THE PULSE OF THE PREACHERS

Your position on the matter of colleges being supported from the church treasury is in complete harmony with the teaching of the New Testament. I wish to also commend the article by Brother John F. Wolf in the last issue of the Banner on George Pepperdine College. I attended the institution for four years, received my B. A. there and enrolled in the graduate school. In view of its modernism, liberalism, and worldly influence, I cannot commend it as a Christian college. It is time that the brotherhood at large should be informed on these matters.

-Hoyt H. Houchen, Central Church of Christ, Los Angeles 6, Calif.

The last two issues of the Bible Banner have been 100 per-cent. The relationship of Church and college is certainly well defined.-O. S. Jaquith, M. D. Indianapolis, Indiana

You are entitled to know that I am enjoying the Bible Banner, and the thrill of reading it is much like making a foul play or two on the gridiron, then steal the ball, run over the coach, knock the breath out of the full back, make a touchdown, then kick the goal.

My foul play or two, is when I read something else; or anything else: then pick up the Banner, at which time the ball has had sleight-of-hand manipulation, down goes the coach; breathless lies the full back; the swiftest runner loses his head; and the first thing the "bystanders" know a touchdown is complete and the goal kicked into complete victory.

They have not passed; "They shall Not pass!"-Warren E. Starnes, Gainesville, Texas

May I add my word of commendation to that of others in your noble fight against the present effort to tie the church to the schools. The position you and Brother Cled and others have stated in the Banner has always been my position. I thought this was Brother Hardeman's position and am much surprised at the stand he is now taking.

I am glad to see the Banner coming each month.--John H. Gerrard, Parkersburg, W. Va.

I have just finished reading your fine article in the Bible Banner of June, entitled, "The Gnat in the Cup," and I must write you and commend you for your stand on the question involved. I enjoyed the article very, very much and have been much profited by it.

I thank God that in our day there are those strong enough to make themselves heard and felt, in the maze-and schisms and "trends,"-men who are big enough and strong enough to "stand in the way" so to speak, of the evil trends of the day.-W. R. Peters, Florala, Alabama
THE WAILING TWINS ARE AGAIN IN TROUBLE
CLED E. WALLACE

Brother Hardeman and Brother Brewer appear side by each, in the same column of the Gospel Advocate of August 7th. They are dressed just alike and the only way you can tell them apart is that Brother Hardeman says he is smiling but the picture doesn’t show it. Brother Brewer doesn’t even claim he is.

They have both consistently ignored the responsibility of an affirmand of a practice to give the law that authorizes the practice. They insist that the negative state the law that forbids the practice. 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 declares that the statement represents his present attitude but that he has never opposed the church giving the money if it will keep it out of the budget. Take it out of the treasury, but keep it out of the budget! He used to be a “strict constructionist.” In the light of his present “loose constructionism” it would be interesting to see him try to explain the difference. Maybe he doesn’t know what a “budget” is. He knows what money is when he gets it from a hardware store. I possibly wouldn’t go quite that far, but he has. Regarding the “law and principle” I stated, he has this to say:

“Now we have it. Churches are hereby estopped from contributing to the building of meeting houses, putting in baptisteries, building, buying, or renting a home for the preacher or a home for the aged and to an orphan home. I challenge this writer to give the book, chapter and verse where any of these things are commanded. If not, the church cannot have a part in any of them, for he says: ‘The church cannot scripturally contribute to or support any work that the church is not commanded to do.’

Now let us smile.”

That is a gesture. Brother Hardeman isn’t smiling. He is too desperate for that. In “law and principle” he is hanging himself over bodily to the digressives. Some good brethren are laughing out loud at him while others, including some of his students, are chagrinned and disappointed. He has taught them through the years the very “law” he is now trying to “smile” out of court. In their efforts to justify instrumental music in worship, digressives have for years been demanding “a list of things forbidden” and shouting for “book, chapter and verse where any of these things are commanded” such as baptisteries, meeting houses, song books, blackboards. Brother Hardeman, along with the rest of us, has been telling them that the “generic” word “go” has “in” the command riding in whatever conveyance is available. The command to meet for worship authorizes a suitable place for worship. The command to support the preaching of the gospel authorizes the providing of a suitable place for the preacher to live. The command to sing authorizes the song books and the command to teach authorizes a blackboard and so on. But what about “putting in baptisteries” he suddenly seems as much concerned as the digressives have been for fifty years. Let Brother Hardeman answer. His memory seems
not to be too good lately and probably he has also forgotten that he has some books in circulation. In “Tabernacle Sermons” Volume 4 under the heading of “Essentials and Incidentals” he shows that a baptistery is a part of the command to be baptized. Hear him:

“Suppose you dam up a branch and dig out a place of sufficient size and baptize a man in it? What have you done? Only that which the Bible demands.”

Now, now, Brother Hardeman we want something out of you besides a forced smile. We want you “to give the book, chapter, and verse where you” are commanded to “dam up a branch and dig out a place of sufficient size” or any other “size.” If Brother Hardeman can’t do so, of course “the church cannot have a part in” it. What is the matter with Brother Hardeman? That is an easy one. He was right in 1938 and when he preached his sermons and had his debate with Boswell and is wrong now. He cannot smile off things like that! It is rather pitiful when a man of his age and experience turns flips that land him right smack into the middle of digressive quibbling. He doesn’t need an “ace writer” like me to point out the fallacies of his embarrassed and forced squirming. Plenty of his boys inside and outside of Freed-Hardeman College can do it easily. The ones who can’t, if they do not get over it, will land among the digressives in a few years if they follow his present line of reasoning, or rather quibbling. It might be well to remind the brethren that I am not answering Boswell, I am answering Hardeman. Now, isn’t that something! And he hasn’t changed. No, not a bit!

A separate column of quotations from Brother Hardeman will be revealing. He said:

“Bear in mind that the word ‘good’ is a relative term. A thing may be good as determined by one standard and bad as measured by another. In all matters of religion the Bible is our standard ... if the Bible is absolutely silent regarding any matter, proper respect for God’s word demands that it be not in the worship or work of the church.”

Yes, that’s right. He said “worship or work.” A thing which is not within the “demands” of the Word must not be “in” the “work” of the church.

So what? If the Bible authorizes by command, example or necessary inference that the church go into the school business, that command would authorize the necessary equipment such as buildings, teachers, textbooks and every other thing else a school needs. Nobody would worry about “a list of the things forbidden.” Brother Hardeman says the school is “a human institution.” Because what God commands the church to do authorizes some “essentials and, incidentals” in effectively obeying the command, he jumps at the conclusion that the church is authorized to support “a human institution” with its long list of “essentials and incidentals.”

Does he have a command for it? Certainly not. Is there any example of it in the New Testament? Of course not. Is there a necessary inference justifying it? None has been offered. Why does Brother Hardeman jump at such a conclusion? It reminds me of a story. A little girl had a little dog she named August. One day little August ran out and jumped at the conclusion of a mule. The next day was the first of September for that was the last of August. “Now let us smile.”

What we want is “the law and principle” authorizing the church to go into the school business. What have we had from the Siamese twins to date? They want a list of things forbidden.” “Show us where it says you shall not.” Sounds familiar doesn’t? Brother Hardeman says:

“Christians are fundamentalists ... to them, the Bible and the Bible alone is the source of authority. Whatever it teaches, demands, or commands they are ready to accept. Beyond its declarations they dare not go ... It is either the sum of all authority or it is none at all.... they claim to be nothing, preach nothing, practice nothing, for which there is no authority in the word of God. When any matter is presented they ask: ‘Does the Bible authorize it?’ Does God command it?’ If so, they are ready to accept it’ and make it a part of their religious program.”

That is what he said in Vol. 3 @Tabernacle Sermons” under the heading of “Authority.” “Now let us smile.” Tell us, Brother Hardeman, where “the Bible authorizes,” where “God commands” the church to make it a part of its “religious program” to support “a human institution” like Freed-Hardeman College which you say is on a par with Hardeman Hardware Company. I think he was right in 1938 when he said:

“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 in their budgets. Such has ever been our sentiments.”

Brother Hardeman’s “sentiments” up until quite recently are very interesting. In his debate with Boswell, he pressed him hard.

“Where is the scripture, where is the commandment, where is the inference? Let me say, ladies and gentlemen, not one vestige can be found.”

If Brother Boswell is reading this now he might say with Hardeman: “until you furnish me the list of things forbidden, it will not be
necessary to write further.” Brother Hardeman admits that

“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.”

but he wants “a list of things forbidden” and “book, chapter and verse” that says “thou shalt not.” His predicament should provoke a smile, pity or whatever the humor of the observer suggests. He loves to preach that he is an “anti-federalist” like Jefferson and not a “federalist” like Hamilton in both politics and religion.

“Mr. Hamilton’s party came to be known as ‘loose constructionists,’ that is, to construe loosely the Constitution, on the ground that we are at liberty to do anything that it does not specifically prohibit. Jefferson’s party was known as ‘strict constructionists,’ that is, they proposed to be governed strictly by what ‘was written,’ and declare there was danger in ‘going beyond’.”

He agreed with Jefferson. He was a “strict constructionist.” Hear him:

“You, my fine friend, have written to me in a considerable length... I must do what the constitution says. Mr. Jefferson’s party was known as the “strict constructionists,” and Brother Hardeman has proposed to be governed by what it says...”

“We have drifted into this kind of an idea.” Well, I should say as much with Brother Hardeman and Brother Brewer crying in unison back and forth in the Firm Foundation and the Gospel Advocate for “a list of the things forbidden.” They are like a couple of bugs in a jug of molasses. S-m-i-l-e does not spell the buzzing they are doing. Brother Hardeman said it in 1938 and thereabouts, before and after, but he is taking it all back now. On the present issue “whatever it is” as Brother Brewer would say, they are both “loose constructionists,” very, very loose. Brother Hardeman has progressed so very far from his former “strict constructionist” views that when he sees such views in print now he just “smiles.” He used-to talk to weak brethren and digressives in Tennessee like this:

“My obligation toward the Bible is the obligation that Mr. Jefferson felt toward the Constitution ... I must do what the constitution says. and not presume to go beyond it ... worship according to his decree, and practice those things, and only those things, for which there is authority in his word ... anything commanded by God, authorized by the scriptures, that we do not preach and practice, we will introduce it ... on the other hand, if there is one single thing preached or practiced that is not authorized by the word of God, I stand individually pledged to give it up ... I do not want to be responsible for sowing seeds of discord or division outside of that which God commanded.”

Here is some “law and principle” he knew many years ago. He has forgotten it and when I remind him of it he “loosely” says, “We demand a list of the things forbidden and if you can’t give it to us, there will be no need to write further.” Now, he just dares us to furnish book, chapter and verse for “a baptistery.” Huh! Considering his former size as an advocate of “the law and the principle,” he certainly has swunk up. “Let us smile.”

As for the other twin, who admits that he can’t get half he writes in the Gospel Advocate “on his plane,” he does manage to get published that his “challenge” for a debate still stands. 0, no it doesn’t. Brother Otey knocked that challenge into a cocked hat. He accepted the challenge and submitted a proposition so fair that he left the word “budget” out and almost leaned over backwards to get you on the dotted line and you backed out. I figured it was all brag and bluster all the time. Further Brother Otey dug up a letter from you admitting the very thing you vehemently denied recently in the Firm Foundation. No, you wouldn’t even be “showmanship” on a platform now. It appears that about all the endorsement you have left is The Christian Soldier. And a few other things you have vehemently denied appear to be backed up by documentary evidence, but that can wait.

Maybe I ought to call this article “Two Bees In A Tar Bucket” or “A Pair of Twins Who Have Lost Their Memories.” Being a kind-hearted gentleman, I can hardly find it in my heart to “smile” at the predicament they are in. They should either go back to “the law and the principle” Brother Hardeman has been preaching, these many years, or “close up like a clam.”

A Nice Letter From Brother Brewer

CLED E. WALLACE

Under the circumstances I feel certain that Brother Brewer entains a secret hope that his highly entertaining letter to me will appear in the Bible Banner. He possibly knows that I wouldn’t think of enjoying it all by myself. And it belongs to that “half I write on my own plane” which could not find a place in the Gospel Advocate or the Firm Foundation. So he sends it to me.

Dear Brother Wallace:

Having just perused your persiflage in the Blasphemous Babble for July 1947, I hasten to pen these paragraphs to you in appreciation of the praise you pour upon poor little me. You do me much honor, not only in the fact that you and your comrades in casuistry and confederates in crime devote your entire magazine to a manhandling of my name and a mishandling of my statements, but you compare me to
such literary characters as Hamlet and King Lear and Don Quixote and such modern paragons of perfection in the histrionic field as John Barrymore and Beezlebub, when I was all the time thinking that “you would scarce expect on my age to speak in public on the stage” This again proves that neither of us has the power for which Burns so devoutly yearned.

Why such a 'sudden sunburst of fulsome flattery'? Why grow so lyrical over my histrionic abiluty? And why this peon of praise of my personal pulchritude? No living mortal remember is to to be 'sneaking suspicion that there may be a quarter of a century even you may abruptly recognize the soundness of my reasoning and the correctness of my position? It couldn't be that all these literary similes and histrionic hyperboles were simply used as a cover-up for someone who is running from that challenge for oral debate? Perish the thought! The Big Bad B. B. Boys wouldn't run from anything!! Or wouldn't they?

If I should engage in rhetorical reprisals! I might find a Shakespearean character to which you bear some more or less striking resemblance. Fallstaff affords us an excellent example of your type of valor.

But, with these compliments and confessions of mutual admiration aside, it is now time to get down to a more serious side of our controversy; if, indeed, you ever get serious. You seem to think that I am pouting or that I am in high dudgeon about what you and your colleagues rade babble about me in the Blasphemous Babbler! That is the most inaccurate feature of all your caricature of me. I am neither pouting, perturbed, peevish nor pestered by your perennial palaver. Once or twice in my early experiences, I looked into the muzzle of a gun in the hands of a mad moonshiner and did not faint; I hardly now would be expected to grow panicky over a squirt gun in the hands of a muddled monkey-shiner, though the material you shoot from the squirt gun does not always have a pleasant odor.

Let me make a confession: Instead of being properly incensed and insulted and scandalized by the Mardi gras performance of you B.B. boys, I am always beset with an almost unaccountable desire to get in there with you. Yes, sir, it is the truth! I may be by birth and training a patrician, but in principle I fear I am a plebeian, a proletarian, surely? I really get lonesome from the squirt gun does not always have a pleasant odor.

Let me make a confession: Instead of being properly incensed and insulted and scandalized by the Mardi gras performance of you B.B. boys, I am always beset with an almost unaccountable desire to get in there with you. Yes, sir, it is the truth! I may be by birth and training a patrician, but in principle I fear I am a plebeian, a proletarian, surely? I really get lonesome from the squirt gun does not always have a pleasant odor.

You go back on all your high compliments of me and state that I do not rate the attention that a discussion would give me! But I do rate all the space in each issue of the B.B.! Either that is a pretty high rating or your space is held for some other reason besides your admiration for me with changing the policy of all the schools, even with converting N. B. Hardman! Still I do not rate any attention! These inconsistencies and contradictions, however, are nothing in the kaleidoscopic careers of some of the B.B. boys. They have left tracks on both sides of every creek. Want the proof?

You can tell your readers that you one time engaged in a discussion with me in which I was rendered hors de combat. But, of course, you would not boast! You leave that to egotists like me! Well, now if we cannot persuade you to enter a debate with me on the current issue—whatever it is—perhaps we can, with proper inducements, prevail upon you to repeat that old discussion in which you so ingloriously Vanquished me. I am still of the same conviction on that point too. I have never changed my position. I am in principle opposed to any oral debate with my viewpoint with any contender. My record is in print and is available. Do you want to enter a battle on that vantage point?

You indicate that you would like to discuss this point of a church's contributing to a college with me in the papers—not orally. I am too much of a showman and your editor turns me over to the tender mercies of your facile pen, but he gets cautious and lays down the requirement that the discussion must be carried in the Gospel Advocate as well as in the B.B!! That was a valiant gesture and, of course, you feel perfectly protected. You know the G.A. is not going to carry your profane babbles. That paper will not have the audacity to print your non-sensical utterances. We will let the Soldier boys contribute their two bits to the controversy also. I think they have some more to say anyway. However, I promise to make no attack on your character or the character of any of your colleagues. I have never done this. Despite the statement that B. B. has repeatedly made with that ugly import. You are a good writer and you could put up a fight worthy of any foe if you had an issue under your feet. At present, there is no issue between you and me upon which you hold any sincere conviction. That is too obvious. Your current contributions contain wit, humor, satire, rhetoric, literary allusions and everything else except sincerity and truth! It would be a pleasure to tear up your ostensible arguments, but I shall let that wait for the real discussion, oral and written.

In the meantime, let me assure you that I am not angry or in high dudgeon. I am calm and collected and still all your B. B. writers insist on having their crack at me, and I do not rate any attention! These inconsistencies and contradictions, however, are nothing in the kaleidoscopic careers of some of the B.B. boys. They have left tracks on both sides of every creek. Want the proof?

This letter goes a long way in justifying the recent remark that I made that "'He is such an amusing clown and takes himself so seriously that it seems cruel to get mad at him. I just can't do it. If anybody feels any 'personal bitterness against' him they ought to quit it. He just doesn't rate it.'"

He is quite happy over "the sunburst of fulsome flattery" I gave him as I knew he would be. One thing I like about Brother Brewer. He is easily pleased and so appreciative. He likes "flattery" so well that when you sing his praises it doesn't make so much difference what "key"
you “sing” it in. So it’s all right if you get a little off key.

His letter reveals another thing that I knew all the time that some others do not seem to know. He does not want to debate. That isn’t so bad. I don’t either. The difference between him and me is that I have never pretended that I did. He modestly suggested himself as a champion in a big debate if the colleges, p. 257-3 and brethren generally would endorse him as such. I haven’t heard of him getting such endorsement. I suggested that if he did and nobody else could be found to meet him, I would if we could find an issue and agree on a proposition. As a matter of fact I never had a debate in my life, the formal kind you know with propositions, moderators, stenographers, sergeant-at-arms, and the like. I could always think of and suggest somebody else who could do it better than I could. Of course it would be impossible for Brother Brewer to think of anyone who could do better than he can. Even I wouldn’t expect that much of him.

The editor of the Bible Banner in a rash moment endorsed me to meet Brother Brewer in a written discussion provided the Gospel Advocate would carry it and we could agree on a proposition. That scared the daylight out of me at the time for it looked like I might have to debate. I feel easier now. Brother Brewer admits that the Advocate would not publish what he would say in a debate on “the plane” he proposes to say it. He must have been kidding about the colleges, papers and brethren generally endorsing him, for all the endorsement he suggests for a debate with me is The Christian Soldier. I’ll admit that is some come-down on his part and I cannot allow it. I do not think as much of The Christian Soldier as he does. I have never circulated it where I preach or written for it like he has. Just to be plain about it, if it hasn’t changed since I saw the last copy I wouldn’t be caught dead in it. I do not claim to “be by birth a patrician” but I’m not “plebeian” enough either by birth or attainments to meet him on that low a “plane”. We is evidently more highly immunized to bad smells than I am. If I ever have a formal discussion in spite of all I can do to keep out of it, I’ll probably be as sedate and strict as a Presbyterian doctor and stick closer to the issue than Brother Brewer does his vanity.

“Your Garrulous Friend” speaks of “the current issue-whatever it is” and suggests “a written discussion-no matter what the issue is.” If he wants to debate that bad, and I don’t, he should have accepted Brother Otey’s proposition which states an issue. Brother Otey accepted his challenge and returned it down. Really, if I debate with him there’ll be an issue and everybody will know what it is. He will affirm that it is scriptural to put the college in the budget and if he doesn’t stick to that issue I’ll see to that it everybody knows why. But he says he doesn’t believe that. It seems that “at present there is no issue between you and me.” Well, what are you crying about and challenging about? That is what I have been talking against.

“It would be a pleasure to tear up your ostensible arguments” but the “ostensible arguments” have been directed against what Brother Brewer says he is also against. The brother doesn’t seem to know which side he is on as usual. He evidently likes a logomachy. Now if you don’t know what that word means, it is not a cussword. The only reason I use it is to show that I can pick out a big word occasionally, even if I do not use them all the time like “Your Garrulous Friend” does.

Brother Brewer wants to debate so bad he is willing to “repeat that old discussion” we had many years ago. Well, that wasn’t really much of a discussion. It was too one-sided. I made the innocent looking remark in the paper that it was good enough to just call the church anything and everything it was called in the New Testament and let it go at that. Brother Brewer, as usual was spoiling for a fight, and in knightly armor he rode at that “issue” and broke a few lanes on it, got tired and quit. “I have never changed my position” on that point. If Brother Brewer wants to reprint it, he has my hearty permission. As allergic as I am to debates, I believe I’ll agree to affirm in debate with Brother Brewer that it is scriptural to call the church anything and everything it is called in the New Testament; if he will affirm that it is scriptural to put the college in the budgets of the churches. But I want it understood that if he can’t get any better endorsement or Find a better place to have it than The Christian Soldier, we’ll just call it off.

I appreciate a compliment as well as Brother Brewer does, well maybe not as much. “You are a good writer and you could put up a fight worthy of any foe if you had an issue under your feet.” Now, thanks! That’s nice of you. Who knows but that some time you and I may be as thick as you and Brother Hardeman are? If you and he can love each other so dearly walking arm in arm back and forth between the Gospel Advocate and the Firm Foundation exchanging coy smiles “on the current issue-whatever it is”-; who knows what an affair you and I could carry on with an issue “under our feet”? As it is, I wonder why ‘that mad moonshiner’ didn’t go ahead and shoot you while he had a bead on you. There must have been some good reason why he let an opportunity like that pass. I have an idea he took one look at you and started laughing.
Brother G. C. Brewer has thrown out a challenge to debate with someone—just anyone—none excepted—on the issue of whether or not the schools should be put into the church budgets. He claims that he has been very badly misrepresented in statements that he has been given credit for and quoted as making. It is reported that he said in a speech at Abilene Christian College several years ago that the church in Texas that did not have Abilene Christian College in its budget had the wrong preacher. Several of us have quoted him as saying that 'because it is reported by several reputable brethren that they heard him say it. Brother Brewer says he didn't say it and moreover declares that he never preached for a church that put Abilene Christian College in its budget. I wonder! I wonder! I wonder! Brother Brewer evidently says and writes a lot of things that he either doesn't choose to remember or that he completely forgets. Compare these statements as an example.

In the Firm Foundation of June 10th, 1947, Brother Brewer wrote:

"I shall once more attempt to make my position clear. I have never advocated supporting the colleges out of the church treasury; I have never even advocated putting colleges in the church budget, and no church for which I have ever preached has ever had a Christian college in its budget, yet it is a known fact that I have preached for some of the largest churches in the brotherhood and these churches have the most liberal budgets that can be found among the saints. Two of the elders of the Lubbock church for which I was preaching at the time I made the Abilene speech were and are members of the Abilene Christian College board. One of the members of the church at Cleburne for which I also preached was a member of the same board. Neither of these churches nor any other church for which I have preached ever put any college in its budget. Yet it has been reported and repeatedly published that I said at Abilene Christian College that any church that did not have the college in its budget, yet it is a known fact that I have advocated putting the colleges in the Budget of the churches. Which is the truth of the matter?

He raises the question in a recent issue of the Firm Foundation. "Would I tell Lubbock church that it had the wrong preacher when I was its preacher?" My answer is that as long as Brother Brewer thinks as much of himself as he has always done that isn't very likely. But the question is, did Brother Brewer say what he is given credit for saying at Abilene about the church that didn't have Abilene Christian College in its budget having the wrong preacher? "The facts given above should convince any reasonable man that I never made any such statement. Would I tell the Lubbock church that it had the wrong preacher when I was its preacher?"

In the Gospel Advocate of August 1, 1935, Brother Brewer wrote:

"At Cleburne and at Sherman also we put Abilene Christian College in our budget for $1,000 a year. We put two orphan homes in our budget at each place for a definite amount. This made it unnecessary for agents to visit us in behalf of either the school or the home or the missions. We were supporting all these regularly with a definite amount.

Just think of what the several hundred churches in middle Tennessee could do for David Lipscomb College if they could get a few of them to systematize their work, to utilize their resources, and to place the school in the budget for a definite amount."

Page 730, Same issue he says:

Before the churches everywhere will do the work suggested in this article they are going to have to be convinced on the following points: (1) that the budget system is scriptural; (2) that it is right to have Christian colleges and orphanages; (3) that it is right for churches as such to contribute to these institutions. The members as a whole would very readily take hold of work of this kind with a little instruction from their elders, but the elders is where the trouble lies. The elders are either not convinced on these things or else they do not know how to set out such a program. The whole trouble lies with the elders. Give the churches proper leadership and they will all do a hundred times more than they are doing.

Brother Brewer isn't a very good witness by u-hi-h to prove what he has done and said and a hat he hasn't. Which time did he state the above matter correctly? Did the church at Cleburne and Sherman put Abilene Christian College in their budget while G. C. Brewer was preaching there or not? In 1935, Brother Brewer said they did. In 1947 Brother Brewer said they didn't. Which time is he right?

He has advocated putting "our colleges" in the budget of the churches? In 1935 he did as witnessed by the articles from the Gospel Advocate, August 1, 1935. But in 1947, Brother Brewer said he never had advocated putting the colleges in the budgets of the churches. Which is the truth of the matter?

He raises the question in a recent issue of the Firm Foundation. "Would I tell Lubbock church that it had the wrong preacher when I was its preacher?" My answer is that as long as Brother Brewer thinks as much of himself as he has always done that isn't very likely. But the question is, did Brother Brewer say what he is given credit for saying at Abilene about the church that didn't have Abilene Christian College in its budget having the wrong preacher? "The facts given above should convince any reasonable man" that he made such a statement. He says almost precisely the same thing about the elders of the churches in the statement taken from the Gospel Advocate of August 1, 1935. Witness the following:

"The members as a whole would very readily take hold of work of this kind with a little instruction from the elders, but that is where the trouble lies. The elders are either not convinced on these things or else they do not know how to set out such a program. The whole trouble lies with the elders."

But what is the trouble that lies with the elders? They either do not believe (1) that the
budget system is scriptural; or (2) that it is right to have Christian colleges and orphan homes; (3) that it is right for churches as such to contribute to these institutions; or they do not know how to set out such a program, according to Brother Brewer. Brother Brewer seemed perfectly confident that if all these middle Tennessee churches were fortunate enough to have the same preacher that “preached for so much of the largest churches in the brotherhood” that “have the most liberal budgets that can be found among the saints” viz., G. C. Brewer, they would soon have the matter all straightened out and would have David Lipscomb in their budgets and everything would be all right.

If Brother Brewer will decide which side of what he is on and what he wants to affirm on the issue of putting the schools in the budgets of the churches, and will get any one of the schools to endorse his position, any one of a half dozen of us will be glad to accommodate him with a debate at the proper time and place. That will not be hard to arrange if we can ever find out what Brother Brewer actually said and where he actually stands. Brother Brewer of 1947 model could debate with Brother Brewer of 1935 model. Maybe that is the trouble. Maybe Brother Brewer thinks he is the only one who is capable of debating with Brother Brewer.

SPEAK FOR YOURSELF DON

ROY E. COGDILL

In a recent article in the Firm Foundation, Brother Glenn 5. Wallace, who preaches for the College Church in Abilene, calls our attention to a decision made by those directing the campaign which is in progress for A.C.C. at the present time. In a sort of apologetic tone Brother Glenn tells us that he is afraid that Brother Don Morris, president of Abilene Christian College, and the present administration, have been misrepresented, and says that “honesty demands that we permit the leaders of Abilene Christian College to express themselves in this matter.” He then quotes from an article which appeared in the Firm Foundation from Brother Don Morris, and the quotation is as follows:

‘When the campaign for the two buildings was started in 1943, it was decided by those directing the campaign not to ask any congregation of the church to contribute to the campaign as a congregation or to place the college in its budget’. He tells us also that Brother Morris made it clear, that, despite any advertisement that appeared to state otherwise, the school administration did not endorse any effort to connect Abilene Christian College with the church’. It can readily be seen that this statement does not meet the issue that is under discussion. It announces belatedly a matter of policy and states no position or principle that is recognized. They could easily have rescinded such a decision as this and decided to ask for contributions from churches later on in the campaign. At least they have asked for such contributions whether or not they decided to do so. Such a change of policy could easily have taken place, especially since they had not announced their first decision.

There are several things about Brother Glenn’s article that perhaps have occurred to others just like they have occurred to me. “Honesty” would demand that notice be taken of recent articles, utterances, and advertisements that do not agree with the decision which Brother Morris says was made in 1943 and made again in 1946. If any notice of this decision was ever given to the churches until the recent article by Brother Morris, I have not heard of anyone who heard of it. Isn’t it rather singular that such a decision was kept private and secret while so much publicity has been given to so many things contrary to it and completely out of harmony with it? Why didn’t the present administration of Abilene Christian College go on record definitely and positively at the beginning of the campaign to such an effect? Why did they permit so much advertising and letter writing and speaking out of harmony with their purpose and intention?

Brother Wallace is more afraid of the influence of dictatorial papers and preachers than he is of the influence of Colleges upon the churches. This is sort of a general “scarecrow” which is being raised. Why don’t some of these insinuators tell us what they are talking about? Are they talking about the Firm Foundation or the Bible Banner? Do they mean Foy E. Wallace, Jr.? If so, why not have the courage to say so and name the scarecrow they seek to erect so someone will recognize him?

He is afraid another Daniel Sommer will arise and another “Christian Review.” From what source does he think this danger will arise? Surely he does not have the Bible Banner and its Editor in mind here for he wrote in a personal letter to him some time back:

“My dear brother, I have just read the last issue of the “Banner” and appreciate what you have to say in it. I do not believe you are an enemy of any school where men are attempting to do the right thing. I am positive that as long as men conduct any sort of undertaking such as a paper or a school that there are times when they should be willing to listen to others and accept criticism. Many people here have not been in harmony with some of the advertisements made of A.C.C. for some time. I have objected to it and have talked with Brother Alexander about it. I told him that I thought it was wrong in principle and many people will see that A.C.C. is trying to do. Glen L. Wallace, minister of the College Church, Abilene, Texas.”

When the Board members, faculty members,
and others connected with our schools carry on what is supposed to be a private correspondence with a Gospel preacher over a point in controversy and without giving the preacher any chance to adjust any matter whatsoever if a mistake has been made, begin the correspondence by sending a copy of their letter to one of the Elders of the congregation where the preacher preaches, it appears that schools at least seek to use some pressure methods that are not so commendable. This reference is to a very recent incident of this kind.

- Again Brother Wallace refers to “efforts to wreck the schools.” Once more we ask what is he talking about? Does he mean the “campaign” in the Bible Banner against the schools soliciting and receiving contributions from the church? He said in his recent letter that he opposed such an attempt. Was he trying to wreck A.C.C. when he made such objections? When he recently joined rather positively in the criticism against George Pepperdine, was he trying to wreck that school?

   He preached against the “College in the Budget” at the College Church. Was he trying to “dictate” to the church about the matter? If not why would others be when they oppose it? Was he showing a “rule or ruin” spirit in preaching on it? Was his effort to wreck Abilene Christian College? If not, then why impugn the motives of others and insinuate such unsavory things.

   Brother Glenn knows that this is not a fight between the “school crowd” and the “anti-school crowd.” All others know that likewise who will stop to reflect upon the facts. The cry of “Dictator” has too much of a political “rousement” tone to be effective on brethren who are interested in the Church remaining loyal to the truth. Davidson tried it on the Bible Banner, Brewer has shouted it, Harding College has shouted it and now some of the other school men have joined in the chorus. Well, if preaching and writing the truth in plain, positive, fashion on any and every issue that confronts the church in an earnest, honest ‘effort, to provoke faithfulness is dictating, we will have to plead guilty and let them make the most of it.

- Brother Glenn was clear enough in the statement made in his letter to the editor with reference to his own position. He surely knows though that even though he is preaching for the College Church he should not try to straddle the fence by bobbing up as a mouth piece for the “present administration” of the College in Abilene. If he does not agree with them in their practice, then he should keep his voice in its natural tone by letting it be known instead of helping them in their shout of “Dictator.”

   If it was the avowed purpose of the present administration to not solicit contributions from congregations, then why did such advertisements appear in our papers as that on the back page of the Firm Foundation, issue of January 21st, 1947? This ad was over the name of Don H. Morris, President, and Robert M. Alexander Campaign Director. Here are three statements from the ad:

   “If This Endowment Is To Be Raised, Congregations Must Volunteer To Raise And Send In Regular Sums For This Purpose.
   Any Amount Which A Group Of Brethren Will Pledge Themselves To Raise Will Be Accepted As Endowment.
   Several Congregations of Brethren Have Already Pledged Themselves to Assist Us in This Campaign”.

   How does the purpose of the present administration appear in the light of such advertising? Will Brother Morris repudiate this kind of advertising? Why did he permit his name to appear in connection with it? Both Brother Wallace and Brother Morris must admit that such advertising certainly is not in harmony with what Brother Morris says was decided upon when the campaign started. Did the President not know what was going on? Or was he just willing to permit it as long as someone did not raise too much fuss about it? How would Brother Wallace explain all of this or would “honesty” demand that it be explained?

   Another thing to be noticed is that the article from Brother Don Morris which Brother Wallace quotes from appeared in the Firm Foundation of May 6, 1947, but the “campaign” of the Bible Banner against making the schools a church institution began with the March issue of the Bible Banner almost two months before Brother Morris announced what the purpose of the school administration had been since 1943. Is when Brother Wallace says, “even before the Bible Banner appeared with its campaign, the president of Abilene Christian College had an article in the Firm Foundation”, he is incorrect in that statement.

   And even before that the issue had been raised by Brother Will M. Thompson in the Firm Foundation in some criticisms leveled, at some advertising of the A.C.C. program.

   Of course, that is incidental for the statement by the president of Abilene Christian College should have been made public at the beginning of the campaign and not just recently. How would the statement look in such an advertisement as the one quoted above?

   Why doesn’t Brother Don speak for himself? Does he personally believe that the work of Abilene Christian College is the work of the church? Does he believe that the churches should support such institutions as Abilene Christian College? Would he defend it as scriptural practice or does he teach that is is unscriptural? Does Brother Morris agree with Brother Brewer that
Abilene Christian College should be put in the budget of such churches as Cliburn and Sherman? If not, why doesn’t he say so? Is the president of Abilene Christian College out of harmony with the Campaign Director of Abilene Christian College who thinks that it is all right for the school to be supported by the churches? Did the present management of Abilene Christian College decide in 11943, as Brother Morris says they did, not to solicit contributions from churches as congregations because they believe it to be wrong or just as a matter of policy? Why don’t they tell us in language definite and plain, so they won’t be misunderstood?

If the present management of Abilene Christian College believes that it is wrong for congregations to support Abilene Christian College, why do they accept such contributions? Are they as guilty of wrong when they accept it as the congregation is which gives it? When a man knowingly receives stolen property he is guilty in the sight of the law. Wouldn’t the same principle apply?

Why have they put the campaign on a congregational basis all the way through when it was their purpose not to do so? Can it possibly be that they are more interested in getting the money than they are in what is right? Are they more interested in the school than they are in the church? Does financing the school mean more than standing for what is right?

I wonder when Abilene Christian College has adhered to the policy announced by Brother Morris. They were not adhering to such a policy in 1938 for in that year they awarded a “Certificate of Honor” to the Southside Church in Fort Worth for contributions received from that church. C. A. Norred took it down off the wall and into the pulpit and preached against such a practice. The elders of Abilene Christian College did this while the school was still under the presidency of Jas. F. Cox and about the time he made his statement denying giving Brother Brewer any authority to advocate churches putting Abilene Christian College in their budgets.

It seems they have been good at saying one thing while their representatives were doing another.

They were not adhering to such a practice and purpose when they gave circulation to the Luther Robert’s lecture advocating the right of the church to support schools. They were not adhering to such a purpose and practice when they wrote their advertising in the Firm Foundation.

They have never adhered to such a purpose and practice in the work of Robert Alexander. He as consistently advocated it, announced that he believed it, advertised it, and encouraged it as their representative. Why do they have such a hard time practicing what they purpose to do? Is the money too attractive?

What Don Morris and the Board decided to do before the campaign started and what they have done and have permitted to be done are evidently two different things. “Honesty demands” that they explain the lack of harmony and tell us what their convictions are on this issue. There is a way out that is right and honorable if they are looking for one. Why don’t they speak for themselves? Why don’t they announce to the whole brotherhood that A.C.C. isn’t the work of the church, doesn’t come within the scope of the vision of the church, should not be supported by the churches and that church contributions will henceforth not be accepted? If they will make that kind of statement and adhere to it as a principle they will certainly clear themselves and we will all be glad.

FROM VOLUME TWO OF MARDEMAN’S TABERNACLE SERMONS

“THE CHURCH—ITS WORK”
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ary to doing the thing that is commanded, such as the use of literature. After we have a hand in it, we can say we are able and then he heads toward a hard fall by showing that a baptism is a part of the command to be baptized. Hear he is a national bank or the establishment thereof. I presume Mr. Jefferson would have said there is no harm in it. That was not the issue. The question was: Are we going to respect the Constitution?" "Just so in matters of religion. We have wandered away on far-off discussions of petty differences. What is the principle? Go back of all these and it resolves itself into this: Shall I construe God's word literally, shall I be governed by what God says, or shall I be privileged to do anything under heaven just so God, in so many words, does not declare: 'Hardeman, thou shalt not.' " "Mark you, if there is no harm in it, God does not prohibit it and it strikes your fancy. Are you at liberty to do it just because God has not specifically forbidden it? No. Your obligation toward the Bible is the obligation that Mr. Jefferson felt toward the Constitution. I must do what the Constitution says, and not presume to go beyond it. It is worship according to his decree, and practice those things, and only those things, for which there is authority in his word. . . . anything commanded by God, authorized by the scriptures, that we do not practice and preach, we will introduce it . . . on the other hand, if there is one single thing preached or practiced that is not authorized by the word of God, I stand individually pledged to give it up . . . I do not want to be responsible for sowing seeds of discord or the construction of that which God commands." (Taken from address on "Federalists and Antifederalists" in Tabernacle Sermons, Volume 1, Pages 76 to 66.)
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**REPLY TO THE N. B. HARDEMAN “HIT AND RUN” ATTACKS**

Through the medium of the two largest papers of the brotherhood the members of the church are witnessing the frantic but futile efforts of N. B. Hardeman to cover an ignoble retreat and to hide an inglorious defeat on the “relation of the church and the college” issue which was recently revived by himself and other college men among us. The Bible Banner did not start this fight. The school men started it themselves. Brother Hardeman helped them start it. But he has run for cover and is doing everything, anything, to hide his defeat and cover his retreat. He employs the “hit and run” way of doing-he hits with sneers and smears and runs away from the issue. In his desperation it is all that he can do.

Since the start of the controversy he has answered nothing, has not once attempted to do so, but demands an answer in detail to every irrelevant thing he says. But not one new thing does he say from one article to another.

To draw attention from the conflicts and contradictions of his own statements, he seeks to array us one against the other, which, if he should succeed in doing, would only show us to be as inconsistent as he himself is. By using his own method of reply, when his conflicting statements are quoted, we could say, “We would rather be right than consistent,” and dispose of everything he has said of us in the same manner in which he has attempted to dispose of his own glaring contradictions. But that does not answer anything. As a matter of simple fact, no man can be right and inconsistent at the same time. If one is inconsistent he must get consistent to get right. It is a poor apology for being wrong to say that “I’d rather be right than consistent.” It is in itself a confession of error.

Brother Hardeman’s latest article is his “double-header,” through the medium of the two leading papers, under the heading: “Foy Versus Roy, Cbd and Himself.” It could have been more properly entitled “Hardeman Versus Foy,” for that is the evident and obvious point of the whole tirade as he joins the Smear Brigade. Bogged in the meshes of his own inconsistencies, unable to run any farther away, he starts throwing mud. Besides descending to the low place of petty personalities, he resorts to outright perversion and down-right prevarication, making various statements which he evidently thinks will require too much writing to explain or correct with a detailed statement of facts.

He undertakes to renew many issues and animosities of the past as though that would answer any argument bearing on the present issue, he revives the so-called “war question” which was throughly threshed out many months ago; the printed statements of mine on that question of some years ago, to which he refers, were later reprinted and twice referred to in my own articles in a straightforward, forthright statement of my views; he prints a letter from me to G. C. Brewer, written about fifteen years ago, which he asserts was a “100 per cent indorsement” by me of Brewer’s views on the college-in-the-budget issue, though the letter said nothing of the kind, mentions no such thing, and carries no indorsement of any argument on anything.

He would have his readers believe that when Roy E. Cogdill, J. Early Arceneaux and W. F. Showers teach some young preachers Bible geography, church history, and hermeneutics, that the church at Lufkin has arrayed “Foy versus Roy” by engaging in something “wholly secular.” It appears to me that “Bible geography” would classify as a “Bible subject” and that the New Testament is a very good textbook on “church history” and I’d consider the apostle Paul a fair professor on hermeneutics. But when Cogdill, Arceneaux, and Showers show some young preachers how to use language grammar and an ‘English dictionary, in connection with teaching and preaching the Bible, it is equal to putting a human institution like a college in the budget of the church and doing it’s work

"Is it nothing to you, all ye that pass by?"

By THE EDITOR
“through a college board.”

He further charged that “Foy” has at sundry times and in divers manners said that “all conscientious objectors were downright hypocrites,” which assertion of his is a deliberate and unmitigated falsehood, known to be such when he wrote it.

He then closes with the grandiloquent flourish that “Foy” is now in the year of the Lord 1947 “unsafe, unstable and unsound.” That makes it final. N. B. Hardeman, president of Freed-Hardeman College, has spoken a dictum from his college office in Henderson, Tennessee, he has issued an ultimatum and posted a bull of excommunication against “Foy”—let the brethren take notice, I am a marked man; Unsafe, Unstable, Unsound—N. B. Hardeman, “the president,” says so.

The president is mad. His wrath has descended. Upon whom? Upon Boll and premillennial sympathizers? No. Upon Davidson and digressive compromisers? No. Upon whom? Upon “Foy”—it is not even “Brother Foy” now, as he was always wont to write it. Just “Foy.”

But when and why did I become unsound? Not when I was writing on the “war question” for I have many letters from President Hardeman during that time inquiring me. Not while I was criticizing weaknesses in other colleges, for I also have many letters from President Hardeman during that time sending me copious notes of material to use against the other schools. Not on the college question per se, because from 1830 down to 1947 I wrote constantly and consistently on the question of the church and the college, holding to the same arguments as now, during all of which time I received many, many letters of endorsement and commendation from Brother Hardeman. When, then, did I become unsound? Exactly when we called his hand and criticized his school and his teaching in the present controversy. That, and that alone, has brought N. B. Hardeman’s anathema upon our heads. Too bad he has the “disposition to count every man” who criticises his own school a “personal enemy.” That is indeed “unfortunate.”

But about the least and lowest little thing in the whole Hardeman article was his apparent intention to leave the impression on all the readers of the Gospel Advocate and the Firm Foundation that “Foy Wallace, of Gunter, Texas,” who is on the board of an institution located there, is Foy E. Wallace, Jr., or else Foy E. Wallace, Sr. “Foy Wallace, of Gunter, Texas” is quoted by Brother Hardeman as saying that the institutions should be supported by the church. Then Brother Hardeman adds, “Now let us smile.” Did Brother Hardeman think that the people of Texas do not know better than to fall for that trick? It so happens that “Foy Wallace, of Gunter, Texas,” does not belong to our family, but is one of several hundred boys in the state of Texas whose parents many years ago named for his father—he is a namesake of Foy E. Wallace, Sr. But if he is even a relative, it is so distant that I do not know it, and I have never personally met up with him. Like a lawyer who makes statements which he knows will be overruled, but which he wants the jury to hear, Brother Hardeman knows the Gunter Wallace is neither of us, but he wanted his readers to think so. Such dishonesty, deception, perversion and prevarication characterized his article throughout.

But inasmuch as the “versus” complex was so conspicuous in the Hardeman diatribe, we will just give him a “versus” treatment. And inasmuch as the Hardeman-Brewer alliance is now so pronounced and public, we will just begin there.

HARDEMAN VERSUS BREWER

Now this is really pertinent and important in the circumstances. And it is President Hardeman who is about to testify. He introduced letter-quoting, so we shall quote just a few of many dozens of letters from him, many of them his own hand-written letters to me, through the years. He complains that Brewer “has become the subject of personal attacks and ridicule” at my hands. But, what does N. B. Hardeman really think of G. C. Brewer?

July 11, 1934: “The Advocate’s course has lessened confidence in it, and I doubt if Brewer will live long enough to regain the place that he formerly held.”

March 14, 1936: “The most dependable brethren everywhere appreciate your ability and the frankness with which you discuss matters. I can’t see what Boll and his satellites can do or say. It seems to me that you have closed Brewer to the satisfaction of all who disagree with him.”

August 8, 1931: “Brewer’s effort, if you have it properly analyzed (and it seems you have) is far below what I thought even he was capable of doing.”

November 3, 1937: “I never would have raised an objection if G. C. (Brewer) had remained in California.” (He did not want Brewer in Tennessee!)

April 15, 1939: “I read the Banner last night and I most thoroughly enjoyed your exposure of “Dr. Brewer.” I wish such an article could appear in the Advocate, but they consider it unwise.”

Let me remind Brother Hardeman of his own words: “Brother Brewer believes now as he did then, but he has become the subject of a personal attack and ridicule. Which one has changed?” Attacks and ridicule indeed!

October 8, 1942: “I have not written you in quite awhile, but this must not be construed
as an evidence of my indifference toward the fine work you are evermore doing ...I am enclosing some articles regarding the Union Avenue Church in Memphis ...I think the trouble at Union Avenue is that they have considered themselves The Church of Christ in that city ... should you see fit to make mention of such affairs, it will not be necessary for you to use my name in such connection. The attitude of this congregation was developed during the pastorate of Brewer.

Ah, yes—he wanted me to expose the “Union Avenue Church” because he had an ax to grind, but did not want me to “use” his name “in such connection.” He wanted me to pull his chestnuts. He did not want Union Avenue Church to know what he had said about them, and did not want G. C. Brewer to know what he had said about him! N. B. Hardeman has said more hard and bitter things about G. C. Brewer than any man in the land. Further witness to this fact is a copy of a letter of recent date from E. G. Creacy to N. B. Hardeman, sent to me by Brother Creacy, with permission to quote:

Horse Cave, Ky. September 1, 1947: “Dear Brother Hardeman: I have your long article in the August 28th issue of the Gospel Advocate. Do you really believe Brother Wallace is “unstable, unsafe and unsound”? And, do you really believe that there are “some now living who will not taste of death till they see him arm and arm with Clinton Davidson and R. H. Boll”? I do not believe that, and I do not have any confidence in any man who does believe this ... You have much to say about “radical changes.” It seems that you have had a “radical change” in your attitude toward Brother G. C. Brewer! I have heard both of you talk! G. C. Brewer and N. B. Hardeman have said more acrimonious things about each other than “Cled and Foy” have ever said about either of them. Witness to this fact also is a letter from E. G. Creacy to me:

May 2, 1938: “I am also telling Hugo what Brewer had to say about Hardeman at Union City, Tenn. Several preachers were present, including Coleman Overby. I have never heard so many unkind things said about anybody, as Brewer said about Brother Hardeman.”

So it appears that we might write another “versus” to this chapter: Hardeman versus Brewer.” But since “Brother Brewer believes now as he did then ... Which one has changed?” And, if Brother Hardeman can now walk “arm in arm” with G. C. Brewer, after all of these and other denunciations of him, “there may be some living who will not taste death until they see him arm in arm with Clinton Davidson and R. H. Boll.” In fact, he may already be in cahoots with Davidson, for I am certain that both Davidsons would be glad to contribute to his campaign of slime and slander—it is in their character—and only a few months ago Brother Hardeman drafted a mighty weak statement and submitted it as a basis of a compromise settlement with Boll, to be signed by editors, college presidents, and prominent preachers, for the church! It was sent to R. L. Whiteside who criticized it and refused to sign it. The document died “aborning” and barely saved Hardeman from being “arm in arm” with R. H. Boll ever now.

Continuing the “Versus” treatment, let us now look into the record of President Harde- man’s attitude toward all of the other colleges, revealing his extreme jealousy and apparent hatred for other colleges than his own.

HARDEMAN VERSUS OTHER COLLEGES

We begin with a mild criticism, then from bad to worse:

July 19, 1934: “I had a long talk with Brother Brewer last Saturday. They regret conditions at D. L. C. ... D. L. C.’s greatest need is the confidence of faithful brethren.”

January 18, 1936: “The fact that Armstrong (J. N. Armstrong) is not a part of the request will, of itself, smack of suspicion. I really wish he had backbone and conviction of truth, rather than a Pharisaical appearance. The biggest capital that outfit has is a forced piety and a complaint of persecution. This, however, is being found out by a great many brethren.”

March 31, 1936: “Brother Brewer is mailing you some material which I trust you may be glad to publish in your next issue. You can do this without expressing your own opinion regarding those things involved ... I hear both commendations and criticisms of your magazine, but the latter comes from those who are in sympathy with Boll theories.”

Now that was a request from Brother Harde- man for me to publish material against David Lipscomb College. I have had many requests from the president of Freed-Hardeman College to publish unfavorable reports against other schools.

July 30, 1939: “You are doing more than anyone I know to stay the tide of departure. You are responsible for D. L. C. and Harding College putting out circulars regarding their beliefs (?). I really believe that the war which is waging against you is proving advantageous both to you and to the cause. I said such to Brother Leon (McQuiddy) and he agreed.”

August 23, 1939: “You have doubtless seen the defense letter put out by Harding College. I am enclosing one from D. L. C. Brother Harper is in the office and we decided to write this letter to suggest that you prepare an article in which you show that these schools have nominally been driven away from R. H. Boll ... Weave it in some way that if these schools are sincere, all of us will rejoice, but warn them that they are being watched and if they do not make good ... you will be back after them again. I wish you would cite again the fact that Ijams must
quit calling on sectarian preachers as he did at Oneonta, Ala., and elsewhere. I very much doubt those who know putting much confidence in these circulars.”

So Brother Hardeman was “suggesting” to me to write another editorial against David Lipscomb College and Harding College. He wanted me to show that they were only nominally not sincerely, driven from Boll. Further than that he wanted me to “weave” into the editorial that we were “watching” them, and if they wabbled on the spindle “he” would be after them? No! No! He said “warn them” that you will be back after them!” Brother Hardeman wanted me to do it! My “shall-not pass” was all right when I was after the other colleges, but when I criticise his school, ‘it comes with poor grace” for me to “criticize brethren and to declare that all who differ ‘shall not pass.’ ” To be sure, I was both safe and sound while opposing the departures of other schools, but the exact moment that criticisms were made of N. B. Hardeman and his school, I became “unsafe” and “unsound!” But more:

September 3, 1939: “I am anxious to see the Banner. Brother Harper told me a number of things that he and Hope had put in it. I thought someone ought to answer the D.L.C. statement. All of that crowd have their backs to the wall and are now forced to fight.”

You will notice that Brother Hardeman never ridicules, abuses or insults—he just refers to Harding College and David Lipscomb College in the polite and respectful terms of “that outfit” and “that crowd” and called the president of one of them, now dead, of “Pharisaical appearance”!

But he “wished” that I would again “cite” that Brother Ijams “must quit calling on sectarian preachers” to pray. Well, Brother Hardeman is now “arm in arm” with G. C. Brewer who was doing the same thing at the same time, in the same state. “Brother Brewer believes now as he did then,” Hardeman says, and Brewer boasts that he has never changed on any thing in thirty years.

It was at Enterprise, Alabama. Cecil Newcom was the song leader in the meeting in which G. C. Brewer was the preacher. The song leader had charge of the introductions, and was asked to call on sectarian preachers for prayer. Brother Cecil Newcom very properly refused—and Brother Brewer took over and called on the sectarian preachers to lead in prayers and I declined, thinking it would be improper to do so. Then the leaders called on said preachers and they lead in the prayers. Finally Brother Brewer also called on them on different occasions, and if he even taught on the subject either publicly or privately I don’t recall it. Your friend and brother, Cecil Newcom.”

Now Brother Hardeman did not want me to let Brother Ijams “pass” on the matter of calling on sectarian preachers. But Brother Hardeman knows that Brewer has done that very thing repeatedly. The meeting at Enterprise, Alabama, has the description of having been a real sectarian praying meeting! But Brother Hardeman laments that “Brother Brewer,” who “believes now as he did then,” should be subjected to personal attacks.” He wanted Brother Ijams exposed for the same thing, but now thinks we should let Brewer “pass.” Being now “arm in arm” with G. C. Brewer “who knows” with whom Brother Hardeman really may “arm” with before he tastes of death?

But let us continue taking the evidence:

September 3, 1939: “Everyone who knows about things has been convinced that your persistent fight has caused the recent announcements that, come from Harding College and D. L. C. You note that, Cox has resigned as president of Abilene. I have an idea there is something back of this not yet published. In your next issue, I think the suggestion that I made would prove timely. I hope and pray that you may ever succeed. I think you are doing a most wonderful work in exposing error, hypocrisy and down-right deceit.”

Yes-Brother Hardeman was making a “suggestion” that I write editorials against Abilene Christian College, Harding College and David Lipscomb College. Every time I said “they shall not pass” he shouted! He “hoped” and “prayed” that I would “ever succeed” in exposing the “error, hypocrisy and down-right deceit” of these other colleges. But he has the colossal cheek, gigantic gall, unmitigated audacity and unblushing brass to say that “it comes with poor grace” for me to criticise brethren, and to talk of “personal attacks, abuses, and insults.”

But hear another quip from the witness:

April 3, 1940: “I suppose you know that Dr. Brewer is to teach with Harding College three months during the school year … Brethren Sandgren and McDougal said they felt sure this would meet with your approval—Of course, they meant the opposite … I am for you as strong as horse radish.”

That was just a little more “ridicule” from President Hardeman, with which all of his letters were so replete, punctuated with “abuses” and “insults,” of “Dr. Brewer” and the other colleges. But you will note that he was for me “as strong as horse radish” then. “What a radical change he has made.”

But we are not through. While David Lipscomb...
College, Harding College and Abilene Christian College and “Dr. Brewer” were all “subject to personal attacks and ridicule” from Brother Hardeman, he did not overlook the George Pepperdine College—they all looked alike to him; and he was against every school but one—his own.

May 2, 1945: “I regret to learn of what has been said concerning Pepperdine College. I am afraid some of our schools are departing from the original intent. There are matters which I would like to discuss with you.”

Now is it not strange that Brother Hardeman wanted to “discuss” all of the other schools with me? And, of course, anybody can tell by the way he has talked of all the other schools how much he really does “regret” to hear anything of an adverse character on any of them! “Of course, I mean the opposite.”

The slickest sleaze of slander that ever came to me through the mails was several pages of typewritten matter against the George Pepperdine College—and it came from the office of President N. B. Hardeman, bearing his notation: “Good Material For The Bible Banner.” All the time he prodded me to print anything, and everything anybody ever heard that would discredit another school, but to my back he criticised me for “attacks on brethren!” And he talks about “hypocrisy and down-right deceit” in somebody else! He wanted me to attack David Lipscomb College. He wanted me to attack Harding College. He wanted me to attack Abilene Christian College. He sent me a lot of messy stuff that no decent paper could publish, even if true, about George Pepperdine College, labeled with his own notation, “Good Material For The Bible Banner.”

In one letter he has even charged me as follows:

“You have now committted yourself against every school among us and I am sorry that you cannot recommend either of them to boys and girls who may ask you about such.”

He is quite wrong. I have not “committed” my self against any school “among us.” But if his charge were true (which it emphatically is not) the only difference between him and me would be that he has committed himself against every school “among us” except one—his own. If my criticisms of the wrongs in the schools mean that I “lack only one step of being a full-grown Sommerite,” since Brother Hardeman has tried personally to involve me in a fight against all the schools except his own, how many steps does he lack of being a full fledged Sommerite? I would say only “one” step, and if “his” school should close, in view of what he has said about the other schools, he could not recommend “either of them” to the boys and girls who may ask him about such.

But in further evidence of all disregard for either truth or consistency take a look at Brother Hardeman’s report of the visit of Daniel Sommer to Freed-Hardeman College in 1939. From an article entitled “An Explanation,” bearing the signature of N. B. Hardeman, in the Gospel Advocate, April 6, 1939, we quote:

After a full and free discussion, we found there was very little difference between Freed-Hardeman College and Brother Sommer on the ‘Bible-school’ question.

Also from an article bearing the signature of L. L. Brigance, in the Gospel Advocate, Feb. 2 1939, in reference to the same visit of Brother Sommer to the South, we quote:

“His opposition to so-called ‘Bible’ or ‘church’ schools is well known. He objected to the name ‘Bible college because the Bible, perhaps, did not constitute more than a tenth of the subjects taught; he thought the name ‘Christian’ was too sacred to be applied to a human institution; he thought it wrong for such schools to call on the churches for donations out of the church treasury . . . When he found Freed-Hardeman College to be practically free from these objectionable features . . . and that we were in substantial agreement with him in his objections, he had no fight to make against us.”

Now, who is it that “lacks only one step of being a full-grown Sommerite?” Brother Hardeman says “there was very little difference between Freed-Hardeman College and Brother Sommer on the ‘Bible-school’ question.” Brother Brigance said, “We were in substantial agreement with him in his objections.” It is evident that the eighty-nine year old Daniel Sommer was hoodwinked at Freed-Hardeman College, and deceived into believing that the college was not what it really is, and were not doing things that they really were doing. Remember that Brother I. A. Douthitt has testified that Freed-Hardeman College solicited money from the churches in Tennessee, took notes from churches made payable to the college, and made notations on the notes of the names of the particular elders of the churches to whom notices for payment should be sent. Brother Douthitt also testified that Brother H. Leo Boles remarked to him regarding the practice of the college soliciting and receiving money from the churches, that “they all practice it and they all deny it.” Brother Douthitt evidently did not resent the publication of his testimony as the editor of the Banner has since received a very friendly letter from him.

It is quite obvious that Brother Hardeman’s announced theory and known practice have never harmonized; and his public utterances have always been inconsistent with his private practices and personal sentiments. His far-famed diplomacy has been found to be stupid duplicity. Yet he is the college president who...
time to time, as his own letters reveal, urged me to expose “deceit and down-right dishonesty” in the David Lipscomb, Harding and Abilene colleges!

But continuing the “versus” treatment let us take a look at Brethren Hardeman and Brewer meeting themselves coming back:

**HARDEMAN AND BREWER VERSUS THEMSELVES**

**First: Hardeman versus Hardeman** on “the law and the principles.”

I cite the reader here to the quotations on page 10 of this issue from Brother Hardeman’s sermons and debates, and to the comments by Cled E. Wallace on page 2 of this issue. His own statements in his books and his debates flatly reverse the stand he has taken in this controversy. No amount of “Foy versus Cled, Foy versus Roy” or Foy versus anything else can deliver him from his own dilemma. He “has met himself coming back” so many times in these utterances that he won’t even speak when he meets himself. He even denies his identity and tries to make believe he is somebody else.

**Second: Hardeman versus Hardeman** on the church-college issue.

In 1938 Brother Hardeman unequivocally said one thing on this question, and in 1947 he equivocally said another. But he has reflected on everybody’s intelligence, without doing any credit to his own, by denying that his statements are inconsistent.

Read them side by side:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1938</th>
<th>1947</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>&quot;I certainly do not indorse Brother Brewer's statements and would oppose any congregation putting Fred H. Hardeman in their budgets. Such has ever been our sentiments.&quot;</td>
<td>&quot;If a church believes any school is teaching the truth ... and such a church desires to help the school to exist it has the right to do so ... That a congregation has a right to make a donation to a school, I verily believe.&quot;</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

We have insisted that Brother Hardeman tell us what Brother Brewer believed in 1938 that he did not indorse. He indorses Brewer now, and “Brother Brewer believes now as he believed then,” according to Brother Hardeman’s own statement in the Gospel Advocate. How, then, can Brother Hardeman indorse him now and not indorse him then? Quote him again: “Brother Brewer believes now as he did then ... which one has changed?” Friends, it is really embarrassing, but Brother Hardeman brought it all on himself. He really made a mistake in the last sentence of his 1938 statement. Perhaps it was a typographical error. It should have read: “This has never been our sentiment.” At least, he could then have called either end of the statement a misprint, according to convenience! “Now, let us smile” indeed! The last trace of his faint, forced smile has turned to a sour pickle

**Third: Brewer versus Brewer on the church-college issue.**

Here we call your attention to the article by Roy E. Cogdill on page 7 of this issue. But we went to take a look at the two statements of Brother Brewer side by side:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1947</th>
<th>1935</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>“I have never advocated supporting the colleges out of the church treasury; I have never even advocated putting the college in the church budget, and no church for which I have ever preached has ever had a Christian College in its budget. Two of the elders of the Lubbock church ... are members of the A.C.C. board. One of the elders of the church at Cleburne ... was a member of the same board. Neither of these churches nor any other church for which I have preached ever put any college in its budget.”</td>
<td>“At Cleburne and at Sherman also we put Abilene Christian College in our budget for $1000 a year... dust think of what several hundred churches in middle Tennessee could do for David Lipscomb College if they could get a few of them ... to place the school in the budget for a definite amount ... (1) the budget is scriptural, (2) it is right to have colleges and orphan homes, (3) it is right for the churches as such to contribute to these institutions. The elders are either not convinced on these things or else they do not know how to set out a program. The trouble lies with the elders.”</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In his famous Abilene speech Brother Brewer charged that the trouble was with the preacher - the church had the wrong preacher! But in his Advocate article the trouble was with the elders-he thought the elders did not know how to set out a program for which I have ever preached. He has boasted that he has not changed on anything in thirty years, and on a point of doctrine-never in his whole life! Well, just take a look at these utterances of his side by side:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1931-34</th>
<th>1938-40</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>“No man who even claims to be a Christian could claim that war is right. Any man who even follows Christ “afar off” knows that war is un-Christian ... then, war being unchristian, when a Christian engages in war he is doing an unchristian</td>
<td>“There is room in this country for only one ism, and that is Americanism. Communism, fascism, nazism, and socialism are out. If and when this nation must fight to prevent the overthrow of Americanism, I for one, am ready to give the last drop of blood</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Fourth: Brewer versus Brewer on the “war question.”**

It should be remembered that Brother Brewer has boasted that he has not changed on ‘anything in thirty years, and on a ‘point of doctrine-never in his whole life! Well, just take a look at these utterances of his side by side:
thing. What does he lack of having surrendered his faith? . . . Granting that all who ask for noncombatant service receive it, there is still the question of whether or not the noncombatant part of any army, which is essential to all armies in all wars, is not as much a part of the war machine as the combatant forces . . . And those who stay at home and buy war stamps, war bonds and in other ways contribute to the funds, are also participants in the slaughter. If the command of a civil government to take up the sword and kill an unfriendly fellow man does not contravene the teaching of Him who said, “Put up thy sword” . . . I challenge any man to name something that would contravene the teaching of Christ. Try to think of one.”

Now, add to the above statements the dramatic shout of Brewer in his debate with Coleman the Communist in California, that he was “ready to shoulder a gun to defend Christianity against Communism.” In 1831-34 Brother Brewer was an out-and-out Conscientious Objector, one who could not even accept noncombatant service in the army of this nation, nor even buy a war stamp or a war bond, for to do so was to become a “participant” in the slaughter. But my! what a change came over him within two years, and how he reversed himself. In 1937 he was “ready to shoulder a gun” to promote Christianity against Communism. In 1940 he said, “if this country must go to war” he “for one” would fight! Since he then was the one who challenged “any man” to name the principle that would justify a Christian to bear arms, let him now, in his own words to others, “try to think of one.” Brother Hardeman says that Brother Brewer “believes now as he did then,” but he is now “arm and arm” with Brewer against “Foy.” They are indeed a cunning couple to be casting knowing looks at each other and talking about somebody else “changing” on anything.

Both Hardeman and Brewer were of “full age” when these first statements were made. They were of “fuller age” in 1947 when their contrary statements were made. Brewer “had been preaching for a number of years” for the “biggest” churches in the brotherhood, and Hardeman had been president for “a number of years” of the only school “among us” that he can endorse. “Why did they not know their stand?” Really, it does take “a lot of gall” for them to say what they said then, and “write such articles now” as Hardeman did in the Gospel Advocate and Firm Foundation. I say again that they are a pretty pair to be talking about anybody changing on anything or of anyone meeting himself coming back anywhere.

Fifth: Hardeman versus Hardeman on the “war question.”

On every hand it has been asked, ‘Where does N. B. Hardeman stand on the government and war question?’ With many that has been the “sixty-four dollar question”-because N. B. Hardeman would not declare himself. In May, 1945, he complained to us in a letter that “both you and Bro. Cleed were trying to line me up as a partisan in this matter and I have refused to become such.” In October, 1945, he wrote me again: “It did seem that you and Bro. Cleed tried to force me to say more than I ever did about the war question.” Now, far be it from Cleed or me to try to force President Hardeman to tell where he stands and what he believes. But he has always boasted that there is not any question before the brethren concerning which he could not and would not state his position “on a post card.” We naturally thought he would do that on “the war question.” But no! He did not want anybody to know his real convictions on that question, if he had any, or to find it out if he didn’t have any. Why not? Was he afraid of someone who was “helping” him, or think they might quit “helping” him?

Well, it so happens that Cleed and I did not have to “line him up”-he did it himself. But he thought the brethren would not find it out. He wrote a letter, this time to the draft board at Okmulgee, Oklahoma. Here is what he said:

February 11, 1943. Local Draft Board, Okmulgee, Oklahoma, Gentlemen: I can fully appreciate the problems that are presented to local boards. My purpose in writing you is to make clear, if I can, the position of the Church of Christ regarding war.

There is no ecclesiastical body with authority to regulate any member’s convictions. Neither does the local church have such authority. As to whether or not any member is a conscientious objector is a matter wholly within the individual and you will find in the same congregation some who are objectors and others who are not. I have no right nor reason to doubt the statement of any member who thus claims to be an and it seems to me that each board should accept the statement made unless there is sufficient reason to show that the person thus making the statement is not honest in so doing.

We have a number of young men in this school. Several have been classified reads to fight; others have been placed in non-combatant service because of their convictions and bona fide preachers of the gospel have been classified in 4-D. From different officials who have visited us, I have found that they are unacquainted with the policy of the Church of Christ, hence
the explanation to you gentlemen.

"This college is not a unit on the matter of objection. Like the church it is an individual affair and some of the faculty would no doubt be objectors, while others of us feel otherwise. "Very truly yours, N. B. Hardeman."

Now notice, Brother Hardeman says: "Some of the faculty would no doubt be objectors, while others of us feel otherwise." Cautious as the Henderson diplomat was, he stated his own classification. "Others of us"-when a man says "us" does he not include himself? So some of Brother Hardeman's faculty are "objectors", but he is one of the "us" who feels otherwise. Why, then, has he not been willing to let the brethren know how he "feels"? Did it make him a partisan to tell the Draft Board? If not, why should it make him a partisan to tell the brethren?

That letter to the Draft Board bears marks of the politician that everyone knows N. B. Hardeman to be-it is a mixture of political and sectarian phraseology. He claims the high prerogative of stating the "policy" for "The Church of Christ" on war. Both his qualifications and his right to do such a thing as that may well be questioned. If for no other reason, no man is qualified to write the policy for the church who will not state his own position to the church. He says plainly that we were trying to force him to do "more than he ever did on the war question." When a man who takes as big a hand in politics as he has always taken in the politics of Tennessee, withholds his position on the government question in order to stand in with certain groups in the church who would turn against him, he is playing politics with both the church and the government, and to call him what he is, simply a cheap politician, is neither "ridicule" nor "abuse," but just plain facts.

Brother Hardeman says of me: "He ridiculed, made fun of, and insinuated that all conscientious objectors were downright hypocrites." That is just another premeditated prevarication. I have never insinuated nor in any way intimated that any "conscientious" objector is a hypocrite. But any man who will write the kind of letter to a Draft Board that N. B. Hardeman wrote, and then conceal it to keep the brethren from finding it out, is a hypocrite.

But is it a fact that to discuss the matter is "more than he ever did about the war question"? His memory on war is as bad as Bro. Brewer's memory on the budget. In the Firm Foundation, May 1, 1934, there appears a statement from N. B. Hardeman on war. He said:

"Inasmuch as that religious body known in the Federal Census of Religions as the 'Churches of Christ' has no organization other than, or larger than, a single congregation and consequently has no way of expressing its position as a whole upon any matter, we, as members, teachers, preachers and leaders in this religious organization take this method of putting ourselves on record in regard to war. We believe it to be entirely contrary to the teaching of Jesus Christ for Christians to participate in combatant service in war."

Now that is certainly revealing as the article is signed by "Members of the faculty of Freed-Hardeman College." The whole article is as contradictory with itself as Brewer and Hardeman are with themselves. The teaching of Jesus Christ, he says, is contrary to "combatant service in war." Wonder how he would go about making these same passages on "non-resistance" which he uses against combat service harmonize with the resistance necessary to "non-combatant service in war," which he declares is not contrary to the teaching of Jesus. His trouble is in misapplying the passages in the first place. The President of Freed-Hardeman College really ought to go to Lukfin and let Cogdill and Arceneaux teach him Bible hermeneutics. Again, he meets himself coming back, and has passed himself "coming and going" so many times that he doesn't sbp long enough to recognize himself anywhere.

It is a matter of record that Brethren Hardeman and Brewer have both switched positions on the "war question." They cannot truthfully deny it. But they are both loud in their denunciations of "Foy" for his "change on the war question." Yea, they would "ridicule" and "abuse" him for doing in lesser degree a thing they have done in a greater degree. "Wherefore thou art inexcusable, 0 man, whosoever thou art that judgest: for wherein thou judgest another, thou condemnest thyself; for thou that judgest doest the same things." (Rom. 2:1)

Take a last look at N. B. Hardeman's statements side by side:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1934</th>
<th>1943</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>&quot;We believe it to be entirely contrary to the teaching of Jesus Christ for Christians to participate in combatant service in war. . . The above doctrine has been taught in this college since it was founded twenty-five years ago.&quot;</td>
<td>&quot;This college is not a unit on the matter of objection. Like the church it is an individual affair and some of the faculty would no doubt be objectors, while some of us feel otherwise.&quot;</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Brother Hardeman was of "full age" when in 1934 he put himself "on record in regard to war." And, "he was of fuller age" when in 1943 he made the opposite statement to the Draft Board. "He had been preaching a number of years and had been president of one of the biggest schools in the brotherhood. Why did he not know his stand?" I know that is embarrassing-but Brother Hardeman brought it all on himself. "He seems not to know today where they will be tomorrow". Again, I say they are a pretty pair to prate about another man
“changing,” walking “arm in arm” with somebody, and meeting himself coming back! “Happy is he that condemneth not himself in that which he alloweth.” (Rom. 14:22).

As for me, when my views on combattant and noncombattant service were straightened out, I knew where I stood, and announced it to all the brethren. I did not suppress my views nor my words, previous or present, but published the 1936 statement in full giving the reasons for the extent to which I had changed and the arguments that had corrected me (which incidentally have never been answered), all of which appeared in the Bible Banner of February 1943, as follows:

"Much has been made of that short statement of mine in the Gospel Guardian in 1936. I have no disposition to suppress my words. Rather have I the desire to correct the misstatements and misapplications of that little article, and to set the matter right.... Nor do I have any disposition to escape the responsibility for the statement. At the time it was written I held the non-combatant viewpoint—but I was never a C. O. I had taken for granted the non-combatant view, having heard it expounded from my seniors from my youth up. The piece I wrote reveals how fully I had accepted and how fervently I felt that sentiment. The article also indicates that it was only sentiment, for not one single argument nor the slightest efforts to prove or to disprove anything was made. On the contrary the article yielded to the opposite view of the military assumption by the admissions that the "deductions" were all in favor of the other side. It thus conceded what was deducible in the premises."

The effort on the part of these brethren now to make it appear that they have ratted a "skeleton in the closet," by dragging the "war question" out, will be considered by all thinkers as their one and only hope of shifting the issue from themselves to us. But they have bogged down in the meshes of their own contradictions and inconsistencies. The only thing they can do is what they have already done, namely, ignore everything, answer nothing and keep on bringing up something else.

As for G. C. Brewer’s War Memorial speech, I have not the slightest "apology" to make for it; and "such blustering from a gospel preacher before a worldly political organization, ought to make every Christian who reads it blush with shame." No, I have no apology to offer, sirs. But in view of what N. B. Hardeman has said about G. C. Brewer, as quoted in the letters herein printed, in the light of his present "arm in arm" step with him—he is the one to do the apologizing to Brewer.

Sixth: Hardeman versus Hardeman on the David Lipscomb book.

On this point he says:

"While Foy was editor of the Gospel Advocate, I do not believe he could have been induced to publish 0. C. Lambert’s attack on David Lipscomb. Later it seemed to give him pleasure to publish Lambert’s attacks on this great man.

But the plain fact is that “Lambert” did not attack David Lipscomb, “the great man,” at all, as “Hardeman” knows. Brother Lambert simply abstracted the contents of the book, Civil Government, which has long been public property.

There was no attack on Lipscomb as a man. Why this from N. B. Hardeman? He does not indorse David Lipscomb’s view on the Christian’s relation to government, nor his book Civil Government. In that book Brother Lipscomb teaches that a Christian cannot vote, hold office, teach in any school under government administration whether municipal, state or national; that a Christian cannot be a "postmaster," that being an administrative office, or hold any official connection with the government. Brother Hardeman not only votes, but votes everybody else he can in West Tennessee, so the politicians say. He has held public office and conducts campaigns for men who run for office, from constable in Chester County to the Governor of Tennessee. The fact is, N. B. Hardeman has a state-wide reputation as a preacher who dabbles in politics. He received some obnoxious publicity through state papers for his political activities, to the extent that some brethren in Nashville and over the state complained that his influence was hurting the church. Does Hardeman believe the book, Civil Government? Oh no! Can he be "induced" to write an article to the Gospel Advocate plainly stating his attitude on the contents of that book, which Brother Lambert clearly outlined? "I do not believe that he could be induced" to make any part of an honest statement of his convictions on the contents of the David Lipscomb Civil Government book, like "Lambert" did, or anything else that cause certain ones to quit “helping” him.

HARDEMAN VERSUS ‘FOY’

It will proper here to answer some of the charges made in the article such as the assertion that "he passed so many times from one position to another"; that "he gave one hundred percent indorsement" to Brewer’s teaching on organizations; and “he must be considered ‘unstable,
First: In reference to the assertion that I "gave one hundred percent indorsement" to Brother Brewer's teaching on Organizations.

Time was when both Brother Hardeman and Brother Brewer were quite confidential with me, and I reciprocated that confidence. Hence, we can all publish letters—they started it, but "two can play that game," if that is what they want. The particular letter to Brother Brewer from me, which Brother Hardeman prints, was written from Albuquerque, N. M., nearly fifteen years ago. It does not indorse any position of Brother Brewer's. It was editorial approval of the publication of his articles.

It was the year of the two debates with Charles M. Neal. The work was heavy. I was in the mountains of New Mexico in August, preparing manuscripts of the debate for the book. I was not in direct charge of the editorial office of the Gospel Advocate, having delegated the work to others. Brother Brewer's articles became mixed and out of order. He thought one or more of them had been cast aside. Hence, the explanation—I had given them editorial approval. For what? For publication. But it is stated that "we talked the matter over before they were written"; exactly so; and I told Brother Brewer, and also Brother McQuiddy, plainly, that I did not agree with Brother Brewer's views on the college-in-the-budget issue. I also told Brother Brewer that if he could prove that proposition I would be his first convert.

Knowing my views which had been so repeatedly stated, and knowing G. C. Brewer as he did and still does, my friend Jack Meyer felt exercised over the result of giving G. C. Brewer a free hand with such a medium. He knew Brewer better than I did, and while I thought then that Brother Meyer was "over-exercised," time and developments proved that he was right. I am not conscious of having been converted by Brother Brewer, but if they can produce the factual evidence that he did accomplish the task of converting me to his college-in-the-budget doctrine, I can counter with the evidence that I did not stay converted (he lost his quarry), and I will admit that I was either unconscious, or suffering from mental fag, or else confess that I have reversed myself nearly as many times as they have, changed almost as many times as they have, and if I should by any chance do such a thing a few more times I will get to be as inconsistent as they are, and have a memory about as bad as theirs. So instead of gaining anything so far as the issue is concerned, it would only put me in their company, and three of that kind would simply be too many. If it happens, I will make my acknowledgements and get out of it.

In proof of my continuous fight against linking the church and the college together I simply cite the fact that beginning with 1930, the first year of my editorship with the Gospel Advocate, I began to write articles on the subject "Concerning the Church and the College." These articles appeared in the Gospel Advocate every year until the last. During the period of discussions of the organization question, John T. Hinds, C. R. Nichol and F. B. Srygley all wrote articles taking opposite views from those of Brother Brewer, and taking the same stand that I had repeatedly taken editorially. I published all of their articles in editorial space with editorial indorsement of the position they set forth. Here are some of the statements made in Brother Nichol's editorial with my indorsement, under the heading "Concerning Christian Colleges" as follows:

"In our issue of February 18 there appeared an article in this column from the pen of Brother John T. Hinds, our query editor, on the relation of the church to the college. The article was written in answer to a querist and was intended for the query department. Brother Hinds' remarks were so timely and his distinctions so clear that his article was given editorial space for emphasis. Later the article was published in the Firm Foundation with editorial indorsement.

In the Firm Foundation of March 8, Brother C. R. Nichol treats the same question with equal clarity and scriptural discrimination:

'It is difficult to oppose the way in which some people do some work without being put down as opposed to the work.'

'It is clearly within the right of the individual to start a school in which he teaches Bible along with other subjects.'

'It is not within the right of the church to take its money and spend it, or place it in the hands of men who will spend it, in maintaining athletics in a college, or teaching the branches called 'science' in the college curriculum.'

'Christian colleges are controlled by a board of regents, or a board of directors: and though they are Christians, they are selected from different sections of the country, and in their activities in connection with the colleges, the board is not the church. It is not within the power of the church to scripturally delegate authority to such a board.'

'The board, is not the church, nor does it have authority to act for the church.

'Numbers of brethren throughout the country think that it is out of harmony with righteousness for an individual or group of brethren to start a school, and when they find they are involved financially to declare the college belongs to the brethren, and they must save it.'

'It is my persuasion that if Christian colleges will make their appeals to individuals—and they have a right to do that—their trouble will soon be over, and local congregations will not suffer.'

I then commented on the Nichol articles as follows:

"Brethren Finds and Nichol are agreed and have set forth the only position scripturally defensible or consistent with the opposition that
has been maintained against societies, organizations, and numerous other infringements upon the local church. If brethren everywhere could be made to see these distinctions and thus differentiate, it would not only save embarrassment to the church, but also be of profit to the schools.

Thus I endorsed the Hinds and Nichol articles editorially. Were Brethren Hinds and Nichol only “one step from a full grown Sommerite”? The editor of the Firm Foundation also endorsed the Hinds and Nichol articles editorially. Was he “only one step from a full-grown Sommerite”? What, then, is the matter with N. B. Hardeman? He is mad-all because we have challenged his teaching and that of his school in the issues of the present discussion. As for G. C. Brewer, we all know what has been the matter with him all of the time.

During this same period of discussion Brother F. B. Srygley’s articles on these issues were also printed in editorial space in the Gospel Advocate, and I endorsed what he said. Among other things, Brother Srygley had the following to say:

“He, Daniel Sommer, seems to believe that the college or school where the Bible is taught, not as an adjunct of the church, but as an aid to the parents, is permissible. This has been the contention of the better informed brethren in this part of the country all the time. Brother David Lipscomb contended all along that these schools could be built and supported by Christians, not as an adjunct of the church, but as a help to Christian parents. Brother Lipscomb said this through the Advocate, and Brother Wallace has said the same in the Advocate, editorially several times.”

Again:

“I do not believe that contributions should be made to these schools or any other secular business from the public treasury of the church. I will join the Review in trying to teach the brethren that this ought not to be done. Brother Baxter, the president of David Lipscomb College, said through the Advocate a few months ago that this should not be done.”

Everyone knows that Brother Srygley’s writings on the subject had more to do with Daniel Sommer’s truce on the college question than any man at, that time. But I suppose Brother Hardeman will say that Brother Srygley was “only one step from a full-grown Sommerite”? Such cheap demagoguery is beneath the ethics of a man who proposes to head an institution for “Christian education.”

After severing connection with the Gospel Advocate in 1934, the Gospel Guardian was launched, 1935, and again my position on the institutional question was expressed. Later, when the Bible Banner began to be published, 1938, in the very first issue of it, I condemned “The current campaign to put Abilene Christian College in the budgets of the churches of Texas.”

The positions stated in the Gospel Advocate, and re-stated from 1930 to 1934 in that paper, were printed and re-printed in the Bible Banner from 1938 until 1947.

But during all of these years between 1934 and 1947, more than thirteen years, Brother Hardeman has at no time challenged the constant and continuous statements in the Bible Banner on these questions, nor charged me with an inconsistent or contradictory course. He evidently did not believe any such thing. I think I know that he does not believe it now, and I know that I think he does not.

Concerning the remark in reference to Brother Showalter in the letter, he could not be expected to exactly appreciate the sideswipe at him, but he has done his share of that sort of thing with us.

It is not amiss here to mention the fact that a few years ago Brother James A. Allen thought Brother Showalter had himself made a “blunder” which he referred to as very “unfortunate,” such as Brother Showalter’s supposed endorsement of the assessment plan and the celebration of Pentecost with the Christian Standard editors. Brother Allen thought Brother Showalter said some “ugly” things in reply, such as calling him “the Gospel Advocate’s office girl.” Brother Allen resented that, and said:

“For more reasons than one we regret the little, mean, unkind things Brother Showalter is saying. The Gospel Advocate cannot reply in kind... It is a tragedy for the cause of truth to have ‘little’ men at the head of publications sustained by the patronage of the brethren.”

Now whether Brother Showalter disclaims saying anything “ugly” about Brother Allen or not, if he can forget what Brother Allen said about him, receive him into his paper with as high commendation as accompanied Brother Allen’s reply to Davidson, he should not allow Hardeman and Brewer to use the things that have passed between him and us to prejudice him and affect his attitude in this case. However, that is altogether up to Brother Showalter, for as we remarked, we have been on both the ‘giving and the receiving end of the line in our relations with him through the years.

He cuts in to say that the reference to him in the Brewer letter had to do with the Morrow Foundation discussion, and that the “editor of the Advocate” was on the “wrong side” of that issue. Well, if I was on the wrong side of it then the editor of the Firm Foundation is on the wrong side of it now, for he has flopped to the position that “the editor of the Advocate,” along with John T. Hinds, C. R. Nichol, R. L. White-side, C. M. Pullias, Cled E. Wallace, and others maintained, namely:

“Brother Morrow withdrew his charter and resumed his work of distributing Testaments and
Since the little “individual” Foundation was operating under exactly the same charter as David Lipscomb College, why has not the college been condemned for it? One had as much right to it as a board. Under the laws of Tennessee eleemosynary and non-profit organizations operated under the same charter. But if the same thing was done after the charter was withdrawn, or the same work done with the charter as without it, there is no real issue, and never was. If Brother Sowalter wants to reprint that discussion in the Firm Foundation, it will be quite all right with me. I was satisfied with it then.

Second: In reference to the assertion that I must be considered “unstable, unsafe and unsound.”

It is certainly pertinent to ask here, when did I become so? I will let some more of Brother Hardeman’s letters testify with unvarying evidence against himself.

Already, in connection with the letters revealing Brother Hardeman’s attitude toward G. C. Brewer, it has been seen that he was quite profuse with his compliments for me.

March 3, 1936, he wrote me:

“The most dependable brethren everywhere appreciate your ability and the frankness with which you discuss matters.”

Again, April, 1939:

“I thank God that you are so abundantly able to present matters as you do.”

I was sound, all right, then. But in December, 1942, after the war had been declared, after I was accused of being traitor to my friends, after Brother Boles had challenged us for a debate on a proposition that everybody knew was not stated in debatable terms—still I was sound, and Brother Hardeman “gave one hundred percent indorsement” to my reply to Brother Boles. Hear it:

December 19, 1942:

I wish all who disagree could manifest the same spirit as evidenced by you and Bro. Boles. I think your reply to him was exceeding fine and your suggestion that the editors and writers of the Gospel Advocate examine this among themselves is well put.”

So I was not “unsafe” nor “unsound,” not even “unstable,” in December, 1942. Moreover Brother Hardeman “gave one hundred percent indorsement” to the “swords” and “spears” argument on Isa. 2. Hear him:

“Your comment on Isa. 2, without doubt, is the truth regarding “swords” and “spears.” Such has been my conception of the passage for a number of years.”

I was not even “unstable” then! And that was 1943. But again in 1943:

“I am far from believing that your efforts have been in vain. I have frequently said that you will not be fully appreciated until, perhaps, you have ceased from your labors. I think you have done more than all of the rest of us to save the churches from Premillennialism. I have preached against the “ism” but much of the material I secured from what you had said. I think the reason the fight has been left to you (while others of us have escaped personal opposition) is because we recognize your superior ability and your medium to put things across.”

No one can imagine that Brother Hardeman thought March 17, 1943, when he wrote those lines that I “must be considered unstable, unsafe and unsound.” But hear him again in the same letter:

“I have seen but few things you have ever written but with them I agree 100 percent. I have sometimes questioned your judgment of propriety but I never doubted your sincerity. I have always admired your bold, fearless stand on what you believe. You have endorsed most of the teaching done here and your influence in our behalf has been evidenced in concrete form. I know you have upheld the school and that it has had no better friend. I hope you may never have occasion to be otherwise.”

And now—as late as the fall of 1946, less than one year ago from the date of his present spasms, I was so stable, so safe and so sound, that Brother Hardeman would not engage a teacher on his faculty without asking my “estimate.” Read this one:

September 23, 1946:

“Regardless of all other matters, I would like to have your estimate of Bro. E. J. Ijams as a possible member of our faculty. If such a connection is had, he would be a teacher only. I understand that you had a talk with him while both of you were in Cookeville and because of your love of the truth and sound position, your statement relative to Bro. Ijams from you will be appreciated ... I certainly don’t want to make a mistake and it just occurs to me that Bro. Ijams might fit into our work. If you do not mind, I hope you may send me at once your estimate and opinion about this matter ... You will remember that some years ago I had an unpleasant correspondence with Bro. Ijams. Since matters have come out into the open at D. L. C. I can better understand his attitude and I would not say now some things that I said then. I mean to say that I did not know that there was an element within that school laying plans and doing their best to get rid of Ijams in order that another might have his place.”

What were the things he said about Brother Ijams “some years ago” that he would not say now? Is it what he said about “calling on sectarians to pray?” Incidentally, his letter suggests the idea that the only objection he ever had to Ijams was his connection with D. L. C. He hates David Lipscomb College with a vengeance.

So as the matters stands, the question stands: When did Brother N. B. Hardeman come to the conclusion that I must be considered un-
It was not due to the position that I occupied on the college question, for that had been stated and restated many times while he was indorsing and commending me.

2. It was not due to any change or modification of my views on combatant and noncombatant army service, because he wrote me many letters of personal indorsement all during that period, even commending my reply to Brother H. Leo Boles.

3. I was not due to my criticisms of weaknesses in the other colleges because he was in all of that, shouting the refrain to “they shall not pass” every time I unfurled the Banner. And he sent me “good material for the Bible Banner” against the other schools, requesting me to write various editorials, but not to mention his name.

When, oh when, did “Foy” become unsound in the sight of N. B. Hardeman? Here it is: Comparatively a few weeks ago, not more than a very few months ago, when we dared to point out his own mistakes on the church-college question, and criticise his own inconsistencies.

In his own words, his disposition to count every man who does not agree with him his personal enemy, is indeed unfortunate.”

Third: The charge that “he turned from his lifelong friends and from those who bad helped him because they would not join him in contending for carnal warfare.”

There was never a more carefully calculated, timed-for-effect, but deliberate misrepresentation than those words carry. And no one knows it any better than N. B. Hardeman. I am glad to say that my life-long friends are still my steadfast friends. Their name is legion, and I can prove it. I have turned from none of them. But friends with me are not mercenary. I have never estimated them on the basis of how much “help” I can calculate on receiving from them. When it comes to stating my convictions I never have considered the effect that it will have on the “help” I may get or not get from a friend or anybody else. Is that the reason Brother Hardeman could not be forced to state his convictions? Some men have “turned from me” because I stood by my honest convictions, but I have never turned against any friend. Some “fair weather” friends have also, for various other reasons, turned from me, but I have never worried over the “help” I lost. And now that N. B. Hardeman cannot use me to pull his chestnuts, and has found out that we will criticise him and his school when they are wrong, just as quickly as we will criticise other men and their schools, he too has turned viciously against me, to walk with me no more, help me no more, fellowship me no more; and to anathematize me “unstable, unsafe and unsound.” Methinks not many brethren, with the average ability to think, will follow his dictum in this matter.

There is a final phase—a serious thing seems certain. Feeling as Brother Hardeman does in this matter he will not restrain himself before his classes. He will without doubt teach all of the young preachers who attend his school his views on the church-college question. And he will fill every young preacher he can with the poison of his own feelings in these matters, as evidenced in his articles. Unless and until brethren of means can be assured that such will not be the case, who could feel justified in placing sums of money at Brother Hardeman’s disposal through his college?

It was not necessary for Brother Hardeman to take this turn. But it verifies what dozens of good men who have known him for years have told me with warnings, that N. B. Hardeman has never been a friend to any man beyond the use that he can make of that man. He turned on A. G. Freed years ago, wrote or had written a long and bitter article against Brother Freed which the Gospel Advocate did not publish, and sent Brother Freed to his grave broken hearted. I have in my possession now a similar article which he wrote in a merciless “exposure” of Hall L. Calhoun after a disagreement between them while Brother Calhoun served on the faculty of the school. It appears to be N. B. Hardeman who cannot get along with men who have too much self-respect to bow-tow to him, and it is he who “counts every man his enemy who disagrees with him” or who criticises him, in his school and out of it. Therefore, when he learned that I do not have a price tag on the lapel of my coat, he turns on me, as he turned on A. G. Freed.

We do regret the necessity of having to say the things that have been said, but facts and fairness, honesty and honor, virtue and value require it. It has come to a pretty pass when it becomes necessary for us to reply to N. B. Hardeman on the same plane and in the same vein in which we were forced to reply to Clinton Davidson. But we did not fear Davidson nor anything that he could do or get done; and we do not fear N. B. Hardeman nor anything that he can do or have done. We believe we are right. Nothing else counts. We could, I concede, with considerable cost to our just cause, have cast aside impelling inclinations of self-defense, and let the personalities pass. But regardless of any one’s judgment in that matter, the issues involved in this controversy are vital, the church of Christ is at stake, and we cannot let them pass. On these issues, they have not passed—and they shall not pass!