BREWER REFUSES TO DEFEND HIS STATEMENT

W. W. OTEY

The following was sent to Gospel Advocate, Firm Foundation and a copy to G. C. Brewer, some months ago. The paper did not publish it and Brewer wrote me positively refusing the offer to deny his own affirmation.

"Brewer's Challenge Accepted"
During the lectureship at Abilene College, in 1938, in a speech soliciting contributions for the college, he urged elders to "put in their budgets" support for the college. A few days later I wrote him what I understood him to say in his speech, and said: "I hope I misunderstood you to advocate putting support of colleges in church budgets." He promptly replied: "As to my statement at the college, you did not misunderstand me, but left off a part of the statement that I think should be included. I said I had argued for the practice of putting the colleges and orphan homes in the congregation budgets, and would be willing to argue it again, if arguments were necessary." At that time I expressed to him my willingness to deny his affirmative statement. I now again repeat my readiness to deny his proposition, and urge him that it is now highly important that this question be fairly, honorably and fully discussed, and put in print. The demand for such a discussion is imperative and immediate.

The following wording fairly states his proposition:
It is scripturally right for the congregations of the church of Christ to contribute from the church treasury to support Abilene Christian College in its work.

Affirmative
Negative—W. W. Otey.

If the above wording of the proposition is not acceptable, then he can affirm the statement he made in Abilene College and repeated to me in a personal letter, date, March 2, 1938, which is quoted above.

Discussion to be oral or in writing as affirmative may decide. If oral, to be held in Abilene College. Discussion to be printed and published jointly or individually as may be mutually agreed. Date and minor matters to be agreed to by personal correspondence.

Belle Plaine, Kansas, May 17, 1947.
Signed, W. W. Otey.

He refused to discuss the question.
In Firm Foundation, May 27, 1947, he writes:
"I shall now try once more to make my position clear. I have never advocated supporting the colleges out of the church treasury; I have never advocated putting colleges in the budget." This is a denial of the correctness of the statement from me appearing three times in the Firm Foundation over a period of nine years, and that has been freely circulated in my free tract, Bible Colleges, for the past several years. Were it not that I have his letters containing the statement, it would be a question of memory or personal veracity. If any one desires to see that original letter with Brother Brewer's undoubted signature, it can be examined at my home. Or I would have a photostatic copy made, and mail it. If he again makes this denial I will either have such a copy made and published, or have a number of reliable brethren examine the letter and so certify whether or not it is a fact that he wrote the statement. It is a matter of grief to me that Brother Brewer would allow himself to get in this sort of dilemma. But two things are involved of serious import. First, the veracity of a large number—who heard the statement when made in Abilene College

(Continued on page 7)
BROTHER HARDEMAN IS READY TO QUIT

CLED E. WALLACE

Brother Hardeman bids us a brief farewell in a late issue of the Firm Foundation. The smile was missing and he was nearly as "lugubrious" as his team-mate Brother Brewer. These wailing twins appear to be very unhappy and I feel sorry for them but they can blame nobody but themselves for the predicament they are in. Brother Hardeman roared in like a lion and ba-a-a-a-ed out like a lamb.

Here is the dying note of the swan-song. "Until the principle is stated and the law is given, along with a list of things permitted and things forbidden, it will be unnecessary to write further." Well, a man needs some sort of an excuse for quitting and if he can't find a good one he must take a lame one. It reminds me of the Irishman who bit into a green persimmon. "If anybody wants to hear anymore out of me, he'd better hurry and get close cause I'm close'n up."

In 1938 Brother Hardeman said:

"I am truly sorry that we cannot get together on matters relating to our schools, I certainly do not endorse the putting of our schools on the church budget. I would oppose having Freed-Hardeman so placed. Such has ever been my sentiment."

He still sticks to that statement but it seems to me that his adhesive qualities have about evaporated. His reason for opposing the school in the budget appears to be sound. "I have always said that I would oppose the placing of our schools in the church budgets and thus binding the church to their support." If he knows "the principle and the law" that directed him to this conclusion it ought to be unnecessary for us to keep giving it to him as he has repeatedly requested. The trouble seems to be that he is nosing around trying to find a loop-hole in the law so that he can get the same results as he could without the law. "But—but—but—but——" "the principle and the law are about to get "but-
other. He just hacked at it.

The readers of the Bible Banner have been treated to some pretty exhaustive lessons on “the principle and the law” governing church activities. Brother Hardeman and Brother Brewer want all the details. You may wonder why. I don’t. I know all the symptoms when men are in need of something to ride out on.

I reckon I ought to leave Brother Hardeman a little something to be comforted over, but I don’t think it would be good for the cause, or him either to do it. We’d just as well make a clean sweep of this thing while we are at it. He assumes and argues from the assumption that the relation of the church to the school is the same as it is to an orphan’s home. What follows? Put the school in the budget where the orphan’s home is. No, no, Brother Hardeman is opposed to that and has “ever been.” Very well, let him make a statement that reads:

“I am truly sorry that we cannot get together on matters relating to our orphan’s homes. I certainly do not endorse the putting of our orphan’s homes on the church budget. Such has ever been my sentiment.”

If he will just sign N.B.H. to that statement then we will know that he thinks the two are parallel. “I predict that such request will not be answered.” And I think he was wise in quitting when he did. It will save him some embarrassment.

Brother Hardeman doesn’t like the way we are carrying on our side of this discussion. He thinks we are “dizzy and confused” and make comparisons and references “for the sole purpose of prejudicing the readers and clouding the issue” that we “must prefer to evade the issue and talk about things wholly irrelevant.” He even takes exception to the nice things I said about his picture and smile and calls them “sarcastic remarks” that “have nothing to do with the issue involved”. He appears to be so “dizzy and confused” that he cannot distinguish a compliment from sarcasm. Of course I knew the smile didn’t have anything to do with “the issue involved.” That was one reason I wondered why it was put in the paper. Bro. Hardeman blames Bro. Showalter with it. Maybe Brother Showalter will be more careful next time and keep such irrelevant matter out of the paper. Really though it wasn’t a serious mistake. I liked the picture all right. It was the article that went with it that wasn’t so hot. He appears to be a bit testy over what I said about the picture and remarks: “Plenty of people there are who can not answer the smile or the arguments.” Really, I meant no harm and I have a plausible explanation which may be accepted for an apology. I needed something to fill my quota of space and since the “arguments” were too light to demand that much space I just filled in with “the smile.” If Brother Showalter has a picture of Brother Hardeman looking like he does when he reads what I write, maybe he had better keep it out of the paper. However, if he wants to put it in I’ll promise not to say anything about it.

Oh, yes! I thought I was about through but there’s one more thing I can use to fill up space. This issue of the paper is a bit hard on me. The editor is flat of his back in Temple, Texas, following a major operation and the work of making up this issue of the paper falls on me. If it is a flop you’ll understand why. The patient is doing well, thank you, has medical assurance that within weeks he will be back on the firing line with normal vigor, and normal vigor for him is plenty. If he would work just about twice as hard as I do and preach just twice as long as I do, he would have more time to take care of his health. Maybe he’ll learn but he is like some other people I know. He doesn’t pay too much attention to me when he’s wrong and I’m right.

But that wasn’t what I started out to say. Brother Hardeman along with Earnest Beam and some others, mostly premillennialists and their sympathizers, are terribly worried over the threat that we hold over the churches as “dictators.” He says:

“I deny the right of any preacher to dictate to a church what it should do with the ‘Lords money’ unless he can show that the thing under consideration is wrong in itself.”

Now, I’m less of a dictator than Brother Hardeman. I reserve the right as a Christian to reprove, rebuke and exhort whenever I think the situation demands it, but I do not claim the power of dictation over a church even if I “can show that the thing under consideration is wrong in itself.” I’m not dictating to a man when I tell him he has to obey the gospel or go to hell. He can take his choice. I can’t make him go to heaven unless he wants to. I can’t make a church do right. But brother, I can tell it what is right. If it wants to stage a donkey show, and some of them are doing it without the sort of donkeys that eat hay, I can’t do any more about it than warn and protest. I don’t even try to boss the church where I live and preach, but I preach. Brother Hardeman knows we are not dictators. Brother Beam knows we are not dictators. Brother Davidson knows we are not dictators. Why all the fuss about dictators? I don’t know unless it “be for the sole purpose of prejudicing the readers and clouding the issue.”

But Brother Hardeman is probably out of hearing distance by now. “It will be unnecessary for him “to write further.” Well, good-bye and good luck. Next time you appear in the paper, picture or no picture, get on the right side of the issue and you can do better and stay longer.
THE CAMPAIGN GETS UNDER WAY

CLED E. WALLACE

In this essay I shall play more the role of a news commentator than a critic. It will be remembered that some months ago we got hold of that now celebrated Norman Davidson batch of letters, the publication of which created such widespread consternation. The letters revealed a plot to white-wash Brother Boll and his premillennial movement into a respectability that would be acceptable to churches and brethren generally. It involved smearing some of the rest of us including some worthies of the past who are now dead but of course that wouldn't matter. "Norman Davidson and His Plea for Unity was to be a blitzkrieg as devastating as the publication of the letters turned out to be. But we beat them to it and nipped the surprise campaign in the bud. They were robbed of the element of surprise. The plan was to secretly enlist the support of more or less powerful men throughout the country including the editors of some of the papers, and some of the presidents of the colleges and then spring a publicity campaign on the unsuspecting brethren. We got hold of the letters, published them and upset the Plan.

I have kept a weather eye open to see what would happen and it has-in the Firm Foundation. I expected it but all signs pointed to Gospel Broadcast. The editor of that periodical has been laying a perfect foundation for such a thing for weeks. To a news-bound like me the metamorphosis of the editor of the Gospel Broadcast is as fascinating as that of a chrysalis into a butterfly. The ugly duckling has changed almost overnight into a charming and smiling debutante. In Texas he was known as the wildest of the wild boys and his name became about the same as a synonym for fanaticism. Brethren will long remember his cavortings in the name of Christ throughout this section. Since he went north something cooled him off. Maybe it was the climate. After listening to him and about him for years, I wasn't quite prepared to find him contentedly purring editorially each week like a kitten full of warm milk. Being naturally suspicious of some folks, I have just sat and watched him. He loves everybody--except the Bible Banner. He can now make all due and undue allowances for Brother Boll and Brother Bixler and the whole premillennial group. It fitted in perfectly with the rumor that came floating by that he was hand in glove with Norman Davidson. In a recent editorial he says:

"Current courses of criticism in our brotherhood are in mind as we write. A Christian goes to a brother to apologize for a sin of the past and instead of it being taken in the spirit of Christ it is used as a basis for a violent attack upon character and intent of the one making the apology."

Now just wipe away your tears over this heartless conduct. The suppliant sinner was Norman Davidson. The hard-hearted man void of the "spirit of Christ" was Foy Wallace. The "violent attack" was made by James W. Adams who reported in the Bible Banner just what happened and what was said when Davidson and Wallace met. And if you have more tears to shed prepare to shed them now.

"Mistakes of our Christian colleges are made the basis for campaigns of criticism which numb the hearts of God's faithful as they, in fear of violating God's word 'know not which way to turn. Anyone and everyone and everything is the basis for criticism by those who hold the first attitude mentioned above."

Now let us all cry! Poor Bro. Davidson and "our Christian colleges" have certainly been near where Satan's throne is. As for "God's faithful" neither their hearts nor their heads are as "numb" as the editor thinks they are. I suspect that the majority of them have begun to suspicious the cause of the change that has taken place in the editor of the Gospel Broadcast.

So sitting, watching and thinking a little I about had it figured out that Brother Davidson would launch his delayed and emasculated campaign in the Gospel Broadcast. Instead it peeps out at us through four-and-one-half pages of the Firm Foundation. In a way that is better for it is getting an editorial review which it probably wouldn't get in the Gospel Broadcast. The Firm Foundation and its esteemed editor are nicer than they used to be when I was writing for the paper, but they are not near as nice as the Gospel Broadcast and its editor. If I can point out a thing or two in "the Norman Davidson plea" that Brother Showalter has possibly overlooked and get him riled up a bit, he will probably do a good job of reviewing that wild and unusual document.

Brother Showalter thinks that

"Brother Davidson is a good man, certainly honest and sincere; were it not the case I would not regard it as worthwhile to let him be heard, or spend time and space in reviewing what he says."

That is very generous of Brother Showalter in view of the fact that Brother Davidson does not appear to fully reciprocate the confidence. It so happened that Brother Davidson quoted Brother Showalter in that private correspondence we got under "false pretenses" and when
it was published in the Bible Banner, Brother Showalter denied some of it and came mighty close to calling Brother Davidson a liar. Possibly after looking him over he has decided that Brother Davidson is not capable of accurately reporting a conversation, and doesn’t hold him responsible. But Brother Davidson hasn’t changed his mind about Brother Showalter and shly insinuates it into the very article he sends to the Firm Foundation for publication:

“My quotations from prominent men were so used to plant fear in the hearts of these brethren and cause them to disavow their previous statements made to me.”

Brother Showalter was one of the most “prominent” of these men Brother Davidson quoted and according to Brother Davidson he got so scared of us it caused him to “disavow” a statement he made to Brother Davidson. Now it is an interesting point they & an settle between them as to who is “certainly honest and sincere.” Brother Showalter says Brother Davidson is. I have been laboring under the impression that Brother Showalter is. Maybe there is just an “honest” mistake somewhere. But anyhow it is crystal clear that Brother Davidson still thinks that Brother Showalter disavowed statements he made to him because we planted fear in his heart. We had no idea of scaring him at all and certainly not that bad.

I do not think Brother Showalter ought to feel too depressed because Brother Davidson doesn’t have much confidence either in his honesty or his courage. Just read what he thinks about us and think at least as much of ourselves as Brother Showalter does.

“Letters Dishonorably Taken”

“My personal, private correspondence was procured under false pretense by a preacher in the largest circles of influence and was published without consent of either writer or receiver of the letters. My quotations from prominent men were used to plant fear in the hearts of these brethren and cause them to disavow their previous statements made to me.

Isn’t it strange that in the name of loyalty and soundness, leaders among us should stoop to such low levels of dishonor as to follow such tactics? Does this unholy violation tell us nothing of the fundamental unsoundness of those who attack our efforts? Is not this unholy spirit, by which they hope to use their public influence, considerably worse than anything they attack? And should not brethren who follow them be informed of all the facts? My conviction is that they should, hence the present effort.”

My conviction is that they should be informed or all the facts in view of the fact that Brother Davidson doesn’t seem to have them, or is unwilling to tell them. The “personal, private correspondence” referred to are the Davidson letters to Brother McQuiddy we published some months ago in the Bible Banner. That we “procured” them “under false pretenses” is a plain falsehood and if you can think of a shorter word you may use it, whether intended or not as the case may be. Brother N. B. Hardeman mailed a complete copy of those letters to the editor of the Bible Banner and they were handed over to me for my respects. These are the letters we were widely accused of “stealing” from somebody’s files. Others received copies from the same source we got ours. Now, I have been reading rumors to the effect that if we publish the truth about this thing, dire consequences will follow, things will be told that will “ruin” us and all that sort of thing. All right, here’s the truth. Now turn on the hot stuff. We have been lied about anonymously and otherwise long enough to get used to it. Norman Davidson himself wrote “private” letters attacking the character of the editor of the Bible Banner and demanded it till he was confronted with the evidence. Then he confessed that he had “sinned” and promised to write other letters correcting it. If he has ever done so I have never heard of it. This is not pleasant but it is the sort of thing we are unaccustomed to. It isn’t shocking to me that leaders in such a movement as Norman Davidson is advocating in the Firm Foundation “should stoop to such levels of dishonor as to follow such tactics”.

It has been going on so long I’m accustomed to it. So I’m willing for Brother Showalter to pass the compliments and make the outsters. I’ll stick to the farts. And when he gets through with Brother Davidson, if we think he hasn’t done enough, we’ll do some more. And we have the facts and the matter to do it with. The only advantage he has over us is money and we wouldn’t swan what we have that he doesn’t have for all the money there is.

---

Since writing the article “The Campaign Gets Under Way” I have received a later issue of both the Firm Foundation and the Gospel Broadcast. Some additional remarks are in order which may modify some things said in that article. They will at least serve as an appendix.

We are inserting in full an editorial by the veteran and esteemed editor of the Firm Foundation. It together with the exhaustive treatment of the situation by Brother James A. Allen of the Apostolic Times plow right into the “Davidson Plea” and ‘tear it to tatters. Pm not the excitable type but it appears to me that Brother Showalter
has knocked the ball clear out of the park and broke up the ball game. I'm as happy as can be over it, and perfectly content to know that we got a base-hit or so before he came to bat.

The Davidson matter came out in the Gospel Broadcast as I have been expecting it to and the carefully worded editorial displays the close fellowship existing between the editor of that paper and Brother Davidson on these matters. I thought possibly Jake Hincs would kick up a bit. He did say a nice piece that sound's like somebody else, and it boiled down to the profound observation that he would about as soon fellowship a premillennialist as a preacher who uses tobacco. That gives the editor of the Bible Banner an advantage of me. He doesn't smoke. I hate for Foy to enjoy more of Jake's fellowship than I do. However a good cigar tastes better to me than Jake's article smells.

There has been a good deal said about Brother Davidson's honesty, sincerity and the like. Our dealing with him is unfortunate. It seems that he made an exception of us. Before he made the changes that we got those letters fraudulently and descended to a low plane of dishonesty, he was made acquainted with the facts and shown impec- table evidence by the editor of the Bible Banner himself. Brother Hardeman sent the letters to us and the copy we got was mimeographed. Others received like copies. Brother Hardeman iater denied that he sent them. Possibly he forgot sending the letters and possibly Brother Davidson, being a very busy man forgot what he was told and shown. Surely "honest and sincere" men would not deliberately do such things! But facts are facts and we have them. So this is to tell everybody who doesn't know that "Brother Hardeman sent us mimeographed copies of the letters with no restriction as to their use. 'Brother Davidson says they were his "private" letters. How come because of the New Testament. (And which to me seem very much out of place.) Quotations that involve only a half truth, and particularly from men who are dead and cannot explain their speculative theories or cor- rect misrepresentations are out of place in a search for truth. Of course, Brother David Lipscomb was not in sympathy with the speculative theories of Boll and his false and unscriptural teaching is ridiculous. And the same is true of Brother Harding and others.

Brother Davidson's trouble when it is all 'boiled down amounts to this, that the churches (or nearly all of them) and at least two of the colleges oppose Boll and his teaching, will not fellowship him, that is will not have him preach for them, and regard his teaching as to a future reign of Christ on earth as a dangerous doctrine, and therefore is wholly unsupported by the teaching of the New Testament. I think he might well have added, also, the other three or four colleges conducted by brethren who are loyal members of the churches of Christ. There must be something wrong with a teaching that is discarded by the elders of nearly all the churches of Christ, and Brother Davidson would do well to post up a little as to the meaning of Premillennialism. It is a pity that Brother Boll persists in his obstinacy to teach his false and speculative theory, and it is also a pitiful thing to see men like Brother Norman Davidson who says he does not believe the teaching of Boll's Premillennialism himself, try to bolster up and hold up the teaching, nevertheless, by defending Brother Boll.

That the New Testament teaches that the disciples of God, the disciples of Christ, should be united there is no doubt. But the apostles of our Lord have also taught us exactly how this unity must be brought about. Listen to the Apostle Paul: "Now I beseech you, brethren, by the name of our Lord Jesus Christ, that ye all speak the same thing, and that there be no divisions among you: but that ye be perfectly joined to-

(Continued on page 7)
THE PULSE OF THE PREACHERS

The Bible Banner is being handled nicely now. You fellows are doing a good job of it. I'm sorry A. C. C. has jumped the track in her effort to raise the endowment but since she has, some of you who are good at writing have to handle the pen. Seeing the trend toward independence being manifest by the colleges, I'm beginning to wonder if an endowment that would make A. C. C. totally self-sufficient would not also put her in position to crystallize certain trends into policies that, being taught year after year to a stream of students, would appreciably change the attitude of the church in general, toward a weaker stand on fundamentals. As it is, if her teachers talk off color, they either must be removed or corrected, or the college stands to lose its support. Though I'd like to see her usefulness expanded, I question the advisability of making her entirely independent of the rank and file of Christians.-Ernest H. Witt, Willis, Texas.

For a long time, I have intended to write you. Other matters have so taxed my time that I just put it off. I just wanted to say that I fully appreciate the fights you have made against "isms" that threaten the church. I don't want you to ever entertain the idea of "letting down" because of hateful things done by brethren who love the wages of unrighteousness. I feared, several years ago, that your heart would be made heavy by some traitors.

I hope the colleges never dominate the church, but I do know that a lot of preachers are dominated by them and especially their presidents. I am a friend to Christian education and have defended it in debate with Ketcherside. With the conditions that now exist, I would not undertake it. When I met Ketcherside some years ago, Bro. Hardeman furnished me a letter, over his signature, to the effect that if, If. C., was an adjunct to the home and depended in no sense upon the church as such for your support. That was just after his debate with Bogard, in Little Rock, Arkansas. If the churches all emptied their treasuries into the colleges, a poor boy would still have to manage for money to attend one. I would oppose money being sent from the church treasury to an orphanage, if I knew that some one would have to pay the orphan child's board and room extra. God willing, my children will attend a Christian school, but I expect to have to foot the bill myself.—Sterl A. Watson, Haynesville, La.

It is my conviction that you brethren have hit the nail on the head.-R. A. Hartsell, Guthrie, Oklahoma.

THE CAMPAIGN GETS UNDER WAY—

(Continued from page 6)

to gather in the same mind, and in the same judgment" (I Cor. 1:10). The only wpgv to unity that God requires is for all to speak the same "thing. The preachers Brother Davidson so severely denounced are teaching that we must all speak the same thing. One cannot teach things not taught in the New Testament and be at unity with those who teach only as the oracles of God teach. They are divided and the only way for them to be united is for them all to teach just what the Bible reveals; then they will all be teaching the same thing, and this is just exactly what Paul here requires. Suppose some one departs and begins the teaching of Premillennialism. He becomes then and there a divider of the people of God; Premillennialism cannot be found as a teaching of the Bible. The only claim its proponents make for it is that it is an effort to interpret unfilled prophecy. "Of the same mind" most assuredly does that allow that we think and teach differently. It means that God requires that his children be of one mind and that they will thus be united. This is the only unity that God approves; it is the unity urged upon the people of God in the New Testament.

As for discord there will always be discord when any part of the membership of the church of the Lord departs from the sound teaching of the New Testament, and the cure for it is not to fete fellowship and unite with the false teacher but to oppose the false teacher and his false teaching. This must be done in the spirit of Christ, but must not be neglected. All Christians must earnestly contend for the faith and oppose what is contrary to it. To do otherwise in order to be at peace with some false teacher is to betray the Master and surrender to the forces of evil. It is true that the Savior came to bring peace on earth and that he prayed that his people should be one; but it is also true that the Savior himself said he came to bring about separation as well. "Suppose we tolerate one to bring peace on earth? I tell you, Nay, but rather division" is his way of expressing it. (See Luke 12:51-53). The right must be separated from the wrong, the good from the bad. This must be done before unity. Can Brother Davidson really know that Jesus said this? Also that John wrote: "If any one cometh unto you, and bringeth not this teaching, receive him not into your house, and give him no (greeting)."—Firm Foundation.
SOME OLD DOCTRINES RESTATED AND EXAMINED

R. L. WHITESIDE

Some denominational doctrines, which a generation or two ago were preached persistently, ceased for a period to be much emphasized, except by a few debaters, and they usually tried to tone them down. Therefore the new members of their denominations did not know the doctrines of their churches. However of late most of these old exploded doctrines are being loudly and persistently proclaimed over the radio. If these doctrines were harmless speculations, we could afford to let them alone; but as they have a tendency to destroy a feeling of personal responsibility, we must again make a determined fight against them. The doctrines I have in mind may be summed up under the term Calvinism, for Calvin's teaching made them popular among the early Protestants. These doctrines of Calvin were incorporated in many of the creeds and confessions of faith. The great Westminster confession was published in 1648. Of this confession Prof. W. J. McGlothlin, in Baptist Confessions of Faith, says, "It was the product of much labor, and is certainly one of the noblest of all the Protestant confessions, if indeed it has a peer." "This Westminster confession, altered to suit Baptist views of the church and its ordinances, was adopted" in 1677 by "the elders and brethren of many congregations" in London and the country. In 1689 messengers from one hundred and seven churches in England and Wales met in London and approved this confession. In America the Baptist Association which assembled at Philadelphia, September 25, 1742, "ordered the printing of a new edition of this confession, the first of this or any other Baptist confession to be printed in America." Two articles were added: one, "concerning the singing of Psalms in the worship of God"; the other, "laying on of hands upon baptized believers." These matters will serve as a background for some things I wish to say.

It is interesting to note what this confession, which has been "held as authoritative by all English speaking Presbyterians," says about God's decrees. God from all eternity did by the most wise and holy counsel of his own will, freely and unchangeably ordain whatsoever comes to pass: whereby neither is God the author of sin, nor is violence offered to the will of the creatures, nor is the liberty or contingency of second causes taken away, but rather established." (Chapter 3, Article 1). If you can understand that, you can go to the head of the class. In the "Larger Catechism," ratified and adopted by the Synod of New York and Philadelphia, held at Philadelphia, in May, 1788, we have this question and answer:

Q. 12.—What are the decrees of God?
A.—God's decrees are the wise, free, and holy acts of the counsel of his will, whereby, from all eternity, he hath, for his own glory, unchangeably foreordained whatsoever comes to pass in time, especially concerning angels and men.

If a man could bring himself to the point of really believing these pronouncements, he would not feel any responsibility for anything he did or failed to do. But the decrees are further stated: "By the decree of God, for the manifestation of his glory, some men and angels are predestined unto everlasting life, and others foreordained to everlasting death. These angels and men, thus predestinated and foreordained, are particularly and unchangeably designed; and their number is so certain and definite that it cannot be either increased or diminished." (Chapter 3, Articles 3, 4.) Again: "As God hath appointed the elect unto glory, so hath he, by the eternal and most free purpose of his will, foreordained all the means thereto. Wherefore they who are elected, being fallen in Adam, are redeemed by Christ, are effectually called unto faith in Christ by his spirit working in due season; are justified, adopted, sanctified, and kept by his power through faith unto salvation. Neither are any other redeemed by Christ, effectually called unto faith in Christ by his spirit working in due season; are justified, adopted, sanctified, and kept by his power through faith unto salvation. Neither are any other redeemed by Christ, effectually called, justified, adopted, sanctified, and saved, but the elect only." (Chapter 3, Article 6).

I would not accuse any one of believing what these confessions say about the decrees of God unless he avows such belief. However before a Presbyterian candidate for the ministry can be licensed, he must answer affirmatively four questions, one of which is, "Do you sincerely receive and adopt the Confession of Faith and the Catechisms of this church, as containing the system...
of doctrine taught in the Holy Scriptures?” Then before he can be ordained as a pastor of any church, he must answer that question again. Hence if a Presbyterian preacher is truthful, he believes what his confession says about decrees. But how can he? God did “freely and unchangeably ordain whatsoever comes to pass; yet so as thereby neither is God the author of sin.” That is, God ordained it, but is not the author of it! He ordained whatsoever comes to pass, but that does no violence to the will of creatures! That is, God unchangeably ordained that a man should do a certain thing, but left him free to exercise his own will! His eternal and unchangeable decree does not take away the liberty or contingency of second causes! Can anyone believe these things?

A part of the doctrine of the eternal decrees is the doctrine of eternal and unconditional election and reprobation. And this doctrine leaves all non-elect infants, who die in infancy, with no provision for their salvation. The confession says, “Elect infants, dying in infancy, are regenerated and saved by Christ through the Spirit, who worketh when, and where, and how he pleaseth. So also are all other elect persons, who are incapable of being outwardly called by the ministry of the word.” (Chapter 10, Article 3.) So non-elect infants and idiots are doomed. But some have tried to soften this matter by saying that non-elect infants never die. Where did they find any authority for such a statement? Besides, if a person is a non-elect, what “difference does it make as to justice and fairness, whether he dies in infancy or old age? He is doomed anyway. To charge God with keeping the non-elect alive till they reach maturity to escape the charge of damning infants puts God in a bad light. According to the doctrine of the decrees, the mature non-elect is as helpless as an infant, for he is not allowed any choice in the matter. How such arbitrary dealings with human beings can be for the glory of God is more than I can see. There is no mercy in it. It looks too much like a cat’s playing with a helpless mouse before he decides to kill it and eat it! One of the glorious attributes of God is his mercy. If you will look carefully into the doctrine of election and reprobation, as set forth in the Westminster Confession of Faith, you will see that mercy for lost sinners was not what moved God to redeem even the elect. Where is mercy, when some are allowed to perish without remedy? Oh, I know the confession talks about grace and mercy; but where is there room for mercy in what is said about the decrees of God? “By the decree of God, for the manifestation of his glory, some men and angels are predestinated unto everlasting life, and others fore-ordain’d to everlasting death.” Did mercy move God to make such a decree? No, he made it to manifest his glory. But does such a decree manifest any glory? Is any glory manifested in decreeing from all eternity that certain ones shall be saved regardless of their character, and certain ones damned without remedy? It seems to me that such decrees manifest neither the mercy nor the glory of God. The “decree” rather represents God as acting on a mere whimsey. And the makers of the confession thought there was also justice in such a decree. The Larger Catechism tells us that God “in Christ,” hath chosen some men to eternal life, and the means thereof, and also, according to his sovereign power, and the unsearchable counsel of his own will (whereby he extendeth or withholdeth favor as he pleaseth) hath pass’d by, and fore-ordained the rest to dishonor and wrath, to be for their sins inflicted, to the praise of the glory of his justice.” (Answer to question 13.) Now, is there any justice in decreeing that man shall follow a certain course, giving them no choice to do otherwise, and then inflicting punishment on them for so doing. It seems to me, that whatever they do would come under the head of what our courts of justice call “an act of God.” It seems to me that the decree makes them no more responsible for what they do than is a bolt of lightning. And our courts do not regard it as just to punish anybody for “an act of God.” But these decrees leave a man with no choice as to whom he will serve; that was settled by the eternal and unchangeable decree of God.

From my eighth year to my twentieth the nearest meeting house to our home was Old Center, a Primitive Baptist place of worship in Hickman County, Tennessee. I heard their preachers quite often, for they were rather numerous in our section and in some adjoining counties. At some time two schools of thought had appeared among them. One group held the old idea of the absolute predestination of all things —the eternal and unchangeable decree of God had marked out for every man his whole life to the minutest detail. If a man were born to be drowned, he would not be killed by a falling tree. But another group believed that the eternal decree applied only to election and reprobation, and a man had no choice as to whom he served; otherwise he was free to do as he pleased. These called the others absoluters. But the difference did not interfere with their fellowship. I never heard their difference publicly aired. But does a man have any choice as to whom he will serve?

“T’call heaven and earth to witness against you this day, that I have set before thee life and death. the blessing and the curse: therefore choose life, that thou mayest live, thou and thy seed: to love Jeovah thy God, to obey his voice, and to cleave unto him.” (Deut.30:19,20). Here God through Moses exhorts the people to choose life. It is folly therefore, to say they had no ability to choose life. Joshua said to Israel, “And
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“Coming events cast their shadows before”. A chilling shadow now lengthens across the brotherhood from coast to coast. The clouds pile high warning of the coming storm. Forces are marshalling for the fray. The battle lines are clearly drawn. Shall victory be lost in a negotiated peace that opens the door to the baneful and subversive influence of the premillennial heresy? Will the sacrifices and sufferings of the gallant soldiers of the cross (some who have already crossed the “chilly river”) have been in vain? Have these heroes of the cross barricaded the front door and repulsed the foe only to have some of our pious moderns traitorously slip in through the back door under the guise of brotherly love? Offensive though it may be to a certain “Christian business man”, I say in the words of one more able than I, “They shall not pass”!

Norman Davidson And The Issue Before Us

By now all who read this are acquainted with Norman Davidson. He and his scheme were given full treatment in the Bible Banner of July 1946. You will remember the article of this writer “I Listened In” in the May 1947 issue of the B.B. in which he recorded a conversation which took place between Norman Davidson and Foy E. Wallace Jr. at Temple, Texas. Likely, you have read Davidson’s article which has appeared in the Firm Foundation and the Apostolic Times. Perhaps you have even received his tract. Jimmie Lovell, the talkative and loose thinking editor of the West Coast Christian, informs us in his sheet of July 1947 that The West Coast Christian and the Gospel Advocate are furnishing Davidson with their mailing lists for the purpose of circulating the tract in question.

For those who are unacquainted with Davidson, may I say that he proposes to see that the premillennial teachers among our brethren be received back into the fellowship of loyal churches. They are not to renounce any item of their faith with respect to the premillennial heresy and are to be permitted to teach what they believe in the matter. This is Davidson’s object, hence any, paper, or institution that aids and abets him in his effort thus becomes a party to and a participant in his unrighteous endeavor.

Norman Davidson and his unworthy scheme would hardly merit respectable notice were it not for the fact that so many prominent agencies among us are giving them attention. The very fact that he is thus noticed portends no good and indicates an attitude that casts a threatening shadow over the future peace and doctrinal purity of the churches of Christ.

In the Davidson article in the Firm Foundation, July 22, 1947, Davidson says, “I do not believe the premillennial views.” I heard him say the same thing at Temple, but in a few moments thereafter, he vehemently said, “I do not know anything about it!” He further said, I have never heard R. H. Boll or O. D. Bixler (premillennialists) teach anything contrary to the New Testament. When Brother Davidson makes any statement about premillennialism, he deserves not to be heard. What he knows about premillennialism could be put in a very small thimble and there would still be room for one of Jimmie Lovell’s editorials, and incidentally, both would make about the same degree of sense.

Brother Davidson seems to think the whole controversy over premillennialism is but a squabble over different interpretations of “unfulfilled prophecy.” In making such a statement, he but reveals the depth of his ignorance concerning premillennialism. I stand ready along with hundreds of other loyal gospel preachers to show wherein premillennialism is contradictory of and antagonistic to the plain teaching of the New Testament. It is not a speculation; it is a false doctrine.

Brother Davidson cries about someone “denying salvation to heathen Japan” because he opposes a premillennialist missionary. He quotes Phil. 1:15-18 concerning Paul’s rejoicing over the preaching of Christ on the part of those motivated by “envy and strife” and shames the brother because he “would deny that Christ be preached at all, even though in sincerity and love, by any who may disagree with his infallible interpretations of prophecy!” Again our “Christian business man” betrays his incompetency to deal with this issue. Brother Davidson, you had better “stick” to designing furniture. Turn to Acts 8:5 and read, “Then Philip went down to the city of Samaria and preached Christ unto them.” Note Acts 8:12, “When they believed Philip preaching the things concerning the kingdom of God and the name of Jesus Christ.” From a combination of these two statements, we learn that to preach Christ is to preach “the things (the truth J. W. A. concerning the kingdom.” No premillennialist on earth of any kind preaches the truth concerning the kingdom, hence does not “preach Christ” in the New Testament sense. Though a premillennialist preach his carnal and materialistic philosophy concerning the kingdom in all sincerity and love, in so doing, he is not preaching Christ. Try again, Brother Davidson, but watch your step. You are not designing furniture, and you cannot cover your mistakes with a little cotton and tapestry. Put it down, Brother Davidson, 0. D. Bixler, our premillennialist brother, and his little ‘embryonic missionary society are going to be opposed every step of the way. In the first place, the movement is unscrip-
tural in organization. The leaders of two congregations constitute its supervisory board; members of several other congregations combined with members of the supervisory congregations form its administrative board; it solicits funds from churches for general missionary work and secular enterprises. A thing like this is wanting in scriptural authority in all of its distinctive features. In addition to this, it is honeycombed with premillennialists and premillennial sympathizers.

Brother Davidson quotes from David Lipscomb in his commentary on Romans, page 206, and implies that Brother Lipscomb’s statement has reference to our attitude toward such as teach the fallacious doctrine of premillennialism as believed and taught by R. H. Boll and his followers twoday. I but ask my readers to get a copy of Lipscomb on Romans and read it to see that Davidson has misused the name, reputation, and work of a man long dead. Davidson implies that Brother Lipscomb held that the theory now believed and taught by R. H. Boll was simply a matter of interpretation of unfulfilled prophecies. I deny that Brother Lipscomb said such. It is not true. Other matters with which he deals having to do with occurrences in the past should be dealt with by those intimately familiar with them. However, if his accuracy is not better there than in his dealings with Brother Lipscomb, his representations are far from correct.

Letters dishonorably taken.—Davidson says, “My personal, private correspondence was procured under false pretenses by a preacher in the largest circles of influence and was published without consent of either writer or receiver of letters.” Knowing that the Bible Banner published the letters referred to in July 1946, the reader would conclude that Davidson refers to the letters. “Can a leopard change his spots?” For years Davidson has misused the name, reputation, and teachings of R. H. Boll. Davidson implies that Brother Lipscomb’s statement has reference to our attitude toward premillennialists and premillennial sympathizers.

That Which Darkens the Shadow

Reference has already been made to the fact that prominent men and agencies among us seem to be giving to Norman Davidson an amount of attention altogether out of proportion with the importance of the man and his movement. Could it be that otherwise sound brethren are letting personal animosity toward other brethren cloud their thinking or does it portend a general weakening with reference to their attitude toward premillennialists and premillennialism?

The West Coast Christian.—Our loquacious friend, Jimmie Lovell-all, the editor, who lovingly designates his distorted idea of certain brethren as “baptized devils” and who is on intimate letter-writing terms with “old Nick” himself graciously provides Norman Davidson with his mailing list to promote his scheme.

The Gospel Advocate.—The Advocate while not printing the Davidson article, according to Brother Jimmie Lovell, obligingly provides Davidson with its mailing list to circulate his proposals. Yes, the editor of the Gospel Advocate did speak rather pointedly some weeks past on this matter, but what does that amount to if they supply their mailing list to facilitate the propagation of Davidson’s views? Does the Advocate have both a public and a private policy?

The Firm Foundation.—The Foundation prints the Davidson article with certain strictures by its editor. We await with bated breath the mature, studied pronouncements of the editor of the Firm Foundation. It is to be hoped that his statements will be unequivocal to the point of being incapable of being misunderstood. May they more clearly indicate his ‘exact position than do his utterances on the question of the support of the colleges by the churches. The deadline for publication prevents my waiting for Brother Sho-Walter’s next article.

The Apostolic Times.—This paper prints Davidson’s article with much praise of Brother Davidson and defers answering until next month. If I were going to print it in a monthly, I think I could find space to answer it in the same issue. We await the answer.

The Gospel Broadcast.—The prophet of old should have lived until our day and he would have a demonstrable answer to the question, “Can a leopard change his spots?” For years the benignant editor of Gospel Broadcast was so sound in the faith and felt so keenly his responsibility with respect to “marking” that he even advocated withdrawing fellowship from those who attended the movies. Now he so loves his brethren that he can fellowship all of them. The gracious mantle of his charity even covers the premillennialists. Yesterday, he gently treads the flower-scented path of compromise: tomorrow, what his attitude will be, Omniscience alone
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WHAT I FOUND AT GEORGE PEPPERDINE

BY JOHN F. WOLFE

(Note: The following article by Brother John Wolfe should provoke some serious thought upon the part of brethren everywhere. The history of religious schools in general has been that when they reach the place of financial independence they remain no longer loyal to the cause that established them. Sectarian schools have run true to that form and are today full of modernism and infidelity wherever they are not dependent for financing upon those who will not have it so. Sectarian churches have been filled with modernists from these schools that have trained their preachers and leaders 95 per cent more or less. Do we want preachers that have been educated under modernistic influence? Is it a good thing for the "leaders" of the churches to be college trained when that is the kind of training in the colleges? Which is worse, infidelity in a state school where it is expected and is not under cover, or modernism in a so-called Bible school where it operates under cover and is not expected?

Those who know John Wolfe will not question for a moment any fact related by him. I went to school with him and have known him for almost twenty-five years. I have unbounded confidence in his integrity. He has given us something to think about in the midst of the present effort of our schools to work their way into financial independence through large endowments and fasten themselves upon the churches as "church institutions." If they are "going the way of the earth" - we should certainly see to it that they do not train too many of the "leaders" of the churches.

There isn't anything very compatible and harmonious between simple New Testament Christianity and "higher education." A graduate school in religion is mighty apt to make a man think he is smarter than God if he isn't careful.

* * *

Many of my friends have asked me about the teaching of Modernism at George Pepperdine College. For some time I have had on my desk three letters, two from preachers and one from a college professor asking for information on this question, none of which I have as yet answered. I feel that these brethren, and the brotherhood at large, have a right to know about some of the things that I learned while attending Pepperdine, and which can only be learned by sitting in the class rooms of that institution.

I notice that Brother Lovell says that Modernism is a word that some "great defender" of the church uses to climb to popularity. I have never coveted such a title or station. Neither am I jealous of the president or of any professor in any college in the brotherhood, as he implies is true of anyone who would call attention to harmful trends in any of our schools. On the contrary, I believe one hundred percent in real Christian education. I went to Pepperdine prepared to find that the rumors I had heard about tendencies toward Modernism were exaggerated. I presumed that they would boil down to a tolerant attitude toward sectarianism and a healthy desire to get away from a too legalistic mode of interpreting the scriptures, I was rudely awakened from these easy-going assumptions.

The Bible Explained by Atheists

I was warned that many of the books I was asked to read were written by men who did not believe in God. I was to learn that there is something far more dangerous than a plain, straightforward denial of the truth of the Bible. That is the interpretation of religion upon the principles of evolution. The majority of the books on my reading lists were written by men for whom religion was something conceived in the mind of man and developed through the ages, mounting to higher and higher conceptions much as the race has developed its systems of languages, arts, or sciences. A large percent of the writers either ignored or tried to explain away anything of a miraculous nature. Thus, the pillar of fire that led the Israelites in the desert was formed by the glowing sulphur and brimstone erupting from Mt. Sinai; the pillar of cloud was formed by the sulphuric vapors of the same volcanic origin; and the voice of the trumpet was the roaring of the lava as it flowed down the side of the mountain. Why is such a large quantity of reading such as this rewired in a so-called Christian school? The only reason given was that we ought to become acquainted with such writers and their books. However, not one attempt, in any of my classes, was ever made to answer the explanations and arguments which these infidel writers set forth. I cannot but wonder about the effect of so much of this kind of reading upon the minds of students who are not firmly and unshakably established in the faith. Nay, I know what the effect has been upon many a Christian, including some
gospel preachers. They have landed in the ranks of the atheists. It may be presumed that students must be required to read the learned (?) books of these atheistic commentators in order to maintain the scholastic standing of the school. Such, I am persuaded is not the case, since there are hundreds and thousands of scholarly books on the Bible, written by men who at least believe in a personal God and in the divine inspiration of His Word. If such is the case, however, then I am sure that every Christian would say that rather than undermine the faith of students, let scholastic standing be thrown to the moles and the bats.

Evolutionary Mode of Interpretation Seconded by Professor at Pepperdine

I have referred to the interpretation of religion upon the evolutionary principle, as a belief and a sentiment conceived and developed through the centuries in the minds of men without reference to miraculous revelations from a Divine Power. He would be blind and deaf who could not discern a strong undercurrent of this very type of interpretation in many of the Bible classes at Pepperdine. In the class I attended, Old Testament prophecy was treated as something that developed with the growing national life of Israel. In the days of David the prophets were few and their prophecies meager. Later on, the schools of the prophets were developed; and finally, with the period of Isaiah and Jeremiah, the tree of prophecy bore its perfect fruit. That, I believe, is a good illustration of the evolutionary method of interpreting the Bible. Emphasis was also placed on the experiences and character of the prophet as elements that contributed strongly to the nature of his message. Required reading was here relied on to give the student a background for the study of the text. To illustrate, Amos, the herdsman prophet, on his journeys to the sheep markets of Samaria and perhaps to Damascus, had opportunity to observe the morally decadent state of Israel. In the deserts of Tekoa he mediated upon the things he had observed. To this observation and meditation was brought a profound moral sense and spiritual perception which enabled him to utter the teachings and prophecies found in the book that bears his name. I grant that much that is interesting and much that is true can be gained from studying the Bible from the human standpoint; but when the human elements overshadow the great truth that the Bible is of divine revelation, we are treading on dangerous ground, from which many have sunk into skepticism and unbelief.

Concrete Example of Modernism at Pepperdine

So far, I have been dealing in generalities; I will come to specific cases. The example I am about to give was not taken from a book or given to illustrate a theory, but was taught as a fact by one of the professors. It concerns "the doctrine of the resurrection," to use the professor's own words. It is to the effect that Israel for centuries looked in vain for the coming of the Messiah and the establishment of the Messianic kingdom. But so great was the honor and esteem in which they held the Patriarchs, Abraham, Isaac, and Jacob, that they could not conclude of a Messianic kingdom in which these heroes of old did not have a share. Evidently then, being long dead, they would have to be raised again to have a part in the glories of the future kingdom. Out of this logical necessity, "the doctrine of the resurrection" was born. Now, if that is not Modernism pure and simple I am at a loss to know what to call it.

While speaking of things of Old Testament interest, I would like to record an incident in one of my 'classes that to me was illuminating. I had called attention to Paul's explanation of one of the prophecies, and the professor made this reply: "Yes, Paul was very fond of taking statements from the Old Testament and giving them an allegorical meaning." I would only ask, If Paul's explanations of prophetic statements were made merely because he was "fond" of this mode of illustrating his point, how much of his other teaching is the result of a mere fondness for the Ideas he expresses? And how many subtle suggestions of that kind are necessary to start a student doubting the divine inspiration of the Bible? Finally, what kind of thinking was back of the statement that Paul was "fond" of certain ideas included in his writings. All discerning students at Pepperdine know the answer to that.

Miracles Are Hocus-Pocus

In another class, the discussion turned abruptly to miracles. Regarding a certain point, I had made the statement: "I suppose the only way to prove that is by the Bible." Little did I think that that statement could stir up such a hornet's nest. Without an instant's hesitation the professor replied: "What is the Bible? Brother Wolfe, how do you validate the Bible?" I replied, "Chiefly by its miraculous element." Those words seemed to add fuel to the flame, and the professor said: "But what is the need for miracles—some kind of hocus-pocus—to sustain our faith? Of course they are all right for adolescent minds, but for minds that are developed they aren't necessary. I don't need miracles to sustain my faith." Those words burned themselves into my mind. They were the most forthright statement I had yet heard concerning this professor's real sentiments, but now that they were out and openly declared, I was not surprised at 'them. They seemed 'to fit naturally against the background of the atheistic books we were required to read. Nor did they seem to cause any great surprise to anyone else in the class. They were all of a piece with the general atmosphere that pervaded the classroom. The class was almost ready to adjourn, but the professor continued: "Mohammed-
anism also claims many miracles.” Feeling it necessary to make some reply, I said: “But they are, false miracles.” The professor said: “But you can’t prove it,” putting special emphasis on the word “prove.” The unmistakable impression that was left was that the miracles of Mohammedanism and those of Christianity were to be placed in the same category, and that none of them could be proved to be actual facts.

Wants to Get Away and Forget

One faithful gospel preacher remarked to me after one of the classes: “It’s pretty hard to take, but when you get away from it and get to preaching the gospel you can forget enough of it so that it won’t have too much influence on you.” If such was the feeling of those most strongly grounded in the faith, you may well ask what is the result in the minds and hearts of the weaker members of the class. The answer to that is provided in the statement of another preacher who said to me: “What I hate most about this teaching is that it is making some of the boys hypocritical in their preaching. Brother— said that when he went back home he would continue to preach what the church believes and what the brethren expect him to preach, but that he no longer believes it.” I wonder if Pepperdine College is proud of that kind of product.

Theological Speculation at Pepperdine

Theology, as the word has come to be used, is something that the brotherhood has a right to hate and fear. Theological speculation has been the most prolific cause of division since the beginning of the great apostasy that followed the apostolic age. Human reasonings, deductions, and speculations from Bible statements and upon Bible themes always take a multitude of directions, and result, and have resulted, in all the human creeds that have cursed the world. This was clearly seen by all the great leaders of the Restoration Movement, who for that reason determined to “speak where the Bible speaks, and be silent where the Bible is silent,” and to call Bible things by Bible names.

The “School of the Bible” at Pepperdine, we were told, is actually a school of theology, but the word isn’t used because the brotherhood would not like it. In one of the classes, the position was definitely taken in regard to the atonement that Christ did not suffer and die to pay the sinner’s debt; that his suffering and death did not represent the penalty that divine justice demanded of the sinner. His death on the cross was simply the demonstration of God’s love for humanity, divine love profoundly and divinely yearning over man, and suffering and dying because of man’s wayward and sinful state, the supreme demonstration of divine love.

I do not say which theory is correct. The former, which has been generally held, was first advanced by Anselm in the middle ages. The latter is of more modern origin. If both had been taught as matters of opinion, accompanied by a warning against speculation on the subject, I would have no complaint. As it was, the latter theory was taught as matter of faith, over which, as was only natural, the class was divided. The latter theory was incorporated in a sermon broadcast by one of the students, and received the public endorsement of the president of the college. One preacher who listened to the broadcast became so perplexed and indignant that he said to me, “If that is a sample of the teaching at Pepperdine, then it is the greatest menace that now faces the church.” That is just a sample of the way people divide over theories and speculations. The church could just as easily be divided over different theories of the atonement as it could over premillennialism.

Isaiah 53 Not a Prophecy About Christ

In connection with the discussions on the above subject, Isaiah 53 was mentioned. “But,” said the professor, “the Jew will tell you that Isaiah 53 does not refer to the Messiah. He KNOWS that Isaiah 53 refers to the suffering servant of Jehovah as represented by the nation of Israel.” This, let me emphasize, was not presented as the Jew’s opinion, but as definite and absolute knowledge. Without any reservations whatever, the Jew was set up as a criterion for the interpretation of this passage of scripture. The implications of the professor’s statement in this instance are so utterly astounding as to make the statement seem incredible. For if the Jew knows that Isaiah 53 does not refer to the Messiah, he knows just as surely that Jesus was not the Christ. In fact, the Jew rejected Jesus because he first rejected Isaiah 53 as being a picture of his sufferings and death. How beyond understanding to go to the unbelieving Jew for our interpretation of the prophecies concerning Christ!

The Church Treated As a Denomination

It is a very significant fact that the professor under whom I took most of my work at Pepperdine always spoke of the Church as “our group”, and upon one occasion as “the group called the Church of Christ.” His view of the church was consistently that of a sect among other sects. Upon one occasion he placed a number of circles on the board to represent the different religious groups. Then he said, “No one group can claim to be the one true church.” On one occasion, in discussing the general councils held by the Catholic Church, he said that he sometimes thought it would be a good thing today for the church to have general councils, but that all the groups would have to be represented. I said, “But we do not recognize these groups.” The professor replied: “If you don’t, you just have to shut your eyes to the facts.”

Let Him Stay in the Methodist Church

In view of such sentiments, I was not at all surprised when a fellow-student, a preacher in
whom I have the utmost confidence, related the following incident. He said that a Methodist student at Pepperdine had become convinced that he ought to be immersed, but wanted to stay where he was in the Methodist Church. In discussing the matter in a small group, this professor remarked, "Why not let him stay where he is?"

Another incident that happened in the class of another professor was related to me as follows: A young lady, a member of the church, had taken a friend to visit the class with the intention of helping her see the truth. The friend was a Baptist, and the professor was apprised of the fact. Instead of trying to point out her error, he publicly lauded the Baptists for their honesty, sincerity and zeal, and the young lady afterward told her friend who had brought her to the class that that was just what they believed in their church, that if you were sincere and lived up to your belief that you were all right. Brother Lovell says that in Pepperdine College Christians are teaching sinners. To preachers who have attended Pepperdine it is pretty evident that someone should begin teaching these Christians.

**Time for a New Religious Movement**

In one class, the professor drew a line on the board representing the Catholic Church. He explained that when that Church became so corrupted, there was a violent reaction and the protestant movement was born. This he illustrated by another line drawn directly under the first one. But this movement finally dwindled down to the expression of partisan spirit and division, and this time the reaction resulted in "our movement." For this another line was drawn under the two preceding ones. Then came the almost incredible statement: "I like to think that we are now right cut here (indicating the end of the last line) and beginning to shape the development of a new era." Even to one who had grown used to hearing such things as I have related, this statement was a stunning blow. This professor, who teaches more advanced (?) Bible than any other in Pepperdine, hopes that the movement to restore the New Testament Church, which he of course looks on as only "our group", is now almost at an end. While he did not so state, the implication was clear that he thinks "our movement" has become so corrupted in some form or fashion that it is now time for something new. And that in a College that professes to the brotherhood to uphold the teachings of the New Testament!

**Preacher Students Encouraged to Go to the University of Chicago**

Preacher students who go to Pepperdine College have now a new and modern Mecca set before them. The theological school of the University of Chicago is now the door of golden opportunity for the would-be preacher of the gospel. In fact, so great is the lure held out that one preacher student asked in all seriousness, if the University of Chicago is so wonderful, why take the time to go to Pepperdine? Why not take all or one's college work up there? Other similar institutions in the East are also lauded as the seats of true wisdom and super-excellence. Emphasis is placed on the great need for students to go to these hot-beds of skepticism and atheism in order to prepare themselves to be the teachers and professors of the future in our schools and colleges. As a result, many of the theological students of Pepperdine are planning to go, and some have already gone to sit at the feet of these learned sages and divines, that they may help in the glorious work of bringing the Restoration Movement to a quick end and ushering in the new and modernistic era, or the church which my professor envisions.

**Reaction Among the Students**

Many will want to know what is the reaction of the students to all of this. In general, the students fall into three classes. The first class, after staying one term or perhaps a whole year, upon finding out what is being taught, leaves Pepperdine for some other school. Another group stays, but protests against the teaching, secretly desiring, as the preacher whom I have already quoted, to get away and forget it all. And finally, there is the third group, composed of no inconsiderable number, who drink it all in and pride themselves on being liberal. I found myself in the second group. I came away, but have not been able to forget nor lightly dismiss what is without doubt one of the darkest shadows that has ever loomed up in the pathway of truth. I bear no malice against any individual, but I warn the church to beware Modernism, theological speculation, and the spirit of sectarianism, as a three-headed viper has raised itself among us. Let the brethren cease to treat as idle rumors what all the students who go to Pepperdine know to be facts.

**COMMENDATIONS**

I've just read and digested the latest Bible Banner. If the Financial Wizard who is a college graduate can't express himself in language that people can understand then it is a reflection on the college or graduate or both, I think. You expressed my thoughts exactly when you said his idea seemed to be get the money any way you can. You are right when you say he is hurting the college more than any one. If he is to be the mouthpiece of the college then let them take the consequences.—Will M. Thompson, Apache, Okla.

The colleges are trying too hard to encroach upon the church. I am not opposed to colleges, but they should be run as business institutions and keep their place. When the church begins to send donations to the Hardeman Hardware Company I shall oppose it with all the might I have.—Fred E. Dennis, Marietta, Ohio.
COMMENDATIONS

I appreciate your contributions to the cause of truth more and more as I live longer. The eternal interests of our souls depend on maintaining the integrity of the gospel and the completeness and sufficiency of the church. The continued effort to substitute the human for the divine will must ever be resisted. Your treatment of the college position has been and is eminently correct, and, I am confident, successful.-Bryan Vinson, Longview, Texas.

Do not know just how my subscription stands with Bibh Banner—but do know that I certainly do not wish to miss an issue—especially at this time. Wish an expression from each gospel preacher concerning the school-church controversy might be obtained.—D. W. Nichol, Beaumont, Texas.

I have just finished reading the May issue of the Bible Banner, and to say that I am happy is stating it but mildly. I knew that you able brethren would speak out sooner or later on the college question, but I have been impatient and could hardly keep quiet.—Rufus R. Clifford, Old Hickory, Tennessee.

The Banner arrived, and has been read from cover to cover. You brethren surely hit the mark.—L. L. Freeman, Salem, Oregon.

SHADOW OF THINGS TO COME—

(Continued from page 11)

knows. The genial editor of the G. B. now takes up the cudgel for Norman Davidson and the premillennialists. In so doing, he feels obligated to give us some lessons in brotherly love. Criticism from this gentleman on such a subject come with exceedingly poor grace. His incompetency would hardly be questioned anywhere. He but makes himself ludicrous when he prattles about brotherly love. Surely, he has cast himself in the wrong role. He is out of character. The rebel of yesterday assumes the role of appeaser today. The militant controversialist becomes the "tie that binds." The staunch defender of radicalism dons the garb of the harbinger of a new era of pacifism. Ah! yes, the "leopard" of Del Rio, Dallas, and Grand Prairie fame has "changed his spots" and sprouted wings. He is now the gentle dove of Iowa. Tell us Brother Smith, do you advocate that the premillennialist should be recognized, fellowshipped, and permitted to teach his doctrine among loyal congregations?

Here We Stand

Brother Davidson says in his article already mentioned that no preacher could stand the attacks made against him because of his proposals, but he says, "Here I will stand, brethren." Brother Davidson has some of the weakest, most cowardly preacher friends that I know anything about. He told Brother Wallace in Temple that "200 prominent preachers stood with him, but were afraid to come out." He continues to harp on this point. We have challenged him to name them. He will not. They are a pack of cowards and will not help him. Indeed his predicament is terrible. Get out of that ''bunch, Brother Davidson, and stand with us on the truth, and we will "come out." Here we stand unalterably opposed to proposals of Norman Davidson, and in the words of a soldier of old, "we will fight it out on this line" if it takes from now on, come what may.

Since writing the above, Brother James A. Allen, editor of the Apostolic Times, has written a most appropriate and timely answer to the letter of the "Christian business man." Brother Allen's article, which is published in the Firm Foundation of July 29, 1947, is not only an answer to Brother Davidson, but is a complete refutation and exposure of Davidson's claims and objectives. It is to be hoped that all members of the church will read Brother Allen's article with care that the exact relationship of the faithful to the premillennial faction might be understood.

Brother G.-H. P. Showalter's full endorsement editorially of the sentiments expressed in Brother Allen's article will mean much to the clarification of this issue in the minds of his constituency. The mighty influence of the Firm Foundation will do much to neutralize the efforts of those among us who would open the doors of Christian fellowship to the teachers of pernicious error.

SOME OLD DOCTRINES—

(Continued from page 9)

if it seem evil unto you to serve Jehovah, choose ye this day whom ye will serve; whether the gods which your fathers served that were beyond the river, or the gods of the Amorites, in whose land ye dwell: but as for me and my house, we will serve Jehovah." (Josh. 24:15). Some one may say that these people were under the law of Moses. True, but that part does not mitigate against the idea that people have the right of choice. But why say more on this point; for every sane person is conscious that he can choose good or evil.