MEDDLING WITH THE CHURCHES

CLED E. WALLACE

My friend (or is he?) Jimmie Love is trying to run his little wheel in a mighty big rut, it seems to me. He is planning a "list of all churches in eleven western states, showing church address and the name and address of some member." He has "spent a great deal of time and money in this effort." It is needed "for contact purposes." It occurs to me that maybe some of these churches don't want to be contacted. They may be, at least should be, awake to their responsibilities as independent churches, with not only the right, but the duty of choosing their own workers, selecting their own fields of labor and raising their own money and directing its expenditure. Any man, however zealous he may be, even if he is "tearing his hair out about doing mission work," as Brother Jimmie says he is, oversteps his authority when he makes an appeal to the whole brotherhood to send him "a penny a day," or any other amount, to be distributed here and there where he thinks it may do good. These "one-man-missionary-societies" who aspire to act as brotherhood clearing-houses are becoming too numerous. The West Coast Christian is taking a lot of territory when it says:

The West Coast Christian may never arouse the church to its duty, but there is one thing certain—it is going to try.

The whole church is a pretty big territory for Brother Jimmie to mother with his benevolent enterprises. A sizeable part of it never heard of Jimmie and his West Coast Christian and is getting along as well, probably, as the part that has. Why even I run across a church occasionally that never heard me preach and it seems to be getting along fairly well inspite of its handicap. Modesty doesn't seem to be one of Jimmie's weaknesses. He possibly got lined up wrong in religion. Possibly he should have been a Methodist; He might have been a Bishop by now. A good many years ago the Christian Standard, I believe it was, defined the duties of a State Evangelist as an overseer of the overseers of the churches in his state; F. D. Srygley commented on it at the time and declared that he didn't want to be a State Evangelist if it fell to him to oversee such overseers as David Lipscomb and E. G. Sewell, unless he could operate over a telephone from an office somewhere in Canada or Mexico. If Jimmie were a State Evangelist, he would probably insist on at least "eleven states" to begin with and wind up with a "try" at the whole brotherhood.

It is too easy for a preacher, editor or school to become officious in meddling with the affairs of the churches. The temptation to do so is not always resisted. Some years ago a questionnaire went out from the office of the president of a Christian College to churches throughout the state in which I live. It was a ponderous affair. It requested detailed information about the churches such as the size of its membership, its Sunday School attendance, the value of its property, its attitude toward Christian education, its contributions etc. It was evidently the desire of the president of the school to assemble this "very important record" in his office "for contact purposes." An elder of a church approached me with one of the things in his hand and a puzzled expression on his face and wanted to know "what for?" I advised him to kindle a fire with it as the school was meddling where it had no business. Institutionalism in religion can become a nuisance, and the main trouble with it is, that it usually does.

Our meddling friend Jimmie isn't satisfied with his own subscription list and a directory of all the churches in eleven western states, to afford him a field of operations of brotherhood proportions. He is plain sore because the publishers of other papers will not rush him a list of their subscribers.

One of the most guarded things among us today is the list of subscribers to one of our religious papers or magazines. I believe that in the judgment God will hold the publishers accountable for the misrepresentations they have made in regard to the number of subscribers which they have. Few of them if any, would dare publish the truth about it.

Suppose that you write to one of the papers and ask for the subscription list to be used in some worthy church work. You will be surprised how gray hair turns before you ever get it. That is a treasured, personal, Commercial secret.

I couldn't say for sure, for I have never felt it was any of my business to nose into the matters Jimmie is hot and bothered about. Possibly the editors do not consider all of Jimmie's schemes "worthy church work" and do not feel disposed to jump every time Jimmie says "froggie." I got it pretty straight that Jimmie jumped all over one of the school to assemble this "very important record" in his office "for contact purposes." An elder of a church approached me with one of the things in his hand and a puzzled expression on his face and wanted to know "what for?" I advised him to kindle a fire with it as the school was meddling where it had no business. Institutionalism in religion can become a nuisance, and the main trouble with it is, that it usually does.

(Cont. On Page 14)
THE CHURCH IN CALIFORNIA

Twenty years ago the church (undenominational) was little known in California. Now there are flourishing congregations of the New Testament order all the way from San Diego to San Francisco.

Ten years ago the churches were struggling against many hindrances, chief of which, perhaps, was the handicap of hobbies. This was due to the fact that the growth of the church in the far west was not made of new material—converts from the East—coming from the arms of ONE Church to another, the converts coming from all over the world. Among the immigrants were all shades of hobbyists, and every one of them aspired to the leadership in the congregations and insisted on establishing the particular custom or order of things peculiar to the section from which he came.

The general handicaps also were many. It was a new field. It was far removed from the center of religious activities so far as churches of Christ were concerned. The brethren who went west with their families had the problem of becoming adjusted themselves socially and financially, as well as religiously. Few had acquired for themselves a home in the new world, and found it difficult to build from the ground up. They had to “start from scratch” religiously as well as every other way, and it was an uphill pull. Brother Gideon Riggs was the first gospel preacher in the Los Angeles district who was without digressive tendencies, and to him the credit is freely given for the establishment of the work in Los Angeles.

Today there are six or seven congregations in Los Angeles, each with a modern building which any congregation in the state would have coveted ten or fifteen years ago. And while gospel preachers were a scarce article then, they are numerous in California now.

THE CENTRAL CHURCH

The most flourishing and best known congregation on the Pacific Coast has been the Central Church of Christ. It came through all the handicaps indicated above, and more. Blessed, however, with an unusually sound and well qualified eldership, they weathered all the storms and grew into one of the very best churches anywhere. They first met from one rented hall to another, until in 1930 the present structure was erected, at a cost beyond the resources of the congregation, through the help of various friends of the Cause in Los Angeles through them, they were themselves making the greatest sacrifices “for according to their power, I bear witness, yea and beyond their power, they gave of their own accord.”

The Central Church of Christ has not only given of their means but they have given of their members. Every church in Los Angeles area has either been started or strengthened by members from the Central congregation. They have given freely of money and members that the church in all Greater Los Angeles might expand.

THE CENTRAL MEETING

Having been engaged with the Central church during a Part of their pioneer period, from 1927 to 1930, it was a pleasure which language is inadequate to express, to be with them again in a meeting after an absence of ten years. The elders of the church have had such a meeting in mind for quite awhile, but felt that the resources of the congregation were so taxed by the indebtedness on their building and the heavy local demands as not to be able to undertake a meeting of such proportions. But where there is a will, when it is God’s will, there is a way, when it is the right way. Brother and Sister J. W. Akin visited California. Brother 0. P. McCann, one of the elders of the Central Church, who had known Brother Akin for years and who knew his interest in the Cause of Christ, mentioned to him the need of this meeting and the desire of the elders to have it, but explained the financial burdens already upon the congregation, and that a meeting of the proportions and length desired was more than they were able to support, considering the expenses of bringing the preacher from such distance for such a period of time. Brother Akin immediately reply was: “When do you want it?” Some time later, knowing nothing at all of what had been proposed, I received a letter inviting me to come to Los Angeles for a meeting to cover a full month, and as proof that the invitation was unanimous the letter was signed by every elder of the church.

A PIECE OF PROPAGANDA

In his West Coast Christian, Jimmie Lovell, with evident design, makes public note that Brother Akin sent me to Los Angeles for the Central meeting. Of course, Jimmie seeks to create the impression that the elders of the church did not want the meeting and it was worked up and forced upon them. He has, in fact, said as much in private references to it both in and out of Los Angeles. The truth of the matter is, however, that it had not occurred to Brother Akin to assist the Central church in supporting a meeting until he was asked by one of the elders if he would be interested in doing so. And the truth of the other matter is that Jimmie Lovell made himself obnoxious by meddling in the affairs of a congregation of which he was not a member in opposing this meeting and doing his utmost to prevent it. Brother B. West sent Jimmie hold him on the phone “about an hour and a half” protesting against my coming to Los Angeles. One of the elders had to tell him to mind his own business. Later, when he failed to thwart the meeting he “made love” to Brother McCann and asked him if he did not “still love me.” Brother McCann replied: Yes, Jimmie, I love you, but I do despise the way you have of meddリング in things that are none of your business!” And Jimmie sulked, and is still sulking. When he left the Central church and went with another congregation, he quit in a huff, because he said the elders would not let him work.
but the elders told me that Jimmie did not want to do what the elders told him to do but was all the time wanting to tell the elders what to do! That accounts for some derogatory remarks that Jimmie Lovell is making about elders in his paper. Jimmie does not like elders. They are in his way. As for Brother Akin, if a man were going to send me, I would as soon be sent by J. W. Akin as any man I know, and would far rather be sent by him than to be "sponsored" by Jimmie and his sheet in his diocese covering "eleven states." — but, as stated above, the invitation I received for the Central meeting was in the form of a letter signed by every elder of the church, and Brother Akin made the financial contribution to it without any suggestion before such a thing had even occurred to him. I have their word and his word (the elders and Brother Akin) for that, and I think it is sufficient to offset any propaganda of Jimmie Lovell's that a meeting: was forced on the Central Church of Christ in Los Angeles. Yet this piece of underhanded propaganda has raised its head in several parts of the country, and I have actually been asked if the elders of the church invited me to hold the meeting!

Such gossip is generally unworthy of notice, but the circumstances and the source of this demand that it should be nailed. If I, through Brother Akin, forced a meeting on the Central church, it is not only most uncomplimentary of me, but of both Brother Akin and the elders of the Central church. So in his effort to reflect on me, Jimmie has reflected on some of the best men to be found in the church. I refuse to pass it up without calling his hand. The elders of the Central church are not that kind of men. Brother Akin is not that kind of a man. And I am not that kind of a preacher. This incident is just another example of the level to which these men who talk so much about "the spirit of Christ" will actually stoop with their insinuations and their propaganda.

As evidence of how the elders of the church regarded the meeting, and to "stop the mouths of the gainsayers," I insert here a signed copy of the letter the elders sent to Brother Akin when the meeting was over. Read it, Jimmie, and be ashamed of what you have said and done.

"Dear Brother Akin:"

"With deep appreciation we acknowledge receipt of your check for three hundred and fifty dollars, favor of Foy E. Wallace, Jr., and know not how to adequately thank you for your liberal contribution to our meeting. We know that your good offices, in this and other instances, are not for favor or praise from men, but prompted by your love for the cause of Christ and to promote the preaching of His Gospel, and will be abundantly rewarded.

"This evening we are closing the greatest gospel meeting that was ever held in Los Angeles. It is the best Central has ever had in point of attendance, interest and visible results, and the most optimistic of us probably do not realize the great good that will follow.

"Many leaders and members of other congregations have come to us with words of commendation for our having brought Foy to California, and with expressions of joy and privilege of being afforded the opportunity of hearing him through the meeting.

"We are of the sure opinion that the church in California, as well as elsewhere, is in great need of the slain and fearless manner of preaching at which Brother Wallace is past master. The church has been strengthened in Southern California by what its members have heard here and the good will be continued by the other meetings to be conducted in neighboring cities.

"Again thanking you for your able assistance, we are,

Your brethren in Christ,


All of this puts Jimmie Lovell, Clinton Davidson and a few others on the spot. Their faces are red. They scattered the impression that "Foy E. Wallace, Jr., cannot go back to the Central church." But he did. So they said, "Yes, but he was sent." And now what will they say? Something else, of course, if it is not one thing it will be another! They said that "Foy Wallace can't even preach where he lives," in Oklahoma City, but he held the first meeting in the new building of the Tenth and Francis Church, where his membership is, and he has been invited to hold their spring meeting next year. They said, "Foy Wallace cannot preach in Nashville," but he held one of the best meetings of his life in Nashville last year, has two meetings in Nashville this year, and still another already promised next year! And for the information of these meddlesome, gossiping, nosing, body-sweaters, I have been invited back to Los Angeles next year, so Clinton Davidson and Jimmie Love11 will have a whole year to oppose it! The trouble is, James L. Lovell and Clinton Davidson tried to prevent the meeting before it began and tried to kill it after it began. Failing in both, they are dying hard. Poor Die-hard Jimmie!

* * *

THE PRESENT PERSONNEL

Some of the strongest men the Central Church have been removed by death, and others have moved away or gone with other congregations. W. E. Bernard, A. J. Dummm and R. L. Smith have answered the summons from on high — three of the strongest men in the church — but they are replaced by others as firm and true. Brother Moore Lynn, formerly Auditor for the State of Texas, is a valuable addition to the congregation, and is one of the elders. Other active elders are W. A. Phillips, George Campbell and O. P. McCann. They are men of ability, integrity and unblemished character. Brother W. B. West is preaching for the church, and was called to this work the third time by the elders. He broadcasts the gospel daily over one of the leading radio stations of the city, preaches each Sunday, does much local work, and teaches in George Pepperdine College, and is allowed to do as he pleases with his leisure time! I do not fear for the loyalty of the Central church of Christ in Los Angeles while it is in its present hands.

* * *

OTHER SOUTHERN CALIFORNIA MEETINGS

Our stay in Southern California was not terminated with the Central meeting. There were others. The meeting at Riverside was a good one. Here an old friend of mine, Brother L. L. McQueen, a "Sooner" from Oklahoma, who was "in the Run" in the early days of Oklahoma, is an elder of the church and has done as much or more than any other man for the church in Riverside. Brother Albert Lovelady, an unusually capable young man preaches for this congregation. Albert was baptized in the first meeting I ever held in Los Angeles in 1927, and I am proud of him. He is not a softie, but already a strong, fearless gospel preacher, baptizing many people even in hard fields, and the church will hear from this young Gideon of the gospel in the future.

The meeting with the Southside Church, Santa Ana, was another good one — they were all good. Floyd Thompson, another of our Oklahoma boys (though no longer a boy) preaches with the Southside church. Plain preaching "took" on him before he left Oklahoma, and he is not apt to do any other kind in California. My old friend, James H. Sewell, lives in Santa Ana. He holds an official position with the Jefferson Standard Life Insurance Company, is Manager of the Burns-Cuboid Company, preacher for the Broadway and Walnut church, in Santa Ana, head of a fam-
ily composed of four children and one wife, and he did not tell me what he does with his spare time. We (my family and I) lived in “the Sewell cottage by the sea,” one whole month, enjoyed the Sewell breezes as well as the sea breezes, and Mrs. Wallace brought home a set of “Cuboids” for foot comfort (with the compliments of the firm) which have given such foot relief as to improve her disposition so much that I am under great obligations to the manager. I cheerfully recommend “Cuboids” to husbands whose wives’ feet give them trouble. Incidentally, George Pepperdine is the main stockholder in the Cuboid Company and it should therefore have no financial trouble in relieving foot troubles. It must be a good product as George Pepperdine has never made a reputation for reckless investments.

The next meeting was at Long Beach, with the Ninth and Lime church. Brother James A. Scott is the preacher. This congregation is generally conceded to be one of the strongest churches in California and is perhaps the strongest, financially, of any of the churches, with the exception of the Southwest church where Brother George Pepperdine is an elder. Long Beach has been in the past the hotbed of hobbies and heresies and the church has had a checkered career in that city. There have been numerous divisions which the church has had to outlive. To Brother Scott is given very largely the credit of guiding the church out of these troubles into a now peaceful, prosperous era, and the church is thriving.

The last meeting of the series was with the York Boulevard congregation in Los Angeles, one of the newest congregations, but has already swarmed once and is still growing. J. E. Wainwright built this congregation up and has been with it from the beginning. He has done a fine work starting new congregations in the Los Angeles area. Thus the first and the last meeting was held in Los Angeles.

R. L. SMITH

After a stay of more than three months, we left for home in Oklahoma City. Upon reaching Albuquerque, New Mexico, a long distance telephone message was received calling me back to Los Angeles to the funeral of one of the grandest men that ever lived—R. L. Smith, of the Central Church. He had prayed to live, and we had prayed that he might live, to attend the Central meeting. By sheer power of will, backed by the invincible spirit that only an unfaltering faith imparts, he attended every service and heard every sermon, save one (one Sunday afternoon), of the month’s series at the Central church. It was the marvel of the whole congregation. After the meeting his strength ebbed away. He had been ill for long. Sister Smith, long under a heavy strain, won the admiration of all for the constant care and tender attention she gave him. He carried his “million-dollar smile” through all of his affliction, and he carried it with him when he went away. The last word we heard him say, when Mrs. Wallace remarked to him how much he enjoyed coming to the meetings, was, “Yes, but there is not much behind it.” But there was much behind it, and his passing was as calm and peaceful as a California sunset. I thank God that I knew R. L. Smith—and knew him well. I thank God that it was my privilege to return to California before he was called and to be with him much in his last days. He was my friend and I loved him. His body is buried beside A. J. Dumm, another friend I loved, and an elder of the Central Church of Christ. They were inseparable friends. They were, together, a strength and stay to the church. They sleep side by side in a California cemetery of entrancing beauty. Sister Smith and Sister Dumm will sit together beside the mounds that mark the graves—but they are not there. They live! Elsewhere!
supervisor of Los Angeles county schools and has had experience in other public institutions and organizations in California. He is at present president of the college founded within recent years by George Pepperdine, founder of Western Auto Supplies and the Pepperdine Foundation. Mr. Tiner served this college previously as dean. Besides these duties he is chairman of committees of the Los Angeles Junior Chamber of Commerce; vice-president and director of the South Side Los Angeles Chamber of Commerce; vice-president and director of the Rotary Club; director of Children’s Home, Ontario; member of the board of managers of the Y. M. C. A. of Southwest Los Angeles, and is an active member of Phi Delta Kappa, an honorary educational fraternity.

“The Truxton Avenue Church of Christ is proud to introduce its series of lectures which will run the entire week of February 18 to 25, with such an outstanding speaker as Doctor Tiner. Other able men will be heard at 10:30 each morning, 2 each afternoon and at 7:30 o’clock each evening until the meeting will close Sunday, February 25, with John Allen Hudson, minister of the Southwest Church of Christ, Los Angeles, bringing a special plea for the restoration of undenominational Christianity. The public is cordially entertained to hear these speakers. All ministers especially are invited.”

It will be observed that Brother Tiner belongs to and is “chairman of committees” in one Chamber of Commerce: is vice-president and director in another Chamber of Commerce; is vice-president and director of the Rotary Club; member of the board of the Y. M. C. A.; and an active member of the Phi Delta Kappa fraternity. I am not certain that these are all the organizations to which Brother Tiner belongs—but this is too many for a gospel preacher to belong to even if he is president of a college. It smacks of worldliness and a bid for popularity already too pronounced in our schools and churches. It will lead us from the humility and the simplicity which should characterize Christian men. It is worldliness. In these organizations Brother Tiner has become popular with the public to be sure, and he has been christened with “a movie actor’s” name—they call him Robert Taylor—but while all of this is a splash with the public, does it enhance Christian dignity or increase spirituality? This is meant for a constructive criticism. A young preacher in Texas has been nearly ruined because he has been made to believe that he possesses movie characteristics.

There is also an organization in Los Angeles known as the “Federated Church Brotherhood” which has furnished the occasion for much handshaking, backslapping, after-dinner-speech-making and toast-toasting on the part of numbers of our leading brethren with sectarian religious leaders and business men, and denominational church workers. The following is an announcement in the papers concerning this Federated Church Brotherhood. The names in black face below indicate the members of the church who were in attendance at the evening dinner of this “Church Brotherhood” organization.

“MANY SPEAKERS ENLIVEN PROGRAM FOR FEDERATED CHURCH BROTHERHOOD HERE”

“Attending a dinner at the Trinity Methodist Church last night members of the Federated Church Brotherhood were addressed by an array of speakers of that organization from Los Angeles. Introduced by E. R. Long, W. P. Williott, state secretary of the brotherhood acted as toastmaster for the evening. Speakers were Dr. Walter R. Elerrath, state president, whose subject was “The Challenge to the Brotherhood.” Clarence Shattuck, business manager for the George Pepperdine Foundation, who spoke on the topic, “The Contest of the Christian Business Man” and William R. Litzenberg, attorney, who stirred the audience with his appeal for “Organized Effort in the Church.”

In addition to the speakers, out-of-town visitors included Mrs. Clarence Shattuck of Los Angeles, H. W. Brockman, George T. Edwards, A. R. Gumelt, C. E. Durden and J. O. Shelton of Taft.

Long Presides

Active in inter-church and inter-denominational work the local brotherhood is headed by E. R. Long, president, and I. M. Rude, secretary. Arrangements for the dinner were in charge of the Reverend Philip T. Dennis and C. E. Rawlings and the dinner was served by the ladies of Trinity Church.

Many Attend


Another clipping reads as follows:

“IMPORTANT GUESTS TO SPEAK HERE FOR SUPPER”

“Several important speakers including George Pepperdine of Pepperdine College, Los Angeles, William Litzenberg, Los Angeles attorney and W. P. Williott, state secretary for the Federated Church Brotherhood, will address a supper meeting here February 9. The event, to be held at Trinity Methodist Church at 6:30 o’clock, will be sponsored by Federated Church Brotherhood of which E. R. Long is president. Reservations may be made by telephoning C. E. Rawlings or the Reverend Philip T. Dennis, Visiting delegations will be present from Taft. Wasco and McFarland.

“The Reverend Addison Moore was the speaker when the local Brotherhood met recently.”

Still another report reads:

“Arrangements are complete for a supper with Federated Church Brotherhood tonight at 6:30 o’clock at Trinity Church at which several out of town speakers will be introduced by E. R. Long, president. Interested persons are invited, and should make reservations with the Reverend Philip T. Dennis or C. E. Rawlings. The speakers will include George Pepperdine, founder of Pepperdine College, Los Angeles; William Litzenberg, president of Southern California Bap
tist Convention, Los Angeles; Dr. J. A. Elregh, state president of the brotherhood, and W. P. Willimott, state secretary.

It would seem to me that this "Federated Church Brotherhood" is as bad as the "National Unity Meeting," except that one is local and the other general.

The majority of parents who send their children away to a Christian school do so in order that they may be advanced as Christians along with their educational development. They do not want them to become worldlins, compromisers and sectarians. But if the men in the high places where we send them belong to all the organizations that they can get admission into, and mix up with sectarians generally in the affairs of a "Federated Church Brotherhood," what attitude toward the church could parents expect their sons and daughters to bring back home?

Now, someone will say, "Brother Wallace is fighting our schools." He is not; and that's one more you could keep from telling; but I am frank enough to say what many others among us, including the preachers, believe but will not say. I believe that such worldly and sectarian affiliations will work untold harm to the church, through the young people, in the future generation. That is the reason why we need men, not youths; experienced men, not novices; sound men, not compromisers; able men, not weaklings; brave men, not cowards; sincere men, not timeservers; humble men, not egotists; men of genuine integrity, not "super-salesmen" and politicians, in the lead both in churches and in the schools. God give us such, and save the church.

The Pepperdine College, notwithstanding its good qualities has some weaknesses that should be corrected. The worldly spirit should be curbed; but there are also doctrinal weaknesses that should be eliminated. Like most of the other schools, the Premillennial influence is there. Brother J. P. Sanders is head of the Department of Religion, and has the full confidence of the brethren in Los Angeles. He has declared himself very plainly on all the public issues, and preaches and teaches against Premillennialism and other iams both in and out of the school. It is hoped that Brother Sanders will become more and more aggressive in opposing these systems of error which have grown up, as well as the general softism pervading the church. Brother Tiner, president of the College, has also been outspoken in his condemnation of Premillennialism, but his connections with the New Christian Leader has had a modifying effect on his utterances. Everybody knows what the Christian Leader is and no man can carry water on both shoulders long-we will see that it spills. The men at the head of our schools, or connected with them, have no business forming compromising connections with such papers as the Christian Leader, with its announced policies, and its "patron saint"-Clinton Davidson!

But Premillennialism has its personal representative in the College through Wade Ruby, head of the English Department, and an ardent disciple of J. N. Armstrong. He believes what Brother Armstrong does on the Premillennial question, which means that he is a premillenialist. I told Brother Baxter this (when he asked me) and he afterward found it out for himself. In a letter to John Bannister, of Oklahoma City, Brother Ruby wrote:

"I am one of the accused weaklings who believes that the dangers of Premillennialism have been magnified, and even misrepresented. Brother Wallace can cry our "Premillennialism dethrones Christ"—and make it look like a very realistic thing. But after all we all look forward to a time when Christ shall reign differently from the way he rules now."

The letter continues in that vein. While Brother Ruby is not in the Bible Department, he is nevertheless a preacher and a teacher in the College and will impart that attitude to those whom he influences the most. There is no excuse for any of our colleges retaining men of such weak attitude on important questions. Those who went to school with Wade Ruby, and even some of his relatives, know and admit that he is a premillennialist, and say that he got it from J. N. Armstrong. As for "Brother Wallace" crying that "Premillennialism dethrones Christ"—both Brother Tiner and Brother Sanders have recently "cried" the same thing. Yet they have a man on their faculty who charges that they have "magnified, and even misrepresented" it when they did so. It is of little use to declare against a thing if we turn right around and compromise the issue by retaining men who declare against what has been declared. Our schools should be renovated of premillennial influence and softism from the attic to the cellar. They cannot be true to the trust of their patrons unless it is done. It is wrong to make public statements that a school is sound and at the same time keep unsound teachers in it.

The George Pepperdine Foundation

In another section of this issue will be found some facts and questions concerning the Pepperdine Foundation, by Brother Ted McElroy, of Colorado Springs, Colo. Brother McElroy is one of the young preachers in our ranks who has his feet on the ground, and what he is thinking is what a great many others are thinking, and will think, as these various movements begin to form among us. The brethren who promote these things had well learn now that their movements and organizations will be put to the test of inspection and discussion. If they are right, let them stand; if they are wrong, they should fall.

Brother George Pepperdine is a fine man. He loves the church. He is sincere. My personal estimate of him can be put in the expression: a high-toned, Christian gentleman. There is nothing low in his ideals or methods; he, indeed, is of a purer strata and moves on a higher plane than some public men who have aspiried to the leadership of the church of late, and who have even sought to advise him. Furthermore, I believe that Brother Pepperdine wants to do exactly what is right, and that he will do it as he sees it, with regard to his organizations and philanthropies and church activities. He has shown the disposition to be guided by men in whom he reposes confidence, yet reserves the right to do his own thinking, and reach his own decisions. Having been much absorbed in business, however, Brother Pepperdine does not have the balanced knowledge of the Bible which he needs to guide him in undertakings of such magnitude as he proposes. It is therefore vastly important that he should be advised by men who know the principles involved in what he is trying to do, and who will guide him away from the departures and deviations into which such organizations have invariably fallen. He needs men around him like Nathan and Gad, of David's cabinet, who will not say to him what they think he wants to hear, but who will point out at all times what the Bible teaches, what is to the best interest of the church instead of the selfish interests and ambitions of men.

That the Pepperdine Foundation has the right to operate the Pepperdine College, own and operate apartment houses and various other institutions, cannot be reasonably denied. But doing the work of the church is quite a different matter. Brother Pepperdine's idea is that the Foundation is, in reality, himself as a corporate entity, seeing that it is his money and his work put in a legal sense. Brother Pepperdine cannot be true to the trust of his patrons unless it is done.
and the officers of the Foundation,” and of what they “believe” about the “character training of youth” and the “teachings of Jesus.” It also calls upon “others who are likeminded to join in the program of the Foundation,” and “it is expected that interested persons will make substantial gifts and bequests to the Foundation.” In answering the question as to “why any organization with several million dollars in assets should ask that you contribute to its endowment or its program,” the answer “straight from the shoulder” is that “your dollars will do more good work when joined with this Foundation than if you scatter your money around in small gifts.” It is then stated: “This organization is permanent and its work will continue perpetually.”

The Missionary Societies of the Christian church have always made precisely the same claims. They have always said that your missionary dollars will go farther if joined with their missionary society than to do your work individually or in the local church.

Brother Pepperdine does not believe in missionary societies, and he does not want his Foundation to be one or to become one. But to keep it from being one, or becoming one, it will be necessary for him to change the basis of his church work. As a member of the church, the money which he wishes to give to the church or for the church, should be separated from “the officers of the Foundation” and “its self-perpetuating board of trustees” and should be given by Brother Pepperdine, either through the church of which he is an elder or as an individual to other churches in the places where he desires to assist in the work of the Lord.

It will not take care of the issue for the Foundation to make some congregation the agent in distributing funds issued by it, whether that congregation be the Southwest church to which Brother Pepperdine belongs or some other church or churches elsewhere. Brother Pepperdine should separate the money that he wishes to give to the church from the Foundation and simply give it through the church, as he may wish, as all other members do. Otherwise the church or churches to which the Pepperdine Foundation issues checks would simply become forwarding agents of the organization. It is on this point that Brother McElroy’s questions are in order.

Brother John Allen Hudson, who preaches for the Southwest Church, senses fully the gravity of these issues. He knows the principles of New Testament teaching and sees where the danger is. It is up to Brother Hudson and Brother Pepperdine to put the church part of this work on a strictly scriptural basis. If it is done, the confidence of the brethren will be enjoyed; if it is not done, there will be widespread opposition.

Another thing more occurs to me. Thoughtful brethren can but wonder where the brethren are who cut up so about the little insignificant Morrow Foundation several years ago. That little affair never proposed to do anything more than sell and circulate Bibles and Testaments at cost, which was not the work of the church. Yet the Pepperdine Foundation, with its vast millions, proposing to actually do church work, has escaped the criticism, and apparently the attention, of these same men. We are made to wonder if the size and influence of it perchance has anything to do with the attitude. Surely not. A thing is wrong or right, regardless of wealth or might.

The fact that an organization is chartered does not with itself make it wrong. Nor does the fact that it does religious work or is chartered to do religious work make it wrong. Publishing religious papers and operating schools in which the Bible is taught are religious works, but not the work of the church. Selling Bibles and other literature is religious work, and so is operating a religious publishing house, but not the work of the church. It is when any organization takes it upon itself to do the work of the church, work that the church, as such, is commanded to do, that it becomes unscriptural and wrong.

There are those, of course, who will encourage Brother Pepperdine to ignore all criticism and opposition. The fact is, he will have a hard time keeping the brethren themselves from making a missionary society out of his Foundation. While I was in California I heard more, far more, in some quarters about “The Foundation” than I did about the church. It was “The Foundation” this, and “The Foundation” that—and it was mentioned more often than the church. Institutions are dangerous, especially when they are rich and powerful. The church must be kept free from their domination and control. No one knows how an institution will go. While Brother Pepperdine lives he may be able (I say, may) to keep his Foundation from infringing upon the church, but after he is gone there is no way to tell what it will be and do. Already there are men on the Advisory Board of the College and the Foundation, and in the organizations, who are not members of the church. Though these places may not be executive, and even if purely honorary, it is a mistake. Digressives and sectarians should not be given a look-in in the work of the church, or even of schools and colleges conducted by brethren when it is not the work of the church, but nevertheless has an indirect influence on the affairs of the church. We all know they are watching every opportunity to take over anything they can get. The digressives always ride free when they can. If they can get anything churches of Christ paid for, or absorb a work which loyal disciples started, they are ever ready to do it. That is the sinister motive back of the so-called National Unity Meetings now. And, let no one beguile you, the digressives in California have their weather eye on the Pepperdine Foundation and the George Pepperdine College, and on Brother Pepperdine himself. They are already trying to love him to pieces.

WHAT IS JIMMIE LOVELL TRYING TO BUILD?

In his paper, Jimmie Lovell recently enclosed a separate leaflet entitled, “Are We Trying To Build A Paper, or The Church?” Well, the church has already been built by the Lord Jesus Christ, and from all appearances Jimmie Lovell is trying to build a missionary society—the one-man kind. In the same issue of his paper he published his missionary map—a drawing of eleven states which Jimmie aspires to take oversight of in a missionary way. He has arrows pointing out of Los Angeles to many points in the Northwest, which he says are being supported by the Los Angeles churches. But the fact that Jimmie did not tell is that The Pepperdine Foundation has been doing practically all of the work he mentions, and not the churches in Los Angeles. The checks have previously gone to these places from the Pepperdine Foundation. And if and when Bro. Pepperdine changes his basis of church work and does it through the church of which he is an elder—still it is not Jimmie’s place to talk about what “WE” are doing in eleven states. Bro. Peperdine said that they didn’t pay much attention to Jimmie in Los Angeles. But he has to talk.

Now Jimmie himself proposes to become an agent—a missionary medium—for the churches. He says that there are some who do not look with favor on either Don Carlos Janes or Barney D. Morehead, and invites all such to send their missionary money to him, and he will distribute it for them. How much better would that be? That is one reason why the other two are in disfavor among the brethren, because they are one-man missionary agencies. But
Jimmie wants to be one. It is evident that one of the main purposes of his paper is to maintain a money contact with churches and individuals to build up his one-man missionary machine.

Occasionally it is said that Jimmie Lovell is rather a freakish sort of a fellow but that he does have a lot of missionary zeal—and some preachers who ought to be able to think better than that have given their indorsement to his missionary work. Let it be known, first and last, that the Bible Banner is in favor of wider and broader evangelical efforts in all fields, far and near. But it should be done by the church, through the church, and the Bible Banner is set against these one-man agencies, just as it is against other errors. It is disappointing to find brethren who are so gullible as to fall for Jimmie Lovell’s line of mission chatter.

Before swallowing his bait, hook, line and sinker—elders and preachers—stop to consider the fact that Jimmie is not working through the church, nor hardly in one. The elders, by his own admission, are in his way. He must have a diocese of his own. Elders of the Central Church of Christ in Los Angeles say that Jimmie would not work under the elders, he tried to work them instead; he would not be told what to do, he wanted to tell the elders what to do. And as long as he was in the Central church, he was a constant source of trouble. He left in a huff, went to another congregation, and he is now complaining about the elders again.

When men grow independent of the church, and want to start a missionary agency of their own, they will do to let alone. When any man solicits money for the church and asks that the money be sent to his private Post Office Box, it is wrong on the face of it. I borrowed this statement from A. W. Lee, elder of the church in Oklahoma City, who was commenting on the very thing that Jimmie Lovell and Barney D. Morehead are doing. The statement indicates the kind of thinking elders of the churches ought to be doing.

Everybody knows that Don Carlos Janes has used his missionary office to support premillennial teachers among the missionaries for years and to saturate certain sections with Bollism. He is one of them, dyed-in-the-wool. It is also said by those who are in a position to know that he has made loans through his missionary offices to build or pay for Bollite-premillennial churches in Kentucky and elsewhere, even as far as Alabama. Yet the brethren will continue to send monthly contributions to Don Carlos Janes.

As for B. D. Morehead, he is linked with Davidson, the new Christian Leader, Premillennialism and Bollism, and also has been an independent, free-lance missionary agent. If and when Jimmie Lovell succeeds with his similar schemes he will be the same kind of a public nuisance. Really and truly, the brethren ought to know better.

SWOOPING DOWN ON OKLAHOMA CITY

In these same connections high-pressure Jimmie tells about his swift descent upon Oklahoma City. He wants all to understand that his mode of travel is flying. Of course, he flies on Du Pont money and time. Wonder if his company knows what he is doing with their money and time when he swoops down on Oklahoma City to banquet the preachers? But he blew in, according to his story, and flew out. He rushes (he was in a hurry) to the phone, calls all the preachers in the city, invites them down to the Skirvin Hotel to a big dinner, and high-pressures the preachers! Yes, they fell for it—all except K. C. Moser-gobbled up Jimmie’s dinner, bragged on him with reservations, and off Jimmie flew with a great report for his paper. But if Jimmie could hear the comments the preachers make now, since he flew in and blew out, it wouldn’t be a suitable story for his paper. And when the churches learn that Jimmie Lovell, like Clinton Davidson, and (they work together), is trying to high-pressure the church with some super-salesmanship that should be devoted to the Du Pont Company, for which he is supposed to sell gun powder, he will go the way of Clinton Davidson with the churches.

Clinton Davidson and Jimmie Lovell are both fanatics. It will be remembered that Davidson is the one who claims the “million-dollar” prayer. He tells that a bank engaged him to find a lost check; it would have taken him two weeks of arduous, tedious searching. He paused before thousands of checks, prayed and the Lord laid his hand on the check! Page the Holy Rollers! Fanatics always pick on prayer.

Now comes Jimmie with his fanatical ideas of prayer. He was, riding in the car with several preachers, all of whom I personally know, in a certain city. When Jimmie stepped out of the car to leave the group, he suggested that they have a prayer, right there in the downtown street. Traffic was being held up. Jimmie asked one of the preachers to pray; he excused himself. Jimmie asked another to pray, and another, and also very properly excused himself. So Jimmie stood by the car, holding up the traffic, and amid honking horns, said in substance: “Well, God, we are just a few fellows trying to get along down here; we are having a pretty tough time of it, but if you will just stick to us we believe we will make it through—In Jesus name, Amen.” This is the substance of the story as related to me by a perfectly reliable preacher.

Frankly, brethren, are men of this type, who are plainly fanatical and unbalanced, to be accepted as leaders in the church? Can the affairs of the church be entrusted to such men? Is it safe to elevate them to any position at all of prominence in the affairs of the church? Yet it is this very type of men among us now who are trying to change the church, take charge of the whole brotherhood, and make it over. The brethren are gradually finding these things out—and these men are on the way out, just as fast as the brethren learn them. And it is only for the sake of the church, and to block the path of the men who are trying to impose themselves on the brotherhood, that the Bible Banner exposes these things. Some will not appreciate it; others will; but whether any do or do not, offers neither incentive nor deterrent so far as the Bible Banner is concerned. It is a duty, and we are performing it fully mindful of its costs.

IT DEPENDS ON WHOSE OX IS GORED

A rather prominent man in the church, whose sympathies have been very definitely with the New Christian Leader and Clinton Davidson, recently wrote a letter to a friend of mine and accused the Bible Banner of engaging in character assassination. It was Clinton Davidson himself who boasted that he could and would expose and destroy a group of preachers in the church. He would do it by means fair or foul—mostly foul, anonymous letters, whispering campaigns—and would not hesitate to sue us if we published anything objectionable to him. The name of the editor of the Bible Banner was not at the top of the list of the men he had marked for destruction. The readers may judge how well he has succeeded with his first victim. Perhaps he should have started at the foot. But now that the tables have turned on the gentleman (?) they are charging the Bible Banner with persecution and character assassination! Strange complex! Germany blitzkriegs England, bombs London, reducing the great metropolis to fires and flames, with hundreds dead and wounded among the casualties—and then complains that British bombers had attacked, without provocation, non-military Berlin!
Assassination and persecution, indeed! Who circulated the anonymous letters? Who has waged the campaign of calumny? Who was it that marked certain preachers for destruction? Who has peddled scandal from California to New York? Who have been the scandal-mongers? The very men who are now crying persecution! It just depends on whose ox is gored.

A man in Birmingham, whose word would not be questioned even by his enemies, told me of this recent occurrence: C. B. F. Young, New York chemist, and "The P-r-e-s-i-d-e-n-t" of the New Christian Leader, talked to one of the preachers in Birmingham over long distance telephone from New York City, and said over the phone that he knew enough on Foy E. Wallace, Jr., in Nashville, Tennessee, to ruin him if he should tell it. Note that-if he would tell it. Does anybody think for a minute that any of them would not tell anything they knew that would ruin the men they are after? That's a joke-if he would tell it! Well, "Doctor" C. B. F. Young, of New York, why don't you tell it? What are you waiting on? I'll give you the space in the Bible Banner to tell what you "know," since your own paper is too "ethical" if you will sign your name to it.

The chemical expert is behind the times. This is what Clinton Davidson threatened to do over two years ago. "Dr." C. B. F. has just heard something and thinks its new. They have just recently begun calling him "Doctor Young"—he is only a chemist—but it sounds big to say that "Dr. C. B. F. Young," of New York, is "the President" of the Christian Leader Corporation. Anyway, "Doctor," when this is being read I will be in a meeting in Nashville, Tennessee. Suppose you come down from New York and tell what you "know," while I am there. I feel sure that Clinton Davidson would buy your airplane ticket both ways. Shall I look for you?

Cleveland Moore, Superintendent of the County Schools, Trenton, Fla., is a friend of mine. He recently attended a service in a certain congregation in that section. The lesson for the evening was "Abraham And Lot." When they came to the statement, "let there be no strife," a certain leader called my name publicly and said their objection to me was that I was causing all of the strife in the church, and apparently intimated that I was anything except the right kind of a man. Brother Cleve Moore promptly challenged the statement and called for the proof. When he pressed the brother to prove his charge, he told Brother Moore that S. H. Hall was his witness and could furnish him the evidence. Brother Moore immediately wrote S. H. Hall if he thought I was the right kind of a man. He received no reply. Determined to "stop the mouths of the gainsayers," Brother Moore wrote a dozen other representatives of preachers—and even wrote Jimmie Lovell—to see what they would say. All of this was unknown to me. The very first inkling I got of the matter was when the preachers began sending me the copies of Brother Moore's letters and their replies to it. As stated, S. H. Hall, their own witness, would not answer. All of the other preachers, except one, spoke of me in terms of love and confidence—and that one said that he was not in a position to answer the inquiry. Even A. R. Sommer, of the Apostolic Review, (Daniel Sommer's son) replied: "I have only met Brother Wallace a few times, but consider him a true Christian gentleman." But Jimmie Lovell (I did not rate him among the preachers) replied, complaining about old money matters, charged that I had misrepresented him and the Christian Leader, and added that he "could but wish that the church did not have such members!" Jimmie would excommunicate me!

The trouble with these men is simply this: they do not know anything about what they are trying to do. C. B. F. Young is a chemist, and knows nothing at all, not a thing on earth about how to run a religious paper, much less be the president of one. Clinton Davidson is a New York Insurance Salesman and James L. Love is a Du Pont Company gun powder salesman. Yet these are the men who are trying to change the church. They should stick to their last, and the church would be far better off.

But now they cry persecution! They are dying hard. It just depends on whose ox is gored.

THE DAVIDSON-SEWELL COMBINATION

My personal friend, T. B. Thompson, of Corsicana, Texas, writes me as follows:

"I note the report in your paper regarding the visit of Clinton Davidson to Abilene. In my opinion the attitude of Davidson in all matters concerning the Boll and religious paper affairs has been unworthy of respectable consideration, being attended by an assumption of ignorance which was only feigned for effect. His attitude smacks of insincerity, which recent developments have so brought to light that there is no further excuse left for any one's not knowing exactly where he stands on these matters. I feel quite certain that he thought his money would win the fight for the Boll faction, and due credit goes to your fight on this matter.

"A note at the close of the above-referred-to article asks why Bro. Sewell, who heard Davidson's speech did not repudiate it on the spot. I had a conversation with Bro. Sewell soon after the occurrence and he told me that after the speech was over that those young preachers took charge of Davidson and that an engagement demanded that he hurry away without having an opportunity to say a word to Davidson, and that he then prepared the statement to be read to the chapel the next morning. Brother Sewell praised those young preachers to me, and had not a word of defense for Davidson. He insisted that would be the end of Davidson at Abilene, in his opinion."

That listens good in print, to one who does not know anything else. But it is a known fact that Brother Sewell has worked himself into a fever on several occasions defending Clinton Davidson. In his exchange with C. A. Norred, published in the Bible Banner, he charged that Brother Norred had listened to the enemies of Davidson, and extolled Davidson as a great man. In San Antonio, he boosted Davidson to the skies, to Austin Taylor, as one of the greatest men in the church, and was bitter toward those who have stopped him. And he has not answered C. A. Norred's questions yet, namely: Is Clinton Davidson financing the series of literature that Sewell is promoting? Does he have any connection with it?

Being affiliated with Davidson, as he is, it was a cowardly act for Jesse P. Sewell to wait until Davidson had gone, and then stab him in the back by 'slanding a little note over to chapel repudiating his speech. I wouldn't do even Clinton Davidson that way. Brother Sewell may be able to make my friend T. B., and some others believe that he was "too busy" to stay long enough to correct Davidson's blunders to his face, but I don't believe it. Sometimes a man gets in too big a hurry, and other engagements are too pressing.

The following card from Brother C. A. Norred expresses my feeling exactly. I believe it speaks the sentiments of most of the best preachers in the church.

"In the July issue of the Bible Banner Brother Homer Hailey has an article "Clinton Davidson In Abilene," in which he insists that those who have openly defended Bro. Davidson should openly acknowledge that they have been mistaken in him. I wish to give my indorsement to that article and the view expressed."—Signed C. A. Norred.

Now that is right. Will Brother Sewell do it? Everybody knows that he is linked with Davidson. He has been
with him on the New Leader. He has defended Davidson and criticised those who have been against him. To set himself right there are two things that Brother Sewell should do. First, he should answer Brother Norred’s question: Is Clinton Davidson furnishing the money to publish the Sewell series of literature? If so, the series of literature is a goner so far as loyal churches will be concerned. If not, then, second: Since Brother Sewell “had not a word of defense for Davidson” and “insisted that would be the end of Davidson at Abilene, in his opinion,” he should, as Brother Hailey and Brother Norred have suggested, simply say so plainly and publicly. He should first tell Davidson himself. He is on the spot with Davidson right now. And he should think enough of the Cause of Christ generally to make his statement public, and clear. For, if that should end Davidson at Abilene, in Brother Sewell’s own opinion, should it not also end him everywhere else? It is Brother Sewell’s time to speak, unless Brother Davidson has something to tell him first. R. O. Kenley says that every man who has followed Clinton Davidson will be henceforth marked “an appeaser of error.” And what about the school and paper he backs? """

THE JORGENSEN SONGBOOK IS ON THE WAY OUT

Your attention is called to John T. Lewis’ remarks on the editorial in the Christian Standard, leading paper of the Christian Church in the nation, on the Boll-Jorgenson songbook as “a symbol of unity” between them and the Christian Church. The Bible Banner has insisted all of the time that the use of Jorgenson’s song book was a connecting link between the Boll party and the churches. The purchase of it has furnished the money to promote the Boll party, and has given Jorgenson standing and prestige with loyal churches, an entrance into them, and a dividing wedge with both individuals and churches.

The Christian Standard has now joined Jorgenson in the promotion and sale of his book-another sectarian affiliation, and furnishes another strong ground of objection for its use in churches of Christ. It is now a tie-up between the digressives and the Bollites. The Standard thinks that by making Jorgenson’s songbook the “common hymnbook” for all the churches, Christian Churches and churches of Christ, there will be a common ground of fellowship and—maybe in time instrumental music may be adopted as a common practice! He even mentions the “dispute over music in the church” as being related to the effort to make of the Jorgenson songbook a common hymnal for use in Christian Churches and churches of Christ.

With the Christian Standard, digressive affiliation, Jorgenson may see a chance to sell more books and make more money— but when the loyal brethren find this out, it will end the “Great Songs Of The (?) Church” with all churches of Christ that have not become so soft as to be past redemption. Churches using this book should not wait until they are worn out to replace them. There is a principle involved. The books should go out of the churches of Christ-Now. They will go out.

In this issue of the Bible Banner appears an advertisement of the new songbook being compiled by Austin Taylor, the dean and prince of gospel singers in the church. The book is being published by the Firm Foundation. The Bible Banner requested this matter of Brother Taylor and the Firm Foundation, to insert in the Banner, because of the interest in the church on the songbook question.

Also in this issue appears the advertisement of “Complete Christian Hymnal,” compiled by Marion Davis, of Fayette, Alabama, and published by himself. He is one of the best singers, and one of the best men, in the church. He has one of the best books that has been published.

Then there are the songbooks and hymnals put out by the Gospel Advocate, compiled by C. M. Pullias and L. O. Sanderson.

What excuse does any church of Christ have for patronizing this premillennial faction, which has now formed an alliance with the Digressives, with an announced intention of making a drive on the churches to force the Jorgenson songbook to become the “common hymnal” of all the churches, as “a noble symbol of unity” between Christian Churches and churches of Christ? Truly, it is time to discontinue, immediately and permanently, the Jorgenson songbook. The brethren should see to it that henceforth E. L. Jorgenson will look to the Christian Church for his patronage.

The Bible Banner should not have to fight this battle alone. It is the duty of the Gospel Advocate and the Firm Foundation to declare against this combine. True, they would be accused of not being ethical—but what difference does it make who accuses us of what, when the interest of the church is involved? The Bible Banner is not “in business,” so it can say what is needed, ethically.

THE HARDING COLLEGE. WHIRLIGIG

On another page of this issue will be found a letter from Brother Clem Z. Pool, member and former president of the Board of Harding College, to H. H. Dawson, now president, resigning from the Board. It is evident that Brother Pool has made a very patient effort to get along with the Board and the College in the efforts to correct the irregularities in the Administration, and in the policies and teaching which have destroyed the confidence of so many brethren in Harding College. Brother Pool has indicated his intention of making a more detailed statement later. The brethren will be waiting for it. He knows whereof he speaks. He has been a friend of the College. He has been president of the Board. The brethren will take his word at face value on the situation at Harding College. Brother Pool says that he simply cannot “indorse the school in its failure to correct these errors” and instead of the condition being improved of late it continues “to grow rather worse.” These statements do not come from an enemy of the school, but from a man who has been its friend and supporter but who has despaired of correcting the policies of its present Administration.

The fact that Brother Batsell Baxter is being added to the faculty of Harding College will be of little value, if any. In going to Harding College, Brother Baxter becomes a part of a regime. He is not the head of the school; he is not even the head of a department. He becomes simply a teacher. But George S. Benson is still the president, J. N. Armstrong Head of the Bible department, and Clinton Davidson its general manager and ram-rodd. It is, in reality, Clinton Davidson’s school. He has furnished it the money to pay its debts and is making it possible for it to operate. What can Brother Baxter do in a set-up like that? His hands are tied. And even if they were not, to become a part of a regime financed and controlled by Clinton Davidson is a mistake, a bad mistake, a sad mistake, and some of Brother Baxter’s best friends, one of whom I certainly am, hate to see him do it.

Brother Baxter hopes to improve the situation. He said to me that if he did not succeed in “straightening it out” the first year he is there that he will not be there the second. Then in all probability he will not be there the second year. Because to straighten it out, he will not only have the task of straightening out J. N. Armstrong and George S. Benson, but he will have another impossible task-the
task of straightening out Clinton Davidson. Brother Baxter cannot do it. Moreover when he tries they will turn on him and crucify him. He does not know the men with whom he is having to deal, as some of us do. If and when they turn against him (eliminating the “if,” when Brother Baxter begins trying to straighten them out) it is my opinion, based on the knowledge of what these men have done in other instances, that they will try to ruin him if and when I say, he attempts to expose conditions in the administration of the college. I personally do not believe that Clinton Davidson and the Administration of Harding College would stop short of anything in an attempt to ruin any man who actively opposes them. I base this, opinion on the campaign of calumny that has been waged against other men, and the underworld methods that have been used to destroy them. Brother Baxter is not of the type and temperament to wage the kind of a fight he would have to wage to clean up Harding College. He would have to clean it out and again I say he cannot do it, with Armstrong and Benson at its head and Clinton Davidson back of it with his politics and money. Brother Baxter will inevitably do one of three things: 1. Go along with them and be a mere teacher in a bad regime; 2. Quit after, if not before, the first year is out; 3. Be crucified by Clinton Davidson and the Administration, if he makes any major attempt to “straighten them out.” I hate to see Brother Baxter get mixed up with Clinton Davidson and Harding College.

As for Davidson, he is on his way out so far as influence with the churches is concerned. His Christian Leader movement failed. He started it to vindicate the premillennial-Boll faction in the church, as developments have proved. It is stated on good evidence that Clinton Davidson said at its head and Clinton Davidson back of it with his politics and money. Brother Baxter will inevitably do one of three things: 1. Go along with them and be a mere teacher in a bad regime; 2. Quit after, if not before, the first year is out; 3. Be crucified by Clinton Davidson and the Administration, if he makes any major attempt to “straighten them out.” I hate to see Brother Baxter get mixed up with Clinton Davidson and Harding College.

As for Davidson, he is on his way out so far as influence with the churches is concerned. His Christian Leader movement failed. He started it to vindicate the premillennial-Boll faction in the church, as developments have proved. It is stated on good evidence that Clinton Davidson said in Chicago that he expected to make enough money out of the New Christian Leader to finance the Word and Work. But F. L. Rowe told John Allen Hudson out in California lately, according to Brother Hudson’s own statement, that the New Leader has less than 2,500 subscribers and is losing them all of the time. So Davidson’s aspirations with the New Leader failed, miserably failed. Davidson cannot live through the New Leader any longer, therefore, he will now attempt to live through Harding College. It was Davidson’s purpose, without question to dominate the church through a new type of Journalism, and the Christian Leader was his instrument. Having failed, he now seeks to control the church through some of the colleges, and Harding College is his choice as an instrument. Who believes he would finance it, if he could not, and did not, control it?

If for no other reason, the fact that Clinton Davidson is the ruling head of Harding College makes it the duty of all loyal brethren to repudiate the school, withdraw their support and patronage, and declare against such an institution fastening itself on Christian families in the churches of Christ in various parts of the country. If Davidson is to finance it and run it, and premillennialism is still to be taught in it or teachers of it condescending, let them do as Jorgenson’s songbook has done, establish “a noble symbol of unity” with somebody else and look to them for patronage and support, and not to the churches of Christ.

No one can blame Brother Pool for resigning from the board. For precisely the same reason Brother Baxter should not go to Harding College. Its utter untrustworthiness on vital issues has been repeatedly demonstrated. We shall await with interest Brother Pool’s “detailed explanation” for his resignation, and I have an idea that it will detail Harding College.

**CHURCH-SPLITTERS AND UNITY MEETINGS**

There is irony in these pretended National Unity Meetings. All the various groups participating in them are church-splitters. First of all, the Digressives are church-splitters. They minimize the music, talk patronizingly of the “dispute over music,” and speak of “a little thing like an organ” being made a test of fellowship—but they are entirely willing to split the church and keep it split over it. By splitting churches they have acquired over the years many meeting houses which they did not build nor pay for—they robbed the loyal people of their houses of worship in these places who did pay for them, but had no recourse other than give in or give up. They gave up their meeting houses, but not the church. They built again. They put the legal restrictive clause in the deeds this time and the Digressives cannot walk in and take them now. So they are trying it another way—by taking the church itself, gradually, through the propaganda of National Unity Meetings. They hope to break down opposition to the music, and through some of our “leaders” to break the spiritual morale of the “conservative brethren.” But the long list of their unrepentant digressive acts is yet on record. Let it be remembered that these very promoters of unity have always been, and still are, church-splitters.

The Premillennialists are also church-splitters. That group goes with every Unity Meeting. The Boll-Jorgenson party is always conspicuously represented and Jorgenson tries to steal the show, with his musical performances. In the Lexington Unity Meeting Jorgenson said that he would like to travel around with and lead the singing for a preacher like Lappin, a leading light in the Christian Church. The Christian Standard says that the use of Jorgenson’s song book will be “a noble symbol of unity” between them, so it may be that Jorgenson can land the job. But the Boll party are church-splitters, the Digressives are church-splitters—and they are the one in the so-called “unity meetings.” The trouble is, they are too short on unity and too long on splits.

The majority rule element within the churches are also church-splitters, and they have joined the “unity meeting” parade. Some of the speakers at the last National Unity Meeting in Lexington have espoused the majority rule procedure in the churches. One of these speakers said to me personally a few years ago when he was having trouble with the church he was preaching for, that the elders were trying to “cut” his salary and that he was going to “kick them out,” and he did, resorting to majority rule procedure to do it. This man was right in the middle of the Lexington Unity Meeting. That element in the churches of Christ are following these great Unity (?) Meetings around, and are as vociferous for unity as if they cared something for it. Much of their declaiming in these Unit-less meetings is directed at our own brethren. They who claim to be of the churches of Christ, conniving with the Digressives on unity, stand before a convocation of compromisers to lambast their own brethren and praise the Digressives! To call them traitors to the Cause of Christ is to put it mildly. I don’t know exactly what they think their potage will be, but they are selling their birthright. They should be, and if they keep on, will be disowned by the loyal churches. Ernest Beam, in Long Beach, California, has-declared for Unity Meetings. He told some Digressive preachers, in the presence of Brother John A. Hudson and me, that he would like to have the Unity Meeting come to California, and repeated once every year. It is well known that Brother Beam is an exponent of the church-dividing, majority-rule doctrine. He advocated the election of elders once every year, and has been direct: ly connected with two or three split-wide-open church divisions in Long Beach. So this group within the churches of Christ following the Unity Meetings are majority-rule church-splitters. They have more in common with the Christian Churches than with churches of Christ, they be-
lieve alike on a number of things, especially on splitting churches.

The other group within churches of Christ that court the National Unity Meetings are the promoters of ethical journalism and ethical preaching. Clinton Davidson, the head of this movement, has done all within his physical and financial power to divide the sentiment of the churches of Christ throughout the nation. He quit the church years ago because he did not like “the alleged church of Christ,” and went to the digressives. During that time, it now comes out, that he also fraternized with the Baptists. (He was in the insurance business, you know) After twenty years he comes back to the church, without any “fruits meet for repentance” whatsoever, launches an invasion to either take it over or split it. And this group has followed the National Unity Meeting.

The gruesome fact is that there is not a single element connected with the Unity Meetings that does not have a church-splitting record. What "a noble symbol of unity," indeed! The loyal brethren are learning that the National Unity Meetings, and those men who go along with them, will do to let alone.

JAMES E. WHITE, THE INDIAN EVANGELIST

While some of the preachers among us who ought to be stable and firm are wabbling on the spindle, it is refreshing to find an Indian gospel preacher who will stand for the truth under a crucial test. James E. White has done this in connection with the Indian work at Oneida, Wis. Here is the story.

The church at Flint, Mich., has had charge of Brother White’s work, and the contributions for the support of this work have been sent to the Flint church. Sometime ago Barney D. Morehead asked Brother White to report his missionary work through him and his missionary medium. Knowing that Morehead is connected with the Christian Leader-Davidson movement, and also that he is operating a one-man missionary agency, Brother White refused to report his work to Morehead. Whereupon Barney D. Morehead puts on some more pressure to induce him to do so. Brother White stood firm. Then the church at Flint proposed to report his work and solicit contributions through Don Carlos Janes, the premillennial-Bollite set-up at Louis ville, and also insisted that he should report to Morehead at Nashville. Brother White still stood his ground and told the Flint church that he would not be aligned with these groups in any manner at all, and did not want any support from those sources. As a result, the church at Flint has served official notice on Brother White that they will not back him, nor “sponsor” his work longer, seeing that he is operating a one-man missionary society. Knowing that Morehead is connected with the Christian Leader-Davidson movement, and also that he is operating a one-man missionary agency, Brother White refused to report his work to Morehead. Whereupon Barney D. Morehead puts on some more pressure to induce him to do so. Brother White stood firm. Then the church at Flint proposed to report his work and solicit contributions through Don Carlos Janes, the premillennial-Bollite set-up at Louis ville, and also insisted that he should report to Morehead at Nashville. Brother White still stood his ground and told the Flint church that he would not be aligned with these groups in any manner at all, and did not want any support from those sources. As a result, the church at Flint has served official notice on Brother White that they will not back him, nor “sponsor” his work longer, seeing that he rejects their demands to link up with Janes and Morehead and the New Christian Leader.

There the matter stands. To say that I admire the conviction of this Indian preacher, and praise his pluck, is too mild. My spirit has stirred within me. He has put to shame some of the weaklings, who call themselves preachers, among us. His action is a challenge. And the brethren should go to his assistance at once.

A letter, to me from Guy N. Woods, who is well known to all the brethren, will serve to emphasize the importance of supporting Brother White at this time.

Dear Brother Wallace:

I closed a meeting last night with Brother James E. White and the Indian congregation on the Oneida reservation in Wisconsin, and am to begin tonight in Stevens Point, Wisconsin.

Four were baptized and a number of others are all most asemed and will surely be baptized by Brother White at a distant date. Brother White is doing one of the most outstanding works here I have seen in any mission field.

Notwithstanding the fact that the Work is only about two years old, fifty-one have been baptized to date and many others have been effectively evangelized and will obey the gospel soon. Denominationalism, as represented by the Episcopal, Methodist, and Lutheran Churches, is dead, and has been in its grave for some time. The Churches have been forced to abandon their Sunday evening services—at which time Brother White has the largest attendance. The time seems especially ripe for a thorough evangelization program to be launched in these parts.

In view of these facts it is especially unfortunate that the Flint church, thus far the sponsor of Brother White’s work, should, by methods that “out-Hitler Hitler,” attempt to force the Christian Leader and Indian Mission. But this is what they have done, and it is imperative that another sponsor be found soon if the confidence that thus far has obtained in the work by the Southern Congregations be maintained. The time has come that Brother White must bow to the “One-man-missionary-society” for his support or see the work fail, if another sponsor cannot be found. We must not permit the work to fail and I am therefore appealing to you to join us in an appeal to some strong southern congregations to assume the oversight of the Work. I pledge myself to encourage churches in the southland to rally to the support, and I have no doubt that all of us working together can see that Brother White has adequate support. He has received less than sixty-five dollars per month, the last two months.

Until some congregation interested enough in the Indian work, which is located in the proper section to look after it, will take it over, the brethren should send immediate contributions direct to James E. White, Indian Mission, Oneida, Wisconsin. And I join Brother Woods in his effort to rally the brethren to Brother White’s support. Send him a contribution now. I do not think any one need fear that he will receive too much, and he will report what he receives through the Bible Banner, until other arrangements are made.

THE LUBBOCK SUBSTITUTE

A few weeks ago, in the several papers, G. C. Brewer announced that he was going to Harding College to give the young preachers of that institution the benefit of his great “experience as an evangelist, writer, debater, local church leader,” so forth and so on to include too much for one man to know everything about. It was announced also, by himself, that he had with much persuasion induced the Lubbock church to let him go, at least, on leave of absence. (It is a very common thing and quite ethical, for men to quit, on leave of absence!)

But somebody threw a monkey wrench into something (imagine that) and the young preachers at Harding College are going to have to get along without Brother Brewer’s diversified experience.

Meanwhile, however, another man was engaged to be Brother Brewer’s substitute during the “leave of absence.” Brother E. Gaston Collins, of Tennessee, was engaged—of course, upon Brother Brewer’s recommendation. what of that—do you say? It is this: Brother Collins is a premillennial and Boll sympathizer. This is not a matter of hearsay. His record will prove it. His associates know it, and there is no one who knows Brother Brewer better than I do. Brother Brewer would have recommended him for the place if he had not been one, or some other kind of a compromiser. It was Brother Brewer who recommended H. L. Oldmstead to the old Poplar Street church in Florence, Alabama, a few years ago, and also brought Olmstead to Sherman, Texas, for a meeting while he lived there—and H. L. Oldmstead is a rank premillennialist, a fact which Brother Brewer must have known.

Brother Brewer loudly disclaims being a premillennialist, but he favors the men who think that way and act that way and talk that way. He must be a little that way. If Brother Collins denies being a premillennialist, or believing
the doctrine, just let it be remembered that during all the time he was working in the Gospel Advocate office, F. B. Srygley was never able, not even once, to induce Brother Collins to declare against the doctrine nor to take a stand on the issue. And all who were associated with him, including myself, know that he went out of his way at all times to favor the premillennial group, indorse them, recommend them, compliment them—but was free in his criticisms of the opposition. That tells the tale. In other words, he is just like G. C. Brewer in that respect.

Just as Jesse P. Sewell introduced some of these Bollites to Texas several years ago through Abilene Christian College, Brother Brewer is now doing it through the Lubbock church. It can mean nothing but future trouble in the church through the gradual doctrinal weakening of the members. With Brewer and Collins at Lubbock we are witnessing the softening of a once strong and rugged church, and through it other churches in the great West Texas area are bound to become affected. When will the brethren ever become aroused to the gravity of these issues, and quit making mistakes in the selection of preachers that require years, sometimes a whole generation, to repair?

A question remains: Is it not passingly peculiar for a man who denies being a premillennialist, even asserts that he is against it, to invariably favor, commend and indorse men whose sympathies are known to be with the premillennial element among us? Consistency, come hither; 0, consistency, where art thou?

THE CASUALTIES OF WAR

In any major war there will be casualties—even among the innocent. It is utterly impossible for England to attack the military objectives of Germany in defense of herself, in bombing metropolitan areas, without inflicting a certain number of innocent casualties. The same is true of a defensive war on error. Counter offensives are imperative. They must be made; and with the offensives there will be offences.

Some will be heard to remark that it is very discouraging to have a fight going on among ourselves. That depends on what the objectives are. When an invasion of error is being met and repulsed; when teachers of error and designing men are being repulsed; when the frontiers of the church are being defended against the invaders—it should be very encouraging to see the fight going on, even when we have to take care of some “among ourselves” to keep our defense intact.

But if some who do not know, and won’t be told, what it is all about drop out, others grow faint-hearted and quit, and others collapse from heart failure and other causes connected with the din and the drone of battle-just remember they are the inevitable innocent casualties of war which cannot be avoided. But in the main the fight will save the church.

“CONGRATULATIONS, DOCTOR NICHOL”

That is the way the Firm Foundation concluded its commendatory remarks on the action of Abilene Christian College in conferring upon Brother C. R. Nichol the honorary degree of LL. D. That Brother Nichol possesses all of the merit and the knowledge, and is deserving of all “honor to whom honor is due,” of which the Firm Foundation speaks, is also my idea of it—that part of it.

But there is a principle involved in this Doctor business which is growing up in the church. Since when has come the urge to “Doctor” the preachers of the gospel by the “honorary” route? I was visiting with R. L. Whiteside a few days ago and these honorary degrees were mentioned. He remarked that they were “oney” degrees, instead.

Nearly every Baptist and Methodist preacher who has aspired to cheap fame has managed to get some ordinary school to confer one upon him. It seems to be about as empty as the laying on of hands would be in Quaker prayer meeting. Ben M. Bogard had quite a round with some of his Baptist colleagues and tried to convince them that he was quite entitled to the LL. D. (always honorary, or onery, as Brother Whiteside said). But Bogard persuaded some second class Baptist College to give him one, so he is now “Doctor Bogard.”

Sometime ago Harding College “conferred” the LL. D. on George S. Benson in “honor” of his signal service as a missionary in China (where he saw that sectarian preacher cast a devil out a Chink). Later, when G. C. Brewer made a Thanksgiving speech at Harding College, they handed one out to him on a Thanksgiving platter. (Brewer had been sighing for a degree of some kind for years, and what a relief it must have been). If I have not suffered mental fag, Brother Nichol poked fun at G. C. Brewer and his LL. D. from Harding College to me, and I believe he commended some jabs that were taken at it in the Firm Foundation by Cled and me. And lo! he receives one from Abilene. So far as the principle of the thing is concerned I would as soon have one from Harding, if I could get it without George S. Benson’s name on it!

A college of some respectability offered to confer upon Will Rogers, the nation’s late and lamented philosopher, an LL. D. degree. In his characteristic style Will Rogers asked the professors what they thought he wanted with the thing, and refused to accept it.

What effect will it have on the church in the very near future when our colleges “degree” our preachers with LL. D. and begin to call them Doctor, Doctor. And if we do not call them Doctor, then why the degree? Where would the “honor” be? If we do call them Doctor, how much better will our preachers be than ordinary sectarian in that respect? I simply insist that it will sectarianize the church, and make egotistical fools out of the preachers.

Brother Nichol missed an opportunity to teach the preachers and the colleges a lesson. Had he, like Will Rogers, refused to accept the empty thing and had told them why, it might have had a definite influence to check this Doctor business among us, if not stop it. It is possible that he could have made his refusal so effective as to have stopped the thing. Just what effect, on the other hand, will his acceptance of this A. C. C. honorary LL. D. have on the preachers and the colleges a lesson. Had he, like Will Rogers, refused to accept the empty thing and had told them why, it might have had a definite influence to check this Doctor business among us, if not stop it. It is possible that he could have made his refusal so effective as to have stopped the thing. Just what effect, on the other hand, will his acceptance of this A. C. C. honorary LL. D. have on the young preachers, who may aspire to be a Doctor, too, and upon our churches, too many of which are already pas-

“congratulations, doctor nichol”

So we have the Doctors. Let us see, there is-Doctor D. S. Ligon (who was the first to grab the title), Doctor G. C. Brewer, Doctor Jesse P. Sewell, and Doctor C. R. Nichol! “Congratulations, Doctor Nichol.”

Brother Nichol has let Abilene Christian College cheapen him. But it is the influence that it has upon the church that concerns us most. When we all grow indifferent to the things that are growing up in our midst the “sorrows of Zion,” the theme of Jeremiah’s Lamentations, will come upon us. Jeremiah asked: “Is it nothing to you, all ye that pass by?”

BROTHER HARPER’S EXPLANATION

On another page will be found an article by Brother E. R. Harper in explanation of his attitude toward Harding College and the recent “agreement” between him and the Administration. It has never been my aim to injure Broth-
er Harper, even when I felt called upon to write as I wrote. And I certainly have no disposition now to hinder him in the effort to repair any mistake which he sees has been made or to retrieve what has been temporarily lost by suspending the fight on the conditions in Harding College, which Brother Pool says have grown worse. I have no doubt at all as to the personal soundness of Brother Harper, nor of his love of the truth and his desire to be wholly loyal to it, even though I believed and still believe that the Cause for which we are fighting suffered a severe set-back in the agreement that was signed. But Brother Harper will have the radio facilities again over which to withdraw his indorsement of the school, which was announced after the agreement was signed. He needs these facilities to resume his fight, and we are glad he is to resume his radio work. E. R. Harper and B. G. Hope have both endured bitter persecution in Arkansas for their stand against the evils in Harding College. They have been put to the severest test. They need all the support loyal brethren in Arkansas can give them, and all the encouragement the rest of us can give. I not only regard them, as I have said before in the Bible Banner, as among the best of men, but also as personal friends, and nothing that has passed between us on the Harding College situation has affected this feeling on my part a particle. I gladly extend to Brother Harper the columns of the Bible Banner to take up the fight again, which he now believes, with Brother Pool, in the light of present conditions, should be resumed. Power to them to the end that they may make it effective.

**WATCHMAN, WHAT OF THE NIGHT?**

The loyal gospel preacher is in a very definite sense a watchman. To Timothy, a gospel preacher, Paul said, “watch thou in all things,” and he was referring especially to things pertaining to sound doctrine, which some in the time to come would not endure.

There are a host of gospel preachers throughout the brotherhood whose sentiments on such issues as the Murch-Witty Unity Meetings have not been known to the general public because of their lack of a medium of expression. The Christian Standard has exulted over these Unity Meetings, and through its columns the Digressive preachers are holding jubilees over what they think is their victory in these “unity love feasts” and feasters. It would doubtless surprise the Christian Standard and these digressive preachers, and the entire Christian Church, if they knew how many of our preachers were opposed to and thoroughly disgusted with these pseudo-unity feasts, and how much ashamed they are of those men among us who have shown such palpable weakness in these shams. There are many dozens of young preachers who have their feet on the ground on all of these issues. In many instances they have more stability than the older preachers are showing. It is my belief that the preachers of the churches of Christ are overwhelmingly against these Unity Meetings. It would have a wholesome effect on the churches, disillusion a lot of digressives, and serve as a rebuke to the promoters among us of such meetings, if all of these preachers, or a considerable number of them would speak out.

Under the spreading caption, “WHO KILLED COCK ROBIN?” the Bible Banner exposed the false claims of that “brotherhood survey” which pretended that 95% of the preachers were back of Clinton Davidson’s journalistic schemes, and it was shown to be a bald-faced assertion, an outright misrepresentation, little short, if any, of factual fraudulence. Men who will do things like that will do most anything, when they think they can get by with it.

I believe the same thing can be done on these hokus-pocus parties called “National Unity Meetings.” The impression that they represent the sentiment of any considerable part of our preachers and churches needs to be effectively relieved. The preachers can put an end to this propaganda, if they will.

Under the caption, “WATCHMAN, WHAT OF THE NIGHT?” the Bible Banner will publish expressions from the preachers, not only on this particular thing, but a brief summary of their views on the general outlook on these issues.

In addition to this, in this news and views section of the Bible Banner, a monthly summary of the preacher’s work is invited—a sort of the news-of-the-month report, since the Banner is a monthly, and not a weekly. This, the editor believes, may be even more readable and profitable than an every week report of the work.

May we hear from the preachers everywhere on these suggestions? The Bible Banner is waging a fight for the truth against multiple forms of error, and desires to enlist every gospel preacher who is a friend to the Cause it labors to uphold.

**AN ACKNOWLEDGEMENT**

The editor appreciates the many expressions of interest in The Bible Banner, being received from so many sources and from over such a wide area. Among these expressions are often personal messages and words of encouragement which “dig in” deep into the depths of my heart, where they lodge. To those who have told me that although they relished to the fullest the other editorials in the July and August numbers but nevertheless “missed” mine in those two issues, I have supplied “three-in-one” this time—and that all may know that I still sign my name to what I write, I subscribe myself the author of what has been written in the preceding editorial pages.—Foy E. Wallace, Jr.

**MEDDLING WITH THE CHURCHES**

(Continued From Page 1)

dreds percent angelic for his tirade against his brother editors. If a spoiled baby ever needed a spanking, I think Jimmie needs one.

I could be wrong in this, but Brother Jimmie, unintentionally I’m sure, seems to me to border at times on irreverence in referring to the Lord Jesus. He repeatedly remarks that “Brother Jesus says” so and so. I am aware that we are “joint-heirs” with Christ and that Jesus is our friend and has been referred to as an “elder-brother,” yet “Brother Jesus” as Brother Jimmie uses it carries a back-slapping familiarity that doesn’t exactly harmonize with my sense of reverence. He is Lord, exalted above angels and men, “who is on the right hand of God, having gone into heaven; angels and authorities and powers being made subject unto him.” Billy Sunday used to shock his audience by his irreverent familiarity with God in his prayers. Jesus is divine and “Brother Jesus” affects me about the same as “Brother God” would. Brother Jimmie reminds me of the linguistic habits of some of the colored people in my section of the country. The Lord Jesus sounds a lot more reverent then “Brother Jesus.”

Brother Jimmie has a poor opinion of the brethren generally, including himself. In spite of their acknowledged faults I think he does the brethren an injustice. He knows more about himself than I do. He says:

Almost any Christian Scientist knows more about the reading matter of the Bible than we who call ourselves Christians know, and the reason is they read the Bible more. If you get mad about that, just remember that you brought it on yourself. I am just as guilty as you.
Well, I'm not guilty and do not believe the brethren generally are. I'm not getting mad about it, I simply think its another one of the wild statements for which Jimmie is famous and which explains why brethren generally do not take him more seriously. It irks me a little more than a little to hear preachers brag on Adventists and Christian Scientists and Mormons and the like and slander the brethren. It doesn't do the cause of truth any good for one to use instruments to accompany worship and those who rank.

It doesn't find out by the "Errett-Jorgenson" song book deal, nor

al accompaniments are an addition to the music prescrib-

in worship" or Brother Errett declares; but over the addi-

tion of instrumental accompaniments to the music prescrib-

ed in the New Testament. That singing as worship is a di-

vine ordinance, will not be questioned in the face of 1 Cor.

14:15; Ephes. 5:18, 19; Col. 3:16; Heb. 2:12, and Heb. 13:15.

Therefore, there can be no trouble over this kind of music, and Brother Errett knows this, and he should have enough respect for facts to state the truth if it does hurt his cause. I would be glad for the readers of the Christian Standard to know what the trouble is about, but they cannot have both. The trouble is not "a dispute over music in worship" or Brother Errett declares; but over the addition of instrumental accompaniments to the music prescribed in the New Testament. That singing as worship is a divine ordinance, will not be questioned in the face of 1 Cor. 14:15; Ephes. 5:18, 19; Col. 3:16; Heb. 2:12, and Heb. 13:15.

Therefore, if Brother Errett does not believe that the Bible Banner is too far out on the idiotic fringe of the Murch religious journalism for him to notice, I will affirm that instrumental accompaniments are an addition to the music prescribed in the New Testament, if he will give me line for line in the Christian Standard. That would give me a chance to show Brother Errett's readers the differences between "maintaining the pitch secured at the beginning with a tuning fork" and carrying the pitch along by the constant accompaniment of a piano or organ." If Brother Errett will not notice me, I predict he is going to keep fiddling around with his "instrumental accompaniments" till he gets the editor of the Gospel Advocate after him, and that will be worse than the Bible Banner, because the Advocate is nearer the "Murch" equatorial journalism.

A NOBLE PURPOSE-BUT AN IGNoble EFFort

JOHN T. LEWIS

I think the above characterizes Edwin R. Errett's editorial in the Christian Standard of August 31, 1940. Read it.

A NOBLE SYMBOL OF UNITY

So regrettable is the alienation between the brethren who use instruments to accompany worship and those who can not conscientiously do so, that any means we may discover, whereby we may draw these brethren together and lead them to express such unity as they do possess, ought to awaken in us a hearty greeting. And when that means possesses a glory of its own, it is doubly welcome. It is, therefore, a matter for unusual exultation that the Standard Publishing Company has joined hands with E. L. Jorgenson in the promotion and sale of the excellent hymn book of which he is the compiler, "Great Songs of the Church."

It is particularly happy circumstances that with alienation caused by a dispute over music in worship, we are not only encouraged not to sing the same hymns, but to sing from a common hymnbook. And the stimulus is made greater by the fact that such a large number of the hymns are those which have been the favorites of the parents and grandparents of the present generation.

If there were no estrangement at all, it would be an accomplishment worthy of brotherhood-wide approbation that a hymnal of such quality has been developed within our ranks.

It would be "a noble symbol of unity," if all God's people would sing the same songs, provided the songs were spiritual, and offered as "the fruit of our lips," but when instrumental accompaniments are added to the divine perrogative-singing and making melody in your hearts to the Lord—we have not "a noble symbol of unity," but an impossibility of unity. No one knows this better than the editor of the Christian Standard unless he has mistaken the pussy-footing of the "Murch-Witty" farcical unity meetings for the real sentiment of those who stand for the unity that Christ prayer for-unity only upon God's word. I am glad Brother Errett knows, and admits, that there are those' "who cannot conscientiously" worship with those "who use instruments to accompany their worship." Therefore, Brother Errett's position on Christian unity presents two alternatives. Either let those who have added instrumental accompaniments to their worship drop them, or let those "who cannot conscientiously worship with the instruments" stultify their conscience, and violate the word of God by worshipping with them. One of these things must be done, or the division must continue, which will Brother Errett recommend? He can worship with me and violate neither his conscience nor the Word of God, I cannot worship with him, and his instruments, without violating both my conscience and the Word of God. I hope therefore Brother Errett will not be so deceived by the Errett-Jorgenson business combine, and the Murch-Witty Unity (?) meetings to believe that the thousands of conscientious Christian men and women who respect the authority of Christ will ever worship with instrumental music, or will ever cease fighting its use in the worship. Every innovation in the work and worship of the church has grown out of a lack of respect for the authority of Christ, but there are legions in the Church who still respect the authority of Christ, as presented in the New Testament and accept it as our last and final appeal in all matters of faith and practice. The Christian Standard and its constituents can have our fellowship without those innovations; but never with them. They are the sole arbiters in this matter, which had they rather have? They cannot have both. The trouble is not "a dispute over music in worship" or Brother Errett declares; but over the addition of instrumental accompaniments to the music prescribed in the New Testament. That singing as worship is a divine ordinance, will not be questioned in the face of 1 Cor. 14:15; Ephes. 5:18, 19; Col. 3:16; Heb. 2:12, and Heb. 13:15.

Therefore, if Brother Errett does not believe that the Bible Banner is too far out on the idiotic fringe of the Murch religious journalism for him to notice, I will affirm that instrumental accompaniments are an addition to the music prescribed in the New Testament, if he will give me line for line in the Christian Standard. That would give me a chance to show Brother Errett's readers the differences between "maintaining the pitch secured at the beginning with a tuning fork" and carrying the pitch along by the constant accompaniment of a piano or organ." If Brother Errett will not notice me, I predict he is going to keep fiddling around with his "instrumental accompaniments" till he gets the editor of the Gospel Advocate after him, and that will be worse than the Bible Banner, because the Advocate is nearer the "Murch" equatorial journalism.
There can be no real New Testament churches without preachers and elders, and there can be no peace and harmony in the churches unless they appreciate their mission, their duty, and their relationship to the churches. As an illustration, fire and water are two of the most necessary elements for the comfort and existence of the human family, but when they go on a rampage, and get out of control, they become the most destructive elements to the human race.

So it is with preachers and elders, when they become negligent of their duty, or disregard the obligations, and restraints that the New Testament places upon them, they become the most destructive elements to the human race. They diminish the power of the church to teach, and influence people for the higher ideals of life, and begin to seek preferment and popularity, instead of the respect and appreciation of the church and membership.

Again Paul said: “0 Timothy, guard that which is committed unto thee, turning away from the profane babblings and nonsensical notions of the world, and the saying of old wives fables” (2 Timothy 4:2). And there is a corresponding responsibility for the membership to guard and respect the ministry of the church. Without this respect and appreciation of the church and membership, much of the trouble in congregations today, and there is plenty of it, grows out of a lack of appreciation, upon the part of preachers and elders, of their duties and responsibilities, and the seriousness of their work.

Preachers and elders should never allow their thinking toward other members to make the impression that they feel themselves above the membership; but they should never become too common with the members. Thirty-five or forty years ago, in Middle Tennessee where I grew up, the names of Lipscomb, Harding, Sewell, McQuiddy, Elam, Kurfees, Larimore, Smith, Strygley, and others were household words. Their names carried weight and respect with the churches. I have no recollection of ever hearing church members addressing those brethren by such vocatives as “hello preacher,” or laughing in their presence and telling what the “preacher” said or did. In those days gospel preachers commanded some respect, and church members addressed them as “Brother” So-And-So. In most places today it is “preacher” or Mr. So-And-So. Gospel preachers are frequently made the butt of all kinds of jokes by the riff-raff of the congregation. This is what I call getting too common with people.

The church is the only blood bought institution in the world the institution through which every responsible being must pass to enter “the eternal kingdom of our Lord and Savior Jesus Christ.” I respect every member of the church who respects him or herself, and I have a right to expect the same respect. There must be a cause for this lowering of respect for gospel preachers on the part of the rank and file of the membership. I believe the preachers themselves are responsible for this unfortunate condition. I do not mean that all gospel preachers are responsible; but when the gospel preacher’s profession or calling has been put on a low plane, the churchmen are frequently made the butt of all kinds of jokes by the preachers who have no sense of appreciation of their sphere and influence in the world, all have to suffer with them.

Paul said to Timothy: “Take heed to thyself, and to thy teaching. Continue in these things; for in doing this thou shalt save both thyself and them that hear thee” (1 Timothy 4:16). There are too many preachers today who are neither taking heed to themselves nor to their teaching. Again Paul said: “0 Timothy, guard that which is committed unto thee, turning away from the profane babblings and omissions of the knowledge which is falsely so called; which some professing have erred concerning the faith” (1 Timothy 6:20,31). Whenever preachers today cease to “guard that which is committed to them” the responsibility of teaching and influencing people for the higher ideals of life, and begin to seek preferment and popularity by catering to the whims of the worldly minded in the church, if elders do their duty, trouble will be inevitable.

Paul says: “For there must be also factions among you, that they that are approved may be made manifest among you” (1 Cor. 11:19). We go on with the preacher’s duty, as taught by Paul. “Give diligence to present thyself approved unto God, a workman that needeth not to be ashamed, handling aright the word of truth” (2 Timothy 2:15). The preacher therefore that heeds this admonition of Paul will not have much time for pop or “pastoral calls” with the sisters while their husbands are at work. During the thirty and three years that I have lived in Birmingham, Alabama, few and far apart have been the calls that I have made with the sisters while their husbands were away. By this I mean to cast no reflection or insinuation upon anybody, I simply do not believe that visiting the sisters is the preacher’s work or duty. We have neither command, example, nor necessary inference, for the practice, in the New Testament.

Paul’s final charge to Timothy, is found in 2 Timothy 4:1-5: “I charge thee in the sight of God, and of Christ Jesus, who shall judge the living and the dead, and by his appearing and his kingdom; preach the word; be urgent in season, out of season; reprove, rebuke, exhort, with all longsuffering and teaching. For the time will come when they will not endure the sound doctrine; but having itching ears, will heap to themselves teachers after their own lusts: and will turn away their ears from the truth, and turn aside unto fables. But be thou sober in all things, suffer hardship, do the work of an evangelist, fulfill thy ministry.” This is the most solemn charge that was ever given by inspiration. The destiny of the world and the church is involved in it. It is clearly implied or stated that there will be “itching ears,” and that there will be preachers to “tickle them.” Preachers can preach on the love of God Always; but never “reprove and rebuke” sin in the church, and utterly fail to fulfill Paul’s charge. All such preachers become the “fifth column” element among those who “will not endure the sound doctrine.” And sometimes the very elect is deceived by their fair speech and pleasing manners. Paul knew what preaching the gospel had brought upon him, and he knew “reproving and rebuking” sin would bring hardships upon any preacher, therefore, he said to Timothy: “Be thou sober in all things, suffer hardship, do the work of an evangelist, fulfill thy ministry.” The work of an evangelist, therefore, is to “preach the word, reprove, rebuke, exhort with all long suffering and teaching.” But the preacher who lights his cigarette by the time he gets out of the pulpit, gives, or attends card parties with the sisters, goes to the movies, to the mixed bathing pools, goes to all kinds of ball games, on Lord’s Days, as well as on other days where the animal man runs rife—drinking, cursing, and gambling—there is not much for him to “reprove and rebuke,” and his exhorting would have about the same effect with sensible people as the branding of a donkey. However, if the elders decided to do some “reproving and rebuking,” it would be an easy matter for the preacher to muster up enough “votes” among the women and children to put the faithful elders out, and put some of his own kind in. Of course that would be turning the church into a mob, and bringing the cause, for which Christ died, into disrepute in the community.

Again Paul said to Timothy: “If thou put the brethren in mind of these things, thou shalt be a good minister of Christ Jesus, nourished in the words of the faith, and of the good doctrine which thou hast followed until now: but refuse profane and old wives fables. And exercise thyself unto godliness; for bodily exercise is profitable for a little; but godliness is profitable for all things, having promise of the life which now is, and of that which is to come. Faithful is the saying, and worthy of all acceptation. For to this end we labor and strive, because we have our hope set on the living God, who is the Savior of all men, specially of them that believe. These things command and teach. Let no
man despise thy youth: but be thou an example to them that believe, in word, in manner of life, in love, in faith, in purity. Till I come, give heed to reading, to exhortation, to teaching” (1 Timothy 4:6-13). This is the only kind of preachers, and preaching that will save the church today. I believe there are some as humble, faithful, consecrated, “making themselves ensamples to the flock.” Paul nearly any one can come along and do the same. They are millstones around the necks of faith, courage, and knowledge of God’s word, to mea-
sure up to this high calling; but the promised reward is not the same. The duty of the congregations to such elders is stated in Heb. 13:17, “Obey them that have the will of God, and lead away disciples after them.” They do not hesitate to tell people that certain preachers, and their kind of preaching is out of date. They expect people to accept their degrees as a substitute for the knowledge of God’s word. College degrees will not hurt gospel preachers who have common sense and faith in the Bible; but if they lack these things then college degrees are a curse both to them and to the cause. When I hear of a young preacher advising elders that their preacher is too old, that they need a younger man, and then tell about his degrees, and how many hours he has had under Dr. X or Dr. Y., I get mighty sick about where my belt is. The great work that they have done for the church (?) is about like the miracles of Mormon elders, in fields you know nothing about.

The novice that has been appointed to the eldership, “the things which befit the sound doctrine,” how aged men and aged women should live, and what aged women should teach young women, he said: “These things speak and exhort and reprove with all authority. Let no man despise these.” Of course, “training the young women to love their husbands, to love their children, to be sober-minded, chaste, workers at home, kind, being in subjection to their own hus-
band, that the word of God be not blasphemed,” is out of date with the bobbed haired, pleasure seeking, club working, card playing, movie going, dancing, cigarette smoking, drinking, and cursing element. Do I not believe that all the worldly element in the church are guilty of all these things, and that usually follows; but all are guilty of some of them, and “reproving and rebuking” any of them, brings their wrath down upon the head of any preacher who would dare raise his voice against any of them. Neither do I believe that it is only the young preachers who cater to the whims of the worldly element. If all preachers would follow Paul’s course as stated in Gal. 1:10, the church would be a different institution, for good, in the world today. “For am I now seeking the favor of men, or of God? Or am I striving to please men? If I were still pleasing men, I should not be a servant of Christ.”

We will now notice the elders’ side of the picture. “The elders therefore among you I exhort, who am a fellow-elder, and a witness of the sufferings of Christ, who am also a partner of the glory that shall be revealed; Tend the flock of God which is among you, exercising the over sight, not of constraint, but willingly, according to the will of God; nor yet for filthy lucre, but of a ready mind; neither as lording it over the charge allotted to you, but making yourselves ensamples to the flock. And when the chief Shepherd shall be manifested, ye shall receive the crown of glory that fadeth not away” (1 Peter 5:1-4). It takes men of faith, courage, and knowledge of God’s word, to mea-
sure up to this high calling; but the promised reward is enough to make or encourage all elders to strive to fill their high mission. The duty of the congregations to such elders is stated in Heb. 13:17, “Obey them that have the rule over you, and submit to them: for they watch in behalf of your souls, as they that shall give account; that they may do this with joy, and not with grief; for this were unprofitable for you.” I do not believe that there are many elders today who fully appreciate the seriousness of their responsibility in “tending the flock of God among them,” and “making themselves ensamples to the flock.” Paul said to the elders of Ephesus: “Take heed unto yourselves, and to all the flock, in which the Holy Spirit hath made you bishops, to feed the church of the Lord which he purchased with his own blood. I know that after my departing grievous wolves shall enter in among you, not sparing the flock; and from among your own selves shall men arise, speaking perverse things, to draw away the disciples after them.” (Acts 20:28-30) Nearly any one can come along today, and tell the elders he is a preacher, and they will put him up to preach. Paul’s charge to the elders of Ephesus ought to serve as a warning against such things. It also shows that elders themselves may depart from the faith, and leave away disciples after them. But preachers, and congregations too, should be slow about making or receiving charges against elders. Paul says: “Against an elder receive not an accusation, except at the mouth of two or three witnesses. Them that sin reprove in the sight of all, that the rest also may be in fear. I charge thee in the sight of God, and Christ Jesus, and the elect angels, that thou observe these things without prejudice, doing nothing by partiality” (1 Timothy 5:19-21). Therefore reproving elders that sin, is a solemn duty, and a serious charge upon gospel preachers, but it should be done as a matter of duty, and not in a personal or partisan spirit. I do not believe that preachers and elders should go around with long faces as though they lived in cemeteries; but I do believe that more solemnity and less foolishness should characterize their lives, and actions. There would be more spirituality among the churches today, if preachers and elders would move in their God given spheres, faithfully discharging their duties.

The novice that has been appointed to the eldership, and the young preacher whose burning desire is not the salvation of souls, nor building up the church; but a position with its emoluments, publicity, and popularity, seldom get to the top of fool’s hill, and where they operate you will find jealousy, faction, confusion and every vile deed. May God help elders appreciate the fact that they occupy one of the most responsible positions in the world, and may He help preachers to preach the gospel on a life or death proposition. This way, and this way alone, can elders and preachers demand and command the respect of People. There is no place in the church for a sissy elder, nor a compromising preacher. They are millstones around the neck of the church.

A LETTER OF RESIGNATION

Austin, Ark., Sept. 10, 1940. Mr. H. H. Dawson, Harding College, Searcy, Arkansas. Dear Brother Dawson: To you as president of the Board of Directors of Harding College, I am tendering my resignation as a member of the Board, effective upon receipt of this letter. Because of the policy of the school, and no prospects of a change in policy, I find myself unable to continue as a member of the Board. I appreciate the fact that no public criticism has been made on my position during the eight years I have served on the Board—two years of which I was president. In the very near future, I shall give you a detailed ex-
planation for my resignation. With kindest personal re-
ards, I am, Your Brother In Christ-Clem Z. Pool.
It was the way, at that time, we honestly thought—coming to my office asking for help and telling me about the Board of Harding; we had letters to prove that Premillennialism was being taught in the school; boys were taking place until we published this thing. Brother Benson is his Christian privilege. But it was not a deliberate let-down. It was the way, at that time, we honestly thought was the “best” way to get that for which he and I had been fighting. It was not an idea of selling out the truth, as some of the readers of the Banner may have thought.

As to my thinking, it was urgent to publish the material I sent to him and the publication of that material was the thing that brought them to us with a definite offer to clean it up, if we would shift our fight from without to within, carrying on the fight. We were hoping to get “inside the camp” where the fighting could be at “close range” and the “bull’s eye” more easily hit. It might have been a mistake, but it was an honest one, not a “compromise nor white-wash.”

He also suggested that “There has been a let-down for the truth.” It may be that this was true. We are not denying that nor criticizing him for even suggesting it. That is his Christian privilege. But it was not a deliberate let-down. It was the way, at that time, we honestly thought was the “best” way to get that for which he and I had been fighting. It was not an idea of selling out the truth, as some of the readers of the Banner may have thought.

As to my thinking, it was urgent to publish the material I sent to him and the publication of that material was the thing that brought them to us with a definite offer to clean it up, if we would shift our fight from without to within, carrying on the fight. We were hoping to get “inside the camp” where the fighting could be at “close range” and the “bull’s eye” more easily hit. It might have been a mistake, but it was an honest one, not a “compromise nor white-wash.”

This is to thank Brother Wallace for his personal offer to me to write an article in reference to his interview with me concerning me, in the January issue of the Bible Banner, or rather to write my explanation regarding this affair.

In his article he suggested that it had “every appearance of a compromise, a mere white-wash,” and to those who did not understand, I can see how that it might have looked that way; and for that there is no objection to be offered. However, it was not a compromise nor was it a “white-wash.” It was but a “shifting of battle grounds” to carry on the fight. We were hoping to get “inside the camp” where the fighting could be at “close range” and the “bull’s eye” more easily hit. It might have been a mistake, but it was an honest one, not a “compromise nor white-wash.”

Now about the statement, “The school must have got that right around and entered a peace pact with Harding College on mere assurance, etc.” Now this may have been a mistake, and things have turned out which make me feel certain that it was a mistake, but if the background of all this were clearly understood, I believe that you would see why we thought we did the only thing, right then, that looked like would bring about the desired results.

Just here let me briefly state the background of our action. We had gathered the proof that Brother Armstrong is a Premillennialist; we have proven that Brother Benson had been one when he went to China and that he still believed that the “devil was not bound and would not be until the millennium, which is in the future.” This his name is signed to, after becoming President of Harding; that Brother Benson would not deny that miracles today could be performed and gave a Holiness preacher in China as the one whom he claimed had performed the miracle; we had proven that Premillennialism was, and had been all along, on the Board of Harding; we had letters to prove that Premillennialism was being taught in the school; boys were coming to my office asking for help and telling me about such teachings.

I got busy and meetings were held and various things took place until we published this thing. Brother Benson came to us through Brother Glenn E. Green and promised us that he would organize a Bible Department for the express purpose of teaching the truth and exposing error, and told me in person that if Brother Armstrong did not stop his teaching it in the classes, and his going to Louisville and running with that crowd, he would retire him and that he would like to have it done then, but as we in Arkansas know, Brother Benson can’t do it with Brother Armstrong’s son-in-law a member of the School Board, and Dean of the college, and Brother Rhodes who has been a teacher under Brother Armstrong for thirty or forty years, a member of the Board, and others placed on the Board by Brother Arm-strong. But Brother Benson admitted publicly that he had been wrong on these matters and that he was now convinced that the Boll crowd was wrong and that he was fighting Premillennialism, in a way, here in Arkansas. His pleadings with us and his promises to us, to give him a chance with our help behind his efforts to clean it up, some way got to our hearts, and we felt this way about the matter: If Brother Benson had really been converted to the truth and was against these errors, if he really had wanted to clean it up and give us a school on the right side, that through him as its president, and some members of the Board that we knew would fight with him, if he really had made up his mind to fight, knowing that they were having trouble in the school among themselves (in that Brother Benson and Brother Armstrong, and especially Mrs. Armstrong and Brother Benson, were not agreeing); that with such a condition as this, we could work our way into the Bible Department with Brother Benson and bring it out afterward, clean. If that could not be done we knew that it was trouble in Arkansas, and to-day the church is hurt beyond the power of words to express. Oklahoma, Texas, Tennessee, and other states are not faced with the seriousness of this affair as are we, and we were not “compromising nor whitewashing” the truth, we were trying to use our best judgment as to how we might get the Bible Department in the hands of sound men.

I never entirely gave up hopes along this line until Brother West came and looked the situation over, and we watched the reactions then and after. I decided that it could not be done, and Brother West wrote me that he would not come under the circumstances, and I did not blame him. Even then I thought it to be the fault of Brother Armstrong and one or two others, and not the fault of Brother Benson, only in that he just could not carry out his plans. But since that, I have some private letters sent to me that show Brother Benson never did intend to do anything about Brother Armstrong and other affairs, about which you shall know, and they have convinced me that we were deceived in Brother Benson’s intentions. So after all it was not intended by us “to turn right around and enter a peace pact with Harding College.” We thought we had a way into the “temple” where we could render help in cleansing it of its money changers and Boll sympathizers. In this we were mistaken.

Now about the statement, “The school must have got the drop on Brother Harper and brought him out with his
hands up,” I just have this to say: Nobody got the drop on me. No one threatened me in the least, if I did not. There was no pressure only the eagerness to, in some way, get sound men in the school that would eventually have charge of the Bible Department, when they retire Brother Armstrong, and that is as soon as it will be done, if ever it is done. As to my hands being “up” they have never been put up because some one gets the drop on me. So what I did was not from “getting the drop on me.” I thought we had an opportunity to win the fight, for which the Bible Banner and others had been fighting.

As to my having to “surrender or be scalped,” let me say no new threats had been made on me that I had not been under for two years. I have fought some hard battles, and been in some close places, but no man in Arkansas, who knows this fight from its beginning, would ever say that I was afraid of the devil much less Harding College, or any one else. I am just like Brother Wallace, they can have my scalp but I will never surrender. There is a difference in “surrendering to save your scalp” and making an honest effort to crush error and win the victory for the truth, even though you make a mistake. My letters to them through all this will show that we never surrendered for one moment, but all the time fought, and that for the truth. I am not afraid when the truth is finally revealed. I wonder if some times all of us have not changed our methods, at times, thinking it the best way to win our point or our fight? Think it over. Yet we had not done so to surrender nor to save our scalp.

As to the expression or suggestion that the Banner will not be “turned over to someone who hits and runs,” I hate this to say. We did not mean to “hit and run.” We felt that our “hit” had, maybe, brought us a “run.” In that we were mistaken, but not “running away.” When the agreement was made, with it was a letter to Brother Wallace, which letter was accepted by them as our understanding of what the agreement meant. Here is a part of it just to show what we had not taken out. It was written on, Saturday before Thanksgiving.

“As to the expression or suggestion that the Banner will not be “turned over to someone who hits and runs,” I hate this to say. We did not mean to “hit and run.” We felt that our “hit” had, maybe, brought us a “run.” In that we were mistaken, but not “running away.” When the agreement was made, with it was a letter to Brother Wallace, which letter was accepted by them as our understanding of what the agreement meant. Here is a part of it just to show what we had not taken out. It was written on, Saturday before Thanksgiving.

“I will never betray the truth, neither will I ever compromise the truth. But if, at last, we have an opportunity to work out our differences in our state for the future good of the church in this state, then I feel that those who know me and how I feel about premillennialism, will trust this job to me and my faithful brethren who in the Banner stood so loyally behind me, and then the many whose names did not appear in the Banner, but who are faithful to the principles in that issue of the fight the Banner did appear. We will ever be watching, and, if at any time in the future we should see that we are being betrayed, certainly we will do as we have always done. But we believe that such will not really happen, will to work it out if we can enjoy the confidence of the brotherhood, and if they will leave it up to me and trust my loyalty to the truth and forget the things that will be said “etc.” This letter was mailed to Brother Wallace. I really thought that this would show that we had done everything but “dance to the music,” “compromise and whitewash,” “surrender or be scalped,” “come out with our hands up,” or even “hit and run.” It seemed to me that what we sent to Brother Wallace’s address yesterday was a “surrender” of what we had their “hands up,” and they were ready to “surrender,” it was in my heart about me. He considered the agreement hurt our fight, having the same effect on the fight being made as if it had been intentionally done by us to surrender the truth. I have, the above article is put to explain my motives, that all who read Brother Wallace’s criticism, may know that I did not mean to stop my fight against error at Harding College, nor compromise the truth, and I accept his explanation of his criticism, and allow him to put his own meaning on his criticism.

Brother Wallace has fought the fight that has saved the church, or may be I should say, has lead the fight in my day at least, that has saved the church from the evils of premillennial defenders, and I am thankful for his defense and his courage, and there rests no personal feelings in our hearts toward each other, only those feelings that bind Christian men together in the fight for truth. I have done my best to write this plainly, yet without any feeling of resentment, revenge, or unkind criticism. We are all men, and sometimes we may not understand perfectly, and make mistakes? but men, Christian men, who love the truth, can always find their way to the path of Christian fellowship if they are looking for that.

Brother- Wallace and I have fought too hard to let the enemy “loat” over an honest misunderstanding or mistake, that has for some months kept us, so far as the paper is concerned, apart in this fight.

E. R. Harper.

SOME SCRIPTS AND POSTSCRIPTS

I appreciate having a part in your good magazine. . . Power to you in the good fight you are making. May the “Strength of Israel” ever be your support and stay in the work.—Homer Hailey, Abilene, Texas.

You have killed Bollism so dead that it will never rise again. . . Many of us make mistakes, but you made no mistake when you took up the fight against Bollism, and you have the job done.—Joe H. Blue, Salem, Ark.

The Bible Banner has my approval that will get the job done.—R. L. Colley, Texarkana, Texas.

I am Pulling for you and will continue to do so as long as you are in the fight for the right. Call me when you need me.—J. L. Colley, Superintendent, of Schools, Trenton, Tenn.

The Bible Banner is doing great work in slowing down the Boll faction.—H. M. Phillips, Murreeesboro, Tenn.

I sometimes wonder just where we might have been had it not been for the fight you have made against subversive activities in the church. Instead of a general sell-out, like the Horse Cave (Ky) stench, it has simmered down to the faction that are the refuge (?) for those who have never been in sympathy with the preaching and activities in the church. —C. L. Taylor, Louisville, Ky.

I consider this the best investment of any dollar spent by me during a long life of 65 years . . . “Carry On.”—C. A. Colson, Valdosta, Ga.

I appreciate having a part in your good magazine. . . Power to you in the good fight you are making. May the “Strength of Israel” ever be your support and stay in the work.—Homer Hailey, Abilene, Texas.

You have killed Bollism so dead that it will never rise again. . . Many of us make mistakes, but you made no mistake when you took up the fight against Bollism, and you have the job done.—Joe H. Blue, Salem, Ark.

The Bible Banner has my approval that will get the job done.—R. L. Colley, Texarkana, Texas.

I am Pulling for you and will continue to do so as long as you are in the fight for the right. Call me when you need me.—J. L. Colley, Superintendent, of Schools, Trenton, Tenn.

The Bible Banner is doing great work in slowing down the Boll faction.—H. M. Phillips, Murreeesboro, Tenn.

I always read it with interest and miss it if it does not come.—G. H. P. Showalter, Austin, Texas.

Be sure you are right, -and go ahead. I am with you. God bless you.—D. C. Riley, Lubbock, Texas.

I consider this the best investment of any dollar spent by me during a long life of 65 years . . . “Carry On.”—C. A. Colson, Valdosta, Ga.

It is having telling effect.—E. C. Detharge, Lexington, Ky.

I am always anxious to get it.—E. E. Young, attorney, and elder, Roswell, N. M.

The best in the brotherhood. Keep up the good fight of faith.

I pray God that you and Brother Cled may keep the Banner going on its mighty mission through the years.—A. L. Colson, Valdosta, Ga.
QUIT MESSING UP OUR PREACHERS

R. O. KENLEY

As a promise to what I am about to write, I should probably first state that I am a friend to so-called “Bible Colleges,” and especially do I believe in educated preachers, whether they hold a degree from some Bible College, University, or only from the school of “hard knocks.”

A preacher must be a teacher, if not, he cannot possibly fill the requirements of the New Testament. I do not believe the possession of a degree from a so-called “Bible College” is a prerequisite to or conclusive evidence of moral or doctrinal soundness. In fact, I realize that these qualities must come from and be imparted by the church and home, and from much personal study and meditation. I was born and reared in the wooden country of Eastern Texas, like my father before me, I have always been a lover of dogs. Notwithstanding my father’s love for dogs, he never permitted the family dog, during a spell of cold weather (as was the custom of some of our neighbors), to stretch himself out before the fire place and shove the children away from the fire and into the cold. The dog was required to stay in a dog’s place.

Bible Colleges and other like institutions, like the dog, must be kept in and learn their place, and not encroach upon the Church.

Through our religious papers we recently learned that Harding College, Searcy, Arkansas, recently conferred upon Grover C. Brewer, an honorary Doctor’s Degree (LL. D.), and seemingly not to be out done soon thereafter Abilene Christian College, Abilene, Texas, conferred upon Chas. R. Nichol, a like Degree (LL. D.). No longer do we have brother Grover Brewer and brother Charley Nichol, but henceforth their names shall be, respectively, Doctor Brewer, and Doctor Nichol.

I know not what others may think, but it appears to me that these Bible Colleges have “messed up” two of our preachers.

These schools, as is the custom of the Roman Church or Pope, have conferred, seemingly, special favors upon these men, when no such favors were merited or needed. So far as Christianity is concerned the degrees conferred are meaningless.

A degree conferred by any school should be evidence of work completed in that school by the named person. I am quite sure that Paul possessed several degrees from the many great schools it was his privilege to attend, and probably the Jewish race referred to him as Doctor Saul, but after he saw and conversed with Jesus, and heard the simple plan of salvation as taught him by Ananias, and had had his body buried with Christ in baptism, his degrees were forgotten, and no longer was he known as Doctor Saul, but as Paul, the humble Christian. He says that he counted all else as “dung.” Doubtless this included his degrees.

“Christian” is the promised new name, and was divinely bestowed upon the followers of Christ. It is perfect. It needs no prefix or suffix.

After Paul’s conversion we do not read of him offering to die for his degrees or alma mater, but in Acts 21:13, we find him saying, “For I am ready not to be bound only, but also to die at Jerusalem also for the name of the Lord Jesus.”

In Gal. 6, Paul says: “For if a man think himself to be something, when he is nothing, he deceiveth himself.”

“But let every man prove his own work and then shall he have rejoicing in himself alone, and not in another. For every man shall bear his own burden.”

No doubt if Daniel Sommer had not appeared upon the scene at the time he did Bible Colleges by this time would be running the churches, furnishing and supplying preachers throughout the country. In the face of brother Sommer’s fight, local congregations tried for a long time and until very recently, to run and support the Bible Colleges, regardless of lack of scriptural authority.

One of the greatest criticisms to be lodged against preachers made or finished in Bible Colleges is their deficiency in the understanding of fundamentals of the church; they fail to evaluate that the church, for teaching the Gospel of Christ, making and teaching Christians, is both inclusive and exclusive. (1 Tim. 3:14-15; Eph. 3:10, 21; Eph. 1:23; 3; Eph. 2:16; Col. 1:18-20.)

The church is an anti-type of Noah’s Ark. Probably during the 120 years Noah was preparing his ark, many others were prepared according to human wisdom and had greater appeal to the human mind, in fact were finer and more pleasing to look upon, but they were not dedicated by Jehovah for saving men and women from the flood, hence they were without value when the deluge came. The church is the dedicated institution for the saving of souls of men and women, and all other institutions are excluded.

Concretely stated, the church is a divine institution, whereas Bible Colleges are only secular or man made institutions.

One may inquire, “Does secular institutions have the right to teach the Bible?” Yes, as individuals, but not as a part of or as an adjunct to the church.

The church, through each local congregation, is God’s divine institution for teaching the Bible, making and preserving Christians. It cannot delegate this duty to any other institution. Christians should avail themselves of every opportunity to teach God’s word, whether in the assembly or out of it, and by every means available. This includes preaching, singing, praying, use of printing press, and radio, and when science discovers some additional means of conveying the truth to human minds we should appropriate it forthwith. Five years continuous preaching each Sunday morning by Wilber H. White, over a radio station in the City of Houston, has probably accomplished more ultimate good, than all other preaching by all other preachers in this vicinity during the same time. His preaching has disced the ground, prepared the soil of the church, made the truth, when preached by others. Brother White has taught much upon the fundamentals of the church, thereby rendering a great service even to Christians.

Brother C. R. Nichol, more than a score years past, compiled and caused to be distributed a little booklet, entitled, “Nichol’s Pocket Bible Encyclopedia,” and by so doing brother Nichol made an invaluable contribution to an understanding of the Bible throughout the Southern States. No Christian, if he only knew it, can afford to be without a copy of this booklet.

Back to our conferred degrees. College degrees are splendid, when attained by one as the result of work and study, but when conferred gratuitously, without work or study, they may do more harm than good. Money is a fine thing to have when earned through work and frugality, but as a bequest from some dead relative it carries with it none of the marks of business ability or frugality. The degrees in this case smack of flattery, when viewed from one angle, and of a sedative, when viewed from another.

A United States Senator from Texas accepted a loan or gift from Waters Pierce Oil Company, whether such loan or gift corrupted him or not, it destroyed his influence.

Elihu, one of Job’s friends said: (Job 32:21), “Let me not, I pray you, respect any man’s person; Neither will I give flattering titles unto any man.”
THE PEPPERDINE FOUNDATION
TED W. MCELROY

Before offering any observations or asking any questions, the text of the statement about the Foundation, taken from the official booklet of that organization, entitled "The Story of The George Pepperdine Foundation," is given in full below. In this booklet officials of the organization have stated their own case so it has not been misstated. The reader is asked to read the statement fully and carefully, and then consider the observations and questions which follow. The emphasis on certain sentences in the statement set in blackface type are portions of the statements underscored by the writer to call the readers attention to their importance as to the nature of the organization.

INTERESTING FACTS ABOUT THE GEORGE PEPPERDINE FOUNDATION

The Foundation was formed in 1931 as a non-profit California corporation, organized for the purpose of doing educational, charitable and religious work, especially among young people.

Nearly all its assets have been donated by its founder who, for a number of years, has been making large contributions to this kind of work, while building up a successful business, the Western Auto Supply Company. After spending thirty years in that business, Mr. Pepperdine retired in 1939, to devote the rest of his life to the work of the Foundation.

It was his purpose in forming the Foundation to place the majority of his assets in an organization which will be guidid by him as long as he shall live, and then be carried on permanently thereafter by its self-perpetuating board of trustees who are in full sympathy with its ideals and purposes.

It is the Founder's belief that human progress in the right direction is dependent upon the proper training of youth, and that a large Fund, the income from which would be dedicated and used perpetually for such a purpose, would be the greatest contribution he could make toward the improvement of future generations.

OBJECTIVES OF THE FOUNDATION

Since this organization is so inherently reflective of the aims and ideals of its founder, the objectives of the Foundation will be most clearly set forth by printing the following statement made some time ago by Mr. Pepperdine:

"It is a source of much satisfaction to have achieved success in building up a great business. The ambition for achievement no longer includes merely the making of money and the acquisition of extensive properties; rather it is how humanity can be helped most with the means that have been entrusted to my care. I consider it wrong to build up a great fortune and use it selfishly. Appropriating wealth to the betterment of mankind engenders far greater satisfaction than the lavish spending of it on one's self, and more nearly justifies one's existence in the world.

"It is because of this belief that the George Pepperdine Foundation was created. It is my hope that this Foundation may continue for many generations to help make life brighter for many underprivileged boys and girls; provide educational opportunities, under strong and safe Christian leadership, for deserving young men and young women; contribute substantially to the spread of the Gospel through the Church, thereby glorifying God and helping to bring the more abundant life to an ever-increasing number of people."

EXAMPLE FOR OTHERS TO EMOULATE

This devotion to an ideal should inspire other men and women in every walk of life.

The happiness that enables men to live with true courage, to face death with satisfaction, and to awake to eternal joy, comes only to him who, here on earth, has found pleasure in doing good to others.

Daniel Webster's words are apropos just here" if we work upon marble, it will perish: if we work upon brass, time will efface it; if we rear temples, they will crumble into dust; but if we work upon immortal souls, if we imbue them with principle, with a just fear of God and a love for our fellowmen, we engrave upon those tables something that will brighten through all eternity."
Careful thought is being given to the preparation of an investment program which will insures the greatest degree of safety and permanence, and yet bring sufficient yield to support the Foundation's program.

A permanent executive and administrative organization has been built up by selecting men of long experience in property management, legal, financial, and general business professions, to insure a sound and prepetuating management.

**Additional Funds Needed for Greater Service**

Obviously, as the program and projects of the Foundation grow, its present endowment will be insufficient. As the work progresses and its value is demonstrated, it is expected that interested persons will make substantial gifts and bequests to the Foundation.

Friends of the Foundation can render a service by sending in the names of persons able to contribute substantial amounts, to whom you would suggest we mail this booklet. Other ways of helping are suggested on next page.

Trust officers of banks and attorneys are invited to ask for further information about the Foundation for the use of their clients who may be interested in leaving bequests for educational, religious, or charitable work.

**Income Tax Credits**

Donations to the George Pepperdine Foundation, or to any of the institutions with which it is connected, are deductible on your State and Federal income tax returns. Charitable and educational gifts are given tax exemption by law for the very purpose of encouraging them.

**Why Should You Help?**

Perhaps you are wondering why any organization with several million dollars in assets should ask that you contribute to its endowment or to its program. That is a logical, natural question. Many people have asked it.

And here is the answer straight from the shoulder! Your dollars will do more good work when joined with this Foundation than if you scatter your money around small gifts. This organization is permanent and its work will continue perpetually. Your money, whether it be one dollar, a hundred, a thousand or many thousands of dollars, if placed in the endowment of this Foundation, will produce income to be used in whatever work you may specify, for generations to come. You will actually be doing good work for ages after your life is over.

If this work appeals to you, you can have a part in it, either by direct gifts or by ways suggested on next page. Your contribution to any one of these programs or to the general endowment, whether the amount you give is large or small, will enable you to say and feel that "we" are workers together in a noble cause.

The Foundation has the set-up, the efficient organization, the worth-while projects for the reclamation of unfortunate children and the education of youth under improved environment.

If a large enough number of friends would help, each according to his own ability, to increase the size of this endowment or to help support a specific work, the Foundation could double or triple its services to crippled children, its care of boys and girls from broken homes; it could multiply Boy Scout troops and boys’ clubs, and it could greatly extend accredited college facilities under Christian leadership to more and more young men and women.

**Strong Financial Condition of the Foundation**

When you entrust your funds to an institution with which to do good work for you, whether you give cash or leave a bequest, you want to be sure of the character, stability and permanence of that institution. You want to know that it will be able to carry on its work through the generations to come.

The statement below shows the financial strength of the George Pepperdine Foundation and College. The character, ideals and objectives of the people who operate all the institutions connected with the Foundation can easily be determined and your investigation is invited.

**Condensed Statement of Assets, Liabilities and Net Worth George Pepperdine Foundation and College**

(Consolidated Statement) as of Dec. 31, 1939

| Cash in Bank | $200,976.24 |
| Stocks and Bonds (market value) | 3,138,784.63 |
| Mortgages, Notes, Accounts Receivable and other assets | 501,877.04 |
| Real Estate, Apt. Houses and other properties (net equity) | 1,114,645.52 |
| College Buildings, Land and Equipment | 673,497.01 |

Total Assets : $5,634,780.44
Total Liabilities : 393,534.21
Net Worth : $5,241,246.23

Several Ways You Can Help This Good Work: Without Cost to Yourself

If you have read the preceding pages, you may wish to help. You are invited to join with others who, through the Foundation, are expressing their faith in our American boys and girls, trying to "build a better world of tomorrow." You may have a share in this service to youth in any of the following ways:

1. You may send in names of persons who might be interested in helping financially, to whom you would suggest this booklet be mailed. Send names to Mr. E. W. Elmore, at main office of the Foundation.

2. You may ask a friend who is thinking of renting an apartment to consider the attractive and moderate-priced Foundation properties. (See next page.) For information, write or call Rental Department, Mrs. Kathryn Collison, 2208 West 8th Street, Los Angeles, Exposition 1105.

3. You may sell your income property to the Foundation and take a 20-year Payment Plan with monthly payments, secured by a Trust Deed on the property. Write Mr. Gordon Wilson, at main office.

4. You may give books suitable for the College Library. If you have rare or valuable volumes or sets, please give title of books and names of authors to the Librarian at the College. Write Mr. Otis Kelly, 1121 West 79th Street.

5. You may form a Memorial Trust, placing a Fund with the Foundation or College to carry on perpetually a specific work, in memory of some loved one of yours. For details write Mr. Eli F. Bush, at main office.

6. You may write in your will, or in a codicil added thereto, a bequest leaving certain cash, or property to the Foundation or College at your death. Write Mr. Eli F. Bush, main office.

7. You may carry Life Insurance, making the Foundation or College the beneficiary, in which case the premiums you pay will be deductible from your income tax return. For details write Mr. J. H. Sewell, at main office.

8. You may help promote our “Living Endowment Plan,” whereby a large number of persons with a little money can greatly increase the volume of our good work in behalf of young people. Write Mr. Gordon Wilson, at main office.

Main Office of the George Pepperdine Foundation 3757 Wilshire Boulevard, Los Angeles, Calif., Telephone DResi 1, 5111.

**Some Quotations From The Pamphlet**

Among many significant things said in the foregoing statement, the following stand out to identify “The Foundation” as a huge human organization by which the work of the church is to be done. Note them again:
The Central Meeting

W. A. Phillips
(Elder, Central Church, Los Angeles)

Great good has been accomplished by the three months visit of Foy E. Wallace, Jr., to Southern California. He was cordially received, renewed old friendships and made many new friends. More important is it however, to observe that his thorough, plain and direct manner of handling vital issues has been of great benefit to the churches in this section. The meetings were well attended by preachers, elders and members generally and the effect of his sound teaching is sure to be reflected in the leadership of the churches for some time to come.

It was a joy to him to begin his campaign with Central, at Twelfth and Hoover Streets in Los Angeles, in the edifice that he was instrumental in erecting while with this congregation in 1928-30. This meeting, beginning May 12 and continuing through four Lord's Days, was, in attendance, interest and visible results, the best meeting that has been held in the building. Considered as a part of the results is the fact that during the three months since the meeting the attendance at all appointments of the church has continued larger than before.

The Central meeting was followed by two-weeks meetings at Ninth and Lime in Riverside, Fairview and Walnut in Santa Ana, Ninth and Lime in Long Beach and a one-week meeting at 4908 York Boulevard in Los Angeles and a number of single sermons in Los Angeles, San Francisco and points between.

The appreciation of and interested manifested in the type of preaching which he does indicates a healthy condition of the churches here. However, that some brethren be not misrepresented, it is necessary to state that there was a slight lack of whole-hearted endorsement on the part of a very few. But we need not be surprised, for we remember that it was said of the Master's preaching, "This is a hard saying, who can hear it?" and they walked no more with him.

The preaching was directed mostly to the strengthening of the members admonishing to faithfulness in the Lord's work, and warning against worldliness and false doctrines within the body. Not only is he a man of deep convictions, based on a knowledge of the Word of God, but possesses ample courage to say the right thing at the right time. By reason of his direct manner of condemning sin, and occasionally mentioning the names of offending members, letting neither the love for friends nor the fear of foes deter him from declaring the whole counsel of God on any subject under consideration, some think he is harsh and say that all things should be done in love. Certainly all things should, but the difference of opinion is as to what love is. Solomon said "Chasten thy son while there is hope, and let not thy soul spare for his crying." Brother Wallace's preaching is motivated by his deep love for the church and for the welfare of its members. It requires far more courage, produced by love of the right type, to rebuke a friend than a stranger and the use of strong language does not indicate a lack of it.

Certainly no uninspired man preaches more forcibly against worldliness in the church than does Brother Wallace, but none of us fall out with him about that (its just his way and a mighty good way it is). And he is just as emphatic against erroneous doctrines and we take that too, except that some among us just cannot stand for premillennialists to be rebuked. That aversion does not necessarily mean belief in false theory on the subject that is being taught in the churches but may only indicate that such have friendly relations with teach, believe or are soft on the issue.

Recent history shows that the erroneous teaching on the millennium question is the most serious problem in the way of false doctrine that is now within the church. In objecting to Brother Wallace being brought to California, one stated as the reason, that we had no premillennialists here and did not want him to come and stir up the "fuss" that is in the church in other places. The answer-If we have none, none can be stirred up, but if we have they should be stirred and routed. The way to find out is to turn on the light. And it worked.

During the past decade the church in Southern California has made a wonderful growth. However, with prosperity comes inclination to worldliness with individuals so with churches and worldliness opens the door to erroneous doctrines and off color practices. It is not meant to infer that the condition is worse in California than elsewhere, Indeed I think it better, but vigilance is needed nevertheless, and the coming of Brother Wallace was timely and his teaching has been truly helpful. With his further assistance, he having accepted invitations for meetings in Central and Southern California for next year, we hope to continue to keep the churches here free from the "fuss."
GREATER GOSPEL SONGS

Ready For Delivery January, 1, 1941

THE GREATER GOSPEL SONGS
A SONG BOOK OF SUPERIOR MERIT

By Austin Taylor Uvalde, Texas

Brother Austin Taylor, of Uvalde, Texas, well known singer and song writer, is preparing his last, great song book. Not many, but good books, has always been Brother Taylor's idea. He has brought into the selection of songs for this new book that fine insight into suitable rhythm and tone that is most impressive in the creation of music best adapted to the meaning of the words. Great care and caution are exercised to select only songs that are scriptural, which makes this the best possible hymn book for the churches.

To Be Supplied In Three Bindings

Prices: TAG, copy, 35c; dozen, $3.00; 50, $13.00; 100, $25.00; MUSLIN, copy, 40c; dozen, $4.20; 50, $16.00; 100, $30.00; FULL CLOTH, (boards), copy, 60c; 50, $36.66; 100, $50.00.

Firm Foundation Publishing House
Austin, Texas

COMPLETE CHRISTIAN HYMNAL

Now Ready-Orders Delivered Promptly

Compiled and Edited by

MARION DAVIS
Cloth-Board Bindings-Unbreakable Backs

It is SPIRITUAL and SCRIPTURAL. Considerable expense was incurred in changing plates to correct erroneous teaching. The compiler was assisted in this work by Foy E. Wallace, Jr., and we believe all vital errors have been eliminated from these songs. It contains—

THE MOST POPULAR, OLD SONGS AND THE MOST POPULAR NEW SONGS

BINDING: Limp Covers and Cloth-board backs.

PRICES: Limp, 35c the copy, $25.00 per hundred. Cloth, 50c the copy, $40.00 per hundred.

SEND YOUR ORDER TO

THE MARION DAVIS COMPANY
BOX 162
FAYETTE, ALA.

EDITORIAL NOTE

WITH BOOKS LIKE THESE, BY MEN LIKE THESE—LET THE DIGRESSIVE3 AND PREMILLENNIALIST'S HAVE E. L. JORGENSEN'S SONGBOOK.—THE EDITOR.