

**A Treatise**  
**on**  
**The Bible College**

(Second Edition)

By  
**A. W. HARVEY**  
Bloomington, Indiana



*A DOCTRINAL QUESTION  
OF VITAL IMPORTANCE TO  
THE CHURCH OF CHRIST*

## PREFACE

WHY this treatise on the Bible College issue? is the first question in the mind of the reader. To say the question is not disturbing you is like living in an infected smallpox district and saying, I don't have it, why be concerned! The brotherhood of the Church of Christ is so seriously contaminated, at the present time, with the virus of "humanisms" that the vaccination may be too late for many congregations.

The reason for alarm is further set out in a statement from Foy Wallace, Jr., an advocate and also a critic of the Bible Colleges, who said some years ago, "It was the Colleges that swept the Church into the first digression in this country and it will come again, if it is not already on its way."

The length of this document may not appeal to you but, as Paul said to King Agrippa, "I beseech thee to hear me patiently." The principle involved is deeply fundamental, and to recognize the right of "humanly organized bodies" on the part of the Bible Colleges to take over a vital part of the work of the Church is to break the backbone of resistance to all humanly organized bodies which have so seriously corrupted the divine order of things.

Notwithstanding the urgent demand from the brotherhood, I am very reluctant in attempting the publication of the second edition of my "Treatise on the Bible College." I feel that others more competent should render this service. As a matter of deep conviction and with a sense of urgent duty, I am, by the help of God, attempting to give these words of warning to the brotherhood, concerning the encroachment of possibly the most insidious innovation that has ever been made on the brotherhood of the New Testament Church. I say insidious, because, from almost every external appearance, to the unsuspecting mind, it seems to be unquestionably good. This appearance of being good obscures the real fundamental sin involved in it, namely, the sin of humanly organized bodies taking over a part of the work of the church and thus robbing God of his glory.

Submitted in love and in the fear of God, with the view of uniting, not dividing the Church.

A. W. Harvey

Bloomington, Ind.

September 1, 1948

The perfection of God's divine arrangement is and always has been generally ignored by the masses of the religious world. It is pitiful to see how far even disciples of Christ will some times go in their efforts to make themselves believe the things which they want to believe and in soothing a guilty conscience with the balm of expediency. Anticipating the possibilities of such things occurring, the apostle Paul ceased not to warn the elders of the church at Ephesus for the space of three years, night and day, with tears, exhorting them to "watch and remember." Having warned them against the danger of the "grievous wolves" entering in among them, not sparing the flock, he said "Of your own selves men shall arise, speaking perverse things to draw away disciples after them." (Acts 20:30.)

History has verified the propriety of this warning. History has also proven the difficulty of maintaining the purity of the original standards in institutions either human or divine. While Paul was still living and working among the churches, he wrote to the church at Thessalonica saying, "The mystery of iniquity doth already work." (2 Thess. 2:7.) Again he wrote, saying, "Evil men and seducers shall wax worse and worse, deceiving and being deceived." (2 Tim. 3:13.) It would require many volumes to note the many departures which have been made from the original divine order of things as set out in the New Testament Scriptures.

Among the first phases of the divine order of things to be affected by corrupting the doctrine, was the organization of the Church. It was only by corrupting the organization that the false doctrine could be most effectively promoted. The New Testament congregational form of government, with the elders and the deacons, was too simple to be best adapted to the work of the enemy of Truth. The infinite and divine wisdom of the great Head of the Church felt that the work of the Church could be best carried on, and the mission of the Church could be most effectively accomplished through the most simple organization. It was God's eternal purpose to make known his "manifold wisdom" to the world, through the Church. (Eph. 3:10.) God made known the fact to Israel that he was a "jealous God" (Ex. 20:5), and said, "my glory will I not give to another nor my praises to graven images." (Isa. 42:8.) Unto the Corinthian brethren Paul wrote saying, "For I am jealous of you with a godly jealousy; for I have espoused you to one husband, that I may present you as a chaste virgin to Christ." (2 Cor. 11:2.) To the church at Ephesus Paul wrote saying, "Unto him be glory in the church by Jesus Christ throughout all ages world without end. Amen." (Eph. 3:21.) God's unchangeable plan made no provision for a changing world. To Timothy, Paul wrote saying, "But if I tarry long, that thou mayest know how thou oughtest to behave thyself in the house of God, which is the church of the living God, *the pillar and ground of the truth.*" (1 Tim. 3:15.) When Paul wrote this statement, declaring the Church to be "THE PILLAR AND GROUND OF THE TRUTH," to it he made no exceptions.

With the apostasy which began in Paul's day and found its consummation in the beginning of the seventh century, the simple organization of the Church was gradually turned into a great religious-political machine and became filled with every imaginable corruption during the "dark ages." Following the period of the Reformation, the Campbells introduced the Restoration Movement in which they endeavored to restore to the bewildered world, the knowledge of God's plan to save the world, as recorded in the New Testament Scriptures. In the second edition of the *Christian Baptist*, August 3, 1832, pages six and seven, Alexander Campbell had this to say, concerning the ancient order of things:

"Their churches were not fractured into missionary societies, Bible societies, *education societies*; nor did they dream of organizing such in the world. . . . They dare not transfer to a missionary society, or Bible society, or *education society* a cent or a prayer, lest in so doing they should rob the Church of its glory, and exalt the inventions of men above the wisdom of God. In their church capacity alone they moved. The Church they considered "the pillar and ground of the truth."

These institutions were then repudiated on the ground that they were "humanly organized bodies," doing at least a part of the work of the Church. As a result they were robbing God of the glory that should be given Him through the Church, by substituting for the "pillar and ground of the truth" such "human organizations" through which to make known the "manifold wisdom of God." Gospel preachers seemed to have a clear vision of this question in the early Restoration period and did not hesitate to voice their opposition to ANY HUMANLY ORGANIZED BODY that was organized for the purpose of doing any part of the work of the Church.

It is interesting to observe how the founders of these institutions in the beginning of their efforts were troubled in trying to find a Scriptural way for doing an unscriptural thing and how their troubled conscience was eventually overridden by an ambitious desire to find a better way of making known "the manifold wisdom of God" than through the Church. I quote from an article written in "*Bible Colleges*" by Paul Hayes of Fresno, California, who was one of the first graduates of the David Lipscomb Bible College, later known as the Nashville Bible College.

"But we had trouble from the first, trying to be Scriptural. Brother Harding didn't want to charge tuition, and that brought trouble. Then an effort was made to bring in certain theological books, and 'helps,' into the course of study. But it was decided, after hot argument, that the Bible should be the only book of a religious nature in the curriculum of studies. Brother Harding didn't want any 'discipline' except the 'golden rule,' and of course that was decided 'impractical.' . . . Presently we moved into a better

building, and there began to be talk of a 'permanent property' and 'more practical organization.' Brother Harding, and others, made a strong protest—contending that it was a 'Church work' and that a separate organization would be unscriptural."

"Others claimed that the school was 'secular' and might be organized. It was shown, on the one hand, that its purpose, in its inception, was religious; that its name was religious; that its published purpose in the catalogue was religious; and that the religious papers, and preachers, and elders, asked Christians and churches to help support it in its 'grand work for God.' With preachers for its teachers, this seemed to many an unanswerable argument. The Church had espoused its cause. With all this in view, Brother Harding, seconded by the lamented C. M. Wilmett and others, tried to bring the school under church supervision, with the elders as overseers."

"But it was clearly shown, on the other hand, that there was no Scripture for the Church to run a school, or control school property." They were already before the world as an organization, with superintendent, secretary, faculty, and stipulated tuition. It was reasoned that anything short of that was 'impractical' and feeling ran high."

"Finally, the 'practical' heads by patient persistence prevailed, and the school kept its name, purpose and work; and since 'perfected its organization,' has a large endowed property, salaried faculty, theological helps, and graduating diplomas."

"I verily thought, at one time, that I could get better training in the schools, than in the Church. That was why I attended the Nashville Bible School."

The Lord's method for training young preachers in Bible knowledge was through the Church, "the pillar and ground of the truth." "And the things which thou hast heard of me among many witnesses, the same commit thou to faithful men, who shall be able to teach others also." (2 Tim. 2:2.) This was the manner in which the older preachers taught the younger ones and the Lord has never changed his plan.

Notwithstanding the bitter denunciation of Bible Colleges by Alexander Campbell, David Lipscomb and J. A. Harding in their earlier life, each of them in later years established just such "human organizations" as they had formerly denounced and "for the avowed purpose of teaching the Bible." With the rise of these institutions, numerous others sprang up and became rivals of each other for funds and patronage.

All of these colleges were schools in which secular courses were taught and the Bible was made a required course. I quote from the *Gospel Advocate*, December issue of 1936, page 1190, from John T.



Lewis and he writes as follows: "In 1891 when David Lipscomb and J. A. Harding founded the Nashville Bible School to help young men and young women, who were not able to get to college, get an education, also FOR THE AVOWED PURPOSE OF TEACHING THE BIBLE, [Capitals mine] as God's revealed will to man, to all students, they were in their rights as Christians and also as citizens of a free country." In September of 1891 David Lipscomb wrote: "The school is not especially for preachers, but to teach the Bible and all branches that will be useful and helpful to the student." Quoting from S. N. Hall in the December issue of the *Gospel Advocate* I find the following comment upon the above quotation: "There is just one point that we wish to make here—viz., the teaching of the Bible was the all-absorbing thought in establishing the David Lipscomb College." Notwithstanding, it was the Lord's plan to "make known by the church the manifold wisdom of God." (Eph. 3:10.)

Similar claims were made by all the so-called Bible Colleges, as to their purpose.

In Acts 19:9 we are informed that the apostle Paul preached the gospel for two years "in the school of one Tyrannus." Advocates of Bible Colleges look upon this incident in the ministry of Paul as a New Testament example for teaching the Bible in a Bible College. Paul also taught in the Jewish synagogues. Does this mean that we are at liberty to establish Jewish synagogues in which to teach the Bible? He also taught in the court of Areopagus. Does this mean that we are at liberty to establish heathen courts in which to teach the Bible? The question of grave importance is, not where a disciple may teach the Bible but THE AUSPICES UNDER WHICH he teaches it.

But some may inquire, "Could a nobler purpose be given or could a more sacred service be rendered to God than the teaching of His word, the Bible? What is wrong with a work of this kind on the part of these "humanly organized bodies?" Let it be remembered, kind reader, that the Lord our God is a jealous God and that He has long ago said, "My glory WILL I NOT GIVE TO ANOTHER nor my praises to graven images." When God gives to His people a plan or method of doing a thing, there can be no substitutes, subtractions or additions to it. He means just that and nothing different. It is God's plan to make known His manifold wisdom "through the Church" which he declares to be "the pillar and ground of the truth." For this there can be no substitutes. I cannot express this matter more clearly than it was expressed by Foy Wallace, Jr., who is both a defender and a critic of the Bible Colleges, in *Bible Banner*, September, 1938. I quote him as follows:

"The Bible further teaches that the Church is all-sufficient to carry out this divine mission, without the aid of human machinery. Any organization, larger or smaller than the local church through which to do the work of the Church, is an unscriptural organiza-

tion through which to do the work of the Church and takes away from it the praise and glory. Therefore, we condemn the Missionary Society as an auxiliary to the Church, a human machine seeking to do the work that God has commanded his Church to do. We pronounce it, without further argument here, unscriptural."

Is not the Bible College as truly "a machine to do the work of the church" as is the Missionary Society? Propriety demands that all that Brother Wallace has said concerning the Missionary Society should also be said concerning the Bible College.

Some will endeavor to justify this corruption of the divine method of teaching the Word of God on the basis of the advantages of the moral and spiritual atmosphere of Christian teachers and the good that grows out of such environment; but as much can be claimed for every denomination and religious organization in the world. There are none of them but what do some—and many of them do much—good in the world. Shall we say that due to this fact they are right in the sight of God? That which is basically unscriptural cannot justify its right to exist on the basis of the good that it does.

"The church's business is to edify itself, look after the poor and preach the gospel and that business should keep its budget too full to leave room for human organizations like papers and colleges. When this gets to be old-fashioned and narrow among us, then we have drifted from fundamentals." Cled E. Wallace in *Bible Banner* page 3, March, 1947.

## THE FRUITS OF THESE ORGANIZATIONS

To "know them by their fruits" is to judge them according to a divine principle. What can be said of the fruits of the Bible Colleges? Let us first consider a statement from Mosheim, the famous historian, who said, "The first theological seminary established at Alexandria, Egypt, in the second century, was the grave of Primitive Christianity." This was quoted by Alexander Campbell in *Christian Baptist*, pages 61 and 62.

I quote next from the July, 1942, issue of the *Bible Banner*, page 10, from an article written by O. C. Lambert. He says in part:

"It has been the history of religious schools that they have been hotbeds and nurseries for heresy. Schools in metropolitan cities in the early centuries of Christianity played a dominant part in the development of Catholicism. Nearly all the great church schools of early American history have long ago outgrown their swaddling clothes — have kicked off their religious parentage — have played the prodigal and are now in the hog-pen of athiesm. Harvard, Yale, Princeton, Vanderbilt, in fact, practically every private college and university in the land were once church schools established by those who loved the Bible and had religion enough to leave the civilization of Europe to brave

the dangers and hardships of the new land of America that they might read the Bible and practice its teaching in peace."

"These schools at the first were manned by God-fearing believers. No others would have been tolerated. Today in any of these schools a professor who dared to defend religion and the Bible would be subject to scorn and probably would be summarily dismissed as a disgrace to a scholarly profession."

"Human nature is about the same the world over and the tendency toward departure from true religion has been experienced over and over among us during the last hundred years. Unfortunately, almost all great and powerful things are capable of a bad as well as a good use, and the devil's agents make more effective use of them than the children of light. If a thing has been tried over and over for thousands of years with only one final result, it is not very hopeful that we can achieve a more desirable end. *Since schools have always finally been productive of more evil than good for the cause of Christ*, this seems an exhibition of divine wisdom that no such means have been specified in the perfect law of liberty. The Harding Bulletin says that those operating schools *could draw safer conclusions on religious questions*. If this is true, the Lord is guilty of leaving out the greatest agency for keeping men in the faith. This a believer cannot for a moment accept."

In a tract published by Brother W. W. Otey of Belle Plain, Kansas and entitled "Bible Colleges," he has the following to say on page 10:

"I come now to name a danger that overshadows all others. It is the danger that Bible Colleges may become afflicted with unscriptural teachings. They are central sources of teaching. Perhaps ninety per cent of the preachers of the future will go out from Bible Colleges. And as the Bible Colleges are so will be churches in teaching and practice. Let the faculty become unsound in teaching and an army of unsound preachers will be turned back on the churches who would soon corrupt the church in teaching and practice. In view of this fact, no other men on earth will have so great an influence on the future of the church as the heads of these Bible Colleges. The purity or corruption of the teaching and practice of the church for the future, lies largely in the hands of the few men and their successors who form the policy, and control the teaching in these institutions. I doubt if any man has yet, or is able, fully to weigh their influence over the church in the coming years. They will very largely mold our preachers, and our preachers will mold the future churches."

Every one who is familiar with the New Testament teaching, knows how contrary to its teaching is the idea of centralized power. And all who are familiar with church history, know equally well how fatal centralized power has proved to be to New Testament Christianity.



Hear Bro. Otey again on page 11 of his tract.

"About one hundred years ago the work of restoring the New Testament church in teaching and practice was in full sway in America. Perhaps, with the purest motives Alexander Campbell established Bethany College, chiefly for the purpose of preparing young men for preaching the gospel. Other such colleges were soon established. For a time these institutions were true to the word of God, and were an asset in spreading the gospel. In the second generation new men came into control, men who were not satisfied with the gospel and church as the Lord established it. Young men who were preparing to preach were indoctrinated with the new ideas that had taken root in these schools. These preachers went back to the churches and turned about three-fourths of the churches into another denomination now known as the Christian Church. That apostasy was due almost entirely to the influence of unsound teachers in those Bible Colleges. The colleges were corrupted, and produced an army of corrupted preachers, who in turn corrupted the vast majority of the churches. When that division was completed, the churches of Christ had not a single Bible College, and a very few preachers who had received their education in them."

"With the clear light before us of the danger of Bible Colleges becoming corrupted in teaching, and so leading into apostasy, we now find ourselves engaged in the same experiment of establishing Bible Colleges to further the interests of the church of the Lord. We are not only willing to admit but to affirm that every religious school from the first down to the five infants now among the churches of Christ have been sources of unscriptural teaching. In view of this fact, the most that can be said in their defense is that they are an experiment. If these do not in the coming years become infected with error that will corrupt the churches, the present and future managers will need to prove themselves wiser and stronger than all others who have gone before in establishing such experimental institutions. To encourage their present and future managers to guard to the utmost of their power to hold them true to the teaching of God's word, and to warn of the danger of the least divergence from the truth, is the purpose of this writing. Churches established by the apostles themselves soon apostatized."

A more recent development as seen by Bro. Otey expressed on page 15 of his tract.

"About forty years ago Brother J. N. Armstrong and the writer engaged in a tense correspondence in regard to the dangers pointed out in what has gone before in this writing. I was very apprehensive at that time, and have been till this, that these institutions would in time become rooted in the church, and so lead to a departure from New Testament teaching. At that time he resented keenly such a suggestion of danger in the future. But

we remained close friends, regardless of our differences of future danger. I have visited and preached and lectured in four of the schools over which he presided. Just eleven days before his sudden death he wrote me a letter out of a distressed heart. I now quote briefly from that letter as a:

### VOICE FROM THE GRAVE

"I feel distressed sometimes over the condition of the church everywhere—For instance I think that our schools are all in line to build up the clergy and that the church in general is trending toward denominationalism. I do not know what can be done, maybe nothing, but I do think there is a need for us to put on the brakes, and warn the brotherhood about the definite trends of these times. I am not pessimistic, but my optimism does not keep me from facing facts. I think, as I said above, that all our schools are set for the training of professional preachers. I tell them at Harding College that we are also being influenced by these trends. For all these years the schools have not offered separate courses for preachers and in the schools, in which I have taught, we have stressed the teaching of the Bible to all students. I am still trying to stress this. We have never had a class here that was not open to any and all students, both boys and girls. But still there is a stress here toward preacher training. I do not know that it does any good for me to write these things to you, but I do believe that you are in sympathy with the ideas that I express. Maybe you could write an article for the papers that would."

"Without a doubt many will be greatly surprised that Brother Armstrong had become alarmed in regard to apparent dangers for the future purity of the church of the Lord." Concerning this quotation from Brother Armstrong's letter, Brother Showalter of the Firm Foundation says:

"I have read and verified the quotation. I add that last June when I was at Harding College to deliver an address on the occasion of the class graduation at that time, Brother Armstrong in a conversation with me stated substantially the same thing. In addition he stated to me that, as is well known, he had his debates with Daniel Sommer on the college question years ago, but that as the schools are now going, Sommer was, after all, largely correct in his criticisms. Brother Armstrong favored the schools, of course, but was pointing out some tendencies and some mistakes where he deemed that correction or improvements should be made."

Some years ago J. N. Armstrong threatened the churches with perdition if they withheld their support from the Bible Colleges. In a 1936 *Bulletin of Abilene Christian College*, in which they made an appeal to the churches for support, they said, "*The church that does not*

*have Abilene Christian College in its budget does not have the right kind of a preacher."*

From the *Firm Foundation*, January 19, 1937, I find this statement from Foy Wallace, Jr., "Indirectly, the college controls the Churches. *It was the colleges that swept the Church into the first digression in this country and it will come again, if it is not already on the way.*"

All these from whom I have quoted are friends of the Bible Colleges but deplore their tendencies.

We hear College brethren say, "The matter of the College is wholly outside the realm of the church work, being secular, and in no sense the work of the church." But brethren, how can you reconcile such claims with that which appeared recently in one of their publications? From "The Visitor" published by the Charlotte Avenue Church of Christ, which has a membership of about thirteen hundred, where Brother Athens Clay Pullias preached for twelve or thirteen years, and where Brother Willard G. Collins, vice-president of David Lipscomb College now preaches, the following report appeared:

"All the contribution last Sunday was given to THE EXPANSION PROGRAM OF DAVID LIPSCOMB COLLEGE. This was in keeping with our custom of giving the fifth Sunday's offering to one of our institutions. The amount given was \$558.79, which was considerably more than the average contribution. Wouldn't it be interesting to watch the influence of this money during the next hundred years?"

Notice, my friends, some items of interest in this quotation.

1. It was reported by this church that it was in keeping with "our custom" to make an offering on the fifth Sundays, for the support of the College.
2. This church claims the Bible College as "one of OUR INSTITUTIONS." How many other institutions they claim and support, I do not know.
3. This contribution made to the College was "considerably more than the average contribution."

The advocates of Bible Colleges have contended that for the protection and preservation of the Christian faith of our youth, they should be sent to Christian Colleges where they could have the safe guidance of faithful Christian teachers. The George Pepperdine College is one of the youngest and most progressive of the Bible Colleges of today. I am offering the reader a few thoughts for consideration—excerpts from page 12 of the August 1947 number of *The Bible Banner*. The article from which I am quoting was written by John F. Wolf, a student of the George Pepperdine College.

"Many of my friends have asked me about the teaching of modernism at George Pepperdine College. For some time I have had on my desk three letters, two from preachers and one from a college professor asking for information on this question, none of which I have yet answered. I feel that these brethren, and the brotherhood at large, have a right to know about some of the things that I learned while attending Pepperdine, and which can only be learned by sitting in the class rooms of that institution. \* \* \* I believe one hundred per cent in Christian education. I went to Pepperdine prepared to find that the rumors I had heard, about tendencies toward Modernism, were exaggerated. \* \* \* I was rudely awakened from easy going assumptions."

"The Bible Explained by Atheists. \* \* \* The majority of books on my reading lists were written by men for whom religion was something conceived in the mind of men and developed through the ages, mounting to higher and higher conceptions much as the race has developed its systems of languages, arts or sciences. A large per cent of the writers either ignored or tried to explain away anything of a miraculous nature. \* \* \* Why is *such* a large quantity such as this required in a so-called Christian school? The only reason given was that we ought to become acquainted with such writers and their books. However, not one attempt, in any of my classes, was ever made to answer the explanations and arguments which these infidel writers set forth. \* \* \* The 'School of the Bible' at Pepperdine, we were told, is actually a school of theology, but the word isn't used because the brotherhood would not like it."

## PREACHER STUDENTS ENCOURAGED TO GO TO THE UNIVERSITY OF CHICAGO.

"Preacher students who go to Pepperdine College have now a new modern Mecca set before them. The theological school of the University of Chicago is now the door of golden opportunity for the would-be preacher of the gospel. In fact, so great is the lure held out that one preacher student asked in all seriousness, "If the University of Chicago is so wonderful, why take the time to go to Pepperdine?" \* \* \* I bear no malice against any individual. but I warn the church to beware of Modernism, theological speculation, and the spirit of sectarianism, as a three headed viper has raised itself among us. Let the brethren treat as idle rumors what all the students who go to Pepperdine know to be facts."

The following is an excerpt from a California newspaper, reporting the climaxing special Holy Week devotions and Easter services;

"Dr. Hugh M. Tiner, president of George Pepperdine College and minister of the Church of Christ, will deliver the Easter Message. The Rev. Leonidas I. Brock, pastor of the Montebello Methodist Church and president of the Ministerial Union, will preside and a

number of other clergymen will participate."

"Choral music will be provided by the Montebello Masonic Chorus, and special cornet numbers will be rendered by William Fike of Grace United Presbyterian Church."

Do you feel, brethren, that the purity of the church will be safeguarded by the preachers who are the products of such institutions?

Many of the friends and defenders of the Bible College are criticizing most severely what other friends of the Colleges are advocating—namely, the support of the Bible College from the church treasury or the putting of the College on the church budget. They contend that the church has no scriptural right to use its funds for the support of a secular work or a humanly organized body. To do so would be a case of robbing God.

But how about the millions of dollars which are contributed by Christians for the establishing and the maintenance of these humanly organized bodies to teach the Bible? Is not that money withheld from the Lord's treasury by those contributing to the support of the Bible Colleges? Do you say that if you had not given it to the Bible College, you would not have given it to the Church? By your works then you would say that you love the humanly organized bodies more than you love the one divine, the blood bought Church of the Lord Jesus Christ. Can such be done without provoking the jealousy of the Lord Jesus Christ?

## PREPARING THE SOIL FOR THE "PLANTS" WHICH OUR HEAVENLY FATHER DID NOT PLANT

There are preachers who are open advocates of the Bible Colleges and will make a pretense of defending them as Scriptural organizations. There are other preachers who do not hesitate to class the "humanly organized bodies" known as Bible Colleges with all other "human organizations" which are doing a part of the work of the Church. Then we have many preachers whose philosophy is set out in the following statement:

"I do not often express my views on the college owned and operated by Christians. [Wonder if he knows of any Bible Colleges which are not owned and operated by Christians?'] Sometimes it is necessary to state your position so that all may understand it and I have never hesitated to do that. I never agitate a question, but preach the Bible and *let my audience make the application*. . . . The truth can be preached and people prepared if the question should ever arise, but *no direct application need be made*." In other words, there is no use to vaccinate until you get the small-pox—plenty of time then. Just that kind of philosophy has placed the innocent congregation at the mercy of the Bible College Advocates. Why not withhold our renunciation of the Missionary Society, the Endeavor Society and instrumental music in the wor-



ship? Why agitate a question? Why not just preach the gospel and "let the audience make the application?"

Again they say, "It is the duty of every Christian to teach the Word whenever and wherever there is an opportunity." Or, as they sometimes put it, "But don't Christians have a right to teach the Bible wherever they are and under any conditions?" Such statements are very misleading to the unthoughtful mind. It is like saying, "It is always right to do right." It is right to teach the Bible. Therefore it is right for "humanly organized bodies" to teach the Bible. Such statements must be qualified. We can say that it is right for a disciple of Christ to give one of his brethren a drink of water and the Savior even made such a service a condition of our salvation. *But Moses gave Israel a drink and lost his inheritance in Canaan as the result.* But you say that it was because he gave not God the glory. Just so, the same is true of the "humanly organized bodies" that substitutes the Church in the teaching of the Word of God, the "water of life"; they rob God of the glory that should come to Him through the Church. The fact that Moses was an Israelite did not nullify his sin of robbing God of His glory. Neither will the fact that those who own and operate these "human organizations" are Christians, nullify their sin of robbing God of His glory.

This is a very representative cross section of the philosophy of that class of preachers who are traveling both sides of the road on the Bible College question which has bewildered the minds of so many good brethren, by reason of its moral aspect.

### Bible Colleges or Missionary Societies?

I quote from Page 443 of the Gospel Advocate, June 26, 1947 "Some Things Not Found in the Church of Christ;

*"There are no humanly-organized missionary societies. While our Lord was upon the earth he charged his followers to "preach the gospel to every creature." The church is to be "the pillar and ground of the truth." (1 Tim. 3: 15.) It then is to uphold the truth. No other institution is charged with the responsibility for preaching the gospel to the world. Any organization smaller or larger than the congregation cannot exist with the Lord's approval to preach the gospel. The church of Jesus Christ is obligated to evangelize the world to fulfill its God-given mission. This is heaven's order, and we cannot improve upon it. To attempt to do so is fatal. The church is the Lord's great missionary institution for converting the world to Christ. To organize an institution separate and apart from the church is to go beyond that which is written. The safe course is to do things the Lord's way."*

### But I inquire, What about the Bible College?

I now quote from another publication, friendly toward the Bible Colleges, but critical of the present "trend of things,"

"There is but one point of difference that any one of them can show between the Missionary Society and the schools as they are operating today. That point of difference is only a matter of plan for organization. To all practical intents and purposes, they are both doing the same kind of work, and the work of both so far as it pertains to religious matters is work that God has delegated to His Church." Page 8, of Bible Banner for Oct., 1947.

A recent avenue of escape from the fundamental issue, in a desperate effort to find some place for the Bible College, is their plea that it is an adjunct to the home and not the Church. But is not the home an institution of divine origin? Since the home and the Church are the only institutions to which God has delegated the divine right to teach his Word, what right have you to hitch on to either of these institutions your "humanly organized body" to supplement the divine? Whether you hitch a trailer to a bus or a truck does not change the nature of the trailer; it is still a trailer. Regardless of what you may make the Bible College an "adjunct" to, it still remains a fact that you have a "humanly organized body" doing a part of the work of the Church.

Again we hear them say, "The schools are private affairs as are farms, groceries, shops, or factories, and the Christian who owns them has a perfect right to teach the Bible to those working for him." But if a member of the shop, the grocery or the farm organization is set apart as a member of that organization, with the assigned duty of teaching the Bible, as is done in the Bible Colleges, it is not the work of an individual but of an organization. As an individual member of the body of Christ, he can teach all the Bible he has time and opportunity to teach to those in the shop or the farm or the school, but not as a faculty member of that body.

For the domestic happiness and future propagation of the race, God gave man the home. For his civil protection and social well-being God gave man the State. And, for his spiritual guidance and ultimate salvation, God gave man the Church. These different institutions must function in their respective realms.

The Roman Catholic church has endeavored to make the State an adjunct to the Church. England has endeavored to make the Church an adjunct to the State. In either case it is a case of corrupting the divine order. Now certain of our "own selves" have arisen and are "drawing away disciples after them", contending that Bible Colleges should be put on the church budget or be supported out of the church treasury, thus making the Bible College an adjunct of the Church. Others who object to this method of supporting the Bible Colleges, but still are favorable to them, insist on making the Bible Colleges adjuncts of the home, another divine institution. However, the President of Florida Christian College, in the Gospel Advocate, Oct. 23, 1947, wrote saying "It" (the school) "is not an adjunct to anything. . . . Let the home do

its work; let the Church do its work; let the school do its work."

Mrs. Agness Meyer, a woman of national reputation and high educational achievement, wrote in the March issue of the Reader's Digest, 1948 under the caption, "Shall the Church Invade the Schools." Among the many worth while things which she said was the following, "But to be effective, religious teaching must, I believe, remain the province of the Church, the family and the home."

Since divine things must function in their divine order, how dare we, my friend, endeavor to do it otherwise?

## IS THE BIBLE COLLEGE AN EXPEDIENCY?

Some have endeavored to find a place for the Bible College in the realms of expediency. Bro. N. B. Hardeman in Gospel Advocate, issue of July 31, 1947, page 560, contends that an act may not be lawful, yet be expedient. He said, "It is said by some that a thing cannot be expedient, unless it is lawful."

Fifty years ago when certain brethren were endeavoring to impose upon the brotherhood certain unscriptural practices, such as instrumental music in the worship, Missionary Societies etc., 'expediency' was the popular war cry of those brethren. The fact is overlooked that when Paul was discussing the subject of "expediency", he placed the things which were expedient in the class of those things which were lawful. He said, "All things are lawful but all things are not expedient." 1 Cor. 10:23. Of the things which were lawful, some things were not expedient. But how presumptuous to say a thing can be expedient which is not lawful!

A very heated controversy has arisen among the College brethren, even to the point of a threatened division, on the question of whether or not the College should be put on the church budget. If this is done, it places upon the church the burden of supporting "private enterprise", "human organizations", and "secular education." Those who favor the Bible College budget system build up this sort of logic. First, the necessary means of obeying the commandment of God is always implied in obeying the commandment. Second, secular learning is essential in obeying the commandment to preach the gospel. Therefore, the Church is justified in supporting secular institutions. But let us go farther into this type of logic. First, the command is "Go preach the gospel." Second, meat and bread are essential to the gospel preacher in preaching the gospel. Therefore the church is justified in contributing to the support of packing houses and bakeries in order that the gospel preacher may preach the gospel. Numerous such syllogisms can be formulated with such false premises. But let us consider what the Bible teaches. The commandment is, "Go preach the gospel." The gospel preacher cannot preach the gospel without support. 1 Cor. 9:7-11. Therefore, the church is under obligation to support the gospel preacher in order that he may be able to buy the necessary

meat and bread, education and necessary transportation. The churches' business is to support the gospel preacher and not butchershops, bakeries, secular educational institutions and automobile factories. Neither does the church have the divine right to organize a packing house or bakery in which to teach the Bible, nor an automobile factory, grocery store or a secular educational institution in which to teach it. Teaching the Bible is the work of the *home* and *the church*.

Anything necessary in the carrying out of a command of God, is implied in that command. This is a principle recognized by all Bible students. But on this argument that the Bible College is a necessary implication in the command to "preach the gospel", Bro. N. B. Hardeman, President of Freed Hardeman College, upsets the apple cart and spills the argument when he said, "Extravagant claims are sometimes made for the schools, and we are asked, What would become of the church if the schools failed? The answer is, the church would continue if every college on earth were to close. Some of the best preachers the church ever had possibly, never saw a Bible College." Page 560 in the Gospel Advocate for July 31, 1947.

According to Bro. Hardeman, the Bible College is not in the command to "preach the gospel."

A preacher, who boasted of his loyalty to the New Testament order of things, said to me in a recent correspondence, in an apology for the Pepperdine "privately owned and operated", "humanly organized body," which is doing a part of the work of the Church:

"We have a lumber company here, owned and operated by Christians. It is a very human organization, for Christ didn't establish lumber companies. But suppose they were to decide to give all of their men an hour's Bible instruction each day, and should select a preacher to do that work, and they paid him for it; would that be wrong? It is a private affair, and so is the college. It is a human organization—so is the college. It has its officers separate from the Church—so has the college. It is a group of Christians trying to accomplish good by teaching the Word—so is the college. What makes one right and the other wrong? If the college robs the Church of her glory, so does the other. Then how much teaching can a private Christian do?"

In my judgment, the answer to the above question is clear and definite. The "lumber company," the "Bible College," the "privately owned and operated school," and all other "humanly organized bodies," doing the work of the Church, come in the same class of unscriptural organizations. If the "lumber company" offered the opportunity for the teaching of the Bible or gave evidence of their desire for such teaching, *I still have sufficient confidence in the Church to believe that the Church would support me in teaching them.* I would be just as clear of accepting a salary from the "lumber company" for preaching the Gospel as I would in accepting a salary AS A FACULTY MEMBER of the

Bible school or "privately owned and operated school" for teaching the Bible.

In answer to the question, "How much teaching can a private Christian do?" I would say that he can do all that time and opportunity will permit him to do, *as an individual member of the Church, but not for an hour as a member of any "humanly organized body."*

So far as education is concerned, every Gospel preacher should have all the secular education that he can obtain and use for God's glory and the good of the cause, but, for his Biblical knowledge, 2 Tim. 2:2 and 1 Tim. 3:15 definitely set out the Lord's plan. When any "humanly organized body" takes over that work, it becomes a human substitution for the divine method.

But some will inquire, "What is the difference between the Bible College and the so-called Bible readings as conducted by many of the congregations of the Church?" In answer we say the difference is the difference between a human method and a divine method. In the case of Bible readings, the congregation calls the preacher to this work as they would call him for a series of meetings: the Church supports him; he is subject to the elders of the Church and not to any "humanly organized body"; and the Word is "committed to faithful men who are able to teach others also." Whatever is accomplished in this respect, the Church receives the glory for it and not some "humanly organized body."

The position has been taken by those defending the Bible Colleges, that an individual has just the same right to teach the Bible in the Bible College that any other Christian has to teach it through his paper, his book, tract, or any other publication. But cannot it be clearly seen that when an individual builds up around himself a humanly organized body in which to do his teaching, as he does in the Bible College, that he destroys the individuality of the act and it becomes the work of an organized body and not an individual? If the paper, the tract or religious publication is owned and operated by an individual, it is an individual work; but if done by an organized body, it cannot be an individual work.

Now, is not the teaching of the Bible the definite mission of the Church, since Paul said it is "the pillar and ground of the truth?" Can it be more clearly stated, that the college is doing the work of the Church, than was stated in the publications referred to that David Lipscomb School was founded for the "avowed purpose of teaching the Bible?" It is also stated by the President of the George Pepperdine College, "It is a noble work to minister to spiritual needs in a public way. *For those who have an earnest desire to preach the Gospel of Christ, special preparation is available. . . .* Courses in other departments are designed to *help those who plan to preach the Gospel or to teach the Bible in the local church.*"

Why do not the advocates and defenders of these "humanly or-



ganized bodies," when quoting or reading Eph. 3:10, qualify Paul's statement concerning the will of God to make "known by the church the manifold wisdom of God", and explain to us that the Church is just one of the many ways of making known "the manifold wisdom of God" and that we have "humanly organized bodies," such as "our schools," that must share that glory? Why do they not explain to us that Paul's statement (1 Tim. 3:15) must also be qualified; and instead of the Church being "THE pillar and ground of the truth," it is just one of the many pillars? Fifth column activities work best under the pretense of loyalty to the Kingdom of Christ.

Beware of the preacher who says he is too busy preaching the Gospel and saving souls to concern himself with the question of warning the Churches of the unscriptural methods of doing the Lord's work. Don't be deceived by the fellow who boasts of "just preaching the Gospel" when in reality one cannot preach the Gospel without rebuking the sinner and condemning his sin. (2 Tim. 4:1-5; Matt. 23.) I knew of a man some years ago who was too busy "preaching Christ" to say anything about baptism. Paul ceased not to warn the church at Ephesus for the space of three years, night and day, with tears, of the men that would arise among themselves speaking perverse things to draw away disciples after them. (Acts 20 :28-31.)

Beware of the preacher who loves peace more than he loves purity and who loves the popular trend of things more than he loves the ancient order.

Do not be deceived by the plea that the operation of a "humanly organized body" to do a part of the work of the Church is justified as a "private affair" so long as it does not take money from the church treasury. The question of its support is incidental and does not affect the fundamental fact that it is a "humanly organized body" doing a part of the work of the Church. It would be quite immaterial to any husband whether his wife used money from the family budget or from her personal earnings, in the interest of another man. The jealousy is incurred by the act, rather than the source of means. If the means is not taken from the treasury, it is withheld by the giver; God is thus robbed and his jealousy is incurred.

## THE DIVINE METHOD OF IMPARTING BIBLE KNOWLEDGE

In the home life, Paul admonished the Ephesian brethren to bring up the child "in the nurture and admonition of the Lord." (Eph. 6:4.) Timothy received much home training from his mother Eunice and his grandmother Lois. (2 Tim. 1:5, 3:15.)

It was through the Church that the "manifold wisdom of God" was to be made known to the world. (Eph. 3:10.) In the New Testament, the Church is declared to be "the pillar and ground of the truth."

(1 Tim. 3:15.) To the church at Corinth Paul wrote saying, "I am jealous over you with a godly jealousy for I have espoused you to one husband that I may present you as a chaste virgin to Christ." (2 Cor. 11:2.) For this reason, Paul wrote the church at Ephesus saying, "Unto him be glory in the church by Jesus Christ, throughout all ages, world without end. Amen." (Eph. 3:21.) Any "humanly organized body" which does the work that God ordained that the Church should do is robbing God of His glory.

## THE LORD'S METHOD OF PREPARING PREACHERS

The apostle Paul was among the greatest of the New Testament preachers and Timothy was an outstanding evangelist. Timothy began his labors and traveled with Paul who was his instructor in the Gospel. At times Timothy was left in charge of the work which Paul had begun, to further develop it. (Acts 17:14.)

When Paul wrote Timothy in regard to the Lord's method for the future development of Gospel preachers, he wrote saying, "The things which thou hast learned of me among many witnesses, the same commit thou to faithful men who shall be able to teach others also." (2 Tim. 2:2.) This is not to be looked upon as an antedated method which will not work today. It is more simple, more economical, and more efficient than the modern "humanly organized" method of the Bible College and is definitely the Lord's plan.

Let the young man who has the Christian conviction to preach the Gospel receive his secular education from a secular institution, and then look to the Church for his religious and Biblical training. The Church is indebted to this young man to see that he receives his necessary Bible knowledge through the channel of the Church. I have known personally many of the most able Gospel preachers of earlier days who received their training under the guidance of older preachers who made them traveling companions. They not only received their Biblical training, but were generally disciplined in some of the hardships, self-denials, and personal sacrifices which made them humble godly men and were much safer men to lead the Churches in the paths of righteousness than are the more professional type of Bible College graduates who, when "through college," are ready to "find a position" with some well-established congregation.

In every congregation, each young man should be given the opportunity to develop his ability to serve the Church. A gold nugget might be buried in the possibilities of some young man who might otherwise go through life without developing inherent qualities which would make him a good elder or an able Gospel preacher. The Church would suffer a great loss as the result of him not being used. When the Church discovers the possibilities of any young man, it is the duty of the Church to give him the necessary help and encouragement in the development of his usefulness, whether it be a service as an elder or a minister of the Gospel or whatever he is most capable of doing. If

the elders are not able to give the necessary training in Bible knowledge, they should make it possible for the young man to get it from an evangelist in some of the various ways that it can be done—namely, by personal training, as a traveling companion, or Bible readings. Let us recruit every conscientious, talented young man which the Church has to carry on some vital work of the Church.

Bible readings conducted by the local congregation of the Church furnish splendid opportunities for the training and development of Gospel preachers. Let the Church establish missions in nearby communities and, in so doing, not only is the Gospel given to other perishing souls but these missions become training stations for the young preachers. As a result, we will then be able to say as was said of Paul's work at Ephesus, "So mightily grew the word of God and prevailed." (Acts 19:20.)

In concluding this treatise, I know of nothing better to say than to give you this quotation from Page 16 of the Bible Banner of July, 1947.

"It is entirely possible therefore that the schools may in the future become a menace to the church, and those brethren who think they are aiding the Cause of Christ by giving large sums of money to endow the schools, may find that they have instead only given a human institution the potential power to lead the church into another large scale digression. The brethren should think on these things seriously. After all, the best place any man can put his surplus money is in the church of the Lord, to be used through the divine institution, for the preaching of the glorious gospel of Jesus Christ, rather than the building up of powerful human, man-made institutions which should be operated as a business like any other business. The colleges are, at the best, not more doctrinally safe nor spiritually secure than the men who head them—and men die, then what?"

Since many millions of dollars are being contributed to these organizations by individual disciples of Christ and from church treasuries, toward building up a centralized power which will furnish about ninety per cent of the gospel preachers of the future, do you not feel brethren that the question which has been herein discussed should receive your most careful and prayerful consideration?

Every one who is familiar with the New Testament knows how contrary to its teaching is the idea of **CENTRALIZED POWER**. All who are familiar with church history knows equally well how fatal **CENTRALIZED POWER** proved to be to primitive Christianity. And, every one should be able to see how *hazardous is the future of New Testament Christianity in the hands of such a centralized power.*

"Consider what I say and the Lord give thee understanding in all things." 2 Tim. 2:7.