

## Preface to the Jack Hyles Story

Jack Hyles was an enigma most of his life. Born in the little town of Italy, Texas (about 30 miles south of Dallas, just off I-35E today) on September 25, 1926, he departed this world on February 6, 2001 at Chicago University Hospital, the victim of a failed heart operation. He was 74 at the time of his decease.

As far as "numbers" in the ministry, his start was very inauspicious. He attended the East Texas Baptist College (SBC) in Marshall and was a student pastor while there. His first three churches – all small ones in Texas – were Marris Chapel Baptist in Bogata, Grange Hall Baptist in Marshall, and Southside Baptist in Henderson. He next went to the Miller Road Baptist in Garland, where his success was not only hailed by fellow Southern Baptists, it came to the attention of Dr. John R. Rice through his advertising manager at the time, Miss Fairy Shappard. I was present when she returned from a business trip to Texas and heard her report with great enthusiasm her visit to his church. Dr. Rice started using him in Sword Conferences and, as a result, he eventually became nationally known. I had known him from my own ministry in Texas.

After Garland, he held a long pastorate at the First Baptist Church in Hammond, Indiana – starting his ministry there in August of 1959 and remaining until his decease. In the latter two churches thousands professed faith and were baptized. In Hammond he had a huge Sunday school and church attendance, reputedly the largest in the world at the time. On August 21, 1972 he opened Hyles-Anderson College in Schererville, a Hammond suburb.

In his early days – and we are speaking here from the standpoint of personal feeling and personal observation – he preached and served God with power. Later in his ministry, starting at about the same time as his fascination with Jenny Nischik – and again we are speaking personally, giving a personal judgment – his ministry began to lose that power. He pounded the pulpit just as hard, hollered just as loud, saw many walk the aisles – but something was missing. Because of his following and his teaching about what we have called "decision salvation," the numbers kept right on going, even increasing, thanks to the dedication of his tremendous group of paid and volunteer workers, especially among his loyal (approaching cult-like devotion) college students.

I think it would be right to say that Dr. Hyles and I were friends, probably because of our mutual friendship with Dr. John R. Rice, although never close. I preached at Miller Road during his pastorate there and at First Baptist in Hammond (as well as his radio broadcast when in meetings in the area), although he never preached in any of the evangelism conferences I sponsored or in a church I briefly pastored in those days. I think it would, again, be safe to say we had different worldviews on evangelism. I put stress on receiving Jesus Christ as Lord as well as Savior, and he very definitely promoted decision salvation.

The time eventually came – and today, about a decade-and-a-half later, I still think I made the right decision – when I became so alarmed at what he was doing I felt some sort of action needed to be taken. The first thing I did was to write an editorial in *The Biblical Evangelist*, without naming him, titled "One of the Blights of Bigness." While it didn't do what I wanted – put the brakes on Hyles' antics – it nonetheless resulted in people contacting me from all over America, telling me Hyles horror stories. Many of them came from Hammond, including correspondence from Victor Nischik, the leading victim in this sickening tale of spiritual tragedy. I did not know him until that time.

When I finally wrote and released "The Saddest Story" it was with no little fear and trepidation. I knew Hyles. I was aware of the tremendous influence he welded in Fundamentalist circles and how my ministry could be permanently ruined. As a psychological motivator he could implant horrendous thoughts about my character and about my ministry in the minds of thousands upon thousands. On one occasion he preached about Moses and wrongly called him a murderer (killing someone is not always murder, obviously, or thousands of our finest military lads are murderers) and said that sometimes some people *need* to be murdered. His followers take such statements seriously.

Evangelist George Godfrey, a 16-year-professor at Hyles-Anderson (called by Dr. Hyles in print "a loyal friend, a thoughtful pal and a faithful servant") had for years gone to the alley adjacent First Baptist, put his arms on the wall of the building, cradling his head on his arms, and prayed with tears for his beloved pastor and the fresh anointing of God upon him during that day's ministry. Yet even he had gone eventually to Hyles and begged him, again with tears, to remove the door between the two offices (in his "Open Letter" he gives the testimony of a man in the office *after* my articles were published, who verified that the door was still there at *that* time).

We mention him in connection with the paragraph above about murder because after the story broke a skit took place in the H-AC chapel in which Godfrey, Nischik and Sumner were gunned down by the Mafia (what is called *thought suggestion* by those familiar with *mind control*). Dr. Godfrey, who lived in the area, had his house splattered with eggs while he and his wife were off seeking to win the lost to Christ in evangelistic meetings, received all kinds of threatening phone calls, had his lawn tampered with to read "100% Hyles," and obviously had reason to fear for his life and the lives of family members.

Hyles' people knew him better than I did and were literally paranoid with fear for their welfare in documenting things to me. That is one reason I named so few names even though I had factual evidence their testimonies were true – the main criticism of my articles was in this area. However, I left out any part of the story where I couldn't verify the facts. I spent months gathering material, getting statements, documenting evidence, and when I eventually went into print I was confident of the story's accuracy. I think time has justified my confidence.

This CD tells the story and we have put it in this form primarily as a record for history. Hyles is gone. The controversy about his life and ministry is fading. However, historians will appreciate a factual record and this is it. We have been very careful to give both sides of the debate, printing his defenses to our charges exactly as he sent them out. We have not changed a word of his defense. After my articles appeared in 1989, Hyles preached a sermon, "Tell the Generation Following." While this is not what he meant, obviously, this CD is *telling the generation following*.

I am grateful to my legal friend, Voyle Glover, for the Introduction he has written. He, at the time of my articles, had been a faithful member and active worker in Hammond's First Baptist Church, a loyal Hyles supporter, having moved his family from Arizona to Indiana just to sit under his ministry. When he read my first article he was vitally interested because questions had been rising in his own mind. He was disturbed at the accusations and eagerly awaited Pastor Hyles' response, knowing that by his answers he could be pretty certain as to the accuracy of my charges. He said, "After I read Hyles' answers, I became convinced of the truthfulness of the Sumner article in virtually every area." We think you will come to the same conclusion. Incidentally, you will notice that Hyles was selective in my charges that he answered (ignoring most of them), *but I answered every single objection he raised!*

Some well-intentioned people said, "Let God take care of it," ignoring such biblical commands as I Timothy 5:20, "Them that sin rebuke before all, that others also may fear." Others argued, misrepresenting the Scripture, "Touch not mine anointed, and do my prophets no harm" (I Chronicles 16:22; Psalm 105:15). Still others said, "We shouldn't laundry our dirty linen in public" (forgetting that God laundered His publicly in the case of some of His best and most faithful servants). We like what Dr. Bob Jones, Sr., who gave his students so many pithy phrases, said about this: "It is better to wash dirty linen in public than not to wash dirty linen at all. A little public dirty linen washing would do this country good!" (Quoted by Dr. George Godfrey, a BJU grad, in his "Open Letter to Jack Hyles.")

Two years after the articles came out, we wrote a brief editorial. We are including that as a Postscript. To help the reader, we have numbered the articles in this CD in a way that will give the story continuity. My second 1989 article, the answer to Dr. Hyles' defense, was the longest and most devastating, perhaps, but it will probably help you get the

full story in all its impact by reading things in their proper sequence. It is as follows:

- 00 Preface to the Jack Hyles Story (Read First)
- 01 Introduction by Voyle Glover, Esq., author of *Fundamental Seduction: The Jack Hyles Case*
  - 02 One of the Blights of Bigness (Intended, Without Naming Him, as a Warning)
  - 03 The Saddest Story We Ever Printed
  - 04 The Jack Hyles Response
  - 05 The Hyles Reply (Our Answer to His Defense)
  - 06 The Final Jack Hyles Response
  - 07 Conclusion
  - 08 Postscript: The Jack Hyles Story Two Years Later

## Introduction by Voyle Glover, Esq

When Dr. Robert L. Sumner came out in *The Biblical Evangelist* with “The Saddest Story,” there were “giants” in the land of Fundamentalism. One of those giants was Jack Hyles, the subject of the story. He commanded a very large following, had boasted for years of having the “largest” and the “fastest growing” church in America, and was a regular speaker at a host of bastions of Fundamentalism. He was not a lightweight. Jack Hyles commanded respect and admiration from a wide range of pastors and leaders from within the ranks of Independent Fundamental Baptists. His peers were men of stature and renown.

Sumner was immediately attacked from all quarters. (The practice of “killing” the messenger is a long established method of silencing critics.) Accusations were hurled against him. Pulpits were pounded with anger and dire predictions made of Sumner’s future and dispersions were made against his character. Charges he had defamed Dr. Hyles were made by men who, in their haste to defend without examination of the evidence, defamed Dr. Sumner without hesitation. Angry letters were mailed. Phone calls were made. Threats were voiced.

It was as though someone had rolled a stink bomb down the church aisle right in the middle of the invitation.

And yes, it did stink . . . to high heaven.

I recall reading the article. Now, understand, I was already out of First Baptist by this time, having left in 1987. I’d left quietly and many folks were not even aware I’d gone. As I read the piece, my first thoughts were: *Someone needs to answer this.*

I was deeply troubled. Even though my family had left the church and I’d known there were some serious problems there, I had no idea the depth of the problems and reading *The Saddest Story* was not just shocking to me. It was, literally, *unbelievable.*

But this story jolted me. It sat me upright. I even (briefly) gave some thought to attempting a response to the piece. But as I thought about it, I understood that only one person could respond to such an article. Even worse, deep down inside, I knew it was true. I’d seen all the signs and had ignored so many of them, finding excuses for Hyles. I’d seen the cover-up job he’d done from the pulpit for David and perhaps himself. I’d seen the brilliant psychological games he’d played with the minds of all of us (once the scales were removed from my eyes in the last year or so of my time there). I’d seen the mask slip a time or two and had been shocked at what I’d seen. But I had been willing to ignore it or make excuses for what I had seen.

Hyles’ response made me realize that there was far more to this story than I had even begun to

imagine and the corruption revealed by Sumner's article was not just probable, but in all likelihood, ran far deeper than I had ever projected.

I am pleased that Dr. Sumner has released the series of articles that began with *The Saddest Story*. Many have never read these articles and they need to read them. Moreover, they need to be made part of "the record," a part of history. This was a major event in the world of Fundamentalism. But it was more than just an event. It was a moment in time when a man dared to do what not a single, solitary man in Fundamentalism dared to do (then): *challenge the credentials of Jack Hyles*.

I find it almost amusing, even somewhat ironic, but mostly irritating, that so many who castigated Sumner or were so frozen at the mouth back then at a time when he was taking so much heat, have now leaped onto the stage and grabbed the mike and are thundering out at the "evils of Jack Hyles," or pretending they were always opposed to his "brand" of Fundamentalism. Understand, I'm not opposed to their denunciation of him. But inside, my thoughts are: *Where were your leather lungs back then, Hoss?*

Frankly, I see some of them as fence sitters who have now decided it is safe to leap up and make their declarations. Here's why: I read their rhetoric, some of them, and I seldom see any mention of Bob Sumner's righteous stand. (You heard me correctly. I said "righteous stand.") He stood when it wasn't popular to stand, indeed, even dangerous to stand. He stood when Jack Hyles was at the height of his power. He stood at the most unpopular time to stand.

But I don't see many of the late bloomers giving him the credit he deserves. I see them willing to use facts they got from him or that were initially developed by him. But I don't see them crediting him for even that. (I know of one man who, besides having numerous factual inaccuracies in his material on Hyles, couldn't even get it right as to the author of *The Saddest Story* and credited Sumner's son, Richard, as the author. That is inexcusable, in my opinion.)

Now, I know Bob Sumner well enough to say I know for a fact that he isn't looking and never was looking for acclaim or "credit." That wasn't his motivation.

But honesty demands he be given due credit for his work and be recognized for his stand.

It remains to be seen whether those who've now leaped onto the stage will give honor to whom honor is due.

If you haven't read the following articles, you're about to read something that is a very important piece of history for Baptists, particularly Independent Fundamental Baptists. You're going to read a slice of history that began the erosion of one man's ministry – for Jack Hyles' ministry

began eroding the day these articles came out.

I thank God for that erosion.

I also thank God for Robert Sumner's dedication to the truth and to God.

And I'm thankful for the opportunity to introduce you to this most excellent journalistic endeavor by one man whose quest for truth was greater than his fear of man.

May we all be so.

*Voyle A. Glover, Esq.*

*October 25, 2002*

## One Of The Blights Of Bigness!

Do you remember the Athenians, the men who invited Paul to speak to them at Mars Hill about Jesus and the resurrection because "he seemeth to be a setter forth of strange gods"? The Scripture says of them, "For all the Athenians and strangers which were there spent their time in nothing else, but either to tell or to hear some new thing" (Acts 17:21).

One of the marks of a cultist is that he must always have some "new light" to present every time his disciples gather. When doing research on the Herbert W./Garner Ted Armstrong cult, the ex-followers we contacted emphasized that the leadership boasted it always had something new to reveal whenever they gathered at the festivals.

Apparently this form of egotism has been spilling over into Fundamentalism and we are alarmed at the results. We will use one man as an illustration and hope what is going on is confined to him, but we have no assurance that it is. This man has long been a leading light on the Fundamentalist conference circuit. He is the pastor of a Fundamentalist superchurch. He founded and heads a prominent school. While we have not been associated with him for a number of years and have heard him speak only once in half a decade, some concerned individuals have been sharing tapes of his messages with us that are shocking, indeed.

One brother sent us a tape of his sermon on Samson, saying he was alarmed at what he heard. So were we! Purporting to answer the question of why God gives some Christians who fall into sin a second chance and does not give one to others, he said that David, for example, committed adultery and murder, but was used again, while others committed the same sins and weren't used again. He wondered why Samson got by with his sin and others in the Bible didn't, concluding that the secret was Samson's "consecration." (We surely wouldn't want to preach a sermon, offering Samson's life as the pattern for a life of consecration!) He put it like this: "God used Samson when He did not use others, who did the same things Samson did, because of one word – consecration. Samson was totally sold out to the plan of God for his life."

One of many amazing statements he made – which sounded like one Jimmy Swaggart used in explaining how his ministry would collapse without him – was, "Samson was valuable to God. Samson was so dedicated to God that when he made some stupid mistake, God said, 'I need the fella too much to put him on the shelf. He's doing too much good for one little bad thing to cause him to forfeit his chance to serve me'." But be assured, no individual, no matter how important he may seem in the eyes of his fellow men (or himself), is indispensable to God and God's ministry.

What this preacher proceeded to develop from the story of Samson was a merit/demerit system for Christian service, one that determines whether God will give someone another chance if that one falls into grievous sin. Perhaps he didn't intend it to be so, but his message came across as saying, "If you set out to do what God's will is for your life, and work hard enough at it, you can do anything you want to do and get away with it! In fact, you can get away with adultery and murder, just like David did!"

His first point was, "God's degree of patience with you when you stumble is determined by how fast you were running." His next point was, "Your chance at a second chance will depend on what you did with your first chance." In short, if you were gung-ho in your labors, always on visitation, always tithing, always witnessing, going day and night in service, God will give you a second chance when you fall. If not, He won't. He said flatly, "God's degree of patience when you stumble will be totally dependent on how fast you were running."

In other words, God operates on a system of merits and demerits. This preacher actually called it "stumbling insurance," concluding, "You'd better be worth enough to God, [have] enough merits built up, so when you stumble the demerits will not over-balance the merits." Referring to Samson, he said, "Samson was so dedicated to God that God gave him so many merits that when the demerits came he had a bonus of merits left over and God used him again."

To illustrate, he referred to a man whose preaching he called "R-rated," but gets by with it because, "God looks down

and says, 'It is sort of strange, but, Gabriel, go check his invitation on Sunday morning and see how it's go-ing. Go check his soul winning; see how hard he works. Go check his Bi-ble study.' And God looks down and says, 'The fella is doing so much good, I'll overlook a few of the blunders he makes!.' And he spoke of another preacher whose language is so bad God looks down and says, "Oh, my soul, I think I'll kill him," but about that time the offending minister gets up and preaches a sermon on Hell, has 200 people saved, and God says, "Hold it a minute. Wait a minute. Let him finish that sermon first." And he opined, "Folks, you'd do the same thing." (Whether we would or not isn't the point, obviously; we are dealing here with a God of absolute holiness and what He would do!) Such teaching is utter nonsense, of course. Actually, it is a warmed over, remodeled version of the old "in-dulgences" philosophy practiced in Roman Catholicism. It has no more scriptural substance behind it than Rome has for its teaching. The primary difference is that the "earned" merit in one is after the fact and in the other it is before the fact. That's all.

He said, "In my church a fellow stumbles, and is immoral – and I am not for immorality; I hate it with a passion, I am against it – but if you are not tithing, shut your mouth about the adultery." (As if there were any resemblance whatsoever be-tween failing to tithe and committing adultery!) And he said a preacher who is busy for God is more likely to fall into sin than one who isn't. (The exact opposite is true, of course, since the one closest to God has the most strength to resist temptation.)

It goes without saying – and it is usually true in this man's sermonizing any way, one much more devoted to whoop and holler than substance – this message was almost totally devoid of Scripture. God does not operate on a principle which allows His servants to store up "brownie points" for use in emergencies. Yet the secret, according to this preacher, is to have more merits than demerits when a showdown comes. You know, sort of a Buddhism/ Hinduism *karma* on a Fundamentalist level!

Nonsense! "Running" has nothing to do with it. If someone falls out of a rocking chair, he can still get up. Contrary to what the brother said, the secret for a fresh start in service does not depend upon merits stored up in reserve; **THE KEY IS REPEN-TANCE!** Yet he did not even mention repentance one time in his entire sermon!

We were still in shock after listen-ing to that tape when a Christian leader, talking to us on the phone about another matter, asked if we had heard this man's sermon on the eternal humanity of Christ. He said, "You *must* hear it."

When we received it, we could hard-ly believe our ears. Here are some ver-batim quotes from the message:

"There has always been a member of the Godhead who was human and God."

"[Jesus] is the human deity now. He always has been. He always will be. He did not become human when He came to Bethlehem."

"That nature in which He came to us in Bethlehem – that nature, we call it human nature—He always had it and He always will have it, and always shall be divinely human and humanly divine. Before man was made, this man-type existed in the Godhead. Before this clay was ever fashioned, this humanity existed in the divinity."

"He always had the same human tendencies we have. He had the same human reasoning that we have."

"The incarnation part: God brought the original down beside the degenerate copy to show me what I was meant to be."

"God didn't look down one day and say that man is a sinner, I think I'll make a God-man. No, He always was the God-man. Just like we've got those fire extinguishers over there in case of, there was a god-man in case a God-man was ever needed. And before Bethlehem, He was the God-man."

"He has my nature. He always has had my nature. He didn't learn how to be a man when He came to Bethlehem, He already was one."

There is so much biblically wrong with this reasoning that one editorial cannot really handle it, but note some pertinent scriptural observations. . .

Jesus was not the *first* man, Adam was. We are told in I Corinthians 15:45-47, "And so it is written, The first man Adam was made a living soul; the last Adam was made a quickening spirit. Howbeit that was not first which is spiritual, but that which is natural; and afterward that which is spiritual. The first man is of the earth, earthy: the second man is the Lord from heaven." It seems very clear from this that Adam possessed the first humani-ty, and that he was given it in creation by Almighty God.

One must have a *body* in order to possess *complete* humanity. Paul prayed for the saints in I Thessalonians 5:23, "And the very God of peace sanctify you wholly; and I pray God your whole spirit and soul and body be preserved blameless unto the coming of our Lord Jesus Christ." Whole humanity consists of spirit, soul and body. If our Lord



eternally possessed humanity, it was *incomplete humanity* because He had no physical body in eternity past. It was necessary to prepare one for Him so He could come to earth and die (Hebrews 10:5).

Hebrews 2:9 shows that His human-ty was something He took on, not something He already possessed. It says, "But we see Jesus, who was made a little lower than the angels for the suffering of death...." That "made a little lower than the angels" is the same word-for-word description of man's creation in Hebrews 2:7. Adam and Jesus were both "made" men.

The same idea is repeated in Hebrews 2:16, "For verily he took not on him the nature of the angels; but he took on him the seed of Abraham." What did He "take" on Himself? It was humanity, "the seed of Abraham." As the next verse says, "Wherefore in all things it behooved him to be made like unto his brethren, that he might be a merciful and faithful high priest in things pertaining to God, to make reconciliation for the sins of the people" (Vs.17). He had to be "made" like the brethren, taking upon Himself their humanity.

Probably the classic statement in the Word of God on the subject is Philippians 2:5-8, which declares: "*Let this mind be in you, which was also in Christ Jesus: who, being in the form of God, thought it not robbery to be equal with God: but made himself of no reputation, and took upon him the form of a servant, and was made in the likeness of men: and being found in fashion as a man, he humbled himself, and became obedient unto death, even the death of the cross.*"

Here is one who already possessed "the form of God" and who "took upon him the form of a servant," identified as "the likeness of men" and "in fashion as a man." Dr. George Lawlor, former professor of Bible and Greek at Cedarville College, notes here, "The form of the verb rendered 'was made' in the King James Version, is the aorist participle of *ginomai*, 'to come into existence, come to pass, become, take place.' It is rendered 'to be made' in the sense of *who* or *what* a person or thing is or has been made, expressed in terms of character, quality, condition, place, or rank. The aorist participle signifies entrance into a new state, and denotes what was contemporaneous with the Lord's emptying Himself. His becoming in the likeness of men was simultaneous with His emptying Himself, part of that act but subordinate to it." Our Lord's human-ty, then, was something that *came in-to existence* at the time of the incarnation.

The statement in John 1:14 is, "And the Word was made flesh, and dwelt among us, (and we beheld his glory, the glory as of the only begotten of the Father,) full of grace and truth." Once again we are told that Jesus, in His Virgin Birth, "was made," or "became" humanity, which is what "flesh" means here. This is no mere taking of a body, it is literally *becom-ing man*.

We know of absolutely no reputable orthodox theologian in the world, past or present, who teaches or has taught the eternal humanity of the Son of God. On the other hand, we can quote them by the bushel who teach that Christ *became man* at the incarnation. B. B. Warfield of Princeton Seminary, selected to write the section on the "Person of Christ" in *The International Standard Bible Encyclopedia*, referred to the phrase "the form of a servant, being made in the likeness of men" in Philippians 2, commenting: "The term 'form' here, of course, bears the same full meaning as in the preceding instance of its occurrence in the phrase 'the form of God.'... Our Lord assumed, then, according to Paul, not the mere state or condition or outward appearance of a servant, but the reality; He became an actual 'servant' in the world. The act by which He did this is described as a 'taking,' or, as it has become customary from this description of it to phrase it, as an 'assumption.' What is meant is that our Lord took up into His personality a human nature; and therefore it is immediately explained that He took the form of a servant by 'being nude in the likeness of men.'" Warfield noted that God "'assumed' man into personal union with Himself, and has in this His assumed manhood lived out a human life on earth."

Charles C. Ryrie, a theologian of no mean repute, sets the idea forth in very clear language: "Though the word [incarnation] does not appear in Scripture, its components ('in' and 'flesh') do. John wrote that the Word became flesh (John 1:14). He also wrote of Jesus coming in the flesh (I John 4:2; 2 John 7). By this he meant that the eternal second Person of the Trinity took on Himself humanity. He did not possess humanity until the birth, since the Lord became flesh (*egeneto*, John 1:14, in contrast to the four occurrences of *en* in vv.1-2). He was *always* God; He *became* man in the incarnation."

The esteemed Presbyterian theologian of yesteryear, Charles Hodge, in his 3-volume *Systematic Theology*, referred

to the biblical phrase “born of a woman,” declaring, “This... can only mean that He was born in the sense in which other children of men are born of women. This is essential to his true humanity ....” If being born “in the sense” of other children was “essential” to His true humanity, He could not have possessed such true humanity prior to Bethlehem.

Floyd H. Brackman, who now teaches systematic theology at the Practical Bible Training School, expressed it like this: “From eternity God the Son was a Person who possessed the divine nature (the nature of God). Upon His incarnation He took upon Himself a human nature, divinely created of Mary’s substance.”

My own systematic theology professor, Dean Emory H. Bancroft, made our class memorize this doctrinal statement: “By His incarnation, Jesus Christ came into possession of a real, human, physical nature consisting of spirit, soul and body, which gave to Him a true humanity.” That is what evangelical Christianity has always held and believed.

Alas, our Fundamentalist leader/brother used his faulty thinking about the eternal humanity of Christ to make some sad and faulty conclusions. In fact, when he finished, he had pre-sented God the Father as the same despot the liberals have always painted the God of the Old Testament (Jehovah), in contrast to the God of the New Testament (Jesus). Here are some verbatim samples:

“The Father and I can’t understand each other because I’ve never been like Him; and He’s never been like me. Jehovah does not reason with our reasoning. Jesus always has reasoned with our reasoning. Jehovah will never reason with our reasoning. And Jehovah looks down and sees me weak, and sinful, and frail, and imperfect. He says, ‘I think I’ll just kill old \_\_\_\_.’ And Jesus says, ‘Father, listen to me for a minute, Father. You have never been human; I always have been. You never have been human in your nature; I always have been. And, Father, you never have been down there.’

“But did you hear what he said to those deacons?”

“Father, did you ever have deacons?” And the Father says, ‘No, Son, you know better than that. I never had deacons.’

“And Jesus says, ‘I did.’ He said, ‘I’ve been down there.’ He said, ‘When I died, the chairman of my board was out cussing. The treasurer was committing suicide. And all the board members forsook Me and fled.’

“What He says is, ‘Father, have mercy on \_\_\_\_.’ Thank God, there’s somebody in the heavenlies who understands me.”

“[Jesus] sits today at the right hand of God the Father, Jehovah God, and He says, ‘Father, let me tell you what it’s like’.”

“You know why I can come boldly to the throne of grace this morning? ‘Cause Jesus is there softening God the Father up for me before I get there.”

“God the Father and God the Son don’t see Heaven alike. God the Father sees Heaven as God. God the Son sees Heaven as God sees it and as man sees it. So He can reach out and fellowship with God and reach out and fellowship with man.” (Are we to understand from this that God the Father can’t reach out and fellowship with man because He has no humanity? Perish the thought! – Ed)

Is the Heavenly Father one who looks down at His frail, failing children and says, “I think I’ll kill old so-and-so”? Of course not, and it is an insult to what the Bible teaches about God the Father to infer it. David said of the Father, “For thou, Lord, art good, and ready to forgive; and plenteous in mercy unto all them that call upon thee” (Psalm 86:5). And again, “The LORD is merciful and gracious, slow to anger, and plenteous in mercy.... He hath not dealt with us after our sins; nor rewarded us according to our iniquities. For as the heaven is high above the earth, so great is his mercy toward them that fear him. As far as the east is from the west, so far hath he removed our transgressions from us. Like as a father pitieth his children, so the LORD pitieth them that fear him. For he knoweth our frame; he remembereth that we are dust.... But the mercy of the LORD is from everlasting to everlasting upon them that fear him, and his righteousness unto children’s children” (Psalm 103:8,10-14,17). Jeremiah expressed it, “It is of the LORD’s mercies that we are not consumed, because his compassions fail not. They are new every morning: great is thy faithfulness” (Lamentations 3:22,23).

Instead of the Father being someone who doesn’t understand us, David declares above, “HE KNOWETH OUR

FRAME; he remembereth that we are dust.” Surely no one could misunderstand that, could he? Never forget, it is God the Father who is called “the Father of mercies” (II Corinthians 1:3). This is not said to minimize the mercy of the Son, but to show that they are equal in this attribute, even as in all the others. What a wicked sin it is to portray the Father as some kind of tyrant who doesn’t understand us, yet picture Jesus as a kind, gentle, merciful friend to whom we can always turn. It is never wise to pit one member of the Trinity against another one.

There are some other things we have learned of late about this leader that trouble us, too, but we do not have the time, space or desire to deal with them now. Some of them deal with what his members have called and told us, almost weeping, things he has said from his church pulpit. And in the sermon on Christ’s eternal humanity, he sang two choruses – he wrote them himself – that were fleshly and sensual, yet he sang them to tunes of beautiful gospel songs. Things like this trouble us.

Suffice it to say, no man is so big to be followed blindly – in our Fundamentalist movement or in any other – and it behooves the least of us to examine by the Word of God, as the Bereans did (Acts 17:11), *everything* the greatest among us have to say. “Search the Scriptures,” Jesus said (John 5:39). “Beloved, believe not every spirit, but try the spirits whether they are of God,” is the way John put it (I John 4:1).

The man who does not want his preaching and teaching evaluated by the Bible has no business being in the pulpit!

# THE SADDEST STORY WE EVER PUBLISHED!

by the Editor, Dr. Robert L. Sumner

One of the hardest things for me to learn – or, should I say, "accept" – is the fact that Fundamentalist preachers put on their britches one leg at a time. By that, I simply mean that they have a fallen human nature and are capable of the same kind of sins the rest of mankind practice on a regular basis. They do not go to Heaven every night and come back every morning to be of service to God and humanity.

In my naiveté, I somehow supposed that the children of Liberals could grow up to be rebellious, ungodly and enemies of the faith – but not the children of Fundamentalists. I had no problem understanding that Liberal preachers could leave town with their secretaries or choir leaders, but never, *never* a Fundamentalist minister. If a newspaper headline revealed an account of ministerial financial shenanigans or absconding with funds, I automatically considered such a man a Liberal – because a Fundamentalist couldn't do anything like that, of course.

Later, as my eyes became accustomed to the reality of the world's light – or, rather, *darkness* – I had to admit that Bible preachers could commit the same identical sins as did some of the infidels in the pulpit. Even then, in my mind, they were the "New Evangelicals." Fundamentalists would never do anything like that.

Alas, the days of my "sweet innocence " long ago evaporated like fog under the burning morning sun. There is nothing a Fundamentalist – out of fellowship with his Master – cannot do. This covers the range from stealing a postage stamp out of another's desk to adultery and murder.

*Murder?* Yes, I recall hearing the late Bob Jones tell of a minister friend (a man for whom he had conducted evangelistic services) who was charged with murdering a woman in his church; it seemed they had an affair and when it was about to be exposed, he killed her. I recall how shocked I was when Jones told the story – and how I thought to myself, "No, he couldn't have been a saved man. He may have *professed*, but he surely didn't *possess*." Yet David was a saved man when his sin was about to be exposed and he connived the killing of his lover's husband, Uriah.

It was also Dr. Bob that I heard say repeatedly, "No man knows what he would do if he were tempted in the right way, at the right time, and under the right circumstances." While I admit to being skeptical then, I am no longer under any such delusion. Paul, writing under the full

inspiration of the Holy Spirit, summed this truth up for the Corinthian Christians: "Wherefore let him that thinketh he standeth take heed lest he fall" (I Corinthians 10:12). The potential is there for all of us.

Which brings me down to the subject at hand. When I started my investigation I had no idea what a can of worms I was uncovering. Quite frankly, this is probably the most difficult article I have ever written for THE BIBLICAL EVANGELIST – or during my quarter of a century in writing for Dr. John R. Rice, either. I do not enjoy exposing a man with whom I have had association of sorts for nearly 30 years, shared Bible conference platforms, preached in his churches – a man who led his church in giving our organization many thousands of dollars, and who was on my personal daily prayer list for many, many years.

Then why do it? Why not just continue the cover-up that has apparently been going on in Fundamentalist circles for many, many years? There are two primary reasons, one biblical and the other practical.

The *biblical* one relates to the demand that pastors must be absolutely blameless (I Timothy 3:2; Titus 1:7), the very first qualification listed in both passages. A preacher who falls into sin is to be exposed, as Paul told Timothy: "Them that sin rebuke before all, that others also may fear" (I Timothy 5:20). To try and limit this command to local church situations is a cop-out, in my judgment; it states a *principle* that covers the whole body of Christ.

One of the major inconsistencies within Fundamentalism today is that sin is so quietly and firmly swept under the rug and the guilty parties go free. Many who argue a cover-up for a fallen Fundamentalist are the first in line to condemn a Jim & Tammy Bakker or a Jimmy Swaggart. Where is the consistency – or even honesty – in this? Do we want to send a message to the world that if a man is "big" enough and "fundamental" enough, he can get by with anything? I think not. One thing is sure: with the massive cover-ups we've had of late, not many preachers are "fearing"; if we can put some holy fear back into men of God, the time and money spent researching this article will have been worthwhile.

Some point to the cases of Korah (Numbers 16), Aaron and Miriam (Numbers 12), the destruction by the two she bears of the young men who mocked Elisha (II Kings 2), but none of these cases relate to sin in a leader's life. Another favorite Scripture often used for not facing a minister's sin is I Samuel 24:6 and 26:9, where David refused to "stretch forth mine hand against [Saul], seeing he is the anointed of the LORD, and, "who can stretch forth his hand against the LORD's anointed, and be guiltless?" But we are not talking about who should be king (or even pastor of a particular church), nor are we talking about slaying someone and usurping a throne.

Neither do New Testament passages about judging motives and casting the first stone concern

this question. This issue is strictly about whether major sin should be covered up for men in the ministry. Regarding the latter, God didn't say, "Leave it up to me; I'll take care of it in my own time," He said, "You *openly* take care of it *immediately!*"

The other reason for this article is *practical*. Because this man is so important in Fundamentalist circles – he, himself, has boasted on several occasions that if he were brought down, Fundamentalism would fall with him ("Just think how much destruction would happen to America and the churches if I quit", "America needs me!" "First Baptist Church in \_\_\_\_\_ is the greatest church in the New Testament age"; "We are the greatest"); to which we respond, "*If Fundamentalism has no better foundation than that, let it fall!*" – word has reached us that both secular and New Evangelical presses have been working on exposés, including one of America's most prestigious metropolitan newspapers. Some of us have come to the conclusion that Fundamentalism ought to do its own housecleaning, uncovering its own failings by facing the matter scripturally and honestly.

We concluded that less harm would come to Fundamentalism if exposure came from within the movement than if the outside world blew the whistle and then stood back to sneer. The scoffing and sneering will come anyway, but hopefully it will not be as loud nor last as long. We want to do what is right in helping Fundamentalism, *but it will not be helped as long as sin is covered*. As Jehovah said to Joshua of old when he was prostrate in prayer, "Get thee up; wherefore liest thou thus upon thy face? Israel hath sinned . . ." (Joshua 7:10,11). It was no time for a prayer meeting: there was sin in the camp. The same is true today.

We have tried to approach the task in a biblical manner, although most of the instruction in the Word of God has to do with local churches, not with movements. While there is no record that Peter was ever approached privately by Paul before the latter delivered his public rebuke (Galatians 2:1-14), some of us have tried to face this man with his sin. He refuses to respond. Even more important, the injured party attempted to follow the principles laid out in Matthew 18:15-17 for handling it within the local church – but was not even permitted to present his statement and accompanying evidence to his fellow deacons.

We have published a few articles in THE BIBLICAL EVANGELIST attempting to warn him and others, but these entreaties have seemingly fallen on deaf ears. We have sought to stir others to action, but the standard answer has been, "That is none of our business. We don't want to get involved." (I keep saying "we" because a number of Christian leaders have been working on this exposé, although I have taken the responsibility for the actual writing.)

Quite frankly, we don't want to get involved either. Our ministry may be boycotted in such a way that it will drive us into insolvency. If so, *so be it!* Many of the statements in this article will be given anonymously because of the fear those individuals have of retaliation, but someone must

stick his neck on the chopping block and we are willing to do so for the good of the Fundamentalist movement.

Some, no doubt, will object to the way we have done it. We reply, "How would *you* handle something like this?" In the past couple of months we have had a host of phone calls about it – pro and con – but when I ask the cons if they have a better plan for handling something like this, invariably there is a long, dead silence on the other end of the line. Others will feel that a continued cover-up would have been better, but no one prospers in the case of covered sin. Paul told the Corinthians that the guilty sinner in their midst should be exposed both for their sake ("a little leaven leaveneth the whole lump") and for the sake of the transgressor ("deliver such an one unto Satan for the destruction of the flesh, that the spirit may be saved in the day of the Lord Jesus"), trusting their action would bring the erring brother to repentance (I Corinthians 5:1-13).

Even if there is no other benefit, this will get the facts of the story out into the open. Over the past several months, from coast to coast, rumors have been circulating about this minister. Often the stories widely differ and some have little basis of fact. This will at least pinpoint exactly what the problems are.

Perhaps our strongest motivation for writing is duty. It won't make us popular, but we agree with what Charles Manly wrote long, long ago:

*"Better than ringing plaudits of a throng,  
Than voice of multitudes in shouts of praise,  
Than smiles of beauty and of rarest grace,  
Are silent whispers of a conscience free  
From sense of duty left undone."*

We want to be able to say with the steward of whom Christ spoke, "We are unprofitable servants: *we have done that which was our duty to do*" (Luke 17: 10). Whether you agree or not, we have done what we felt was our duty.

### **READ THIS LETTER AND WEEP!**

As an introduction to the problem, let me quote one of the most tragic letters addressed to a gospel preacher I have ever read in nearly a half century of following Christ. It should bring genuine tears to your eyes, as it did mine. The writer is a fine Christian lady – she and her husband grew up and went completely through "the system" in this man's church; in fact, her husband's grandfather was chairman of the board when he was called to the pulpit and the letter surely speaks for itself. She wrote:

"As I am sure you are well aware, my husband and I are moving to the Los Angeles area this month. The culmination of many events in our lives brought us to the decision that we have made to move. By this letter I wish to express my thoughts on the role you have played in these events over the past fifteen-plus years.

"I remember hearing once that it is not wise to put anything in writing that one would not want the entire world to see. (You know well the horrifying effects doing so can cause, don't you?) That thought prompted me to write you on my leaving, for it would be the pleasure of my life to have the entire world see in print my feelings on you, your establishment and your gross perversion of the sacred role of Pastor.

"For over fifteen years I have watched and learned much from the circus that you have performed with the lives of those I love most in the world. With your own insecurities and personal failures as your driving force, you have quite simply played havoc with an entire church, some of my dearest friends and worst of all, my family. The saddest realization is that it has all been under the guise of Christianity. How I emerged from such a pit of secret sin, manipulation, and hypocrisy with the slightest interest in my professed religion at all, I do not know.

"Actually, I have become quite a person with these many lessons of life under my belt and must admit that you were quite a teacher. You exemplify everything in this life that I do not want for myself, my marriage or my children. I thank God for giving me the sense to decide not to become one of the neurotic puppets you employ. That decision and my close friendship with your ex-daughter-in-law (you remember her, don't you?) helped salvage what was left of my self-respect. In an incredibly short amount of time I have healed much and think I would surprise even you with the strength I have gained.

"Incidentally, Paula and I have volumes of stories to swap, and it is interesting to see just how similar they are. What was it that you used to say, 'Little leopards have spots because big leopards have spots'? How true it is.

"Sadly, in your very heart of hearts you must be the most miserable, lonely person alive. You are a self-proclaimed giant, sensationalist, exhibitionist, and 'big-time spender' grasping for every expression of love, admiration and loyalty that you can get your filthy little hands on. Yet, you have failed with the most precious gifts God could have ever given you – your wife, your children, and now, your ministry.

"I pity you, \_\_\_\_\_, for you will be experiencing the consequences of your actions for a very long time. You may have convinced your following in the past twenty years that 'it did not happen if they did not see it,' but God has seen every moment of those years, and my faith will not let [me] believe that He will let you go unpunished.



"With these thoughts expressed, I bathe myself of you and any influence you may have had on me in the past. With God's help, I will make my life in California everything that He would have it be and, unlike you, will not fall.

"Sincerely,"

(Signed)

Quite frankly, if I ever received a letter like that – and it contained even 10% truth – I'd walk out of the ministry without ever looking back. I could not handle even the *private* knowledge that such a letter were even *remotely* true.

This letter, which the writer told the recipient "it would be the pleasure of my life to have the entire world to see in print," explaining that he exemplified "everything in this life that I do not want for myself, my marriage or my children," was signed by Judy Nischik Johnson. It was written on October 1, 1986, to "Mr. Hyles." He is better known as Dr. Jack Hyles, pastor of the huge First Baptist Church in Hammond, Indiana, and Chancellor of Hyles-Anderson College. The Paula in the letter is Dr. Hyles' former daughter-in-law. And we should probably note that Mrs. Johnson hand-delivered the letter to his office to make certain he received it, rather than trusting the United States postal service. She was that serious about it.

Others knew about this long before we did, since its roots go back at least to 1971, but the philosophy and practice of Fundamentalism has been to sweep things like this under the rug, to bury it in the back recesses of Fundamentalism's closet . . . then lock the door and throw away the key. But this, dear reader, is neither right nor biblical.

## **THE BACKGROUND OF THE LETTER**

About 17 or 18 years ago, Judy's parents, Victor and Jennie Nischik along with their two children, Judy and Jack, were members of the First Baptist Church in Hammond, happy as a family and dedicated to serving the Lord and the church. Vic was a deacon and a Sunday school teacher. As a young man, he given up a lifetime job with General Motors to become a part of Hyles' ministry, even though his preacher father warned him against so doing – in fact, he said "my parents practically disowned me for coming to Hammond." By his own testimony, Hyles was "a man I worshipped for nearly two decades as being the nearest thing to deity on earth." He says, "I was his most loyal follower; in the Bus Ministry for nearly 25 years; Choir Director for nearly 5 years in the '60s; and Deacon for over 24 years. " He also sang in the choir and served as song leader in the Sunday school.

One day Dr. Hyles came to Vic and said, "I need your wife in my office. " Even though their children were small, both husband and wife were delighted that she could be involved in such a worldwide ministry and Vic readily gave his consent.

A little time went by and the Nischiks began experiencing marital problems. She would not permit Vic to touch her. In 1971, Jennie told Vic she wanted a divorce; in fact, she gave him 24 hours to get out of town and never see his children again. He refused. When she called Hyles to the home, the latter offered Vic financial help to relocate elsewhere, suggesting Denver. Nischik totally rejected the offer, saying he wanted to keep his home together for the children's sake and because he loved his wife. Nothing was settled that night and the next day the three met again. This time, as Vic testified under oath:

*"At that meeting the substance of it was that I produced evidence of an improper relationship between my wife and Hyles, and produced evidence to that effect, which caused him to beg me to stay for the sake of the church and the ministry, and after a number of days discussion, I agreed to stay for the sake of the church and for the sake of my children."* He defined that improper relationship as personal involvement going farther than mere friendship, adding that when he produced his evidence, ". . . Hyles backed off about me leaving and, in fact, begging me to stay, and worked out the arrangement under which we have lived ever since." So, when this evidence was produced, instead of "get out of town within 24 hours and never see your children again," it became, in effect, "stay around and put on a front for the good of 'the ministry'."

The bizarre solution Hyles worked out for the Nischiks was as follows: continue to live in the same house, but not see, speak, eat together, ride in the same automobile, or even contact one another in any way except for an hour or so on Christmas, exchanging gifts with the children. A schedule was even worked out about when each parent could be with the children, one that was rigidly followed.

At first Vic merely had a rollaway cot in the unfinished basement, but eventually a room was fixed up in one corner, for which he paid Jennie rent, even though he was allowed no physical contact whatsoever with her. This arrangement was "forced" on him and when, under oath, he was asked by his wife's attorney, William H. Tobin of Saul I Rubin & Associates, "Who forced that arrangement whereby you lived in the basement on you?" he replied, "Hyles did."

After more than a decade, in 1983, the basement living quarters became very damp and dangerous to Vic's health, so he went to Hyles and said he was going to move back into the master bedroom with his wife. Hyles told him, "I'd rather build a room for you," and he himself contacted a building contractor and paid for the addition at a cost, according to Hyles under oath (deposition taken on May 1, 1986), of "approximately \$11,000," and according to Vic under oath (deposition taken on March 10, 1986), "\$10,306." That room was over the garage.

A few years later, when Vic again demanded that Hyles terminate the affair with his wife, Hyles ordered Jennie to file for divorce. She did, but when Hyles realized that Nischik planned to put him on the witness stand in open court, the former met with the attorneys on both sides and unilaterally negotiated the terms of the divorce settlement.

According to Vic's attorney, Robert Hess of the firm Sachs & Hess, Vic did "everything in his power that is humanly possible" to keep his marriage intact. On May 28, 1986, writing to the Moody Bible Institute, Hess described it: "Initially, in 1971, at the sole request of his wife, he moved into the basement of the parties' home in order to keep the family together, his family being two young children at that time. He has lived separate and apart from his wife during this period, but in the same home, from 1971 until present, all for the purpose of keeping the family together and also for the purpose of keeping the marriage together even if it was in name only.... To show you how strongly he felt about keeping the marriage together, even when the basement started getting water seepage, where it was impossible to live in the basement any longer, he had a dormer added to the home in order to have separate quarters so that his wife would not at that point in time either file a petition for dissolution of marriage or have him evicted from the home in a dissolution of marriage proceeding. This occurred in 1983. Unfortunately, Vic had no control whatsoever over his wife ultimately filing a petition for dissolution of the marriage and that was done as stated above on or about November 4, 1985, at which time Victor retained me to represent his interests in this dissolution of marriage proceeding. "

Vic opposed the divorce to the very end, even refusing to file a cross-petition, but under Indiana law the only requirement is for one party to state under oath that he/she wants the dissolution. Jennie so stated before Judge Kanz on May 23, 1986, and the divorce was granted. Attorney Hess declared of the case, "I might add that in twenty years of practice I do not recall any other case where an individual like Vic has taken the steps that he did to preserve his marriage, such as living in a basement for twelve years and then building a dormer at considerable expense in order to appease his wife and allow him to stay in the marital home." It is not merely interesting, but extremely significant that Vic's employer, the Moody Bible Institute, overruled a century-old policy written by Dwight L. Moody himself, which states, "Divorced, separated, or individuals married to divorced persons will not be employed as members of the Faculty, teaching and/or counseling staff of the Institute. Neither will they be employed at the vice-president, manager or director levels. At the time of the divorce, Vic was the MBI Director of Accounting. Several times he offered his resignation and it was refused.

At the church, when she was hired, Jennie Nischik was fixed up with an office adjoining Dr. Hyles' office, with a connecting door which, incidentally, had a huge drape in front of it so that no one coming into her office would know that a door was there. At least one of the fine ministers long associated with Hyles left because he could no longer, in good conscience, tolerate it. In response to my direct inquiry, a dear brother whom I have long respected as a man of integrity,

wrote me on February 6, 1989:

"Thank you for your letter. You asked why my wife and I left Hyles-Anderson College having taught there for fifteen years, whether or not it had to do with any wrong doing on the part of Dr. Jack Hyles.

"Starting two years ago we were told by letter and personally by individuals that Dr. Hyles has a mistress, and that she is an office worker who has the office immediately next to his. About that same time I learned that those two offices not only each have a front door off the hallway but also have an inner door between their offices.

"After a while I was bothered by the rumors to the degree that I went to talk to Brother Hyles after a Sunday morning church service in his office. I began on a positive note. 'Brother Hyles, I love you very much. I have told you so frequently in person and in notes. I have served you faithfully these thirteen years. Now I am going to ask you to do me a favor.' 'What is that,' he asked. 'There re rumors going around that you and the lady in the next office are having an affair. The favor I am asking is that you get this inner connecting door boarded up, move this lady to a different office, and put male staff member in your adjoining office. I really believe it would help eliminate the rumors going around about you.' Dr. Hyles' reply to me was, 'No, I am not going to do that. You are wasting your time.'

"Although his refusal to grant my request did not prove or disprove anything, I felt in my heart that the Lord wanted my wife and me to leave First Baptist Church and Hyles-Anderson College and serve Him elsewhere. We left at the end of the 1988 school year."

In a follow-up letter, written 10 days after the first one, he said he believed "it would be very helpful to insert that this lady (Jennie Nischik) is not his secretary, but rather mails out his sermon tapes. Dr. Hyles' secretary is Mrs. McKinney who has an office across the hall from his office. " It is necessary for Hyles to leave his own office and cross the hall to personally visit his secretary.

When Hyles told this brother he would not honor his request, the latter reminded him that the Word of God enjoins us, "Abstain from all appearance of evil." And Hyles' response was, "My people need to trust me." The Bible support for abstaining from all appearance of evil is found in I Thessalonians 5:22. Where is the Bible support for "My people need to trust me" in times of appearance of evil? There is none, of course.

As my friend noted in retrospect, "Someone said, 'While we can always trust the Lord, we cannot always trust those who are trusting the Lord.' Is Hyles a better Christian than David or a stronger man than Samson? Yet both of these great men of God succumbed to adultery. We should not

place ourselves in a position where temptation will arise." *Amen!*

Is this preacher a disgruntled church or faculty member with an axe to grind, trying to "get even" with Hyles? Quite the contrary, Hyles has been his hero for 20 years or more, a man he describes as having "the distinction of being the man I have loved more than any man who ever lived." His own dad had been an alcoholic and Hyles, as the father image he had never had, won his heart, got his admiration, and became his number one hero. His goal was to eventually become an associate pastor under Hyles.

Dozens of times when the church auditorium was empty, he would kneel at the altar right next to the pulpit and pray for the man he loved and respected. Scores of Sundays he would go to the alley behind the church, place his hands on the bricks outside Hyles' office, and pray for God's anointing on his pulpit ministry that day. He says, "For many years I would have died for Dr. Hyles at the drop of a hat if there had been a need to do so." He still loves him, but he had to leave and is willing now to speak out because he feels Hyles betrayed the trust he placed in him.

The situation really came to a head in late 1985 when Vic had a showdown with Hyles, demanding that he leave his wife alone. It resulted in Jennie divorcing Vic on Hyles' orders, with Hyles picking up the tab, a matter Nischik says his ex-wife admitted to him. Three depositions were taken, one each from Hyles, Vic and Jennie. One responsible minister of unquestioned integrity, who read each of them, noted this about Hyles:

"Here is what I observed from Dr. Hyles deposition taken on May 1, 1986: He said that . . .

"He buys Mrs. Nischik a new automobile every two years.

"He loaned Mrs. Nischik \$35,000 in which to invest so that she could derive interest from it.

"He gave her a gift of \$ 10,000."

"He bought aluminum siding for the Nischik house

"He gave Vic Nischik approximately \$11,000 in order for him to have a room added to his house (pages 40-42)."

He wrote about Jennie's:

"This is what I observed from Mrs. Nischik's deposition taken on February 5, 1986:

"Over approximately the last eighteen years . . .

"[Hyles] purchased her a new automobile (usually Buick or Oldsmobile) every other year for about the last eighteen years. . .

" Paid for the insurance on the automobiles . . .

" Paid for the driveway for the Nischik's house . . .

" Paid for the air conditioner for the Nischik's house . . .

" Gave \$5,000 for her daughter Judy's education.

" Gave \$11,000 to build a room onto the Nischik's house . . .

" Paid for a second telephone for the Nischik's house, a 'business' phone in her bedroom"

Writing about Vic's he said:

"And then I observed some things from Vic Nischik's deposition which was taken on March 10, 1986. He said ...

"When their house in Munster was bought in 1968, that you were the one who negotiated the purchase. Vic said that he was never a party to the contract. That was 7 years after they were married, having married in 1961 . . . . "

This deal was certainly a strange one since Vic never paid a dime on it, never even signed the contract, nor did he have any say in selecting the floor plan. That house, by the way, was at 8219 on one street and the Hyles residence was at 8232 on the street behind it. The two houses could be viewed at the time-with lights flashed as signals-although trees have since blocked it.

We are not quoting more from his evaluation because the matters omitted are faced elsewhere in this paper. Since those depositions were made, in the Fall following the divorce, Jennie moved into a brand new beautiful condominium, paid for in cash to the tune of \$150,000. While this may not come under the classification of supporting a mistress, it certainly is an excellent imitation! Hyles explains is as being due to his naturally generous character - a matter we do not deny, although we have a right to reserve our own opinion about why he is so generous.

The Nischiks had a 2,000-square foot house in an affluent section of Munster, unofficially appraised in mid-1981 at \$125,000. After the 1971 fiasco, Mrs. Nischik was *totally* responsible for all expenses pertaining to the residence – house payments, taxes, insurance, utilities, upkeep, weekly cleaning lady, food, clothes, school tuition and everything else involved – all on her small secretarial salary. The daughter said they were never "wanting" and "always had very nice things," adding that she hated most of them because she knew why she had them and where they came from. "Hush money," she called it.

Yet it is important to remember that Vic only paid "rent," set by Hyles, of \$250 a month until the room over the garage was added, then the " rent" went up to \$268.34 to cover the extra expense of the maid cleaning an additional room, Vic, whose take-home pay was two or three times hers, said in a statement he was not permitted to present to the deacons, "Under no circumstances could I have been able to provide for her such a high life style." He also charged at that time, "Jack Hyles insisted that the financial support for Jennie be his responsibility," and noted that "annual vacations were provided for her," as well as "indications that substantial funds were being accumulated for future needs," concluding his marriage was wrecked "by a constant inflow of unaccounted cash."

When we asked Judy Nischik Johnson if she knew anything about Hyles her mother money, she replied, "Yes, I do. Everything that was provided when I was growing up was money that somehow mysteriously appeared to my mother." Without her seeing him put it in her mother's hand, she said she "knew it came from him," adding that she sometimes saw large amounts of cash lying round.

Perhaps a word would be in order about the large sums of unaccounted cash Hyles dispenses – with no records of any kind. By his own statement, he does not deposit his speaking honorariums in the bank, cashing them instead and disbursing them as he chooses – doing the same with gifts from "friends" across the country – and there is no record kept of the monies or of their distribution.

When he was subpoenaed to give a deposition in the Nischik case, he was ordered to "bring all his records. " He brought none. When the attorney asked why, he responded that there were none, that he never keeps any. Hyles says he has given hundreds of thousands of dollars" this way. (Whether the IRS knows of this interesting system of accounting or not, we cannot say.) We are not talking about petty cash, but large sums that have, at least to one individual, totaled tens of thousands of dollars.

Victor Nischik, as indicated earlier, tried his best to work within a biblical framework at the First Baptist Church, rather than telling his story to the outside world. He refused to resign from the deacon board and on two separate occasions, during deacons' meetings at the church, Nischik stood up and tried to tell his brethren what was going on, calling Dr. Hyles, an adulterer and a home wrecker.

The first time, when he attempted to read a 3-page letter, Hyles shouted, "You are trying to destroy Fundamentalism!" and the deacons joined with him in shouting Vic down, denying him the right to present his case. The statement he was not permitted to read said, in part, ". . . my home was tampered with and my marriage deliberately wrecked by Jack Hyles. He stole my wife, her loyalty and affection, and when the divorce hung in balance, unilaterally met with the two attorneys and negotiated the divorce settlement." The latter meeting took place only 8 days after Hyles' deposition was taken under oath, and just 12 days before the case was to be heard in court. *The divorce was finalized two weeks to the day from Hyles' deposition!*

Another deacon came to Vic's defense, but he was shouted down as well; in a letter to Hyles later, that brother noted, "I tried to speak to you about these areas and was put down by you." When still another deacon suggested that the rumors ought to be faced and answered, Hyles angrily responded, "There are rumors about me and any number of women; I can't answer them all. There are even rumors about me and *your* wife!" That silenced him and all the other deacons, too, since

none wanted rumors *started* about their wives. The second time Vic brought it up the only response was stony silence. Since then, "about one third of the Deacon Board has resigned over this issue."

Strangely, one deacon resigned in protest because Vic, now a divorced man, remained on the board – and we are certainly not belittling his convictions – but said not a word about the mess involving the pastor! *Why?* One long-time member suggested it might be an ego problem not just in his case, but with all the others – an unwillingness to confess, "I've been an idiot, duped for the past 20 years, believing this man." That *would* be hard to admit!

Nonetheless, it was about this time that Judy wrote her letter, quoted earlier. The two Nischik children give their dad "unqualified support," freely acknowledge he is the one who has been wronged, disapprove of their mother's actions, and charge that the instigator of the trouble in the Nischik home was Hyles; *they lay the totality of the fault at the minister's feet!* Vic said to me, "I would never have taken on Jack Hyles unless my children had given me their full support."

It should be emphasized that Hyles and Jennie have never been caught in the act, as far as I can discover, like the woman in John 8. He has thoroughly indoctrinated his people with the idea, "If you didn't see it, it didn't happen." Even if they it I walked in a pastor's study and found him and some woman embracing and kissing on the floor, I'd just think he was giving her mouth-to-mouth resuscitation." While that quip always gets a laugh, it is at the same time subtle indoctrination to ignore what is going on. Perhaps it should be remembered, as one brother said to me, "Adultery never has been a spectator sport." There are never many witnesses, if any.

Yet, as the daughter said to me, it really doesn't matter to her whether he ever touched her mother or not, since what he did was wrong and destroyed their home, totally orchestrating the four lives of its members, day by day and minute by minute, right down to the last detail. As a child, her life was filled with fear, thinking that the pastor, for whom she has never had the slightest respect, might "snuff her out" if she caused trouble. The home environment in which the children were raised cannot be described as anything short of incredible. Remember, the only time the parents were in the same room together was an hour on Christmas morning when Vic and the children opened presents in the family room and Jennie sat at the kitchen table drinking coffee.

Every night, while sitting at the table around dinner, Judy recalls listening to her mother on the phone with Hyles, whether he was in town or not. In the early days, she did not answer the phone when her mother was at home. Later, when she did answer and Hyles was on the other end, it was embarrassing for both and he would say something like, "I'm in such-and-such a city and I'm running out of tapes. I need some more." Of course, there would be no way to get tapes to him before he left that city and it was an insult to Judy's intelligence for him to think she didn't know what was going on. Still later, they developed a signal: the phone would ring once and quit, then



Jennie would go upstairs and call him back. Eventually a private line – a "business phone" – was installed in her bedroom and the privacy problem was solved. Hyles paid for all of it, including the monthly bill. That was probably the only "business" telephone in the greater Chicago area with an "unlisted" number!

Since Hyles and Mrs. Nischik lived around the corner from each other, one would follow the other home from church and when the one in the lead turned into his or her drive, there would be a "lights on and off" signal like two teen-agers.

Again we emphasize that good men have tried to face Hyles with these serious problems. Several prominent Fundamentalist ministers have independently written Dr. Hyles about them and asked to meet with him. He does not answer their communication. Dr. Ed Nelson, a prominent Colorado Fundamentalist, told me he wrote him twice and received no response either time. Dr. Walt Handford, a long-time friend of Dr. Hyles, wrote him a very kind and earnest letter asking if they could discuss the problem. He received no answer. Later, in a personal contact, he asked Dr. Hyles if he had received his letter. After Hyles replied in the affirmative, Dr. Handford asked, "When will you let me talk to you about it?" Hyles answered, "Never. I am the husband of one wife, the mother of my children." Sometimes he adds, I have been told, "and she's the only woman I've ever been with." I offered Dr. Hyles an opportunity to include an additional disclaimer in this article, but received no response. No one *has been able* to do anything.

In fact, his standard answer is that his policy is not to answer critics or respond to rumors. That is not entirely true. For example, the last two years he sent out mailings prior to Pastors' School in an attempt to shoot down rumors (or, some think, boost attendance). Earlier this year he mailed a release for the '89 school that started:

"Dear Friend of Pastors' School:

**"THE RUMORS ARE NOT TRUE!!!!!!"**

"It has been called to my attention that rumors have been circulated around the country that I am resigning the First Baptist Church, and that there will be no Pastors' School this year, Another rumor has it that I am terminally ill.

**"NONE OF THE RUMORS THAT YOU HAVE HEARD IS TRUE, THEY'RE ABSOLUTELY FALSE. I PLAN TO BE AT FIRST BAPTIST CHURCH FOR THE REST OF MY LIFE. THE CHURCH HAS NEVER BEEN IN BETTER SHAPE. WE HAVE NEVER HAD A BETTER SPIRIT, AND, YES, WE WILL HAVE PASTORS' SCHOOL THIS YEAR."**

So Jack Hyles *does* answer rumors – and the seven exclamation points (count 'em) are exactly as

he had them in his letter. It is just reports – coming from sundry and divers sources – about his relationship to Jennie Nischik that he will not answer. (In our judgment, it is false to say "the church has never been in better shape," also!) Since the rumors started circulating around First Baptist, one long-time member estimates that "perhaps forty percent of his teaching and preaching has been in defense of himself, seeking to squelch the scandal."

## **THE MESS PERMEATES ALL OF FIRST BAPTIST CHURCH & HYLES-ANDERSON COLLEGE!**

Since, as Dr. Lee Roberson has so aptly insisted, "Everything rises and falls on leadership," let's start at the top with Dr. Hyles and work down from there. According to some in the church and school, the idea, "who can stretch forth his hand against the Lord's anointed, and be guiltless?" (I Samuel 26:9), has been hammered home so hard and so repeatedly that the church deacon board and school administration have been paralyzed. As we already noted, however, this verse was never intended to help *anyone* escape the consequences of his sin.

Before we start, perhaps we should say again that we are not charging Jack Hyles with adultery at this time. We are charging him, however, with very poor and unwise actions that have devastated the lives of many, many people whom he has tried to control. As the young woman we quoted earlier expressed it: *so what if nothing ever happened between him and her mother – if he never laid a hand on her – does that make right everything else that went on?* She added, "I'll probably never know until I get to Heaven whether he did anything or not, but I don't care whether he did or didn't." She observed that if he had gone out and slept with a prostitute, but other people's lives hadn't been devastated, it would have been sin, but not as bad as what he has done in turning family members against each other, friends against friends, and all the rest.

Let's take a look at some of the things in this sordid story that distress us.

1. Hyles adopted what could be considered a Mormon philosophy of celestial marriage to justify his relationship with Jennie Nischik. When, under oath, Vic was asked the nature of his evidence about the "improper relationship" between Hyles and his wife, he responded, "I produced some intimate letters. " Under oath, he described the contents of those letters from Hyles to his wife as: "Expressions of love, expressions of affection, expressions of gratitude for having lunches together, expressions of meeting different places and whatever, and expressions of loyalty and love forever." (This is what was put "in writing" that the daughter, Judy, referred to in her letter to Hyles, paragraph 2, quoted at the beginning of this article.)

Explaining it later to me, Vic said the letters described what the two had as a heavenly marriage. One thing is sure, as another family member explained to me, Jennie's loyalty to Jack Hyles was supreme, coming before loyalty to husband, daughter or son.

2. In 1971, when Jennie first demanded that Vic leave, Hyles came to him and asked if once a divorce had been granted, he had permission to marry her. Obviously, there were no witnesses to this conversation and its truthfulness or falseness should be evaluated in the light of everything else this article reveals.

3. Bizarre as it seems' in 1985, when Vic demanded that he give him his wife back, Hyles told Vic that he could have Beverly (Mrs. Hyles), with the same relationship Hyles enjoyed with Jennie. The offer was declined, of course. Once again, this was a private conversation with no witnesses. Mrs. Hyles did leave her husband at one time, but she, too, came back "for the good of the ministry." At any rate, you may also evaluate this charge in the light of everything else.

Regarding these private conversations with no witnesses, one lady who was long a leader in the Sunday school and held other important positions in the church, told me of being in his office when he revealed some "inside information," then warned her about ever revealing what he had said. Peering at her over the coffee table, he threatened, "If you say I said this, I will deny it – and it will be your word against mine." Others have told me the same.

Doesn't Hyles love his wife? A man who taught in Hyles-Anderson College for 15 years and had a member of First Baptist even testify that after sitting through countless services he had only Hyles mention his wife approximately 10 times – all, in his recollection within the last 2 years when pressure of the problem seemed to dictate it – and even then never in reference to affection, only such matters as, "I helped Mrs. Hyles dress the children when they were little," "Mrs. Hyles is selling her book after the service in the lobby," and things of that nature.

He said, "There is no doubt about it that for years a person could join First Baptist Church on Sunday morning, sit in every service *for a solid year* hearing his every announcement, Sunday school lesson, Sunday morning and evening messages, and not know he had a wife." He also said that during the 16 years he had been a member, he had seen Jack and Beverly together 3 times: when the chairman of the deacon board asked both to come to the pulpit area to receive a gift from the church, at a wedding rehearsal dinner for one of their daughters, and once when he went to the Hyles home with a gift for Mrs. Hyles' mother.

One man, long on the faculty the college and who knew them well – on a first name basis – told me, "In all the years I was there I never once saw Jack and Beverly together. I never once heard them say a word to each other. That not the way it was in the early days when I first knew them." The Hyles marital difficulty probably goes back at least to 1967. One of his associates went to Hyles over 20 years ago, at Mrs. Hyles request, to ask him to stop the affair. His reward for interfering was to be verbally brutalized by Hyles and, soon after, he was forced to leave.

As distasteful as it is to mention, perhaps we should refer to what one First Baptist deacon called "common knowledge" around the church, namely, that Jack and Beverly have separate bedrooms, the latter confiding to one of her best friends in Hammond, who told me herself, that Jack had not "touched" her in over 20 years. Others have told me the same. This woman, by the way, quoted Beverly, "Jennie Nischik is the one woman in my husband's life." Mrs. Hyles did not get to attend Dr. John R. Rice's funeral because her husband would not permit her to travel with him to Tennessee. When some of her friends offered to take her with them, she declined, saying she would not know how to explain it to the Rice sisters.

As far back as 1971, Hyles took four women, including Jennie, on an all-expense trip to Hawaii. He went alone with these women, the only male in the group, stayed at the same hotel with them, *but his own wife did not accompany the party!*

We suggest to Dr. Hyles that he go back and read chapter 11 of his book, *Let's Build an Evangelistic Church*, published in 1962, titled, "Let's Include the Family. It could revolutionize his marital situation – if he would take his own advice, written before Jennie Nischik came into his life, and when his home was apparently what God intended it to be.

**4.** Judy Nischik Johnson described her former pastor as a thief. She charged him with robbing her of a normal childhood, never knowing what it was like to have family discussions around a dinner table, never going as a family on a picnic or to the zoo, never visiting as a family with friends or relatives, never having family worship with a father and mother, never even able to go to church together as a family unit, and never able to invite friends into her home because of shame over what was going on.

She said Hyles also robbed her of feelings of self-worth ("He literally robbed me of my self-worth for 20 years! I thought I was a bad person because of this"), strength ("I wonder now how I even lived"), and even hope for the future since she believed a normal marriage and home life with husband and children was unattainable in her circumstance. The latter was the result of a sermon she heard Dave Hyles preach at camp about kings' sons being like the king – and children like their parents. She was filled with horror, thinking it was predetermined that she must have a home like that of her parents.

**5.** While we are not breaking any new ground with Hyles' only son, we add the story again now because it fits the total picture and helps explain the overall problem. David (whom his father called "the most brilliant, spiritual man he ever met"; but the feelings were obviously mutual since Dave told a friend of mine, "My dad made Dr. [John R.] Rice"), although married at the time, was involved with numerous girls and women in Hammond. A student who served as a security guard said the women were coming and going from Dave's office in the Youth Center in a steady stream. Often Mrs. Hyles would call and ask him, "What woman does my husband have

in his office now?" In fact, the matter so disturbed him that he decided "what's the use" and dropped out of school. Fortunately, he later finished his training and is now serving the Lord as a pastor.

On occasion, Dave used a friend's apartment for his "counseling sessions" with the ladies. One of the saddest cases involved a college administrator's daughter while she was still in high school. It seems clear to me that he took advantage of a teen's innocence and seduced her, which makes this "conquest" even more nefarious than some of the others. In a telephone conversation with this writer, the father said he completely repudiated the entire story as "totally erroneous," "an absolute I lie," and we assured him we would print his disclaimer to that effect. However, the abundant evidence we have in hand of its truthfulness is, in our judgment, unimpeachable.

One minister who gave me this information was formerly associated with Hyles in Hammond, but left when one of the leaders – one of the more prominent men associated with Hyles over the years – came to him privately as a friend and said that if he, like this man, had teen-age daughters, he would not want them in such an environment. On reflection, he decided he didn't either, took the brother's warning, and left. It makes you wonder about the full-page college ads Hyles runs in the *Sword of the Lord*, "**WE PROTECT YOUR DAUGHTERS,**" doesn't it?

While this is what got Dave away from Hammond, the problem had been going on for a long, long time. One minister, who both went to school and worked with Dave, said it was common knowledge at the church that he had moral problems. People quit the church over it. Pastor Hyles refused to even discuss it. Parents went to him with letters Dave had written their daughters containing obscene and immoral content. He would reach for the letters and say, "I'll take care of it," but the only thing taken care of was the evidence, which the parents no longer had in their possession.

After these shenanigans in Hammond, Hyles let his former church – Miller Road Baptist Church in Garland – call Dave without the slightest warning to the leadership in Texas of any problem. When the deacons called Dr. Hyles and asked what he thought about their calling his son, he only said, "Well, Dave is his own man."

In a short time Dave became involved with a number of women at Miller Road and the whole thing blew sky high. Young Hyles had foolishly put a large number of pictures of women and himself, sans clothing – some members, some not – in a suitcase, then put the valise in the dumpster behind the church. It was a nice looking fairly new suitcase and the janitor's son spotted it while he was playing around the trash. He helped himself, as kids are prone to do, but, since it was locked, he took it to his father, who managed to get it open.

*What a shock!* The janitor, in turn, took the pictures to a couple of the deacons, who met privately

with Dave before taking it to anyone else. The chairman of the board called a meeting to discuss it with all the deacons and eventually the board unanimously asked for Hyles' resignation. There was not even one dissenting vote.

Hyles then abandoned his wife and children, going to Illinois with another man's wife – one of the women he had been involved with – living together without the benefit of clergy. A child was conceived and eventually the couple married. At one time, with reference to Miller Road, Dave had made arrangements to come back to the church and apologize, confessing all of his sin, but on the scheduled night, just a few minutes before he was to leave for the church, he received a call telling him not to confess.

*He didn't.*

In the meantime, while still a Miller Road, Dave and another youth minister started a magazine for teens. We do not think more than an issue or so had been distributed before the story of the adulterous relations ships blew up and numerous Christians around the country were out the money they had invested. No did any who had subscribed receive refunds. In addition, the Miller Road Baptist Church was threatened with a lawsuit by the printer who had been doing the work. Although the church was not tied into the magazine in any way – it had not authorized it or assumed any kind of responsibility – for the testimony of Christ, Miller Road Baptist paid the printer's bill of well over \$10,000. Dave, in the meantime, had taken a good job with an insurance sales organization headquartered in Atlanta, boasting to friends that he was making as much as \$17,000 a month, well over \$100,000 a year, and he assured some of the men in the church he would repay the money.

*To date, he hasn't paid back a dime!*

As one close to the Hyles family explained to me, "David Hyles had an incredible teacher. Dave is the way he is because his dad is the way he is, although their problems may not be exactly parallel. After seeing your father get away with things for so many years, why wouldn't you be convinced that you could go out and do the same, or worse, and get away with it?"

We are not sure whether Hyles' book, *How To Rear Children*, is still being published.

6. Hyles' second daughter, Becky, is married to Tim Smith, one of the famous Smith brothers, friends of Dave Hyles and products of the First Baptist ministry from their youth up – Terry, Tim and Tom – a trio often used in the past to illustrate the tremendous work First Baptist is doing. When Tim, whom Dr. Hyles always called "the tow-headed fool," was with the Sheridan Road Baptist Church & School at Saginaw, Michigan, he "conducted an extended relationship with a seventeen-year-old student, whom he took to Florida for several months, leaving his wife and

children behind and devastating the church," according to a major exposé cover story article ("A Jim and Tammy Tale in Dallas; Power, sex, greed – and a wealthy Baptist church ripped apart") in *D Magazine* of Dallas, dealing with the large Canyon Creek Baptist Church in suburban Richardson where all three brothers are located (Terry is pastor; Tim is School Administrator; Tom, apparently, merely a member). In addition to claiming Terry had made sexual advances or had affairs with "seven other women," whose names members of the church uncovered, the magazine implied numerous financial shenanigans by both Terry and Tim.

Since then, David Frost, on NBC-TV's new "Inside Edition" – in fact, the premier program – featured Kristina Becker and her allegation that Terry Smith had emotionally and sexually abused her when she turned to him for counseling. She and her husband, Gregory, are now suing Smith and the church for "sexual assaults by deception and fraud," seeking damages in six figures. The Smiths deny all the allegations. One man, who was a deacon at the time of the "explosion," told me if he hadn't been involved in the work of the Lord for 35 years, such a revelation "would have put me under."

At this writing, in addition to Mrs. Becker, at least four women have given depositions in the case and the trial is tentatively scheduled for April 3, too late for us to report the outcome in this article.

We think the situations involving lack and David Hyles have lowered standards at the church and college to such an extent that normal qualifications for workers and leaders held by other Fundamentalists no longer exist in Hammond. We will list some cases as examples, strictly among the leadership, for the purpose of showing a pattern.

**7.** Marriage is treated so lightly in Hammond that some think divorce is the rule rather than the exception. Karen Plopper, on the church staff, divorced her husband. When the latter, Ray, sought pastoral help to save the marriage, Hyles refused to intervene. Roy Moffitt is one of the associate pastors and his wife, JoJo, is a women's conference speaker. Their daughter divorced her husband after only a few weeks of marriage – a matter for which we would not normally fault the parents – but she did so while blaming her father for pushing her into a marriage she did not want. (Roy was recently given an honorary degree from Hyles-Anderson College and JoJo, was one of the featured speakers at the "Digging for Gold 14th Annual Christian Womanhood Spectacular" at First Baptist last October.) Mrs. Earlyne Stephens, the college bursar and Jack Hyles' sister, is divorced. So is her daughter, Mrs. Margaret Oats.

**8.** Mrs. Fay Dodson heads the highly touted Phoster Clubs at the church and college, credited also with starting 900 similar clubs throughout the country. She divorced her first husband and shortly thereafter was given the job of starting and directing the Phoster Clubs. Her second husband was Louis Dodson. At last Fall's Women's Spectacular at the church, Mrs. Dodson was honored at a

special tea reception and cited as being the greatest miracle in First Baptist. According to an alumnus with two degrees from Hyles-Anderson, she "owes thousands of dollars to a businessman I know personally, and counseled another friend of mine's wife to divorce him."

9. Dr. Dennis Streeter is the college physician. His wife, Jean, is a part-time faculty member who was asked to establish the Marriage & Christian Womanhood curriculum at Hyles-Anderson College and head up that department. He got a nurse associated with his medical practice pregnant and the Streeters are now divorcing; we consider Jean an innocent victim. He still retains his position with the college. Strangely, back in 1987, Dr. Cal Streeter, Dennis' brother, wrote Nischik a very pious letter, quoting Scripture and preaching to him about his attitude and actions relating to Jack Hyles.

At any rate, we think the First Baptist deacon was right when he said divorce at the church and schools have reached "epidemic proportions." There are numerous other cases we could describe, but time and space prohibit it.

10. The head of one of the church's ministries was caught by a pastor in Michigan, where he was holding meetings, with a woman in his motel room. This man had an affair with a student's wife, and that home broke up. Hyles knew this, but still helped the guilty get out of town and into a pastorate. The more we learn, the less we think of that slogan, less we think of that slogan, "**WE PROTECT YOUR DAUGHTERS!**"

11. Sex problems, as noted above in Dave's cases, are treated lightly ' One teacher discovered that a student was a homosexual, reported it to the school authorities, was told "we'll take care of it," but nothing was done and the homosexual is now a graduate of Hyles-Anderson. (That teacher, no longer at the college. related the incident in his classroom, to the shock of all the class.)

Some years back, two deacons discovered a secret room in the basement of the Rescue Mission – mirrors on walls and ceiling – that served as a place for homosexual encounters; Hyles was told, but did nothing. He was also told several times that his mission director, now deceased, was a womanizer and viewer of X-rated videos, especially ones dealing with incest. He refused to do anything about it, no doubt because "if he didn't see it, it didn't happen." The same man was also overheard numerous times using profanity while dealing with converts at the altar of the church during invitations; Hyles refused to intervene. A high school faculty member was caught by another faculty member having sex with a teen-ager on school property; Hyles was informed, but refused to deal with it. We are aware of two other college faculty members guilty of adultery.

12. Hyles "married with much pomp and circumstance" a young Korean Hyles-Anderson coed, Yuck (also called Yuoak, Yulee, and various other names") Chong, to Dr. John Stancil, circulation manager of *The Sword of the Lord* and a frequent Sword Conference speaker, less



than 5 months after the latter's divorce from his wife Brenda was finalized on April 6, 1988! As someone said to me, "That was a mighty short time for a man to court, fall in love, become engaged, and marry another woman." Actually, much of the romance was carried on while Stancil was still married to his first wife. Brenda said she later learned that "he had been seeing Miss Chong in Indiana for quite a while before his divorce became final and that he had spent Christmas of 1987 with her and her family after telling our children he would be home alone. She was in Murfreesboro on at least four occasions . . . ." All this was while the Stancils were still married.

One of those visits calls attention to an even more unfortunate and unsavory matter. Since college regulations called for Miss Chong to stay with someone else while at Murfreesboro, arrangements were made for her to visit in the home of Mrs. Doris Roberts, a *Sword* employee of long standing and Stancil's secretary, business manager and close confidant. Conveniently, the latter was given a plane ticket to visit her son in Florida at that time, leaving Miss Chong without proper chaperone.

A lady who went to the house to meet her and get acquainted relates, "When I got to the door, I found she and John there alone making love on the sofa." (She defined "making love" as "lying fully prostrate, clothing in disarray, with movement, stroking, kissing, and bodies touching"; she said she could not "say for certain if sexual intercourse was occurring or had occurred," a matter that seems immaterial when considering the fact Stancil was still married to another woman.) The lady watched for awhile, then left and went to a friend's house nearby and asked her to return as a witness, finding "the two were still on the sofa." The lady placed her business card on the window of Stancil's Mercedes-Benz and left.

Stancil's position with *The Sword* did not change throughout all of this and his pulpit ministry is still being promoted in its pages!

**13.** One of the men on the staff at the college spoke in the high school chapel earlier this year, supposedly warning young men about how girls entice boys, but he used such suggestive, obscene language in describing what the girls did that one of the lady faculty members raised a ruckus. No one else seemed to object.

**14.** Regarding the slogan "We Protect Your Daughters," when my editorial appeared last October a brother called to ask if it were about Hyles. After answering in the affirmative, he said that he had been so distressed about things in Hammond that he called his students at Hyles-Anderson home (he had as many as 7 at one time). The straw that broke the camel's back was when the bus came to pick up the girls at the dorm and take them to the services. The bus driver, a college staff member, stood on the steps as the girls boarded, forcing them to squeeze by. The daughter of this preacher, who later called to tell me her story personally, said that when she got on he put his

hand on her derriere and rubbed her. It startled and frightened her, she commenced crying, and went to the back of the bus to sit down.

Later, when her roommate asked the problem, the latter told her she must report it. When she said she'd rather just forget it, the roommate insisted, saying the same man had been making passes at a friend of hers who worked on scholarship in his department. This girl had reported him and he, in turn, said the problem was that she wasn't doing her work and he had been forced to reprimand her. It resulted in the girl, on a work scholarship for 3 years, being transferred and told she had "a bad attitude."

At the insistence of her friend and a friendly faculty member, the girl who talked to me eventually went to the school president with her story. What happened? She was told the staff member would not be permitted to be on the girls' buses again – and that's all that was done. *A month or so later he was back on the bus!* There had been some other problems which went begging for solutions – for example, one of the girls in the room was stealing from the others and when the pastor's daughter reported it, she was told she ought to "share" things; eventually the thief was just switched to another room – so the pastor finally decided he wanted "better protection" for his daughter, called all his students home, and started his own Bible institute.

**15.** One person who was on the college staff for well over a decade wrote me about Hyles: "He has a fun and games meeting once a month with the college girls in the chapel. He showers thousands of dollars on these girls every month. The girls swoon over him like the young people do for movie celebrities as they crowd all around him on the pulpit throughout the entire meeting." The same person sent me a copy of a song he taught them to sing at these sessions – I already had it since he "sang" it on his "Eternal Humanity of Jesus" tape – which goes like this:

*"Look at all that hair, Look at all that hair,  
'Tis the answer to a college woman's prayer;  
It's no joke that I'm provoked,  
'Cause I'm not allowed to stroke  
Those bushy locks of  
Boopsie-Woopsie's hair.*

*"Blessed locks, precious locks,  
On those dear old hair-sprayed  
threads I love to look;  
As I sit in chapel chair  
And adore his gorgeous hair,  
I can hardly keep my mind upon the Book. "*

"Boopsie-Woopsie," incredibly, is the coeds' pet name for Hyles. And he taught them to sing this inane ditty, which he says he wrote himself, to the tune of the sweet gospel song, "My Mother's Bible." If that is not sacrilege, it will do until someone can think up some!

He also wrote this one, sung to the tune of another precious gospel song, "Come and Dine":

*"Where's the beef,' the women calleth,  
'Where's the beef?'  
As they gaze at bulging biceps of the chief.  
There they drool with envy green,  
While with jealousy they dream,  
Wishing they could find a guy with equal beef."*

When he appeared on the platform at Pastors' School in the past, his associates, primed in advance no doubt, started chanting "Where's the beef?" Here's a friendly eyewitness account from a preacher who attends annually: "Most all services conducted at pastor's school begin with such foolishness as him flexing his muscles. People shout out "where the beef?" and Hyles takes off his jacket and shows them his arms. For about 10 minutes or so it is plain foolishness. It doesn't offend me, but it doesn't edify me either."

Here is an eyewitness account of what happens when Boopsie-Woopsie gets together with his coeds:

"The meeting with the girls is once a month, usually on a Thursday evening starting around 8 p. m. The girls are in the chapel waiting with all kinds of gifts and letters for him. When he finally arrives, fifty or more girls run up and crowd around him and sit down on the platform. He takes off his jacket and flexes his muscles and poses this way and that while they scream, ooh and aah and carry on. He jokes with them and carries on conversation with those who call out to him. He sits down on the platform with the girls all around him. They joke and he jokes with the girls in the audience. He brings with him a stack of love letters and gifts that the boys give to him for the girls or he picks them up off the pulpit where they have been left by the boys to give to the girls. He opens each note and reads it to the girl after he has her stand up. She then comes up to get her note and gift from her boyfriend via the preacher. Then they all sing choruses, love songs, old songs and songs he writes.

"On occasions he has given out round trip airline tickets to several girls, honeymoons, telephone call to each girl, money to spend at Peddlers Way on campus, tuition for a month or tuition for a semester, a dress or outfit for several girls, or any other need he wanted to fill. He also has given a \$ 10 bill to each lady who walks across the platform and shakes his hand. About 800 ladies creates a whopping bill, along with all the other gifts handed out in one night – plus pizza, pop,

ice cream and candy bars for a 10 p.m. treat in the dining hall that he joins. One of the evenings was figured to be around \$17,000."

One of the financial officers said he knew for a fact that this money sometimes came out of the surplus fund. What a potential for ill is this coed meeting – a loaded powder keg with a short fuse! – although, in this case, we are willing to give him the benefit of the doubt and credit him with trying to keep the coeds from getting homesick. If he has such a service for the boys, we are not aware of it.

**16.** Before we leave the moral issues, we must say how distressed we have been for several years with what we consider must surely be untruthfulness in his preaching. His stories are so colorful, so fantastic, so numerous, so uncharacteristic of normal reality, we could not help but wonder if he did not take smatterings of fact and build them into delightful tales. One thing is sure: Jack Hyles is always the hero in each and every one of them, and the listener cannot help saying to himself, "Boy, what a spiritual giant, a hero of the faith!" As our youngest son, in his review of *The C S. Lewis Hoax*, wrote recently: "**Beware the man who is the hero of all his own stories!**" We think that advice is very fitting with reference to Hyles, too. Later we will mention his attendance, baptism, and other statistics.

Does all of this have an effect on the church and student body? *How could it not?* Here is an illustration. An evangelist associated with the school spoke at a church in Southern Indiana. A short time later the pastor confided to him this sad but true story. His son had been a student at Hyles-Anderson. In his junior year he quit because of the rumors about Hyles and his mistress. The brokenhearted dad said, "Upon coming home, my boy shortly afterward took up with a divorced woman and now has a son by her out of wedlock. Usually, he won't come to church now. My boy was going to be a preacher."

There are other charges we think are true but were taken out of this paper as we prepared to go to press because we couldn't document them. Those who knew the facts were afraid to speak out – or chose to remain silent for personal reasons. Undeniably, however, we have presented sufficient to substantiate our case.

Someone is going to answer to God for these matters, you may be certain!

## DOCTRINAL DEVIATIONS

Dr. John R. Rice used to say "Mark this down: false doctrine leads to false living, *and false living leads to false doctrine.*" When a man goes wrong in one, don't be surprised when he goes astray in the other.

In our October 1, 1988, issue, in my "Off the Cuff!" feature, I wrote an editorial, "One of the Blights of Bigness." I called attention to some heresy a prominent pastor and leading Fundamentalist had been preaching. Although I did not name him then, I was speaking of Hyles.

Most of our readers, knowledgeable of the Fundamentalist movement, correctly surmised the man I had in mind. A number of them wrote or called to give additional information. One brother, who earned two degrees at Hyles-Anderson over an 8-year period, wrote: "It took a great deal of courage to write the article on Dr. Hyles recently, but it needed to be said. I, too, am greatly alarmed by some of the statements coming from him, and have been for years. I am a graduate of Hyles-Anderson, and a long-time reader of your paper. After sitting under his ministry for eight years and obtaining two degrees from the school, I can assure you that you are right on target, and the half has not been told! I heard more 'new' truth there than you or God could ever dream of!" Some who have been in the church for years refer to this new truth as "Hyles-ology!"

Note the following...

**1.** In Hyles' sermon, "Don't Cut the Grass," he taught that all of us have wheat and tares in us, but we should let both grow side-by-side and not cut anything, lest we cut out the wheat (good) in us by mistake. This is a horrible misunderstanding, a completely unscriptural misapplication of that parable.

**2.** On numerous occasions, Hyles has taught that there are two gifts of life in salvation, one is eternal life and the other is everlasting life. The distinction being, he says, is that one is qualitative and the other quantitative. One member wrote me, "This heresy has wrought havoc among the church membership," people concluding they are only half saved.

Here is how he explained it in a sermon, "The Gifts of God Are Everlasting Life & Eternal Life," on April 28, 1985. He started by misquoting Romans 6:23 as "the gifts of God" (plural) instead of "the gift of God" (singular). He said, "When a person receives Christ as his Savior ... God gives him immediately – and he is an immediate possessor of – everlasting life. Though he has a gift of everlasting life, he does not necessarily possess eternal life. For everlasting life is a quantity of life and eternal is a quality of life." That is mere mumbo-jumbo, of course.

He went on, "At that same time of salvation, God makes available to that person who is a recipient of everlasting life, the gift of eternal life. The gift of everlasting life is taken once and for all when you receive Christ as Savior, and the gift of eternal life is made available." "Eternal life is a gift, but it is only made available at the acceptance of everlasting life."

Eternal life, he said, "is a life that must be received every day," adding, "Every time you get out of bed at the sunrise in the morning, God looks at you and says, 'I have another gift for you today.

I have the gift of eternal life. You can accept that gift and live in eternity, or you can refuse that gift and live like the base animals of the world live.'" He said there were hundreds of members of First Baptist Church of Hammond who "have everlasting life, but you are not a possessor this morning of eternal life. You are living like the animals of the field live."

To them, Hyles said, "God comes to everyone this morning who by faith has received the gift of everlasting life and, God says, 'Now, let me give you, while you're on your way to Heaven, let me give you eternal life, full life, rich life, spiritual life.' . . . How I long for our people to have eternal life." He said the problem with Fundamentalism is that "we're preaching the gospel of everlasting life, but not preaching the gospel of eternal life," calling the latter "another life," "something else," "a gift besides everlasting life."

When he got ready to close his message, he said, "[God] comes this morning to you who have never received Him, 'Believe on Me as your Savior and take my gift of everlasting life.' He comes to those of you this morning who have done that already and says, 'Now, receive My free gift of eternal life'." Such a distinction between everlasting life and eternal life is totally unwarranted from the Word of God, of course. It is pure fantasy.

**3.** Hyles goes once a week to the mausoleum where his mother's remains are interred and prays to her. In his prayer meeting talk on December 3, 1987, he noted that his mother is not dead, just moved beyond his senses. "Hence, I go to the cemetery and visit with her and speak to her. She can hear me, but I cannot hear her." (Why go to the cemetery? His mother is not there; she is in Heaven. According to this philosophy, she could hear him if he talked to her from a bar.) Let the Catholics pray to Mary, Hyles prays to his mother. As one of his members wrote, complaining about "the deification and adoration" of Mother Hyles: "We have heard on many occasions how God used her to bring the latest savior into the world. His attachment to his late mother borders on the bizarre. We in Hammond have our own Holy Mother of Hyles."

On the Saturday before the "big" Sunday (November 22, 1986), according to what he told his congregation, Hyles went to the mausoleum and pleaded with his mother to pull for him to reach the goal he had set (have more people in Sunday school than the population of Hammond). Hyles later claimed victory: 139,000 in Sunday school and 29,000 conversions! Both figures, I have been assured, were highly padded. (One of his workers, in a case with which I am familiar, quit over the lies and exaggerations dealing with attendance and conversions.)

As one deacon at First Baptist put it, "attendance and conversion statistics have been padded for years." Another deacon's wife assured me the same and explained how she knew. Although we had forgotten all about it until we were working on this article, there is indication he falsified, intentionally or unintentionally, the figures at Miller Road too. Since it was being advertised that he had "baptized over 700" his last year or two there, at my request the pastor who succeeded him

had his secretary run a tape check on the baptisms. The figures for the last three years were 296 (1956-57), 324 (1957-58), 275 (1958-59). Baptisms for the church's out-of-town missions were, in the same order, 195, 147 and 32. Even with these added, the figures were only 491, 471 and 307, showing a steady decline. Please do not misunderstand: *307 baptisms his last year in Garland was great!* But it is not even half of "over 700."

Getting back to praying to the dead, Hyles has pictures in his study of John R. Rice, Lester Roloff, his mother, and Lee Roberson. Before he leaves town on a speaking engagement, he says he follows this ritual: he stops before the pictures of Rice and Roloff, promising them he will do his best; then he stops before the picture of his mother and asks her to intercede for him to do a good job while he is preaching.

4. Not only does Hyles pray to the dead, he apparently prays for the dead. In a sermon on February 7, 1988, "Full Reward," he said one of the reasons he was so driven in his ministry was that he hoped his efforts would lessen his father's suffering in Hell. He told about his father first cursing him when he told him he had been called to preach, then telling him to go out and build the biggest church in the world. Later, he said, on the day Elmer Towns presented him with a plaque for pastoring the church with the world's largest Sunday school, he went to his office, got on his face, and cried, "Daddy, I did what you said the best I could." Then he said, "I'd like to think maybe that one little statement he gave me gave me some motivation and I'd like to think that maybe my life will help a little bit his eternity."

That is full-blown Roman Catholicism, on two counts. First, in the matter of praying to the dead; and, second, thinking something he could do would ease his lost father's suffering in Hell.

5. He totally reversed his posture on Bible translations and now endorses the Peter Ruckman position. An alumnus of Hyles-Anderson wrote me: "I believe that the death of Dr. Rice was a downhill step in Dr. Hyles' life. In 1979 I heard him take our position on the KJV, the historic position, and vowed to expel students who advocated Ruckman's position. Shortly after Dr. Rice's death he jumped on the Ruckman bandwagon, and now acts as if he believed it all along. I was there! I heard the message, and it disturbs me that he changed. One friend of mine was nearly expelled because of asking several about the change. [Hyles] now plies the 'new posture' consistently. "

We were interested that an excerpt of his sermon printed in the *Evangelical Methodist* quoted him, "I don't like the Statement of Faith that says we believe the Bible is the Word of God in the original manuscripts." The Sword of the Lord Foundation statement of faith, which Hyles is required to sign every year, says he believes "in the verbal inspiration of the Sacred Scriptures and their absolute reliability and authority, without error, **in the original manuscripts.**" And, in so signing, he "solemnly affirms" that he believes so "from my heart, without mental reservations

or evasion." He also annually promises to resign that post when he can no longer so sign the statement.

A note of humor here: on the opening Sunday night of Pastors' School a few weeks ago, Hyles called John Stancil to the platform and told the people he wanted everyone to subscribe to *The Sword*. Ushers were ready with hundreds of sample copies – and it turned out the issue was for March 17, 1989, containing a prominent front-page article written by Gary R. Hudson, "Ruckman's Unscriptural Claims for the K.J.V." We got a chuckle!

**6.** In light of the previous item, not only does Hyles now say the KJV is the only "inspired translation," he claims that if your personal worker used any other English translation you are not saved: the genes we flawed.

**7.** For those who missed my October 1, 1988, editorial, Hyles teaches that one should store up merits (works) to offset times of demerits (sins). If you have enough in reserve God will forgive your sin and put you back in business. It is "second cousin" teaching to the old Roman Catholic doctrine of indulgences, a tenet totally repudiated by the Word of God. For example, Ezekiel 33:12,13, say, "The righteousness of the righteous shall not deliver him the day of his transgression. . . neither shall the righteous be able to live for his righteousness in the day that he sinneth. When I shall say to the righteous, that he shall surely live; if he trust to his own righteousness, and commit iniquity, all his righteousnesses shall not be remembered; but for his iniquity that he hath committed, he shall die for it." Note especially for the one who falls: "**all his righteousnesses shall not be remembered!**" There certainly is no building up merits for use against demerits here, is there?

**8.** As noted in the same editorial, his message on the eternal humanity of Christ was blasphemy and heresy. It had been preached on February 16, 1986, and we frankly hoped was some idea that hit him on the spur of the moment. No, it is some thing he has preached again and again over several years and we have since heard it on a number of his tapes. On March 13, 1988, he was high lighting it in his Sunday evening sermon, "Human Nature Is Not Really Human Nature," saying again that "Jesus did not become human in Bethlehem." He told his people that God had decided to "make some 'more' human beings," a "whole race of little Jesuses," so He created Adam and Eve.

According to Hyles, God made man body, soul and spirit, but when man fell, he lost his spirit and became only body and soul – on the same level as an animal. He said that when man fails he is no longer human, but becomes an animal, arguing, "Man in his unregenerate state is not human." He called to the "animals" in his congregation to illustrate his point, saying to the dogs ("Come on, puppy dog"), the cats ("Come on, Kitty, Kitty, Kitty, Come on" and the hogs ("Souee, Souee, Souee"). "It is not human to sin," he said, "it is human not to sin."



One of the most truthful thing in the sermon was when, after he said, "Man fell, and failed, and was no longer human," he declared, "You don't need the Bible to believe this." No, you don't; that is something strictly *extra*-biblical! In fact, it is *anti*-biblical since Numbers 16:22 and 27:16 clearly say that all flesh have spirits ("the spirits of all flesh." Dogs, cats and hogs may not have a spirit, but all humans do. Putting man on the animal level is what evolutionists do, not Bible-believing Fundamentalists.

"All of redemption," Hyles said, "was to make man human again." And he concluded, "You either walk in the Spirit or you are not human." It is interesting that several times he said he was not denying Jesus' deity or trying to pull Him down, but "I am trying to elevate humanity to deity." That was what Adam Eve tried to do when they listened to Satan's lie, "ye shall be as gods," and partook of the forbidden fruit.

As early as December 26, 1982 he was preaching this idea that Son of God was *always* human. In fact, at that time he declared, "I not preaching heresy. I am preaching the truth that Fundamentalists h believed through these years." I challenge Dr. Hyles to name one Fundamentalist who *ever* preached the eternal humanity of Christ!

To prove his point, he uses verses like Hebrews 13:8, John 1:2, other passages saying Jesus is the "same" – past, present and future. But these statements do not prove He was human in eternity past any more than they prove that He had a physical body of flesh and blood in eternity past.

One of the problems with saying Jesus was always human lies in clear description of Adam as the *first* man (I Corinthians 15:45-47) and Jesus as the *second* man. And it might be wise to note that the word "human" is not a KJV word; the English dictionary equates it with the word man. As a theological word, in his *Concise Dictionary of Christian Theology*, Millard J. Erickson notes that "human nature is made up of both material and immaterial components." Christ had no material components in eternity past, of course, so had no human nature.

**9.** Hyles says sin does not need to be repented, only forgotten; we don't even have a right to remember our sins. He used Hebrews 10:17 as his proof text. My concerned friend said, "I am afraid to repeat what Hyles called God in this context. 'Suffice it to say that he used the word senile'."

**10.** A former faculty member made a thorough study on subliminal, sexual messages in Hyles' preaching. One discovery related to the street language of prostitutes used in many of his sermons. Some of the students now make a game of trying to find these subliminal messages in his sermons. One female faculty member got up and walked out of a chapel service in disgust when Hyles was graphically going through every part of a woman's anatomy, it was so base.

**11.** In his sermon, "The Good Man Versus the Spiritual Man," preached on Sunday night, December 20, 1987, he said David was a spiritual man even when he committed the sin of adultery with Bathsheba and followed with the murder of Uriah. He went onto say that the difference between someone who has committed adultery and one who has not is that the latter has the sin of adultery "in remission."

**12.** Regarding the New Year's Eve Watch Night service on December n 31, 1987, Hyles told his people in it advance that the meeting would be sacrilegious, warning them not to come if they wanted a spiritual time.

**13.** Hyles says that adultery is not a sin, just a "mistake." One of the evangelists who counts First Baptist as his home church called me all upset following that remark, wondering if it was laying the groundwork for his son Dave to rejoin the ministry there. Whatever it was or wasn't, the idea is inane.

**14.** Hyles preached on Sunday night, January 17, 1988, saying no sin disqualifies a man from preaching. He said, "You are qualified to preach no matter what you did. If one confesses and forsakes his sin, he is free to preach or evangelize. He has a right to preach!" His text was Psalm 130:3, "If thou, LORD, shouldest mark iniquity, O Lord, who shall stand?" But that Scripture has to do with an individual's standing before God, not his qualifications for service.

**15.** In a Wednesday night sermon on the text in II Corinthians 12:13-15, Hyles made the strange statement, "All men are mental homosexuals." We do not know what he meant, but if he meant what it sounds like, he is totally mistaken. Perhaps he is a "mental homosexual," but we aren't.

**16.** In a sermon early in 1988, Hyles told of a teen-age girl in the church who birthed a baby out of wedlock and he expressed his hope she would one day be a Sunday school teacher there. Anticipating the objection, he said, "What, Brother Hyles, use a fallen woman to teach Sunday school?" And he responded, "Isn't that all we have here?" An evangelist in the congregation said he wanted to jump up and cry, "No, preacher, my wife is not a fallen woman. My dear wife was a virgin when she married me. In these wonderful 25 years of happy marriage, [she] has been nothing but a virtuous woman. I believe she is perfectly described in Proverbs 31. And there are hundreds and hundreds of other ladies in our church who are just as pure."

Perhaps this would be a good place to mention a deacon who left First Baptist after being active for years. When a friend of ours asked him why, his exact words were: "Hyles is against the family." Another longtime member noted that in all the years he had been an active member and worker, the pulpit had been strangely silent about marriage, the permanence of the wedding vows, the home, the family, and divorce. The only exception was once, about 1978, when he

invited parents to attend a 2-hour session at the church on how to rear teen-agers. Hyles has said repeatedly that he has a list of about 20 topics he preaches about; the sanctity of the home is apparently not on the list. If the charges in this paper are true – and we wouldn't be publishing them if we were not convinced they are – we understand why his tongue is bridled in this regard. Ours would be, too!

The truth of the matter is that there are no standards in this area at First Baptist or at Hyles-Anderson. One former faculty member, who holds to biblical convictions, said there were a number of students who had divorced their wives – or had been divorced by them because of what they had done – who came to Hyles-Anderson and, after being there awhile, went to Dr. Hyles and asked if they could remarry. He always said yes. And the brother sadly noted, "Many of those who remarried have since divorced the wives they married there. "

**17.** Among the letters we received after our "Blight of Bigness" editorial was this one, which we will quote only in part: "After reading the October I issue, I started to write to you, but I was too upset. 'One of the blights of bigness' struck very close to home. Although you did not mention any names, I feel I know who you were talking about – Jack Hyles. My husband and I were on the staff of the college and schools for 11 years. About 4 years ago we began to suspect that error was being preached . . . . I will not go into detail, but we are extremely thankful to be out of that place . . . . There are so many problems in Hammond. We pray almost daily for the people there. Many of our 'friends' will have little to do with us since we left. We don't feel sorry for ourselves, but for them and how they have been brainwashed. My husband and I are still healing from the spiritual and emotional wounds. That is why we are so thankful for your paper. We are rethinking so much of what we were 'taught' while in Indiana . . . . Thank you for taking your stand in love.

**18.** On Sunday night, February 7, 1988 Hyles preached on "How to Decide What to Do?" from II Chronicles 10:1-12. He repeated the order for seeking the will of God several times: first, the Bible (he only spent a few moments on that, saying it was only one-fiftieth of his notes!); second, Jack Hyles (actually, he said older, more experienced people, but those listening got the message because of the repeated references to himself); third, the Holy Spirit. While it is incredible that he would put himself ahead of the Holy Spirit, nevertheless, only after checking the Bible and checking with the pastor could his people have "freedom of choice" and be at liberty to ask the Holy Spirit for direction. He especially emphasized that the pastor should have "veto" power and that young people should come to him for advice about marriage partners.

We hardly think telling young people the will of God in marriage is his strong suit! We know of one young man, recommended to the college by his pastor, who was advised by Hyles to marry the daughter of a very prominent family in the church. His parents opposed it (they even refused to attend the wedding), his pastor opposed it, but the young man went ahead anyway because Hyles had assured him it was the will of God. In 6 months they were divorced (she took

everything he had, a real tragedy, even his car) and the young man turned his back on the things of the Lord, although, we understand, he later repented of his folly and is now in fellowship with Christ again. Incidentally, where was Hyles' consistency here? Why did he perform the ceremony for this young man when both his parents and his pastor had "vetoed" it?

Perhaps this is a good place to note the exalted opinion Hyles has of himself and of his ministry. Again and again he brags that if he fails, Fundamentalism will fail. We noted earlier how he told Vic Nischik, when he brought up Hyles' affair with his wife during a deacons' meeting, that he was trying to bring down Fundamentalism.

A typical claim about his importance can be seen in his sermon, "Led by the Holy Spirit to be Tempted of the Devil. "After telling how his military training was *"hell, I mean that, all but the fire,"* he asked the people why God made him endure such torture. The answer: "God knew back yonder years ago that Dr. Jack Hyles was going to pastor this church and God knew that probably 10,000 preachers across this nation would call me their pastor, and God knew that somebody needed to grab the old steering wheel of Fundamentalism – at least to help to do it – to try to steer it so it won't get back in some of this little penny-ante, second-rate, new evangelicalism where the Bible is not real, and a Hell hasn't fire, and a Heaven that has no golden streets, and sin is not black. **God knew that somebody in this age would have to grab the steering wheel and hold it firm while others are turning, and others are changing, and others are pussy-footing, and God said, 'I've got to make him strong enough to take care of it some day. I'll put him through the fire and make him strong,' but the victory was never in doubt.**" Actually, this estimate of his worth is one of his milder descriptions.

Sometimes he carries on a shouting match with his congregation, a la Jesse Jackson visiting an inner city grammar school. He shouts, "Which is the greatest soul-winning church?" and the crowd screams, *"First Baptist Church."* He comes back, "Who is the best-known preacher that stands for soul winning?" and a loud chorus responds, *"Brother Hyles!"* He questions, "What church stands for separation?" and the answer is, *"First Baptist Church in Hammond."* Then he shouts, "What preacher stands for standards?" and the people scream back, *"Brother Hyles."* He ended this particular exchange, **"WE ARE THE GREATEST!"**

On one occasion, early in 1988, two Sundays in succession his Sunday school lesson offered 10 things he had done to help others and, on one of the same Sundays, his morning sermon listed various ways he had lifted up the fallen (how the Lord lifts the fallen would be more appropriate, in our judgment). One deacon put it this way, "The hymn is being rewritten, 'O Mighty Hyles, How Great Thou Art'."

**19.** On Sunday morning March 20, 1988, the unofficial opening of Pastors' School, Hyles preached on the theme, "What to do With Your Problem," saying he had counseled with 152

people that week, even though all the arrangements for the School were going on. (At a mere 10 minutes each, which certainly wouldn't be much, that would be well *over* 24 hours – one of the 7 days – just for counseling!) While the message had no Scripture, it did have considerable sick humor. Discussing remedies for baldness, he told one funny story after another. One cure was dabbing vodka on his scalp, noting, when it didn't work, he "drank the vodka," which brought a good laugh. He also made one of his many, many light remarks about marriage, telling the wives never to leave their husbands in a moment of anger. He told them to wait until "he grabs you in his arms some night. And kisses you with a passionate kiss, then you look at him and say, 'I'm leaving!' That's the way you do it. (While not in this message. one of his favorite jokes is to say, when making wedding announcements, the couple will be committing marriage "suicide.")

By the way, Hyles had four points in this message about your problem: *see* it, *study* it, *state* it, *solve* it. The starting point is to admit you have a problem, he told his congregation. If what we have printed in this article is true, Dr. Hyles has a problem. Would to God he would see it, face it, state it, *and solve it!*

**20.** One former student, married with children, called me and said that when he had to drop out of Hyles-Anderson because of finances, he wanted to go to the college night school. Alas, the only courses being offered were things like wood carving, crocheting, and such; no Bible courses of any kind were being offered. There was, as I understood him, a Leadership Class on Wednesday night, but that course simply taught blind loyalty to the pastor. He and his family finally dropped out of First Baptist, disillusioned over what was going on.

Hyles does expect *absolute loyalty* from all who are associated with him. One former co-worker told of one of the college workers who stood in chapel and assured the president he "gave himself" to him totally, calling off point by point such features as his hands, his eyes, his feet, etc., pledging to him the kind of dedication reserved for followers of Christ in Romans 12:1,2. The man who described it to me, expressing shock, discussed it with one of the top men on the church staff at the time, who replied, "You know where he got it, don't you?" And he proceeded to relate how Hyles had said to him, "If you will give me total loyalty, I will make you another J. R. Faulkner." The price was too high and that man left Hammond.

**21.** In light of the previous item about blind loyalty, one man who called me said he heard one of First Baptist's ministers, Ray Young, the bus director (who was given an honorary doctorate at Hyles-Anderson last year), say that if Jack Hyles told him to burn down the First Baptist Church he would do it because he'd know it was the will of God. That is inane, of course, the kind of allegiance the followers of Jim Jones had which caused them to drink the poisonous Kool-Aid. Even more recently, a deacon's wife related how he told the church his staff was so loyal to him he believed if he told them to commit suicide, all of them would. Jim Jones had that kind of loyalty too.

As recently as Sunday night, March 5, 1989, Hyles told his congregation that if he were to call back from Michigan that week and tell each one of the men sitting on the platform to go jump off a bridge and commit suicide for him, he had no doubt but what each one would do it, they were so submitted to him. Not a word did he say to the children (or impressionable college students present who idolize him) that suicide is wrong, or that such loyalty/submission is *totally* unbiblical. It is never, never right to do wrong, no matter who says to do it. It would have been as logical/scriptural for him to have said, "If I call back from Michigan and tell each man to murder his wife, all would do it because they are that 'submitted' to me."

Actually, rather than "loyalty" – and this is the frightening part – it should more aptly be defined as "cultic." Such blind obedience is the kind of mind control cults have over their followers. While we do not have the space to go into it again now, we suggest interested readers obtain the book by Steven Hassan, *Combating Cult Mind Control*, reviewed and advertised in our February 1, 1989, issue.

One lady, long close to the Hammond situation, called Hyles' repeated claims about such loyalty "sick" and compared it to a Jim Jones movie she viewed on television – one of the scariest she ever saw in her life – adding that the similarities were incredibly frightening, even if the results are not exactly the same. Some of the things Jones said were verbatim to what she had heard Jack Hyles say. Both men control the wills of those around them. Both are "mind benders," probably the most easily recognized trait of a cult leader – they take away their followers' logical, rational thinking, causing black to become white and white black. Both claim they are accountable to no one. (Once, when a question of misappropriation of funds arose, Hyles told his people, "Even if I did, I don't have to give an account to you." That is not the talk of a biblical shepherd speaking to his sheep.) And both put others down in order to exalt themselves. Even Hyles' most ardent supporter must acknowledge that he needs a whipping boy to ridicule every time he gets in the pulpit. In his own church, it is Johnny Colsten almost every service (although the exact opposite is for Mrs. Colsten) – and folks have remarked to me that they have no idea why he has put up with it for 20 years (loyalty, obviously). In outside services, it is whoever happens to be handy. In one preachers' meeting it was my son, who had asked an honest question in an open forum, and the rest of the hour Hyles kept referring to him as "stupid" – a matter that amused my son far more than irritating him.

One former member of First Baptist sadly said to me, "If Jack Hyles, tomorrow, were put in handcuffs and hauled off to jail, charged and found guilty of the most heinous criminal act, there would be those who would show up in church on Sunday morning, hoping he'd be there, believing in him, trusting him." And that person used David Hyles as an illustration, noting that after a suitcase full of pictures was found of him with many of the women in the Garland church, there were those who wanted to forgive him and keep him as pastor.

This matter of mind control cannot be overemphasized and it is one of the most serious and dangerous things about Hyles and his ministry. Again and again in doing research on this article I have faced unreasonable fear of retaliation on the part of my contacts. Just as those entrapped in the cults – we think of those in the Moonies, Way International, Armstrongism, Jehovah's Witnesses, and all the others – have an unnatural fear of what will happen if they leave their movement, so with many now associated and formerly associated with Hyles.

Those in cults remain long after they want out because of this, and often they have nowhere else to turn. The only thing they know is their group – they have already severed all connections with family and outside friends – and the cult is "family" to them. This latter item is highlighted again and again by Hyles: his staff is "family" and loyalty to him and the church/school is greater than anything and everything else. It is amazing how many of his ex-workers/followers have said this to me.

It is interesting that a banquet speaker for workers, very prominent in evangelical circles, leaned over and asked Hyles how he obtained such loyalty. While it really didn't answer the question, he responded, "I'll show you." He called to a friend of mine, who was on the staff at the time, and said, "Stand up." He did. "Sit down." He obeyed. Hyles repeated the silly commands at least three times, merely humiliating the worker by having him pop up and down like a jack-in-the-box, then turned to the guest and said, "That's how."

**22.** In his sermon, "I Am Only Human," preached on Sunday morning, December 26, 1982, Hyles argued that "God can be maneuvered," saying, "The Old Testament saints knew God so well they maneuvered with God. They all started off, 'Thou, the great God of Jacob, Thou, the God of the creation, Thou, the God that made the stars,' and the Lord God in Heaven, I think He said, 'That's me. Ha, Ha, Ha! That's me!' Well, you say, 'How do you know God's that way?' Cause if I made stars, that are the way I'd be." We hardly think it wise to determine the character or nature of God on the basis of Hyles. Nor do we think flattery works with Deity, no matter how thick it is sliced! He cannot be manipulated or maneuvered. In an unsolicited letter just received, one brother told of hearing Hyles preach on the subject, "How To Make God Your Slave!" His idea of God is apparently that of a genie.

**23.** On May 26, 1985, he preached on "Thank you, Adam," actually thanking Adam and Eve for disobeying God and bringing sin into the world. He said such things as, "Thank God for the chains of sin," and, "If nobody ever got drunk I wouldn't enjoy preaching."

Perhaps that is one reason why sin is treated so lightly at First Baptist; no one is ever faced openly with his sin. In fact, one deacon, in his letter or resignation, pointed out that the board has no system of checks and balances in operation. Then he lamented, "For example, I *know* (he has

confessed to me) a deacon that is involved in preached-against 'deep' sin. This has been going on for years that I know of. There is no doubt in my mind that this man will be on the board until he dies. Now, if I know of this situation, how many others exist or will exist, *with no hope of correction?* I propose that this one is too many. Again, we have separated ourselves from and placed ourselves above other fundamentalist churches and other organizations who have the basic common sense to have a system of checks and balances" (emphasis in original).

**24.** On July 19, 1987, Hyles had a message, "Backsliding, A Necessary Part to Spiritual Growth," which he called "one of the great truths of the Christian life." He mistakenly claimed God says that everyone has the same temptations (He doesn't), that backsliding is a part of spiritual growth, and that going backward is as much a part of a Christian's growth as going forward. He said someone who cursed before getting saved would never rise completely above it, and made this strange statement about spiritual condition, "If you are not as high as you used to be, jump up and down and say 'Hallelujah!'"

**25.** "Just what is sin anyway?" was preached on February 22, 1987, and he said each sin is as bad in the sight of God as any other. He said if you drank milk and did not do it in faith, it was sin – hence not drinking milk in faith would be as bad as committing murder or adultery! In the Old Testament, adultery was a sin deserving capital punishment. Should death be the penalty for drinking milk without faith? *How absurd!*

Referring to the "works of the flesh" in Galatians 5, Hyles said it wasn't "totally true" that they were sins – and that God didn't call them sin, adding that these works of the flesh were never called sin in the Bible. This is untrue, of course, and David's adultery with Bathsheba is a case in point. When Nathan faced him with what he had done, David cried, "I have sinned!" (He didn't say, "I have made a mistake!") And the Prophet Nathan agreed with him, calling what he had done "thy sin" (II Samuel 12:13). Murder is called sin in Deuteronomy 22:26. Fornication is called sin in I Corinthians 6:18. His entire argument is an inane play on words.

Perhaps this would be a good place to respond to the idea that sins of the flesh are no worse than sins of the spirit – and if one who judges his brother can remain in the ministry, so can one who has committed adultery. We like what David Neff, an associate editor of the neo-evangelical publication, *Christianity Today*, wrote in a 1987 article, "Are All Sins Created Equal?" Without giving all of it here, Neff pointed out that "at least three realities set sexual immorality apart from other sin and moves us to treat it far more seriously when we discover it in the life of a leader."

The three things, each of which he enlarged upon, were: "First, like no other sin, *dalliance destroys trust . . . .* But not only does adultery break a leader, *it brands a leader . . . .* Finally, *sexual sin destroys a leader's image.*" And Neff rightly concluded, "In short, whether or not all sins are created equal, *different sins have different social consequences,*" and he noted that Paul



classed "sexual sins, apart from sundry other trespasses" in I Corinthians 6:18.

Hyles has actually preached that one who talks about a person committing adultery is worse than the one who is actually guilty of it. In another sermon he said, "You *false* accusers are not the ones who are Satanic inspired as much as you *true* accusers, folks that tell *true* garbage." He forgot to give Bible references for either of those gems!

We think we have made it clear that while Hyles overlooks nearly every sin known to man – including divorce, adultery, cursing, pornography, etc. – the one thing he will not tolerate is lack of loyalty in any shape, form or manner. Whatever it is in *theory*, in *practice* the final authority is not the Word of God, but what Jack Hyles or others in leadership positions say.

Let's take a case in point. One young man, a senior nearing graduation, was expelled from Hyles-Anderson right in the middle of finals week – and they were not even going to let him take the rest of his exams until he demanded a \$2,000 refund for the semester; then they permitted him to take the tests at a public library – and a faculty member who knew him well, admiring his strong testimony for Christ, called the Dean of Men and asked if the report of his dismissal were true. On receiving an affirmative response, she inquired why and was told, "He was preaching heresy!" What heresy? The dean replied, "Women ought to be keepers at home!" When she asked if the Bible didn't have more to say about that than anything else for women, he said he didn't have time to discuss it and hung up.

In fairness, we should say that the young man had experienced at least one previous run-in with the dean. Being in the latter's pastoral counseling class, he objected to nearly everything the man taught – for example, once he recommended a long list of authors, mostly New Evangelical, saying they were some of the best books he had ever read and they should read them, too – and he especially objected to his hammering home repeatedly "the key to success is attitude." While that is undeniably the world's standard and fits beautifully with Hyles-ology philosophy, it is a far cry from the biblical pattern of meditating on the Word of God, prayer, and obedience to Christ as outlined in such passages as Psalm 1, Joshua 1, and Psalm 119. The teacher and pupil had a "strong" discussion about it one day and the youth was warned at that time he'd better change his attitude or he would be dismissed. So the "heresy" charge was merely the straw that broke the camel's back. The homosexual mentioned earlier was permitted to stay and graduate with an earned Hyles-Anderson degree. The man who stood up for what Paul said about women was booted.

The biblical issue of "keepers at home" is a very sensitive one in Hammond since so many women are in places of leadership. One former deacon, now a pastor, said that when he attended staff meetings approximately two-thirds were women and the women were making major decisions.

**26.** In another sermon minimizing sin, "No One Practices What He Preaches," delivered on April 22, 1984, Hyles emphasized a favorite theme: *no one has a right to judge another about anything!* As always, he referred to the statement that all judgment has been given by the Father to the Son – ignoring the many other statements *demanding* that Christians "judge righteous judgment," judge sin in a believer's life, etc., etc. – such as the man committing fornication with his father's wife (I Corinthians 5). If Hyles had been the pastor at Corinth when the Apostle Paul wrote that epistle, he would have fired a letter back and rebuked Paul, telling him all judgment belonged to the Son and that his sin of criticizing the dear brother who had his father's wife was every bit as bad as the man's fornication – especially since Paul was writing on hearsay ("commonly reported") without first going to the man involved!

Hyles, attempting to show how God will use someone after terrible sin, said David wrote the "Hallelujah" psalms (Psalm 146,147) after his sin with Bathsheba. However, we know of no one else who thinks these are Davidic psalms. In fact, the Septuagint, which goes back 2,200 years or so closer to the time they were written than does Hyles, credits them (along with Psalms 148 and 149) to Haggai and Zechariah; obviously, they are much nearer the time of Christ than was David. Incidentally, in this sermon Hyles offered his hearers this gem: "The way to success is to keep on failing!"

Hyles, if we may be permitted a note of humor in this sad story, is an excellent illustration of someone not practicing what he preaches. Again and again he has decried preachers being called "Reverend" or having "Reverend" before their names. Yet in his court deposition, when the attorney asked him to state his name, he responded, "Jack Hyles." When the lawyer persisted, asking which he preferred, "Reverend Hyles" or "Mr. Hyles," the reply was: "I have no preference at all."

Another illustration relates to his oft-repeated pulpit declaration that he is not putting anything away for a rainy day ("Nope! It's raining on people now. I must help them. God will take care of me.") Yet he admitted to an attorney under oath that he had put thousands of dollars in an IRA and thousands more in a Keough program. As one of his former assistants said, "He preaches the hardest against the things he is doing himself."

**27.** In his sermon, "I Am Human," Hyles came close to a teaching akin to the Roman Catholic mass. He said, "The vicarious death of Christ is still reality. Jesus didn't die just at one [time] – though He did die at Calvary – that was only a picture of the giving of His life.... Somebody said, 'Brother Hyles, don't you think it was awfully hard for God the Father to see His Son on the cross, bearing our sins?' Yes, it was, but not any harder than it is today because the great heart of God the Father still possesses the God the Son and the Triune God, and that God the Son is still the God that gives Himself."

**28.** In the same sermon, speaking of forgiveness, he said, "The Man Christ Jesus forgave. It wasn't God the Father that forgave; the Man, the human Christ Jesus, forgave." Such a distinction between the roles of the Godhead in redemptive forgiveness is totally unwarranted, of course.

**29.** Hyles preached a sermon he called "To Be Known of Him," based on the parable of the 10 virgins in Matthew 25:1-12. Saying preachers all across the country misunderstand it by thinking the virgins represent both saved and lost, he assured his hearers that all the virgins were saved ("wise" and "foolish" in another parable in the same Gospel – Matthew 7:24-27 – are unquestionably saved and lost, as our Lord clearly said), but these saved virgins couldn't go into the wedding because they "didn't do what they were supposed to do" (a partial rapture?). He applied the parable to Christians having "extra oil" of the Holy Spirit for meeting emergencies. But the parable is not talking about oil for "an emergency," but not having oil for the very thing they were there to do: *Meet the bridegroom!* To Hyles the "shut door" is merely a missed opportunity in life, having nothing to do with salvation – even though the bridegroom told them, "I know you not," and the Lord Jesus Himself made the application relate to not being ready for His second coming.

**30.** In a sermon, "You Believe Because You Love," preached on the Sunday night three weeks before the church's centennial, he boasted that Hyles-Anderson College did not have courses on hermeneutics or apologetics for its preacher boys. He said, "The reason we don't is this: those courses have to do with the proving of the Bible." He is 50% right (or 50 % wrong, depending on your viewpoint), since apologetics is defined as "the branch of theology concerned with the defense or proof of Christianity," while hermeneutics is "the branch of theology which treats of the principles of biblical exegesis." Although the former has to do with proving the Bible, the latter is simply teaching men how to preach.

But is apologetics wrong or even unnecessary? Of course not! Paul was giving the Thessalonian Jews a lesson in apologetics in Acts 17:1-4, and enough of them "believed" as a direct result that he was able to establish a church in Thessalonica and our Bibles now contain I & II Thessalonians. We are frank to say that young men not trained in apologetics and hermeneutics are not adequately prepared for the ministry. To illustrate, one of the ministers I talked to was instructing some of the college young men, all juniors and seniors, regarding a phase of the work. He asked them to turn to the pastoral epistles – *and they didn't know where or what they were!*

Hyles also stated in that message, about Christ, "No one said His life corresponds with verses in the prophets. No one said, 'I believe He's the Messiah because I've studied the Old Testament prophets and His life coincides with that'." If Hyles had been around in the days of the early church, he could have saved Matthew a lot of trouble. That is what his Gospel is all about: *proving from the Old Testament Scriptures that Jesus is s the Messiah, the King of the Jews!*

**31.** On Sunday morning, February 5 1989, Hyles preached on, "How About Those Who Never Saw the Promised Land?" He quoted I Corinthians 10:4, "And did all drink the same spiritual drink: for they drank of that spiritual Rock that followed them: and that Rock was Christ." According to him, from the time Moses smote the rock in Horeb, that rock followed the Israelites in the wilderness everywhere they went. "Every time that God would lead them," Hyles said, "He would lead them with a pillar of cloud in the front and a piece of rock behind."

While there is a rabbinical legend that a 15-foot fragment of that rock spewing out water, followed the Israelites for 40 years – although the older, more complete legends called it a "well," not a rock – we do not think that is what Paul was saying. We understand his reference as simply saying that the True Rock, Christ Jesus, was with them all the way.

In this message, too, he seemed to minimize sin. Talking about using men and women with an unsavory past, he said, "Who better can tell boys and girls not to drink than those who've drunk? Who better can warn boys and girls to be pure and clean than those who've not been pure and clean? Who better?" It is the old argument that one must go into sin in order to effectively reach those who have fallen. Such a philosophy is absurd, of course.

Sometimes, as in this message, he says dumb things – we trust, on the spur of the moment, not really meaning them. Reminding his people of when he lost his memory for three hours the previous July, he observed, "I was more like God then that I ever was in my life, 'cause *God has no memory at all*. 'Their sins will I remember no more'." While it is true that God doesn't remember sins under the blood, it doesn't mean He "has no memory at all," of course.

The worst thing about this message was the light way he referred to the "spiritual Rock that followed them: and that Rock was Christ," saying that for 40 years there was "a pillar of cloud by day and a pillar of fire by night and behind you comes a little rock saying, 'Wait for me! Wait for me!' And take that rod out and smite it again and the rock says, 'Don't hit me! That hurts! Just ask me; speak to me.' And you look at the rock and say, 'Rocky, want some water.' Whoosh." We have no objection to humor in the pulpit: blasphemy offends us deeply, however.

One brother took notes on Hyles sermons for some time. At the bottom of the page, after the sermons, this item appeared repeatedly: "*Observation*: After the initial Scripture reading by Johnny Colsten, the Bible was not referenced at all." In on sermon, preached on Sunday night February 14, 1988, Hyles started by saying, "This is not going to be a sermon, it will be a Bible study." The note taker wrote, "The only problem: not one Scripture verse referenced after opening Scripture read by John Colsten." Some Bible study!

Another member of First Baptist, who with her husband has serve as leaders in the church for

about 20 years, told me Hyles very frequently says, "Close your Bibles; just listen to me." A former deacon, now a preacher, explained that this was because of Hyles' habit of taking verses out of context – if people read on, they'd see it is teaching something beside what he is saying. Perhaps so, but for some reason the Bible is not a very popular book in Hammond. The same man said he showed up at a deacon's meeting with his Bible and the others laughed at him, one of them saying, "What are you going to do, preach to us?" And he went on to relate at least one instance where they were ready to pass a motion and another deacon objected, "This is contrary to Scripture," but they passed it anyway with an "end justifies the means" attitude.

Other illustrations could be given, but suffice it to say that the matter of Hyles' sermons is getting worse, not better. One prominent pastor in the Hammond area, who has been monitoring his messages for some time, wrote me, ". . . we noticed that these 'unbiblical' type sermons have become much more frequent of late. Where they seemed to be one in fifty a while back, they are now about one in four." And a deacon who felt compelled, because of convictions, to resign from the board, said, "Our condition here is a state of apostasy." While not all will agree it has gone quite that far, there certainly are major problems.

### Conclusion

Pray for Jack Hyles. We certainly have not enjoyed exposing him as we have in this article, and it is only because of our love for the cause of Christ that we have done so. Pray for his restoration to the Body of Christ. Pray for his home. Pray for the First Baptist Church of Hammond. Pray for Hyles-Anderson College. We hold no personal animosity toward him or anyone involved with him in any way. Our concern is strictly for Christ and His Word.

Do you ask which is worse, Hyles' moral problems or his theological problems? Either group, in our judgment, forfeits respect for him from the ranks of Fundamentalism. If we were in his shoes, as we noted at the start of this article, the moral problem alone would force us out of the ministry forever. We do not think that his "merits," whatever they may be, outweigh his "demerits." He has not been "running fast enough" to continue. Our conclusion, sadly, is: *Jack Hyles does not meet the "blameless" requirement for the gospel ministry!* Do you protest that this is judging? Perhaps so, but it is in an area where the Word of God itself tells us to judge. If any doubt remains in your mind, go back to the beginning and reread Judy Nischik Johnson's letter, especially her charge, "You exemplify everything in this life that I do not want for myself, my marriage or my children . . . . You have failed with the most precious gifts God could have ever given you – your wife, your children and now, your ministry."

One brother, whose ministry Hyles virtually destroyed over a quarter of a century ago, at that time wrote us lines that now seem prophetic: "All personalities and personal involvement set aside, I have a growing concern that a man who can convince himself that black is white and

white is black should have the position of leadership and esteem that he has, in the country." To our shame, we filed the letter and forgot all about until it resurfaced while doing search on this article.

What can Fundamentalism and Fundamentalists do? For one thing, we can start standing up for what right and opposing what is wrong, even – or especially – in our own movement. Perhaps we should forget the liberal Presbyterians and the compromising Convention Baptists for a season and concentrate on setting our own house in order.

We desperately need men of God who are willing to take a stand, no matter what it costs. Beloved brethren, we do not have one man in our midst – Jack Hyles, or anyone else – so valuable to our Fundamentalist movement that his sin should be covered. As one of the preachers I interviewed said to me, "This is directly the problem. We have not had men who have been willing to stand on an issue." Sadly, he spoke the truth. Myriad are the men who face every issue on the basis, "How will it affect me?" rather than, "What is right?"

Dear friend, *will you stand?* (Ephesians 6:10-18).

## **First Baptist Church of Hammond in Indiana**

### *A Personal Word From Brother Hyles*

As you perhaps know, I am not speaking at the National Sword of the Lord Convention at Bob Jones University. I want my friends to know that this was my decision and not the decision of my good friend, Dr. Curtis Hutson. Through the years and especially now, Dr. Hutson has been a real true friend to me, and I am his friend in the strictest sense of the word. Dr. Hutson wanted me to speak. I only canceled because I did not want my presence to be harmful to the Convention, neither do I want my Absence to be harmful to Dr. Hutson or to the Sword of the Lord. Please be assured that my absence from the program was not of Dr. Hutson's choosing but of mine. I have nothing but the highest regards for my beloved brother, Dr. Curtis Hutson.

Five Twenty-Three Sibley Street

P.O. Box 6448

Zip Code 46325

---

## **DR. JACK HYLES REPLIES**

### **Dr. Jack Hyles Answers Robert Sumner's Accusations in *The Biblical Evangelist***

#### **PREFACE TO THE ARTICLE**

I am an amateur at this. I have for years had a policy of "no attack, no defense." I have avoided the practice of letter-writing and letter-printing. I have tried to love those who hate me and to bless those who curse me. I have until now resisted the temptation to answer my critics, so I am an amateur. My accusers are not. I can only do my best to defend what I KNOW to be the truth.

I have no animosity toward anyone; I simply have come to the place I MUST defend the integrity of my wife, my staff, my church, my college, and myself.

Basically what you are about to read is a defense of those dearest to me and of myself--against

false charges. I am financially honest, doctrinally sound, and HAVE HAD ONLY ONE WOMAN IN MY LIFE, THE MOTHER OF MY CHILDREN.

*This article may be copied without permission, but only in its entirety.*

(For years I have not answered my critics. That makes this very hard to do, and I certainly do not enjoy it. To the best of my God-given ability, I am replying as a Christian gentleman.)

In January of 1981, shortly after the death of Dr. John R. Rice, trouble began brewing at the Sword of the Lord Foundation in Murfreesboro, Tennessee. This trouble did not surface until February 1, 1982, when a letter of ultimatum was placed on the desk of Dr. Curtis Hutson, Editor of *The Sword of the Lord*, and the chosen successor of Dr. John R. Rice. There was open opposition to the leadership of Dr. Hutson. Not long after this letter of ultimatum, Dr. Hutson called me and told me of the problem and the battle against him in which Dr. Robert Sumner, an employee of The Sword of the Lord, was an active participant.

A meeting of the governing board of The Sword the Lord was called. At the board meeting I vigorously stated my loyalty to Dr. Hutson, for several reasons. First, Dr. Rice chose him to be Editor of *The Sword of the Lord*. Second, I believed, and still believe, that he was God's choice; and third, I am Dr. Hutson's friend. The majority of the board voted for Dr. Hutson. The minority of those who would not be loyal included Dr. Robert Sumner.

Not knowing any details about Dr. Sumner's financial condition and not wanting him to have financial problems, I immediately went home and asked my board to include Dr. Sumner in our budget for \$200 a month. I thought Dr. Sumner was wrong in opposing Dr. Hutson (I still think so). However, since I stood in Dr. Hutson's defense, I felt impressed to make a monthly financial contribution to Dr. Sumner.

This same Robert Sumner published a vicious attack on me, my wife, my family, First Baptist Church of Hammond, and Hyles-Anderson College in his *Biblical Evangelist* dated May 1, 1989. This article is in answer to Mr. Sumner's accusations and vicious attack. I sincerely plead with the readers to read my defense in its entirety.

Much of the information collected by Mr. Sumner came from Mr. Vic Nischik, whose wife has faithfully served on the staff of the First Baptist Church for approximately a quarter of a century. Mr. Nischik wrongly attributes to me his marital problems and his divorce. Mr. Sumner, in his attack on my morals, basically quotes from Mr. Nischik and from those few disgruntled church members and former church members whom he has influenced. I will point out the mistakes, untruths, innuendoes, and distortions of Mr. Nischik's charges used by Mr. Sumner.



1. **The condominium.** On page 17 of the May 1, 1989, edition of *The Biblical Evangelist*, column 5, last paragraph Mr. Sumner says, "Jennie moved into a brand new beautiful condominium paid for in cash to the tune of \$150,000." This One Little Statement Is Packed And Filled With Untruths. Untruth #1 is that Mrs. Nischik's condominium was new. It was not new. Untruth #2 is that it was not paid for in cash. Mrs. Nischik took her part of the profits made on the sale of their house and used it as a down payment for the condominium. She then secured a loan from the American Savings and Loan in Munster, Indiana, for the balance, and has been making monthly payments since. Untruth #3 is that the condominium cost \$150,000. It did not. The price for the condominium was \$67,900. Untruth #4 is the innuendo that I had anything whatsoever to do with the purchase of the condominium. **I DID NOT.**

Pictured on page 2 is a copy of the settlement statement for the purchase of the condominium. Notice line 101: Contract Sales Price--\$67,900.00 and a copy of the mortgage note stating that \$26,000 was borrowed.

Chicago Title Insurance Company form, top left section. Includes fields for 'NAME OF INSURED', 'ADDRESS', 'PROPERTY', and 'INSURANCE POLICY NUMBER'.

Chicago Title Insurance Company form, right section. A detailed table with multiple columns for 'POLICY NUMBER', 'DATE OF POLICY', 'AMOUNT OF POLICY', etc.

NOTE form. Contains text: 'NOTE: THIS POLICY IS SUBJECT TO THE TERMS AND CONDITIONS OF THE POLICY...'. Includes a signature line at the bottom.

Mr. Sumner told an untruth when he said that it was new, when he said it was paid for in cash, when he said that it cost \$150,000, and when he implied that I had something to do with its purchase. **I HAVE HAD ABSOLUTELY NOTHING TO DO WITH THE CHOOSING, THE PURCHASING, OR THE PAYING FOR OF THE CONDOMINIUM FOR MRS.**

## **NISCHICK.**

I have, however, on occasion, helped other people in the purchasing of houses and condominiums. One of our staff ladies has multiple sclerosis. Her name is Pat Cunningham. She shared an apartment with one of our Christian school teachers whose name is Jewel Belson. I purchased a mobile home and gave it to these two ladies.

Mr. and Mrs. Joe Hackett teach in our school system. I paid the down payment for a brand new condominium for them.

My secretary, Mrs. Erma McKinney, and her husband were living in an apartment. I wanted to help them get a place of their own. I gave them \$20,000 as a down payment for a brand new condominium.

Phil and Gail Merhalski are two of our fine members. Gail is on our staff. I helped them in the down payment of a home.

We have on our staff a lady named Reva Conger. Years ago she became a widow. She had to rear her children alone and had no adequate place to live. I purchased a house in my own name. I am making payments on that house of \$441.61 a month. I have been offered \$600 a month for rent. I have rented it now for many years to Mrs. Conger for \$200 a month.

Mr. and Mrs. Bob Shofroth are members of our church. Mrs. Shofroth is a secretary at our grade school, and Mr. Shofroth is a deacon on our deacon board. I gave them \$4200 to help them with a down payment on a new house.

Mr. Ed Wolber is a deacon in our church. He had some financial difficulties and was about to lose his house. I gave him \$5000 so he could keep his home.

Eddie Lapina is on our staff. I helped him in the purchase a house.

Dr. Dan Musser is a faithful member of our church. I helped him and his wife in the purchase of a house.

Earlyne Stephens (my sister) is in charge of the bookkeeping department at Hyles-Anderson College. I paid the down payment for her so she could purchase a condominium.

John and Elaine Colsten have been on my staff for many years. They needed to do some remodeling work at their house. I gave them several thousand dollars for this work.

My salary at First Baptist Church is \$18,308. I live very frugally. I have no wants that would necessitate the expenditure of money. Consequently, most of the love offerings that I receive for speaking around the country are given away. Recently, while in Rapid City, South Dakota, I told the pastor to give my love offering to the missionary who spoke with me. The same was true last fall at Maranatha Baptist Bible College. While in Canoga Park, California, last year, I gave my love offering to the evangelist with whom I shared the pulpit. I make no claims of being an unselfish man. Everyone likes to spend his money for that which he enjoys. That is exactly what I do. It may be that my motives are quite selfish. I like the feeling I get when those whom I love are happy and pleased. It would certainly be in keeping with my practice had I given Mrs. Nischik some help on her condominium, **BUT THE FACT REMAINS, I DID NOT.**

Mr. Gary Sumner, a teacher at our Hammond Baptist Grade School, and his wife, who has for a number of years been employed at Hammond Baptist Junior High School, received my help with the down payment for a house.

How could a man who tells four untruths in sixteen words and one number be trusted in the rest of his article? This is just an example of Mr. Nischik's and Mr. Sumner's untruths and distortions.

2. **Staff cars.** I am accused of buying Mrs. Nischik a car. Yes, one of the benefits of Mrs. Nischik's job is a car. The same is true for my secretary Erma McKinney, for whom I purchase a new car every two years. Maxine Jeffries likewise receives a new car on a regular basis. These three ladies are the full-time lady staff members with the most seniority on our staff.

Sandy Shelhart is one of our single staff ladies. I bought a car for her. Adrienne Hilliard is one of our staff ladies who is rearing her children alone. I bought a car for her.

I gave a \$13,000 leisure van to the Judson Mitchell family. Mr. Mitchell teaches at our college, and the family has endured an unbelievable amount of sorrow and trouble.

Stan Harris is a teacher at our college. I have made the payments for his last two cars.

I purchased a car for singer Bill Harvey several years ago.

I purchased a car for the late Pastor Bob Keyes after he had had a serious heart attack.

I have purchased two cars for Pastor Owen Miller, my predecessor at First Baptist Church. In fact, I am making payments on one of his cars now.

So Mrs. Nischik has not been singled out. The interesting thing is that when time came for her to receive a car as a benefit, I went to Mr. Nischik and asked for his approval. He enthusiastically

agreed and even helped pick out the first car.

**3. Gifts to staff members and friends.** As was mentioned before, I give away most of the money given me as love offerings for my speaking engagements. When people give me sums of money, I give away most of that also. I am not a wealthy man. I could have been, but I have chosen not to be. Gifts that are given to me I share with others, especially those who work with me. If any of them, including Mrs. Nischik, has a need that I feel I can supply, I do so. **MONEY HAS NEVER BEEN GIVEN TO ANYONE IMPROPERLY OR WITH OTHER THAN PURE CHRISTIAN MOTIVES.**

A young lady who grew up in our church whose name is Kim Jarrell was having some unbelievable financial difficulties. She and her husband were going through the valley. I gave her \$1,700 to get her out of her financial bind.

Mrs. Fay Dodson who is in charge of our Phoster Club, came to me telling me that the Phoster Club was in serious financial condition. I borrowed \$5,000 to get her out of her bind.

Mr. Bruce Johnson was at one time a member of our church. He was about to lose his home. I gave him some money and other help to avoid foreclosure.

Mr. Ken Smith is a crippled man on the staff at Hyles-Anderson College. I financed, on several occasions, trips to Mayo Clinic for Mr. Smith.

Mr. Mike Huetten is a member of our church. He was in financial straights. I gave him \$1000.

Duke Morales is on the staff at Hyles-Anderson College, as are Kris Grafton and Glenn Gipson. These dear friends have been at various times in financial need. When that need arose I helped them financially. I have also helped Bill Grady and Dan Wolfe, both of whom are on the staff at Hyles-Anderson College.

I was in Salisbury, Maryland, with Pastor Hamilton. His wife had a serious problem with her teeth. I sent her \$1,750 to have them fixed.

I have given sizable gifts to different members of my staff from time to time. Some of these are Pam Rhodes (now Mrs. C. W. Fisk), Karen Plopper, Jewel Belson, Roy Moffitt, Elaine Colsten, Jeff Owens, and others. Yes, from time to time each of my staff members has a need. If I am able at the time to fill that need, I do.

Then there are many lay people in the church whom I have helped financially through the years: People such as Becky Sprunger Towne, Mrs. Carol Cottone, Mrs. Laura Stenberg, Patty

Thraikill, Sandy Poole, Mary Joyce Johnson, Steve McCracken, Gary Rice, Harriet Goodlow, Sharon Blythe Lewis, Mrs. Joyce Santaguida, Rick Lansbury, and many others.

On a recent Sunday evening, in order to prove my point, I had all the people whom I have helped financially to stand. There were several hundreds of them; in fact, it looked like 25% of the crowd.

I realize that I am making myself vulnerable to the accusation of boasting. Of course, this is not true. All of this has been kept secret until I felt it was needed for the defense against the insidious accusations that have been hurled against me. By the way, I would rather be accused of being boastful of generosity than to be accused of immorality.

I hold in my hand a copy of a letter from Mr. Nischik to Mr. Sumner. Most, if not all, of Mr. Sumner's personal accusations against me come from Mr. Nischik's letter or from his conversations with Mr. Sumner, or from a few people who are quoted over and over again in Mr. Sumner's article, making it sound like he is quoting a great host of people.

### **WHO IS VIC NISCHIK?**

If you choose to believe Vic Nischik and not believe Jack Hyles, you should at least know whom you are believing.

First, Mr. Nischik's wife initially wanted to divorce him because **HE ASKED ONE OF HIS FEMALE EMPLOYEES TO RUN OFF WITH HIM.** This fine young lady terminated her employment with Mr. Nischik. Because of this set of circumstances Mrs. Nischik was led to desire to seek a divorce. This divorce, in my opinion, was only prevented because of my intervention. By the way, the young lady whom Mr. Nischik asked to run off with him still resides in the Calumet Region, and this accusation can be proved.

At a later date, I called long distance from Canada to my office. Mrs. Nischik had asked the switchboard operator to put her name on the list of those to whom I would talk when I called in. She told me that the night before, late at night, she had found Mr. Nischik in his pajamas in a bedroom with a beautiful young lady. Again Mrs. Nischik wanted a divorce. Again I pleaded with her for the sake of their children not to seek a divorce.

I hold in my hand a letter from a lady who worked for Mr. Nischik in the summers of 1968, 1969, and 1970—in 1968 and 1969 at a Chevrolet dealership in Gary, Indiana, and in 1970 at a Ford dealership in Highland, Indiana. Following is that letter:

"Dear Brother Hyles: I worked for Mr. Vic Nischik during the summers of '68, '69, and '70: In '68

and '69 at a Chevrolet dealership in Gary, Indiana, and in '70 at a Ford dealership in Highland, Indiana.

In the summer of 1968, Mr. Nischik's personal secretary went on a maternity leave. The salesmen – the 'hotshots' and the straightforward, stable family men alike – made comments about 'Victor's behavior.' They speculated about whose baby that was. I overheard one comment to another that he wondered if the secretary's husband knew that that was really 'Victor's baby.'

"During both of the summers of '68 and '69, in addition to my regular duties as the relief secretary whenever a secretary was on vacation, I did some extra work that required that I work late many evenings until the dealership closed at 9:00 p.m. Any evening that I worked late, one salesman – one whose personality, demeanor, etc., was like my father's; a man who was probably ten years my father's senior, a man who had been married to only one woman, who by that time had grown children; a man who had a reputation for being honest; a man who was not the 'typical hotshot' salesman – always came upstairs into the IBM machine room where I was working, he said, 'Just to check on me.' He told me to be sure that I was never alone with Mr. Nischik. The two or three times that Mr. Nischik did come back during the evening hours to check on things, this salesman always followed him up the stairs and stood in the hallway just outside the open office door. (Now at this time, as a 17- and 18-year-old girl, I was too naive to have thought Mr. Nischik would have tried anything. I did understand the importance of avoiding all appearance of evil, I knew it was not wise to be in a room alone with a man, so I accepted this salesman's fatherly protection without question. I did, however, notice the serious look of concern on his face any time Mr. Nischik did come in the evening; the salesman's concern and tight-lipped expression never led me to question the goings-on.)

"In the summer of '70 I did not work at the dealership where Mr. Nischik worked, though I worked for him. At that time, his IBM machine office was doing the books for a number of other dealerships, including the Ford dealership in Highland. In that dealership, the rumor flew that Mr. Nischik 'had a thing' for the female office manager. (This gal, during the following school year, did break up the home of the parts department manager; they ran off together.) At the Ford dealership in Highland, Indiana, the owner and his son-in-law, who was the general manager, again looked out for me and the rest of the office girls. Here I never worked late. I did work on Saturdays and was the only girl in the office then. Mr. Nischik never came on Saturdays, but I was told by the owner and son-in-law to be sure and let them know if Mr. Nischik ever did come around on Saturdays. Anytime Mr. Nischik came into the office during the work week, again all the salesmen – what I would call the good ones and the loose ones – had comments to make about both Mr. Nischik's carryings on with the opposite sex.

"The next two summers I spent in Germany. I talked with one of his former female employees, asking how things were going. She said I was lucky I had not been in the Gary office during the

past summers. She said that things were bad, that Mr. Nischik's reputation was worse, and that he had asked her if she would run away with him. (I'm sorry I don't remember the conversation word-for-word – this is an abbreviated, right-to-the-conclusion recounting of our conversation.) I was stunned and didn't want to believe it and was glad I was out of the picture and tried to avoid the talk.

"Then, when I taught at Hammond Baptist High School during the school year of '75 and '76, talk was flying that a girl from Hammond Baptist High School was sleeping with Mr. Nischik. I thought that it was malicious gossip and ignored it. After the girl graduated I overheard her telling someone that she and Mr. Nischik have been sleeping together, that she had been in the Nischiks' house many times (this conversation was overheard at the church.) During this same period this girl and Mr. Nischik were together before and after the services; I saw them flirting with each other – they were both clearly enjoying it."

The above letter was written by one of the most trusted and respected ladies in First Baptist Church of Hammond – Mrs. Gail Merhalski.

I am reading from a letter written me by a lady who at one time was a babysitter for the Nischiks. I am quoting. "As you know, I used to be their babysitter for years. It was the setup that Vic picked up the sitters and took them home afterwards. I can attest to the fact that Vic was a flirt with the teenage girls. He made me feel uncomfortable many times. I watched him time and time again as he did to others also. The only person I ever told this to was Darlene Fisk. I asked her advice and she suggested that I stop sitting for them which I did."

On May 19, 1980, I was interviewed for nearly three hours by reporters from THE TIMES. One of the questions that they asked me was if I had become aware that some people were calling Mr. Nischik a homosexual. I replied that I had become aware of the fact. They asked me if I believed it. I told them that I did not know, but I thought it was very interesting that they asked me that question. I am not making an accusation because I refuse to use the tactics of my accusers.

In my opinion, Mr. Nischik has practically no credibility at the First Baptist Church of Hammond, Indiana.

Mr. Nischik told me himself that at one place where he worked (an automobile agency in Chicago), they locked him out of his office when he arrived one morning. He was fired and could not even go back to his office. The next automobile agency where he worked hired someone else to take his job and moved Mr. Nischik to another job. These words also came from Mr. Nischik's lips.

I can take you to a man in our area who testifies that Mr. Nischik had an affair with his wife and



broke up his marriage.

When a preacher's reputation is attacked and he is slandered, certainly the credibility of that preacher and the credibility of his accuser should be seriously considered.

Let me give you some examples of untruths and distortions and innuendoes in Mr. Sumner's article as he relays information he got from the aforementioned Mr. Nischik and a few others, such as Mr. George Godfrey.

### **UNTRUTH #1**

On page 16 of *The Biblical Evangelist*, column 4, paragraph 1, Mr. Sumner says that the Nischiks were "happy as a family." This is not true. The Nischiks had marital problems nearly from their wedding day. Shortly after their marriage, Mrs. Nischik came to me telling me of the intolerable circumstances under which she was living and of unbelievable treatment that she was receiving from Vic and from his parents. I believe that basically it was only because of my pleadings that she stayed with him.

On one occasion Mr. Nischik came to me in a frantic state. I counseled with him, helped him and, in my opinion, saved the marriage from divorce.

### **UNTRUTH #2**

The same column, Mr. Sumner says that Dr. Hyles came to Vic and said, "I need your wife in my office." **THIS IS UNTRUE.** I did employ Mrs. Nischik on our church staff (to this day she is one of the most respected members of our staff), **BUT I DID NOT TELL MR. NISCHIK, "I NEED YOUR WIFE IN MY OFFICE."**

### **UNTRUTH #3**

The same column says, "A little time went by and the Nischiks began experiencing marital problems." **THIS IS NOT TRUE.** The Nischiks had marital problems from day one.

### **UNTRUTH #4**

In the same column Mr. Nischik mentions my being called to their house while they were having marital problems. This call was for one reason and one reason only. Mr. Nischik had asked a woman to run off with him, as was mentioned earlier. Mrs. Nischik wanted him to leave and she wanted a divorce. Mr. Nischik's statement that he wanted to keep his home together for the children's sake and because he loved his wife is ridiculous. Likewise is the statement concerning

my offering him financial help to relocate elsewhere. The truth is he wanted to leave his wife. If he didn't, why would he ask a lady to run off with him?

### UNTRUTH #5

Mr. Nischik talked about evidence. He had none then and he has none now.

### UNTRUTH #6

Mr. Nischik accused me of working out the arrangement under which he has lived ever since. This is untrue. **I HAD NOTHING TO DO WITH SUCH AN ARRANGEMENT**, and I know for a fact that when Mrs. Nischik asked Mr. Nischik to help pay the tuition for the children, he refused to do so.

### UNTRUTH #7

On page 16, column 5, about the middle of the column, Mr. Sumner says, "Hyles ordered Jennie to file for divorce." This is a blatant, malicious, scandalous untruth. Mrs. Nischik was fed up. She had had all she could take. Because of this she did not even come to me for advice concerning her divorce. She knew that I would try to talk her out of it. **I HAVE NEVER IN 42 YEARS OF PASTORING RECOMMENDED OR APPROVED OF DIVORCE, NOR HAVE I EVER ADVISED ANYONE TO GET A DIVORCE.**

The only involvement I had with the divorce was that Mr. Nischik and his attorney subpoenaed me. I had to get involved because of the subpoena.

### UNTRUTH #8

Mr. Sumner says in the same paragraph, "When Hyles realized that Nischik planned to put him on the witness stand in open court, the former met with the attorneys on both sides and unilaterally negotiated the terms of the divorce settlement." **THIS IS UNTRUE.** It was Mr. Nischik who said at the deposition that he wanted if possible to avoid a court case. It was Mr. Nischik's attorney who asked to meet with me privately I wanted no involvement; I sought no involvement, but I was forced by subpoena.

### UNTRUTH #9

On page 17 of *The Biblical Evangelist* of May 1, 1989, at the bottom of column 5, there is reference to the house the Nischiks built in 1968. Mr. Nischik came to me when the building was planned and told me that he knew little or nothing about building. He knew that I did and asked

me if I would do him a favor and keep my eye on the building, which I did.

### **UNTRUTH #10**

On page 18, paragraph 1, column 5, Mr. Sumner says the rent was set by Hyles. **THIS IS AN UNTRUTH.**

### **UNTRUTH #11**

On page 18, column 5, in the middle of the column, Mr. Sumner says, "There is no record kept of the monies." **THIS IS NOT TRUE.** I keep an accurate record of all of my come from every source. Of course, this is necessary for tax records. I have often wondered if Mr. Nischik has kept a record of all the money I have given him.

### **UNTRUTH #12**

Mr. Nischik did stand up at deacons meeting and try to spread his garbage. At the bottom of page 18, column 5, he says, "Hyles shouted." **THIS IS NOT TRUE.** He then said that I shouted, "You are trying to destroy fundamentalism." **THIS IS NOT TRUE.** Mr. Nischik also says that the first time he stood up at deacons meeting he was shouted down and the second time they sat in stunned silence. **THIS IS NOT TRUE.** The second time the deacons shouted Mr. Nischik down again.

### **UNTRUTH #13**

On page 19, column 1, line 22, Mr. Sumner quotes Mr. Nischik as saying about one-third of the deacon board has resigned over this issue. **THIS IS ABSURD.** We have 99 men on our deacon board. They have stood behind me through all of Mr. Nischik's tirades. There is not a church in America that has a better deacon board than the First Baptist Church of Hammond, and there is not a preacher in America who has had more loyalty from their board through the years.

### **UNTRUTH #14**

On page 19, column 1, paragraph 4, Mr. Sumner says that I have "thoroughly indoctrinated his people with the idea, if you didn't see it didn't happen." **THIS IS AN UNTRUTH.** I dare Mr. Sumner, and I dare Mr. Nischik to prove that statement. It is typical of the reckless distortions of the article. Let me tell you what I do say, which is the real statement that has been distorted. I often say this: "I do not believe an accusation against a brother or a sister unless I saw it happen or they admitted it happened." I did not say it is not true. I said I do not believe it. I have never

told people to use that criterion for me; I have simply made this statement that is my policy. I have always stood with the preacher unless I knew for a fact he was wrong. I have always stood for the accused unless I knew for a fact it was true. I have defended my preacher brethren across this nation for 42 years.

### **UNTRUTH #15**

In the same paragraph, I am quoted as follows, "If I walked in a pastor's study and found him and some woman embracing and kissing on the floor, I'd think he was giving her mouth-to-mouth resuscitation." **THAT IS AN UNTRUTH.** That statement was made about my dear friend Lester Roloff concerning a vicious attack on his morals that was made not long before his death. This is a man in whom I believed without reservation then and without reservation now. Two well-known preachers in America told me in a motel room at the Dallas-Ft. Worth Airport Hotel a malicious accusation against Brother Roloff. I told them they were not telling the truth, the rumor was a falsehood, and I would not stay in the room and listen to that kind of garbage. I have often made the statement that I had enough confidence in Lester Roloff that if I found him kissing a woman, I would think he was giving her mouth-to-mouth resuscitation. The statement that is attributed to me in this paragraph is, in my opinion, a vicious distortion. I resent their trying to take my support of Brother Roloff and making it something other than what I said.

### **UNTRUTH #16**

On page 19, column 2, nearly halfway down, Mr. Sumner says that Mrs. Nischik and I would follow each other home from church. **THIS IS UNTRUE.** After every service I stay at the church for counseling for an average of an hour or more. On Sunday morning, I stay in my office to counsel with lay people in the church who need my help or advice. On Sunday night, I counsel with college men, and on Wednesday night I counsel with college ladies. The truth is that Mrs. Nischik is one of the most discreet, proper women I have ever known. There is no access between our offices, and she does not even come into my office to ask me a question. **NOTHING IMPROPER HAS EVER HAPPENED BETWEEN US.**

### **UNTRUTH #17**

On page 19, column 3, just above the middle of the column, a statement is made by Mr. Sumner: "One long-time member estimates that perhaps 40% of his teaching and preaching has been in defense of himself." To read Mr. Sumner you would think that if **ONE MEMBER** says something it must be true. Why not check with the people who get my tapes every week all over America. Ask them. This is just another example of accepting something as fact because one person says it. Why not ask the people who have been in the pews through these years about my preaching. Why not ask the thousands of people who are happy members of First Baptist Church

of Hammond and not one or two disgruntleds.

### **UNTRUTH #18**

Mr. Nischik mentions some intimate letters that I had written. Produce them, Mr. Nischik. **THIS IS AN UNTRUTH AND HE KNOWS IT.**

### **UNTRUTH #19**

On page 19, column 4, under number 3, Mr. Sumner says, "Hyles told Vic that he could have Beverly (Mrs. Hyles) with the same relationship Hyles enjoyed with Jennie." It is hard to believe that even the most vicious man could make such a statement. Every time I read it or even think about it, I find myself wanting to see blood. This is the most vicious, corrupt, scandalous, malicious untruth I have ever read in my life. In the first place, Mrs. Hyles is a decent woman. She is a moral woman, and as I am dictating this answer at this moment, my lips are quivering, my fist is clenched, my face is burning, and justifiable anger fills my soul. Mrs. Hyles is one of the most proper, respected and loved ladies in America. She has been the model pastor's wife for women all across the country. She and I have not had a cross word or spoken an unkind word to each other in years. She teaches a course at Hyles-Anderson College on "The Pastor's Wife." In all of my ministry she has never received, to my knowledge, one word of criticism about her demeanor. She is a lovely Christian lady and has been faithful and loyal to me all through these years, and I cannot, and I will not let her go undefended. When you attack her, you attack me. As Christians, they need to apologize to my wife.

### **UNTRUTH #20**

In the middle of column 4, page 19, Mr. Sumner says, "One lady who was long a leader in the Sunday school and held other important positions in the church told me of being in his office when he revealed some 'inside information,' then warned her about ever revealing what he had said. Peering over the coffee table he threatened, 'If you ever say this, I'll deny it, and it will be your word against mine.'" This is a distortion of a statement that I often make in a joking manner. I make it concerning my weight, my age, and other matters, but it is never made in the context that Mr. Sumner's words make it appear to be.

### **UNTRUTH #21**

At the bottom of that same column Mr. Sumner says, "One man, long on the faculty at the college and who knew them well on a first- name basis, told me...." **NOBODY AT THE COLLEGE KNOWS ME ON A FIRST-NAME BASIS BUT MY SISTER AND MY WIFE.** Nobody who has ever been at the college has known me on a first-name basis but my sister and my wife, who

teaches part-time.

### **UNTRUTH #22**

On page 19, column 5, paragraph 1, Mr. Sumner says, "Mrs. Hyles did not get to attend Dr. John R. Rice's funeral because her husband would not permit her to travel with him to Tennessee." **THIS IS AN UNTRUTH.** I was preaching on the West Coast. (I believe it was Santa Maria, California.) I had to fly from Santa Maria to Los Angeles to Nashville through the night to get to Dr. Rice's funeral.

### **UNTRUTH #23**

In point #5, column 5, page 19, Mr. Sumner quotes me as calling my son David, "the most brilliant, spiritual man he ever met." **THIS IS UNTRUE.** I never called David the most spiritual man I ever met. I have often said that he has one of the most brilliant minds I have ever known, and he does, in my opinion, have an amazing mind.

### **UNTRUTH #24**

On page 20, column 2, number 7, Mr. Sumner mentions that I refused to intervene when Karen Plopper divorced her husband. **THIS IS NOT TRUE.** I counseled with Mrs. Plopper and her husband and pleaded with her not to get a divorce.

### **UNTRUTH #25**

Mr. Sumner in the same paragraph mentions the possibility that Roy Moffitt pushed his daughter into a marriage she did not want. **THIS IS NOT TRUE.** I counseled with the entire family at this time, and Roy did no such thing.

### **UNTRUTH #26**

On page 20, column 3, number 8, Mr. Sumner says concerning Fay Dodson, "She divorced her first husband and shortly thereafter was given the job of starting and directing the Phoster Club." Mrs. Dodson's husband left her for another woman.

### **UNTRUTH #27**

On page 20, column 3, near the middle of the column, Mr. Sumner says, "At any rate, we think the First Baptist deacon was right when he said, 'Divorce at the church and school have reached epidemic proportions.'" Following are the exact figures concerning this so-called epidemic. There

are 556 people employed by the First Baptist Church and its ministries. There are 26 who are divorced. This doesn't seem like much of an epidemic, does it? And, by the way, practically all of these who are divorced were forsaken by their mates for another person.

### **UNTRUTH #28**

On page 20, column 3, number 11, Mr. Sumner says sex problems are treated lightly. **THIS IS AN UNTRUTH.** He then says, "One teacher discovered that a student was a homosexual, reported it to the school authorities, was told, 'We'll take care of it,' but nothing was done, and the homosexual is now a graduate of Hyles-Anderson College." You see, the difference between Mr. Sumner and Hyles-Anderson College is that if one person says something, we don't take it as being true. It's amazing how many times in his blasphemous article he says, "One person said," "a former member said," "a deacon said," "an ex-deacon said," "an ex-faculty member said." We do not believe that accusation proves guilt. The truth is that any employee of the church or any church ministry, including all the schools, and any student in any of the schools whom we know to have committed adultery are immediately dismissed. Any of these people who even admitted to have homosexual desires had been immediately dismissed. However, we have not disciplined people based upon hearsay when we have no proof. Would God Mr. Sumner would use the same justice. In the aforementioned case, detailed investigation was made and nothing could be proved, but Mr. Sumner says, "the homosexual is now a graduate of Hyles-Anderson College," which mean, he calls someone a homosexual because one teacher said so. This is proof by accusation which is wicked.

### **UNTRUTH #29**

In the following paragraph Mr. Sumner says, "Some years back two deacons discovered a secret room in the basement of the rescue mission – mirrors on the walls and ceiling – that served as a place for homosexual encounters. Hyles was told but did nothing." **THIS IS A BLATANT, BLASPHEMOUS UNTRUTH.** The first I heard about this was when I read it in Mr. Sumner's article. He then says, "He was also told several times that his mission director, now deceased, was a womanizer and viewer of X-rated videos, especially ones dealing with incest. He refused to do anything about it." **THIS IS AN UNTRUTH.** I have investigated it and found it untrue.

### **UNTRUTH #30**

"A high school faculty member was caught by another faculty member having sex with a teenager on school property. Hyles was informed but refused to deal with it." **THIS IS AN UNTRUTH.** I know of no such case. It has never been reported to me. And how does Mr. Sumner know it is true? Because somebody told him. Mr. Sumner also says that he is aware of two other college faculty members guilty of adultery. It's amazing how he states things as fact

when "one person told me," "a deacon told me," "a former deacon told me." I cannot prove his statement true or untrue. By the way, neither can he, but I am not aware of it and never have been. **IF IT COULD BE PROVED THAT ANY OF OUR COLLEGE FACULTY MEMBERS ARE GUILTY OF ADULTERY, THEY WOULD BE DISMISSED IMMEDIATELY. THE SAME IS TRUE WITH ANY STUDENT.**

### **UNTRUTH #31**

On page 20, column 4, number 13, Mr. Sumner says, "One of the men on the staff at the college spoke at the high school chapel earlier this year, supposedly warning young men about how girls entice boys, but he used such suggestive obscene language in describing what the girls did that one of the lady faculty members raise a ruckus. No one else seemed to object." **THIS IS AN UNTRUTH.** I heard about the situation, and I objected and corrected it immediately.

### **UNTRUTH #32**

On page 20, column 5, Mr. Sumner puts a little song in his paper which is supposedly sung to the tune of "Come and Dine." He attributes the writing of this song to me. I had never heard the song until I saw it in his paper.

### **UNTRUTH #33**

Mr. Sumner in discussing my meeting with the girls at the college says, "Hyles takes off his jacket and shows them his arms." **THIS IS NOT TRUE.** The girls often shout, "Where's the beef?" So do the boys. So do the men at Pastors' School. So do people where I travel around the country. I often kid about my biceps, and people jokingly holler, "Where's the beef?" but I never take off my coat.

He is right about my giving an airline ticket to several girls. One was a missionary's daughter whom we flew home for the holidays. Yes, I did give a honeymoon to a young couple who were very poor. Yes, I did give a wedding band to a young couple who could not afford one. Yes, I did buy each girl a dress. On Easter Sunday morning, two or three years ago I looked out and saw all of the First Baptist people with their Easter outfits. You could spot the college girls. They were dressed in the same clothes. Most of them could not afford Easter outfits, and most of them had worked on bus routes that morning. They had gotten wet in a shower, had been up since before dawn, and had gone to the ghettos to get poor little boys and girls and poor people to bring them to church, and I felt for them as I saw them compared to the ladies who were wearing Easter Outfits. Because of this, I had a meeting with the girls and told them that we were going to have an Easter Service the next Wednesday on Chapel. I gave each girl a \$20 bill and told them of stores where they could buy dresses for \$20. Then the next Wednesday they were to wear their new dresses, and we going to have Easter on Wednesday. We had Easter lilies on the platform,



one of our faculty members sang an Easter song, I brought an Easter message. After the service we went to the dining hall for a turkey dinner and called it out Easter dinner.

Then Mr. Sumner says, "If he has such a service for the boys, we are not aware of it." I met with the boys twice a month. I met with the girls five times during the entire school year, and the boys have as much fun as the girls do. Of course, I do not give the boys \$20 to buy clothing because our boys are allowed to work off campus, and our girls are not.

### **UNTRUTH #34**

On page 21, column 2, number 3, Mr. Sumner says I pray to my mother, and his innuendoes about my mother are as wicked and vile as a man can get. Again he says, "As one of his members wrote." This follows Mr. Sumner's logic that if one person says it, it must be true. The truth is I loved my mother with all in heart. She sacrificed for me and reared me in the most destitute of circumstances. Mr. Sumner is an unfair man when he uses that kind of tactics. **OF COURSE, I DO NOT PRAY TO MY MOTHER.** I go to her grave every week, and I say, "I love you, Mother." Millions of people do the same thing. It is not prayer. Of course, my mother can hear me cause she is one of the witnesses in Heaven, but for him to say I pray to my mother is ridiculous. By the way, this is just one of the quotes that he uses from Mr. Nischik's slanderous letter, a copy of which I hold in my hand at this time. In fact, many of the things that Mr. Sumner accepts as true, he has only Mr. Nischik's letter or words.

### **UNTRUTH #35**

In column 3 of page 21, a little below the center of the page, Mr. Sumner says that I have jumped on the Ruckman bandwagon. **THIS IS AN UNTRUTH.** I do not know Mr. Ruckman. I may have shaken his hand one time while walking out of a church in Florida, but I am not sure. I would not know him if I saw him on the street. I have never read one of his books. **I HAVE NEVER HEARD HIM PREACH AND I NEVER HEARD ONE OF HIS TAPES.**

But I do plead guilty of believing that the King James Bible has been preserved for us. I believe in original inspiration and divine preservation.

### **UNTRUTH #36**

At the bottom of this same column in point number 6, Mr. Sumner says, "In light of the previous item, not only does Hyles now say that the King James version is the only inspired translation, he claims that if your personal worker used any other English translation, you are not saved: the genes were flawed." This is another quote from Mr. Nischik's letter, and **IT IS AN UNTRUTH.**

### **UNTRUTH #37**

On page 21, column 4, reference is made to one of my sermons. Of course, as usual, he misquotes. For example, he says, "If you have enough in reserve, God will forgive your sin and put you back in business." **I NEVER SAID THAT. THAT'S ANOTHER UNTRUTH.** However, after I preached this particular sermon in Colorado, I received a letter from Dr. Wayne Van Gelderen telling me that he had received a tape and thought that probably the sermon was a bit dangerous. I took his advice and wrote him, telling him that I had decided not to preach the sermon any more and thanked him for his gracious, kind approach. I received a letter from Dr. Walt Handford and one from Dr. Ed Nelson voicing the same thing, and I sent them a copy, as I recall, of the letter I sent to Dr. Van Gelderen. At least know I expressed to them the same thing concerning the decision I had made not to preach the sermon again.

The discussion that Mr. Sumner makes concerning my belief on the eternal humanity of Christ should be addressed. I did not mean at all what Mr. Sumner says that I meant, and according to his statements concerning the definition of the word "humanity." **I DO NOT BELIEVE IN THE ETERNAL HUMANITY OF CHRIST.** I simply meant that I believe that man was made in the image of God and was meant to be like Christ. I did not mean that Christ was like man, and though I do believe that Mr. Sumner's attack was unnecessary, I also admit that I was not very articulate.

### **UNTRUTH #38**

On page 21, column 5, number 9, Mr. Sumner says, "Hyles says sin does not need to be repented, only forgotten." **THIS IS AN UNTRUTH.** It is also another one of the quotes he makes from Mr. Nischik's letter. Our altar is filled every Sunday night with people repenting of sin.

### **UNTRUTH #39**

On page 21, column 5, number 10, Mr. Sumner gives one of his biggest distortions when he says that in my preaching I used, by subliminal suggestion, the language of prostitutes. **BY GOD'S GRACE AND MY MOTHER'S TRAINING, I AM A PURE MAN.** I have always been a pure man. I don't even know the language of prostitutes or the language of the streets. Mr. Sumner also states that I was graphically going through every part of a woman's anatomy while preaching on chapel. **THIS IS AN UNTRUTH** – a dirty, filthy untruth. Mr. Sumner, produce the sermon. Produce the statements. Produce the language of the streets and language of prostitutes. By the way, this also comes from Mr. Nischik's letter on page 8. How wicked can untruths become!

### **UNTRUTH #40**

On page 21, column 5, number 13, Mr. Sumner says, "Hyles says that adultery is not sin, just a

mistake." **THIS IS AN UNTRUTH.** I think that adultery is a sin, and I preach against sin as much as Mr. Sumner does and probably more. Mr. Sumner goes on to say one of the evangelists who counts First Baptist as his church home called all upset following that remark. This evangelist, in my opinion, has little or no credibility in our church and is not supported or approved or out as one of our church evangelists and never has been.

#### **UNTRUTH #41**

On page 21, column 5, number 14, Mr. Sumner says, "Hyles preached on Sunday night, January 17,1988, saying no sin disqualifies a man from preaching." The idea of my message was and is that no matter what a person has done in the past he can still win souls to Christ. The word I used was the word "evangelize." I believe that anyone, regardless of his past, can be a soul winner. An illustration of this is the woman at the well of Sychar. I was not talking about pulpit preaching.

#### **UNTRUTH #42**

On page 21, column 5, number 15, Mr. Sumner says that on a Wednesday night I made the statement, "All men are mental homosexuals." I did not make that statement. **THAT IS AN UNTRUTH.** I do not believe that all men are mental homosexuals.

#### **UNTRUTH #43**

On page 22, column 1, about two-thirds down the column, Mr. Sumner says that the pastor should have veto power and that young people should come to him for advice about marriage partners. This is right. I believe that no young person should marry without the approval of his parents and his pastor. **I HAVE NEVER MARRIED A COUPLE IF THEIR PARENTS OPPOSED THE MARRIAGE.** The truth is that's one of the first two or three questions I ask a couple when they come to me about getting married. I ask them, "Do your parents approve?" Again, Mr. Sumner did not do his homework.

#### **UNTRUTH #44**

On page 22, column 2, about a fourth of the way down, Mr. Sumner makes an accusation that is almost laughable. He says, that I "carry on a shouting match with my congregation." He says that I shout, "Which is the greatest soul-winning church?" and the crowd shouts, "First Baptist Church." I shout, "Who is the best-known preacher that stands for soul winning?" and a loud chorus responds, "Brother Hyles." I question, "What church stands for separation?" and the answer is "First Baptist Church of Hammond." Then I shout, "What preacher stands for standards?" and the people scream back, "Brother Hyles." **THIS IS AN UNTRUTH** – a dirty, blatant untruth. Bring forth the proof, Mr. Sumner. Play me a tape. This has never been done in

my ministry, and if it weren't so blasphemous, it would be funny.

### **UNTRUTH #45**

The same column, point 19, Mr. Sumner quotes me as saying I counseled with 152 people that week. He implies that this is impossible. Again he is wrong. **I DID** counsel with 152 people that week, and I counsel with nearly that many every week. Some of this counselling lasts for 30 seconds, some lasts for an hour. I stand at my door on Sunday morning, Sunday night, and Wednesday night and counsel with people who come by for brief, short counselling needs. Then I give many hours a week to counselling with my people in segments; that average about 15 minutes each. The average week will have about 150 people walk inside my office door to ask advice or seek counsel.

### **UNTRUTH #46**

The same column under point 20, Mr. Sumner says that the only courses offered at night school were like wood carving, crocheting etc. He goes on to say that no Bible courses of any kind were being offered. I am quoting from Dr. Jorgensen, the Vice-President of Hyles-Anderson College, in charge of our curriculum: "**BROTHER HYLES, THIS IS SIMPLY NOT TRUE.** We have always offered several courses in Bible every semester we have our night school. I have copies of old schedules to prove this. We did offer wood carving in the fall of 1986 as a ten-week practical training class for church members who wanted to learn a hobby. That same semester we offered four Bible courses in night school, namely, Old Testament Survey; Acts and Paul's Shorter Epistles; Christ and the Old Testament; and Bible Historical Books."

### **UNTRUTH #47**

On page 22, column 3, at the bottom of the column, Mr. Sumner says, "Once when a question of misappropriation of funds arose, Hyles told his people, 'Even if I did, I don't have to give an account to you.'" **THIS IS A BLATANT UNTRUTH.** I never made such a statement and never would, nor do I believe it.

### **UNTRUTH #48**

On page 22, column 5, point 25, Mr. Sumner said that I said in a sermon that if you drank milk and did not so in faith, it was sin; hence, not drinking milk in faith would be as bad as committing murder or adultery. **I NEVER SAID THIS.** I don't believe this. **I DO** believe that if you do anything not in faith, it is sin (Romans 14:23). I do not believe that drinking milk without faith is comparable to murder or adultery. I have never implied this. I may have said that it is as surely a sin, but not ever have I said it is as great a sin.

### **UNTRUTH #49**

At the top of column 1 on page 23, paragraph 2, Mr. Sumner says, "Hyles overlooks nearly every sin known to man, including divorce, adultery, cursing, pornography etc. **THIS IS ABSOLUTELY UNTRUE.**" My standards are probably as strict as any man's in America. I preach against adultery, unscriptural divorce, cursing pornography, rock music, dirty magazines, X-rated movies, R-rated movies, all movies. I preach against soap operas, prime-time television, hatred, jealousy, covetousness, lying, cheating, stealing, and even misrepresenting truth in articles.

### **UNTRUTH #50**

Mr. Sumner, in the middle of column 1, page 23, states that the world's standard of the key to success is attitude and fits beautifully with Hyles-ology philosophy. The truth is that when I heard that certain books like this were being taught at Hyles-Anderson College, I immediately met with the leadership, and we took the books out of the college. Anybody who has heard me preach around the country knows that I strongly condemn this success-oriented philosophy of growth or prosperity at any cost.

### **UNTRUTH #51**

On page 23, column 1, about three-fourths down, Mr. Sumner says, "One former deacon, now a pastor, said when he attended staff meetings approximately two-thirds were women, and the women were making major decisions." **THIS IS NOT TRUE.** Deacons are not allowed to attend staff meetings. It is true that we have many fine women on our staff. They do **NOT** make the decisions, but we do seek their input before the decisions are made.

### **UNTRUTH #52**

On page 23, column 4, second paragraph, Dr. Sumner quotes me as saying, "Who better can tell boys and girls not to drink than those who've drunk. Who better can warn boys and girls to be pure and clean than those who've not been pure and clean." He totally misrepresents the purpose of this message. Nobody preaches purity more than I do. By the way, because of the grace of God and Mother's teaching, nobody practices purity more than I do. **I HAVE HAD ONE WOMAN IN MY LIFE, THE MOTHER OF MY CHILDREN.** He goes on to accuse that in sermon was the old argument that one must go into sin in order to effectively reach those who have fallen. This is **NOT** what I believe. I believe that a person should do everything in his power to stay pure and clean. I do believe, however, that if a person has been in deep sin and gets right with God, God can still use him, and one of the effective things that he can do is to warn others not to do what he did. It is simply another stick with which to hit the Devil on the head. Again Mr. Sumner

misrepresented the purpose of a message.

In the last column of his article on page 23 at the top of the page, Mr. Sumner made mention of a deacon showing up at deacons' meeting with his Bible, and the other deacons laughed at him, one of them saying, "What are you going to do, preach to us?" I was there when this statement was made. It was the same kind of a statement that would be made to a fellow who showed up with a black suit and a black tie and a pair of black shoes and socks, and one of the fellows would say, "Hey, you look like a reverend." It was done in friendly jesting and, by the way it was only one deacon even as Mr. Sumner said. He then gives an instance where the deacons are ready to pass a motion, another deacon objected and said, "This is contrary to Scripture." He goes on to say that they passed it anyway, and then he says, "with an end-justifies-the-means attitude." **THIS IS AN UNTRUTH.** Our deacons would never pass something that they thought was unscriptural. **ONE MAN** thought it was unscriptural. The rest of the deacons, after much discussion, agreed it was Scriptural. This is a false accusation against the finest deacon board in America.

James Wigton graduated from Ohio State University in 1976. He is the former editor of the Ohio State daily newspaper, *The Ohio State Daily Lantern*. He is former editor of the weekly Londonville, Ohio, *Times*. He is a former reporter for the St. Petersburg, Florida, *Times*, for the Dayton, Ohio, *Journal-Herald* and for the Norfolk, Virginia, *Virginian-Pilot*. He was a national award winner in college news writing. He was one of four student members in America elected to the National Board of Directors of the Sigma Delta Chi, the professional journalistic society Mr. Wigton read Mr. Sumner's article and without solicitation voluntarily wrote this article, as follows:

### **COMMENTS FROM A JOURNALIST** by James Wigton

From a journalistic standpoint, the article in *The Biblical Evangelist*, by Robert Sumner, alleging charges against Dr. Jack Hyles is filled with a multitude of violations of the basic principles of investigative reporting.

As a former editor, I could not have published such a poorly documented report. As a former reporter, I could not have turned in to an editor such a poorly investigated report.

It is a serious matter to bring charges of a moral nature against any preacher, much less a key leader in fundamentalism. As a journalist, I am offended.

I will leave to others who are better able and more familiar with the facts to defend Brother Hyles. But as a journalist, I wrote down nearly 40 examples of violations of journalistic principles in Dr. Sumner's article. Those examples boiled down into 11 categories:

**1. Quoting Secondhand Sources:** *The Biblical Evangelist* article frequently quoted secondhand sources where firsthand documentation would have been easily attainable. No competent journalist would quote people who said they saw a legal deposition when the reporter could look at the deposition himself. No competent investigative reporter would quote people who said they

saw what happened at Pastors' School when the reporter could attend for himself and see firsthand.

If one-third of the deacon board has resigned over an issue, that is a fact easily attainable through investigation – not to be reported based on hearsay. If 40 percent of Dr. Hyles' preaching is in defense of himself, that is a fact that can be verified by listening to his tapes – not based on one listener's opinion.

**2. Incomplete Investigation.** The article was fraught with incomplete research. If Dr. Hyles has admitted in a legal deposition to giving special gifts, such as an automobile, to one member of his staff, is she the only one? Or is this a common practice of his? An investigative reporter would find out. If there were "intimate letters," where are they? Let's see them. If those "intimate letters!" expressed love and gratitude, was this romantic and improper – or was it simply Christian love and gratitude expressed frequently to many staff members?

Further research would also have established the well-publicized fact that it was upon Mrs. Hyles' request that Dr. Hyles refrained from referring to her much in public. Further research would have uncovered that well-publicized origin of the college girls calling Dr. Hyles "Boopsie-Woopsie." Further research would have established that Dr. Hyles meets more frequently with the college men than with the college women.

Dr. Sumner, in regard to one sermon by Dr. Hyles, said, "We don't know what he meant." Then, find out! Did Dr. Hyles Counsel the 152 persons in one week which he claimed? Get the facts. If he did, then published skepticism is totally unjustified.

**3. Provable Charges.** Dr. Sumner frequently published in the article charges which were unproven and unprovable. Not only is this a violation of Scripture (I Timothy 5:19), but it is journalistically unsound.

Victor Nischik unsubstantiated allegations were frequently quoted as fact, without being attributed to him. His attorney, who obviously is reflecting what Nischik told him, is likewise quoted. Sumner refers to Dr. Hyles' "affair with his (Nischik's) wife" with absolutely no prior documentation. Judy Nischik Johnson's fear that Dr. Hyles would "snuff her out" is totally without justification. Journalistically it is unsupported.

The alleged private conversations are yellow journalism at its worst. There is insufficient evidence. A publication is liable for what it publishes, even when quoting others. Truth is a total defense in libel, but the truth must be provable. To prove that someone said something is insufficient; the journalist must be able to prove the truth of what that person said, or the publication is liable.

**4. Libel.** Although Dr. Sumner claims he is not accusing Dr. Hyles of adultery "at this time," he clearly implies it and publishes the alleged quote of Nischik charging Dr. Hyles with adultery. This was reported to have happened at a deacons' meeting. That is libelous. In Sumner's opening he tries to tie Dr. Hyles' situation in with the published accounts regarding Jimmy Bakker and Jimmy Swaggart. The one difference he ignores is that there is no proof, no evidence, no confession of a woman in regard to Dr. Hyles. That is a glaring difference!

**5. Lack of Attribution.** Sumner frequently uses alleged facts which are totally unattributed. Who

says that the car lights were flashed as signals? Who says Dr. Hyles' unilaterally negotiated the divorce settlement for Nischiks? Who says that other deacons joined Dr. Hyles in shouting down Nischik? Who says that Dr. Hyles conducts shouting matches at First Baptist Church a la Jesse Jackson?

There is no documentation of these charges. They are simply stated as fact by Sumner.

**6. Out of Context.** Sumner frequently quotes out of context. He quotes the legal depositions out of context. He quotes Dr. Hyles' sermons out of context. He alludes out of context to those few in Dr. Hyles' vast ministry who have been divorced.

For example, Sumner lists a number of persons under Dr. Hyles' ministry who have been divorced. But he does not give us the number of undivorced on Dr. Hyles' staff of several hundred. The reader in the average-sized Baptist church receives a totally false impression. Several times Sumner failed to include the context of humor in the description of events surrounding Dr. Hyles. For example, any visitor to Pastors' School knows that the so-called "flexing of his muscles" is in the context of comedy, not hero-worship. Similarly the teasing with the other college girls is in the context of comedy, not hero-worship.

**7. Opinion as Proof.** Dr. Sumner quotes opinion as if it were proof. At the beginning of his charges and at the end he refers to a letter from an individual woman to Dr. Hyles as if it were some kind of proof. Many are the fundamental Pastors who could have received such a letter from one disgruntled woman. Journalistically the letter is meaningless.

**8. Improper Quoting.** Sumner frequently quotes Dr. Hyles authoritatively but secondhand, without proper documentation. If Dr. Hyles said that fundamentalism would fall were he to fall, when did he say it? Where did he say it? To whom did he say it?

**9. Universal Statement.** Dr. Sumner violates a tenet of journalism by making a totally unjustified universal statement. He said that regarding marriage "there are no standards" at First Baptist Church and Hyles-Anderson College. The improper prejudice of such a statement is obvious. Any standard at all – be it strong or weak – makes Sumner's statement untrue.

**10. Publishing Gossip.** Dr. Sumner frequently quotes loose, secondhand gossip, which no respectable publication would do. For example, the reports on Brother Stencil were extremely unworthy of publication.

**11. Irrelevance.** Dr. Sumner included in the article a number of totally irrelevant reports. The discussion of Moody Bible Institute's divorce policy and how it applies to Victor Nischik, as well as the alleged moral violations of other men whom Sumner wrote about, have nothing to do with the charges against Dr. Hyles.

With my limited knowledge of the specifics, I myself can disprove a number of Dr. Sumner's allegations. However, I have tried here simply to show the total disregard for basic principles of investigative journalism displayed by the article in *The Biblical Evangelist*.

End of Wigton's Comments

Mr. Sumner's article has attacked my wife, my family, my staff, my friends, my college, my church and my integrity. He has done much damage that can never be un-done. A shadow has



been cast over my ministry that will never be removed, and, yes, he has done an injustice to fundamentalism, and all of this with a careless disregard of truth. As I sit here and casually go back through the article, I see such statements as, "One former deacon said." It is interesting how many things are presented as fact following the word "one." In other words, for one disgruntled person to say it means that it's true. How unfair! Why not quote the thousands of happy people at First Baptist Church? Why not quote the hundreds of people who work for us that are happy? Why not quote the vast majority of our deacons who are loyal and faithful? Why not quote Dr. Wendell Evans, Dr. Jim Jorgensen, Dr. Mark Rasmussen, Dr. Ray Young, Dr. Johnny Colsten, Brother Keith McKinney, Brother Bill Schutt, Dr. Elmer Fernandez, Dr. Roy Moffitt? Why not quote Jack Schaap, Darrell Moore and thousands of happy people instead of a handful of disgruntleds. What a tragedy to use such poor journalism in an attempt to destroy a great church, a great college, a pure and sincere preacher and an innocent woman.

But there is more to it than that. Mr. Sumner's brand of fundamentalism and mine are not the same. Mr. Handford's brand of fundamentalism and mine are not the same. The battle is also a philosophical one. Mr. Sumner's associations and affiliations are not the same as mine. Moody Bible Institute, the school where Mr. Nischik worked, has a philosophy that is totally different from mine. Basically, one of the main battles is old-fashioned, soul-winning, separatist, Hell-fire-and-brimstone Christianity versus a new, watered-down fundamentalism which is not fundamentalism at all. Be reminded that if this issue had never come up, I would not have invited Dr. Sumner to preach for me and he would not have invited me to preach for him. I am not saying that the philosophical battle is the entire battle, but I am saying that I am not and never have been in Mr. Sumner's camp. The only support I have ever given him was \$200 a month for a rather lengthy period of time in an effort to help him live and meet expenses because he had resigned *The Sword of the Lord* after my defense of Dr. Hutson.

Yes, there is at stake the future of a great church, the future of a great school, the ministry of a sincere preacher, and the reputation of a decent and pure woman, and **YES, DR. SUMNER – AND YOU MAY USE THIS AS YOU WILL** – the future of old-fashioned fundamentalism is also at stake.

*This article may be copied without permission but only in its entirety.*

# THE HYLES REPLY!

by Robert L. Sumner, Editor

First of all, I would like to thank Dr. Jack Hyles for making my job easier in responding to his published defense of my charges. In a court of law, the most incriminating evidence possible is what is known as *testimony against self-interest*. That is when someone admits something that is against his own best interest in the case.

By way of example, if a defendant in a murder trial, on the witness stand, acknowledges that he was in the victim's home on the night of the murder and that a heated argument developed over the latter's involvement with the defendant's wife, the confession of his presence and the ensuing argument is more incriminating than if a dozen witnesses took the stand and said the same. He has testified against his own best interest through his admissions.

That is what Jack Hyles did in the "Answers" he mailed out to over 60,000 pastors and Christian leaders – written in collaboration with James H. Wigton – and using, in part, a mailing list purchased in Nashville. (Actually, he sent out two mailings, but there was nothing of substance in the first one, merely speaking of what fine folk everyone I mentioned was, how much he loved his children, and that he was pausing to go "out for a bite to eat" with Dave, "He is my buddy and my son, and I love the guy." He signed the letter after 3 pages, then, perhaps because someone pointed out he hadn't even mentioned his wife, he added a postscript and said, "There is not a more loved or respected woman in America than Beverly Hyles," but he still neglected say that **he** loves her.)

*How did he testify against his own best interest?*

Well, he admitted to the basic thrust of the first half of my article: **Hyles, First Baptist Church, and Hyles-Anderson College are the scene of one great, massive cover-up of sin!**

Consider carefully what he said about Vic Nischik. While we will deal with the charges against this good man later in this article, note now that he says Vic "asked one of his female employees to run off with him." He says again, Mrs. Nischik found him in "his pajamas in a bedroom with a beautiful young lady." He quotes a letter from a former employee of Vic's who passed on the following office gossip: (1) when his secretary went on maternity leave, one of the salesmen wondered aloud "if the husband knew that that was really 'Victor's baby'"; (2) whenever she had to work late, Vic's reputation was so bad a man older than her father would come up and check on her to make sure, the inference was, Vic was not molesting her; (3) Vic "had a thing" for the female office manager; (4) when she had to work on Saturday, the owner and his son-in-law told

her to let them know if Vic ever came around when she was working, the inference again being clear; (5) "all the salesmen – what I would call the good ones and the loose ones – both had comments to make about Mr. Nischik's carryings on with the opposite sex"; (6) when she returned after being in Germany for two summers, one of his former female employees told her Vic's "reputation was worse, and that he had asked her if she would run away with him"; (7) a "girl from Hammond Baptist School was sleeping" with him (this was "overheard at the church!"), and she saw them "flirting with each other – they were both clearly enjoying it." Hyles also quotes an ex-babysitter who says she can "attest to the fact that Vic was flirting with the teenage girls."

**YET, DEAR READER, THROUGHOUT ALL OF THIS, HYLES BEING PRIVY TO MOST IF NOT ALL OF IT BY HIS OWN TESTIMONY, VIC REMAINED A MEMBER IN GOOD STANDING OF THE FIRST BAPTIST CHURCH, SONG LEADER IN DR. HYLES' OWN ADULT SUNDAY SCHOOL CLASS, CHOIR MEMBER, A KEY WORKER IN THE BUS MINISTRY (WHERE THE "PICKINGS" WOULD BE DELIGHTFUL AMONG LOVE-STARVED, FATHERLESS, TEEN-AGE GIRLS), A TRUSTEE OF HYLES-ANDERSON COLLEGE, A FINANCIAL ADVISER AND ASSISTANT WHO HELPED HIM OBTAIN A \$1,500,000 LOAN FOR THE PURCHASE OF THE HYLES-ANDERSON CAMPUS, AS WELL AS A RESPECTED DEACON IN THE FIRST BAPTIST CHURCH! ON THE BASIS OF DR. HYLES' OWN ADMISSIONS, I REST MY CASE ABOUT THE MASSIVE COVER-UP OF SIN UNDER HIS LEADERSHIP!**

In passing, it is interesting to note that the above evidence against Vic is loose, unsubstantiated, secondhand, hearsay gossip from unnamed sources, the very kind for which "journalist" James Wigton so roundly criticized me, saying, "As a former editor, I could not have published such a poorly documented report. As a former reporter, I could not have turned in to an editor such a poorly investigated report," then adding, "As a journalist, I am offended." Talk about the pot calling the kettle black!

This is probably a good time to clear up the matter of "journalist" Wigton, whom Hyles and Hutson both billed as "the former editor of the Ohio State daily newspaper, *The Ohio State Daily Lantern*. He is former editor of the weekly Londonville (sic), Ohio, *Times*. He is a former reporter for the St. Petersburg, Florida, *Times*, for the Dayton, Ohio, *Journal-Herald*, and for the Norfolk, Virginia, *Virginian-Pilot*. He was a national award winner in college news writing. He was one of four student members in America selected to the National Board of Directors of the Sigma Delta Chi, the professional journalist society. Mr. Wigton read Mr. Sumner's article and without solicitation voluntarily wrote this article...." Hyles titled the article, "**COMMENT FROM A JOURNALIST.**"

There is certainly nothing there to indicate that Wigton is the pastor of the Peoples Baptist of Bay City, Michigan. His editorship of the small town weekly was prior to his education at Ohio State and all the other journalistic experiences listed were during his student days. After graduating from Ohio State in 1976 (where he edited the school paper for one semester), he told me he went back to Loudonville and started the First Alliance Church, pastoring there from 1977 to 1979, then going the pastorate of the Midland Street Peoples Church in Bay City (which only recently became a Baptist church). Instead of the implication that he is a full-time journalist, he has been a full-time pastor since 1977.

Would you get this impression from the glowing tribute both Hyles and Hutson gave him? Instead of "Comments From a Journalist," the heading in both papers might better have said, "Comments From a Pastor Who Was Once a Student Journalist." While he has dabbled in journalism over the years while serving as a full-time pastor, it must be more of a hobby with him than anything. He didn't remember them when I called and interviewed him, but he has written me several times since, as he thinks of them, listing other journalistic accomplishments. So far he has not mentioned "ghosting" the Hyles story to me, but he has to others.

In the Hyles article, telling what sins he *preaches* against (which was not my point; I was talking about his *practice*, noting that he preaches hardest against the sins of which he is guilty), apparently intended as a jab at me, Hyles said he preaches against "...even misrepresenting truth in articles." Yet he and Hutson both misrepresented Wigton's status, seeking to present him as something he has not been for more than a decade. Why didn't they call him "Rev. Wigton"? Why didn't they say he was a pastor and list his church? Why didn't they give his mailing address? Understand, I, personally, think Wigton's student journalism credentials are impressive; it is the dishonesty and deception to which I object.

Even more. He is not the disinterested "journalist" the article implies, a man only concerned with setting the record straight. He frequently attends Hyles' Pastors School, taking men from his church with him. He has students from his church at Hyles-Anderson. His church contributes financially to Hyles-Anderson. As recently as last May he was a chapel speaker at the college. A loyal member of his church for many years, but who recently got fed up and left, called him "a little Hyles," adding, "Recently, Wigton's church has experienced its third major split in about 6 years. Wigton is guilty, himself, of every one of his 'violations of journalistic principles'."

For what it's worth, Wigton's original thesis had 12 categories – one was dropped, "Editorial Opinion" and a paragraph at the end was omitted in which he declared that "no respectable secular newspaper will publish charges against Dr. Hyles," concluding, "Believe me, if they had something concrete, if they could topple one of Fundamentalism's I giants – they would." Obviously, Wigton is not much of a prophet; respected secular newspapers *have* carried the story...*and there are more to come!*

## HYLES' RESPONSES

Actually, Hyles has responded to my article three times. The first was on Sunday night, May 14th, in a sermon he called "Weathering the Storm." He ranted and raved, whooped and hollered; declared "war" on me, Dr. Walt Handford, Evangelist George Godfrey and some others; but there was absolutely nothing of substance regarding my charges. He did a lot of name calling and referred to excretion – both of which his students imitated almost en masse in their letters to me – but he danced all around the issues. In the sermon he told the audience not to send a tape of it to me, that he would personally send me the first copy. He lied. He has sent me nothing – sermon tape, second response, or third response. The tape was very poorly done, one large section was repetition, and those familiar with electronics assured me it had been altered. Comparison with it and a privately made tape verifies this.

His second response was in a mailing dated May 19. He mentioned several individuals I referred to in my article and said they were nice people. He also said that he loved his children. That took three pages and then, seemingly as an afterthought, he added a fourth page and said his wife was a lovely lady, too. At no place does he express love for his wife, either in this response or the other two. As one brother wrote me, "It is interesting to note that he says Mrs. Hyles is loved all over America, but he does not once say *he* loves her. Not even in the sermon tape does he say 'I love Beverly'." There was nothing of any substance in this response.

The third was the one we have already started examining and to which we will give our attention in this article. (An influential Hammond area pastor called it "full of holes, and, I have to say, full of lies.") Hyles has already admitted my basic thrust in the first half – dealing with morals – namely, that there is a massive cover-up of sin under his leadership, as per his confessions about Vic Nischik.

### WHAT HYLES "DOESN'T" SAY!

Anyone who has read my original article and then his third reply can easily see that my major concerns are not dealt with, something we consider an admission of their accuracy. Hyles starts with what he feels is his strongest point – Jennie's condominium and the description of his generosity – and this covers between one-fourth and one-fifth of his entire reply. Next is an all-out attack on the character of Vic Nischik, followed by 52 "untruths" I supposedly published, then the assessment by "journalist" Wigton, and then Hyles' conclusion.

While he jumped on this single sentence about the condo to open his defense, the careful reader immediately notices he has deftly sidestepped a host of charges. Again assuming this to be an acknowledgement of their truth, we will list some of them again to refresh the reader's memory.

...The incriminating letter from Judy Nischik Johnson, Vic and Jennie's daughter, about which I said "if I ever received a letter like that and it contained even 10% truth, I'd walk out of the ministry without ever looking back. I could not handle even the *private* knowledge that such a letter were even *remotely* true." Incidentally, while he did not respond to this letter publicly, he did write a private letter that he addressed to "Jack and Judy Nischik," a *vicious* letter in which he accused them of destroying their Mother "and did it on Mother's Day." The latter is absurd, of course. He is the only one who did anything on Mother's Day. Judy wrote her letter on October 1, 1986; our May 1 issue was released in late April; *but his "declaration of war" tirade was issued on Mother's Day, May 14th!* Incidentally, if he has written anyone a letter like this in defense of his wife, we are not aware of it.

...The matter of the "business phone" in Mrs. Nischik's bedroom that Hyles paid to have installed and each month pays the bill "in cash." In our article we noted that it "was probably the only 'business' telephone in the greater Chicago area with an 'unlisted' number!"

... The comfortable living arrangement of Mrs. Nischik. Her husband's take-home pay was two or three times hers, yet Vic said in his prepared statement for the First Baptist deacons, "Under no circumstances could I have been able to provide for her such a high life style."

...The testimony of the Nischik daughter about all the money that "somehow mysteriously appeared to my mother" and the "large amounts of cash lying around" that she sometimes saw.

...The deacon who came to Vic's defense and wrote Hyles later, "I tried to speak to you about these areas and was put down by you." I have a copy of the letter.

...That Mrs. Hyles left her husband and then came back "for the good of the ministry."

...The fact that he took four women, including Jennie, on an all-expense paid trip to Hawaii – going alone with these women and staying at the same hotel, the only male in the party – but his own wife was not present.

...The charge by Judy that Hyles was a thief.

...The seducing of a Hyles-Anderson College administrator's teen-age, high school daughter by David Hyles, an act we called "more nefarious than some of the others." The benefit for Hammond was that it got him out of town; the curse for Garland was that it put him into the pulpit of that church in Texas where his notorious immorality really blossomed. In addition to all the evidence I had before, an "innocent" participant sent me a 4-page letter, verifying all the details of this incident – matters she had kept covered even from her own minister father because

the Hammond crowd had convinced her it was for the good of the ministry. Shame, shame.

...That Dave Hyles skipped town owing a \$10,000 printing bill, one that had nothing to do with the Miller Road Baptist Church, but the latter paid it so that its testimony in the community would not be blighted even more. For what it's worth: before me is a letter from a former Sword of the Lord employee (no one who was associated with me in the problems there, or even there at the time) who talked to the brother, now in jail in Florida, of a Dave Hyles successor at Miller Road. He said, "I'm convinced this young inmate's wretched life is a result of watching 'famous' fundamentalists up close, manipulate, sin and manipulate 'successfully' again. Weeks before your 'Saddest Story' was printed, he told me he had witnessed Jack Hyles verifying that he advised Dave NOT to pay his debts after he was 'caught' at Miller Road."

...In fact he treated everything about Dave like it was the plague, staying totally away from it. I received a heartbreaking letter from a lady who was one of Dave's victims, speaking of the psychological problems she is still having. By the way, she went to Jack Hyles when he was preaching in Garland and told him, "I'm sleeping with your son." She wanted help; she needed help. What was Hyles' response to this troubled young woman? First, *don't tell anyone*; second, move out of the State. (She did, but Dave visited her in that place, 700 miles away, and they continued the affair. When Hyles came to preach in that area, she confronted him again, "We are still sleeping together," again crying for the help she did not receive.)

...He ignored the matter of his three famous protégées, the Smith brothers, including Hyles' son-in-law, Tim (the one he calls "the towheaded fool"), and his immorality in Michigan/Florida. He merely said that Becky "and her fine husband, Tim, have three children who are a tribute to them." Elsewhere in this issue we have up-dated our readers on the outcome of Terry Smith's immorality trial.

...He ignored the immorality of the college physician, Dr. Dennis Streeter, who treats the coeds at the school.

...He did not respond to our charge that the head of one of the church's ministries was caught in immorality by a pastor in Michigan, where he was holding meetings, whom Hyles rewarded by helping him get out of town and into a pastorate in another State.

...Hyles deftly sidestepped the sordid story of John Stancil and the young Hyles-Anderson coed, now his wife, which took place while he was married to another woman. Hyles married the couple a short time after the divorce was finalized.

...Also sidestepped was the matter of the college staff member rubbing the derriere of girls as they boarded the bus at the dorm. After reporting the incident and being told the staff member

would not be permitted to be on the girls' buses again, a month or so later he was "back in business."

...He ignored my revelation that he teaches "everlasting life" and "eternal life" are two different things, causing all kinds of confusion at First Baptist and elsewhere. I have before me a letter from a brother in Kansas who said an evangelistic team from Hyles-Anderson came to his church and preached this heresy. They argued that the rich young ruler was saved because he asked for eternal life, meaning he already had everlasting life (as Hyles teaches it). When Jesus replied, He was not telling the ruler how to be saved, but how to get rewards in Heaven! Hyles' clones are helping spread this dangerous, foolish doctrine.

...That he pads his reports, dating all the way back to his days at Miller Road in Texas. I gave the exact totals for the latter, compared with what he claimed.

...His Romanist teaching that his deeds could make it easier for his dad in Hell.

...His teaching that fallen man is not human and that an unsaved man does not have a spirit. One brother wrote to point out that this is identical to the teaching of the cultist, Victor Paul Wierwille, founder of The Way International, observing that "he said the exact same thing."

...That he has no standards against a divorced person remarrying, no matter the grounds for the first marriage break-up.

...His repeated cultic claim that his staff would commit suicide if he told them to do so.

...His teaching in his sermon, "Thank you, Adam," praising Adam and Eve for disobeying God and bringing sin into the world, making such silly statements as, "Thank God for the chains of sin!"

...His teaching that backsliding is a necessary part of spiritual growth ("one of the great truths of the Christian life"), and his strange conclusion, "If you are not as high as you used to be, jump up and down and say 'Hallelujah!'"

...His teaching that *no one has a right to judge another about anything*, contradicting the clear insistence of the Word of God that we are to "judge righteous judgment" and, since Christians are one day going to judge angels, "how much more things that pertain to this life?"

...His hypocrisy in saying he is putting nothing away for a rainy day when he has thousands salted away in an IRA program and thousands more in a Keough program. We think much more is coming to light soon in this area.



...His blasphemous teaching about forgiveness, "It wasn't God the Father that forgave; the Man, the human Christ Jesus, forgave."

...His strange teaching about apologetics, even denying that the apostles and early Christians used it in their preaching to prove that Jesus of Nazareth was the long awaited Messiah.

...The tragic fact, noted by almost everyone who has ever heard him preach, that he uses almost no Scripture in his message beyond the text, plus the fact that he often takes his text out of context and the sermon has nothing to do with what the passage is teaching. I complained about this to Dr. Rice when I was Associate Editor of *The Sword*.

One editor called and said he had counted 64 different items in my article that Hyles either totally ignored or covered inadequately and inconclusively.

To deal with what Hyles *did* answer, I want to start with a word about,

### **WHY WE HAVE REFUSED TO NAME MOST NAMES**

Beyond any question of a doubt, this has tremendously weakened our account of the Hammond story. Again and again good men have complained about this to us. We are sorry, that is the way it *must* be, even our story is not believed.

#### **Why?**

These people fear for their lives and their ministries, that's why! Some who live in the Hammond area had their home broken into, files rifled, materials stolen, and some have received actual death threats. One brother in the Hammond area had his house "egged" and vandalized while he was out of town serving the Lord – and his daughters had to take time off from work to clean the debris. My son received a call in the middle of the night saying his children were dead, greatly upsetting his teen-age daughter. I have received several "middle of night" phone calls, one threatening to burn my house to the ground; in fact, calls from midnight to 4 a.m. are a fact of life for Hyles' disciples. A former faculty member at Hyles-Anderson warned me that I should "hire a security officer to man your facility when it is closed and through the night" (the local police are keeping a special watch).

One First Baptist staff member, Eddie Lapina – who identified himself to me as the church's Youth Pastor prior to publishing our first article – called (with fellow staff member Chris Stansell bravely listening in; the latter told me later he "said a word or two," but I was not conscious of anyone else speaking), threatening me about what he would do if I printed the article ("I'm going

to tell you something, if that article comes out...if I ever cross your path I'm going to deal with you *big time*," and later he added, "you and I will meet some day, somehow, somewhere"; when I asked what he meant, sarcastically saying he "really frightened me," he said I could take it any way I wanted to). Since I understood him to mean he would physically assault me, I asked his age, and he said 30; I pointed out that I am nearly 67 and he was very brave to threaten to beat up an elderly man. Lapina then backed off and said there were other ways "to fight" than physical, but he did not explain. A school principal at First Baptist, Don Boyd, was not as cautious. He wrote me frankly, "If I see you I will punch you right in the mouth." Believe it or not, Boyd's official duties at the school involve *discipline!* We wonder what punishment this disciplinarian metes out to a kid who threatens to punch another kid in the mouth on school property?

A member of First Baptist called me so frightened he could hardly speak, saying he had wanted to write but Hyles had stood in the pulpit waving a letter from Vic Nischik to me, saying he had "intercepted" it. The dear brother was afraid to write me thinking Hyles would intercept his letter, but I assured him the communication Hyles had "intercepted" was a copy the writer had mailed out to many ministers and one or more had turned them over to their boss. The same man, concerned about my welfare, warned me about what he called "Hyles' hit men." Others have warned me of the same. Perhaps you recall my quoting the Nischik daughter's fear of being "snuffed out." Any number of individuals have warned me about my phones being bugged, including a former staff member who suggested it would be worth the expense to call in professionals to check it out. Right now there is a tremendous "witch hunt" going on in Hammond as the leadership tries to ferret out the non-loyalists (the loyalists are sporting "Hyles 100%" buttons and bumper stickers), one that makes the Communist Chinese leaders' efforts to identify the students active at Tiananmen Square fade into insignificance.

Our advertisers are being harassed. A pastor in Maryland, Tom Carpenter, is writing our advertisers, seeking to get them to drop their ads in THE BIBLICAL EVANGELIST, saying my article had "provoked a narrowly avoided church split." (I told him he was not going to lay that guilt trip on me – it belonged in Hammond; I merely reported it.) Even before that, advertisers had notified us they were being contacted to drop us. Only two have canceled at this writing and, since neither gave a reason, we do not know they were related to the Hyles matter. Not many respectable businessmen will bow to being bullied and intimidated, in our judgment, And we think most of those writing our advertisers are not even subscribers, merely people who obtained the May 1 story and are writing those who advertised in that one issue. A concerted effort is also being made to get people to cancel their subscriptions, but we have had relatively few – at least in light of the campaign being made. Many, many more have subscribed.

The *Hammond Times* is receiving the same treatment. Assistant Pastor Ray Young (who showed his interest in his church's missionary program by writing me, "Before you decided to attack Bro. Hyles I had never heard your name. I had never heard of your paper. I had never seen a copy of

your paper. I had never read an article in your paper, neither do I ever plan to"; yet we were on the church's missionary budget for years, until we refused, as a matter of conviction, to accept FBC monies any longer – Young has been on the church staff 14 years), according to the newspaper's June 7 edition, told the *Times* he would contact the paper's advertisers and urge a boycott unless one of the following happened: "The Times retracts its articles and fully supports and endorses Hyles, First Baptist Church, Hyles-Anderson College and the church's related ministries; The Times prints Hyles' side of the story verbatim, without editing; Advertisers call Young to tell him they 'will no longer be advertising in the Hammond Times'."

Publisher Jack McCarthy responded that it was "The Times' opinion that Young [was] proposing an 'illegal boycott' of the newspaper which is exercising its First Amendment rights of a free press." In a telephone conversation, McCarthy "told him we thought his actions were illegal and we asked him to cease and desist," and noted that Young's actions might "be blackmail." At the time of that issue, only one advertiser had canceled, a member of the church. As for others, the *Time's* advertising director, Don Caldwell, said that most of the advertisers he had talked with were furious over "being threatened or blackmailed about where to spend their advertising dollars." We think most good people react the same way.

Let it be known by one and all, however, that we will go right on standing for righteousness and opposing sin if we lose every advertiser we have (don't worry, we won't!), and we'll go right on publishing THE BIBLICAL EVANGELIST as long as God wants us to do so. (We have no desire to continue longer than that.)

Nor are we afraid of all the threats cowards have anonymously been making. Going to Heaven is not a bad thought for us at all. Neither will we bow to blackmail. BUT WE ARE NOT GOING TO REVEAL OUR SOURCES AND SUBJECT THEM TO THIS KIND OF TREATMENT, EVEN IF OUR STORY IS DISCREDITED AS A RESULT!

### **THE "NITTY-GRITTY" OF THE HYLES RESPONSE**

I will now go over his paper and seek to face every charge he has disputed. For his benefit – and that of our readers – I will number them.

**1.** His opening paragraphs bring up the supposed power struggle at the Sword in early 1982. He speaks of the "meeting of the governing board," etc., and says, "the majority of the board voted for Dr. Hutson. The minority of those who would not be loyal included Dr. Robert Sumner."

There never was any such vote of the "governing board." As noted in my editorial last month ("That 'Famous' Sword 'Power Struggle!'"), I offered my resignation before Hyles even knew there was a problem. Curtis Hutson has admitted that. In his story of what happened at that first

meeting of the board members who worked at Murfreesboro (it was not a board meeting, merely a meeting of some of the members who were available), he acknowledges that I resigned and says I "promised to have his resignation from the Board of Directors on my desk the next morning." The others present, excluding Curtis Hutson, pleaded with those of us who had resigned to delay until an outside mediator could be brought in. The issue of my resignation (and of the others) had nothing to do with who would edit the *Sword*, but exclusively with the truthfulness and honesty of Curtis Hutson.

The second meeting – *still not a board meeting; one of the board members was even refused admission by Hyles and Hutson* – was with the same ones who lived in Murfreesboro, plus Jack Hyles. There was no vote. As soon as the meeting opened, Jack Hyles took charge and told everybody what he thought should be done. At the end, he went around the circle and asked who would "give Dr. Hutson another chance." One man who had resigned did, but none of the others followed because Hutson refused to acknowledge any wrongdoing or promise to change. There was no vote of any kind.

The third meeting was the only meeting of the "governing board" and it was not held to remove Hutson or plead with us to stay. The main topic of discussion was about who would take over Jack Cornelius' responsibility to repay the \$200,000 or so still short in the trust fund. Also, certain gifts were voted to those who were leaving. For example, Dr. Ron English was given the highly valuable Voice of Revival equipment because he felt led to continue Dr. John R. Rice's radio ministry. Biblical Evangelism was given – as Curtis Hutson has made so much of – a lump sum of \$5,000; allowed all the time needed to remove personal library, desks, files and other office equipment belonging to us; and permission to leave our book stock on the premises until December 31, over 9 months hence.

*Does that sound, even remotely, like a power struggle?* Does any intelligent person think someone said, "Hey, Sumner! You tried to oust Hutson and failed. Here's \$5,000 for trying, and, by the way, you can keep your belongings on the property until next year! And Dr. English, since you bungled it too, as your reward we'll give you valuable radio equipment, much of it just purchased brand new last year and some of it reconditioned – worth perhaps as much as \$25,000 – along with broadcasting rights and permission to reproduce Dr. Rice's radio booklets!" *How inane!* I wish Hyles and Hutson would put this silly falsehood to rest.

**2.** He said he didn't want me to have financial problems, so he went home and asked His board to put me on the budget for \$200. Wanting to give the correct, fair situation, let me add that he also gave an initial check for \$2,000, in addition to that monthly support. However, it is misleading to say that the money came to me, because it didn't. I was receiving \$00.00 per year from *The Sword* for my labors, so when I resigned there was no change in my material status quo. As a long-time *Sword* board member, Hyles knew that fact, but I am willing to be charitable and say he had

perhaps forgotten.

He may also have forgotten that I wrote him saying that I did not want the support, but he continued to send the checks. Since the money was going into our nonprofit work, I did not feel I could press the matter. Eventually, something came that convinced me it *would be unethical* to continue accepting it and I so informed Dr. Hyles. Remembering how the checks continued coming when I expressed that feeling previously, this time I told him they would be returned if sent. He continued to send them and we continued to return them. Hyles finally became convinced that we meant business and the checks stopped.

3. Hyles says much of the information in my article came from Vic Nischik. While he did provide much of the initial information – and much he did not – any thing he supplied was checked out with others, as much as could be. Obviously, there was no way I could document personal conversations between Hyles and Nischik; I had to make an editorial decision according to what I felt was true. Since I have never yet found Vic untruthful in any area, and since I have absolute proof of numerous lies on the part of Hyles (as this article will show), I took the farmer's word in those cases. But let it be known that I spent 6 months in earnest, laborious toil on the "Saddest Story," talking and corresponding with literally hundreds of people.

4. Hyles speaks of my sources as "disgruntled" church members. Those into subliminal speech will recognize this immediately as a programmed word. It is intended to conjure up thoughts of trouble make soreheads and church splitters. For example, I was called a "disgruntled Sword employee" even though I walked out on issues of truth and honesty. By this standard, Martin Luther could be called "a disgruntled Roman Catholic" when he nailed his "Ninety-Five Theses" to the church door at Wittenberg. Most of the so-called "disgruntled" First Baptist and Hyles-Anderson people I talked with were brokenhearted over what *had* and *is* happening.

5. Regarding the condominium for Mrs. Nischik, Hyles obviously felt this was his strongest point because he lifted a single sentence from the middle of my article and used it as his starting point, giving approximately one-fifth of his entire "reply" to it. But apparently there is more to this condominium deal than meets the eye. For thing, an experienced newspaperman man, very knowledgeable in such areas, called as soon as Hyles' paper came out, assuring us that the photocopies Hyles reproduced (which were so difficult to read) showed evidence of having been altered. Acting on this lead, we checked at the Recorder of Deeds office at the Lake County government offices and what do suppose we found?

*Almost nothing!*

Other than a brief statement on the \$26,000 mortgage, the file on the property is as bare as Old Mother Hubbard's cupboard. There is only one reason I can think of for someone cleaning out the

cupboard – the lady in charge said she couldn't imagine what had happened – is, namely, to remove evidence. If you don't think there is hanky-panky going on in this area, you are not very sharp.

There are other considerations. Everyone connected with the real estate business is familiar with what they call "sweetheart deals," money under the table, and all the rest. It certainly harmonizes with the other tens of thousands of dollars Hyles acknowledges giving this woman. Too, doesn't it seem strange to you that Mrs. Nischik put everything she got from the divorce settlement into this property? The figures seem too convenient, too pat. If the condo cost \$67,900 and she borrowed \$26,000, this indicates a down payment of \$41,900 – actually about \$1,600 *more* than she received in the settlement (which was \$40,316.37, to be exact). How many people do you know who put *all the money* received in the sale of one property into the purchase of another – especially one who has just been divorced and has all the financial problems attending it? There are taxes, closing costs, new insurance, and a host of other matters that must be paid on the spot. In her case, she had disposed of much of her furniture and had major purchases to make in this area, too.

6. Hyles next goes through a long recital about his generosity, a fact we acknowledged in our original article. We spoke there of his "naturally generous character," adding that we reserved the right to "our own opinion about why." Intricately involved with our feelings on the subject is the constant refusal of those who had information on him to say anything to us because he had given them sizable chunks of money. It was what Judy called "hush money" in our article: *he can keep them under his thumb, have power over them, make them forever indebted to him*. Thank God, there are some people who cannot be bought!

It is only fair to add that in some areas he is not so generous. For example, he selected 10 men from Hyles-Anderson College – the pick of the litter, so to speak – to go out and start new churches, promising them \$1,000 a month in support for 6 months. For several months, at the end of each month they would contact the church to inquire where their check was, only to be given some excuse and be assured that the money would eventually arrive. One of the men brokenheartedly called me to say that neither he nor the others ever received a dime. This man had a wife and several children, so was forced to quit the ministry and get a job working for an honest employer to pay off his debts. On this particular deal, Hyles had a gift from a businessman and wanted to set up a trust for this purpose. He had Vic Nischik do all the groundwork, select the men, and send them out. In the meantime, Vic refused to be involved with the trust fund unless he had access to the figures, both income and expenditures. Hyles refused, and what he did with the money we have no idea. We do know he broke his promise of support to 10 good men.

By the way, a very practical suggestion for Dr. Hyles came to us while we were reading the glowing recital of his gift giving: **"Why not pay your help a living wage so they won't**

**constantly be in a financial bind, requiring you to bail them out? Of course, you couldn't control them nearly as well, but it should certainly do wonders for their self-esteem."**

7. Hyles next deals with "staff cars" and a closer look certainly needs to be taken at it. Under oath, the deposition taken on February 5, 1986, Mrs. Nischik testified that her salary, before taxes, was \$15,372.96 – saying it was her "total income" from the First Baptist Church. (This is for handling Hyles' tapes.) At that time, she had a 1985 Buick Tornado, purchased when the new models came out, costing \$17,500. The trade-in difference was, she testified, "About \$4,800." She said Hyles gave her "an allowance" that paid for it over a 2-year period, along with money for a weekly tank of gas – *all in cash*. When Attorney Hess asked, "Do you get a W-2 form, or do you get some type of form from Reverend Hyles to file with your taxes?" she replied, "No." He then questioned, "Is this reflected – this benefit, is this reflected on you income tax return?" and she again simply responded, "No." When he asked why, she replied, "I guess I never thought to." Further questioning revealed this had gone on for "quite a long time," nearly as long as she had worked for Hyles she said, and when Attorney Hess pressed her, "And none of this income is reported on any of your tax returns?" she admitted, "No, sir." She went on to say that she "assumed" Hyles kept records of the payments and if Hess would subpoena him, "he would – most likely," have them. But later, under oath, Hyles said he kept no records of this nature.

Hyles says this is "one of the benefits of Mrs. Nischik's job," but she admits she does not report it on her income tax. Hyles went on to claim that he buys a new car for his secretary, Erma McKinney, and for Maxine Jeffries. What he doesn't say is that *he has been buying Jennie new cars since 1968 and he only started buying Mrs. McKinney a new car, in 1985, the year Jennie Nischik filed for divorce, and it was a white 1985 sub-compact Buick Skyhawk, costing about half what Jennie's cars cost!* Hyles plays fast and loose with the truth when he implies ("likewise") that he buys Maxine Jeffries a new car every two years. Her car is one of over 30 church cars leased for various members of the staff, a matter determined by the board of deacons (in her case, because of all the shut-in visitation and benevolent work associated with her duties). As for the car he bought Adrienne Hilliard, it is a "clinker" with an estimated value of about \$700.

All the other ladies mentioned are either single, divorced, or/and indigent; Jennie had a husband who was gainfully employed in the automobile business in an executive capacity from 1964 to 1983 and could easily have provided her a car. He always had a company car – Cadillac, Chevrolet, Ford, or any number of import models – but she never rode in a one of them, even when the children drove.

As for Vic's participation in this magnanimous gesture for an employee who alone was signaled out for this annual benefit – *and one who had an automobile executive husband fully capable of supplying any such need* – it is true, as Hyles says, that Vic "enthusiastically agreed and even helped pick out" the car. A whole lot more truth lies under the surface needing to be dug up,

however. At that time, in 1968 (remember, it was 1985 before his personal secretary got in on this deal – and her "staff" husband was far less capable of providing it), Hyles came to Vic and told him the 1967 Chevrolet Impala Hardtop Coupe – top of the line, a white sporty job, pale blue leather interior, a real "cream puff" – was not good enough for Jennie even though it was just a year old and only had 26,000 miles. Vic says Hyles had him sell the Impala and he confesses, "Yes, I was impressed with the purchase of a new car for Jennie, especially with Jack Hyles paying for it in cash. But this is the only car purchase in which I ever participated. I never got to ride in any of her cars."

**8.** Before we leave the money question there is a very interesting matter that ought to be brought out. In the deposition taken from Jennie Rae Nischik on February 5, 1986 (and since so many have written to ask: yes, we do have a complete set of those depositions of Jennie, Hyles and Vic under oath, going over them very carefully before printing our first article), the following exchange between the witness and Attorney Hess took place:

"Q. Mrs. Nischik, before I get into some of these documents, did you have a safe – a safe in your home with – a combination safe?

"A. A little portable one.

"Q. Yeah, a portable one.

"A. Yes, sir.

"Q. And was that in your bedroom?

"A. Yes, sir.

"Q. And what did you keep in there?

"A. I have my passport; I have my watch; I have some keepsakes from high school, diploma; I have a couple of pieces of jewelry; I have some letters that have been sent to my children or me through the years that I wanted as keepsakes because it was fireproof, and I wanted to keep it in that. I have two or three silver dollar certificates that I've been given. I have a compact.

"Q. Let me ask you this: Have you ever kept cash in that –

"A. Never.

"Q. Never. Where did you keep the combination?



"A. (Indicating).

"Q. Did you ever have it behind a picture frame?

"A. No.

"Q. No?

"A. No.

"Q. Approximately five years ago, did you – approximately, did you ever have about \$28,000 in that safe deposit box – in that safe?

"A. Never.

"Q. Never?

"A. Never.

"Q. Did you have – either it could have been 20,000 or 25,000 in cash?

"A. No.

"Q. You're saying under oath that you never had it?

"A. Yes, sir.

"Q. Did you ever have it for someone else –

"A. No, sir.

"Q. (Continuing) – maybe not your money, but holding onto other people's money –

"A. No sir.

"Q. (Continuing) – in that kind of dollars?

"A. No sir."

Later, in the deposition of Jack Hyles, on May 1, 1986, Attorney Hess followed the same line of questioning. Quoting from the record:

"Q. Do you know if Mrs. Nischik ever had \$28,000 in cash in her possession at one time?

"A. I would be shocked if she did. I have no knowledge of it.

"Q. You have no knowledge of it?

"A. None whatsoever.

Here's the reason behind the attorney pressing so hard on that issue. One day Vic came to the house and discovered that Jennie had enlarged a picture of Jack Hyles holding Vic's son when he was an infant, placing it in one of those double picture frames, the other half containing a picture of the two children together. She had blown the photograph up to an 8 x 10 size and had it in this family frame where the husband/father normally would have been. This so enraged Vic, he smashed it and ripped the picture into shreds. But when he removed the picture he discovered, attached to the back, the combination to the strong box.

When he opened it, he was shocked to find it stashed full of bundles of \$100 bills. *He quit counting at about \$27,000 or \$28,000!* There were also other valuables – coins and that sort of thing. A few days later the strong box disappeared, possibly replaced by the portable safe Jennie referred to in her testimony.

On another occasion, Jack Nischik, the son, was in Jennie's office when Hyles called her to come into his office. She entered through the door between the two offices (the one Hyles denies exists) and the son, playing around, saw a safe in the passageway – either unlocked or partially open – and when he opened it he found it filled with gold bullion. Others, far more competent in this area than we, are currently investigating Hyles' finances, so we will await their report for a full story.

**9.** The "vicious attack" (to use a favorite Hyles phrase) on Vic Nischik's reputation merits special, close examination. While we want our readers to come back and study them again after we quote, near the end of the article, what a former associate of Hyles says about his veracity, we will answer them separately right now, using considerable space to do so because these are serious, serious charges.

**A.** Although we have this young female employee's name (and obviously Hyles knows who she is since it is his story), we will not name her. Here is Vic's response:

"She was set up for the 'kill' just like I was in 1971. Let me explain:

"J\_\_\_\_\_, like so many others, had gone to Hyles for counseling over the years. She was a dedicated employee and had expressed to him the satisfaction she had working in data processing for me. When Jennie asked for the divorce in 1971, Jack Hyles called J\_\_\_\_\_ into his office and confided in her that I was having marital problems, urging her to step in and become that 'Jonathan' type friend to me. She had no idea that Jennie and I were having troubles and was in total shock over this revelation. Then he started on me, telling me how great this gal was and urging me to take her as a close 'friend.' In those days, he was constantly on the friendship kick, preaching a long series of messages on the subject. He considered friendship the highest form of human relationship.

"At that time I had developed a flourishing data processing business, providing automated bookkeeping service to over a dozen major customers in our community. J\_\_\_\_\_ was the equipment operator, and I was on the road most of the time, servicing my accounts. With Jennie persisting in her demands for me to leave her and the children, Jack Hyles offered to help me relocate. Since he knew that I loved and talked fondly of it, Denver was chosen because he felt that his friend Dr. Ed Nelson would help me get settled there. (Dr. Nelson did not know a thing of these plans until I shared them with him a year ago.)

"For a time it looked like Jennie would not let go, and that I would have to leave. Jack Hyles offered to help me financially in getting set up in the computer business in Denver. I discussed the possible move with J\_\_\_\_\_ to keep her informed as any honest employer would, and on one occasion I did ask her if she would consider coming to Denver to work in my business, should I be forced to relocate. Jack Hyles encouraged me to ask her and I did tell him on one occasion that I had. He also urged me often to tell her that I loved her. When I refused to leave my family and his scheming failed, Jack Hyles flew into a rage and accused me of not having the capacity to love. 'You have a computer mentality. You don't know how to show affection. No wonder your marriage failed!' *There never was anything personal between the young woman and me!* She was an extremely capable achiever in a business that required diligence and timeliness. Here is another case of an innocent victim who fell into an unbearable situation through no fault of her own.

""Keep in mind that all this transpired after Jennie told me she was divorcing me. This was the result of the threat, not the cause. These were traumatic days for me and I was so vulnerable to this intrigue. I thank God for sparing me from potentially doing something very dumb in my life. God's grace was sufficient.

"After J\_\_\_\_\_ quit my data processing company, she worked briefly for another local company. I sold my computer business, not having the help nor the strength to carry on. Then she was hired

by Marlene Evans, wife of Dr. Evans, to work with CHRISTIAN WOMANHOOD. She left that position suddenly, reasons unknown. She has been gone for perhaps 6 to 8 years, except for a brief visit on a Sunday or two about the time the divorce started. I do not know how to contact her or who would know how. I have not talked to her since then.

"Hyles mastery over us was done by pitting one person against another. He did that with Jennie and me and, in this case, between J\_\_\_\_\_ and me. In the end, the poor girl finally could not handle the pressure and resigned. I never mistreated her in any way.

"The only 'proof' Jennie had of an affair was a sales slip from Montgomery Ward on my credit card and signed by J\_\_\_\_\_ for the purchase of women's clothing and accessories. It was on that basis that Jennie was asking for a divorce, not that I wanted to run off with somebody. This purchase was for a pre-teen bus girl, Betty Sue Cook, who won a contest on my bus route. The prize was a new Easter outfit. Prizes like this were given out all over the church, in Sunday school and on the buses. I had asked J\_\_\_\_\_ to take the girl shopping.

**B.** This charge is even weirder. Vic was, indeed, in his pajamas, but he also had a robe on because he had gone up (from his basement room in the corner, where he was forced to live) to answer the persistent ringing of the doorbell. At the door was one of his bus teens, her face bruised and bleeding, begging for help after being beaten up at home. He asked her in. It was the den where they were, not a bedroom. She was on the couch and Vic was standing nearby, trying to calm her. The reason Jennie came in was due to the fact that **she and the children were in the house all the time and she, too, came to discover why the doorbell was ringing so persistently at that hour of the night!** Jennie ordered the girl out of the house, in spite of Vic's protests that she needed help. He says, "This particular girl, needing help from a beating, never recovered emotionally and she has disappeared. No one knows where she is today. I did try, unsuccessfully, to locate her." This girl was a close friend of two other girls in the neighborhood. They are now married with families and are willing to verify, if necessary, Vic's version of what happened from personal knowledge of the beating and their friend's description to them the next day of the incident at the Nischik house.

**C.** The long letter Hyles quotes was written by Gail McKinney Merhalski. She is the daughter of Tom and Erma McKinney and the sister of Keith McKinney. All four are Hyles' full-time staff members. Gail asked Vic for a summer job, and he gave it to her, while she was attending Bob Jones University. He also hired her husband, Phil, one summer when he was teaching at Hammond Baptist High. One of Mrs. Merhalski's current duties is that of staffing the church nursery. She recently conducted a survey among those workers, demanding 100% loyalty to Hyles – and those who could not were requested never again to report for duty.

Regarding "Mr. Nischik's personal secretary" having a baby and the salesman at the Chevrolet

dealership joking about what the husband would do if he knew his child was really Victor's baby, that is dead easy to answer *because Vic never had a secretary!* He says, "In all my professional business career I never had a personal secretary, not even at the Moody Bible Institute where I supervised 30 employees. I used the secretarial pool exclusively. At the dealership in Gary I had two middle-aged title clerks and one middle-aged insurance clerk. I had two single computer operators. There was also a married woman working in the service department. There were a number of different switchboard operators over the years. To the best of my recollection, we never had a lady take a maternity leave. Maternity leaves were unheard of in the '60s. There may have been one of the operators who quit to have a baby, but I do not remember. That is all the female help we had in Gary."

As for the "fatherly" salesman protecting Gail, Vic puts it well: "A car salesman needs commissions to make a living. I find it incredible that a salesman would be that benevolent, standing guard at the office door, away from the car lot and the showroom, to protect her virtue. The owner, Mr. Baker, would have booted the fatherly salesman out the door if he found him loitering upstairs instead of selling cars." It is interesting to note, too, that in spite of all her insinuations, she never accuses Vic of laying a hand on her or doing anything even remotely unethical. In fact, the careful reader will note that this "naïve" teen-ager, as she described herself, was able tell the "typical hotshot" and the "loose" salesmen, but she never dreamed she should be worried about Vic. So much for her evaluation.

She tells another tale about the Ford dealership and Vic's "thing" for the female office manager, whom she says later broke up the home of the parts department manager, saying, "they ran off together." Vic's account is radically different: "The owner of the Ford dealership in Highland was Dick Ohms, a Christian Reformed Dutchman and an upright man. The parents of the office manager, who is also a believer, were close friends of the Ohms family. I was a paid consultant to the dealership. I would have been thrown out on my ear by Dick Ohms if he suspected any impropriety between me and the office manager. The story is absolutely false."

Do you sort of get the idea that this Gail McKinney Merhalski, whom Hyles calls "one of the most trusted and respected ladies in First Baptist Church of Hammond," is not a very reliable witness? *So do we!*

Since the old saying is, "turn about is fair play," perhaps we should print at least part of a letter written to me (I just received it today as these notes were being prepared) about Gail McKinney Merhalski. I will not give the name of the writer even though Hyles will know immediately who she is because of the incident she mentions at the start. After introducing herself to me and saying she lived, as a girl, less than a block from both the Hyles and Nischik homes, she continued:

"Jack Hyles used to tell a story of a little girl in Montgomery Ward's, when he was in a torn T-

shirt, and this little girl yelled across the store and pointed at him, 'There's Jack Hyles! He's my preacher.' Well, I am that little girl. I went to First Baptist and Hammond Baptist High School. I went soul winning every Saturday night. I was involved in everything. I was a greeter at all youth conferences and Pastors Schools. Most everyone knew me by name and by sight! When I was a junior in high school I quit believing in religion. I believe in the I AM of Moses. I believe Jesus Christ was His Son and by grace you are saved. Why I still believe, I don't know, but I lost my faith in religion because of rumors I heard that I didn't want to believe, but there were facts to back up those rumors with eyewitness accounts.

"Let me explain just one example. One of my friends, R\_\_\_\_\_ C\_\_\_\_\_ was supposed to have had an affair with Dave Hyles at the time he was engaged to Paula and then newly married to Paula. I didn't want to believe it until I overheard R\_\_\_\_\_ and Mr. B\_\_\_\_\_ (the Bible teacher). He had seen R\_\_\_\_\_ and Dave having sex in the back of a car and he was trying to counsel R\_\_\_\_\_ on it. Her father had taped telephone conversations and had other proof, and was going to file statutory rape charges against Dave (she was 16), but Jack Hyles threatened her father's job if he went ahead – and also paid *hush* money!

"Also, a recent article said a Gail Merhalski spoke against Mr. Nischik. I knew Gail as Gail McKinney. She taught German, English and one year of Gym in Hammond Baptist High School. She was supposed to be the 'ideal lady,' but the facts speak differently. As a teacher she was an outrageous flirt with the good-looking high school students, especially the basketball team. I overheard several conversations of basketball players telling of their *conquests* of her. I could name names, but I don't want to spread gossip or drag people in and cause them problems for something that happened over 10 years ago...."

She described her current problems and said, "I know I deserve the hell I'm living in, but Mr. Nischik, no. When I was young and going to run away from home, I sat and talked to him for hours, crying; he counseled and consoled me. He was my friend. He would give me a ride to and from church on Sunday nights and sometimes on Wednesday. We'd talk and laugh and stop for root beer on the way home (just for the record and to keep him above reproach, his children, Judy and/or Jack were with us). I always thought it strange that he and his wife were never seen together, even talking. I know of many young people he counseled and he always did it out of love, compassion and the desire to help. It is because of Mr. Nischik that I haven't killed myself, he talked me out of it more than once and made me smile and laugh when I never thought I would smile again! He has not always told me what I wanted to hear, but what I needed to hear. He's chewed me out when I needed it and been there when no one else was. I thank God I knew Mr. Nischik; he is a true friend and more Christ-like than anyone else I know is. I won't stand by and watch him slandered by Jack Hyles...."

"I want Jack Hyles to know that the little girl who embarrassed him in Wards is now a woman – a

strong, stubborn woman – who will stand before him, look him in the eye, and say, 'There's Jack Hyles. He's a liar and a thief, but far worse because he does it all in the Name of Christ and Christendom.' I don't hate the man; I feel sorrow and pity.... "

Notice that this lady talks about 'flirting' and 'overhearing' things, the kind of accusations we would not normally print, but we do so now only because they are exactly the same things Hyles quoted from Gail about Vic.

As for Gail's claim that he was flirting at the church with teen-agers, Vic says, "I was their father image. There are expressions of affection and frequent hugs to this day. Any dedicated bus worker in the country can relate to this. For one person to say that I was flirting with them in the church auditorium is totally ludicrous. With thousands of people present? I CARED FOR MY BUS KIDS AND LOVED THEM ALL DEARLY. I had many of them from the time they were little children, through their teen years, and into adulthood – and have had lifetime relationships with them. Incidentally, this is what kept me going the many years I was separated from Jennie. "

**D.** Next, Hyles reads from a letter by a former Nischik babysitter. We assume he is still referring to Gail Merhalski since he quotes from it immediately after her letter and very carefully does not say it is from another source. Vic says, "I checked with my children and to the best of our recollection, we come up with the following names of baby sitters we used: Gail Merhalski (!!!), Debbie Jones, and Laura Burnside. The Jones and Burnside families are my friends to this day. As for Gail, why would she come to me asking for summer work if I had mistreated her as one of our baby sitters?" A very good point! The only person Gail says she told is dead and can neither corroborate nor disprove it.

**E.** The matter of homosexuality. We will not dignify that slur with a response other than to note Hyles can't have it both ways. Is Vic an uninhibited lecher, a menace to every woman who comes near him, or is he a closet homosexual?

**F.** Hyles' statement that Vic "has practically no credibility at the First Baptist Church." Perhaps not, after he declared war on him and spread all these lies about him. Prior to that, however, he had credibility. Vic says, "Only three church members, Dexter Graves (a deacon); his mother-in-law, Mrs. Florence Mitziga; and their close friend, Mrs. Lorraine Ciesar – asked me to leave First Baptist after my troubles with Hyles in 1985. Everyone else treated me with kindness and courtesy. Many, many asked me to stay in the church and fight the battle. My credibility was strong enough for him to come as heavy as he did in his reply letter."

**G.** The "firing" and "lockout" at the Chicago automobile agency. Vic says, "The owner, Steve H\_\_\_\_, utilized my experience in computers to develop a software package to provide accounting services for car dealerships. Our plan was to market the product nationwide. When all the

development programs were completed, he stole my work and locked me out. I had been contacted by Hanley Dawson Cadillac Company and went to work for them within days of that incident. Steve H\_\_\_\_\_ soon developed cancer of the colon and on his deathbed asked my forgiveness for having made the silliest mistake of his life. Steve was also a believer, a deacon in a church in Wilmette, Illinois. I had the joy of reconciling with a brother before he slipped into eternity. The computer product bombed out because he did not have the technical assistance to make the venture fly. Jack Hyles is not the only man who betrayed me over the years."

**H.** The next agency, Hyles says "hired someone else to take his job and moved Mr. Nischik to another job." Vic says, "Max Madsen, Vice-President, personally requested my transfer out of the Cadillac agency to the Imports, because they were the real performers in the company. Prior to the transfer, I had financial responsibility for all franchises we managed (6). The work became too big for one person."

**I.** Hyles' final attempt at destroying Victor Nischik's reputation was: "I can take you to a man in our area who testifies that Mr. Nischik had an affair with his wife and broke up his marriage." If the offer is serious, we suggest someone take him up on it.

After several days of trying to figure out who this man is and whose home was broken, Vic concluded he was referring to his bus partner for 17 years, a man who suddenly left his wife and two children for a married woman at work. When the high school principal requested prayer at a faculty meeting for a senior "whose father had walked out on them," a teacher, Mrs. B\_\_\_\_\_ M\_\_\_\_\_, who is also a deacon's wife at First Baptist, offered the following gossip: "Yes, I know why he left. The mother and her boss (Vic) both work in Chicago (at MBI) and ride to work together all the time. That is why he left the family." Hence the implication that Vic broke up the home. The fact is, she and Vic never rode to work or from work one single time! Vic always used public transportation. For what it's worth, Vic went to work on the husband and succeeded in getting the couple back together. Alas, the lure of forbidden fruit was too strong and the man returned to his mistress again, this time divorcing his wife and marrying the other woman. But to blame Vic for the marriage break-up is absolutely inane.

That man, incidentally, is now a "spiritual leader" at another church, so obviously Hyles and First Baptist are not the only ones operating on an "anything goes" basis for church leaders.

There is a humorous aspect to this wild story, if anything like this can be humorous. Earlier this year Jennie Nischik announced at a staff meeting that Vic had married the woman in question. The poor man got calls from all over the country, congratulating him on his marriage. His standard answer was, "Thank you, but would you mind telling me who the new bride is? I haven't met her." The story received added credibility, of course, since it came from Jennie. To this day he is still having to refute it.



We are going to sum up all these wild accusations by quoting Vic in wondering aloud why Jack Hyles, if these things were true, allowed him to:

"Work on a bus route for 24½ years, requiring him to handle thousands of children and teenagers, and always with adult men working with him?"

"Serve on the deacon board for 25 years?"

"Be part of the pastoral staff for a quarter of a century, working at the altar during the invitation, and dealing with thousands of people who came forward to make spiritual decisions?"

"Serve as church choir director for 4½ years?"

"Lead the singing in the Auditorium Pastor's Adult Class for 26 years?"

"Work for many, many years assisting Jack Hyles (and later, John Colsten) in the baptistry during the baptismal services, working on the ladies' side, assisting them into the baptistry and helping them out again? (Jack Hyles had him there in that extremely sensitive area because he could trust him. Check with Mrs. Fay Johnson or Mrs. Carroll Lail, who worked in the ladies' dressing room, and ask them if there were any signs of impropriety on Vic's part.)"

"Go with Dave Hyles' singing group, 'Strength and Beauty,' as chaperon three years in a row on extended nationwide tours? (It was his job, as per Jack Hyles' orders, to keep discipline, including that of his son.)"

"Be the business manager for Hyles-Duckels Camp for a number of years, requiring frequent visits during camp season? (Check with the resident caretaker, Paul Carr, who still lives near the camp, about Nischik.)"

If Vic is the moral bum Hyles implies, let him answer these questions.

Consider next what Hyles calls "untruth" in my article.

**10.** "Untruth #1" is that the Nischiks were "happy as a family" before Hyles messed with them. Hyles says they "had marital problems nearly from their wedding day." If so, other than normal marital problems such as all couples have, Jennie never told Vic. The latter says, "This statement came from Jack Hyles, allegedly quoting Jennie, after she threatened to file for divorce in 1971. We did have a happy marriage until Hyles tampered with my home. I have many photos to prove it. I also have two children to prove it."

**11.** "Untruth #2 " is that Hyles didn't tell Vic, "I need your wife in my office." This is nitpicking. That kind of a statement is not supposed to be an exact quote, 20 years after the fact. Perhaps he asked, "Would you be willing to have your wife work for me?" or something like that. Vic does recall Hyles saying Jennie's mind was too brilliant to merely be a simple housewife.

**12.** "Untruth #3 " is the same as #1, except he exaggerates a little more; in #1 he said "nearly from their wedding day" and in #3 it is "from day one. " No one has marital problems "from day one."

**13.** "Untruth #4" fails to point out any alleged untruth. Hyles admits he was called to the Nischik home because Jennie said she wanted a divorce, which is what we said. Hyles says the idea of him offering Vic "financial help to relocate elsewhere" is ridiculous. Go back and read how generous Hyles says he is in helping people and see if you think this is so ridiculous, and then go back and reread "9.A" above. There was no discussion of anyone running off with anybody; Jennie was asking for a divorce on the basis of a misunderstood Montgomery Ward sales slip. Hyles also claims here, "The truth is he wanted to leave his wife. " Then why didn't he, instead of sleeping in a cold, damp basement for years until his health was about to break, then living in a dormer over the garage? There is absolutely no validity or common sense to this argument whatsoever.

**14.** "Untruth #5" is summed up by Hyles in two sentences: "Mr. Nischik talked about evidence. He had none then and he has none now." Of course he doesn't. This related to the intimate letters Hyles had written Jennie, which Vic testified under oath he had discovered. The agreement the three reached that night was that Jennie would not divorce Vic and he could live in the basement – if he would give Hyles the evidence. His home and family meant enough to Vic that he agreed, handing over the letters to Hyles. They are the letters daughter Judy referred to when she said to Hyles, "I remember hearing once that it is not wise to put anything in writing that one would not want the entire world to see. (You know well the horrifying effects doing so can cause, don't you?)"

**15.** "Untruth #6" is that Hyles says he "had nothing to do with" the living arrangement worked out whereby Vic lived in the basement. How in the world could Vic and Jennie have worked out the arrangements when she refused to speak to him from the first Sunday in July of 1971 until August of 1985? Vic says, "How could we possibly have made these intricate decisions without someone's help? That eager help came from Jack Hyles." The fact is, the arrangement existed.

It is also under this point that Hyles says, "I know for a fact that when Mrs. Nischik asked Mr. Nischik to help pay the tuition for the children, he refused to do so." Not so, says Vic. "She and Hyles insisted on paying all the expenses for the children themselves from 1968." He had the

money ready to pay the children's tuition, but "Hyles urged me to spend the money to send a number of my bus kids to our Christian schools, which I did. At one time I had as many as six bus kids enrolled in our schools, paying their tuition bills."

**16.** "Untruth #7" is Hyles' claim that he didn't order Jennie to divorce Vic, adding that "she did not even come to me for advice concerning the divorce." Those who know how Hyles operates will have a hard time swallowing that one. **NO STAFF MEMBER AT FIRST BAPTIST IN HIS OR HER RIGHT MIND WOULD MAKE A MAJOR DECISION WITHOUT SEEKING THE APPROVAL OF JACK HYLES FIRST.** This is a policy he has publicly stated for years and thousands have heard him. And, in spite of the light way divorce is treated in Hammond, that is a major decision. This is merely one more example of the cultic mind control Hyles holds over his followers. They are not capable of making major decisions without him. And when he advises people like Jennie and Vic, where he has a vested interest, his policy is to pit one against the other. Vic says, "His repeated counsel to me was that I had to break Jennie like a wild pony before she would be a submissive wife. The counsel always was confrontational and not constructive or conciliatory. He rarely had any positive advice. You can only imagine what he told her to destroy her love and confidence in me. *Jack Hyles is as master a manipulator as any cult leader has ever been: pitting one against the other.*"

If Hyles has such strong convictions against divorce, why doesn't he preach against it? Why doesn't he discipline members who break up homes and run off with other mates? If he has such strong standards against divorce, why does he marry anyone and everyone who asks, even before the ink on the divorce papers is figuratively dry (John Stancil, for example). Vic says, "When I asked Jennie in 1971 if she had a scriptural basis for her actions, her reply was, 'I don't care what the Bible says!' She learned that defiant attitude from her mentor and boss, Jack Hyles."

Hyles says the only reason he got involved in the Nischik case is because Vic subpoenaed him. But why would Vic subpoena him if he wasn't already involved?

Incidentally, it is interesting that Hyles calling her "a wild pony" fits another description given by a long-time deacon at First Baptist, a loyal supporter of Hyles, who also was a neighbor of the Nischiks. We will not name this brother because he has threatened to go to court to force me to print his long 6-page, single-spaced letter defending his friends in Hammond (without answering any of the charges, however), but we will say that his two lengthy letters to me were courteous, kindly written and in a Christian spirit – seeming like an oasis spring in comparison to most of the letters from Hyles' supporters. And we did assure him that if we wrote about the matter again, we would make mention of his support for Dr. Hyles (consider it done). At any rate, this good brother told of talking in his yard to Vic when Mrs. Nischik came out and ordered the latter home, saying he had work to do and a lawn to mow. This good brother says, "I told Vic Nischik immediately to tell her to shut her mouth and go back in the house, and he at that time asked me

what I thought he should do. I told him that after he wrapped the lawn mower around her neck to let the grass grow around her ears, and I indicated to him that he better take care of that situation before it got further out of hand." This good brother was speaking facetiously, of course, but it does indicate her "wild pony" spirit.

**17.** "Untruth #8 " is a denial that he "met with the attorneys on both sides and unilaterally negotiated the terms of the divorce settlement." Ah, but he did. As I write these lines I am looking at the bill for the attorney's services for a meeting between the two lawyers and "Rev. Hyles" on May 9, 1986. Attorney Hess told Vic that, after the deposition was completed, Hyles met him in the hall and wanted to talk with him, saying he didn't want to go to court. As a result, the two attorneys (Vic's lawyer and Jennie's lawyer) met with Jack Hyles – just the 3 of them; neither Vic nor Jennie were present – and worked out the divorce agreement. Yet Hyles says, "It was Mr. Nischik's attorney who asked to meet with me privately. I wanted no involvement; I sought no involvement, but I was forced by subpoena." There was no subpoena of Hyles to meet on May 9th with the two lawyers in the case. He met with them because he *wanted* to; he met with them because he *asked* to.

**18.** "Untruth #9" is his denial of what Vic said under oath, that he was never a party to the contract for his own house in Munster, that Hyles made all the arrangements and that "Vic never paid a dime on it, never even signed the contract, nor did he have any say in selecting the floor plan." Yet the truth of the matter is that the contract for the construction of that house is still in Vic's files, *unsigned!* Neither he nor Jennie ever signed it. Vic put up no deposit. Somebody did; no contractor outside an insane asylum would build a house without a contract being signed by someone.

About that house, Vic says, "I did not spend a dime on the house, including the construction. I did take care of the yard. Jack Hyles handled everything else, including decisions to cover all hardwood floors in the upstairs bedrooms with deep pile carpeting and to install central air conditioning, new aluminum siding, new driveway, the dormer, and many other major improvements. Keep in mind, he totally controlled our lives. Neither did I purchase the lot on which the house was built. Hyles did."

**19.** "Untruth #10" is the denial that he established the amount of rent Vic would pay to live in a corner of the basement. This has already been answered in #15 ("Untruth #6) above.

**20.** "Untruth #11" is a denial of my charge about his lack of financial record keeping. Told by the court to bring his financial records to the deposition, Hyles showed up with nothing. The following testimony ensued about cash payments to Mrs. Nischik:

"Q. How much have you been paying her then?"

"A. I don't know. According to what she needs and what I have.

"Q. Do you have any records of that?

"A. No, sir. I keep no records of anything I give away."

We will not say more now because we understand startling revelations about Hyles' finances are about to be published, making further word from us unnecessary.

**21.** "Untruth #12 " relates to his denial that he "shouted" when Vic tried to scripturally (Matthew 18) face Hyles at a deacons meeting about destroying his marriage, or that he shouted, "You are trying to destroy Fundamentalism." Anyone who knows Hyles has no trouble believing he shouted. If Vic's charges are false, as he claims, he *should have* shouted. As for what he said, those familiar with his inflated and repeated claims about his importance to Fundamentalism will have no problem with it, either.

The most easily recognized facet of Hyles' nature is his ego. A lady who visited First Baptist with friends back in 1977, when Hyles preached on pride, recorded in her diary that night her observation of the sermon: "People need to be careful to use other people as examples when preaching or teaching on humility, not themselves." The head of a ministry in Missouri wrote: "I must say that I was not the least bit surprised to hear about Jack Hyles. I first came into contact with Jack Hyles over 30 years ago through the pages of the Sword of the Lord. I have read numerous sermons he preached in that paper, and have listened to several of his taped sermons. I have also heard him numerous times on the radio. Nearly 30 years ago I told my first wife (deceased) that Jack Hyles was headed for a fall. I recognized even back then that he was a very proud-hearted man. He was constantly promoting himself and pushing himself forward. He also made claims that anyone with sense above a goose could see were false. A man who has to bask himself in adulation from others and who has to make false claims in order to build himself is not a spiritual man in the biblical sense."

**22.** "Untruth #13" is his denial that "one-third of the deacon board has resigned over this issue." This information came from several past and present people involved with the board. One of our inside sources said "one-half," but we chose to use the more conservative figure. If Hyles would like a list of names of men who resigned or refused to be reappointed in 1985-1986, we can produce them. Since the article appeared, one former lady staff member at the church, now living in another state, wrote: "The wives of the deacons who have resigned from the deacon board are close friends of mine who have written me regularly for encouragement."

**23.** "Untruth #14" is his denial that he has "thoroughly indoctrinated his people with the idea, if you didn't see it happen, it didn't happen." Ah, but he has! He goes on to say what he *believes*, but

we were speaking of what he has convinced his people to believe – and we stand by our statement. That is exactly what his people have concluded. What he describes is his actions toward other preachers, and this has led to the massive cover-up of sin, ignoring things that are taking place. The case of his son is just one illustration; fact after fact, proof after proof, was presented to him and he "didn't believe it."

A prominent independent Baptist preacher in Georgia, after our article appeared, wrote me about question marks he sensed over the years: "I *wondered* why he flew to Atlanta to defend a Marietta, Georgia, preacher in immorality. I *wondered* why he again flew to Atlanta to defend one of 'the famous Smith brothers' – Tom – in his immorality, divorce, remarriage, and home breaking. Many babies-out-of-wedlock followed those escapades in that church here in Forest Park. I *wondered*, 'where is the Scriptural defense?' I *wondered* why he hired F. Lee Bailey to come here to defend an Indian preacher, who shot a boy in cold-blooded murder after chasing him for blocks in his car, having seen him steal gas from the church buses. That particular preacher had broken up one Christian marriage that I knew of personally. These things troubled me – BUT – his name was Jack Hyles."

While we could give examples until readers become weary, a letter came from Michigan where a man pastored who was, "as he stated many times, 'the closest preacher boy to Bro. Hyles after Johnny Pope'." He "counseled about his 'problem' with Bro. Hyles many, many times" and "then, suddenly, he took another pastorate in Georgia upon the *recommendation* of Bro. Hyles." We sometimes wonder if Hyles spends more time flying around the country helping preachers cover up sin and get out of town than he does in conferences. One thing is for sure: *guilty preachers know whom to call when they get caught!*

**24.** "Untruth #15" relates to the "mouth-to-mouth resuscitation" matter. Why he calls this an untruth we have no idea because he admits saying it and saying it "often." The thing that amazes and saddens us is that he sullies the memory of one of Fundamentalism's most beloved men by publicizing false slander about him. He says *he* doesn't believe it and *we* don't believe it, so why send gossip nobody believes out to some 65,000 or so preachers – many of whom had never heard it?

**25.** "Untruth #16" is twofold, a denial that he and Mrs. Nischik followed each other home after church, and that there is no access between her office and his. Regarding the first denial, I was not talking about last Sunday night. I referred to the "old days" when the children were young and this sordid mess was just beginning. I have information about this coming from one of his own children, as well as others.

As for his denial of a door between the two offices, that is a lie borne out of obvious desperation. Elsewhere in this issue is a photocopy of the floor plan showing the door. Previously we

mentioned young Jack Nischik finding the gold bullion in the safe when the door was open. In Mrs. Nischik's office is a long drape that extends from one end of the wall to the other. In Dr. Hyles' office the wall stretches from end to end with paneling and the door is of the same material, blending in so that the average person would not detect it. If necessary, I can produce sworn, notarized statements by people who have *seen* it and *used* it. Naturally, our statement does not make the claim for its existence today, only that it was there at least until the Nischik divorce. I am told that the maintenance man, Randy Erickson, built bookshelves over that area in recent months; perhaps so. Readers will note that Hyles only says "there *is* no access" (present tense). As for "*is*," I can't say; but for "*was*," I am positive.

**26.** "Untruth #17" denies the longtime member's estimate that "perhaps 40% of his teaching and preaching has been in defense of himself." He invites those who listen to his tapes to check it out; we do, too. Obviously, the brother who made the claim was referring to the *aim* of the messages, not that Hyles stands in the pulpit and defends himself (although he does that, too). He was referring to the constant references by Hyles to the good he is doing, the results he is having, the programs he offers, the important status of pastors, the need for absolute loyalty, Sunday school lessons on themes like "10 things I have done to help others" (mentioned in our "Saddest Story" article) – in short, *preaching aimed at making himself look good*.

**27.** "Untruth #18" refers to the intimate letters he wrote Mrs. Nischik. This is a repeat of a matter already dealt with. Go back and reread #14 above ("Untruth #5"). He is wrong about saying Mr. Nischik knows this is an untruth, but he is right in saying he can't produce the letters. Hyles has no worry here; he destroyed them in exchange for getting Mrs. Nischik to allow Vic to live in the basement instead of divorcing him in 1971.

**28.** "Untruth #19" is a denial of the offer he made Vic regarding Mrs. Hyles. He talks about his blood boiling and describes it as "vicious, corrupt," etc., which was Vic's feelings exactly when the offer was made. Vic says, "It was a vulgar offer. When he made it, I told him to his face that he was sick." This is another one of those "if you say I said this, I will deny it and it will be your word against mine." We said at the time that there were no witnesses, of course, and the offer should be evaluated in the light of the rest of the article. We stand by that.

Under the same point he says Mrs. Hyles "is one of the most proper, respected and loved ladies in America." We have no argument with that and we consider her a pure and virtuous woman. Our only complaint is that she has known about this mess for over 20 years and has been part of the cover-up "for the good of the ministry." In this particular incident, Vic told her of the offer within days and says, "She was not at all surprised that he would do so."

**29.** "Untruth #20" is his claim that the statement made in the previous item about "your word against mine" is only made in jest about his weight, age and other matters. That he often thus

jokes is a matter of record – heard by thousands, we suppose – but we are not talking about pulpit jokes, we are talking about deadly serious conversations in private. He has said it again and again to numerous individuals. His published reply to me is an illustration of how it works!

**30.** "Untruth #21" is a denial that a man was long on his faculty who called Jack and Beverly "on a first name basis"; he says no one "who has ever been at the college has known me on a first-name basis." This is not true and the man in question was a good friend in the Texas days, before he became so important in his own mind that everyone must call him "Doctor" Hyles or "Brother" Hyles. While we stand totally behind the statement that he was on a first-name basis with Jack, note that he ignored the charge this good man made: "In all the years I was there, I never once saw Jack and Beverly together. I never once heard them say a word to each other. That was not the way it was in the early days when I first knew them."

**31.** "Untruth #22" relates to why Mrs. Hyles did not attend the funeral of Dr. John R. Rice. His answer is totally unacceptable, of course, because he could as easily have flown from Los Angeles to Nashville via Chicago (maybe he did) as any other way. The fact remains, she did not attend – something I was not aware of until a member of First Baptist related the story to me.

**32.** "Untruth #23" is his denial that he ever called his son "the most brilliant, spiritual man he ever met." This, by the way, was all he had to say about our charges against Dave. While he denies the "spiritual" part (for obvious reasons), he admits he has "often said that he has one of the most brilliant minds I have ever known."

Well, this brilliant man is the same one who put all those vulgar pictures in "a nice looking fairly new suitcase" in a dumpster behind the church where he was pastoring and got caught as a result. This brilliant man got trapped at a Hammond area Holiday Inn because he insisted on trying to continue an affair with a teen-ager he had already seduced, but who told him repeatedly she wanted nothing more to do with him, so she set him up to make Father Hyles believe her. This brilliant man, after being exposed in Texas, was given a job by a personal friend from First Baptist/Hyles-Anderson days and then he tried to set up a tryst with an employee on the job. She took the note to the boss and his friend fired him on the spot. Then this brilliant man left incriminating evidence in his desk, copies of which are before me as I write.

The first is a note he wrote. It was in a company envelope that said on the outside, "Me! An answer is demanded immediately! NOW!" The note inside, on "*From the desk of DAVID HYLES*" stationary said: "When are you going to meet me at 6:00 A.M.? I promise to be in a super good mood! I really would enjoy getting to know you better. I'll even meet you for breakfast! Come on chicken! You are tough aren't you?!? I am waiting for your answer. Hey, I'll change the time even. You tell me!" And the handwritten note was signed with his initials, "D. H." So he was still playing these games after he abandoned Paula and his daughters and was



living in Illinois with Brenda.

But this brilliant man made an even more "unbrilliant" mistake. He also left a copy of a letter addressed to him from the Illinois Department of Children and Family Services, dated April 01, 1986, which is also before me as I write ("SCR Case No. 0200125B2A20"). Without quoting it all, here are the opening 3 paragraphs:

"You were previously notified that this Department was investigating a report of suspected child abuse or neglect in fulfillment of its responsibilities under law.

"After a thorough evaluation, we have determined the report to be 'indicated.' This means that credible evidence of child abuse or neglect has been found.

"You were identified as a person responsible for the child abuse or neglect."

It was signed by Dennis H Stuckey, Administrator, State Central Register.

That is pretty serious stuff and how or why a brilliant man would leave it lying around is beyond me. We knew of this charge before our "Saddest Story" article was written, but chose not to mention it because someone got the charges dropped. We have since learned that when the body of his stepson was sent to Garland for burial, another coroner reached somewhat the same conclusion. Under "Case No. 110885," I have before me a 5-page report signed by M. G. F. Gilliland, M.D., Medical Examiner in Dallas, Texas. The only date on the report relates to the date and time of his examination: November 8, 1985, 11:30 A.M. Much of it is written in technical language and far too lengthy to reproduce here anyway, so we will just give Dr Gilliland's conclusion, in its entirety:

"In my opinion the cause of death of Brent Stevens, a 17-month-old white male child, is undetermined after two complete autopsy examinations, toxicologic examination, microscopic examination, and bacterial culture. **In the face of unexplained and inadequately explained broken bones in a year old infant the cause of death should not be ascribed to the minor level of infection consistent with the recent upper respiratory tract infection. Because lethal injuries can be inflicted on a child of this age without leaving marks, and this child was injured in a pattern consistent with deliberate infliction by an adult, his cause of death is best left as undetermined. Postmortem technology reveals only methanol used in the embalming process**" (emphasis added).

And Dr. Gilliland joined the Illinois examiners in refusing to rule accidental death, putting at the end of his report: "MANNER OF DEATH: Undetermined."

**33.** "Untruth #24" is whether or not he refused to intervene when Karen Plopper divorced her husband Ray. This is another case of "your word against mine." Our main and original point remains the same, namely, divorce is treated lightly at First Baptist. Here is a staff member with whom Hyles says he "pleaded with her not to get a divorce." She did anyway. Did it affect her status on the staff? No way. Incidentally, it is interesting that custody of their son was awarded to Ray, not Karen.

**34.** "Untruth #25" is another "your word against mine." The fact remains undenied that their daughter divorced her husband after only a few weeks of marriage. If the father didn't push her into "a marriage she did not want," *why?*

**35.** "Untruth #26" is not an untruth at all. I said that Mrs. Fay Dodson "divorced her first husband and shortly thereafter was given the job of starting and directing the Phoster Club." Hyles admits it. In fact, when her current husband wrote and threatened me ("Where I come from we dont usually take a person to court for things like slander and falafying. We just go out and stomp our own snakes.... If you would kindly write my wife a letter saying how sorry you was then I might be inclined to forget about this matter. If you dont then one of these days I may just haft to come down there and talk to you myself and I just know you would not like that not even a little bit"), I reminded him, "I did not write one single lie about your wife. If so, kindly tell me what it was. I said she had divorced and remarried. That is a matter of public record. I said she 'owed thousands of dollars to a businessman.' I know that man. I said she counseled a woman to divorce her husband. I know that woman, too."

Note in passing, not only was the "untruth" Hyles charges me with not an untruth, but also he deftly sidestepped the other serious charges. We are getting a little weary with Hyles answering serious charges by saying, "She is a lovely woman," "He is a great soul winner," and the like.

It is interesting about Mrs. Dotson that a former Hyles-Anderson coed, working later in another ministry, lived with her when she was still Mrs. Meredith. She tells me that Mrs. Meredith met Lou Dotson in early August of 1974 and they were married the following month, a real whirlwind courtship. The lady who told me about it, who was present at the ceremony, said: "She had a GIGANTIC wedding at First Baptist, wearing a very fancy off-white wedding dress with Phoster Club ladies as bridesmaids (which were numerous!). It was a very big deal for a *divorced* couple. Jack Hyles performed the ceremony! I was in shock and rarely stayed in touch with her again."

**36.** "Untruth #27" relates to what a deacon at First Baptist charged about divorce at the church and school reaching epidemic proportions. Hyles answered by saying that only 26 people out of "556 employed by the First Baptist Church and its ministries" are divorced. But we were not talking about those in leadership positions; the deacon we quoted was talking about members, students and everyone involved with the church. But if Hyles has 26 people in leadership

positions who are divorced (you have to watch his words because he is tricky with his tenses: "there *is* no access between our offices"; "there *are* 26 who are divorced"; he may not be counting the ones who have remarried since divorcing), that is 26 too many, in our judgment.

**37.** "Untruth #28" contains his denial that he treats "sex problems lightly" in his ministry. Our answer is: go back and read the sordid charges he makes against Vic, then see how lightly he treated them, placing Vic in some of the most prominent positions in the church. He talks about the homosexual, saying it was never proven, but ignores the charge that a student was booted for teaching the "heresy" that "women ought to be keepers at home" – which I compared with the homosexual who stayed and graduated – and that when the "heretic" was dismissed during finals week, the administration was not going to allow him to take his exams and get his credits – until he demanded his \$2,000 back for the semester, then they permitted him to take the tests at the public library (not on campus).

In Hyles' answer he also said "any student in any of the schools whom we know to have committed adultery are immediately dismissed." Is that so? How about the faculty/staff member who seduced the administrator's teen-age high school daughter? All kinds of evidence was given against him. When was he "dismissed"? When was she "dismissed"? He never was, of course, nor was she, and the cover-up continued.

**38.** "Untruth #29" relates to the rescue mission basement room that served – mirrors on walls and ceiling – as a place for homosexual encounters. He calls this "a blatant, blasphemous untruth." I know the two deacons who discovered it. They *did* report it to Hyles who, indeed, did nothing.

Under this same item Hyles denies that his mission director was a womanizer and viewer of X-rated videos, especially ones dealing with incest. Hyles says, "I have investigated it and found it untrue." Then his investigation was not very thorough. Before me as I write is a letter from a lady who grew up a block from the Hyles home and who thanked me for not giving the deceased mission director's name because it would have hurt his family, and his stepdaughter is her best friend. Then she says, "I remember being at the \_\_\_\_\_ house when [the wife and daughter] found the X-rated books that \_\_\_\_\_ had lying around. They were sick, and the basis of most of them was incest. [The daughter] felt the need to have a talk with her young sister, \_\_\_\_\_, who was just 10 at the time, and teach her how to react if \_\_\_\_\_ ever tried anything with her." This eyewitness testimony ought to settle the matter. (By the way, Hyles was given the rental receipts from Rabin's, where the man rented the X-rated videos! He was also given evidence by two deacons that the same mission director was carrying on an adulterous affair with a local prostitute, whose name we have. Those deacons are two of the many who have since resigned and left the church because of the cover-up of sin.)

While not related to this point, the writer went on to say, "I must tell you of one effect that your

article has had. Several of my mom's friends, who are former First Baptist members, said they were calling their children to apologize to them. Our parents feel so guilty for putting us into that environment. But, at the time, they thought that they were doing what was best for us." And she went on to tell of the problems she was experiencing in trying to get involved with another church and preacher, after being exposed to all the hypocrisy at Hammond. (At the end of this article we will give the address of a support group where ex-members and ex-students can write.)

By the way, this lady had nothing but praise for Vic, who stood by her "when Hyles had given up on me, and said I would never amount to anything. I am happy to report that I have lived *up* to Vic's assessment of me, rather than *down* to that of Hyles," and she credits Vic's faithfulness to turning her life around. God bless her, and all others like her who have been hurt.

**39.** "Untruth #30" is Hyles' denial that one faculty member caught another faculty member "having sex with a teenager on school property." We have the names of both faculty members involved. If Hyles expects us to believe that this faculty member walked in on such an incident and didn't report it, he is more naive than we now believe.

He also lightly treats my other charges as hearsay – but we adamantly refuse to name our sources for reasons already indicated, even if no one believes us, and Hyles puts in big bold capital letters: **"IF IT COULD BE PROVED THAT ANY OF OUR COLLEGE FACULTY MEMBERS ARE GUILTY OF ADULTERY, THEY WOULD BE DISMISSED IMMEDIATELY. THE SAME IS TRUE WITH ANY STUDENT."** Yeah, just as faculty member Dave Hyles was immediately dismissed after Hyles was given a "ton" of evidence regarding his immorality – to say nothing of all the other faculty members I have mentioned. When Hyles doesn't "see" it, I guess he doesn't believe it.

**40.** "Untruth #31" relates to the vulgarity of the faculty member during a high school chapel earlier this year. I said one lady raised a ruckus but no one else seemed to object. Hyles responded, "I heard about the situation, and I objected and corrected it immediately." Evidently that correction took place in a corner, as per other kindred situations in Hammond. What the occasion called for, but didn't get, was an appearance by Hyles on the high school chapel platform to apologize to the students for what they had endured, ask their forgiveness, publicly rebuke the teacher, and promise that something like that would never happen again.

**41.** "Untruth #32" is Hyles' denial of the song "Where's the Beef," irreverently sung to the tune of the gospel tune, "Come and Dine." He says, "I had never heard the song until I saw it in his paper." Come, come, Doc. I have a tape recording of your Sunday morning sermon, February 16, 1986, on the subject, 'The Comfort of His Eternal Humanity,' where you again preached that heresy. At the start of the message you described your "Boopsie-Woopsie" routine, sang, "Look at all that hair," which you said you wrote and sang to the girls that week. Then you went on, "I

also wrote this one," proceeding to sing "Where's the Beef" to the tune of "Come and Dine." While your musical talents are roughly those of Lester Roloff (whom we all loved to hear anyway, because we knew he was *real*), I did manage to make out the two tunes. You can get your own tape and listen to it; I want to keep my copy as evidence.

**42.** "Untruth #33" relates to his "Where's the beef" foolishness. He admits to most of what I said, but adds, "I never take off my coat." I was quoting there what I called "a friendly eyewitness account from a preacher who attends annually" his Pastors School. This preacher read the "Saddest Story," listened to Hyles' declaration of war, read his 4-page letter and his 11-page "Reply," then publicly stated that he believed Hyles and I are both innocent – Hyles of the charges and me by virtue of being "taken in" on the story. So it is a *very* friendly eyewitness whom Hyles is calling a liar and, if mistaken, it was certainly very innocent on his part.

As for Hyles, we are not sure whether he is claiming that he *never* takes off his coat (some preacher don't, in public), or whether he simply means he never does when he flexes his muscles. If the former, it is easy to prove contrariwise and we can supply pictures. Strangely Hyles wears short sleeve shirts and when his coat is off, rolls up the short sleeves even shorter – almost to the shoulder! Be that as it may, we have the testimony of others who have seen him shed his coat for his silly muscle flexing routine. We have no idea why he denies it.

**43.** "Untruth #34" is his denial that he prays to his mother. At the same time he does indeed acknowledge that he "goes to her grave every week to talk to her." He ignored our question and comment, "Why go to the cemetery? His mother is not there; she is in Heaven. According to this philosophy, she could hear him if he talked to her from a bar." His mother, like the Virgin Mary, is not omniscient, omnipotent or omnipresent. The Blessed Virgin cannot hear more than one speaking at a time and neither could Hyles' mother. We know of no Scripture teaching that *any redeemed person* in Heaven hears *anyone* on earth, redeemed or unredeemed. It is possible that they do, but, if so, the Word of God is silent about it. And Hyles *did* tell his congregation, before the "big Sunday," he had gone to the cemetery and pled with his mother to "pull" for him to reach their goal. If that is not praying to the dead, what is it? And he *does* go through the Rice/Roloff/Roberson/Mother picture routine before he leaves to preach – and says he asks his mother to intercede for him to do a good job. Tens of thousands have heard him say so.

**44.** "Untruth #35" relates to his jumping on the Ruckman bandwagon. He says he doesn't know Ruckman, has never heard him preach or listened to one of his tapes. I didn't say he had become a Ruckman follower; I said he had endorsed the Ruckman position on the KIV. If he hasn't, Ruckman is sure fooled. He printed a banner headline across the entire front of his paper: "**Jack Hyles Takes Stand Against Alexandria**" (June, 1984), and in the article quoted him:

"It bothers me when people say, 'We believe that the Bible in the *original manuscripts* is the

word of God.'

"Then we HAVE NO BIBLE.

"Do you understand: *WE HAVE NO BIBLE.*"

Ruckman was smart enough to understand that Hyles was endorsing his position and teaching contrary to the historic Christian position – that inspiration relates exclusively to the original manuscripts. That was Hyles position, too, until Dr. John R. Rice died, when he suddenly made a 180° turn. Reread the testimony of the Hyles-Anderson alumnus in our May 1 issue, if you doubt it.

**45.** "Untruth #36" is his denial that he said one was not saved if the personal worker used another English version, claiming "the genes were flawed." Again, this is a case of Hyles' word against Vic's – who was so shocked when he heard him say it – but it is a very minor point and if he says he never said it, we will not quibble.

**46.** "Untruth #37" relates to charges of his heretical preaching in the "Merit vs. Demerit" sermon, quoting me as saying about his teaching, "If you have enough in reserve, God will forgive your sin and put you back in business." I did not claim to be quoting him word-for-word (there were no quotation marks around the statement), merely giving the *exact gist* of it. Many, many other preachers have heard the same sermon tape and came to the same conclusion I did. Hyles actually called what he was teaching "stumbling insurance" and said flatly, "God's degree of patience when you stumble will be totally dependent on how fast you were running." In fact, his first point was, "God's degree of patience with you when you stumble is determined by how fast you were running." His second point was, "Your chance on a second chance will depend on what you did with your first chance." His conclusion was, "You'd better be worth enough to God, [have] enough merits built up, so when you stumble the demerits will not overbalance the merits." My evaluation harmonizes exactly with what he said. We pointed out that the teaching was "a warmed over, remodeled version of the old 'indulgences' philosophy practiced in Roman Catholicism." It is! *And the tragedy is that the tape of the sermon we have was preached at a conference in Colorado with hundreds of preachers present who whooped and hollered and shouted their agreement all the way through.* Has Fundamentalism come to this?

But wait, in what is probably the closest thing in his reply to an admission of guilt, he says Dr. Wayne VanGelderren, Dr. Walt Handford, and Dr. Ed Nelson had all voiced an opinion to him that the teaching in this sermon "was a bit dangerous," to quote VanGelderren. But wait again, since he himself involved Dr. VanGelderren, let me note that in a letter to me prior to my "Saddest Story" article, Dr. VanGelderren said, "I have reproached Brother Jack several times concerning material from several of his sermons. Each time, he has very humbly admitted that he saw the

point and said that he would not preach the sermons anymore." *There is something wrong with the theology and reliability of a preacher whom others must keep correcting!*"

The amazement becomes stronger when he denies, in this same "Untruth #37," that he believes in the eternal humanity of Christ. Hyles says, "I DO NOT BELIEVE IN THE ETERNAL HUMANITY OF CHRIST." Then he seeks to explain it away by saying, "I simply mean that I believe that man was made in the image of God and was meant to be like Christ." This is absolutely incredible; that is nothing like what he has been teaching. We documented clear statement after statement in which he taught "the eternal humanity of Christ," even claiming Fundamentalists have always believed and taught it. While I could invite readers to go back and reread my October 1, 1988, editorial in which I abundantly documented this teaching, suffice it now to simply give what could be interpreted as his "doctrinal statement" on the subject. In his message of February 16, 1986, after the Scripture reading by John Colsten, and just before Hyles prayed, he said he wanted to make this statement (part of which is true, of course): **"There has always been a member of the Godhead who was human and God. The Trinity did not last only for 33 years. There's always been Jesus Christ, the same yesterday, today and forever. He is the human deity now. He always has been. He always will be. He did not become human when He came to Bethlehem. He became flesh, but not human. He's always been human. And I wanna talk this morning on the subject, 'The Comfort of His Eternal Humanity'."** That is every word in his statement; he then prayed and preached. For him to explain away those clear declarations with a mere "I also admit that I was not very articulate" will not suffice. He has taught it in many of his messages and he has expounded it clearly and repeatedly. It is heresy in the first degree.

**47.** "Untruth #38" is his denial that he has an improper understanding of repentance. To prove it, he says, "Our altar is filled every Sunday night with people repenting of sin." This illustrates his misunderstanding. "People at the altar," even weeping and wailing, is not repentance. While he says he teaches his workers to get *conversions*, what they often get is *professions*. That is why tens of thousands of his converts do not stick – there is no repentance.

A case in point: just this past week I read a long paper written by a Hyles-Anderson alumnus who served on the mission field. His life was as immoral as the lowest profligate, almost completely controlled by wicked lust. While at Hyles-Anderson he "became active in a bus ministry and even started a Sunday school class for Thai speaking people in First Baptist Church at Hammond, Indiana, where my wife and I sang in the choir." Yet he was practically a whoremonger. What was the problem? He blamed it on "an easy believism message which I had trusted and taught and which was the basic cause of my own unsaved state. I thought my motive was pure. I wanted only to build a big church so that many would come and hear the message. I wanted to have many decisions and I fell into the false belief that the end justifies the means, so I used many unChristlike practices in my evangelistic invitations and appeals."

He says he used the Roman Road appeal and got many "yes answers," but there was no repentance, no changes in the lives of his converts. He used the same techniques to get decisions for Christ that he had learned when he was a cookware salesman with the West Bend Corporation. He confesses, "I had balloons and bubble-gums, give-aways and gimmicks that brought huge crowds, but the message I preached and taught gave no true salvation, no deliverance from sin."

No, crowds at the altar on Sunday nights are no indication of repentance, at least the kind producing the new birth and its resultant revolutionized lives. I ask the Hyles tape crowd to tell me the last time they heard him preach a biblical sermon on repentance. There is no "Turn or Burn" in his repertoire such as John R. Rice and Charles H. Spurgeon preached. Hyles does warn about the *burning*, but he is sorely lacking on the *turning*.

By the way, the pastor who sent me this missionary's testimony, in the accompanying letter, said he and his wife "went through the missionary school at Hyles-Anderson. While they were at the school, the man had one or more affairs with some of the women on staff at the church and college. According to their own testimony, signed by them. The wife found out about the affairs and took the matter to Jack Hyles, but he did nothing but cover it up."

Another former Hyles-Anderson student pointed out: "The 'soul winning' done at First Baptist and H-AC has *one very important* ingredient left out – repentance of sin. Many, many thousands of people are lost and going to Hell because they repeated a 'prayer' to get someone off their back and were never explained about repentance."

**48.** "Untruth #39" denies his subliminal suggestion in preaching. This charge came from a former faculty member who spent months evaluating his messages in this area.

**49.** "Untruth #40" is his denial of what an evangelist reported who counts First Baptist as his church home, that Hyles said adultery is not sin, just a mistake. He says, "This evangelist, in my opinion, has little or no credibility in our church and is not supported or approved or held out as one of our church evangelists and never has been." If he knows who this evangelist is and has an opinion about him, let him take it up with him. He could explain to him why, since he had "little or no credibility" in Hammond, he let him preach for 14 years at the church's mission. And he could explain why he gave him permission to use his name as a reference in evangelism.

**50.** "Untruth #41" is Hyles' denial that he said no sin disqualified a man from preaching. He answered by saying he was talking about soul winning; if so, I heartily agree. Unfortunately, he said, "You are qualified to *preach* no matter what you did. If one confesses and forsakes his sin, he is free to *preach* or evangelize. He has a right to *preach!*" Notice carefully, Hyles said "preach



**OR** evangelize." He distinguished between preaching and soul winning, saying one has a right to do either "no matter what you did." We suggest doubters obtain that January 17, 1988 tape and check it out for themselves. We don't know what he *meant*, we only know what he *said* – and the entire tenor of the message related to *both* preaching and soul winning.

**51.** "Untruth #42" is Hyles' denial that he said all men are mental homosexuals. On page 104 of his book *How to Treat Different Types of Church Members*, Hyles says: "In a sense, this is – almost what could be called mental homosexuality. For example, a man may want a woman's love, but he may want it to be mentally the same love that he gives her. In other words, he wants her to love him emotionally and mentally like a man, but she is not a man! She is a woman and she must love him, emotionally and mentally as a woman would love him." This is apparently what he means by men being mental homosexuals. We still violently disagree with it.

Incidentally, Dr. Roger Voegtlin, in his sermon, "Why I Am Not 100% for Jack Hyles" (he is not even 1% for him) – we will tell you how to get the sermon in a moment – told of a Pastors School a couple of years back when Hyles preached this "mental homosexuality" bit and preachers were stopping at his church (not far from Hammond) by the dozens and saying, "You wouldn't believe what Dr. Hyles was teaching us – that all men are mental homosexuals," and they were all joking about it, saying, "Maybe he is, but I'm not." This was a long, long time before I charged him with teaching it. If he is not preaching it, he is not making himself very clear; those who hear him think he is!

**52.** "Untruth #43" is his pastoral "veto power" in the lives of young people. He has ruined any number of lives with this business and I have the letters since my article came out to prove it. He not only has "veto power," he thinks he has the ability to "select" mates for his young people. This, too, has resulted in disaster. And he **has** married couples when one or more of the participants' parents were strongly opposed. By the way, in this matter Hyles said, "Mr. Sumner says that the pastor should have veto power...." *I* did not say that; *he* said it. I do not believe it.

One of the problems is that the leadership at First Baptist has applied the words of Jehovah to Moses about Aaron, the man who was to be his mouthpiece, "...thou shalt be to him instead of God" (Exodus 4:16), and tried to make it into a New Testament doctrine about the pastor. That is horribly wrong, wicked exegesis. But don't take my word about his "veto power" teaching, get that sermon I quoted ("How to Decide What to Do?"; February 17, 1988) and hear it for yourself. He lists three facts: the Bible (which he barely touched on), the pastor, and his veto power (which was the main part of the message), and the Holy Spirit (whom his followers would be free to consult only after the first two). We consider that order, putting himself ahead of the Holy Spirit, bordering on – if not actual – blasphemy.

**53.** "Untruth #44" is his denial of the shouting about who is the greatest. Hyles asked for the

proof. It happened on Sunday morning, February 1, 1988, and the sermon was "Ours Is a Fruitful Hill," using Isaiah 5:1 as the text.

**54.** "Untruth #45" is his insistence that he counsels with an average of 150 people a week. He said, "Some of this counseling lasts for 30 seconds, some lasts for an hour," and he says the average is "about 15 minutes each." In the first place, *no one* could adequately counsel *anyone* in 30 seconds. He could give answers, but he couldn't counsel. For example, if a student came up I and said, "Should I commit suicide?" he could say, "No, of course not." But to counsel it would be necessary to take the Word of God and show what the Bible teaches about suicide, why it is wrong, and many other facets of the subject.

Interestingly, however, I had only pointed out that his claim to counseling 152 people that week, *at 10 minutes each*, would require well over 24 hours. His claim of an average of 15 minutes for 150 people comes out to 37½ hours! Remember, he is out of town Mondays and Tuesdays, has sermons to prepare for several services in his own church, plus all the other duties involved in pastoring what he calls "the greatest church in the world." A full-time counselor only puts in a couple of hours more per week than he says he does. Forgive us, please, but we are indeed implying that it is "impossible" – at least for one doing the job right. We know that we wouldn't want to be on the *receiving* end of that kind of counseling.

A letter from former members of First Baptist offers a sampling of what his counseling is like: "... we left in '74 because we were not being fed from the Word of God, so we could grow. My husband spent so many hours at church we were close to a divorce ourselves. I went once to Hyles for help. He talked with me for a few minutes and ended up by saying, 'You keep it up and you'll go to Hell.' I didn't call that help." Nor do we.

**55.** "Untruth #46" had to do with the courses offered in the night school at the college. The good brother who told me this, with a broken heart, had come all the way to Hammond from somewhere in New England. He was a family man who had to work a full-time job and was trying to carry a full-time load at the school (this builds character, male students are told) and his health broke. When he told his counselor his doctor said he could no longer handle such a heavy load, instead of comfort and compassion he was told, "I'd rather burn out than rust out." At any rate, here is the story as he explained it to me. In late summer, handout sheets are distributed at the church, listing the courses expected to be available that Fall. The sheet that year listed such things as wood carving, home making (cake decorating) and, to the best of his recollection 3 years after the fact, crafts. (Another man verified this to me and said it was the standard joke among the men around the church at the time, which of the courses they were going to take.) He was not interested and tossed the sheet in the trash. He said the courses Dr. Jorgensen spoke of were offered in 1985 and may have been offered in 1986, although they were not on the handout sheet. He said interested students are told to meet after church in the balcony and fill out forms

and if there is enough interest in some other subjects, they are included. Possibly that happened, but our original declaration of the type courses being offered that year stands.

**56.** "Untruth #47" relates to his telling his people he did not have to give an account to them. This fits the "if you say I said it, I'll deny it – and it will be your word against mine." This was only one parenthetical sentence in almost two full columns giving illustrations of the cultic mind control under which Hyles has his members. We suggest our readers go back and see what we said, then ask Hyles why he ignored everything else in that long passage.

**57.** "Untruth #48" is another "skip and jump" to selectively choose his responses. He passed by my comments on his sermon thanking Adam and Eve for bringing sin into the world, and saying, "Thank God for the chains of sin"; my comments on his sermon, "Backsliding, A Necessary Part to Spiritual Growth," where he said about his hearers spiritual condition, "If you are not as high as you used to be, jump up and down and say, 'Hallelujah!'"; and my comments on his sermons "I Am Only Human" and "How to Make God Your Slave." In the sermon in question, talking about the sin of cursing, for example, he said, "As far as the Bible is concerned, the one who criticizes the curser is just as sinful as the curser is because both are doing something to occupy their tongue and keep them from using their tongue to do what God intended for the tongue to do." That is inane, of course. We are told to "rebuke before all" when others sin. Hyles makes the sin and the rebuke co-equal. Again, "If you ate lunch today not for the glory of God, you sinned. I am not talking about little sin, I'm not talking about little white sin, I'm talking about black sin, I'm talking about big sin." Is adultery a big, black sin? So is not eating lunch to the glory of God, he says, meaning the two are equal (if language means anything). He said that saying "Did you hear about so-and-so" was as bad as whatever so-and-so did. Murder? (He said a slanderer is "*worse* than a murderer!") Adultery? Blasphemy? Heresy? He made no exceptions. (We are not defending any of these awful iniquities; merely saying that not all sins are "created equal.") And he did say, as we quoted him, about the works of the flesh, "I don't think you will ever find these things called sin in the Bible." The comparison about milk and adultery was not a statement he made, although he did speak of not drinking milk in faith, but a conclusion most hearers would get from listening to the message. In this message he kept telling his hearers that the manifestation of sin was not the real problem, insisting you've got to "get the root out." That will never happen, of course, until the Adamic nature has been eradicated. Is he teaching that? We cannot understand this message if he was not. This milk/adultery business is indicated by the title of another sermon, "The Bad Backslider Is No Worse Than the Good Backslider," in which he declared, "If you have been in a tavern and living like an animal, God is just as close to you as He is to the one who didn't pray last night." Utter blasphemy!

**58.** "Untruth #49" is his objection to my statement that "Hyles overlooks nearly every sin known to man, including divorce, adultery, cursing, pornography, etc." I showed in my article how he overlooks all of those things. Hyles' defense is that he "preaches against" all those things, but we

were not talking about his *preaching*, we were talking about his *practicing*, and he has overlooked all of those things among his leadership.

**59.** "Untruth #50 " related to my saying that a faculty member – who is still at Hyles-Anderson, incidentally – repeatedly emphasized, "the key to success is attitude," which fits in with the success-oriented philosophy of the world. Hyles responded, "Anybody who has heard me preach around the country knows that I strongly condemn this success-oriented philosophy of growth or prosperity at any cost." Note the last three words. We didn't say he was advocating it "at any cost." But if the Hyles philosophy is not success-oriented, he has his followers fooled. The number one response from his crowd about my article was: "Look at all the success he has. Surely this proves he is right!" Everything is based on success (numbers).

One dear lady, a pastor's wife, wrote to confess that she had put her husband down in her mind for many years because he was not the "success" Jack Hyles was, feeling "as if my husband were a complete failure." His church, which he has pastored for over a quarter of a century, never has been able to climb above 300 in the preaching services. And she lamented, "I always felt that if my pastor-husband were as dedicated to the Lord as Jack Hyles, we would have a lot of people, too." She always thought if only her husband could attend the great Pastors School in Hammond, it would make him a great preacher as well. (Fortunately, they never had the money!) It was a long letter, but suffice it to say she concluded, "This story about Jack Hyles makes me appreciate my little 'nobody' preacher-husband a lot more. God keep him a little 'nobody' if becoming a somebody would make him become what so many preachers have become by being a 'somebody.' All of this may sound crude, but it is from my heart. We will pray for Jack Hyles tonight before we go to bed and for the many who have been brainwashed into thinking that numbers are a sure sign of the blessings and power of God."

**60.** "Untruth #51" is Hyles' denial of the charge by a "former deacon, now a pastor," regarding the many women staff members and the fact that these women make many of the decisions through their input. The facts are these: the composite of the First Baptist Church staff is approximately two-thirds women. Department heads in the Sunday school are almost exclusively women. Most of the decisions for the church are made in staff meetings. Staff recommendations are endorsed by the deacons. It is interesting that Hyles' theme at Pastors School a few years back related to the church staff – and so many of the women were doing the "preaching" (we use the term advisedly) that a good number of godly pastors got up and walked out.

**61.** "Untruth #52" relates to my quote of him saying (and he did not deny saying it), "Who better can tell boys and girls not to drink than those who've drunk. Who better can warn boys and girls to be pure and clean than those who've not been pure and clean." He claims I misrepresented the purpose of the message, but what he said speaks loud and clear. I simply reported honestly what he said. When he said no one can do it better, what else could he have meant? It fits another

charge in my original article, which he did not answer, where he told of a young woman who had just given birth to an illegitimate baby and said it was his dream that she would one day teach young people in his Sunday school.

In the same item, he called "an untruth" the matter of his deacons voting to go ahead with "an unscriptural" position. We will let our readers decide. The case had to do with Mrs. Glenda Patterson being the physical education teacher for boys in the Hammond Baptist grade school. The matter had been brought up previously and a number of the deacons had objected, saying they did not want their sons watching a woman bounce around during calisthenics and other vigorous physical activities. *The deacons then voted to remove her from that position!* Lo and behold, Hyles had it brought back up at another meeting and used his influence to reinstate her, over objections that it was "unscriptural." That, as Paul Harvey is so fond of saying, "is the rest of the story. "

Hyles closed with the same untruth with which he started his defense: "The only support I have ever given him was \$200 a month for a rather lengthy period of time in an effort to help him live and meet expenses because he had resigned *The Sword of the Lord* after my defense of Dr. Hutson." While, as previously noted, not one red cent of First Baptist money was ever used by me personally – it went into our ministry, as the back of every canceled check the church has will show – this is not the untruth I am highlighting. Note that Hyles is still saying I resigned I "**after**" his defense of Dr. Hutson. I resigned "**before**" and he had absolutely nothing to do with it! I have proved this point many, many times.

As far as we know, we have answered *absolutely everything* Hyles brought up in his "reply." Three or four of the answers are weaker than the others, perhaps, but I didn't sidestep a single thing, regardless. What a tremendous difference between my reply and his! Our phone has been ringing off the hook with men calling to complain that he evaded and ignored much of my article – and much of what he did answer was a simple denial without proof. We already noted that one editor said he had listed 64 separate items Hyles had either ignored or answered inconclusively. We think there were even more. This is a serious matter and we have honestly attempted to treat it seriously.

## **OTHER ITEMS FOR CONSIDERATION**

We want to briefly mention some other matters people have contacted us about.

**1.** Mrs. Hyles' anonymity is explained by saying "she didn't want to be mentioned." But why is she never seen with him? Is that her preference, too? A former member of Miller Road says, "I used to sing in trios with his wife, Beverly, in Texas. He used to speak of her often in his sermons, then." Those were the good old days.

A pastor in Pennsylvania, who attended Pastors School in 1974, wrote, "What you revealed is what I've wondered for a long (since 1974) time. First, I took my Bible to Pastors School. I never used it except for my devotions. Hyles would read a verse and the rest would be "Hyles-ology." Second, we *never* met or heard **anything** – not a word – about Mrs. Hyles. At once I thought that to be peculiar, especially since we heard tons about teachers, daughters, son, etc., *and* much about 'Mother.' We stayed with an elderly lady who was a member. I asked her about where Mrs. Hyles was. She got 'icy cold,' gave no reply, and the subject was dropped."

2. We have never liked to call others liars, so let's just say that Hyles has a bad habit of misrepresenting things – and we have given numerous illustrations in this article. (One prominent preacher, formerly associated with him, said Jack Hyles was the biggest liar he had ever been associated with, noting that he would rather tell a lie than tell the truth. This is in Dr. Roger Voegtlin's tape, mentioned above.) Another case in point is the little insert he sent out with his defense, "A PERSONAL WORD FROM BROTHER HYLES." He started out, "As you perhaps know, I am not speaking at the National Sword of the Lord Convention at Bob Jones University. I want my friends to know that this was my decision and not the decision of my good friend, Dr. Curtis Hutson.... I only canceled because I did not want my presence to be harmful to the Convention.... Please be assured that my absence from the program was not of Dr. Hutson's choosing but of mine."

Let's set the record straight. The decision was not Jack Hyles'. He did not cancel. The decision was not Curtis Hutson's. He did not cancel. The decision was made by Bob Jones University and by Bob Jones University alone. It was made late in April and was not the result of pressure from anyone, merely the feeling that Hyles would need to clear his name before he could be honored with his presence on the BJU platform. That was scriptural and sensible; we commend BJU for its action.

Here's another illustration – and it goes with the opening item in this section also. Before my "Saddest Story" article appeared, Hyles wrote me a 4-page letter in longhand, pleading with me not to print it. Two pages were asking for Mrs. Nischik's sake, one page was a plea in behalf of his son, and the remainder contained what Hyles called "a few observations." In my reply, I wrote: "You pleaded for justice for Mrs. Nischik and 'mercy' for Dave. I found it incredible – and, perhaps, highly significant – that you showed no concern for your wife. She is the one who has my sympathy and I truly wished there were some way I could uncover the story without involving this woman whom I believe to be totally innocent." We still find it incredible!

But even more incredible was what he claimed about Dave. I quote his letter, "I wish I had known before he went to Garland of his problem, but I did not.... The first I knew of his problem was in 1984 when it all broke open at Miller Road. The same is true as far as his mother is

concerned. She, likewise, had no forewarning. Perhaps we were naive." To which I responded: "Jack, you flat lied to me in your letter and both of us know it. I am talking about you saying that you did not know of his problem before the Miller Road incident. Everyone else in Hammond did, almost. And minister after minister, school leader after school leader, church leader after church leader, faced you with his problems in those days. You were given written evidence, which you promised to take care of, yet did nothing. You knew of his affair with \_\_\_\_\_, too. It is this 'cover-up' of sin that is so wicked and now causes you to lie. Nor are you telling the truth when you say that the Miller Road church did not contact you in advance of calling him. It did. When the deacons asked what you thought of the church so doing, your only response was, 'Well, Dave's his own man'."

In this regard, a man in Canoga Park, California wrote, early in 1986, and asked Hyles 5 questions. He answered 3 of them (the other two were to be answered only if questions 2 and 4 required a "yes" answer). These 3 questions were: "Did you know that David had a problem with women and/or/pornography before he got married? Did you know that David had a problem with women and/or pornography when he took the church in Texas? Did you recommend David to the church in Texas?" He wrote "No" after each and sent the questionnaire back. He told an out-and-out falsehood on the first two and bore false witness on the third since he recommended Dave by "silence." By the way, the minister on the staff at First Baptist, Jack Schaap, who married Dave to his present wife, Brenda Stevens, acknowledged to that same brother that he had no *scriptural ground* for so doing, but did so for *personal reasons* (he is Dave's brother-in-law, Dr. Hyles' son-in-law). How lightly "Bible convictions," are discarded.

One pastor in Texas, very close in the Dave/Garland matter, wrote me: "I tried to confront Dr. Hyles about David's sin and the fact that he knew about it and covered it; he would not answer any correspondence or talk to me."

**3.** Most of Hyles defenders have based their arguments on results. They point to the good he has done, the souls he has won, the accomplishments they see. A brother in South Dakota hit the nail on the head when he wrote, "The big numbers that have been used at Hammond are not necessarily indication of God's blessing. They appear to be more of an indication of Jack Hyles' drive, determination and 'win at any cost' attitude, and the corresponding gullibility of many to believe the Madison Avenue philosophy that big is right." To which we add: the biggest church in the world is the Full Gospel Central Church in Seoul, Korea, pastored by Paul Yonggi Cho, and we have previously shown (April 1, 1989) the occult influence there; size and result are not necessarily a mark of God's blessing. The illustrious Adoniram Judson, one of the most revered missionaries in history, labored seven years in Burma before he saw his first convert. As one who has given most of his life to evangelism, far be it from me to knock it in any way. Perish the thought! But might is not right and, regardless of what you may have heard, *soul winning does not cover a multitude of sins!*

4. As readers of our article know, the cultic/mind control issue in Hammond is one of our major concerns. It is with others, too, if our mail is any indication. A pastor in Tennessee wrote: "I have attended several Pastors Schools at Hammond, the last one being 1984, at which time I noticed the cultish atmosphere, the manner in which Dr. Hyles is revered, almost to the point of human worship, and the fact that I had never heard him speak of his wife in messages. I came home and expressed these things to my own family. I have young people in my church who are presently attending Hyles-Anderson, and after their first year, I saw how they were being brainwashed, to place Hylesology above the Word of God. I became very concerned about the type of training they were receiving."

An Indiana pastor wrote: "I have been very concerned about Dr. Hyles over the past 15 years. I am most alarmed concerning his doctrinal deviations, especially since the vast majority of his students (and pastors) take every word of his to be gospel truth. A family in my church have a daughter and son-in-law at Hyles-Anderson College. They make periodic trips to visit their daughter at Hammond, and they have returned to tell me of the blind, fanatical zeal that the students have toward Jack Hyles. This man's son-in-law has jokingly referred to Hyles as 'the fourth member of the Trinity'!!!" Another Indiana minister told me he has a tape of a message in which one faculty member confesses to kneeling in prayer and sometimes catching himself starting, "Dear Dr. Hyles."

An evangelist in the West commented: "I have been on to him for 25 years now...and, for the last 10 or 12, have accused him of being a cultist of the rawest kind. It has cost me some very good friends and acquaintances, but I have expressed my opinion loud and clear."

A couple wrote – both had attended Hyles-Anderson – to say, "We were so delighted and amazed that you understood and used the term 'mind control.' That is exactly what it is." The husband has written a book on the subject.

An especially enlightening letter – because his comments were written before our article was published – came from an associate pastor in Kentucky. He and the senior minister had attended this year's Pastors School and could "no longer stomach" it after two days. He said: "Some of the very same comments in your article came from my own lips and were written in the notes I was taking at 'Pastors School.' Things such as 'heretical,' 'Jim Jonesism,' 'fake,' 'brainwashing,' 'misleading,' and many more." By the way, another minister – this one from North Carolina – said, "Your article also helped me to better understand the lack of 'reverence' on the part of the Hyles-Anderson students during this year's Pastors School."

A lay couple wrote to say they believed my article because of their own experience, adding: "We were feeling these things long before we ever read your paper. You see, 8 years ago our daughter



went away to H-AC. After 5 years she graduated. For the past 3 years she has been on the staff. We have seen what we feel is brainwashing in her. We have felt like she is in a cult. She has all but divorced our family. Her loyalty is to J. Hyles. We feel he has divided our family. Our daughter comes from a good Christian family who really loved her and sacrificed for her. Will we ever get back? I can hardly think about her without crying."

A Hyles-Anderson graduate (Class of '81) wrote: "I was unaware of any inside wrongdoings during my time there. The greater offense to me personally was learning a type of Christianity which puts the 'doing' before the 'being.' It has taken years for me to understand God's way of growth, that it is a work of grace; to rid myself of judgmental thinking; to understand that there are many ways to reach this world for Christ; to find out that although I had a degree from a Bible college, I had not been taught the Bible. It is clear to me that this ultra-fundamentalistic type of ministry breeds such horrendous behavior. It is repressive, destructive, and has hurt the cause of Christ deeper than any so-called liberal."

Cultic groups are obsessed with "new light." Those who have monitored Hyles' sermons for any length of time are amazed at how frequently he tells his congregation, "Listen carefully, you've never heard this taught before," or, "I'm going to give you something now that others do not know'," or words to that effect.

Many H-AC alumni expressed feelings of betrayal and concern about emotional damage they have experienced. One called to say he had been helped by going to an organization specializing in aiding ex-cult members recover from the psychological harm, giving us the name, address and telephone number of that group. Since it is not exclusively evangelical, we will not pass on that information, but we are saying that such organizations are available.

Too, some have called and written and wondered about a support group for ex-Hyles-Anderson and ex-First Baptist people. One dear lady, willing to put her neck on the line and face the anticipated abuse to head it up, is Mrs. Loretta (Knudsen) Harrison, Class of '82. You may write her: 5003 Sugar Pine Drive, Montgomery, AL 36116.

**5.** Is exposing sin in leaders' lives "shooting our wounded"? An editor in Texas recently wrote, "Great men have said that the Christian army is the only army which shoots its wounded." A pastor in Colorado wrote me, "I first heard that statement from Truman Dollar long before he resigned his church with a moral problem. Now we hear it all the time. My answer to it would be this. When a fellow soldier is wounded as you fight together against the forces of Satan, do all you can to help him. When he joins the enemy, traitors are to be shot. The bank president who stole money from his bank may truly repent. Forgive him, but don't make him president of the bank again. He has violated a position of trust." Amen.

6. There is the matter of the Hyles "clones" now permeating the country. We previously said one purpose in writing our article was because he was developing so many "little Hyles" across America, preachers who are following his techniques and imitating his belligerent, dictatorial pastoral style. What a flood of letters we received from lay people complaining of his "clones" in their church pulpits! A missionary, who had to leave his home church because of this, wrote: "I read with very deep interest the article on Dr. Jack Hyles. What attracted my attention most is that my wife and I have just left a church, after nine years of highly active membership, over almost identically the same circumstances. Only the names in your article were different.... It is of further interest that this pastor is a devoted fan of Jack Hyles and receives a tape from him each week. Much of the heresy Hyles is preaching has been coming out from that pulpit."

A pastor in New England wrote: "Good, decent and fine men of God from this area have gone to his Pastors School, only to come back with an arrogance that does not speak of Christ. Christ is not edified or lifted up, only Mr. Hyles. One pastor has a picture in front of his desk that he prays before every day. It is very difficult for some of us pastors to comprehend how Mr. Hyles can command such lordship. It now seems that these once sweet spiritual men have had the 'spirit killed' and Hyles is reigning. The leavening that comes from the school seems very deceitful."

A former staff member said much the same, evaluating it: "We've lost sight of the humanity of Christian leaders. Twenty years ago, though, I saw the subtle training of preachers at Pastors Schools, as well as later at the college, to instill into leaders their almost God-like standing before their people. It was all so subtle, but now across the country we have thousands of preachers who feel they are not accountable to anyone." What a tragedy.

A lay couple in Iowa, who called "frightening" those who have been led astray, wrote: "In the past, we've known of pastors who were his followers, who have split churches and ruined the churches' testimony. For example, at the present time there is a 'Hyles Pastor' in our area (who fashions his ministry after Hyles and announced from his pulpit that Hyles is the *greatest* preacher *ever*"), uses the dictatorial, intimidating approach, 'whips' the congregation, dwells on *sex related* subjects, is dishonest, a big spender, etc."

Hyles' superficial view of divorce (his *practice*, not his *preaching*) has influenced many preachers. A minister in Wyoming wrote: "The church I pastored in Illinois was a Hyles church. Divorce and adultery were both practiced and condoned. I lasted six years and almost lost my health."

7. Many misunderstood the statement in my previous article, "if these charges are not true," as doubt on my part. *Absolutely not!* I was merely trying to be kind and gracious – along with an admission that I am not deity and have all the frailties of humanity – nothing more. I was absolutely convinced of the charges when I published them, and the overwhelming additional

evidence I have received since that time has strengthened my conviction 100%!

8. We were going to write a special article about Hyles-Anderson College but decided against it, choosing to merely mention it here. While we doubt not that many fine students have graduated from that school in the past – and, in the past, some outstanding faculty members have ministered there – we do not think much of it now." *Why?* Because of the letters we have received from current students and faculty. Very few are polite or even well written. The majority have been rude, crude and even vulgar. (After listening to the Hyles tape when he declared war on us, we found where most of the crudeness was coming from – the students were merely repeating him, only carrying it to extremes.) One recognized historian of no little repute wrote me on May 2, "HAVE READ AND REREAD your Hyles issue of May 2. Are you ready for the Niagara of Nastiness which will surely flow your way from the Hammond Network?" He *understated* it.

One letter *mailed on official Hyles-Anderson College stationary* was addressed to "Mr. 'Smut Face'" (we were going to photographically reproduce it for all to see, but decided not to waste the space). Another was addressed to "Mr. Sumner, 'Americas Most Trashiest Christian Voice,'" (not only was the grammar and the punctuation bad, but "Christian" was crossed out and "Opps!" written above it – we assume the writer meant "oops!"). A host of them were addressed to the "Biblical Enquirer" (which they got from Hyles and, like him, didn't seem to see the inconsistency of calling it "Biblical"). When we apologized to the local postal authorities for the kind of mail we were receiving, they just laughed and said they were used to seeing mail from "nuts." Actually, it was Hyles-Anderson that was hurt by such actions, not us, in the eyes of the public.

Misspelled words, grammatical blunders and other un-collegiate errors filled many of them. Name calling was the rule rather than the exception: "You're the worst, ugliest, lowest, dirtiest old crook ever born," "scummy manure spreader," "if I were God I'd send you to the hottest part of hell," "do you eat doggy poo?" One student, foolish enough to put his name on the envelope, actually sent me excretion in a plastic bag. What kind of school is Hyles running? Doesn't he teach them how to be ladies and gentlemen, even toward those with whom they disagree?

The students, of course, wrote in blind loyalty to a mere man, never having read my article – they were forbidden to do so. Most didn't know what they were writing about and passed on rumors that were rampant at the college. One girl angrily charged, "Why don't you put in print your *own* 'testimony'? You've been divorced FOUR TIMES!" (Mrs. Sumner and I celebrated our 47th wedding anniversary this month!) The extent of their idol worship can be seen from one coed's claim that Hyles was "the greatest preacher since Moses!" So much for Peter, Daniel, Paul, Isaiah, John, Elijah, Stephen, Nehemiah, John the Baptist...*and the Lord Jesus Christ!* So much for Savonarola, Martin Luther, Charles Spurgeon, John Wesley, Bob Ketcham, Alexander Maclaren, Billy Sunday, J. Frank Norris, George Truett and the giants of all ages.

Hyles-Anderson students and First Baptist members wrote so many rude letters to the *Hammond Times* that one dear Christian lady in that area felt the need of sending her own. She wrote the newspaper: "I am a Christian and I am very embarrassed by the nasty, unChristian letters you have been receiving from some of Jack Hyles' supporters. I'm sorry you are getting the wrong impression of a true Christian attitude and I want you to know that there are many of us who try harder to have a loving spirit toward our enemies...." Amen! God bless that good lady. She said a lot of other good things, too.

What kind of education do H-AC students receive? Kevin J. Farley, who was in the Bachelor of Theology program at Hyles-Anderson, sent us a lengthy, 4-page letter we wish we had space to print in its entirety. As it is, we will just deal with one paragraph about the educational standards at H-AC. To show his qualifications for expressing an opinion in this area, prior to his conversion he graduated from Union College in New York, a respected private institution, with a B.S. in Mathematics. Currently, he is in his second year of the 4-year Masters in Theology program at the Dallas Theological Seminary. In addition, showing his roots, his father has long held an earned Doctorate in Education. What does Farley say? Under point "3" in his letter, "Academics/ Education," he writes:

"Bro. Hyles has no respect for Education. As is obvious to all 'Sword' readers, he disdains 'Bach, Beethoven and Brahms' in music, and emphasizes haircuts over History and Hermeneutics, not to mention any other academic discipline. Both my wife and I were truly disappointed with the level of academics at the college. Other graduates have agreed with us, not bitter ones either; good honest, godly Christians who thought they were spending their hard earned money and valuable time to get training that they now know was a sham. The secular subjects, such as History, English, Science and Mathematics are all on the high school level at best. Much of the Faculty are alumni of the college and have little more educational attainment than their students. (Recall my opening comments as to my basis for comparison, a degree from an established private college and a family background in education.) The sacred subjects such as Bible Exposition, Theology, and Greek are even more primitive. The Bible Faculty have no set of Hermeneutical principles and do not have a basis for interpreting the text other than their own predilections or a sermon they heard by Bro. Hyles or someone else. Theologically they use only books by Bro. Hyles. Works by Warfield, Charnock, Chafer, Hodge and Berkhoff are too liberal for these learned men. The Greek curriculum consists of using an interlinear Greek New Testament, an Analytical Concordance, and learning a few tenses. Their entire program is the equivalent of less than one month of seminary level Greek within a three-year program. The real tragedy, however, is the heart of their Pastoral Program, the 'Church Education' course. This is a required 4-year course for the majority of the male students, meeting 1 hour per day, 5 days per week. I repeat, *this is for four years!* Clearly, it is their top of the line course offering which is the heart of their entire program by virtue of the amazing requirements. What does this course consist of? The

student learns how to baptize, organize a Sunday school, have a wedding or funeral service, how to enlist workers, etc.; *i.e.*, the basic methods of the Bro. Hyles approach to ministry. The textbook is the *Hyles Church Manual*. Sound reasonable? Let's think about it. The material amounts to a 1-semester course, meeting two times per week. The course is stretched out over one year to give time to memorize all of the minutiae in the textbook. This is the least of the issue, however. *The same material is taught over and over again for the entire four years you are at the college!* It is almost impossible to believe unless you are there. The theory is 'it takes 4 years for all of this invaluable doctrine to sink in.' Ask any student of the school, this is the truth!"

And he summed it up: "I believe the worst charge of all that Bro. Hyles must face, however – perhaps the greatest possible offense against both God and man – is that Jack Hyles is guilty of trying to conform man to his own image. He does not encourage individuality, self-expression, development of God's unique gifts to each of His children. No, as Bro. Hyles has said scores of times, he wants to recreate himself in others. He wants to have '*little Jack Hyles*' all over America. He makes himself to be like God."

Before we leave the matter of H-AC students, we might note that the front page of the June 10, 1989, *Hammond Times* carried this headline across the full length of the top of page one: "**Ex-student is suspect in motel slayings.**" Without naming the youth because the investigation was not complete, Police Chief Jerry McCory said the student was registered at the Merrillville Days Inn the night 24-year-old Mary Margaret Gill was shot to death there – and 34-year-old Jeanne Marie Gilbert was killed at the Rensselaer Days Inn with what police believe was the same .22-caliber handgun. Both women had been sexually assaulted and cash taken from both registers. H-AC President Wendell Evans acknowledged that the youth was a student at the college, but says he was expelled some time after the murders for "excessive demerits on his record, and he 'had checks bouncing all over the area'." Evans said that on the night in question, the student had been returning to the campus from Chicago, became tired, and decided to check into the Inn for the night. (The motel is about 3 miles from the campus!)

9. We heard from many ex-students, ex-First Baptist members and ex-faculty and staff people who wholeheartedly supported our position. One letter, partially quoted above, came from a lady who worked for Hyles for a decade and, when she resigned to become a mother, "This almost cost me excommunication at the time as Bro. Hyles felt I was wasting my time and God-given abilities." Eventually the family moved out of the State to get away from the Hammond influence and she says, "I can't begin to tell you the recovery process I had to go through. It took a good year for my spiritual rehabilitation. Grace McMullen was such a special help to me along with some other godly people. I never had to say a word about all I had been through. For some time, I didn't really realize all I had been through...the harassment, brutal yelling sessions, memos that absolutely tore me up." And she said, "My husband and I have prayed all these years that someone would have enough intestinal fortitude to say, 'Enough is enough'," then added, "I have

never worked for anyone like Bro. Hyles who is so expert in covering his tracks. I mean he is a real 'pro'." She also mentioned Dave, saying, "I personally had counseled with some young women who had suffered because of him."

A couple in Michigan said: "We attended church in Hammond for several months, but we are so thankful the Lord saw fit to move us from there. Some of the things we wondered about have now been made plain."

An ex-faculty member wrote to show support and explain, "I am sure at this time the pressure is great, as it was when I was taking my stand at the college."

Ex-members: "Having lived in the Hammond area all our lives and attended First Baptist about 10 years ago, we have heard and seen much of what is in your article about Jack Hyles. It is sad, but it needs to be dealt with. We are praying for you and for Jack Hyles. "

Ex-members: "We think you did a splendid job covering this story on Hyles. We attended that church for 20 years, leaving only 2 years ago."

Ex-members, ex-faculty: "We witnessed many of the facts that you revealed. We worked in the 'Hyles system' for 14 years. Finally, in June 1987, we knew we had to separate ourselves.... We admit that we should have left years before, but because of our positions of influence that we thought we held, we stayed. We tried to do our part to warn of the error that was being presented by Jack Hyles, in his preaching and teaching. A group of us banded together to encourage one another against this onslaught of heresy. Some of the group confronted deacons, staff members and, as your article revealed, even Jack Hyles himself. Alas, to no avail. There are still some of the group there who have yet to take the step of faith and separate themselves."

Ex-members: "We were members there for 15 years. I'm sorry to say, I vividly remember my four teenagers telling us about the sins of their youth leader, David Hyles, but, we didn't believe it then. We were taught to not listen to criticism of any leader! The article is true in what it says about Jack Hyles, even if he does deny it!"

Current member: "I am a member of First Baptist Church. Have been for about 30 years. I want to thank you for your efforts in unveiling the travesty that has been going on...."

Missionary parents of an alumnus: "While he was in school my wife stayed with our son and his wife and attended services quite often at First Baptist. She was quite disturbed with some of Jack's teaching. One that really bothered her was a study on Daniel, the backslidden prophet. It was terrible. Then, also, his tape on Samson, the Spirit-filled judge, is nothing short of heresy."

Ex-student (male quartet, church soloist) sent a 5-page, single-space letter, too lengthy to reproduce, but here are a few interesting items:

"I was not a rebel or problem student. I was in total conformity. Now I look back and say I was 'sucked in.' I bought all the rules and their reasons and most if not all of the 'doctrine.' When we left for the summer quarter tour I had made up my mind. If my parents did not agree with 'brother' Hyles I was not returning home. In several of my classes and in many chapel services it is taught that if your parents do not like what you are being taught, or if you are under any pressure when you return home not to return to school, then do not go home.... I remember many different students commenting to me, 'Hyles is the most spiritual man in the world today! If you ever need to know what to do, go see him.' They would line up at his office after the services and without question do whatever he said. I recall clearly a girl telling me her former fiancé broke off their engagement due to Hyles' order.... The night I was asked to sing in church I got a ride home in the car with a teacher from the grade school. Another faculty member was in the front seat with him. On the way back to Baptist City, where my room was, he told him how one of the married students had committed suicide that day. He had gone in the bathroom and killed himself. The bus ministry and other 'requirements' had gotten to him.... I toured different churches with a quartet for 6 or 8 weeks in the summer following the school year. My fellow singers were judgmental, unkind, rude and crude. One of the fellows joked with me about how our single female pianist had told him how she had lost her virginity. They used crude language, yelled out the window at any girls they saw wearing pants, and made fun of any church that was not named Baptist. Our leader led us by *example*.... The rest of that summer and into the next year I fought with the issues and standards of Hyles. I was going to be a preacher, but now I just wanted to get away. Many times I have thought about other experiences there and things that I heard, and although I attended several other colleges, *I never felt the hatred, confusion, distrust, selfishness or dependence and worship of one man as I did there at Hyles-Anderson College*.... I can personally vouch for many of the examples you cited. I have still in my heart much dislike and distrust for Jack Hyles and his band of weary men. They won't leave him. He is all they have. Please forgive my dislike for the Baptist movement, as Hyles directed that into my life also." What a pitiful story.

**10.** We said earlier that Dr. Roger Voegtlin had preached a sermon on Sunday night, June 25th, "Why I Am Not 100% For Jack Hyles." It is a blockbusting barn burner, naming names and going further in charges about Mrs. Nischik and Mr. Hyles than I ever did, some of it based on what one of Hyles' secretaries told him when her husband forced her to leave First Baptist and tell Voegtlin why they wanted to join the latter's church, back in 1973. He also plays portions of a number of heretical sermons, some of which we have mentioned, so that listeners can hear Hyles' heresy in his own words. It was such a long sermon it takes one tape on both sides and a second tape on one side. The quality of one part on my set is not perfect, but it can be made out. If you want this message – and I urge everyone to obtain it – send \$4 to the Fairhaven Baptist Church,

86 Oakhill Road, Chesterton, IN 46304, and request the tape by name.

We have not delighted in this sorry task of exposing a brother. Since our May issue, there have been no praises of what we did in *"Letters We Love!"* nor will there be. We are not after the commendation of our peers in this. On the other hand, perhaps readers will forgive one exception because it relates to one of our heroes in the faith, a man of another denomination whom we admired tremendously, Dr. Robert P. "Fighting Bob" Shuler, long pastor of the Trinity Methodist Church in Los Angeles.

His youngest son, whom we have also admired as a faithful preacher of the gospel, Evangelist Phil Shuler, sent us a very nice letter supporting what we did, and saying, among other things, "My prayers are with you in this endeavor. Concerning the Hyles story, a preacher told me last year that the facts had come to light, and the story told, but ended up by saying, 'But woe to the man who ends up telling it!' Well, I can honestly say that my dad would do it without once thinking of the personal cost to him, but then, old 'Fighting Bob' Shuler was a different breed of cattle." We agree; "Fighting Bob" – dear friend of both Bob Jones, Sr., and John R. Rice – would have told it!

### **Conclusions**

**1.** Fundamentalism needs to reexamine its philosophy of loyalty – and that goes for pastoral leadership, too. As one lady in Michigan wrote: "I was heartsick, but not surprised about the [Hyles] situation. For about 20 years I was in secretarial work for Christian organizations. I loved my work, the ministry and the people. But in two different organizations there were things being said and done by the leader that I could not support. I was not allowed to voice my concerns or opinion to ANYONE without the threat of being fired. I was reminded 2-3 times a month that total loyalty was expected at all times. The first sign of ANY disloyalty, for whatever reason, would result in my being 'fired that day, on the spot, without notice and without being able to clean the pencils off my desk.' My devotion to God took priority over loyalty to this leader and I was asked to resign. And that I did. I went from the frying pan into the fire in my next position in the ministry. That one lasted only weeks. I saw and heard more than I could stomach in a very short time and left voluntarily. In both situations the Boards were so 'loyal' that sharing any concerns with would have hurt more than help."

Brethren, are we so insecure we cannot stand the slightest criticism from those who have our own best interests at heart? Do we prefer "playing God," pretending we are omniscient in every area, than to accept the slightest opinion from an "underling"? Is it necessary for everyone working with us to endorse our every thought, decision and action? Surely not. Let's be honest and admit that "total loyalty" is to be reserved for God alone! No creature is to usurp that position in any heart or mind. We don't need or want "rubber stamp" boards in either our churches or in our



Christian organizations,

**2.** A wise Fundamentalist leader in Florida wrote: "I would say that Fundamentalism as we know it will probably never be the same. I think probably it shouldn't be, **for it seems to me that we have made too much of man and too little of God for far too long!**" Amen, brother.

**3.** A wise lady in the Hammond area wrote: "I'd like to make a suggestion in regard to this immediate problem you have exposed. Your paper has a wide circulation so you can reach many caring people. Could you in your paper suggest a day of fasting and prayer for God to deal with this?" That is an excellent suggestion, one we heartily endorse.

**4.** It behooves us all to take inventory of our ministries. One dear Presbyterian minister, who opened a can of worms in his denomination years ago – and paid a dear price for his faithfulness – offered a list of 10 "signs of a weak Christian church or organization." We pass them on to you as helps in your own self-examination:

- a. Leadership and decision-making is reserved for a privileged few.
- b. A patronage system is in place and is known to insiders.
- c. Self-examination type questions within the organization are frowned upon.
- d. Evidence of compromise in doctrine, morals or ethics is overlooked.
- e. Major efforts go toward dealing with problems rather than symptoms.
- f. Strife and reverses continually decimate the ranks.
- g. A leader is in place with a recognizable "I" problem.
- h. Attention is continually drawn to the failings of others.
- i. An inordinate dwelling upon the past or maintaining the status quo.
- j. Messages invariably inform people how well things are going.

[NOTE: As we said in our last issue about Curtis Hutson, we absolutely refuse to turn THE BIBLICAL EVANGELIST into a voice for battle with Jack Hyles, or anyone else for that matter. We stated the Hyles story in our May 1 issue; we have answered in detail, point-by-point, his defense. This is it. We will answer any additional charges privately, not in this paper.]

*Note to the readers of this CD:* In the original article we produced a diagram showing the layout of Miller Hall, where the offices of Dr. Hyles and Mrs. Nischick were located, and pictures of Dr. Hyles with admiring co-eds around as he, in a short-sleeved shirt rolled even higher, and a picture of Dr. Hyles seated in his office with the "offending door" immediately behind him.

**First Baptist Church of Hammond In Indiana  
Five Twenty-Three Sibley Street  
P.O. Box 6448**

August 3, 1989

An Open Letter From Dr. Jack Hyles

Unless there is a drastic turn of events, this will be my last correspondence to you concerning the attacks of Vic Nischik and Robert L. Sumner against me, my church, my Staff, and my college.

I will not answer Dr. Sumner's latest article. In the first place, I cannot afford it. In the second place, I believe it would be an unwise use of time. I cannot conscientiously grant it a high place on my list of priorities. Then, also, my answer would be basically, the same as the first one, because the first one is absolutely true. Lastly, Dr. Sumner's charges and accusations are basically the same, with just a few added distortions and untruths. So, as far as I can see now, this will be the last correspondence you will receive from me concerning this issue.

This will not be lengthy; I just want to make a few observations, as follows:

1. Our church is enjoying the best summer we have ever had. The crowds are the largest we have ever had in the summer. All of us are amazed. It's just been wonderful. The spirit has never been better, nor have we ever had as many conversions and additions to the church during the summer as we have had this year. Our nationwide Youth Conference had over 7,000 delegates (the largest ever) with 2,008 of those delegates surrendering to full-time Christian service. This letter is being dictated on the Thursday afternoon of our Vacation Bible School week. This morning we had 2,396 in attendance (the largest in history).
2. Mr. Sumner's articles have basically been soundingboards for accusations made by Mr. Nischik to Mr. Sumner directly or to Mr. Sumner through someone else.
3. **NOT ONE OF THESE ACCUSATIONS IS TRUE.**
4. It is interesting that Mr. Nischik has not accused me of immorality. In his deposition he made this statement in answer to the attorney's question.

Attorney: "You never accused Jennie and Reverend Hyles of any improper sexual relationship, just a very close, intimate friendship?"

Mr. Nischik: "That's correct."

Likewise, on national television, Mr. Nischik stated that he was not accusing me of immorality.

5. Mr. Nischik asked a young lady to run off with him. When denying this on national television, he made an amazing statement, as follows: "It's a fabrication; there's no truth to it. If I had somebody to run off, I would have run off with that somebody. I would have been glad there would have been a way to escape."

6. It is hard to believe that some people would believe a man who would make such a statement. It sounds like the only reason he did not have an immoral escapade is that he had no one to go with him.

7. I am doctrinally sound and in no way endorse any doctrine that could be considered heresy. I am a Baptist by conviction and believe the historic Baptist convictions and doctrines.

8. I have been criticized by some for allowing Mr. Nischik to remain as a deacon for so many years. In the first place, I do not choose the deacons; they are elected by the people. In the second place, almost all the accusations against him surfaced after Mr. Sumner's article. To this date, people are coming to me with unbelievable accusations against Mr. Nischik. In the third place, through all of those years I had no evidence or proof that Mr. Nischik had committed adultery. In the fourth place, I loved him wanted to salvage him.

9. I have had one woman in my life – the mother of my children.

10. I have never covered up sin on my staff, neither do I spend my life in a search or an investigation to find it, nor do I believe it is true just because someone said it.

11. I did not recommend my son David to the Miller Road Baptist Church of Garland, Texas. They contacted him apart from my knowledge and never sought my recommendation.

12. I had no evidence whatsoever of Dave's problems before he left First Baptist Church.

13. My goal for Dave and his goal for himself is that he can be rehabilitated and be a good soul-winning layman at the First Baptist Church. He attends the services here regularly, and he and I are good buddies, but neither he nor I feel that he will ever be on the staff here again. I do believe, however, that God can use him as a layman, and I believe God will. Please pray for him. He is our boy, and Mrs. Hyles and I love him.

14. Mrs. Hyles has been a real soldier through all of this. She has stood firmly and loyally, and I

am proud of her.

15. Recently I was with Dr. Myron Guiler in Marietta, Ohio. He told me that 25 years ago he had Dr. Sumner for a revival meeting. He said it was absolutely the worst week of his life, and that even then Dr. Sumner spent much of his time criticizing me.

16. Apart from Mr. Nischik and Mr. Sumner, the most vicious attack against me has been launched by Mr. George Godfrey, and apart from Mr. Nischik and Mr. Sumner, Mr. Godfrey is perhaps the most dedicated person to my destruction.

Well, there you have it. I doubt if this letter will change many minds, if any. Everyone is probably pretty well decided. It all boils down to the word of Victor Nischik versus the word of Jack Hyles. I imagine most people will believe whom they want to believe, and I seriously doubt if this letter will have much affect on the opinions of people. My friends do not need it because they trust me. My enemies won't believe it, but somehow I had to write it. I hope this will be the last I will have to write. I think it is.

I am tired; I am wounded; I am hurt, but I will not quit.

Sincerely,

Jack Hyles

JH:jr

Jack Hyles, Pastor

Zip Code 46325

(219) 932-0711

## The Final Jack Hyles Response

Because of our promise not to print any more exchanges between Dr. Hyles and myself in *The Biblical Evangelist* – but to respond privately to any who wanted answers – I did not print a reply to the last Hyles letter, which really didn't say much anyway. I did prepare a brief response and sent it to those who asked for it, but apparently we gave them all out, exhausting our supply. At any rate, I cannot find one. (If any one reading this CD has a copy, send it to me and I will include it in all those we send out after receiving it.)

I will give a brief reply now to each of his 16 points, following his numbering:

1. This is typical Hyles spin. See what we have said about his "reports" and use your own judgment about these figures.
2. Note the scores of people I quoted and see if this is merely a sounding board for Victor Nischik. This is a cop-out.
3. They are **ALL** true! The kind of accusations I was willing to go to court on, if necessary.
4. He didn't need to. The evidence was there for the world to see and make its own conclusions. That was not the place, on public television, to make the charges.
5. If that doesn't explain the frustration Mr. Nischik felt, what would?
6. This is simply "spin." Mr. Nischik would not have run off with anyone, no matter how Mr. Hyles said it "sounds."
7. Doctrinally sound? Go back and count the ways of his theological aberrations.
8. Again, go back and read the story.
9. More spin.
10. Still again, go back and read the story of his massive cover-up of sin in his camp.
11. Totally untrue. Go back and read the evidence.
12. Same as #11, "Totally untrue. Go back and read the evidence."
13. A noble goal, perhaps, but a total failure. His actions were worse after Hyles wrote those

lines than they had ever been before.

14. As true a statement as he has made in any of this. We have never leveled charges against Mrs. Hyles, the poor victim in all of this. Our only fault for her was joining in the "cover-up."

15. See below.

16. George Godfrey's only "sin" in the eyes of Hyles is that he finally came to the place where he couldn't stomach what was going on any more and stood up to tell the truth. And he paid a heavy price from those in the Hyles cult, I might add.

The only real charge of any substance was #15, so I moved it to the end. It was what he claimed Dr. Myron Guiler, an Ohio pastor, said about me. I will reproduce below what I explained in a letter to Dr. George Godfrey about that incident. It is, I think, typical of most of Hyles' attempts to answer my charges by smearing my reputation.

October 5, 1989

Evangelist George Godfrey  
629 North Oakwood  
Griffith, IN 146319

Dear George:

Since you asked for any additional word I could give you, and since Jack Hyles has just started circulating a 2-page response to my lengthy August article (his letter is dated August 3, but as far as I have been able to determine, no one received a copy before some time in mid-September), I thought I'd drop you a note.

In the first place, his letter is inane, basically saying nothing new and answering nothing new. What he does attempt to answer consists of a repeat of things we have previously shown to be untrue. Probably the most damaging item is his statement:

“Recently I was with Dr. Myron Guiler in Marietta, Ohio. He told me that 25 years ago he had Dr. Sumner for a revival meeting. He said it was absolutely the worst week of his life, and that even then Dr. Sumner spent much of his time criticizing me.”

That is typical Hylesism. The facts are: (1) Twenty-five years ago, I was one of Jack Hyles' strongest supporters, answering every criticism made against him. (2) Twenty-five years ago, Myron Guiler, according to his own testimony, knew almost nothing about Jack Hyles, having

heard little about him. (3) The implication that Myron Guiler told Hyles this story when the latter was with the former in a meeting is untrue. (4) Myron Guiler is not sympathetic to the Hyles type of ministry and would never invite him to his church. The men in his area, in the past, have wanted Hyles and since Guiler's auditorium is the only one in the area able to handle that type of conference, it is held in his church. They barely speak when Hyles is there, although Guiler is friendly to Hyles. (5) The story Hyles quoted was not received in conversation with Guiler. Two of Hyles' men – students, Guiler thought – called and pleaded with him to bring his young people to the Youth Conference in Hammond last summer, saying “Sumner was trying to destroy Hyles' ministry” and they needed a big crowd to make it appear everyone supported Hyles. Guiler refused. However, the young men kept him on the phone so long, pleading with him, that Guiler eventually discussed our meeting, although what he said was completely taken out of context. Here is what he told them: I had been with him for a two-day conference and he had asked me to return for a longer meeting. Since I was booked up and could not give him a date, he requested that I keep his church in mind should a cancellation come up. Later I contacted him and told him I had just had a cancellation in February, saying he could have it if he wanted it. He accepted, but said he feared the attendance would be bad if the weather wasn't good, noting that his people didn't support special meetings well anyway. The weather was terrible, the attendance was horrible, and Guiler was just recovering from pneumonia. That, and that alone, was what he meant by it being the worst week of his life! Hyles totally misrepresented Guiler's comments. (6) Guiler did not say even back then, nearly 25 years ago, I spent much of my time criticizing Hyles. His comment referred to a question he asked, namely, did I think I would be the next editor of the Sword (this was in 1965). When I said no, he asked who I thought would. I said, “Jack Hyles.” Apparently I also laughed and added by way of explanation that Hyles was a real “apple polisher” (something apparent even back then; for a more modern picture, reread the story of his gift giving). At any rate, from that innocent remark on my part, Guiler assumed I didn't care for Hyles. (He was wrong; I supported Hyles back in those days, defended him, and praised him – both publicly and in my books. He was John R. Rice's “fair-haired boy” and I respected Dr. Rice's judgment – more so, apparently, than my own Mother's, who heard him one time, back when he was pastoring at Miller Road in Garland, and said she would never listen to him again in her life! She didn't, either, even though she didn't go to be with the Lord until last year.)

When the “August 3” letter of Hyles was received at our office, I was on vacation. My son contacted Guiler and the above is what he said to Dick on the telephone. Dr. Guiler is willing to verify that account if anyone contacts him about it. He was very upset that Hyles quoted him that way and said he would be writing Hyles to ask some very pertinent questions and, if Hyles failed to answer – or did not answer to his satisfaction – he would break off all fellowship with him.

Even so, there are other evidences that Hyles has misrepresented Guiler's position about me and my ministry. For one thing, in the past Dr. Guiler has sent sermons to me for printing in THE BIBLICAL EVANGELIST, something he would hardly do if he had no confidence in our



ministry or did not want to be identified with it. We have printed two of those sermons over the years. Second, he has promoted THE BIBLICAL EVANGELIST in his church. Under date of September 11, 1975, he wrote me, "I certainly thank the Lord for the paper. I feel that it is meeting a need and saying some things that no other Christian Periodical is saying. Some things that desperately need to be said." A little over two weeks later, on September 29, 1975, he wrote back to say, "I am planning on having a 'Biblical Evangelist' Day in October at which time I hope to get all of our families to subscribe for it." Does that sound, to any intelligent person, that it would even be remotely honest to evaluate the "worst week" of his life with an attack on either me or my ministry?

Please remember that Jack Hyles is a desperate man, fighting to stay alive in Funda-mentalism, and willing to do anything or say anything that will help him do so.

Keep up the good work, my brother!

*Additional word:* I mentioned, in the letter above, Hyles as being admired in the '70s by Dr. John R. Rice. It is apparent to me that Dr. Rice had begun to question his own judgment in the year or so before his death. Businessman Jack Cornelius, who traveled with him everywhere during those final years in order to be of help to him in his advancing feebleness of age, told me Dr. Rice said to him, regarding Hyles, "I've created a monster and I don't know what to do about it." It would have been a real dilemma for a man in his 80s who had invested so much in another.

## Conclusion

While we doubt that people are moving to Hammond anymore to worship at First Baptist Church, there may be many doing so to attend the college. If you know young people thinking of attending Hyles-Anderson you might want to share this CD with them. There are so many *good* evangelical, fundamental schools out there offering a sound, scholarly education it is a shame that young men and young women end up at H-AC.

The kind of cult mentality observed around Hyles described in this CD is seen in the fact that his first church building has already been moved from Texas and rebuilt on the Hyles-Anderson College grounds. It is currently used as a spare classroom. In less than 9 months after Hyles' death, plans were announced to move the house where he was born to the campus. An associate at the church, Ray Young, who was given credit for the idea by the local media, said he wasn't sure yet what it would be used for, but promised it wouldn't be as a spare classroom. If we may offer a prediction as to its use, it will be as a "worship center," if you know what we mean. The *Hammond Times*, in announcing the story, described it as "a permanent monument to Hyles."

In our electronic age there are many web sites, we understand, dedicated to exposing Dr. Hyles. May their tribe be multiplied. Unfortunately, those we have seen have little more to offer than what the sponsors gleaned from our past articles – and few of them give any credit to their sources. Alas, some didn't even get the facts straight. We are not complaining about their use of our material – we merely wish they would be *accurate* in what they publish. As for me, I am just glad the message is getting out. Hopefully, many lives and ministries will be saved as a result.

Unfortunately, the same sordid story is still going on. Out of many, many examples we could give, here is just one fruit of the Hyles mentality and practice, something we published in our May-June 2000 issue of *The Biblical Evangelist*. It will probably remind you of the David and Brenda Hyles situation with little Brent Stevens. This was the editorial:

### **ANOTHER TRAGIC HYLES FALL-OUT!**

We consign this terrible tragedy to the Hyles syndrome because, for one thing, the man in question was formerly head of the Hyles-Anderson College Bible Department and billed by Dr. Jack Hyles as the greatest Bible teacher in Christendom, or words to that effect. For another thing, he is a Hyles clone, the man who testified publicly that he sometimes, in petitioning deity, catches himself praying, "Dear Brother Hyles" – a matter which may not miss the mark all that much for many of the Hammond elite. His name is Joe Combs and until recently he was pastor of the Emmanuel Baptist Church in Bristol, Tennessee (now defunct).

This sad story began in 1977 when Joe and Evangeline Lopez Combs, unable to conceive

children, decided to adopt a son. Evidently they were pleased and the following year the couple went to what is now the Baptist Children's Home and Family Ministries, Inc., in nearby Valparaiso, Indiana – a highly respected organization on the approved list of social agencies at the time for the General Association of Regular Baptist Churches – and selected a beautiful 4-month old girl. They signed an adoption agreement and took custody of her, naming her Esther Alice Evangeline Combs. (Strangely, the womb was then opened and the couple produced four biological children.) So far, so good.

Alas, this beautiful story ends right there. The Combses made that precious soul their personal slave and subjected her to a life of horror and abuse – physical, mental, emotional and social – one that ended only when she went to authorities in Georgia and told her tale, bringing to termination nearly two decades of horror. (She had been sent to that State to live with Joe's brother and his family because Tennessee police had filed a petition for guardianship on Esther – and for the first time in her life she discovered living.)

*A life of horror for Esther?* Let me count some of the ways.

■ Her earliest memory was of being thrown down the stairs while strapped in her high chair.

■ At age 3 or 4, after accidentally dropping a spoon in a pot of hot oatmeal, her hands were burned when Mrs. Combs made her dig it out.

■ Accused by siblings of jumping on a bed, Mrs. Combs hurled her against the wall and knocked out two front teeth, which were hurriedly placed back in their sockets and grew oddly spaced and crooked.

■ On one occasion, in a fit of temper, Mrs. Combs threw a shoe at her, hitting her in the head and opening a bloody cut. Evangeline promptly sewed it up with needle and thread, then referred to the scars as “her marks of the beast.”

■ She was beaten with a hose for falling asleep in church.

■ Esther was treated as a slave for the rest of the family her entire life, told by the Combses that this was God's purpose for her life. When she didn't finish her duties on time, she was beaten.

■ Over the years she was burned with a curling iron, beaten with a baseball bat, and tortured in other ways. Altogether, **there were 410 scars on the poor girl's body**, all documented and charted by the prosecution for the jury!

■ While the other children were home schooled, she rarely got to attend. When a baby sitter

taught her to write her name, Esther was beaten and the greatest Bible teacher in Christendom told her that Jesus didn't learn to read and write until He was 12 years old, and she shouldn't either. By the way, this girl and another sitter testified that they suspected abuse, but were afraid of this highly revered Bible professor. The other girl did report her misgivings to the school president, but no action was taken. (The policy is, you may recall, *If I didn't see it, it didn't happen; even if I did see it, I was probably mistaken; and even if I did see it and wasn't mistaken, someone else had to have seen it in order to confirm that I saw it!*)

■ As a teen-ager, Combs bound a rope around her neck, then draped her over his back, cutting off her air supply until she passed out.

■ It was also as a teen-ager that the greatest Bible teacher in Christendom raped her repeatedly, usually on church property (where they were living).

■ Esther said Mrs. Combs repeatedly pulled chunks of her flesh out with a pair of pliers.

■ On at least two occasions Esther ran away from home, not getting far either time and each time brought back by police – when she was severely beaten for her actions.

■ Finally, as a legal teen-age adult, desperate and unhappy, she decided to end her life by drinking antifreeze. She was found unconscious and rushed by ambulance to an area hospital and the seeds for ending the abuse were planted. Physicians found layers of scar tissue from wounds and fractures than had not healed properly. She had no birth certificate, no school records, no medical records, and no Social Security. Because the frightened girl denied being abused, she was returned to the horror house, but a few months later the police filed their petition for guardianship.

Prosecutor Barry Staubus summed it up well: “Esther lived as a broken person, devastated by physical, verbal, psychological and sexual abuse without any other family... and deprived of self-worth.”

*Is the above true?* I would certainly be interested in someone *explaining those 410 scars on Esther's body in any other way!* The jury concluded both were guilty on 15 of 16 charges (Judge Jerry Beck had dismissed four charges earlier, agreeing with the defense that the prosecution had not filed them in time – not that the pair was innocent of them) and the verdicts certainly pointed to their guilt. (By the way, the fact that the jury only deliberated four hours indicates the panel thought the evidence was overwhelming.) The only acquittal came on the charge against Mrs. Combs of aggravated assault, which her husband had committed but during which she had stood passively by and hence permitted and condoned.

Joseph Combs was found guilty on 11 counts, namely, charges of especially aggravated kidnapping, aggravated assault, aggravated perjury, aggravated rape, and 7 other counts of rape. The jury imposed fines totally \$240,000. Evangeline Combs was found guilty on 6 counts, namely, charges of especially aggravated kidnapping, aggravated assault, and 4 counts of aggravated child abuse. The jury levied \$150,000 in fines against her. The actual sentencing was scheduled for April 25<sup>th</sup> (past our deadline for reporting) and, if sentences ran consecutively instead of concurrently, "the greatest Bible teacher in Christendom" could get 144 years in the slammer and Mrs. Combs 73 years. It is our conviction that neither should ever see the outside of a prison wall again, but we are enough of a realist to know that American jurisprudence in our day and age doesn't work that way.

The big surprise to us was that the "great American emancipator of preachers from sin's penalties," Jack Hyles, didn't fly to Tennessee and testify for the Combses, trying to get them off the hook – as he has done for so many others over the years. Perhaps he realized there was too much evidence for even him to offset in this case.

Strangely, the Baptist Children's Home apparently didn't follow up properly on the adoption and may be in a spot of trouble itself. While the legal adoption was the duty of Combs and his wife, the Home was seemingly negligent in making sure it took place, *i.e.*, that it was finalized. While the Home sent letters to the couple in 1980, 1984 and 1994 inquiring about the adoption status and requesting a copy of the court record, those letters were not answered and the 1994 missive was returned as undeliverable. Combs' excuse for failure was that the Home wanted ten percent of his income over an undetermined period of time and he refused to give it. *False!* The Home never asked for a single penny.

Are you ready for a final shocker about this case? Do you remember our major book review of that horrible tome by Roy Branson, Jr., *Dear Abner, I Love You, Joab*, that we so profusely panned [*The Biblical Evangelist*, November 1, 1992] because it appeared to give *carte blanche* to antinomianism? The glowing Introduction was written by Branson's pastor at the now defunct Emmanuel Baptist Church in Bristol, "the greatest Bible teacher in Christendom," Doctor Joseph Combs himself. No fooling!

We have other editorials we could run, but have determined this sample is enough.

*I am afraid the full record of the damage done to Christendom and to individual Christians by Hyles and those in his orbit can never even be imagined – to say nothing of being told – this side of the Judgment Seat of Christ!*

**[A word regarding *The Biblical Evangelist*.** We mail it free to anyone requesting it. At the end of one year we send a "renewal" notice, giving the subscriber an opportunity to cancel, contribute

"We haven't gotten that far yet," Young said, adding that it will not be used as a part-time classroom as is the relocated chu

an offering, or do nothing. If the latter, we continue the subscription. It is strictly a faith ministry. To subscribe, send your name and complete physical address to The Biblical Evangelist, 5717 Pine Drive, Raleigh, NC 27606, or request a subscription via e-mail: [kjsher@msn.com](mailto:kjsher@msn.com)]

## Postscript: The Jack Hyles Story, Two Years Later

The following editorial appeared in my "Off the Cuff!" column in our May 1, 1991 issue:

Most secular publications – and many religious ones – follow up their major stories a year later to report on what has happened since the release of the original account. We were urged to do so with the Hyles exposé last year, but did not feel led. Now, two years after the fact, we seriously considered doing it, but abandoned the project after it was half written, deciding instead to print a couple of articles by others which deal with the over-all issue [*Editor*: Those articles were "A Critique of 'Let Baptists Be Baptists'," by Pastor John K. Hutcheson, pastor of the Tabernacle Baptist Church in Clayton, Georgia, dealing with a sermon Hyles was preaching in conferences around the country; and "Reclaiming the Name of God-Honoring Fundamentalism," by Dr. E. Wayne Wall, pastor of the Metropolitan Baptist Tabernacle in West Columbia, South Carolina. The latter is now an Assistant to the Editor for *The Biblical Evangelist*, but he had no connection with our magazine at that time.] Hyles, of course, continues to portray himself as "Mr. Clean" and "Mr. Fundamentalist." Both are misnomers, undeserving tributes to his immense ego.

He reminds us of Saddam Hussein. Do you remember what happened when the Gulf War ended and the Iraqi dictator – whose gargantuan ego had caused him to make such fantastic and ridiculous predictions of what he and Allah would do to the infidel United States and the other nations in the coalition – announced to his nation that the war had been terminated? Saddam got on radio and television and broadcast to his people that *Iraq had won a great victory, totally humiliating the pagan opposition!* What a shock it must have been to them when they later discovered the truth. Some, no doubt, still think they won!

That is a perfect illustration of Hyles. Over and over he has pronounced his victory to his people, telling them everything reported was "lies" told by "the enemies of Christ." Hundreds have broken-heartedly learned the truth and have severed the bonds of mind control he held over them, leaving the church, school and other facets of his ministry. Others, like many Iraqis, think Hyles has cleared himself and support him as loyally as before. They are the "100% Hyles" cult group, plus the preachers who have him in their pulpits and who appear with him on platforms across the country.

If someone asks, "If you had to limit your answer to one thing, what would you say was the most telling evidence of Hyles' guilt? Was it your first article in May, your second article in August, the Glover book, the Nischik book, or what?"

*None of the above!*

Our response would be: *the Hyles answers in his own defense!* They have been more telling than

anything anyone else has written. Over the past 24 months he has stonewalled, sidestepped and uttered blanket denials of every charge, continuing right on in his ministry as if nothing had happened. He has spent the majority of his time in his own pulpit preaching on gossip, rumors and other such matters (trying to quell the spread of information about his own case), and preaching about the sins of Bible characters that he mingles with accusations against other Fundamentalists in a manner that appears a justification of "anything goes" in the ministry, bordering on antinomianism.

An example is his message, "Jesus – The Friend of Sinners," appearing in Dennis Corle's paper, *Revival Fires!* It was a recital of Bible failures whom God forgave and used. (A note of humor: early in the sermon Hyles spoke of "the 26 books in the New Testament"; we passed it off as a typographical error the editor didn't catch, but before the message was over, Hyles was again referring to "the 26 books of the New Testament." There are 27, Jack; count 'em!) The good minister who sent us a copy, whom we will not name even though we have his permission, wrote the editor and said, in part:

"Having known Brother Hyles for over 31 years and having served him as a deacon, trustee, teacher, and associate pastor in the Hammond church, I know of NO 'Pharisees' attacking the Sunday school teachers and soul winners in the Hammond church.

"As a biblical Fundamentalist I do know of godly men who have scriptural grounds for asking for church discipline of a pastor.

"Brother Hyles' sermon was a 'smoke screen' to divert attention from himself as it was preached in his church and printed by you. 'The best defense is a strong offense! ATTACK! ATTACK! ATTACK!' (emphasis in original).

The same could be said of the sermon on Baptists that Hyles is now preaching in his conferences. Pastor John Hutchenson has critiqued it elsewhere in this issue. We received a tape copy last year and listened to it, making notes with a view of writing a piece on it, but didn't feel led, put it aside, and forgot it. Since we are running Hutchenson's evaluation, however, permit just a few of our observations:

1. It was very amateurish and loaded with errors. A freshman seminarian, in preaching class, could have done better . . . or flunked the course. As with most of Hyles' sermonizing today, it was pure and simple "Hylesology," rather than the Word of God.

2. He said only 51% of Southern Baptists believe in the verbal inspiration of Scripture. That is a figure he apparently pulled out of thin air to make his message impressive, a statement totally without objectivity. We have been around Southern Baptists for many, many years – covering their annual meetings for more than a decade, listening, reading and interviewing – and we are



quick to say that the *overwhelming majority* of Southern Baptist believe in verbal inspiration. Perhaps Hyles based his statement on the fact that the inerrantists have won over the moderates by such narrow margins in some of the elections. If so, he is way off base, jumping to erroneous conclusions from firm data.

Obviously, no moderate is going to vote for an inerrantist, but many inerrantists vote the moderate ticket for an assortment of reasons: they have swallowed the moderate slogan, "unity in diversity," or they admire a particular candidate, or they feel the inerrantist program is too divisive, or they have imbibed the argument that the inerrantist cause will hurt the Cooperative Program, or whatever. As a matter of fact, several of the candidates on the moderate ticket have been *strong* inerrantists who have honest convictions that unity and the Cooperative Program are more important than what they see as mere terminology. We don't think so for a minute, of course, but to charge them with not believing in verbal inspiration is absurd.

**3.** He said "all Southern Baptists believed the Bible" when he "pulled out." There are two things wrong with that. First, there was more liberalism in the SBC back when he was a member than there is now, something an informed observer will tell you. Second, he *never* "pulled out," he was *booted* out.

Along the same line, he said you "couldn't find" a SBC preacher who "didn't believe the Bible" in the days when Norris, Roberson and he "came out" (all three were kicked out of their local Associations; we do not say that disparagingly, but it does indicate the climate at the time).

His memory is certainly less than phenomenal! To refresh it, let him read some of Norris' stuff about infidelity in the Convention in his day, or some of Noel Smith's material, or some of John R. Rice's writings. The latter's *Southern Baptists, Wake Up!* (subtitled, "Modernism, Neo-Orthodoxy, Unbelief, Compromise and Worldliness in Southern Baptist Seminaries, Colleges and Literature") sums up the situation very adequately regarding that day and time. In fact, it reports Hyles being kicked out. Read it!

**4.** Hyles said C. I. Scofield was "a Plymouth Brethren." Wrong again! Scofield was *never* any kind of a Brethren. Immediately after his conversion he was under the tutelage of Dr. James H. Brookes and the Walnut Street Presbyterian Church in St. Louis. Eventually he joined the Pilgrim Congregational Church in the same city, pastored by Dr. C. C. Goodell. The Congregationalists licensed him to preach and he was subsequently ordained a Congregational minister, later becoming pastor of the Congregational church in Massachusetts where D. L. Moody was a member. As his pastor, in fact, he preached at Moody's funeral.

**5.** He said Scofield taught that the "false church" was the "local church." Nonsense! Scofield never taught any such foolishness and Hyles can't show where he did, either in the notes of his

Scofield Reference Bible or any of his published sermons, some of which we have printed in THE BIBLICAL EVANGELIST. Incidentally, Hyles formerly gave visiting preachers gift copies of the Scofield Reference Bible with their names stamped in gold on the cover. He gave me one, in fact. Doesn't that seem strange, if Scofield were such a heretic?

6. Hyles voiced all the radical statements made by the ultra-Baptists (often, but not always, uneducated, but sincere, good men), such as: the only true church is a local Baptist church (so much for some of the greatest local congregations in church history); all believers are not part of the Bride of Christ; there is no such thing as an invisible (universal) church; all believers do not form the Body of Christ. All of this is directly opposite to what Hyles' mentor, the late John R. Rice, taught about the church. (See Rice's sermon, "'Churches' and 'The Church'," in the big book for which Bob Jones University gave him an honorary D.Litt., *Twelve Tremendous Themes*.) Was Dr. Rice a heretic, too, in Hyles' estimation?

7. He mentioned this writer by name in the sermons, saying I was part of the #1 group (who came out of the American Baptist Convention) [*Editor: Actually, I was never a part in any way whatsoever with that group, but that is a small detail to Hyles, since I later lined up with some who had come out of the ABC over issues of liberalism*], and quoting a telephone conversation with a friend of his when I allegedly said I was out to destroy Hyles' Pastors School. I will let that stand as basically correct, but what I was – *and am* – concerned about is the flood of young preachers going to Hammond and coming back as Hyles clones. It is going to wreck the Fundamentalist movement. (And ditto with these new so-called "Fundamentalist Conferences" currently being held around the country!)

Let me give you a case in point. One of the harshest, most vitriolic letters we received immediately after our first exposé of Hyles came from a man in the South whom we respected highly. In fact, for a couple of weeks it was almost the *only* such letter. He didn't think we ought to say anything about Hyles, telling us it was none of our business.

Alas, as we were writing this item, a call came from a distraught Christian school administrator (female) in a Northern State. She told my son, who handled the call, about her youth pastor in the Carolinas – married and with a baby daughter at the time (he now has 3 children) – who molested her and 7 other young teen girls in that youth department, most of them 14 and 15 years old – including the pastor's two daughters. Finally, after graduating from high school and determining she *had* to get out of that environment, she went off to Bible college. The pastor was told and did nothing, saying he didn't want the story to get out and "harm the ministry" (shades of Hyles!), obviously not wanting it revealed about his own daughters. Finally the guilty party (child molester and immoral reprobate) went off to college for training (he was "untrained" staff at the time) and is now a teacher at the Junior High level.

*Guess where?* In the school of the Fundamentalist who sent me such a hot letter for exposing Hyles! When this dear lady, thinking she was doing the minister a favor, called to warn him about the man who was working with his youth, he refused to listen to her, saying it "was all in the past." Whether it is or not remains to be seen, and this pastor may eventually learn to his shame that some of his own young, innocent girls have been seduced.

Pray for this lady, 10 years after the fact, still laboring under the load that this scoundrel dumped on her. Her present pastor has seen to it that she is receiving counseling and he is doing all he can to help her work through her problems. Put her down as another victim of the Hyles "cover-up sin" syndrome, all in the name of "the good of the ministry."

One of Hyles' major problems continues to be his recklessness with truth. All of us were born liars (Psalm 58:3), but Hyles never won the victory. One of his former associates, now head of a large work of his own, said Hyles was the biggest liar he had ever been associated with, arguing that he would rather tell a lie than the truth. In our judgment, Hyles is the Pinocchio of Fundamentalism.

A prime example of his falsehoods are in his "success syndrome" area. He reports in glowing terms how everything is bigger and better than "last year at this time." In truth and in fact, all facets of Hyles' ministries are in decline – and have been for the past two years. By way of example, the school year following our articles (1989-1990), in *The Bridge*, the alumni paper at H-AC, the front page of the Fall 1989 issue was headlined, **Another Record Enrollment**.

After using the first three paragraphs to tell how great all the other ministries were, the fourth started: "This year at Hyles-Anderson College we have a record enrollment of 2,709, a significant increase over our previous record." Not bad, eh?

Now let's look at the facts. Before me is a copy of the school's own computer print-out, dated September 28, 1989, giving the "STUDENT BODY LIST, FALL OF 1989." It has the last, first and middle names of the entire H-AC student body, a total of 36 pages. There are 50 names to a page except for only 35 on the last, starting with Ruth Elisabeth Abel and ending with Gloria Jean Zienert. As any child who has advanced to second grade math could tell, that is a whopping grand total of 1,785.

*Why claim 2,709?* Because it sounds so much better, of course!

Isn't that dishonest? Not to Hyles, who uses a slick system to make the attendance sound better than it is. Before the school year, at the church, an appeal is made for members to take "practical training classes," either for credit or merely audit. In the hand-out sheet before me, courses offered (a total of 10) include Tolé Painting; Investments, Insurance, and Taxes (the chancellor

should take this one and learn what may happen if you don't report your income); Advanced Sewing and Tailoring; Cake Baking and Decorating; Calligraphy; Home Crafts; and Basic Sewing.

Is padding a 1,785 college enrollment list by well over 900 (a 50%-plus increase!) in this fashion honest? We don't think so. If Hyles claims it is, why doesn't he break it down into full-time, part-time, and church members taking a class for 10 weeks? Reputable schools break their enrollments down to exact figures. Why doesn't Hyles-Anderson? Apparently because it would ruin the "image" Hyles is trying to establish that will conform to his "success syndrome" philosophy.

Another area of his falsehood relates to those he thinks are his enemies. Anything he feels is derogatory, apparently, is good material. We offer our own case as an example. On one occasion he told his members I am going blind (surely this would be evidence of God's judgment upon me). Not a word of truth in it. I have the normal cataracts of a man almost 70 and when they "get ripe" I'll have them taken off, a lens implant made, and be better than new again, just as my wife did.

On another occasion he told his church I had joined a Southern Baptist church and was no longer an independent or a Fundamentalist. *Hogwash!* I am a member of the Central Baptist Church of Ingleside, an independent Fundamentalist church pastored by my own son.

He treats his other "enemies" the same way. Just today, as this is being written, a brother wrote: "I heard Dr. Hyles speak a few months ago and was taken back when he, Dr. Hyles, referred to Dr. Falwell as the golden image of Nebuchadnezzar. I was under Dr. Falwell's ministry for two years and I know for a fact he is not deserving of such a statement. There is no doubt Dr. Falwell is a man of God and I believe that thousands of lives have been changed for the better because of Dr. Falwell, mine for one."

We will not take time to look again at his son, David. Even Hyles' most ardent supporters stand at the head of the line to acknowledge his perversion and decry what a moral derelict he is. The latest flap regarding him relates to pictures of his wife Brenda in male "adult" magazine advertisements showing parts of her anatomy that should be private. Here's a sample of these ads: "Clean, discreet, hot lady, looking for young men, women, couples, who are attractive for fun and a variety of sexual pleasure. Must be sincere and include SASE and good photos for reply. I am bi and very horny. Write today or call."

Photocopies of these, along with a letter asking if First Baptist believes and practices church discipline – and, if so, what would be done about Dave and his wife – were sent to all the deacons. This brought a teary response on Sunday night, March 10, 1991, from Pastor Hyles, admitting that the stories about his son were true, saying Dave and Brenda were asking to have their names dropped from the membership of the church and would be moving to Ohio. Thus

ended nearly a decade of stonewalling, cover-up and denying that he had any knowledge of Dave's sins.

At the same time, he said the Glover/Nischik crowd was trying to destroy this year's Pastors' School, telling the congregation they were planning to pass out handbills with the revealing pictures to arriving guests. The idea had never occurred to them – until Jack suggested it, that is. Apparently, seeing the handwriting on the wall, Hyles was trying to lay the groundwork for an alibi if the 1991 school flopped. He had already combined 7 events, which in the old days would have been distinct and at different times – pastors' school, laymen's, youth, ladies' mini-spectacular, ladies' soul-winning convention, Christian school teachers' convention, and what he called the original pastors' school – to try and attract a decent crowd. Glover and Nischik made a convenient "fall guy" team.

Incidentally, if you don't have their books, . . . you ought to obtain copies and circulate them widely.

*Along with the above editorial we reproduced a chart prepared by Attorney Voyle Glover, with the heading:*

"If I Were a Deacon of First Baptist Church of Hammond, I'd Be **WORRIED!**"

*Why?* Because millions of dollars flow through church accounts without any stewardship reporting to anyone. The deacons, of course, would be the ones responsible to the IRS for the church's 501(c) exemptions and all the accountings thereof.

In Glover's chart, underneath the "Worried" heading above, he had two main sections, the first was "Sources of Income for First Baptist Church of Hammond, Indiana." The second was "Funds and Disbursements of First Baptist Church & Hyles-Anderson College."

Under "sources of income" he had boxes for the following: Tithes & Offerings; Special Offerings; Bookstore; "Fat Cat" Gifts; Hyles Publications; City Baptist Tuition; Hammond Baptist Tuitions; Stewardship Department; Hyles-Anderson College; Youth Conferences; Pastors' School; Trust Properties; Sale of Assets; Cemetery; Insurance Claims Settlements; and Other Conferences.

Underneath that was "Funds and Disbursements of First Baptist Church & Hyles-Anderson College" and the first, which went all the way across the chart was a box headed SURPLUS FUND and the explanation: "Supposedly, all income from the above sources flow into this account. Does it? Who knows? The Deacons don't know. No one really knows how much comes in or whether what does come in is all put into the Surplus account."

Underneath that box were two columns of smaller boxes. We will number them (the chart did not, so the numbering is ours, for your convenience only) and tell what was in each box.

- 1. OPERATING ACCOUNT.** Funded by Surplus Account, all checks written on this account are shown on monthly Treasurer's Report, which also shows checks written on Surplus Account. This is the only report given to Church Membership.
- 2. BUS FUND.** No accounting to membership or deacons for the income or disbursements on this account. No Treasurer's Report. Hyles, in past years has raised enormous sums for buses. In 1989-1990 he raised \$249,000 in a special offering. When asked by a few deacons for an audit to show where the money was spent, he threatened to resign if an audit was demanded. The subject was dropped. See Nischik's book, *THE WIZARD OF GOD*, pages 143-145.
- 3. HYLES PUBLICATIONS.** Hyles admits he does with income of this church account "as I see fit." Neither deacons nor membership know of income or disbursements of this account. No Treasurer's Report is given. Hyles admits this is church money in sworn deposition; evidence exists that he used church money to purchase expensive gifts for friends and for Jennie, his secretary.
- 4. SALE OF ASSETS.** Income for this account is from the sale of books and tapes by Hyles. All wages for staff of Hyles Publications are paid for by the church. See Glover's book, *FUNDAMENTAL SEDUCTION*, pages 211-215, 304-328.
- 5. HYLES-ANDERSON COLLEGE.** Issues a Treasurer's Report, is a corporation. Unsure of accounts within this organization. School often pays church bills, Hammond Baptist School payroll; enormous "Transfer of Funds" made from this entity to . . .? Don't know where money is transferred . . . to church? other accounts? It is not clear.
- 6. PHOSTER CLUB ACCOUNT.** No accounting of monies or use thereof is made to the deacons or the membership or anyone. Sources of income include college, church speaking engagements, seminars, donations. No Treasurer's Report.
- 7. SUPPLEMENTAL ACCOUNT.** Source of income is church (not sure what accounts); Does not appear to have any accounting made to deacons or membership for the income or disbursements of this account. **THIS IS THE ACCOUNT WHICH HYLES USED TO PAY SON'S CHILD SUPPORT PAYMENTS TO SON'S EX-WIFE, PAULA.** See Glover's book, *FUNDAMENTAL SEDUCTION*, pages 383-385.
- 8. CHRISTIAN WOMANHOOD.** Source of income is college, church, donations, newspaper

put out by entity, seminars. No accounting of this income or the expenditures of this entity. No deacon knows. The College Report in some years show it getting over \$5,000, and even over \$7,000 in one month alone. Where does all the money go? There is no accounting for these funds to the church or the membership and perhaps not even on the college level. Salaries for staff are paid by the college, not the entity. **NO TREASURER'S REPORT.**

**9. PASTORS' SCHOOL FUND.** No accounting of this fund is made to deacons or membership. No one knows income or disbursements. No Treasurer's Report given. Funded by tuition, plus church gives money to this account.

**10. UNKNOWN ACCOUNTS.** There may be other accounts in the church and college which are not known to the deacons or the membership.

A box across the bottom simply stated: **Prepared by Attorney Voyle Glover**