppose their doctrines, without introducing the issue? The issue ought to be introduced everywhere, and its heresies exposed. The gospel poses the issue. Men who do not know the issue, and who cannot meet the issue, ought to be kept at home and taught before sending them anywhere to teach anybody either at home or abroad. Yet recently a young man planning to go to Africa would not consent to a declaration of views on these questions on the ground that no one had a right to ask, and besides, he said, the money of the premillennialists was as good as anybody's money! So it is with this centralization of eldership, a big eldership of a big church takes over the work of the elders of many churches with the concentration of authority. overseeing workers by the scores who are not even members of the congregation where these elders are supposed to elder, sending unsafe and unsound teachers and preachers by swarms into the foreign fields with all of this. what will the harvest be? And what will be left of the autonomous organization of the New Testament church? It
has already happened in Texas and in Tennessee, whether you are among those who have believed it could not happen here or not.

In the midst of all of this false teaching, and among all of these false teachers, there are yet some brethren who are so afraid of disfellowshipping anybody that they extend fellowship to everybody. We suggest that Rom. 16: 17 covers their case and that Tit. 3: 10 prescribes the procedure. Extending fellowship is a rather singular way to mark and avoid, and supporting them in foreign fields is a rather peculiar form of rejection, which are the exact actions the two passages command.

The Cooperation Question. The definition of “cooperation” and “cooperative” in my dictionary is “working together for common ends; concurrence.” Business firms can concur in matters of civic obligations and work together for the same ends without surrendering their identity to one firm and all the others working through it. Nor is it essential to cooperation “working together for the same ends,” for all the churches to send their missionary money to the elders of one church to do their work for them.
The references that have been made to “co-operative” gospel meetings held and to be held in some of our cities do not parallel the missionary programs of these brotherhood elderships. If the eldership of a church in a Texas city should siphon funds from churches everywhere to sponsor a “co-operative” meeting in Oklahoma City—that would be a start on drawing a parallel. There is a width of difference between local cooperation and centralized brotherhood elderships, but even so, in any local effort where more than one church is involved there are certain principles that should be observed. It has not been denied, so far as I know, that contributions can be made to a church to assist in a work being done where its elders are elders.

But every article of late with even an attempt to deal with this issue has referred to the case of Antioch in Acts 11:29-30 as a solid example for centralization practice. It is not an example of what is being done. Even a casual reading of the case will reveal the loose thinking and careless writing in evidence in some of the papers.

The passage reads: “Then the disciples,
every man according to his ability, determined to send relief unto the brethren which dwelt in Judea: which also they did, and sent it to the elders by the hand of Barnabas and Saul.” The first thing to observe is that the disciples in Antioch sent the relief to the elders where the brethren dwelt in Judea. One writer said the Antioch disciples sent the money to the church in Judea-no, that is not what it says. As well talk about the disciples in Tennessee sending something to the church in Texas. There were churches in Judea: "the churches are in Christ Jesus.” (1 Thess. 2: 14) The passage in Acts states that the disciples in Antioch sent relief to the brethren that dwelt in Judea, and sent it to the elders, obviously where the brethren that dwelt the relief dwelt. There is not so much as an indication in this passage that money was sent to the elders of the church at Jerusalem for all Judea. This passage does not even mention Jerusalem nor elders at Jerusalem. It merely states that relief was sent to the brethren that dwelt in "Judea," and that it was sent to the "elders" by Barnabas and Saul. What elders? The elders in "Judea." Where in Judea? The elders where the brethren dwelt.
So the passage certainly does specify what elders and where. Acts 11: 29-30 is not a case in point for what some brethren are promoting in the wag of a general eldership as a ‘board of benevolence and missions for all the churches.

Comes now a writer of some note who thinks he has proved that Paul delivered all of the funds to the elders of the Jerusalem church, who acted as elders for all the other churches in this administration of funds. His method is this: Paul went from where he was to Jerusalem; then Paul returned to where he was from Jerusalem; therefore, Paul went nowhere except Jerusalem! But the facts are that Paul was in Judea on this trip for many months, and McGarvey points out that he toured Judea, going among the churches rendering his personal service in connection with this emergency, going in and out of Jerusalem all of this period of time. It is certainly a thin premise and a slim conclusion upon which to predicate an argument, to say that Paul went to Jerusalem, stopped in Jerusalem and stayed in Jerusalem, when the text itself states that the relief was for “the brethren that dwelt in
Judea" (not Jerusalem) and was sent to "the elders" (where they dwelt).

It is doubtful if the brethren who are arguing this matter have considered the consequences of their contention. If their argument is true, the elders of the Jerusalem church were ecumenical in character—that is, a general or universal eldership for the whole church. Are they ready to accept such a conclusion? If so, then instead of local elders now, let us have a general eldership in each state, subject to an ecumenical eldership somewhere else, and settle all our disputes! There were elders in every city (Tit. 1:5), and in every church (Acts 14: 23) including the churches in Judea (Gal. 1:22; 1 Thess. 2:14), and it is an assertion warranted and unsupported that disciples in various parts of the world, including Antioch, sent their funds to a diocesan eldership in Jerusalem for all Judea, or anywhere else.

What the advocates of brotherhood elderships need, but cannot show, is one or both of two things: First, where the church in Antioch solicited the churches over all the world to send their money for Judea to the elders at Antioch—so they in turn could
sponsor the relief work in far-away Judea. That would be a solid example. Second, where the churches at Antioch, Philippi, Thessalonica, Berea, Galatia and Corinth contributed their funds to the eldership of one church, a concentration of funds in a centralized eldership, to be used in distant places where they were not elders. That also would be a solid example.

/“But the facts are that when the disciples in other parts of the world, such as Antioch, sent relief to the brethren in Judea they sent it to the elders of the church where the brethren dwelt that needed the relief—and that is exactly what is stated in Acts 11:29-30.

Besides all of this, the passage says that relief was sent to the “brethren” in Judea; and Paul’s itinerary was for the “saints” in Jerusalem. There is no precept for nor example of the church undertaking to feed the world.

The practice that many brethren are now advocating calls for a diocesan eldership. Bulky accounts, solicited from all of the churches of the nation, are deposited in their local treasuries, amounting to hundreds of
thousands of dollars. These churches have in effect become banking institutions, with huge payrolls, involving many jobs, and promotional projects all the way from grade schools to medical centers, with all that such projects involve, in equipment, laboratories, doctors and nurses and school teachers, all under the oversight of a local eldership in another part of the world! Truly we need to learn all over again what the work of the church is, and how to scripturally do it.

There is yet another phase to this discussion. What about small churches that desire to have part in "missionary work" but are unable to support a preacher alone, or a "program" of their own? The answer to this supposed difficulty applies to the preaching of the gospel at home as well as abroad, there can be no difference in the principle involved. Let us make the application. There are scores of small churches in the State of Arkansas that cannot support an evangelist to preach the gospel in their own county. So the eldership of a church in Oklahoma City (another State) proposes that all of these Arkansas churches send their limited contributions to the elders of this Oklahoma church, who in turn select and
oversee an evangelist to do the preaching in Arkansas for all of these small churches in that state. **That is an example of what is being done by some missionary sponsoring churches among us.**

Still another application. The state of Texas needs evangelizing. There are scores of small churches that cannot support a full time evangelist. So the elders of one church Dallas or Fort Worth propose to all the churches to concentrate their funds in the one eldership which in turn will oversee a “state evangelist.” **That is another example of what is being done in principle by these sponsoring missionary churches with their centralized elderships.**

The deductions set forth in the foregoing examples are the exact arguments used by the digressives years ago to justify their “state evangelists.” The only difference is that they appointed a board of missions out of several churches, and we have a self-appointed board of missions in the eldership of one church. In either case it destroys the autonomy of the local church in doing its work, and develops elders of a local church into diocesan bishops.
When we criticise these deviations from New Testament principles in the organization and work of the church it does not mean that we oppose the work. All of the effort to foment feeling and plant prejudice against men who plead for adherence to “the stipulated conditions of the New Testament” by charges that we are anti-foreign-missionary, anti-Christian education, and anti-cooperation will not prevail in the end. Many sober minded brethren are already seeing the light on these issues, and many others will as we shall continue to set forth these principles. It is the same battle over the same issues that had to be fought fifty years ago.

If elders of a local church can function in a general administration of the affairs of many churches in one thing, what bars them from doing so in all things, benevolence, missions, discipline? That being the case Presbyterians, Methodists and Catholics can all justify their ecclesiastical forms of church government, and we will have surrendered the whole ground on the organization of the church of Christ.
RECEPTION

Congratulations on TORCH!-W. L. Wharton.
May TORCH live and burn!-Avis C. Wiggins.
I welcome this publication.--Chas. A. Holt, Jr.
I look forward with interest to each issue.-Granville W. Tyler.
My best wishes, without reservation, to you in this venture.--Jack Meyer.
More power to you. We need the kind multiplied.-Dr. J. B. Terrell (Mt. Pleasant, Texas).
Glad to know that the brethren will be hearing from you monthly through TORCH.-C. B. Douthitt.
The Lord will bless your effort, there is not a doubt.-A. F. Thurman.
I like its size, I like its tone, and I like its editor.-Boyd D. Fanning.
I like its make-up, its tone and its author.-Mother Jewell (Mrs. Foy E. Wallace, Sr.)
I am very happy to see you produce this magazine.--Reuel Lemmons.
I have been a subscriber to every paper put out by Foy E. Wallace Jr.-Edgar Furr.
Enjoyed the first number immensely.-Glenn L Wallace.
They say one should not play with fire, but I will catch your “Torch,” and trust I will not get burned.-G. K. Wallace.
Believe it is worth the price hearing from you occasionally.--G. L. Billingsley (Frankston, Texas).
Of course, I would give a dollar to learn what your reactions are to the issues of the day.-J. G. Savage (Lewisville, Texas).
I commend it most heartily. You have done and are doing a wonderful work.-James A. Allen.
A very attractive piece of work... even before reading it I am sure I will want to receive it regularly.-L. O. Sanderson.
ENCOURAGEMENT

YOU HAVE A BROAD FIELD. YOU HAVE MADE A GOOD START. GO RIGHT ON.—AUSTIN TAYLOR.

YOUR UNDERTAKINGS IN THE PUBLICATION WORK HAVE NEVER BEEN FAILURES. YOU MAY HAVE RUN SHORT OF "FILTHY LUCRE." BUT NEVER OF PRECIOUS AND POWERFUL TRUTH. YOUR TRIBUTE TO YOUR FATHER IS A CLASSIC—THE FITTING PRAISE OF A WORTHY SON. THE OPPOSITION HAS NEVER MET YOU ON AN ISSUE: THEY ALWAYS DESERT AND RAISE SMOKE SCREEN OF PERSONALITIES OR TRY TO JUSTIFY THEMSELVES BY WHAT SOMEONE ELSE IS DOING THAT IS QUESTIONABLE, OR APPARENTLY SO. THERE ARE SOME THINGS GOING ON IN SCHOOLS, PAPERS AND CHURCHES THE ATTITUDES AND TENDENCIES OF WHICH ARE TOWARD HERESY AND ANARCHY. “STAND FAST IN THE FAITH, BE STRONG.”—C. E. WOOLDRIDGE.