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THE BIBLE THE BOOK OF TRUTH

The inspired king of Israel delivered a dual avouchment for the everlasting stability and the eternal integrity of the words of the book of God. "Forever, O Lord, thy word is settled in heaven."

The word "settled" is a sublime assertion of transfixed stability—the Bible has stood the test of time. "Thy word is true from the beginning."

The word "true" is a definitive declaration of immutable integrity from the first word—the Bible has stood the test of truth.

I. THE BIBLE AND SCIENCE

The revelation of science is not the purpose of the Bible. Its object is the revelation of the origin and destiny of man, and to reveal the will of his Maker to him. If the Bible had been a revelation of Science, it would have been in the nature
of it a premature announcement of scientific discovery, and a direct communication to men of matters in the realm of human knowledge which are left for man to ascertain for himself. But the Bible is truth, and’ though its language is not scientific, in the academic sense of the term, every reference in the Bible to science is scientifically accurate; every mention of things geological is geologically correct; and every word in it touching things astronomical is astronomically true. Thus while science searches and revises its findings, the word of God is settled and fixed. It is by reason of this fact that the Bible, though not a revelation of science, anticipates the discoveries of science. Therein lies the incontrovertible proof of inspiration. The scientific truth and accuracy of the Bible are witnesses to its divine origin as the inspired word of God.

In the cosmogony of the Bible it never mistakes fables for facts. For instance, the delusions of astrology are not confused with the researches of astronomy. The former is superstition, the latter is science. In all the writings of men certain errors and misconceptions of the times in which they lived are found in their books. What kept these errors and superstitions of the times out of the Bible? No indorsement of such is to be found
in it. To the contrary, in times of such misconceptions the Bible anticipates with scientific accuracy the truth in whatever realm the reference is made. The examples of this fact are numerous. Time was when men believed that the "firmament" was solid. But in Psalms 19 the Spirit of God had David to use the Hebrew word "expanse" for our word "firmament" in that passage, thus anticipating science. When men thought the earth rested on some sort of a foundation such as huge rock pillars, Job declared that it was hanging "on nothing" (Job. 26:7)-poised in space-and thus anticipated discovery of gravity.

II. Genesis and Geology

The same is true of the geology of the Bible. The geological order of the scientist is the exact creative order of Moses. Geology teaches that a vast watery waste existed; Moses said the earth was void and without form, and that darkness was upon the face of the deep. Geology claims that watery vapors were lifted and formed into an expanse; Moses ascribes the same procedure to the creative act of God. Geology asserts that the earth pushed itself up from below or beneath the waters, and vegetation followed; Moses wrote that the dry land appeared and yielded grass, herb and
tree. Geology says that the heavens then were cleared of the dense atmospheric expanse hanging over it, and that the luminaries of the heavens began to shine on the earth; Moses records that on the fourth day of creation God made these luminary bodies of the heaven to give light upon the earth, to divide the day from the night, for seasons, for days and for years.

In the order of animal creation geology gives the order from the lower to the higher-fish, reptiles, birds and mammals, which the geologist lists according to the "proportion of brain to spinal cord." But Moses records this exact order of animal creation. What did Moses know about comparative anatomy, that fish are lower than reptiles, and reptiles lower than birds, and birds lower than mammals, of the geological discoveries? The record of creation in Genesis, centuries before science was born and ages before geology was known, tabulates the order without a geological error or a scientific blunder. This undeniable agreement between the Bible record of creation and the modern discoveries of science is indisputable proof that He who made the world wrote the Book.

The efforts of some of the critics to create contradictions between geology and the Bible on
the basis of the age of the earth and the date of fossils have proven presumptive and futile. Geology cannot date the "age of the earth, and the Bible does not date it. How can there be disagreement over a date, when the one cannot fix it and the other does not set it. Neither biology nor geology can set dates. Nobody knows the date of a fossil. But it is known that fossils have formed in ocean beaches within a half-century; and fossils of Indian tracks made no earlier than the Civil War are in evidence here in the U.S.A. Even the Dinosaurs (of the Sinclair Oil Company's advertisements!) are about to be identified as of pre-Columbian Indian origin, which perished when geological catastrophe cut off the source of food supply, causing them to perish by starvation, and when the section of the country where their skeletons have been found was raised by volcanic disturbance, causing the ocean to change its shores, and when the shifting sand and silt turned to stone, the carcases became fossils—a process which could occur within a few centuries. Actually, it is now a demonstrated fact that artificial fossils can be produced by chemical process. If artificial fossils can result from chemical action in a short time, why should it be judged incredible that the natural conditions, such as geological upheavals, crustal disturbances and volcanic eruptions, could cause a
chemical process that would produce the same result naturally in far less time than the aeons that geological speculation arbitrarily decree. Once we were told that the earth was a few million years old; later we were re-advised that it was a billion; only still later to be re-instructed that the age of it is ten billion; again, one hundred billion; once more, three hundred billion-and now, comes one who avows that the rocks, the formations and the fossils all prove it to be not less than five hundred billion years-perhaps! Those are “New Deal” figures-excuse me, I cannot figure there; this latest tabulator would make a good candidate for a federal office in the Democratic party!

One thing we may know, and of that we can be assured-that the science of geology will never read into the records of the rocks a layer of strata, nor find from the fossils a skeleton of fact, that contradicts a syllable of the word of God. It remains that the question of origins is philosophical, not scientific.

After all is said, the genesis of the Word of God does not deal with the question of antiquity, but rather with the matter of origins. Nor does the genesis of geology settle-the question of antiquity. Harry Rimmer said, when a geologist is asked how he knows the age of the rocks, he
will reply that he knows the age of the rocks by the kind of fossils in the rocks. But when he is asked how he knows the age of the fossils, his answer is that he knows the age of the fossils by the kind of rocks the fossils are in! So the fossil tells the age of the rocks, and the rocks tell the age of the fossil-then which was first the rock or the ‘fossil, and how does anybody know they are telling the truth?

But the propaganda of pseudo-science shows itself everywhere. Official guides for the parties of tourists at Carlsbad Cavern and the great Grand Canyon are turned into teachers of evolution. They lecture their parties on the million-year geology of the stalagmites and the stalactites of the Caverns, and the one hundred million years that it supposedly took the river to cut the Canyon. Every one who has ever visited these resorts has heard the guides prattle their story. But their tale does not allow for earthquakes, crustal disorders, volcanic eruptions, and other geological upheavals, which could shake the earth and loosen the strata, so that the river could and would obviously cut its way far more rapidly than their 100,000,000-year schedule. Such upheavals could, in fact, cause such changes in the conditions of rocks and strata as to destroy all the time-tables and calculations of
the computer who seeks to upset the Bible. The fact remains that rocks have no anniversaries and fossils are not dated. There is actually no science of origins.

III. THE BIBLE AND EVOLUTION

No one who is informed will array the Bible against science. It is pseudo-science, not science, that contradicts the Bible. The proper statement of the correct thesis would be: The Bible and Science versus' the theories Of evolution.

The theory of evolution teaches that matter made mind. But the truth holds to the absolute power of mind over matter, and the facts show that matter was made for mind and kept for mind. The world is full of illustrations of these facts. By the inventive genius of man lightning has been chained; the power of steam has been controlled; the strength of the lion is made weak; the energy of the atom is being utilized-all by the power of the mind. If matter made mind, then matter created something greater than itself. Who is the scientist that believes that?

Evolution teaches that out of something without sex, things that have sex gradually developed; and though the sexes do not connect in any way except to propagate their kind, without any fore-
thought on the part of the non-sex thing out of which they evolved, all the sexes sprang from it—the single non-sex cell. Where is there a scientist who can believe it?

Evolution teaches that inorganic matter became at once organic matter, and that organic matter evolved into man. This means that inorganic matter became vegetable life; vegetable life became animal life; and animal life became man. As well say that the magnificent granite capitol of Texas, which was once in the granite hills of Llano county, "without outside help," and "by forces resident in itself," and “unaided by external force,” formed itself into the stately capitol building; and some future day this domed and marble-columned mammoth building will become legislators and governors of the states and finally the presidents of the nation.

On this hypothesis we may develop a theory of the evolution of an automotive vehicle. The first two-cylinder Thrash sprang into existence from a junk pile, which evolved from mineral substances, and gradually developed into a 4-cylinder Ford, then a 6-cylinder Chevrolet, an 8-cylinder Buick, a 12-cylinder Cadillac, and finally a 16-cylinder Rolls-Royce—but all this “without outside help," and “unaided by external force:”
and by "powers resident in itself"! That would be what evolution teaches in reference to the single cell theory, the origin of species, and the descent of man.

Let the evolutionist find a start on a change from the inorganic to the organic; from the vegetable to the animal; then from the animal to the man. From the beginning of history all of these have been the same in their respective classifications, with man created as man, existing as man, and with power over all flesh.

It is a known fact that animal cells and vegetable cells are radically different in structure. A simple illustration shows this to be a fact. Organic nourishment will destroy vegetable cells; but inorganic nourishment will destroy animal cells. For an example, put rotted manure from the stable in a potato hill and it will produce better potatoes; put it in the cow to produce better butter, and see the result! On the same principle, feed raw meat to a dog and it will make him fat; but put it on a cabbage plant, and it will die.

If animal life comes from vegetable life, why is the life in the vegetable kingdom the same in all examples, but in the animal kingdom this is not
true. The tiny blade of grass and the giant oak tree are nourished in exactly the same way; but it is not so of the ant and the elephant, or of a doodle-bug and a man.

These simple facts of nature show that the theory of evolution violates the law of cell structure. And it violates the law of kinds-the law that "like begets like." If animal life comes from vegetable life, explain why hair grows on the cow and the horse, wool on the sheep, and feathers on the goose-they all eat the same food. And what became of the law of development? If animal life came from vegetable life explain why and tell us when the development became static. What power started the incline and prevented the decline?

Then, what about the law of resistance--chop on a tree and there is no resistance; but try it on a mule-pick out his hind leg for the first test--and see, or feel, the result, and experience the difference. Remove the skin from the hand and it will heal; but remove the bark from the tree and it will die. Also there is the law of absorption. The tree and the plant drink the rain and the sunshine and grow; the rain on the earth refreshes it; but let it rain on a horse, a dog or a man and
there is no like result. The theory of evolution violates these simple laws of nature, the law of resistance, the law of absorption, the law of kinds, the law of development, and the law of cell structure.

There is also the law of mutation. This law of mutation operates only within the species, or kind. There are many examples of this law, take for instance the chicken world—but there is no example of a chicken being developed into something that is not a chicken. That would be transmutation, or crossing over the line of species, a thing for which not one example has ever been produced. When the evolutionist finds a cat that lays eggs and hatches a litter of kittens, and a hen that gives birth to a brood of chicks, that will be a start toward the task of proving the possibility of the transmutation theory. This one fact stands in the way of the evolutionary theory.

With reference to kinds and varieties—there are only a few kinds, but there are many varieties. In the feline family, besides the common cat, are the tiger, the panther, the pumas, the lion, and that “Oklahoma City leopard.” In the canine family are dogs, wolves, foxes and jackals. In the equine family are horses, zebras, quagga and
the like. To the mastadon belong the elephant, rhinoceros and hippopotamus. Infidels carp at the idea that two of all the animals on the earth were housed in the ark, but the Bible does not say that. It says two of each kind. It does not sap varieties, it does not even say species—it says kind. There are many varieties, but few kinds. There are five races of mankind, all of which can be crossed in marriage, and the product continue to bear seed after its kind. This is not true of animals. The mule, for instance, is a hybrid and cannot produce its kind; but he is a stronger animal than either ancestor. If all animals are from the same parent stock there is no explanation for these and many other examples in the laws of nature. It is proof that Intelligence, not fortuity, was the guiding principle in the creation of all forms and phases of life.

IV. Questions Evolution Does Not Answer

The principle of adaptation by law is against the idea of fortuity, establishes Intelligence, and proves that animal life did not spring from vegetable life; and that human life has not evolved from animal life. On the supposition that all life has developed from the same aboriginal parent, the evolutionist finds himself without any explana-
tion as to how certain shifts took place and when the changes occurred. It will not be amiss to list a few of such questions that the theories of organic evolution do not answer.

1. If all examples of the animal kingdom are from the same animal insect or stock, why do the progenitors of some have two legs and others four? And why do we not find birds with four legs and men with wings? It might be added that this will be in the next world, but the evolutionist does not believe in the future life!

2. If fortuity and not Intelligence is the guiding principle, animals should naturally be expected to appear with all manner of deformities: Eyes where ears should be; nose behind and ears in front; a horse with the head of a cow; and a cow with the horns of a rhinoceros. And since the cow will kick, the same as a horse, why do not horses have horns like a cow? The horse thus has only one defensive weapon, while the cow has two, and that looks like discrimination! Let the evolutionist infidel account for the neck of the giraffe, the trunk of the elephant, the eye of the eagle, and the hand of man. And it may be added that if man had used his hand only to feed himself, would he just have retained his front legs, like his supposed monkey ancestor has?
3. If evolution is true, and the tendency is upward, why has not a new species of mankind developed—an angelic species, with a higher sphere of existence and abode? But there is actually more difference between the highest in the ape and the lowest in man (which is next in order in the supposed ascending scale) than there is in the highest in the ape and the lowest in the monkey family. Why are there no examples of a series of intermediates?

4. If man descended from the animal, why is the animal grown so much sooner, the monkey, for instance, in two years. But man has lived to a much older ending, according to both history and the Bible—why, if he came from the animals of so much shorter life. If thousands of years ago man came from such short-lived animals, but lived so long himself, why does he not live longer now? If evolution is true the development would be the same in all nations; and the tendency being upward, why has there been a decline? And since it is true, according to science, that negro blood will break out in the tenth generation, if man’s ancestry is the monkey, why are not babies born with long tails now?

5. Moses said, "male and, female created he them 'T-in the beginning. In all animals the male
is better formed, i’s’ more graceful and attractive, in plumage, in carriage and in beauty. But this is not so of man. If the animal and man are from the same aboriginal parent, when and where and how did the shift take place? And when and how did the change begin?

These are only a few of thousands of examples to prove by the law of adaptation that neither fortuity nor evolution is the process, and that nothing short of Intelligence can be the cause of all forms and phases of life, and that by creation.

The Bible affirms direct creation, that God created man as man. Moses said that man was formed out of the dust of the ground. Darwin said that man evolved out of certain influences from the bottom of the sea. So Moses said dust, and Darwin said wet dirt-just a difference between “dry” and “wet” dirt. So the only idea Darwin had in the direction of being correct, he borrowed from Moses!

The Scripture account of man’s origin is simple and rational, and agrees with geology that each species created was perfect in kind at the first. Man was physically, mentally and morally pure at the first, and corruption came by sin. The
infidel socialist says that immorality is due to man's struggle to maintain life; but his infidel evolution theory says that out of the struggle to maintain life comes morals and clean living—In which is he correct? How could moral force in man develop out of a great struggle for life, and then be lost by the struggle to maintain it?

If improvement is the law of nature, then perfection is the end, and it follows that if there is no God, there will be, when that perfection is reached. Why not accept the God of revelation: In the beginning God created.

These are just a few of the many illustrations and examples that thwart the theories of trans-mutation, and that show the doctrine of organic evolution to be unscientific and untrue.

I want to tell you that your statement relative to Israel in Palestine is as accurate as if you had been there and observed it as I recently did. I was moved beyond words at such accuracy.

—J. T. Marlin.
In the year 1910 the *Standard Publishing Company* printed a book under the title *Biblical Criticism*, consisting of the articles of J. W. McGarvey in a department of the *Christian Standard* from January 1893 through the year 1904. The purpose of the department was to deal with the criticisms against the Bible in the field of Higher Criticism, better known as Destructive Criticism, and to expose the fallacies of the modernists of his time, who were at that time beginning to drive wedges into the colleges of the Christian Church, such as Transylvania and Bethany. History repeats, and this same modernism is now edging into the colleges being conducted by our own brethren today. It is interesting to note that the same sophistry being put out now by the modernists of the Chicago University, and their proteges of the miniature replica of that institution in Los Angeles (Pepperdine College), were demolished under the
withering fire of McGarvey. Other books by McGarvey, such as Evidences of Christianity, and Authorship Of The Pentateuch, are exhaustive works and exceedingly valuable, but the short and incisive articles of Biblical Criticism are glittering gems of truth, casting scintillating rays of impenetrable faith in the unanswerable arguments made in support of the absolute integrity of the Bible as the verbally inspired word of God.

The articles were written for the masses, in an easy and understandable style, often bubbling with wit and bristling with humor, to which some objected who were the objects of his shafts; but it was plain to see that the gravity of his logic, rather than the levity of his witticism was the real ground of objection.

On this point Brother McGarvey inserted the following note in his department, entitled “Criticism and Witticism”:

Under this heading there is an editorial in the Christian Evangelist reviewing the last lesson which I gave its senior editor. He says: “Professor McGarvey, so far as we know, never manifested the qualities of a humorist until he assumed the role of a Biblical critic.” He does me too great honor in representing me as having assumed the role of a Biblical critic. I make no such pretension. I only aim to stand in between
the critics, some of whom I have had opportunity to study, and my brethren who have not enjoyed this opportunity, that I may give the latter the benefit of my readings, and guard them against being misled. If the editor had known me better, he would have known that, without being a humorist, I have always been somewhat given to humor; perhaps too much so for a preacher. I have always been disposed to laugh at things which are ludicrous, and the only development in this respect of which I am conscious in connection with Biblical criticism, is this: I find myself now disposed to laugh at some things which once made me angry. When I first began to read these destructive critics, I was like Elihu while listening in silence to the sophistical arguments of Job and his friends—my wrath was kindled. I recollect particularly that when I read Robertson Smith’s “Old Testament In The Jewish Church,” I was out of humor from beginning to end. But now that I see farther into the sophistries and follies of the critics, I laugh at some things which then kindled my wrath. I have experienced a change somewhat like that of the barnyard animals when, after the ass had come in clothed with the lion’s skin, and had frightened them all, they saw his long ears stick out, and all broke into a roar of laughter. I must be excused, then, if I laugh at some of the ridiculous positions of the critics and their apologists.

I have observed, too, that some things are exposed in their nakedness as soon as you turn the laugh on them, and that a good laugh is sometimes more effective than any amount of argument. If a fellow should stand up and say that two and two make
five, and you should undertake to argue with him, such a fellow will dispute all day, and have the last word in spite of you. But if you laugh, the company will probably laugh with you, and that’s an end of the matter. It is precisely so in regard to many of the positions and expositions of the destructive critics; so I have laughed, and I will laugh, at their folly. If I were writing a book, I would try to straighten my face and put on my dignity; but as I am only writing for a weekly paper, I can afford to have a little fun. (pp. 71-3)

While the usually sedate McGarvey deviated from his serious vein "to have a little fun," at the expense of the critics of the Bible, he also took a few other excursions from the main purpose of his department to take care of a few other issues, apropos to present day sympathetic attitudes toward error and the teachers of error, as the following quote on “Heresy-hunting,” so interestingly reveals:

Some people have a very confused idea about hunting for heresy, and about Christian liberty. If a man advances and seeks to propagate teaching which I regard as very injurious, if not ruinous, and I assail it with vigor, such vigor as he feels unable to resist on the merits of the question, it is common for him, and his friends to cry out, “Heresy-hunter! Heresy-hunter!” If a lot of us should go prying into some man’s utterances to find something wrong, somewhat as W. T. Moore’s hounds kept up a yelping all night
because, as the old darkey said, “dey smell somethin’,
but can’t 'zac'ly locate it,” we might be charged with
hunting for heresy; but if those hounds had seen a
fox coming out of some man’s hen-roost, nobody would
have objected to their giving him a chase. The fox
might cry out for personal liberty, and say, “I have
just as good a right to take a chicken as you have to
take a fox,” nevertheless, the common judgment of
mankind would say that to chase the fox away would
be a righteous act. Out West there are bear-hunters.
They go creeping around among the hills and rocks
trying to slip up on a bear and take advantage of him.
In this, they are like real heresy-hunters. But if a man
is walking along the public road, and meets a bear
reared on his hind legs, and reaching for him with
his fore paws, there is bound to be a fight or a foot-
race; and if the man should fight the bear, no man
could on this account call him a bear-hunter. The
bear might say, “I am free, and have as much right
on this road as you have,” and the man could answer,
“I am free, too, and have as much right on this road
as you have.” And if the man should also say, “You
are after hugging me, and you hug everybody you can
get hold of, so I will put a bullet through you,” the
average citizen would say that the man was in the
right. So if heresy does not want to be shot at, it
should play sly and not walk out into the public road.
(pp. 383-4)

With the same piquancy of pen the versatile
McGarvey took time out to pay his “respects”
to the pretenders of miracle-working cults and
'divine-healing revivals,' evidently in vogue. Answering a querist on this subject, he wrote as follows:

The writer's mind is evidently controlled by the one consideration set forth in her second paragraph, where she says: "Ever since I have been old enough to read the New Testament with any understanding, I have felt that if Christians would put themselves in the same attitude toward Christ as did those who came to him for healing when he was on earth in the flesh, it could not be otherwise than that he would answer their petitions as he did then." This feeling rests with her on the fact that Christ is the same yesterday, today and forever, and upon his promises to answer prayer. It is a feeling quite common with the readers of the New Testament, who have not learned to discriminate between the miraculous and the providential.

The fact that Christ is an unchangeable being is sufficient proof that he will always act on the same unchangeable principles, but not that he will always act in the same way. It is proof that he will always have compassion on the sick, but not that he will always restore them to health in this world. Furthermore the fact that he healed the very few sick who were in all Palestine, and none outside that little district, if we except the Canaanite woman's daughter, by a touch or a word, is no ground for supposing that he will now heal all in the whole world who call upon him, and thus put an end to disease and death so far as his kingdom extends. He never proposed to inter-
fere in this way with the Father’s decree, “Dust thou art, and unto dust thou shalt return.”

It is true that Christ promised to answer prayer, and that some of his utterances on this subject are so unlimited in their terms as to have the appearance of being unlimited in reality; but we must remember that one of the apostles was afflicted with a malady which was so painful and irritating that he called it a messenger of Satan to buffet him, yet his earnest prayers to Christ for healing left him still in his affliction. These promises are to be construed in a general and not in a universal sense. The same is true in the matter of life and death. Christ delivered Peter out of the hand of Herod when all the world would have said it was impossible, and when the church, though they prayed for him, prayed not for his deliverance, but for the steadfastness of his faith in the death which appeared inevitable; but when the elder James was taken by the same Herod a few days earlier, though he doubtless was also a subject of the prayers of the church, Christ permitted Herod to cut off his head. A miracle was wrought in the one instance for special reasons. In the other the ordinary course of providence prevailed.

It is true, also, in the passage which our sister cites from the apostle James, sick disciples were directed to send for the elders of the church, that they might pray over them, anoint them with oil, and raise them up; but every reader of the New Testament should know that this was written when many elders of the churches possessed the miraculous power
of healing, which was imparted to them by the imposition of the hands of an apostle. To argue from this that elders of the church, or anybody else, can do the same in the present day, is to leave out of view the one thing that enabled them to do it then; that is, the imposition of apostolic hands with prayer for this gift.

The practical working of this precept of James, even in the apostolic age, is modified by actual facts which are too often overlooked. Paul had the power to heal by a word or a touch, and he used it on proper occasions; but on one of his journeys through the province of Asia he left Trophimus sick at Miletus (2 Tim. 4:20). On another occasion, Epaphroditus was sick “nigh unto death.” He had been sent to Rome by the brethren at Philippi to minister to Paul’s wants as a prisoner, and he incurred this sickness in consequence of the journey. Paul was, therefore, doubly sorrowful at the prospect of his death; but he did not heal him. He did not anoint him with oil, nor raise him up (Phil. 2:25-30). Again, Timothy was an invalid from some disease of the stomach; yet Paul neither healed him nor told him to pray for healing, but advised him to take a little wine as a tonic. These facts show plainly that the precept of James was exceptional and temporary, even in the age of the apostles, and that the later practice of Paul is to be looked upon as the permanent order of the kingdom of Christ.

Finally, there is a negative evidence on this subject which in itself is conclusive: unlike these modern advocates of “divine healing,” the apostles were never known to go about exhorting people to come forward.
For the healing of the body. They effected miraculous cures in a few instances, "as a sign to the unbelievers," but they never proclaimed, either to saints or sinners, that the healing of all diseases was a part of the gospel which they were sent to preach. These so-called faith-cure churches, therefore, and the preachers who officiate in them as "divine healers," or what not, are not modeled after the apostolic type, but are misleading the people by humbuggery. Fortunately for the people, the great majority of them have too much good sense to be humbugged by a device so transparent. (pp. 348-351)

In similar vein McGarvey would frequently puncture arguments of the Adventist., Universalist and Millennial cults, with incisive brevity, which also "punctures" the dishonest references by some of millennialist sympathy today to what, without warrant, they have termed "McGarvey's millennial tendencies." He has spoken too plainly, and too repeatedly, in his articles and books, for such misrepresentations to go unchallenged, in such direct comments as the following under the title "The Restoration Of All Things."

There is no passage in the Scripture more constantly garbled by the Universalists, and some others, than Acts 3:21, in which the expression "the restoration of all things" occurs. In the verse, as usually quoted, Peter, speaking of Jesus says: "Whom the heaven must receive until the times of the restoration of all things";
and it is claimed that by the restoration of all things is meant the restoration of the whole human race to its primitive condition .... They quote but a part of the sentence, leaving off a modifying clause. The whole of it reads, "Whom the heaven must receive until the times of the restoration of all things whereof God spoke by the mouth of his holy prophets who have been since the world began." In other words, the heaven must receive (and retain) Jesus, until all things which have been predicted by God's holy prophets since the world began, shall be fulfilled. This is a totally different conception, and it is time that preachers of all classes had learned to quote the passage as it is. (pp. 404-5)

That is "a totally different conception" from that which is held by millennialists who assert that Jesus Christ will dwell on the earth one thousand years in bodily presence between two resurrections. In 1 Cor. 15, Paul quoted two Old Testament prophets, Isaiah and Hosea, on the subject of the resurrection of the dead, and applied both prophecies to the abolition of death. But as long as the grave holds a single victim, good or bad, death has not been abolished. As long as one victim of death is rotting in the ground, death has not been destroyed. But the prophets prophesied the complete abolition of death. And as McGarvey correctly says, Peter said in Acts 3 that Jesus will stay in heaven "until all things which have
been predicted by God’s holy prophets since the world began, shall be fulfilled.” Not until the time for the last dead person to be raised has come will Jesus leave heaven. How then can he dwell on the earth in bodily presence one thousand years after the resurrection of the righteous but before the resurrection of the wicked? If there is to be a future millennium on this earth between two resurrections, Jesus will not be in it, for he will be in heaven, not on earth, according to McGarvey’s ‘tendencies.’ It would be very interesting if a certain perverter of some of the pioneers, who carries a department which he calls "Precious Reprints," would reprint this "precious" print from McGarvey, the like of which there are numerous others.

There are many rich writings which it is our purpose to quote from time to time, under this heading, as TORCH continues to cast rays of light into some dark corners.
“BIRDS OF A FEATHER FLOCK TOGETHER”

The following “Revival” announcement in a Louisville, Kentucky, newspaper, is another bit of evidence to verify what has recently been said in these columns concerning the premillennial churches of Chicago and their modernism in teaching and practice.

REVIVAL
ROBERT E. BOX, Chicago, Ill.
OCT. 30-NOV. 3--7:45 P. M.
HIGHLAND CHURCH OF CHRIST
1273 Bardstown Rd.
EVERYONE WELCOME

This man Box is the preacher for the premillennial Cornell Avenue church, in Chicago, whose writings have shown him to be a modernist of the “ultra” class. The Highland church mentioned in the news-ad is the E. L. Jorgenson premillennial church, where the Christian-Church s. S. Lappin also held a meeting. It is significant that while Ralph G. Wilburn, the Liberalist of Pepperdine College, was the preacher at Cornell, he also held meetings for the premillennial church in Louisville. A combination of premillennialism and modernism is the pattern in Chicago, and to it is added the sectarianism that always goes with it.
MENTION has been made in the papers of the men of eighty—the octogenarians among us—and congratulatory cards, letters and telegrams on such occasions are well deserved and fully in order.

At Denton, Texas, in a modest suburban home, there is in retirement a man of eighty, a nobleman indeed, a great scholar, a tested and tried and true servant of God—R. L. Whiteside. He is a godly man; unpretentious, unassuming, undemanding, but not unappreciated by those of us who have long known him, loved him, and recognized his 'extra-ordinary intellect, his vast knowledge, and his deep spiritual capacity. His writings excel in scholarly exegesis and spiritual simplicity. His Commentary on Romans surpasses Lard’s or any other, and Whiteside on Romans is a companion work to McGarvey on Acts—any student who has one of these should have both. His pen and tongue
have been of inestimable value to the church of the Lord Jesus Christ. As McGarvey once wrote of another: "What a pity we cannot move back the dial of his life about twenty years."

Both Brother and Sister Whiteside are invalids. But they are as serene as a summer breeze and as calm as a Texas sunset. The world has been blessed by their lives; the church especially has received the benefit of his great powers.

Now he is eighty. When? Exactly, I do not know; but why wait for another date to come. Salute this man of God—with cards, letters, and better still from some of you who have prospered, with a check, and make it substantial. It will not hurt you and it will help him. And order his book, *Whiteside On Romans*, $3.00, from him, at Denton, Texas.

No permission was asked to write these lines. He will not know of it, nor will anyone else (except the printer), until it is read. He may rebuke me for doing this, but I have written this piece because of the deep devotion for this veteran of the cause of Christ; and because I am among those who, knowing him, appreciate him. A belated salute to this man of eighty.
A VOICE FROM LUBBOCK

The letter inserted below is from a business man in Lubbock who has been an active and faithful member of the church many years. He is not a crank, nor an extremist, but a sober man, who knows the truth and wants the church to do right.

Dear Brother Foy: We have read with interest your TORCH, and are firmly convinced, regardless of all innovations, sponsorships and concentration of authority . . . . it becomes the duty of someone to fight the battle for pure New Testament Christianity. I have felt a few times along the line that you were, perhaps, too hard and not charitable enough toward those who were endeavoring to do mission work; but this insidious thing is growing within the church . . . . and there is no easy way to kill it . . . . I thoroughly believe with our departed J. D. Tant that we are drifting, and I can look back over the past forty years and see with alarm how far we have drifted . . . . Fight on, brother, fight on, till the battle is over and the victory is won . . . . God bless you, is my prayer.

-L. D. Morgan

There are many others in Lubbock and vicinity who have spoken the same sentiments, and many more who feel these sentiments but have not spoken them.
THE TORCH SPECIAL

1. God’s Prophetic Word ................. $3.00
   (The Houston Series on Premillennialism.
   400 pages, clothbound)
2. Certified Gospel (Enlarged) .... $3.00
   (Gospel Sermons delivered at Port Arthur.
   Texas, with special addresses added)
3. TORCH (Subscription) ......... $1.00
   (Thirty-two pages plus cover, published
   monthly) $7.00

Special to TORCH subscribers: All in one order
(Five Dollars) ...................... $5.00

MAIL ALL ORDERS TO:
FOY E. WALLACE JR. PUBLICATIONS
Box 1804 Oklahoma City
THE TORCH SPECIAL

1. God's Prophetic Word .................... $3.01
   (The Houston Series on Premillennialism,
   400 pages, clothbound)

2. Certified Gospel (Enlarged) ............... $3.00
   (Gospel Sermons delivered at Port Arthur,
   Texas, with special addresses added)

3. TORCH (Subscription) ................... $1.00
   (Thirty-two pages plus cover, published
   monthly)

$7.00

Special to TORCH subscribers: All in one order
(Five Dollars) .................................... $5.00

MAIL ALL ORDERS TO:
FOP E. WALLACE JR. PUBLICATIONS
Box 1804 Oklahoma City