Brother Hardeman thinks "the Banner Boys" have "Become Enraged." He reminds me of the alcoholic who staggered up to a policeman, accused him of being drunk and tearfully begged him to go home because he was in no condition to be out on the street. His "desperate effort to shift the issue and, if possible, prejudice the readers" makes it clear who is hot and bothered. His reckless and baseless charges lead us to expect nothing else from him than to "ignore everything, answer nothing and keep on bringing up something else" as far as the issue is concerned.

After all, possibly he is not to be blamed too much. I think he is doing the best he can under the circumstances. I am not "enjoying" his predicament as much as he thinks I am. I regret that a big man like he is can get himself into such a mess and feel sorry for him even if some substantial people think he doesn't deserve it. After holding me in high esteem for many years, or at least I thought he did, he has this to say of me:

"Brother Cled is indeed a garrulous writer. He seems to think he must say something regardless of its relevancy. He would, no doubt, love to be classed among the humorists. He will continue to talk. He can truly 'pace all day in the shade of a tree' and be no farther on his journey at sundown than he was at the break of day. He enjoys himself, and what he says does no harm to the arguments presented, so—let him rack on."

Brother Hardeman knows I'm not "enraged" and I know why he is worried because I "pace all day in the shade of that tree." He is up in it and he wants me to go away so he can get down. I'm under the right tree and I know what I have treed. And it isn't even smiling. The snarls and growls do not sound like Brother Hardeman used to, but I cannot be mistaken. His name is signed to the scent I have trailed him by. No, I'm not ready to trail off after the "Sommerites" or jump on to the orphans' homes. I'll just pace awhile longer in the shade of the same tree. And I don't expect him at the moment to "class" me "among the humorists." I know that what I'm doing isn't a bit funny to Brother Hardeman. "Too bad!" Tree sitting isn't supposed to develop a sense of humor. And it is likely to breed queer ideas. For instance, he thinks that I have sawed off the limb between me and the tree because I contend that "The church can scripturally contribute to and support any work that the church is commanded to do, anything that is the work of the church; but the church cannot scripturally contribute to or support any work that the church is not commanded to do, that is not the work of the church."

If this is sawing the limb off between me and the tree, I think I'll just hang on to the limb and take my chances. Anyhow, I believe that to be the truth. The rejoinder that such a contention "estops" the church from...
building meeting houses and baptisteries and anything incidental or necessary in carrying out its appointed mission is cheap quibbling. Commands are inclusive and exclusive. In this instance, our agitated brother is trying to torture it to include the financial support of "a human institution" with "a board of directors" which he defines as a business somewhat like a hardware company. He has no command, example or necessary inference that can be stretched that far. What is his answer to this? He "racks on" about "a list of things forbidden" and talks about somebody sawing the limb off between him and the tree, and tears his hair over "Sommer." Who is making "a desperate effort to shift the issue and, if possible, prejudice the readers? He can be located in the tree I'm pacing under.

Brother Hardeman up in a tree is the climax of some interesting events. In 1938 he said:

"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."

He then "certainly", no doubt about it, did not endorse what he now advocates. His twisting and squirming to get around that statement without disavowing it and frankly stating a change of views is one of the highlights of the meandering that led him to the tree I'm pacing under. What was the situation back there? From the first year that Foy became editor of the Bible Banner "beginning with 1930" until the last, he wrote articles on the subject "concerning the Church and the College." He took the same position then that he does now. John T. Hinds, C. R. Nichol and F. B. Srygley all wrote articles taking the same stand Boy had taken editorially. These articles were published and given editorial endorsement. These men "certainly did not endorse Brother Brewer's statements" any more than Brother Hardeman did. Throughout the years in the Gospel Advocate, the Gospel Guardian and the Bible Banner right up to date Foy has maintained the same position on the institutional question. In

1938 in the very first issue of the Bible Banner Foy condemned "the current campaign to put Abilene Christian College in the budgets of the churches of Texas." He was fighting the same thing then that he is now. Brother Hardeman backed him up. He did not think Foy was inconsistent and contradictory. He did not think him "unstable." He does not think so now. He is treed.

Brother Hardeman's effort to reconcile his present position with what he said in 1938 is about the weakest excuse I have ever read. This ought to take your breath:

"I did not endorse his idea, as reported in the paper, of putting schools in the church budget, and thus binding them upon the church. These Banner brethren have done their best to make me say that I favored this idea. They have absolutely failed. I have always believed that a church has the right to contribute to a school . . . if it wants to."

The truth is that back there nobody thought of the distinction between putting the school into a church budget and contributing from the church treasury. Brother Srygley, Brother Nichol and others specifically opposed churches making "contributions" to schools. They had editorial endorsement from Foy and every other kind from Brother Hardeman. He was backing Foy up against Brother Brewer one hundred percent. That is what the statement of 1938 meant.

Brother Hardeman's current report of what happened when Brother Sommer came to Freed-Hardeman sounds like some of the facts had been juggled a bit. He is not too specific about what he said in his speech that so impressed Brother Sommer. Anyhow Brother Sommer was so overcome that he is reputed to have arisen and said:

"If Brother Hardeman wants to debate the merits of Freed-Hardeman College, I will not be his opponent. If that is the true story of this school, I have no criticism to offer."

Did Brother Hardeman tell Brother Sommer that he thought a church had a right to contribute to Freed-Hardeman out of its treasury if it wanted to? And that Freed-Hardeman was glad to accept such contributions? I'm afraid he didn't. It so happens that Brother Brigance
deposed on this point. He wrote of that occasion:

"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."

Brother Hardeman wrote:

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

That was because Brother Hardeman then believed and talked like we do now. That was when he did "not endorse" Brother Brewer's ideas. He thinks it would bind the school upon the church if the church puts the school "in the church budget." But it can "contribute" to a school if and when it wants to and all binding ceases! Brother Hardeman ought to put a sign over the door of his office: "All Sorts of Turning and Twisting Done Here."

Brother Hardeman's rage is directed chiefly against Foy.

"Foy's radical changes on vital issues declare him unstable. Being unstable, he cannot be a safe leader."

"Foy is an isolationist."

"Brother Foy has broken connection with all of our schools, and he cannot endorse any of them."

"He has severed connections with all of our papers and editors, except the Bible Banner, and he is at variance with both Cled and Roy in it."

"He has broken relations with many of the oldest and most influential preachers in the brotherhood."

"Is it possible for it to be possible that all of our schools, our papers, our editors, and many of our ablest preachers are all in the wrong and Foy alone is in the right? Truly the whole army is out of step and only Foy is in line."

The malice and falsehood seething in these sentences are plainly evident. When did Foy become so "unsafe" and "unstable" in Brother Hardeman's eyes? As late as September 1946 he wrote a personal letter to Foy in which he commended his "love of the truth and sound position." In 1943 Brother Hardeman wrote:

"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 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 out things across."

"I have seen but few things you have ever written but with them I agree one hundred percent. I have sometimes questioned your judgement of propriety but I never doubted your sincerity. I have always admired your bold, fearless stand on what, you believe."

What "radical changes on vital issues" has Foy made since then? None. The so-called "broken relations with many of the oldest and most influential preachers in the brotherhood" had all taken place. He mentions Brother H. Leo Boles as one of them. What was the "broken relation" there? Brother Boles challenged for a debate, sent propositions to several of us and we turned them down as not properly worded. Brother Hardeman thought what Foy said to Brother Boles was "well put." He commended "the spirit" of it. He mentions Brother C. R. Nichol and 'Brother G.H.P. Showalter. Wonder why? They have both spoken through the years and not as Brother Hardeman now speaks. Only recently Brother Showalter wrote an editorial voicing opposition to an orphan home operating under a board made up of brethren from different congregations. He says it is unscriptural. Just how "safe" and "sound" is he, Brother Hardeman? Did anything that ever happened between the men he named and Foy Wallace turn Brother Hardeman against Foy and lead him to the conclusion that he is "a double minded man and unstable in all his ways"? It did not! While all this was taking place, and Brother Hardeman's insinuations along this line are both base and baseless, was "the whole army out of step and only Foy in line" according to Brother Hardeman's current enemy? He never thought of such a thing and was all the time loving and flattering Foy. But now, right lately, he has become "unstable" and "unsafe"! Ah, Brother Hardeman, something has happened to you.

Since Brother Hardeman has made false charges and cried "unsafe," "unsound" "unstable" I am going to make a true charge backed up by the strongest evidence. Brother Hardeman sent Foy those Davidson letters. He sent a personal letter along with them. He sent Brother Whiteside a copy of them with a personal notation attached. Brother McQuiddy was quite put out when he found that they had gotten into our hands, He did not know it until he saw them in the Bible Banner! He phoned Brother Hardeman and asked him how Foy got the letters. Brother Hardeman told Brother McQuiddy that he did not know. He said the same thing in a letter to Brother McQuiddy that Foy read with his own eyes. Question! Is Brother Hardeman qualified to pass judgement on a man for being "unstable"? What can Brother Hardeman do under the circumstances? He can just "rack on" as long as the Gospel Advocate and The Firm Foundation are willing to let him "rack." Under the circumstances, the course he has chosen to pursue is contemptible.

This is not pleasant, of course. I am not enjoying it as Brother Hardeman suggests that I am. The nearest to "a radical change on an important issue" that Foy has ever made as far as I know was when he took a forthright position on the government question. He frankly stated the size of the change and why he made it. It was all right with Brother Hardeman then, but not lately. He is in a terrible state of mind and proposes to hang Foy's scalp on his belt by fair means or foal. Well, he won't!

If Brother Hardeman makes it necessary, I may have to pace some more under the same tree.
PARADISE LOST AND REGAINED
CLED E. WALLACE

One of the longest and most curious letters I have ever received is the “Open Letter To Brother Cled Wallace” appearing in a late issue of the Gospel Advocate. It was unnecessary for Brother Brewer to sign his name to it. Nobody else in the world, not even Brother Hardman, could have written it. It laughs, it weeps, it cajoles, it threatens, it scolds, it apologizes and trumpets forth a scope of forgiveness toward his enemies, past, present and future that leads to the suspicion that he is in a trance. and sees himself sitting on one of the twelve thrones judging the twelve tribes of Israel. Sinned against, but never sinning, he “turns out the forgiveness in wholesale lots,” not even waiting to be asked. He appears to be wholly unaware of the fact that everybody who has kept up with the succession of events during the years, knows that his course has been so repeatedly provocative as to justify the chastening he has received at our hands. He even promises that after he gets through with his present spree of ugliness, he is “never going to get ugly anymore.” He is going to climb back up on that “pedestal” where his friends, including some of the “Wallace in-laws and other connections” can again adore him, and be real nice the rest of his life. I hope he can do it, be real nice I mean for even a reasonable spell, but I have known him a long time and feel compelled to put him on “probation.” His spirit may be willing, but I think the flesh is weak.

It makes me feel a little cheap to look a gift horse in the mouth, but when Brother Brewer offers me an apology, unsolicited, unexpected and with that patronizing air in which he is above or below competition, my natural curiosity gets the better of me and I examine that horse fore and aft, and a strange mixup of horse feathers he turns out to be.

That apology is a Brewer classic. With gracious condescension he purrs that “I am going to apologize to you here and now for that letter of July 30, 1947.” That was the letter which was published in the Bible Banner and which lost him paradise. It brought him “a dozen or so letters” from his “good friends” and revealed to him the pitiable condition into which he had fallen. We tempted him and he fell-right smack off the “pedestal” where his friends, including some of “the Wallace in-laws and connections,” had exalted him-right down, down, down “to the level” where “the Bible Banner boys rage.” His friends are “scolding” him “soundly” with the inference that he is getting to be no better than we are and it has broken his “big heart.”

He is mistaken, his apology is not to me, it is a plea to his “good friends” to restore him to paradise, put him back up on that “pedestal” where he can again bask in the soothing sunlight of their admiration. He thinks it “may not hurt” me but it “does hurt” him for his friends to see him on my level and he proposes to make any sacrifice necessary “that my friends and your relatives will regain their respect for me and confidence in me” even if he has to refrain from getting “ugly anymore” and be nice for awhile.

I think a friendly warning is in order. If he succeeds in getting perched back upon that lordly “pedestal” and starts to preening his feathers and acting too important, I’ll try to see to it that it is not all glory for him. I may not be able to knock him off again, but by the grace of God, I’ll put a dunce cap on him if it is the last thing I ever do. I have never had any ambitions to get on a “pedestal” and if my friends ever act foolish enough to put me on one, I’ll come down on my own power. I’d rather “pace all day under the shade of a tree.”

It isn’t too great a puzzle our apologetic brother poses about “members of some of the Wallace families-in-laws and other connections” having “too high a regard” for him and such a low regard for me and Foy. The Wallace tribe is numerous and it multiplies. I am the oldest of eleven children and naturally have some “in-laws and other connections.” It wouldn’t be at all surprising if one or more of them should stop to stare at Brother Brewer sitting on a “pedestal” and become a bit dazzled at the spectacle. I have an idea however that the whole thing is somewhat (exaggerated. It is hard, I admit, to keep everybody, especially “in-laws and other connections” from having “too high a regard” for things they oughtn’t to, but I’m doing the best I can along that line. I have one “in-law” for instance who, when I heard last, was an executive secretary of the United Christian Missionary Society. No telling what he is by now but it is something above “the level upon which” I “am now writing.” He was at one time the protege of Jesse P. Sewell and David L. Cooper in the days when we kept Brother Sewell hot and bothered about some men he kept on his faculty at Abilene. This promising young fellow yearned for higher levels, collected as many degrees “as a thermometer” and has been flying high, wide and handsome ever since. He feels real sorry for some of his relatives, natural and spiritual, who have stayed on a low enough level to keep their feet on the ground. My advice to Brother Brewer is to sit somewhere where he can reach the ground with his feet, even if it does “disappoint” some of
his “good friends” and some of “the Wallace in-laws and other connections.” Such considerations are not a major problem with me when I am considering religious matters.

Brother Brewer is particularly anxious for us to know that there is no “coalition and collaboration between Brother Hardeman and me.” Brother Hardeman wants everybody to know that there is no “collaboration” between him and Brother Brewer. I had an idea that neither of them was enjoying that reputation too much and I don’t blame them for that. Under the circumstances, I would hate to be accused of “collaboration” with either of them. They do look quite twinnish but there is this difference. Brother Brewer is down off his “pedestal” and wants ‘back up. Brother Hardeman is up in the tree I’m pacing under and wants down. If one can get up and the other get down, if it doesn’t make them happy, they’ll at least feel better.

Brother Brewer makes a whale of an admission for him. It is really a confession. There is “some basis for some of the things” we “allege against” him. “You represent me as having talked two ways on some issues and you cite the proof, but.” Well, I should say as much. “But” what? “You do not put a fair construction upon these circumstances and statements.” He explains that there are times when he writes “in moments of sober thinking and deliberate expression.” I agree with him that such is usually momentary. Then there are times when he orates “in the excitement of impassioned speech,” is not to be considered too responsible and besides he gets misquoted. “Pacificism” is one of the four horses of communism, but he is a pacifist when he is sober and wants to fight when he’s not. He begs for charity and I think he needs it. Wonder if Brother Hardeman, with whom he has developed such a sudden and wonderful “friendship,” thinks he is “stable”?

He wants to get back to his “life-long view of a Christian’s part in war.” He was “sober” when he said that “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.” But he again must have imbibed a bit too freely of something “impassioned” when he reported that the church he was preaching for was investing money in “war stamps” and “was bonds” to be used in “post-war work.” But he assures us that he is now “sober” and safe back home in the folds of pacifism. I have an idea that he may stay that way until he gets through at Harding College next winter unless something “impassioned” gets him excited again. I warned the readers some time ago that when Brother Brewer had one of his spells he should not be held too strictly to account, that he was not entirely responsible at such times. I hardly expected him to come right out and beg us to “put a fair construction upon these circumstances.”

This “open letter” of Brother Brewer’s is both “exciting” and “impassioned” and lacks soberness throughout. He really has a crush on Brother Hardeman. Brother Hardeman purportedly said some unkind things about me.” Portrayed, my eye! He did, wrote it down and signed his name to it! But Innocent Brother Hardeman is not to blame in the matter. No, not he. He was the innocent victim of the depravity of Foy Wallace. “I know that Foy Wallace has prejudiced him and many others, and Brother Hardeman probably believed many things about me that were not true.” Huh! Innocents abroad like Hardeman and Brewer should have some sort of protection against Foy Wallace.

Both Brother Hardeman and Brother Brewer have labored long and painfully to prove that Foy in the past endorsed what he is now fighting against—the colleges in the budget of the churches. They have brought forth about everything but the proof of their reckless assertions. The record is too clear. Foy is “purported” to have called Grover from Sherman to Denton to preach on the “budget system.” “Foy publicly endorsed my sermons.” It is significant that he does not claim to have advocated church support of schools in that “budget system.” Foy tells me, we “collaborate” you know, that such a thing as Brother Brewer tries to remind us of did not happen at all. Something similar happened at Temple when I was there. I recall nothing of the kind. Perhaps it happened when I was not there. Anyhow it was nearly a hundred years ago and if I did listen to and endorse some of the foolish aberrations Brother Brewer can be guilty of, it merely means that I did not have as much sense then as I do now and that he ought to have “by reason of the time.”

Those awkward propositions Brother Brewer submits for debate will not help him get seated back on his “pedestal” unless his “good friends” and “some of the Wallace in-laws and connections” are dumber than I think they are. I admit that I have some “in-laws and connections” who are not as smart as I am but I think they are smarter than that. Methodists have asked us to affirm that it is wrong to sprinkle babies and digressives have insisted that we affirm that they cannot scripturally use instrumental music in worship, but we have always understood that it was because they were unwilling to assume the burden of proving their own practice. Now we are asked to affirm that the church cannot scripturally support a “human institution” like a college out of its treasury. Evidently, they do not care to assume the burden of proving their practice, unless we handicap ourselves by affirming a negative. He claims
the “endorsement of several colleges.” It would be interesting to have him name them. I think I know of two that will not endorse him “in writing.”

In 1938 Brother Hardeman said:

“I certainly do not indorse Brother Brewer’s statements and would oppose any congregation putting Reed-Hardeman in their budgets. Such has ever been our sentiments.”

Now Brother Brewer says:

“You try to show that Brother Hardeman has reversed himself on several points. You quote him as saying he does not endorse my statements, but you do not show to what statements Brother Hardeman alluded. If he meant that he does not endorse the position that a church may donate to a college, then he would have contradicted things he had both written and said years before that denial that you quote was made. But Brother Hardeman was alluding to statements that were attributed to me, which statements I never made.”

There is only one trouble with that “evasion.”

The facts in the case do not support it. We did not “try to show.” We did. Brother Hardeman understood Brother Brewer all right and Brother Brewer understood Brother Hardeman and neither of them liked what they understood. But if that be true, then Brother Hardeman “contradicted” himself. Well, it looks very much like that is exactly what happened! I can admire Brother Brewer’s sympathy with Brother Hardeman in a tight place and his newly acquired solicitude for his consistency, but he is at a decided disadvantage when it comes to the facts in the case.

Now, if Brother Brewer decides to get “ugly” some more, he might be able to justify himself in the eyes of his “good friends” and “some members of the Wallace family in-laws and other connections” by blaming it on me and Foy.

More Brewer-Hardeman Perversions and Prevarications Refuted

FOY E. WALLACE, JR.

The word perversion means to turn from the true end or purpose; to corrupt; to misapply. The word prevarication means to deviate from the truth. These words express accurately the character of the articles that have come from the pens of N. B. Hardeman and G. C. Brewer in their coalition to force upon the brotherhood by their combined efforts the church-college issue which but for their continued insistence would have been resolved and laid on the shelf. Other college men were and are willing to abandon the issue—but not N. B. Hardeman. He proposes to push it, not only in all the papers to which he may through his influence find access, but in his school as well, for he announces that he will most assuredly teach his views on this issue to the “two hundred” young men who are preparing under him to be preachers. Thus the issue will be kept alive—and therein lies the danger of domination in his own school over the church itself, through the preachers he will train. He has himself so announced. It is not a mere “fear” of ours but by his own bold announcement a “well founded” one, for that is precisely what he says he will do. Therefore, let the patrons of the school and the donors to it take notice. If that is what you want your young people and our young preachers taught, you have it; if it is not what you want them taught, it is time to decide whether to support with your money the teaching of something you don’t want taught but believe to be against the interest of and detrimental to the church of Jesus Christ. Brother Hardeman has drawn the issue right there by his bold announcement of his future policy on this question.

This liberal element in the church has found in Brother N. B. Hardeman a new leader. All at once he has become their mouthpiece. He is their strategist; and his battle strategy appears to be Hitlerian: encircle, divide and destroy. He boasts that he has the medium of all the papers while we have “only the Bible Banner.” His statement carries an intimation that the other editors understand that they will give him space, apparently unlimited space, with the idea that he may completely encircle and overwhelm us. But he will need the help of all the editors and all the space they can supply—he will need them all. We have the truth, and with it we are more than a match for them all, with “only the Bible Banner” as a medium.

It has been suggested by a man who has been intimately associated with the editor of the Firm Foundation for many years that the reason why that paper is giving so much space to N. B. Hardeman and G. C. Brewer is to bring them out into the open where their position can be known to all and therefore exposed. It could be. We know that the Firm Foundation’s editor has declared himself against the position occupied by this newly formed Hardeman-Brewer partnership, so there must be some reason why the editor features them so. Many are wondering why, are asking why, and are concerned about the why. The answer seems to be in the open forum policy of the Firm Foundation.

We have no way of knowing how far the madness of the Brewer-Hardeman combination will drive them, nor how far and long the thing they seem bent on doing will go, but their tactics are obvious. They propose to make more charges than they think we can substantiate a denial to, and inject insinuations which they hope will go farther than any possible explanations. They will not bother about facts to bear out their charges. The latest Hardeman article is a sample of bald and unprecedented assertion.
It shows clearly that Brother Hardeman is willing to stoop lower than he believes we are willing to go, lower in fact than he knows we are willing to go, and he is depending on his reputation to bear him along. He may succeed in a measure, but his reputation is not as strong as he thinks it is in some parts and may not hold out as long as he thinks it will, in or out of his territory. How long the Gospel Advocate and the Firm Foundation will be willing to carry his campaign remains to be seen, but we are prepared for "a long war" if that is what they are determined to wage, on whatever grounds they choose to put it, short of indecency and dishonor.

But for the gravity of the situation it is a hilarious thing to see N. B. Hardeman and G. C. Brewer yoked up together. Neither is enjoying it. Brother Hardeman is visibly embarrassed and Brother Brewer is no less visibly ashamed. They are both blushingly uncomfortable. But it is their role and they will have to play it, or quit.

They both deny that they have collaborated in the articles they have written, and Brother Hardeman says that he did not even consult Brewer before his first article appeared. But the following paragraph in a letter from L. N. Moody, Cookeville, Tennessee, to G. C. Brewer, October 28, will reveal something on this point:

"I notice that Brother Hardeman says that he has not conferred with you prior to the publication of his first article in the Advocate and yet you told me last summer before the article appeared that Brother Hardeman was going to publish it and use the letter from Brother Wallace to you. Will you please tell me the facts about this?"

Thus they tell on each other. How could Brother Brewer know that a personal letter from me to him would be in the article written by Brother Hardeman, if he had not been consulted directly or indirectly? How could Brother Hardeman insert a personal letter from me to Brother Brewer in his article if Brother Brewer had not sent it to him directly or indirectly? Whether direct or indirect, there was collaboration. This is a sample of the prevarications with which we are having to deal in these men. Their articles teem with such discrepancies and are full of such irregularities.

But while Brother Hardeman continues to occupy the columns of all the papers from the Gospel Advocate down to the Gospel Broadcast, Brother Brewer retreats to a private print shop and puts out a pamphlet. We will attend to them in order-the Pamphlet first.

I.-THE G. C. BREWER PERVERSIONS

When part truths and half truths are stated it often results in not being the truth at all-and the Brewer pamphlet of perversions is that.

First: His reckless methods.

He inserts a personal letter with a dare to deny its authenticity or genuineness, declares that the author (meaning himself) holds the penciled original, but he typed it, and in doing so made an error in the date, which he corrects with pen and ink, then makes a photostat of my signature, from which he makes an engraving, and patches a photostat of my signature on to a typed copy of a penciled letter! Such tampering! I suppose he thinks that authenticates the letter. Why photograph an original signature and paste it on a typewritten copy of a penciled letter? No court could regard such a document as anything but a forgery. But that is G. C. Brewer—he is a grandstander, and has the reputation of strutting while he is sitting down! So with his usual flourish he proclaims that "the author of this tract holds the letter." Well, what of that? Just keep holding it, no one has denied it nor repudiated its authenticity.

Second: The letters bearing my signatures do not state his conclusions at all.

The one thing G. C. Brewer and N. B. Hardeman need which they do not have is a statement from me in either documentary or oral form that I endorsed G. C. Brewer's position on the church-college-budget issue.

Brother Brewer repeats the assertion that his "series" converted me to his viewpoint and that I so stated. Then why did he not just print the letter in which I so stated instead of other letters in which I did not, so state? That would have made it wholly unnecessary to print anything else on that point and would have ended that matter. There is no such letter or he would have produced it and published it before now.

His general argument on the existence of private organizations and institutions both Brother Hinds and I indorsed; but we both disented from the view that such organizations can be scripturally supported by the church. Brother Hinds knew it... I knew it. And Brother Brewer knew it. If it be asked why I did not state that exception in the letter, it is simply because, as the letter shows, that it was a hurried note (both of them) as Brother Brewer admits, and my exceptions had been made to him more than once personally. The personal letters to him were not dealing with the exceptions. Had I been writing more specifically or for publication, the points of exception would have been repeated. The penciled note from Vernon, Texas and the letter a few days later on the same trip from Albuquerque, N. M., were not for that purpose, as the contents show. The expression in one of them "they ring the numbers" of certain ones did not refer to the church supporting the college. It referred to other phases of the organization controversy, and Brother Brewer knows it just as well as I do. If it had referred to the church supporting the college it would have been ringing my own number in-
stead of “several fellows” for I was myself definitely committed editorially and personally against the college in the budget or the church supporting the college—and Brother Brewer knew that, and still knows it. Knowing that he knew it, and thinking that I was writing personal notes to a trusted fellow-editor and a confidential friend, I did not discuss in the letters the points on which he knew I disagreed with him. But at the very time I believed Brother Brewer to be such a friend and fellow he was using underhand methods to undermine me. He wrote certain letters admitting that he had said I was unfit to be editor of the Gospel Advocate; that I was not qualified for a successor to David Lipscomb in the editorial chair; that I did not agree with Lipscomb’s views on several things; that none of the Wallaces were eligible for the editorship of the Gospel Advocate for several reasons but one of the main reasons with him was that we were born and reared west of the Mississippi, and that disqualified any man to be editor of the Gospel Advocate! The real reason, or course, was that G. C. Brewer wanted to be the editor of the Gospel Advocate himself, and to hear him talk he appeared to think that he was!

My whole experience with G. C. Brewer from 1930 to 1934, while I was editor of the Gospel Advocate, was a case of misplaced confidence. I was thirty-three years old when I went from Los Angeles to Nashville to be editor of the Gospel Advocate. I was new, guileless and unsuspecting. I made numerous mistakes, but one of the worst mistakes made was in choosing certain men to trust. I have been often chided since, By men who knew then that these men were not loyal either to me or to the gospel Advocate, for being a poor judge of human nature in some such selections I innocently made. The reprint of the Brewer speech at Abilene, with my editorial reply, and Brother F. B. Srygley’s comments, together with the general reaction in 1934, will furnish sufficient evidence on this point.

Third: He seeks the prestige of the names of John T. Hinds, Batsell Baxter, H. Leo Boles, James F. Cox, and his present colleague in this controversy, N. B. Hardeman

And he even adds my name to his notable list. But he is as reckless with names as he is with facts. Let us see how he handles his names and quotations.

He mentions H. Leo Boles, but it was Brother Boles that I. A. Douthitt quoted, you know, as regarding the practice of the colleges in soliciting the support of the churches, and Brother Boles said: “They all do it and they all deny it.” It is known that Brother Boles once taught against it, and if he taught otherwise later, he changed.

He claims that Batsell Baxter indorsed his position, but Brother Baxter declared himself against the church supporting the schools in an article in the Gospel Advocate which was quoted and commended by Brother F. B. Srygley on the editorial page while I was yet the editor.

As for James F. Cox, Brother Brewer opposed Brother Cox (privately), as president of Abilene Christian College. He told me and others that Brother Cox was a complete misfit in such a place (like I was as editor of the Gospel Advocate, you see), but when he wants the prestige of his name and influence he will misuse and misapply his statements. Here is what James F. Cox said:

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

Though he is now “arm in arm” with N. B. Hardeman, after they have both said the bitterest things possible about each other all through these years, notwithstanding that Brewer and Hardeman are now all-out for each other, here is what N. B. Hardeman said then:

“I certainly do not indorse Brother Brewer’s statements and would oppose any congregation putting Freed-Hardeman in their budgets. Such has ever been our sentiments.”

As for John T. Hinds, it is a known fact that before and after the Brewer organization series, Brother Hinds wrote editorials against the church supporting the school, or contributing to it. This was done while I was still editor of the Gospel Advocate, his article which was written for the query and answers department was inserted on the editorial page with my own indorsement, and this is what I said:

“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 query and was intended for the query department. Brother Hinds’ remarks were so timely and his distinctions so clear that his article was published in the Firm Foundation with editorial indorsement. In the Firm Foundation of March 8, Brother C. R. Nichol trench the same question with equal clarity and scriptural discrimination. Brethren Hinds and Nichol are agreed and have set forth the only position scripturally defensible or consistent with the position that has been maintained against societies, organizations, and numerous other infringements upon the local church.

In the face of all of these statements to the contrary Brother Brewer attempts to array Hinds, Boles, Baxter and “the editor of the Gospel Advocate” (meaning me) as being all in favor of lending indorsement to his church supported college contention.

Both Brewer and Hardeman insist that I could not have commended his organization articles without indorsing the church supported or budget part of his argument. But if John T. Hinds could commend his articles, as Brother Brewer says he did, without in-
dorsing the church supported part of his argument, as everyone knows he did not, as Brother Hinds himself says he did not, then why could I not do so on the same basis that Brother Hinds did? And that is exactly it. A general discussion of the whole organization question was going on and there was much that was held in common between Brewer, Hardeman, Hinds, Srygley, Boles, Showalter, Nichol, Whiteside, Cled Wallace, Foy E. Wallace Sr. and Foy E. Wallace Jr. And we all to my certain knowledge, including N. B. Hardeman, took exceptions to Brother Brewer’s position on the church supporting the college and stated our objections to it. The fact that I did not repeat the exceptions that were already understood in each and every editorial note or letter only shows that it was already understood and such was not the purpose of the personal notes and letters.

In his ‘Open Letter to Cled Wallace’ Brother Brewer quotes a paragraph “taken from” one of my letters to him fourteen years ago referring to “an old scalawag like J. D. Tant,” and offering to “forestall” taking sides with C. R. Nichol in case of a written discussion between them in the Gospel Advocate, of which I was editor. It becomes necessary to state the facts concerning that matter.

First, concerning Brother Tant: A debate had been held in or near Memphis between J. D. Tant and some Baptist preacher, which debate Brother Brewer told me he neither endorsed nor attended. It did not please him for Brother Tant to represent the church in the vicinity of where he preached. I am rather certain that “scalawag” was Brother Brewer’s own word. When he suggested issuing a challenge for the discussion for which he apparently itched, I reminded him that J. D. Tant would probably be the first one to accept it, which was the opposite of what J. D. Tant would probably be the first one for which he apparently itched, I suggested issuing a challenge for the discussion of the whole organization question all of the time, a fact that was already understood in each and every one of his letters to him fourteen years ago referring to “an old scalawag like J. D. Tant,” purposely misspelling the word

Brother ‘Tant later wrote me in his characteristic way, as follows:

“My dear Foy Wallace: I am sending you $100. Hope you will not trouble me for one year. I am just back from Tennessee where I held three meetings and one debate with Baptists. My last meeting there was at my old home where I lived six years with eleven baptized. Spent two days in Nashville, where I feel like D. L. College will go with the new deal. I think Cleddie is running with the slander crowd and I am sure he has talked candidly about me but after reading his ‘Invasion of Texas’ (on Clinton Davidson) I will forgive him all of the mean things he ever did... Sam Hall, Sam Pitman, Jesse Sewell and all D. L. College have gone off in the new deal... and in the next five years Showalter will go with them. When Showalter wrote one article about the corruption of Abilene College he then backed off and if Cleddie does not smoke him out he will go with them. Don’t think we can any longer depend on the F. F. and Advocate for Bible teaching. I will not do so on the same basis that Brother Brewer told me he neither indorsed nor at tempted. It did not please him for Brother Tant to put a strain on the strong tie between Brother Brewer and stated our objections to it. The fact that I did not repeat the exceptions that were already understood in each and every one of his letters to him fourteen years ago referring to “an old scalawag like J. D. Tant,” purposely misspelling the word

It can be seen that other things worried J. D. Tant more than Cled’s punning his name as a ‘rantankerous old maverick.” But before passing, another “unpublished letter” from J. D. Tant will be intersting:

“My dear Wallace: I am at this place trying to encourage eighteen members who were put out of their house three years ago by one woman who preferred the sound of an organ to their fellowship. The brethren claim I have had the largest turn out known here in twenty years and I hope my meeting will do good. From here I go back to the farm where I am going to be back to the far m I'll come in August, 12, 1938.

These letters do not indicate any hard feelings between Brother Tant and Cled and me. When Brother Tant left this world, I was called to talk at his funeral. If Brother Brewer has in mind to put a strain on the strong tie between his son, Yater Tant, and me, my opinion is that his effort will fail completely.

Second, concerning Brother Nichol: When Brother Brewer suggested a written discussion of the issue then he intimated that he would like to have C. R. Nichol for an opponent. But mentioned the “handicap” he would be under in such a discussion in the Gospel Advocate as a member of the staff because I had committed the Gospel Advocate to Brother Nichol’s side, by my indorsement of the Nichol and Hinds articles, as well as my own. With the Gospel Advocate editorially on Nichol’s side he would feel at a disadvantage in the discussion. To be entirely fair and give him an even break I offered to “forestall” prejudice or “handicap” by an announcement of “an open mind” investigation to ascertain only the truth, without “taking sides” in advance. And now, because I “leaned over backwards” to favor Bro. Brewer, he is trying desperately and frantically with N. B. Hardeman’s help to twist it all into an inordainment of his position on the church supported college, though I was in fact stating my exceptions to his position on that phase of the question all of the time, a fact no one knows any better than G. C. Brewer himself.
To say that I was party to the error in his articles on the point of objection is silly. Brother Showalter is publishing everything Harde-man and Brewer want to say—does that mean he indorses what they say? Well, he says he does not. But according to the Brewer and Hardeman dictum he does! The fact that I would have been glad back there to have read a discussion between C. R. Nichol and G. C. Brewer, and that I agreed to "forestall" disadvantage to either side by announcing an "open mind," and that if he could prove his contention he would have me for his first convert --if he proved his contention, mark you—falls very short of the indorsement he claims. He knew and understood my exceptions to his letter trying to prove I agreed with him and other's take the position that it is all right for an Individual to donate to "our schools," but that it is funda-mentally wrong" for a church to do so. Brother Foy gave a strong article along this line in June of 1931.

That statement from Brother Hardeman shows where I stood then, and shows the utter insincerity of what N. B. Hardeman and G. C. Brewer are doing now.

Fourth: His claims that I "requested" him to write his series on Organizations.

That depends on the latitude of the word. Brother Brewer repeatedly expressed the desire to answer Brother G. A. Dunn's questions on Organizations. Later, I acted on his own express desire and did what he calls "delegated" him, with the warning to "take only safe positions." His own admission on this point shows that I did not share his extreme views and had misgivings as to the positions he would take. Every time he attempts to prove that I indorsed his position, he proves that I did not!

It can surely be seen by all now that both Brother Hinds and I were too generous in our attitude toward Brother Brewer and too liberal with our comments on his organization "series." We may be pardoned only in the fact that we both set forth the truth on the point of difference both before and after the "series." We did not, of course, anticipate the unscrupulous use that Brother Brewer, joined by Brother Hardeman, has made of these matters. As a matter of fact, all of this time while Brother Brewer's assurances of "loyalty to the G. A. and to me" were "melting my heart" so, he was neither a friend to me nor the Gospel Advocate, as Brother F. B. Srygley's letter of comment on the Brewer Abilene speech will verify. It was soon after the dates of these very letters that Brother Brewer is now publishing that he (G. C. Brewer) made the speech at Abilene, publicly slapping the Gospel Advocate, editor and editorial policy in the face, while he himself was a staff writer on it, the story of which you may read in other pages of this issue in a reprint of Brother Showalter's report of the Brewer speech, my editorial comments, F. B. Srygley's criticisms and the general reaction of the brethren everywhere, including Brewer's late colleague, N. B. Hardeman!

Of that incident Brother Srygley had the following to say to me in a penciled letter which I received from him, written at Tarpon Springs, Fla., March 27, 1934. and still possess: It reads as follows:

"Your criticism of Brother Brewer was fine. If I could object to anything in the article it would be this sentence: "I consider him in some outstanding respects among the greatest preachers in the church." First, I doubt the correctness of the statement and, second, I doubt the wisdom of recommending a man who has made such a mistake as he, I grant that he has a good memory and plenty of self-confidence. He has never been a very great friend to the Gospel Advocate, and he seems to enjoy contradicting its policy. He wanted to enter the discussion of the political question of changing the constitution of the U.S.A., and when he was not allowed to discuss it in the Advocate, he went into the Firm Foundation ip order to do so. In this he got himself in the attitude of receiving pay for one paper while writing for another. In things like this he is outstanding but I do not propose to compliment him for it."

In my files are yet many, many letters of that kind from leading brethren all over the United States, protesting the things G. C. Brewer said and did at Abilene in his apology for R. H. Boll and his slap at the paper and editor on which and under whom he served as a staff writer. He thought it would be a disadvantage to him to enter a discussion with C. R. Nichol on Organizations with the paper on which he served committed editorially against him, but he felt no such ethical obligations toward the editorial policy of the paper when he assailed it publicly at the Abilene lectureship on the policy of the paper and its editor toward R. H. Boll. But all rules work only one way wth G. C. Brewer—he has his own private and personal rule of ethics!

Still, yet, though and despite all of this Brother Brewer has through various mediums, oral
and written, claimed credit for all that the Gospel Advocate was during the term of my editorship! He claims that he arranged its departments; he decided its policies; he was “requested” and “delegated” to handle its difficulties—he was in reality the editor, and I was just a notch on the stick or a knot on the staff! But that is G. C. Brewer-ask him one question and he begins to imagine he has told you all you ever knew or will ever learn anywhere else!

For several years he circulated privately a fifteen or twenty page “exposure” of Foy E. Wallace Jr., of which there was supposed to be two versions, one milder than the other according to the use he made of it or the persons to whom it was shown, but all the time taking every precaution to see that the document did not fall into my hands. Incidentally I have it in my possession through a friend who copied it! True to form in this long harrangue he claims all the credit, even for the arguments that I used in the Neal-Wallace debate! Why yes, he even prepared the material for my speeches, analyzed my arguments in advance, and did a great amount of “research” on millennialism, just to help me! All of which, of course, is without a vestige of truth, and is not even good fiction much less fact. There was hardly a truthful statement in the whole story he told. The simple and short fact of the matter was that I submitted a page of questions bearing on the propositions for debate to a group of brethren, including R. L. Whiteside, C. R. Nichol, John T. Hinds, M. O. Daley, Cled E. Wallace, and others, and sent this same page of questions to G. C. Brewer. All of the other brethren went into detail with their answers and exchange of ideas—but Brother Brewer appeared irritated because I submitted questions to him, objected to the debate, wanted to argue me out of it and “dissuade” me from it, and merely answered the questions referred to crisply on the same page and line—which means he did not answer them at all—and returned them to me. On the question regarding the millennium of Rev. 20, he answered that he did not know, that he had never studied it an hour in his life! But he prepared material, analyzed arguments and loaded my gun for the Neal-Wallace Debate! And now for fifteen years he has wailed about being a martyr to his effort to make me his protege! No man can have an imagination like that—It must be charged up to a vanity that grows into an obsession that leads to prevarication.

Fifth: The Brewer explanations of his inconsistent, contradictory and opposite statements on the college-in-the-budget question

While Brother Brewer is looking up some more letters and penciled notes of mine to publish, let us take a look at some of his statements and his explanations, side by side.

1. Brewer's "Position"
(1947)
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. 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.

2. Brewer's "Report"
(1935)
"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 mission-aries. We were supporting all three regulars 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.

Thus the record of his inconsistencies, and denials of his own statements, and attempted explanations speaks for itself. There is nothing he can do or say to deliver him from his predicament. It would have been far more honorable to acknowledge his wrong since he plainly says that it was not a “lapse of memory” in that case he did it on purpose! Perhaps he thought the memories of all his readers had lapsed! His effort to show a difference between churches supporting a college on “a year-by-year” budget, and simply “making out such a list or budget each year” is downright silly. He reported that “at Cleburne and at Sherman also we put Abilene Christian College in our budget for $1000.00 a year.” Now he attempts to deny out of that by saying that he did not mean that it would be right to put it in the budget “year-by-year” For Cleburne and Sherman to put the college in the budget “for one thousand dollars a year” is all right, but to do it “year-by-year” would be wrong! Anybody who can see through a ladder can see the predicament in which Brother Brewer has involved himself. And everybody ought to see, as we believe they do, that there is no difference in the principle when a church makes a contribution to a college and reports it afterward and when a church guts it in the budget reporting it in advance. One is a pre-budgeting and the other
a post-budgeting, but both are what the church has done. The effort of brethren Hardeman and Brewer to dodge around this point is the sheerest sort of evasion, and only adds to the shame of their inconsistencies and the dishonor of their denials.

But to show further that N. B. Hardeman is in the same predicament with G. C. Brewer, let us look at his various statements side by side with his down-to-date explanations.

Back in 1932 Brother Hardeman wrote Brother Brewer a letter. I was editor of the Gospel Advocate, standing on this issue exactly where I now stand, as the following letter shows.

Dear Brother Brewer:

Yours of this morning is the first letter I have had about “our schools.” I would not have been caught had Bro. Nichol or anyone else written me in advance. We have contended here, ever since I can remember, that the church has a right to contribute to anything it considers a good cause. It is true that most of the appeals I have ever made for this school have been to individuals, but I have also solicited and received contributions from churches and have never felt that it was in any wrong to do so. It looks like this matter must come to an issue and be thoroughly discussed. I know of no one better prepared to do it than you, who are free from all school relations.

I do not understand just why brethren Nichol, Wallace and others take the position that it is all right for an individual to donate to “our schools,” but that it is “fundamentally wrong” for a church to do so. Bro. Foy gave a strong article along this line in June of 1931.

If you think it wise to enter into the discussion, I am with you always, even unto the end.

Faithfully yours. N. B. Hardeman

When the above letter was written Hardeman was “arm in arm” with Brewer. He knew of no one better prepared to do it than Brewer, and to Brewer he said, “I am with you always, even unto the end.” But compare that letter to Brewer with his remarks about Brewer, in his letters to me. 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.”—1934. “It seems to me that you have closed up Brewer to the satisfaction of all who disagree with him”—1936. “Brewer’s effort is far below what I thought even he was capable of doing”—1937. “I never would have raised an objection if G. C. (Brewer) had remained in California.”—1937. In that year Hardeman did not want to be in the same state with Brewer, nor closer to him than the distance between Tennessee and California! “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”—1939. “The attitude of this congregation (Union Avenue, Memphis, Tenn.) was developed during the pastorate of Dr. Brewer”—1942. So that is the way N. B. Hardeman talked to Brewer and the way he talked about him during the years between 1932 and 1942—but he was “with” him “always, even unto the end!”

During the time that N. B. Hardeman was talking two ways on these questions, I was standing right where I stand now. In one letter Hardeman said: “I have solicited and received contributions from churches and have never felt that it was in any wrong way to do so.” But in another letter he said: “I certainly do not indorse Brother Brewer’s statements and would oppose any congregation putting Freed-Hardeadman College in their budgets. This has ever been our sentiments.” Yet he has the temerity to talk about somebody else shifting positions!

For a real example of a man going in and out of a revolving door and meeting himself coming back, just take a look at N. B. Hardeman’s statements side by side:

1. Hardeman in 1932.

I have solicited and received contributions from churches and have never felt that it was in any wrong way to do so. It looks like this matter must come to an issue and be thoroughly discussed. I know of no one better prepared to do it than Brewer, and to Brewer he said, “I am with you always, even unto the end.”

2. Hardeman in 1938-47.

“I certainly do not indorse Brother Brewer’s statements and would oppose any congregation putting Freed-Hardeadman College in their budgets. Such has ever been our sentiments”—Hardeman in 1938.

“That a congregation has the right to make a donation to a school I verily believe.”—Hardeman in 1947.

“Let it be understood that for a number of years, I did not agree with Brewer on many things. I did not indorse his idea as reported in the paper of putting schools in the church budget and thus binding them on the church.”—Hardeman in 1938.

“In all that I have written there is no conflict”—Hardeman in 1947.

Thus the record speaks of their gross inconsistencies despite their denials to the contrary. Their efforts to make distinctions without differences between churches making contributions and taking the money from their treasuries is indeed “unworthy of attention” and many of the young preachers who have gone to school to Brother Hardeman have expressed their disappointment in the weakness Brother Hardeman has shown in such an attempted dodge.

And Brother Brewer’s effort at an “explanation” of Brother Hardsman’s slap at him, and of his own contradictory statements regarding the colleges in the budgets, is worse than “the weakest excuse I have ever read.”

Sixth: The Brewer contradictions in his retractions on the war question.

Back in 1934 Brother Brewer declares him-
self to be an all-out conscientious objector. He said: “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.” But in 1940 he said: “If this country must go to war again I, for one, will fight, and I know every red blooded American citizen will do likewise.” Then, during the war between 1942 and 1945, Brother Brewer announced that the Lubbock church, where he preached, had bought and were buying many war bonds, aggregating thousands of dollars, as an investment, to be used in post-war work. But now in his “Open Letter to Cled Wallace” he renounces his 1940 war speech and declares that he has returned to his 1934 conscientious objector views, that is: “Those who buy war stamps and war bonds are participants in the slaughter.” Now where does that put G. C. Brewer and the Broadway Church of Christ at Lubbock? They bought thousands of dollars worth of war bonds. G. C. Brewer was their preacher and announced it. So Brewer and that entire church are participants in the slaughter, according to his “Open Letter To Cled Wallace”? What will the elders and members of the Broadway Church of Christ think of that? Will they return to Brewer’s 1934 “conscientious objector” position with him?

If Brother Hardeman objects to being “joined together” with Brewer, remember he said that he was with him “even unto the end”-and this appears to be the end.

II.-THE N. B. HARDEMAN PREVARICATIONS

Due and proper attention to the latest Harde-
man article in the Gospel Advocate and the
Firm Foundation has been given in the editorial
by Cled E. Wallace, but there are a few remain-
ing facts to review.

First: The government question.

In the effort to escape the inconsistency of his
letter to the Draft Board, Brother Hardeman
gives, me a lesson in grammar. He says the an-
tecedent of “us” in his statement is “faculty.”
Well, what of it?—I knew that, without being a
college president-but how does it help him?
It could only mean that some of “them” (fac-
ulty) are objectors and some of “us” (faculty)
“feel otherwise”? It still leaves Brother Harde-
man in the “us” that “feel otherwise,” anteced-
ent or no antecedent. His statement divides the
faculty and puts himself in the “us” part of it
that “feel otherwise” than the objectors to war.
Brother Hardeman cannot even dodge good.

But he denies that his Draft Board statement
lines him up, and says that it is perfectly con-
sistent. Well, as a matter of fact, it is per-
fecely ridiculous, but we have another document
to submit. Let us see if it lines him up.

“What will Brother R. H. Boll fight the government of Rome, in influence, by word or with sword? No. Why not? That would be fighting against God. All right: if he should be a loyal citizen of the United States and, in sentiment, want to defend our flag, what about it? He would be fighting against God when Mussolini tries to exercise authority over this fair land of ours. Why? Because premillennialists say that God’s agent, Mussolini, is carrying out God’s
word, then they must not fight the Roman empire. And
if Italian ships were to land on our eastern shores and
want to plant their flag on the soil of our country, pre-
millennialists cannot fight them. Why? That’s God’s order;
that’s God’s fulfillment. Therefore, I am charging tonight
that all premillennialists who believe as Brother Boll does
would, of necessity, have to become traitors to the govern-
ment of the United States or else fight against God.
Friends, let me ask you in all candor. Do you subscribe to a doctrine of the kind?


Now who is doing that tall talking about “de-
fending our flag” and condemning a “doctrine”
that makes “traitors to the government” be-
cause the one who believes it “cannot fight” for this “fair land of ours” when or if “Italian ships were to land on our eastern shores and want to plant their flag on the soil of our country”?

Well, it was “none other than N. B. Hardeman.”

Brother Hardeman quotes a statement of mine in 1936, where I said, “I am not a patriot-I am a Christian,” and he wants to know if I will re-
verse it now and say that “I am not a Christian
-1 am a patriot.” No; I answered myself on that
point several years ago in the Bible Banner, while Brother Hardeman was writing letters to the Draft Board and still indorsing the Bible Banner, in which I showed that I had learned
that one can be both a Christian and a patriot.
Now let me ask N. B. Hardeman a question.
Since he has told R. H. Boll that the doctrine of
premillennialism makes him a “traitor to the govern-
ment” because in believing the doctrine
he “cannot fight”... if Italian ships were to
land on our eastern shores”-since Brother
Hardeman says that a Christian cannot fight,
does not Christianity make the same Mind
of a traitor out of him that premillennialism
does out of Boll? He wants to know if “Poy” is
now a Christian or a patriot. Well, is N. B.
Hardeman a Christian or a patriot? Tell us,
Brother Hardeman, did you become a traitor to be a Christian? Hear him: “I am charging tonight that all premillennialists who believe as
Brother Boll does would, of necessity, have to become traitors to the government of the United
States.” But I am charging now that for the
same reason all Christians who believe as
Brother Hardeman says he does would “have
become” the same kind of traitors. Brother
Hardeman then with a great pose, flings this
question at his audience: “Friends, let me ask
you in all candor-Do you subscribe to a doctrine
of that kind?” Now, what kind of doctrine?
A doctrine that will not allow one who believes
it to “fight” to defend our country if an enemy
nation “were to land on our eastern shores.”
Brother Hardeman, let me ask you in all candor
-do you subscribe to a doctrine of that kind?
To further impress upon the reader the in-
consistent predicament into which Brother Harde-
man has “flipped,” let us look at his “war”
statements in parallel.
I. N. B. Hardeman in 1934

"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."

According to Hardeman, a premillennialist "cannot fight," but according to Hardeman a Christian cannot fight. What was that he said about "Foy's soundness"? Here it is: "Brother Foy was sound in 1936 when he taught that Christians cannot engage in carnal warfare. He became unsound in 1942 when he flopped to the exact opposite." Very well, if that be true of "Brother Foy" how does it apply to Brother Hardeman "when he taught in 1934" that a Christian cannot participate in combatant service in war but in 1938 he so vigorously and "in all candor" condemned "a doctrine of that kind"? If Brother Hardeman was sound in 1934 he became unsound in 1938 when he flopped to the exact opposite. He is indeed a pretty poser as a conscientious objector! It is a joke to everybody who knows N. B. Hardeman, except that it is too disgusting to be humorous.

He says that was when they were teaching premillennialism. No—he will have to hunt another alibi. The schools had already issued bulletins declaring themselves against premillennialism when Brother Hardeman wrote me the letters stating that he did not "put much confidence" in their circulars "regarding their beliefs" and wanted me to expose them further as having only "nominally" been "driven" from R. H. Boll, and to "warn" them that they would be "watched" and to "weave it in some way" that their sincerity was doubted! So his effort to justify himself on this point is just as weak as everything else he has attempted.

And he is also wrong in his effort to crawl out of his embarrassment on that "slimmest sluice of slander" which he sent me on the George Pepperdine College, with his own notation—"Good Material For The Bible Banner." It was not the articles of Brother Forsythe at all, which were put in printed form and sent to me by Brother Forsythe himself. Nor did the matter to which I refer contain an article from Brother C. R. Nichol, and it has nothing to do with the Vermont Avenue Church. It was a mass of matter typed by a former student, or students, of Freed-Hardeman College who were then in Pepperdine College, and the matter was cleared across N. B. Hardeman's desk in Henderson, Tennessee, and sent to me with the notation—"Good Material For The Bible Banner." It appeared to confirm what I had been hearing, namely, that through his ex-students N. B. Hardeman had a pipeline from Los Angeles, California, to Henderson, Tennessee.

Third: Regarding his charge of "broken relations" with a group of men he names.

He asserts that I have committed myself against all the schools, which is but another prevarication. But suppose I had done so—1 would be only a step ahead of him, for he has committed himself against every school except one-his own. And he asserts that I have also broken with all the other editors and papers, which is another untruth. But suppose I had done so—will he repeat in print the things that he has said to me about the Firm Foundation and its editor? And I already have in print in the form of letters rather uncomplimentary things he has said about the Gospel Advocate, its publisher and its present editor. Brother Hardeman forgets that his letters and statements regarding the papers and the editors are of the same character as his letters about the schools and Brother Brewer. His conduct is reprehensible and his tactics in trying to escape his inconsistencies are repulsive. Brethren everywhere who regard ethics as anything or hold in honor the principles of integrity are bound to repudiate such tactics. It is no compliment to their intelligence or his integrity for him to attempt the thing he is doing.

He mentions the late and lamented and illustrious M. C. Kurfees. It was never my good fortune to meet Brother M. C. Kurfees, but his worthy brother, J. F. Kurfees, a business man in Louisville and an able member of the church, has helped the Bible Banner from its beginning, and has contributed to it as recent as the special issue exposing the Norman Davidson letters, which Brother Hardeman sent to me and afterward denied doing it. I wonder what Bro. J. F. Kurfees will think of Brother Hardeman when he learns the facts about that Norman Davidson matter? Before and after I went to Nashville in 1930, as editor of the Gospel Advocate, G.
C. Brewer was among the number who endeavored to prejudice me against M. C. Kurfees. He did not like him; he did not want me to like him. He and others accused Brother Kurfees of dictating the “Boll policy” of the Gospel Advocate and of being the cause of the “Boll trouble” in Louisville. And they all began to accuse and oppose me in the same way after the debate with Neal and Boll at Winchester, Ky., and after my editorials in the Gospel Advocate against R. H. Boll. Any allusion Brother Hardeman can possibly make to any such thing would be in connection with my first experiences with Brother Brewer while I was learning the cold, hard facts about certain matters. Brother J. F. Kurfees understands that matter, and if Brother Hardeman is attempting to break relations by his underhanded allusions, I think I know that his effort will fail.

It is nothing less than unblushing brass for N. B. Hardeman to criticise anybody for “broken relations” when we think of his own affairs with A. G. Freed, Hall L. Calhoun, the president of other schools and a legion of such rubbish that has cluttered his own front yard.

There can be one purpose only in his unspecified charges of “broken relations” with a group of men whose names he merely lists—the sole purpose is to seek sympathy for himself by imputing to me through insinuation unethical and unhonorable conduct toward a “list of others.” While throwing stones at me, he throws kisses at them—he wants their favor now, because he needs it.

Fourth: He once more mentions the “Foy Wallace of Gunter, Texas” but his reference to it is too insipid to even classify as a weak excuse.

Not satisfied to cast aspersions on Cled and me, he descends to slur our father who is in the seventy-seventh year of life and all without occasion or cause. N. B. Hardeman knew that neither of us was running an institution of any sort in Texas or anywhere else. My address was on the editorial page of the Bible Banner, before his eyes, and he need not say that he did not know it. If he wanted to dictate a letter to either of us I firmly believe he could have done so without asking where to address the letter. His “explanation” of this is not even a decent dodge, does not show good breeding, and reveals the fact that he is grabbing at any straw he can catch.

Fifth: Teaching his young preachers “about 200 in number.”

He announces that he will surely teach them the doctrine of the church supported school. Well, that settles it. He will not teach any of mine: nor any others on my recommendation. It now becomes a matter of duty. Let the brethren take notice—see where your donations will go and what they will be used to teach? What effect will it have on the church in the next decade for a couple of hundred young preachers a year to be taught this link-up between the churches and the colleges. It shows that the schools have the power to sweep the church into digression on any point at which they may themselves digress and choose to push.

Sixth: His claim that approval for publication of the Brewer articles made the editor a party to their error.

In no part of Brother Hardeman’s labored effort to defend his indefensible position does he grope more blindly than here. Take for instance his statement to the Draft Board: “This college is not a unit on the matter of objection. . .some of the faculty would no doubt be objectors, while others of us feel otherwise.” But Brother Hardeman now declares that it is a sin for a Christian to fight, as he declared in 1934. He has returned with G. C. Brewer to his original statement. “So what? There are “some “on his faculty who believe otherwise—they do not believe that it is a sin to fight. Are they on the faculty with your “approval,” Brother Hardeman, or do you have some on your faculty without your approval? If they are there with your approval, you are a party to their error! You have endorsed their false teaching! His effort on the point surely cannot be “satisfactory to himself.”

Seventh: That summing up—Feeding him out of his own spoon:

N. B. Hardeman has himself shifted about and changed from one position to another. He has talked two ways on all of the following things:

1) He wavered on digression years ago, having preached for the digressive church in Henderson—he “changed.”

2) He has made conflicting statements on the war and government questions, statement.

3) He has taken contradictory positions on the church-college issue, reversing himself in such a way as to make impossible an escape from his inconsistencies.

4) He has backed up in his criticisms of the other schools and their presidents, but his embarrassment remains.

5) He is guilty of duplicity in his attitude toward various able preachers, editors and papers.

6) He has made opposite statements regarding the Davidson letters, and how they were obtained by me for publication, a matter which involves N. B. Hardeman’s integrity.

7) He has vacillated on the premillennial issue, having drawn up a weak compromise statement for a settlement of the Boll trouble.

Having reversed himself so many times on so many things, the charge against me of being
"unstable, unsafe and unsound" has boomeranged. By the same token he cannot be "considered" as a "safe leader," and he is "a double-minded man, unstable in all his ways" by his own dictum. "Too bad"—but we cannot let him pass!

**STAND BY FOR THE FACTS**

As the Bible Banner goes to press N. B. Hardeman’s last blast in the Gospel Advocate appears. The fact that he has resorted to the old campaign of calumny is evidence of utter defeat and complete frustration on the issues. We deplore the necessity of replying to his personal attacks but the source from which it comes leaves no alternative—honor and equity require it. The next Bible Banner will answer this latest "sleace of slander."

As the press is held for this insertion, I wish to make the following statements:

1. It is not true that I called upon N. B. Hardeman to help me out of the financial misfortunes of '1934. My letters to him were written at his solicitation. He entered the matter at his own suggestion with plans of his own formulation for the editorial management of the Gospel Advocate then, and for the control and operation of the Firm Foundation later, I hold documentary evidence to sustain this statement.

2. It is not true that I suggested or approved any suggestion to settle my just debts on the basis of fifty percent discount or any other discount. I hold evidence that I had previously assured every creditor a one hundred percent settlement, if I lived long enough to accomplish it. This assertion of N. B. Hardeman’s is wicked. Through all the years, until very recently, he has never even intimated such a thing. It is wholly uncalled for now. I deny his charge with all of its implications and imputations absolutely.

3. It is not true that I schooled a son at Freed-Hardeman College on N. B. Hardeman’s charity. Ten years ago I sent a son to his school—he attended the school four months only—and the costs were agreed upon and paid, value received in full and in advance, understood and acknowledged by N. B. Hardeman himself at the time. This is the cheapest thing that he has done or said in all of his contumelious scoffing. It reveals the real stature of the man—how little he actually is. It proves that he will stoop to anything, nothing too low for him to do, to discredit us.

4. It is not true that I have been the mere object of N. B. Hardeman’s grace. The record holds the evidence that on the very pecuniary basis he puts it, I have done far more for him and his school, directly and indirectly, than either he or it has ever done for me. His attempt to put the matter on such a basis is but further proof of his own mercenary mind. I feel deeply ashamed of the whole unworthy and unholy thing. But it will serve as a warning to anyone who has ever accepted a favor from him, or is about to do so, that he will use it to either control you or crush you, if he can.

5. It is not true that the war question was “the beginning of what has resulted since” unless in this statement he is confessing instead of accusing. All during the war I received letters from him of commendation, praise and appreciation. If he is sincere now, he was hypocritical then, and his attitude was feigned. No change of attitude on my part nor supposed “refusal” to take a stand on his part was the beginning of anything that has happened since. Nor did I attack Brother Hardeman—he is the aggressor and the attacker. It was first in the dark, but now comes in to the open. He tacitly tells us why—it is because he has been pushed off the fence on both the “war question” and the “church-college” question; he fell on the wrong side, the side he does not really want to be on. He was put on the spot. He was “lined up” against his will. He is mad about it. So with anger and malice aforethought he is prosecuting his present attacks.

6. Nothing in N. B. Hardeman’s closing eruption of his pent-up animosity is true. It is a perversion of truths and half-truths which make the whole of the graceless thing an ingenious torturing of facts, resolving the entire attack into a fusillade of falsities.

Since this job has to be done, though unwanted and undesirable and unpleasant it is, we aim to make it complete. I will disclose the real reasons for the Brewer-Hardeman attacks—the true background of it all. **Stand by for the next Bible Banner.**

FOY E. WALLACE, JR.