Dear Cled and Foy:

Just received the Bible Banner. It gave me a thrill of encouragement, that you have called N. B. Hardeman’s hand on putting colleges in the church budget. I have spearheaded this opposition for you, as you will see, if you have not already, from copies of “Bible Colleges” under separate cover. I paid in full for a whole edition of that tract, and if you will call attention to it, it is free while the supply lasts. When these are gone I will pay for another printing. There is as certain to come in this generation another division as “whatsoever you sow that shall you reap.”

I began the fight sixty years ago, and have often felt weary and inclined to quit. But then the words of the Lord came to my mind, “Be thou faithful unto death” and so as long as I have a voice and can find space, I must keep on.

When Abilene’s advertisement came out, saying that congregations were supporting it, as such, I started an article, but stopped. When Hardeman came out in the Gospel Advocate I wrote a reply and put his statement in that article by the side of the one he made in 1938, that you will find in the tracts I am sending you. I sent it to him and told him to make his reply and send to the Gospel Advocate. He had it rewritten so as to leave G. C. Brewer and Abilene Christian College out of it, and sent it back to me without any reply. I studied the matter and decided to let it rest awhile. Then C. B. Douthitt came out in a terrific reply, which is far stronger than I could have made it, and many times more effective, coming from a new man. Now Thompson and Howell have struck in the Firm Foundation. This is as it should be. Now you two have struck in the Bible Banner, and so in the providence of God others are stepping into the breach, and must carry the load in the main. I had almost given up hope of any others coming to the task, and know full well that even if I had the age and strength one man can go about so far.

If the putting of the schools in the budgets of the churches, to be supported out of the Lord’s treasury is not stopped, and I doubt if there is power enough to stop them, then there will be another division in this generation. And how much can be saved? About 1887, when the other apostasy was getting in full swing, we had the Review, the Leader, the Gospel Advocate and the Firm Foundation, all of them strong. With a larger equipment of papers than the digressives had at that date, we perhaps did not save twenty-five percent. Now there is not a single weekly, the policy of which is against the joining of these schools to the church. The best we can look for at present is freedom of opposition against this plain innovation. You two have strong associates of mature, vigorous, and also young men, all of whom have shown that they have the courage of their convictions. If you take a positive, unyielding stand against uniting the church and the schools and strike hard, it may be stayed for a short time. Unless this opposition comes fast and vigorous the apostasy will soon be well on the way. You and your associates form by all odds the strongest spearhead against the backward movement. Please see that you both read this letter and that each of you carry a copy of the tract, so that you will have at all times the statements of “policy” of the schools nine short years ago.

I am now writing a short article for the Firm Foundation, and I may step out of the picture for awhile, and let other and younger men take up the word. Though I have just passed the eightieth mile stone, I am more intensely concerned about the “trends” than in fifty years. May the Lord strengthen your hands and hearts, and raise up a host of young men. From many letters recently there appears to be a great number, many of them graduates of the colleges, who see the danger.

After G. C. Brewer made his Abilene speech, I said: “There is the Isaac Errett of this generation.” Errett headed many digressive movements, and so does Brewer. Every action of his has confirmed that state ind.

In faith, hope and love,

W. W. Otey,
Belle Plaine, Kansas.
PEERING THROUGH THE FOG

CLED E. WALLACE

There are some interesting and significant reactions to my recent article "Putting the Schools Where They Belong." A brother out in New Mexico comments that the article is confusing. He observes that

"I can't see through the fog. These schools are in the same class as Methodist or Baptist schools, as far as the church is concerned. They are recognized by every one—saint or sinner. Christian, Jew, Catholic or denominations, as the "Church of Christ" schools. We support them. Our children go to them. Whom do they belong to, if not the church?"

The venerable editor of the Firm Foundation blows a few puffs into the fog which might make a hole big enough to see through if the fog-makers were not blowing harder and oftener than he is. There are undertones of uneasiness, and well there may be, in his remarks.

"That religious schools and colleges have been, in the past a power for good or evil is well known to students of history. The denominational schools have come to dominate the churches; they are recognized as an integral part of them. But this is not true of the Christian colleges under the direction of members of the churches of Christ. I have understood all along that the brethren who are engaged in the school work are doing this as a human institution, not having any connection with the church as an organization, and that churches have not been solicited to support these schools. There have been some exceptions, it seems. We carry regularly the advertisement of these schools, on a commercial basis, and because we believe that it is nothing but just and right that the brotherhood should have the opportunity to know what the schools claim for themselves, and what they are doing. Any one may or may not support them as he pleases. The reports from the churches, and their calls for help when it is needed, on the other hand, are published free and are not charged for as advertising. The schools understand the difference—that the school is not the church, a church, or any part of the church of Christ. They are organized and operated much after the order of a religious periodical. It is not the church or any part of the church and does not claim to be.

That is what I have thought but now I'm afraid that Brother Showalter and I have been too naive. A shocking reversal of policy is in the making on the part of the schools and it may not be long now before Brother Showalter has to forget "the commercial basis" and give the schools free advertising along with the churches. Brother Bob Alexander, who is spear-heading this reversal of policy, is flooding the pages of the Firm Foundation with the spiritual exploits of the schools and the indebt-
head “us” off. It is high time for somebody to yell like the little boy did who was yoked to the calf: “Head us off, somebody!” I think Brother Showalter ought to put the campaign finangelist on “a commercial basis” and charge him for advertising for two reasons. The Firm Foundation is entitled to the money for services rendered, and Brother Alexander needs the lesson Brother Showalter thinks the school already understands “that the school is not the church, a church, or any part of the church of Christ.”

These college “Innocents Abroad” peering into church treasuries with a come hither look on their faces, apparently do not, realize, or else hope the brethren will not, notice, a radical change of policy on their part. I propose to turn some light into the resulting fog. Along about 1938 something happened at Abilene Christian College. Blanks were distributed through a large audience “to give individuals the opportunity to subscribe whatever amount they were able and willing to give, to aid the college in its plans.” Nobody objected to this. They were acting “entirely within the bounds of their liberty as men and as Christians.” Then Brother G. C. Brewer, who is more or less famous for saying the wrong thing at the psychological moment, grabbed the spotlight and urged that “elders put in their budgets and plans of expenditures certain amounts of money for Abilene Christian College.” The thing back-fired and resulted in some published statements which under present circumstances really make sensational reading. Brother Jas. F. Cox, who was then president of Abilene Christian College, said of date, March 4, 1938:

“I have never, myself, raised any money nor have I authorized any one to raise money through the churches—I regret that Brother Brewer mentioned the matter the other night. We asked him to say a few words to encourage the people to give to Abilene Christian College, but we did not authorize him to make a statement about churches putting Abilene Christian College in their budgets.”

Less than ten years later Bob Alexander sits cross-legged in his office at headquarters in Abilene Christian College, divides the state into districts, directs the churches to arrange mass-meetings at central points and plans to do just what Brother Brewer suggested in 1938. It took the seed of Brewer’s suggestion a good while to sprout, but it is now growing fast. Brother Alexander is telling the churches through official communiques sent out from headquarters, and through the Firm Foundation, “and not charged for as advertising,” that the stalk depends on the sucker for its health and fruit-bearing ability, and that if the stalk doesn’t, carefully and liberally support the sucker, then the stalk will die. When the fog has cleared away, it may be clear to all that we will have to pull the suckers off the churches. At least it is good practice in growing corn.

George S. Benson, president of Harding College under date of June 7, 1938 said:

“At Harding College it has been our general practice to solicit individual contributions. We expect to continue on this same basis.”

But now President Benson favors the college in the budget of the churches.

Brother J. N. Armstrong who was president of several colleges during his life, last of Harding College, said under date of June 6th, 1938:

“Harding College has never appealed to churches, as churches, for help. This has always been my position, and the position of every college over which I presided.”

Brother N. B. Hardeman, president of Freed-Hardeman College, said under date of June 11, 1938:

“I am truly sorry that we cannot get settled on matters relating to our schools. I certainly do not endorse Brother Brewer’s statements and would oppose any congregation putting Freed-Hardeman College in their budgets. Such has ever been our sentiments.”

That was in 1938. But it is not Brother Hardeman’s “sentiments” now. He now thinks it all right for a church to contribute to a school to help it to “exist.” In the Gospel Advocate of Feb. 13, 1947, Brother Hardeman says:

Since these schools are human institutions, the church is under no direct obligation to them, any more than to a hospital in which brethren might minister to the sick and dying. If, however, a church believes any school is teaching the truth and is thus furnishing an avenue through which parents may train their children, and such a church desires to help the school to exist, it has the right to do so.

What he would “oppose” in 1938 he recognizes as a right in 1947.

What I am wondering is this. If these schools are as vital as Headquarters in Abilene say they are, then what, would happen to the churches so dependent on them if the schools should go wrong and head an apostasy, as many have done in the past. What responsibility rests on those who direct the schools! According to headquarters they hold the destiny of the churches in their hands. The school-men stick together on the same side, the right side, of a vital issue in 1938. Then a few years later, they all flop together to the other side, the wrong side of the same issue. Is that leadership? If it were the right thing to do, can the churches afford to tie up to such a set-up and depend on headquarters to lead them alright? I trow not!

I’m impatient to get one point out of my system on paper. Schools are all right in their place. Brother Showalter has the right idea. School men have it part of the time, and could have it all of the time,
if they could resist the temptation offered by church treasuries. The idea that churches cannot live and grow and carry out the Lord’s will without schools is just plain rot. Churches lived and thrived before there were any schools and will continue to do so even if all the schools we now have apostatize and go to the devil. The school is a human organization and the church was built by Jesus Christ. The church is not dependent on schools or anything else including religious periodicals for its life. Editors generally understand this 1 think, and still can enjoy some satisfaction over the good they are doing. The schools had better learn it, before churches have to teach it to them the hard way. You know a school can get too big and too bossy. And it has when it gets to the point where it thinks it is so important that churches cannot live with it.

Some forty years ago Brother W. W. Otey expressed to Brother J. N. Armstrong his grave fears that these institutions would in time become root- ed in the church, and so lead to a departure from New Testament teaching. “At that time” Brother Armstrong “resented keenly such a suggestion of danger in the future.” Departures from the truth always begin with trends. Brother Armstrong could not see the trends Brother Otey thought he saw, but these trends developed into something Brother Armstrong could see and become alarmed over. Just eleven days before his death Brother Armstrong wrote Brother Otey a letter. Ponder this paragraph from that letter.

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

Concerning this quotation from Brother Armstrong’s letter, Brother Showalter of the Firm Foundation says:

“I have read and verified the quotation. I add that last June when I was at Harding College to deliver an address on the occasion of the class graduation at that time, Brother Armstrong in a conversation with me stated substantially the same thing. In addition he stated to me that, as is well known, he had his debates with Daniel Sommer on the college question years ago, but that, as the schools are now go-
serve very well for a start until we get the church educated and propagandized so we can have something more advanced and put us abreast with the Baptists. Of course we can’t do that now. Even the schools would be opposed to it. But then this is now. Ten years from now they may change their minds again if it becomes expedient. Who knows anyhow what a new administration may do in this progressive age when we are more interested in imitating the Baptists and surpassing the Digressives and even showing up state legislatures than we are in learning and doing the will of God?

I am fully aware that we are not much inclined to profit, by the lessons of the past or mark the similarity of our present experiments to those that in a former generation spear-headed the digressive movement. The stage is being set for history to repeat itself. It is well enough though for us to recall that the business of independent churches is to use a New Testament in edifying themselves, look after the needs of the poor and preach the gospel. It is the business of the church, each local church, to raise its own money, select its own field of activity, choose its own workers, oversee its work and attend to its own business generally. It is not the business of one church to be forever meddling with some others and it is not proper for any confessedly human institution such as a school to be meddling with any of them.

Finally, it is somewhat embarrassing that about the time we about had everybody convinced that the Sommer boys were wrong, the schools themselves rise up, reverse a policy that promised to be permanent, and act up generally in such a fashion as is calculated to show that the Sommer boys were at least partly right all the time. Yes, it is embarrassing.

HOW DOES THIS LOOK?

Brother Robert M. Alexander who is desperately trying to make the keys of the colleges fit the doors of the churches, like the keys of the kingdom do, shudders at the thought of what and where the churches would be “if we had not had Christian schools turning out preachers of the gospel during the past fifty years”? He thinks the churches ought to pay for the services the school has rendered them. Now, I’m not at all inclined to deny the schools any of the glory due them for the good they have done. It is admitted that up to now they have done a fairly good job, with some exceptions, without fastening themselves on the churches. They have up to now been classified as educational institutions with the same right to operate as the Gospel Advocate, the Firm Foundation and the American Christian Review. Brother Showalter might suddenly develop a case of shakes over what would have been the results to the church had the Firm Foundation not rendered the service it did in teaching the brethren and staying the tide of digression in Texas, “during the last fifty years.” What would have happened had it not been for the Gospel Advocate and its valiant fight when Lipscomb and his staff of able writers battled with the forces of digression? I have an idea that the churches owe as great a debt to the papers as it does the schools. They have always disavowed any intention of being “church papers.” They have not divided the brotherhood into districts, called mass meetings and the like and requested or demanded that churches as such support them. They could have called attention to the far greater circulation of denominational papers, insisted that the welfare of the cause demanded that “we” match them in circulation, and campaigned to get into the budget of the churches. They didn’t. I do not think they will. Personally, I do not think, and I fervently hope the schools will not get by-with it. There is too great a principle involved. The Baptist and Reflector is the official organ of Tennessee Baptist organized work. It nestles comfortably and safely in the budgets of Baptist churches. The Baptist Convention does not hesitate to set quotas for churches and tell them what they ought to do, even if they do not tell them they have to. We do not have any official organs.

I think Brother Alexander would like to have one, but my candid judgment is he would not know how to play on it if he had it. As long as papers and schools keep their places, and churches attend to their business, and all of us behave ourselves fairly well, things will move along all right. What we cannot do within the simplicity of New Testament teaching, but have to imitate the Baptists or some of the other nations around us, to get done, we would do well to just let alone. By the way, it has occurred to me and some others that Brother Alexander and the schools recommend themselves a little too highly anyhow. They might profit by some of the humility the New Testament recommends to the churches.-C. E. W.

ANNOUNCEMENT

With this issue of the Bible Banner a monthly schedule of publication is being resumed. By the god providence of God and the continued help of our brethren we will bring the Banner out each month. WE NEED AND MUST HAVE TEN THOUSAND NEW SUBSCRIBERS. SEND IN A LIST TODAY AND HELP CARRY ON THE GOOD WORK.
The following letter speaks for itself. This is the response of the Lufkin congregation to the appeal from Abilene Christian College for church support. If churches all over the land would be quick to voice a similar sentiment, a quick nait could be called to the present abandonment of the only defensible and scriptural position that schools like Abilene Christian College can maintain.

Dear Bro. Alexander:
We are in receipt of two letters from you with reference to your money raising campaign for Abilene Christian College. This may serve as a reply to both.

In the first letter you asked that we take the matter up and decide what we could do in the way of regular help for the school. This letter was directed to the elders of the Lufkin church. We drew the conclusion from this letter, and the fact that it was so addressed, that you had in mind the church, as such, giving some regular help to Abilene Christian College. We know of no other reason why such a request would be directed to us as elders of the church. If this is what you intended, our reply is that we have already decided, and thought that the Lord’s people had long ago decided, that maintaining a school is an individual proposition and in no way the work of the church. Our conviction in this regard hasn’t been changed by the increasing size, influence, and power of “our” schools. We are old fashioned enough down here in East Texas that we do not believe in an organization larger than the local congregation through which the Lord’s work is to be done. We therefore confine our activities as a church to the business of the church and we don’t believe maintaining a secular program of education is a part of that program. Therefore we hereby notify you and those connected with you in your program that we are not in sympathy in any way with your efforts to enlist the churches to support your school.

As to the second letter to Brother Roy D. Spears, we will say first that for the above reason we do not believe you want to carry out your plan of holding a rally here for the churches of this “district.” We could not co-operate in such a “rally” for the reason that we believe that the very spirit and purpose of those promoting it are not in harmony with New Testament principles. You would not want it here over our opposition.

Furthermore, we do not appreciate the tone of your letter notifying us that you and President Morris had planned to have such a rally here on August 17th. It seems to us that if the school respects the local church, instead of writing us to the effect that you had such a rally planned and hoped that we would cooperate with you in it, you would first have written and asked for the approval of the church here for such a rally. Of course, if it is your plan to hold the rally in Lufkin whether the local church cooperates with you in it or not—then we have nothing further to say for we have no control over the town as a meeting place for any kind of a gathering.

It is our conviction that the school is becoming too high-minded in its attitude toward the church. We also believe that some of you have an exaggerated idea of the importance of your program of work. It is not at all our conception that the church of the Lord would be a failure without the schools. We still believe that the Lord’s work can be done most successfully in the Lord’s way—through the church.

As a final word, let us say that we are not opposed to Christian individuals operating a school to teach anything that is wholesome and right. We do not believe that such efforts should be fastened upon the church, usurp the work of the church or undertake to control it. We believe an educational society in the work of the church is just as unscriptural and wrong as a missionary society. We believe in the all-sufficiency of the church just like we believe in the all-sufficiency of the scriptures. Yours sincerely, R. C. Trimble, R. L. Stanaland, F. D. Thompson, M. S. Bills, Roy D. Spears, elders.

Twenty-five years ago the fight over the missionary and aid societies had not been forgotten. On every hand you could hear gospel preachers declaring that any organization larger than the local congregation to do any work of the church was unscriptural. The “digressives” were completely and thoroughly “whipped out” by that scriptural principle. The churches seemed thoroughly committed to the principle that while congregations could cooperate in doing any scriptural work, yet that cooperation must not assume the form of an organization and must not be larger than or distinct from...
the local church. This we had not only found to be a “safe and tenable” position but we had convinced ourselves that it was Bible truth. Hence for several decades we had preached, declared and affirmed in debate that church support for co-operative societies to carry on either the teaching or benevolent work of the church was anti-scriptural and therefore wrong. I heard that taught and preached during my boyhood and as a young preacher and I grew up on such information on that subject as can be found in the Otley-Briney debate and other such sources.

When “our” schools were started, they drew heavy opposition from prominent men who had come through the battle over Missionary Societies anti human organizations. Daniel Sommer became the spearhead of this opposition. Their charge was that the schools were trespassing on the work of the churches and would some day reach such proportions that they would not only be trespassing on the work of the churches but would try to assume control over the churches. Against such opposition “we” developed what “we” believed was a defensible position. We contended that the schools were “secular” institutions and that they were not owned and run by the churches but were maintained and operated by a group of Christian individuals who wanted to provide an education for their children under Christian influence and that since it is right for Christians to teach the truth anywhere and everywhere, it could not be wrong to teach the Bible in such schools. We defended them on the ground that the ownership of “our” schools and maintenance for them was on a par with “our papers.” Brethren who were interested and active in such school work gladly seized upon this position and stoutly maintained it. Brethren Lipscomb, Armstrong, Boles and others fought the battle out on this ground with Brother Sommer until before his death, I understand, he acknowledged that to a great extent he had been wrong about “our schools.”

Almost every leader in school work among us is on record on this issue either by public utterance or in written statement. But what has happened? Almost over night-and with such unanimity that it is astounding—“Our School Brethren” have been converted on this issue and have done an about face. Whereas formerly, such men as Hardeman, Pullias, Morris, Alexander, and others now prominent among us in such work would not defend “church” support for our schools, and would state that they were not and had not asked the church as such to support “our” schools, now, openly, without apology, and without telling us any of the why or wherefore of their conversion on the matter, boldly an-
Brewer so declared himself several years ago and stated in connection that the Texas church that does not put Abilene Christian College in its budget has the wrong preacher. None of us was surprised at such a statement from him. He is even liberal enough to call on sectarian preachers for prayer, accept sectarian baptism, and declare that there are Christians who will be saved in denominational institutions. You wouldn't expect a man with those views to restrict himself to a scriptural position with reference to the independence and autonomy of the local church. Most of our school men disagreed with him then, or at least did not indorse his statement. Perhaps his influence over them has been stronger than we supposed and he has converted some of them to his way of thinking. Maybe he has converted them to his other viewpoints, too, and they just have not declared themselves.

Brother Robert Alexander has a peculiar slant on the autonomy of the local church. He does not hesitate to call upon them for regular support for Abilene Christian College. He has no objection to their putting the school in their budgets, in fact, where the money comes from or how they raise it is a matter of no concern to him, for on these points he has no convictions. Just so the money is raised, he is pleased. He plans “district meetings” that involve the local churches and notifies them, but he thinks the small matter of how they raise the money is of no consequence. It involves no principle of truth, hence, should be left entirely to the local church. There is not any right way or wrong way, for it is not a matter of faith but of opinion, anyway. That is the defense of the instrumental music advocates. They think it belongs in the realm of opinion, hence, should be decided by the individual for himself or at the most by the majority in the congregation, and when they have so decided no one has the right to say, Nay! Is the autonomy of the local church a matter of faith or opinion? Is it right for local churches to federate themselves or associate themselves in any work through an organization outside of and larger than the local church? Would this involve any scriptural principle and if it does, is it to be settled by the decision of the congregation? Suppose Brother Alexander inform us about how the congregation should render such a decision. Should the elders arbitrarily decide such matters and either bind or loose the conscience of some, as it is—what should be their action about the matter or is that important?

The autonomy of the congregation does not involve the right or power to decide principles of right or wrong. It involves only the independence of the congregation from every other congregation in the management of its own affairs within scriptural principles. Brother Alexander’s position would render him obligated to fellowship any congregation which in its own way decided to support the Christian Endeavor Society or the United Christian Missionary Society—would he do it?

When any congregation steps beyond the boundaries of local church organization and government, it becomes sectarian as definitely as it would by introducing human innovations into the worship, or by adopting a human creed. The idea that support for an unscriptural organization can be justified by the scriptural principle of the local church governing its own affairs is ridiculous. That would mean that the church had been given the authority in its own government to abandon its government and federate itself into a larger organization and government. The idea of scriptural church organization and scriptural church government cannot be separated. Brother Alexander must either take them both or abandon them both.

Participation and support for an organization larger than the local church cannot be justified upon the ground of the independence and autonomy of the local church. The very right of the church to govern its own activities within Christian principles, restricts the activity of the local church to such work and relationships as are in keeping with that principle. It is not a question of opinion but a question of New Testament teaching and faith and vital to Christian fellowship and the identity of the church. Brother Alexander’s position amounts to this; the congregation because it is autonomous has the right to decide whether or not to be autonomous. He is capable of better reasoning.

---
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I LISTENED IN
JAMES W. ADAMS

No, I am not an eavesdropper, and I am not on Lum and Abner’s party line, but what I heard was interesting and enlightening. I am under no obligation whatsoever to keep silent regarding that which I heard. It concerns a very live issue involving some of the most prominent men and agencies among “us.” What I heard may be as enlightening to the reader as it was to me since it clarified some matters that might otherwise have been obscure. I believe that a conversation to which I listened on April 3, 1947, should be made public, hence this article.

I have just listened to a conversation between Foy E. Wallace Jr., and Norman Davidson of Chicago. It all happened quite by accident. I was visiting Brother Wallace in his apartment here when Brother Davidson came by, unannounced, for a session with Brother Wallace. At the invitation of Brother Wallace, I stayed and listened. Brother Davidson explained that he was on his way to Austin to see Brother G. H. P. Showalter, editor of the Firm Foundation. Having heard that Brother Wallace was in Temple, he stopped by for the purpose of apologizing for certain bitter, personal attacks which he had made on Brother Wallace via United States mail. He apologized most profusely and abundantly. His approach to the reason for his surprise visit was circuitous-by way of many repeated questions and much clearing of the throat. Perhaps my presence “cramped his style.” Witnesses have been known to have that kind of effect. He was utterly devoid of that poise so characteristic of the successful man of business. Finally reaching his point, he launched forth into a general discussion of his views and conduct respecting the issue involved. I “hitched up” my chair and listened. At first I listened with amazement coupled with amusement, next with incredulity, and finally with disgust. Brother Davidson seemed almost beside himself. He was at once: embarrassed; confused; naive; humble; arrogant; vindictive; pious; inconsistent; determined; vacillating; uninformed. He was a study in contrasts. He seemed a man at war with himself. Surely, brethren, if the churches are in Babylon as he thinks, he definitely is not the man to lead them out. That you may appreciate my bewilderment concerning Brother Davidson, note The Basis of These Impressions

Brother Davidson and Premillennialism. The conversation naturally moved to the premillennial doctrine. At first, Brother Davidson firmly stated, “I have made a study of it.” When asked what he had learned about it, he said, “I do not find anything in it contrary to the New Testament.” When it was pointed out that if he found nothing in the doctrine contrary to the New Testament, it must be in harmony with the New Testament, he said, “Well, I do not believe the doctrine myself.” Being, asked why he did not believe it if it is harmonious with the New Testament, he heatedly replied, “Well, I don’t know anything about it.” When this self-contradictory statement was made, it provoked two hearty laughs. You would have laughed too. Retreating in confusion, Brother Davidson offered this alibi, “Foy, you’ve had too many debates for me to argue with you.” Now just what, does Norman Davidson believe about premillennialism or know about it for that matter? Ask someone who has not talked with him. One guess is as good as another. I will confess that I have a haunting suspicion concerning what he believes about it. What about you?

Brother Davidson and O. D. Bixler. You will remember O. D. Bixler for his connection with the attempt of the Cornell Avenue church in Chicago to
compromise C. A. Norred while he served as its preacher. See back issues of Gospel Advocate and Bible Banner. Bixler has been groomed by Bixler and his friends, among whom is Norman Davidson, to have charge of the evangelization (†) of Japan. Brother Davidson said, "I am for Bixler; I will never change my mind." He further said, "Bixler believes the doctrine of premillennialism." In this connection, Davidson also affirmed, "I have never heard Boll or Bixler teach anything contrary to the New Testament." I wonder if Brother Davidson would know it if they did. It was at this point that Brother Davidson reached some sort of a climax. Rising, he struck a very dramatic pose and passionately declared, "0. D. Bixler is the most god-fearing man known to me. If premillennialism makes such men, let's have more premillennialism?" (Emphasis his). Brother Wallace calmly pointed out that the same might be said of a Methodist preacher and Methodism. In fact, a young man recently converted from the pernicious errors of Christian Science told me that a certain Christian Science practitioner was the most pious man of his acquaintance. Shall we with Brother Davidson say, "If Christian Science makes such men, let's have more Christian Science." Brother Davidson virtually takes the position that if one opposes the sending of O. D. Bixler and his crew to Japan to make premillennialists, he opposes the evangelization of Japan. It could be so if what I hear is true. I hear that Bixler has secured from the military government of Japan the authority to designate who may or may not enter Japan as a religious worker from the churches of Christ. Would Bixler agree to designate men of unquestioned loyalty who are not premillennialists as workers to Japan, leave them unhampered in their activities, and allow them to be supported scripturally by loyal churches? What do you think? Davidson says that Cornell Avenue Church in Chicago shares his views on Boll, Bixler, and premillennialism. It is no wonder that C. A. Norred could not "stomach" that work, 

How did Bixler obtain such power from the military government of Japan? Your guess is as good as mine, but it smacks of misrepresentation. Who gave an avowed premillennialist the power of an ambassador with the military for plain churches of Christ? Brethren, enough is enough! Churches of Christ should inform General McArthur in no uncertain terms and with haste that Bixler is not representative and should repudiate his right to thus act in their behalf.

Brother Davidson and G. H. P. Showalter. In a letter to Brother McQuiddy of the Gospel Advocate published in the July 1946 issue of the Bible Banner, Davidson claims to have talked with Brother Showalter via long distance telephone and quotes Showalter as saying relative to the premillennial doctrine, "The thing never should have been an issue; it has always been a matter of personalities, and not of convictions; many preachers have made capital of it for their own gain." Brother Yater Tant wrote Brother Showalter concerning this quotation. Brother Tant's letter and Brother Showalter's answer may be read in the Firm Foundation, August 20, 1946. Brother Showalter denies making these statements. When asked about this matter in the conversation contemplated in this article, Davidson said, "Brother Wallace, I have never misquoted any man in my life." Davidson was on his way to Austin to see Brother Showalter. Perhaps they worked this matter out. Will Brother Showalter give us an account of their visit? Brother Showalter's constituency would no doubt be interested in a forthright statement from Brother Showalter concerning what he believes our attitude should be toward those who teach the premillennial heresy. He has been exceedingly pointed concerning the repudiation of the theory. Will he be just as pointed concerning this other matter? Such a statement from the editorial chair of the Firm Foundation would be far reaching in its effects.

Brother Davidson and Two Hundred Prominent Preachers. Davidson said, "Most of the preachers known to me have expressed themselves as being in complete agreement with me on this matter of fellowshipping Boll, Bixler, and premillennialism." When pressed to tell how many preachers were "known to him," he settled on two hundred, at the same time refusing to give us a list of their names. Of them he said, "These agree with me three to one." When asked why they did not so express themselves publicly, he said, "They are afraid." Being asked if he had much confidence in their sincerity by reason of their fear, he became visibly confused. Preachers take notice; Every preacher of Davidson's acquaintance has been by Davidson placed under a two-fold suspicion (1) Of being guilty of insincerity through fear (2) Of believing that the premillennialist and premillennialism should be fellowshipped. It would be interesting to have written statements from all preachers who know Davidson setting forth their attitude in this matter. Personally, I do not believe that Brother Davidson knows 150 prominent preachers who agree with him.

Brother Davidson and His Love for Brother Wallace. Ah yes! this was a love feast among other things. The meeting closed with prayer too. Be-
lieve it or not! Davidson said almost in tears, “Back in Los Angeles, Foy, I loved you more than any man on earth outside of my family.” That was almost twenty years ago. During all this time there was no meeting or correspondence between them. Suddenly the silence of almost two decades is broken by this ardent lover with a tirade of personal abuse under cover of mail against him for whom his soul panted. Surely, the line between love and contempt is a fine one indeed. Davidson’s attention was called to his inconsistency only to elicit puerile excuses and accusations.

**Enough About Brother Davidson.** No doubt you see why he so variously impressed me. Surely I cannot be blamed for having little faith in Davidson or his schemes. His competency to lead the church in any matter is exceedingly questionable. A cause with even a degree of merit could surely find a better champion.

**My Impression of Foy E. Wallace, Jr., Gained from This Conversation**

This treatise would not be complete without something on this point. Brother Wallace was calm, deliberate, sure of his ground, kind yet firm, plain and uncompromising in stating his position, and little agitated even under extreme provocation. He showed unmistakably an utter disregard for personal attacks and injury and a complete consecration to the peace, unity, and purity of the church of our Lord. No honest man could have heard this conversation and have failed to choose the right. I was not lacking in faith in the essential integrity of Brother Wallace nor in his competency as a leader in this fight, but my faith was renewed and strengthened. I count it a privilege to stand with him and the Bible Banner in this struggle.

**THE EXPLANATION DOES NOT EXPLAIN**

**CLED E. WALLACE**

Brother Robert M. Alexander accuses Brother Will M. Thompson of “misrepresentations” in connection with Brother Thompson’s criticisms of Brother Alexander’s efforts to enlist churches as such in raising funds for Abilene Christian College. Brother Alexander is the official “Campaign Director.” He denies that he ever did such a thing. I thought he did. Brother Otley thought he did. Brother Nichol thought he did. Brother Showalter evidently thought he did. My father thought he did. Brother Douthitt apparently thinks he did. In fact it still looks like he did. If he didn’t then I should revise an article I have written but I’m sending it in as is. Brother Alexander evidently thinks he didn’t, but if he didn’t he has a very awkward way of expressing himself. He should be careful about slinging around the charge of “misrepresentations.” I have read carefully his explanation and it reminds me of a fly trying to get out of a saucer of molasses.

“We have not asked congregations to support the school through their treasuries. However, I do not consider that such a practice would be wrong. I think furthermore that congregational autonomy leaves every congregation with the right to decide for itself where it will place its money for the best advancement of the cause of Christ. I do not believe any individual outside of the particular congregation nor any institution has the right to tell the congregation just where and how it shall place its money.”

I am under a strong impression that the Campaign Director has been busy for some weeks trying to convince congregations where it shall place some of its money. He says he hasn’t asked congregations to support the school through their treasuries but makes it clear that he isn’t too good to do it. It isn’t expedient to push the matter under present conditions so “any way you do it will be all right just so we get the money.” That is a free quotation of course.

“The plan we suggest is for the brethren in the congregation to have a business meeting and set up a goal of money which they think they should raise, select a committee to raise it, and mail in the results.

As the matter now stands, we do not ask congregations as such to raise money for the school, but we suggest that congregations as such do so and send 77s the results. If Brother Alexander has a better explanation to offer we are anxious to hear it.

Brother Alexander’s idea of “congregational autonomy” is interesting. According to him I suppose that if a congregation wants to put the Firm Foundation publishing house or even the American Christian Missionary Society in its budget, it is nobody’s business. That might be so in a way, but then I possess a sort of personal “autonomy” which possibly means I might say something about it if it did. If I think a congregation decides contrary to the scriptures, congregational autonomy has nothing to do with my saying what I think about it. How did Brother Alexander get the idea that he can advise a church to do something but that I have no right to advise it not to.
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CONCERNING THE COLLEGE CONTROVERSY

In the present controversy over the sphere of the school, the college and the church, the colleges are again the aggressors. Every few years the issue is revived by colleges or representatives of the colleges. The controversy can be as easily stopped as it started—let the schools cease to infringe on the divine principle of the independence of the church from all human institutions, quit imposing the college on the church, and all will be well. In short, let the college stay in its place, and let the church alone. A leader in the campaign to put the colleges in the budgets of the churches is on record as saying that if it is not right to put the college in the budget, then he would join Daniel Sommer and be done with it. In other words, he will have the college in the budget or he will have no college at all! It is that “this way or no way” spirit that has always driven the wedges, forcing issues upon the churches, then blamed those who opposed their schemes for the division. It was true of the digressive movement that split the church. It has been true of the premillennial party “Boll movement” which says “we will have our theories.” So it is in the controversy with the colleges when their financial mouthpiece says “we will have the college in the budget of the churches.” With this announced attitude, the colleges can blame no one but themselves for the growing sentiment against them, because of the increasing opposition to their campaigns.

They alone are to be blamed for any division or alienation that may arise over the discussions.

We will be charged again with the crime of “attacking the colleges,” with being anti-college, and with having a desire to destroy these institutions. But speaking for myself, I attended one in early life, and have had my children in them at intervals through the years. The charge of being an enemy of the schools is too thin to be taken seriously by anybody who is informed enough to hold a conversation on the subject. None of us in the controversy over the “college in the church budget” is opposed to colleges—we are simply opposed to the extremes to which they go, to the dangers we see in their practices, to their tendency toward ecclesiastical control, to their doctrinal weakness, and to their general departures. We are not alone in this. Some of the trustees of these institutions have admitted things that have been charged, recognized the conditions as they exist and have expressed themselves as desiring to perform the needed reforms. If all those in the high places were of the same mind, and others upon whom they have apparently depended for leadership, were of the same disposition, the institutions could hold the respect, confidence and support of a great many brethren who are now unalterably opposed to their practices.

The Church and the School

If education consists merely in the training of the intellect, we need have no concern for the establishment and maintenance of such colleges. But it is the keenly felt need of heart training that has brought the “Bible College” into existence. Education has its degrees; and, grammatically speaking, physical culture is the positive degree, intellectual culture is the comparative degree and moral culture is the superlative degree. Hence the demand for schools that will give emphasis to the moral above every other line of human development. The Bible being the greatest textbook of morals in the universe, it is but a matter of simple reason that it should be prescribed in the course of study by a school seeking to reach the heart, as well as the mind. Because the Bible has thus been adopted by such schools, they have been denominated “Bible colleges,” while in fact, all other branches of learning found in all colleges of arts and sciences are also taught. But the name “Bible College” has confused the minds of many and become the occasion for the age-long discussion of the “relation of the school to the church.”

It is generally agreed that the Bible teaches that the work of the church is twofold: First, evang-
istic—pertaining to the spread of the gospel, the salvation of souls. Hence, the church is called “the pillar and ground of the truth.” Second, benevolent—pertaining to the care of the poor and needy. The Bible further teaches that the church is all-sufficient to carry out these divine missions without the aid of human machinery. Any organization larger or smaller than the local congregation is an unscriptural organization through which to do the work that the church, as such, is commanded to do. It is agreed also that the missionary society would be auxiliary to the church, a human machine doing the work that God has commanded his church to do, and without argument here, is agreed to be unscriptural.

What, then, of “Christian Colleges”? It, too, is an auxiliary, but not properly or scripturally, to the church. The mission of the home is to “train up a child in the way he should go,” and it is the duty of parents to their children to “bring them up in the nurture and admonition of the Lord.” But when the child reaches a certain school age, when it must pass from the home into the school, does the responsibility of the parent cease? Is it not still the serious duty of the parent to select the school where the influence of the home is continued? In this matter, then, the school simply takes the place of the home and the teacher assumes the responsibility of the parent. So the “Bible College,” or the “Christian College,” or whatever you may please to call it, is no more than an auxiliary to the home. It supplements the work of the home. Some who have not made proper discrimination have wrought confusion by associating such colleges with the work of the church. Others have, therefore, opposed it on the ground that it is a “church school,” while others think it is wrong and sinful to teach the Bible in school. Of course, such a conclusion would drive the Bible from our homes and force the conclusion that the Corinthians had turned the Lord’s Supper into a church dinner, he scathingly asked: “What? have ye not, houses to eat and to drink in?” What would have been entirely proper in home life was not at all permissible in the church. The same principle will apply to the work of the church as well as its worship.

To grant that the home is a divine institution does not warrant the conclusion that everything related to the home may have the same relation to the church. The state is also a divine institution. (Rom. 13.) Shall every auxiliary of the state be made agencies of the church?

The home and the church fill distinctly different spheres. One is the sphere of moral right and privilege; the other is the realm of scriptural authority. In the home, anything right, right in itself, is permissible; in the church, only what the New Testament authorizes, a “Thus saith the Lord.” Christ is not only head of the church, but he is head over all things to the church. (Eph. 1:22, 23.)

Secular education is not the work of the church. But Christian men and women have the same right to conduct such schools as they have to engage in the mercantile business, farming, banking, publishing houses, or any other honorable business. They also have the right as individuals to teach the Bible in such schools as in any other sphere of individual life. Such schools should not derive their name from the Bible any more than from science, mathematics, philosophy, and other knowledge it imparts. In choosing the atmosphere in which to educate their children, it is not only the right of parents, but their duty, to choose schools in which the influence of the home will be continued. The teacher assumes the responsibility of the parents and the school supplements the work of the home. It furnishes no parallel for institutions and organizations which supplant the church.

Whatever the church, as such, is commanded to do can be done only through the church. And the only way to do anything through the church is to do it through the local church, which is the only organization known in the New Testament. The missionary society performs the functions of the church. It stands between the church and the work being done. Its organization supersedes and usurps the organization and work of the church. The missionary society, therefore, supplants-displaces the local church.

But individuals have certain rights and privileges.
Individuals may establish publishing houses to publish papers for those who subscribe to them or they may establish schools to educate those who patronize them. They do not have to bar the Bible and religion from such in order to have the right to operate them. But such endeavors thus conducted are private enterprises, and the individuals conducting them have no right to make their own enterprises adjuncts or agencies of the church.

If it is permissible to have a Bible college as an agency of the church in the work of education, it could not be denied with any consistency to have the missionary society as an agency of the church in the work of evangelization would also be permissible. But nothing is “permissible” as an auxiliary, adjunct of agency of the church which is not scriptural. And it is not scriptural for the church to delegate its work to boards and organizations other than the church. Institutions cannot be made mediums and agencies of the church, scripturally. The only way the church can scripturally do anything is through its local organization of elders and deacons—and that is the church at work.

Institutionalism has been a menace to congregational independence as taught in the New Testament. It has wrought havoc to the church in the past, and growing tendencies present hazards for the future. The truth of this has been seen by the more conservative element in the Christian (digressive) Church. They are trying to swing back. But while they are swinging back, in the same spirit of digression which led them away the leaders of these “movements” and “campaigns” are swinging away again, trying to sweep the church with them. The simplicity of the work and worship of the New Testament church needs re-emphasizing now in a very serious way.

Colleges, Societies and Companies

In an article that was featured in editorial space in the Gospel Advocate the president of one of the colleges defined the difference between the missionary society and the college as being in the fact that the society controls preachers and the college does not. That is not the only objection I can raise to the missionary society. If they had no control over the preachers; if the churches selected the preachers and controlled the preachers, but operated through the organized society as an agency, I would still oppose the society. We oppose them on the ground of what they are as well as of what they do.

But does not the college control the preacher member of the faculty, and other faculty members, who teach the Bible in the school? Does the church engage them; are they in the employ of the church; and could the church dismiss them? They are, of course, employed by and subject to the college, and the church contributing to the college is doing its work through a college board as its agency. Moreover the church so doing would be giving to the support of an institution engaged in the main in a work that is not even a part of the work of the church—namely, the teaching of arts and sciences, of sports and dramatics, and all that belongs to a college curriculum. If the church can support such activities, then our criticism of churches that have organized local church baseball and football teams, tennis games, and the like as churches, was all wrong. If it is right for the church to contribute to the institution engaged in such secular work, then it would be right for the church itself to do so. If not, why not?

Still further, the teaching of arts and sciences, dramatics and sports, et cetera, that the students enrolled in them may receive the various academic degrees, is the main work of the college, for it has always been insisted that the teacher on the faculty only exercises his personal, individual right to teach the Bible in the school as in any other business in which he may be engaged. Since the article mentioned cited the “Hardeman Hardware Company” at Henderson, Tennessee, as an example? the logical consequence of the comparison would be that it would be just as scriptural to put the Hardeman Hardware Company in the budget of the churches, on the ground that it is doing good (people working in it even teaching the Bible), as it is to put the “Freed-Hardeman College” in the budget of the church. If it is right to do the one, it is right to do the other, by their own illustration. The whole truth is that the colleges are privately owned and privately operated institutions, engaged in the education business, and churches are neither responsible for them nor obligated to them, and cannot scripturally support them.

“Christian Education an Adjunct to What?”

Coming now the representative of Abilene Christian College in an article given editorial space in Christian College, which was published also in the college bulletin, asking: “Christian Education Is Adjunct to What?” and he asserts that the colleges are not adjuncts of the church, in fact, the adjunct of nothing! Now, the heading of the article is a bit misleading—“Christian education is an adjunct to what?” We are not discussing Christian education, as such, on this point—we are discussing the institution through which it is done; whether or not the institution is an adjunct, or not. The college agent had as well try to prove that the missionary society as an institution is not an adjunct of anything by asking the question: “Gospel Preaching Is an Adjunct to What?” Well, any human
institution that demands the church to have the gospel preached through it would be an adjunct to the church. It is the institution that is the adjunct, not the education or the preaching in either case.

This representative thinks, in order for a thing to be an “adjunct” of something else it must become “a vital part” of that other thing. He should have consulted the dictionary before he pulled that one so green. I suppose Webster would be an authority on the word “adjunct” and he says just the opposite of this brother’s assertion. Here is his definition: ‘Adjunct, attending; consequent-something joined or added to another thing, but not essentially a part of it; a person joined to another in some duty or service; colleague; associate; in logic, a nonessential quality.’ Webster then refers to the word Adjunct, meaning, “to lie contiguous to; to be in contact with; to abut upon.” Very well, just take your choice of the above definitions and we will prove that the church is being made an “adjunct” of the college by the campaigns now being conducted! The churches are certainly being called upon to “attend” to college affairs; to be “associated” in raising money, and therefore “colleagues” in and “joined” to them as the other person or party “in some duty or service.” And if these calls from the college for “district meetings” of the churches to raise money for the college financial campaign do not cause the college “to be in contact with” the church, neither words nor actions have any significance. Webster says “contiguous” means “in actual contact; touching; adjoining”; and he says “adjunct” means contiguous. So when the church is in contact with, or touches, the work of the school it becomes contiguous to, an adjunct of the college.

It appears to the most of us that when the colleges call for district meetings of the churches, for the evident purpose of lining the churches up with and behind the schools, that they are “touching” the churches, “in actual contact with” and “lie contiguous to” and “abut upon” the churches. And when they turn right around and deny their activities with their evident and obvious aims and purposes, if they are not careful they will not only “lie contiguous to” but may lie some other way.

Our reaction to this effort of the financial wizard of Abilene Christian College to escape the fact that they are making the church an adjunct of the college is, that he may be a great financial campaigner, but he would not qualify for the English grammar department of the college, and he will do less harm to his cause if he will write fewer articles on the subject.

But if he or anyone else wishes still to quibble over what is or is not an “adjunct,” it certainly cannot be denied that when the church puts the college in the budget, or in any way contributes to it as a church, the college becomes the agency through which the church is doing what is done. If and when the government makes a contribution to a certain project (another illustration used by the college representative) the government is certainly using that particular project as its agent in the thing done. Webster says that makes a thing an adjunct, but if the agent of A. C. C. thinks it does not, everybody else knows that it does make it an agency, and that word serves our purpose fully as well as the word adjunct. According to their idea of an adjunct, a missionary society would not be an adjunct—so we would ask if the missionary society is a scriptural agency through which the church may operate? If not, then we ask is a college board of trustees a scriptural agency through which the church may operate?

But again—if the representative of the college wishes to insist that the college is not an adjunct, not an auxiliary, to the home, to the church or to anything else, not even an agency, but something else altogether its own-then that removes it even farther from a thing that the church can scripturally support or put in its budget. Why put anything so completely outside the realm of the church into its budget? If the college is made an adjunct, auxiliary, or agency of the church, it is unscriptural; and if it is not such, then there can be no ground upon which to obligate the church to it, and to attempt to do so is both inconsistent and wrong.

Of course, anybody who is thinking in proper terms, without trying to justify an unlawful practice, knows that schools supplement the work of the home, and therefore, according to both Webster, common sense and ordinary intelligence, they are adjuncts, auxiliaries, supplements, agencies and mediums of the home—simply secular institutions through which parents may educate their children or in which individuals may educate themselves. The men and women employed by the college to teach school are simply engaged in a secular calling, as much so as if they belonged to the faculty of any other college or university, and have the right as individuals to teach the Bible exactly as they would teach it at home or in any other personal way. Let the colleges keep this distinction and they will not be always embroiled in a fight that hurts them far more than it helps them. But as long as they persist in putting on these campaigns which involve the churches, we shall fight them to the last ditch, with the result that their losses in the good will of thousands of worthy brethren will far over balance all they may hope to gain.
by such campaigns. As the matter stands, the colleges are antagonizing many brethren, confusing many others, and are doing irreparable harm to the cause of Christ thereby.

Theory versus Practice

As an example, a very fine man of my acquaintance in the North has been brought up under the "Sommer influence." He has for years heard arguments pro and con. In his contacts with various brethren and preachers from the South and West, he was repeatedly assured that Sommer had misrepresented the "college brethren"; that none of us believe in annexing the colleges to the churches financially or otherwise, nor in taking money from church treasuries to support them. About this time Daniel Sommer came South and West, visited the colleges, returned North and stated that he had been assured by the college officials that such was the truth about the matter, whereupon he had modified his views on the college controversy. The brother here referred to, with many others, accepted that version and were rapidly ceasing to make an issue of the college question. But lo! hardly had this progress been made until agents of the colleges, partisans of the schools, and campaigners for money began to call upon the churches to put the colleges in their budgets. Debates were held in which attempts were made to justify churches supporting the colleges. This brother in confusion on the question felt, that the brethren in the South and West had deceived them by their assurances, naturally thinking that these campaigners and debaters on the issue were representative of the churches on the question. After some further study of the matter, however, and talking with others of us over these questions, he was able to see the extremes of both the Sommer brethren and the "Church Budget" brethren, and expressed himself to me as now being able to chart his own course in the matter. Such has been the experience of many sincere people who have every right to feel that the colleges and their representatives have not dealt forthrightly with these issues. They have theoretically taught one thing but in fact have practiced another.

The college as a Machine

The point raised by Brother W. W. Otey is not to be overlooked in this matter-namely, the power that has through years been gained by these colleges. Therein lies the danger. Brother Otey wonders if they can be stopped. There is no doubt that the colleges, all combined, do have the power to dominate even the churches through their organization, influence, patronage, enrollment and thousands of members of the church who belong to the alumnus of the various schools, enthusiastic young people who are unable to discern the issue, and out and out scalists for the colleges honeycombing the churches. But machines, as powerful as they are, can be stopped—by the truth. Abraham Lincoln said, "Let the people know the truth and this country is safe." We say, Let the members of the church know the truth in these matters and the church can be safe. But not until then, and some of us are determined that the churches shall know the truth.

We sincerely hope and pray that the elders of the churches may realize the divine mission of the church, and discern the error of these campaigns to make the colleges the agencies of the churches, and have the conviction and the courage to reject their demands. Human organizations and agencies supplant the church in fulfilling its divine mission. "Unto him be glory in the church by Christ Jesus throughout all ages, world without end. Amen."

Doubtless now, because the college presidents have been answered and their statements challenged, they will retreat for a time to wait more favorable sentiment. Meanwhile their partisan followers will cry misrepresentation and charge that we have attacked the colleges. But ours is the defensive; theirs the offensive. The colleges and their representatives are the aggressors in this controversy, as in the years previous when the issue has repeatedly been revived, and when it became imperative, as now, that their aggression be repulsed. If their present extremes are tolerated further, or if the issue is compromised now, more serious extremes will follow in rapid succession, as has been ably pointed out by Brother Otey in articles that all lovers of the truth should appreciate. Then it will be too late.

Who are the enemies of the college, and who are its friends? Some of us believe that we who seek to correct their evils are the real friends of the schools. The real enemies of the colleges are those who so loudly profess to be their friends. It is the effort to affiliate church and school, by the budget system, that is driving away the patronage of many brethren whose influence and support they need. Thereby they become the worst enemies of the colleges. On the other hand, if the colleges would listen to reason and sincerely right their wrongs, they would receive the unanimous support of those individuals among the brethren who are interested in the causes espoused by the colleges. It is a case, therefore, of the friends of the colleges becoming their enemies, for as surely as these departures continue there will be a steady, determined and unrelenting opposition, and if the torch falls from the hand of one, it will never hit the ground, for the hand of another will bear it upward and forward. So help us God—they shall not pass! -F. E. W. Jr.