BROTHER HARDEMAN COMES CRASHING DOWN

CLED E. WALLACE

Something evidently happened to the limb Erother Hardeman has been sitting on, between him and the tree, for he comes crashing down right where I have been pacing. It won't take long to finish him off.

He anticipates his demise in these words.

"No reason has been assigned why a church cannot contribute to one of our schools. I anticipate nothing new, and this article closes my part of the discussion."

What something “new” should he be looking for in view of the fact that he said in 1938—and hasn't changed his position:

"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 to the “my part of the discussion,” a few pointed remarks are in order. Nobody is able to recall even a respectable effort he has made to justify a church putting “a human institution” like a college in its budget or supporting it out of its treasury. In the puniest sort of way, he has sought to put us to affirming a negative and evaded his responsibility as an affirmant. He has followed the dodging, squirming tactics that digressives have followed for fifty years and more. He has whined for “a list of the things forbidden” and when the “law and principle” were supplied him what did he do? He took what every informed person knows to be a digressive dodge. He has been whipped all over the road and has practically paid no attention to the things we have said which are right smack on the issue. At first he just made a few lame gestures and said: “Now let us smile.” He isn't smiling now. Just any digressive, whipped to a frazzel, can say: "No reason has been assigned why a church cannot" use instrumental music and work through a human board. "I anticipate nothing new." The brethren would understand what ailed him, and don't kid yourself Brother Hardeman. They know what ails you.

Whipped on the issue, he thinks he can partly escape on “personalities.” Since you want it that way you are going to get it that way. And by the way, the Gospel Advocate and the Firm Foundation have forfeited every right to even lift one eye-brow at us for “personalities” in view of what they published from Brother Hardeman. His last desperate effort is an attempt to escape by painting Foy as a depraved ingrate. Some plain and simple facts will take care of that. And when they are stated
it will be in order for some college to confer the degree of Ash-hopper on Brother Hardeman. Here are the facts and I'll excuse you if you hold your nose while you read them. Foy's financial difficulties due, according to Brother Hardeman, to "sinful extravagance and utter lack of business judgment," were threshed out years ago to the entire satisfaction of Brother Hardeman. "The sentence was removed. . .far for dollar." Since "then" he has held the "Norris-Wallace debate," the "Neal-Wallace debate," the "Wallace-Tingley debate" and whipped premillennialism in the church so effectively that it would be hard to find the track of one not too cold for a hound to smell. In all this since "then", mind you, he enjoyed the confidence, friendship and full support of the "now" editor of the Gospel Advocate, Brother Hardeman and a host of the strongest, most loyal men in the church.

As late as 1943, six years after Foy's "sinful extravagance and utter lack of business judgment" got him into trouble, Brother Hardeman bad a "fine picture" of Foy "engraved upon his heart." Read a letter he wrote Foy 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 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."

The "personal opposition" Brother Hardeman refers to was the very same sort of opposition Brother Hardeman is resorting to "now." The attack on Foy's character was "then" made by a hodge-podge of bitter-enders who resisted and resented his efforts "to save the churches from Premillennialism." They "then" spit out the same sort of "rage" against Foy anonymously, that Brother Hardeman does "now" and signs his name to it and gets it published in the Gospel Advocate and the Firm Foundation. I suggest that he have them publish that letter he wrote Brother McQuiddy denying that he knew how we got those Davidson letters, when he knew that he sent them himself. Brother Hardeman is the last man in the world to sneer at somebody's "honesty," "honor and virtue!"

It is not true that Foy asked Brother Hardeman to help him with his affairs when he was in sore need of such help. He entered the affair voluntarily with "plans" involving the Gospel Advocate and asked Foy to cooperate with him, Brother Akin and Brother McQuiddy. Foy has nothing to hide and never has had. He has been frank and open in all matters, making confession and amends where they were necessary and possible.

It is not true that Brother Hardeman schooled Foy's son free of charge. The attendance record of that son was only about four months and that was on a dollar for dollar basis. Month after month Foy ran full page ads for Brother Hardeman in the Gospel Guardian and the Bible Banner. He admitted that the school owed Foy and wanted to settle the debt by tuition. Foy has letters from Brother Hardeman offering to further settle the school's debt to him by giving tuition to his other children.

"Great indeed is his sense of 'fairness!' His 'honor and virtue' are amazing! His 'honesty' has astounded the whole brotherhood!"

Brother Hardeman says he is through. I think as much. As bad as he looked on "the issue" he would have looked a lot better than he does "now" if he had quit when he threatened to before. He ought to look and feel pretty cheap from now on riding a $25,000 (twenty-five thousand dollar) white horse which some brethren are wondering how a preacher and school teacher can afford without "sinful extravagance and utter lack of business judgment"! "Too bad!" Farewell, Brother Hardeman.

I do not expect to see this either in the Gospel Advocate or the Firm Foundation. I am not even sending them a copy. It might embarrass them to aid and abet "personalities."

BROTHER HARDEMAN'S
"APOLOGY"
CLED E. WALLACE

In the Gospel Advocate of November 20th Brother Hardeman makes "An Apology" in these words:

"Some months ago I wrote an article on the position of Freed-Hardeman College. A number of articles have followed, both in favor of and in opposition to the position stated. Possibly some good has resulted from the arguments thus presented. It is regrettable that personalities have been injected. Truth and not victory should be the object of all controversy, and any effort to lessen the force of an opponent's argument by wit, caviling, ridicule, or reflection upon his character should be strictly avoided. This rule has been accepted to govern in all honorable debates. I have yielded to the temptation to violate this principle, and I offer to the brotherhood a genuine apology. Never again do I expect to descend to such low levels."

It is the generous thing to do, and the right thing to do to accept a "genuine apology" when it is offered to the right party or parties, and bears the earmarks of a genuine effort to right wrongs that have been committed. Frankly, as much as I desire to believe and say otherwise, Brother Hardeman's "so sorry" piece does not measure up to the demands of a genuine
apology?" A friend of mine, whose ability and fairness are widely recognized reacts in these words:

"Dear Cled: That apology-uh. Things must have got pretty hot for NBH. But it is a mere effort to whitewash himself. He makes no apology to Foy—"to the brotherhood." He does not apologize for false statements. If I am a part of 'the brotherhood' he had in mind, I count his apology worthless. Let him go to work to undo what he tried to do. Now let BCG and GHPS apologize for printing such stuff."

He signs off "In disgust."

Like Brother Brewer, Brother Hardeman apologizes to the readers of the papers, evidently feeling that he has fallen far in their esteem. Before he did so, he said all he wanted to say, drove the knife of slander into Foy as deeply as he could and then says coolly: "Never again do I expect to descend to such low levels." He makes no apologies to Foy, makes no retractions and obviously hopes we will quit without exposing the false statements that marked as "descent to such low levels." He should have saved us that by making his apology complete. We can't quit until his slanders are corrected, and we have the facts to correct them. We sympathize with and share the feelings of a lot of good brethren who deeply regret the "low levels" this discussion has developed. We cannot, however, in justice allow Brother Hardeman to make his farewell a "hit and run" affair. He cannot "whitewash himself" at Foy's expense. Our part will soon be finished unless Brother Hardeman or Brother Brewer, or both, make it necessary for us to say more.

My character has not been attacked to a degree that raised my blood pressure any. It is true that Brother Brewer said that I had everything but "sincerity and truth" but then I make allowances for him. He did not write that in "a sober moment" but "in the excitement of impassioned speech." I'm putting a "fair construction upon these circumstances." I do not consider that anything either of them have said about me endangers either their salvation or my reputation. They can forget it.

There is one thing I do feel deeply about, very deeply. I have the greatest confidence in Foy's personal integrity and loyalty to the truth. In addition to that I have the deepest personal affection for him. I have always gone to his defense when he was unjustly attacked, with all the power of heart and pen at my command, and I will do it again if need be, and I have never been tempted to offer anybody any apologies for doing so. That is just the way it is.

There is another angle I'd like to say a few words about before I close my part of this unpleasant affair. If Brother Hardeman is under obligation to apologize for descending to "such low levels" so are Brother Goodpasture and Brother Showalter for publishing what he wrote on those "levels." Some years ago Brother Goodpasture "spread irritation over three pages" in which he did about the same thing Brother Hardeman has done and he has never even apologized "to the brotherhood." It looks as though he should have stuck some sort of an apology alongside of Brother Hardeman's. And while I'm saying things, it looks a little like Brother Showalter has "played monkey on the end of a string" for Brother Hardeman and the Gospel Advocate. Why didn't he leave the fight up to the Gospel Advocate and the Bible Banner? Hardeman and Brewer are both in Tennessee. The Gospel Advocate is a large paper, but Brother Showalter joins them in an effort to destroy Foy's influence. Brother Whiteside felt so strongly in the matter that he wrote Brother Showalter a letter inquiring why he joined the planned effort to discredit us in Texas! Our father and Brother Showalter have enjoyed a wonderful friendship in the past. He has admitted the fact that Foy has been his strong supporter and once sent him two hundred (200) subscribers from one town. Since he has had the Bible Banner, he helped send a large list from Oklahoma City to the Firm Foundation. And now he publishes scandals on Foy. It looks as though Foy secured whole gobs of subscribers for the Firm Foundation so they could read attacks on him. This in my opinion is stretching an "open forum policy" too far. It is like Foy sending large numbers of students to Freed-Hardeman College to hear N. B. Hardeman attack him in their classes. This had been going on for no telling how long before Foy found it out. Brother Hardeman's apology is too narrow in the middle and too short at both ends. It just doesn't cover the situation.

It is obvious to everybody I think that "the opposition" has been out after Foy and not me. I "have escaped personal opposition" to a rather remarkable degree. The plan was to "discredit" if not ruin Foy. It failed as it has failed before. Aside from all this it is still true 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 Brother Hardeman will make that apology genuine and complete and return to his former stated conviction that

"I certainly do not indorse Brother Brewer's statements and would oppose any congregation putting Freed-Bardeman in their budgets. Such has ever been our sentiments," then maybe we can convert Brother Brewer and glory will abound and strife will cease.
THE PERSONS AND PERSONALITIES IN THE COLLEGE CONTROVERSY

BOY E. COGDIll

For some time now a discussion has been going on through the pages of the Bible Banner and some of our other religious papers on the question of whether or not it is right for a congregation of the Lord's church to contribute to a college or school in which the Bible is taught when that school is organized as a human institution doing a secular work under a board of trustees.

As a discussion grows warmer and the pressure heavier, men find themselves involved because of their relation to the issues. There is absolutely no way to prevent this in any discussion about anything. However, to point out a man's inconsistency concerning the issue under discussion is one thing and to make an open direct assault on his character about matters that have absolutely no relation to the issue is quite another.

Brother N. B. Hardeman elected to take the lead in this discussion in favor of church support for the schools. It is presumed that he offered every argument that he could make in support of his position, and those arguments were examined and refuted completely and absolutely. He and others standing with him have been completely routed on the issue. Many of the inconsistent contentions made were exposed but no assault was made on his character, though perhaps he is as vulnerable from that point of view as any man before the public. Nothing of a personal nature entirely separated from the issue was injected into the discussion, until Brother Hardeman, aware of the weakness of his argument and the pressure and power of the truth against his position, completely abandoned the issue and everything connected with it, and launched as infamous an attack against the character of Brother Foy E. Wallace, Jr., as any of us have seen in this day. No political campaigner has ever made a more unfair, inexcusable, and untrue assault against the character of his opponent than N. B. Hardeman has made in this discussion. Why he has done so is obvious. Bro. Hardeman is not weak enough to think that whether Foy E. Wallace, Jr. pays his debt or doesn't pay them has anything to do with whether or not the church should support a human institution such as the one of which he is president. He knows that it doesn't have any bearing whatever on that question. He has followed the old plan-if you don't like the message of the prophet, kill the prophet. His final answer to everything that has been said is: Foy E. Wallace, Jr. didn't pay his debts and isn't honest, therefore the church should contribute to the support of the colleges. Now isn't that conclusive proof? We expected better than that from Brother Hardeman.

The editors of the religious papers that published these 'attacks are just as guilty as Brother Hardeman. They knew the representations were untrue and printed them anyway.

PREMILLENNIAL TACTICS

Brother Hardeman has followed the same route that all the premillennialists and premillennial sympathizers have followed in the past. When they could not meet the issue and were exposed in their attempt to propagate their false doctrines, they always disprove every argument, to their own satisfaction I guess, with a personal fight against Brother Wallace. They have had the idea that if they could make brethren believe that Foy E. Wallace, Jr. is dishonest and a debt beater, that would make premillennialists out of all of them. Years ago they dragged all of Brother Wallace's personal affairs out into the open and sought to discredit him with them. At that time all the matters to which Brother Hardeman has referred were reviewed and the facts about all of them given by Brother Wallace and published in the pages of the Bible Banner. In fact, even before that, Brother Wallace had voluntarily made a statement to the brotherhood about his affairs and Brother Hardeman endorsed that statement a hundred percent as you will see from a letter by him to Bro. Wallace quoted in another article in this issue. Nothing new has developed since that time. The situation with reference to these personal affairs is exactly the same "now" as it was "then," but Brother Hardeman is not the same. There lies the difference.

A PARALLEL SITUATION

Several years ago Brother S. H. Hall was in Oklahoma City in a meeting. During that meeting they had a special service one afternoon for all the preachers and elders of the city. Brother Hall proposed to explain his participation in the "unity meetings" with the Digressives and his attitude on premillennialism, and people lo t questions to be asked. I was called by some of the brethren and asked to attend that meeting. When Brother Hall had finished his speech, he was asked this question: 'Why did you leave town during the fourth Hardeman meeting in Nashville and refuse to cooperate in it, when you knew that the meeting was to be especially directed against premillennialism?' In response to that question Brother Hall stated that he could not fellowship Brother Hardeman in that meeting because of his character. He was pressured for an incident in Brother Hardeman's life and conduct that made him unworthy of fellowship. He mentioned the incident that occurred in Huntsville, Alabama, in which some charge8
were made against Brother Hardeman. He admitted when questioned further that the incident was old, had happened years before, and that he had known about it when Brother Hardeman held his first three meetings in Nashville at the Ryman Auditorium, and when the Boswell-Hardeman debate was held. He further admitted; when pressed, that he had fellowshipped all three of the former meetings, and the debate, knowing just as much about that incident as he knew when the fourth meeting came. He decided all of a sudden after three meetings and a debate that Brother Hardeman wasn’t worthy of his fellowship because of that incident which he had known all the time. None of us believed that to be the real reason why Brother Hall didn’t fellowship the fourth meeting. I believed then, and I do till now, that premillennial sympathy on Brother Hall’s part was the real reason. The point however, is this: Brother Hardeman stands in exactly the same position now with reference to Brother Wallace. He knew all about the settlement of Brother Wallace’s affairs at the time it had happened, having injected himself into the matter. He endorsed the settlement then, and Brother Wallace’s statement about the settlement, without reservation. He has pretended ever since “then” and until “now” to be a close friend to Brother Wallace, but for some reason—all of a sudden—Brother Hardeman has decided that Brother Wallace is unworthy and unreliable, for reasons that he has known about all the time. Who can give him credit for sincerity in his reference to matters that occurred almost fifteen years ago, when he has endorsed those particular matters all of these ensuing years? It will take more than a half-breathed, superficial apology to the brethren to restore any confidence in N. B. Hardeman’s sincerity about any of these matters. It has just about been destroyed with most of us for all time to come.

A similar situation with reference to the fourth meeting in Nashville developed between Brother Hardeman and the Central Church in Nashville. That church recorded in its minutes a resolution signed by the officers of the congregation refusing to announce or permit to be announced the meeting to be held by Brother Hardeman. Of course they had no other fellowship with it. Later on in explanation of their action they denied premillennial sympathies and assigned their action to the fact that they did not count Brother Hardeman personally worthy of their fellowship. They had fellowshipped him before, and have done so since, but they suspended it for a season. If they knew anything they had not known all the time, nothing was said or done about it that anybody knows. If Brother Hardeman has corrected the reason they would not fellowship him since the fourth meet,

ing, nothing has been said about that, though the refusal to take part in the meeting received wide publicity. You would think that after tasting that kind of treatment Brother Hardeman would be slow to administer such to anybody, but maybe that is where he learned it.

HOUSTON CENTRAL CHURCH TACTICS

When Brother Hardeman’s name was suggested for a meeting in Houston supported by all the churches, objection to him was raised by the Central Church on the ground of his character. The matter was dropped at that time. Later plans were made by the Norhill church to conduct such a meeting in the Music Hall with Brother Foy E. Wallace, Jr. doing the preaching. Because they had not made the plans and were not making the arrangements for the meeting, and for other reasons probably, the Central Church refused to cooperate in that meeting. They made, through two of their elders and their preacher, Burton Coffman, the same kind of a fight against Brother Wallace that Brother Hardeman has recently made, objecting to him on the ground that he had acted dishonestly, and would not pay his debts. This accusation was introduced in the presence of thirty or thirty-five preachers in the Houston area. When the charge was brought out into the open, it was disputed and denied in Brother Wallace’s behalf, and given the name that properly describes it—“a dirty lie.” They were called upon to produce the proof or stand branded as such. They could not do it. Later the elders of the Norhill church, joined by the elders of the Heights church, wrote them and requested that they name the incident where Brother Wallace had ever refused to honor any obligation that he had made and do his best to discharge it. They were told that if they would produce the instance of it that it would be taken to the elders of the church where he lived and the demand that they deal with him and it be made. That instance has never been shown until this day by them or anyone else. Brother Hardeman cannot show it now, and until he does produce some proof of dishonesty—some specific instance of an obligation denied and no effort made to meet its demands—he stands with the elders of the Central church in Houston, with Burton Coffman, their preacher—guilty of propagating a lie to the injury of a gospel preacher and to his own condemnation. Brother Hardeman needs to repent—not just apologize. He has not acted just discourteously but dishonestly.

WHAT ARE THE FACTS?

There has been so much misrepresentation of the facts concerning the incurring of Brother Wallace’s obligations and their settlement, and the matter has been so many times amplified and overdrawn, that once again people who do not know the truth need the facts. It is inexcus-
able to keep dragging out a matter almost fifteen years old, after it has been settled completely and entirely, even if there had been wrong done in connection with it. It is even more inexcusable to continue to misrepresent it.

The amount of the indebtedness has been considerably overdrawn. It needs to be stated again that the sum total necessary to liquidate Brother Wallace’s debts did not exceed $5,000. That is not a huge debt for a man who is trying to do anything. I have an idea that many of us have owed that amount several times in our lives, and probably if our creditors had pinched down on us at times we would have been utterly unable to pay.

If Foy E. Wallace, Jr. was guilty of “sinful extravagance” as Brother Hardeman has charged and these debts were incurred as a result, it was “extravagance” exercised in generosity of spirit toward his friends, brethren, and family, and not upon himself or for anything dishonorable. The real explanation of Brother Wallace’s difficulties is found in what he had done and was trying to do for the cause of Christ. He has never been content to accept a soft, easy position with liberal remuneration and live “sumptuously” as an aristocrat. I have known him perhaps as well and as intimately as any man living, and all who know him really know that he has been spent in a busy life of consecrated activity and sacrifice for the cause of Christ. He has gone day and night for thirty-five years in endless toil in the interest of the truth. He has made the outstanding sacrifice of personal security, family association, physical strength, mental ease, personal popularity, and self-interest that has been made in this generation for the Lord. He could have gone his way taking things easily, protecting his own interests and standing, and still have been without a peer as an evangelist. He could have situated himself in a large congregation and contended himself with a soft, easy job, stayed at home with his family, drawn the highest pay, and lived in luxury as others have. He might even have had a horse to ride if he had chosen. Instead he felt the need of service which he was able to render.

He was prevailed upon by some of his friends to give up his evangelistic work and go to California, Central Church, Los Angeles, and help to strengthen the cause in that section, which was then a great mission field. He gave up a liberal support for his meetings and went at a moderate salary. His family was large, the expense of doing work in a large city was heavy. There were calls all over the state from weak congregations for help and he went night and day to try to give it. He did his work in Los Angeles in the day and drove back and forth at night and preached incessantly at points sometimes a hundred miles distant. A church building was needed sorely that would correctly represent the cause of Christ in the gateway city of the west and Brother Wallace stepped under the load and it was built. The money to pay for it was raised by him personally to a large extent, in eight or ten trips in his car through Texas, Oklahoma, and the east. These three years were exacting, expensive, and exhausting financially and physically. The splendid building at 12th and Hoover in Los Angeles stands today as a visible monument to that great work. Spiritual strength built into the brethren of this section as a result of that work is still discernible.

The financial involvement started in this work. After three years he was called to become editor of the Gospel Advocate, and he moved his family to Nashville. For that work he received a smaller salary than in the California work. He counted on going on with his evangelistic work and being able, as he always had, to live on the support from his meetings and accordingly reckoned that he would be able to pay for a home for his family out of the salary received from the Advocate. Instead of his meetings supporting him as they always had, they fell far below normal support. This was due to several factors: Brethren thought he was being paid by the Advocate and would not need as liberal support as otherwise would have been the case. Then too, the depression was in full swing and churches were not as able to support as they had been. Also much of the meeting work during that period was in the east in difficult places where the church was weak. The result was that Brother Wallace found himself more deeply involved as time went on, and on top of that the Gospel Advocate, because of the depression, cut his salary.

During this period the challenge of speculative teaching was thrown before the brotherhood. Someone had to meet it. Gospel preachers received a challenge from Charles M. Neal to discuss the premillennial question. I presume Brother Hardeman got one, but he did not accept it. He had neither the time nor disposition to lead out in such a fight as that. Besides he had to stay at home and tend to his horses. Brother Wallace again assumed the burden. Much time was given to preparation for that fight, for which no support was received. Meetings were left off that would have helped bear the burden of expense which was heavy in the gathering and preparation of material. That did not help pay indebtedness or bear family expense.

As a result of his leadership in this fight against speculative teaching everywhere he has gone almost.
Brother Hardeman bore none of these sacrifices for the cause. If he has ever made any to amount to anything there isn’t anything known about it. He has lived in comfort and plenty growing wealthier year by year without enduring anything like the hardship that Brother Wallace has suffered. For him now to take up the fight started by premillenialists and keep it alive is too low for one to say about it what he would feel.

In 1934 Brother Wallace awoke to the fact that his situation financially was hopeless. For more than a year he had applied his salary from the Advocate almost without exception to the indebtedness against his home. It had even been so assigned to Brother McQuiddy. Other expenses could not be met out of his other income. When he reached the conclusion that his situation could not be improved while he continued in the same work, he determined to give up his work with the Advocate and get back into his meetings and try to pull out of the difficulty as rapidly as possible. He turned his home over to Brother McQuiddy after paying about $5,090 on it. His furniture and other personal belongings went toward settling debts and with his family in his car he left Nashville until he could repair his financial condition and take care of his obligations. The following article written by W. E. Brightwell, and printed in the Advocate of May, 1937, explained the outcome of this situation:

Foy E. Wallace, Jr., Denton, Texas, spent two days of last week in Nashville. They were probably two of the happiest days of his life, for he was collecting receipts, every one of which read, “Paid in full”.

Ordinarily no publicity is given to the fact that an individual pays his bills. That is considered a strictly personal matter. But the fact that Brother Wallace was involved in debt had been given publicity. It had become generally known, and had been talked not merely to the detriment of Brother Wallace but to the injury of the cause. It had doubtless been given more publicity because he was recognized as a leading evangelist, debater and writer, and because he had so effectually opposed speculative teaching. It is hoped that similar publicity will be given to the fact that Brother Wallace came back and paid every debt in full, both for the restoration of Brother Wallace to the respect and admiration of all the brotherhood, but for the repair of the damage to the cause also.

No criticism of Brother Wallace has ever been received by those who knew him except that he had become involved in financial debt—which he candidly admitted. When he left Nashville, it was in the daytime, and with the full intention of returning if and when possible to liquidate his indebtedness. Some of his creditors were so insistent in their efforts and methods of collection that he despaired of returning to Nashville for two meetings several months after his departure. But he made it a point of principle that if he could not preach in Nashville he would not preach anywhere. Several of his friends advised him to take advantage of bankruptcy, so that he could protect himself and family while continuing his preaching. This he did.

He came to Nashville to hold the meetings scheduled. He first called the elders together and advised them of the action he had taken, and explained that the court action had nothing to do with his sense of moral obligation to liquidate the indebtedness as rapidly as possible. The elders of the two churches told him that it was the only thing he could have done, and invited him to conduct the meetings as they had been planned. Good meetings were held.

Despite some reverses of a financial nature, including illness in his family, he has been retiring some of these debts, and on last week came to Nashville to personally clear up those contracted there. Some accounts are being handled by correspondence elsewhere. In the course of a few days all will have been completely liquidated.

The friends of worship known to Brother Wallace intimately have never experienced a misgiving as to the nobility of his intentions and the cleanliness of his life. Even his financial misfortune had some of its roots, at least, in the abuse or over-development of certain virtues-generosity and independence. He was always doing something for others. If the church supported him, he supported the church: if his support did not seem adequate, Brother Wallace made up the deficit. He never worked a day at any secular employment, but has devoted all his life since high school days to preaching the gospel. Even with seven in family, he usually had one or more students of David Lipscomb College living in his home. There are scores of those who have tasted his unstinted generosity who can and will testify any time as to the character and ability of the man. In fact, if all who were indebted to his generosity could have fully repaid him in kind, he could have liquidated his indebtedness long ago, but that is where his independence came into the picture!

But now that all has been paid in full, it is useless to speculate about causes. The future is the thing. Brother Wallace is young, and has many useful years ahead of him. He has not missed a day—except because of illness in his family—but his work will be more pleasant and more fruitful of good throughout the brotherhood, because he has come back and paid his debts in full. Let the good news find as swift and open acceptance all over the world as it did the bad news of financial disaster. No single event has meant more to the good of the cause in years than this visit to Nashville, together with all that it means. A ringing welcome to the man who came back!

Every friend of the truth and of Brother Wallace rejoiced when the debts were all paid. Brother J. W. Akin made an investment in the preaching of the gospel that has already proved to be the greatest he has ever made in all of his beneficencies. He made it possible for Foy E. Wallace, Jr. to go on in the great fight he has waged for the cause of truth and righteousness.

THE BANKRUPTCY ACT

The congress of the United States provided by legislative act long ago for relief to be given to the man involved in financial difficulties. That act has been revised from time to time, but every time it has been strengthened and not weakened in behalf of the man in difficulty, and for his protection. The very purpose of this act originally and now is noble and good. It was designed to prevent the man suffering reverses from being utterly and forever crushed into fin-
al doom financially, and to unending despair, by those who are his creditors, among whom there are always grasping, ruthless, selfish men without mercy or consideration. The action is pursued through the federal courts of this country and carried out under their jurisdiction. There is not anything dishonorable about taking advantage of this provision thus afforded by our government. That is especially true when the relief it affords is necessary in order to provide a living for one's family. Every Christian understands that such a provision would not settle or discharge any moral obligation to anybody. It simply cancels the legal liability of the debtor under the law and that is the only way such protection could have been afforded. There is no attempt in the act to release anyone from a moral obligation in any sense. This act has often been misused and hence has come to be regarded ignoble and unchristian in the minds of a lot of people. That is largely due to ignorance, prejudice and misrepresentation. When Brother Hardeman plays upon such prejudice to discredit Brother Wallace by his reference to it as a dishonorable thing, he is either ignorant or is purposely stooping to a low, unfair, unchristian and dishonorable thing.

Foy E. Wallace, Jr. did not take bankruptcy until he was advised that it was the only way he could make certain unscrupulous men, including some brethren, leave him alone until he could satisfy them. Before he started to Tennessee to hold the meetings mentioned in Brother Brightwell’s article he was warned that he would be met at the Mississippi river with a citation issued, a suit instituted and an attachment of his support, by those who were seeking to destroy him. He went for advice and help to Paul Taliaferro in Tulsa, Oklahoma, an eminent and successful lawyer, and one of the finest men in the church who had known Brother Wallace from his own childhood. He also discussed the matter with Federal Judge Kennamer, also his friend and a member of the church. He discussed the matter with elders of the Tenth and Francis church in Oklahoma City, his home congregation. He went to Weatherford, Texas and talked the matter over with his brother-in-law, Nolan Queen, an honorable man and a fine lawyer. He came to Dallas, and he and I talked it over. Without exception all of us advised him that his only recourse to prevent being crushed and ruined in his work and to continue to be able to provide for his family was the relief provided in the Federal Bankruptcy Act. He returned to Tulsa and instituted through Brother Paul E. Taliaferro the proper proceedings for such relief.

Brother Wallace today has in his files copies of letters that he had written to all of his creditors assuring them that he did not consider himself &If released from moral obligation in any sense and that he would see to it through the good providence of God that every debt would be paid as quickly as possible without discount. He was doing that as rapidly as he could when Brother Akin came to his rescue and fastened the conclusion of the matter.

These are the facts concerning the bankruptcy proceeding and they can be misunderstood only through ignorance of the real facts or misrepresentation. Brother Hardeman is guilty of one or the other, and I don’t believe he is ignorant. I too am ashamed of you Brother Hardeman, for stooping so low. I am even ashamed for some of the things that we are having to put in the Bible Banner, but I have lived in the west long enough to know that you can’t fight a rattlesnake with a pair of tweezers.

When others have accused Foy E. Wallace, Jr. of dishonesty and dishonorable dealing, they have been met with the charge of lying and a demand for proof. Not one time have they presented any proof of any kind. Once more in his behalf, not because he needs me to fight his battles for him, for he does not as every one knows, but because of my appreciation for what he has meant to the cause of Christ and what he stands for and is, and because of my confidence in the good that he can do, and because of the need of the cause for him and his strength, I deny that he is dishonest in any sense or ever has been, or that he has been dishonest in his dealings. IT IS NOT SO and Brother Hardeman can’t do any better job of proving it than others have done. He stands in the same class with Clinton Davidson, Burton Coffman, and all the rest of their kind—unless he repents and retract.

GOSPEL ADVOCATE REFUSES TO PUBLISH R. L. WHITESIDE’S ARTICLE

Dear Brother Roy:

If the Banner has not gone to press, say that my article was sent to the Gospel Advocate, and that B. C. G. refused to publish it, and returned it to me. And say anything else about it. When some men are put in a place too big for them, they try to swell up to the needed size; but swelling up does not add weight to them—they are still lightweight. That so-called apology of N. B. H. was not an apology—he merely tried to white-wash himself, so it seems to me. Or did he mean to say that the things he said about Fop were not true? Hardly would he confess to being a liar.

I hated to bother Leon B., but I knew B. C. G. would say nothing about my article to anyone: so I wrote Leon a long letter, and sent him the article B. C. G. returned, and told him if he could not induce B. C. G. to make amends, I reserved the right to publish the letter I wrote him. B. C. G. will not slip out of that as easily as he thinks—if I live. I do not like to be snubbed by a swelled toad.

You cannot know how much I enjoyed your and Cled’s visit. In hope and love,

Robertson L. Whiteside
THE PLAIN FACTS VERSUS THE N. B. HARDEMAN FALSEHOODS
FOY E. WALLACE, JR.

The reading public of the churches of Christ has never in all the history of journalism witnessed such an abandonment of an issue; and the resort to personalities as that which has been staged by N. B. Hardeman in the church-supported college discussion. Deserting the issue weeks ago, depending on his personal power, backed by the two oldest periodicals among us, he has set out to do what others before him have failed to do, crush us and destroy us by wholesale assault in an onslaught of slime and slush and slander. His whole air has been arrogant and his spirit vile and vengeful.

Notwithstanding the desire of all, as well as my own, to see such a discussion as this terminated, there have been some matters recently introduced that compel attention.

I. "AN APOLOGY"

After weeks and weeks of spiteful personalities in the leading papers Brother Hardeman now comes out with "an apology", the weakness and insufficiency of it must be apparent to even a casual reader.

1. No apology was made for what was said; he only apologized "to the brotherhood" for saying it.

2. The apology carried no retraction but was in effect a reiteration in the form of a concession that he had "descended" to our own "low level". I deny being "low" and I disclaim the last Hardeman article in effect a reiteration in the form of a concession that he had "descended" to our own "low level". I deny being "low" and I disclaim the "level" to which he descended. I may be lowly but I am not low. Brother Hardeman's articles have been filled with falsehoods. If falsehood is sin, he has sinned grievously. If slander is a sin, he has sinned enormously. No "apology" is worth anything that is not accompanied by repentance and retraction.

3. It has every appearance of planned strategy. He even told certain ones ahead of time that his "Then and Now" article would be his last. What occurred between the short interval between his "last article" and his "apology" that caused him such compunction of conscience? Look at the facts, friends: N. B. Hardeman dips his hands deep into the mire, brings them full of mud. He then slings the filth all over us, and then in immediate order published an "apology" to the "brotherhood."

4. The Gospel Advocate and the Firm Foundation are weeklies. The Bible Banner is a monthly. It is evident that he thought they could overwhelm us with concerted and coordinated attacks, aided by the editors of these papers. They expected to give us more than we could do, to say more than we could answer and then step up with an "apology" to the public leaving the reflections on character, the falsehood, the slander and the libel, all unanswer- ed, to stay in the record unchallenged and uncorrected. After he says all that he wants to say, slings all the mud he wants to sling, he wants help to turn loose of something he has started, so he runs for cover behind a specious apology.

With these apologies on the apology, I want now to look into the last Hardeman article in the Gospel Advocate, to defend my honor and the honor of other members of my family against the false assertions of that article.

II. "THEN AND NOW"

We stopped the presses on the last issue of the Bible Banner to insert a notice for all to "stand by for the facts" in this issue and we shall now make good that promise.

1. It is not true that I called upon N. B. Hardeman to help me out of the financial misfortunes of 1934.

When Brother Hardeman approached me by letter in March 1937, with certain plans, it was altogether unexpected, and he approached me with caution, realizing that it was a delicate matter, he said, to inject himself into my affairs. But he was pleased with my "reaction" and wrote me as follows: "I have read your letter over and over until the whole is thoroughly digested. I hesitated to write you as I did know the unpleasant reflections it might occasion." But he said, "Your reception was fine and the spirit you evidence is indeed commendable." He then said, "I will arrange to see Brother McQuiddy during the week and, if all is well, I will then arrange a meeting with him, Brother Akin, you and me (only these with no one else knowing anything about it). Be prepared to come regardless."

Thus it can be seen that my own affairs were only part of a plan which Brother Hardeman had formulated with reference to the management of the Gospel Advocate. He used my affairs to enlist Brother Akin, and used the whole situation to accomplish an end concerning the Gospel Advocate. As the matter developed I was called into a meeting with Brother Hardeman and Brother McQuiddy at Henderson. Brother Akin was invited by them and was present. The plan submitted was that I should return to the Gospel Advocate as editor if financial matters could be adjusted. Brother Akin asked Brother McQuiddy if the financial situation was the only thing that stood in the way, and he (McQuiddy) said that is was the only barrier, for he had rather have "Foy" as editor of the Gospel Advocate than any man.
living. Brother Akin then offered to provide the funds with which to put all of my financial affairs on a current basis so the arrangements could be concluded. I agreed to the plan on the condition that I would not be required to return to Nashville to live. Brother McQuiddy agreed that I could continue to live in Oklahoma City, as W. E. Brightwell could take care of all office duties pertaining to the Gospel Advocate, and I could serve as general editor away from the office, living in Oklahoma City with my family. This will explain many things with reference to Brother Hardeman’s interest in my personal affairs then, and why he does not have the same interest in me now.

Immediately after the meeting at Henderson, Brother Akin did all that he offered and agreed to do. I did all that I could to make matters pertaining to my personal affairs right in the sight of God and man. I went in person to every man who held “ought” against me and settled every claim, in some instances going beyond what I knew to be the right figures. A full and forthright statement was published in the Gospel Advocate and the Firm Foundation, on which Brother Hardeman commented in a letter to me as follows:

Brother Brigance and I have both read your article two or three times and we fail to see where any change would improve it. I believe you have very correctly presented the facts and your reference to those to who have criticized you is just and ought to serve the purpose of causing all of us to think twice before we let go from our tongue a “sluice of slime.”

But how difference “now” and “then!” It is Brother Hardeman who has “let go from his tongue” and his pen now the “sluice of slime.” Did he “think twice” before he “let go” his own “sluices” in his recent articles?

When Brother Akin read the statement which Brethren Hardeman and Brigance commended, he also wrote me a touching letter, which I prize to this day, commending me for being “so willing and anxious to do right,” one paragraph of which reads as follows:

“I feel like when anything is put in the past that it should be in the past, and the confidence and trust that was in the beginning is the place I would like to start, and the things that have happened between that and now merely be for our profit and nothing more.” (May 1937)

It gives me an inward joy in the midst of these outward buffetings to know that this good man, J. W. Akin, “in whom there is no guile” feels toward me now as he wrote then.

Again of the same matter Brother Hardeman again wrote:

“I have read and re-read all you have to say. . . . I am deeply impressed with your plain and unimpressive statements and your willingness to adjust all matters.” (Aug. 1937)

It was in these letters that Brother Hardeman referred to G. C. Brewer’s personal attacks in these words: “Brewer’s effort is far below what I thought even he was capable of doing.” And in the same letter, he continued, “I am ashamed of men who claims to be such,” that is-men who would do what Brewer and others were doing. Now Brother Hardeman is doing exactly the same thing in greater measure, and in so doing has gone “far below” what he thought “even he (Brewer) was capable of doing,” and has joined in with the very men and their “such” of whom he said he was then “ashamed.” It is therefore a just conclusion that all good people should now be ashamed of Brother N. B. Hardeman, and I believe they are.

As time went on, Brother Hardeman was unable to consummate “all the program” that he had planned. Because of admittedly heavy pressure put on him by various men among us, college men, premillennial sympathizers, a Nashville group, the Davidson element, the Brewer influence, and their kind everywhere, Brother McQuiddy felt that the opposition was too great, and he receded from the original plans.

Brother Hardeman then wrote me as follows:

“I have a call from Brother Leon (McQuiddy) to meet him in Nashville, Friday, this week . . . be assured that I will do my best to urge a speedy consummation of all the program and I hope and pray that our plans and purposes may not miscarry. I believe the cause of truth can best be served by what we are trying to do . . . When I have had a talk with Brother Leon, I will write you again.” (May 1937)

You will observe that Brother Hardeman referred to “all the program,” my own affairs being only a part, and relatively a small part, in the whole program. But his “plans and purposes” affecting the Gospel Advocate did “miscarry,” and the “plans” were all at once changed and the “program” shifted from the Gospel Advocate to the Firm Foundation. Brother Hardeman joined Brother McQuiddy in an effort to secure the ownership and management of the Firm Foundation, believing that if Brother Showalter was offered enough money he would sell it. But as in numerous other things, Brother Hardeman did not want anybody to mention his “name” at all “in connection” with these matters. He has shown himself to be great at getting others to do things when he does not want his own name mentioned! Some quotations from a few of the many letters in my files from him will show his “connection” with all the program.

“When Brother Leon (McQuiddy) returned from Memphis, he called me at Jackson and said matters were fairly satisfactory. This I have told you before. I have been expecting a letter from him since his trip to Austin. If I do not hear from him by Monday or Tuesday I will find occasion to write him a word. In fact, I am writing him now.” (Apr. 1937)

So he wrote Brother McQuiddy as follows, the copy of which I have before me:

“I am sincerely hoping that I may hear from you within a few days of your visit to Austin and that all plans are completed. In going over this whole matter, I can’t see anything other than wisdom in the consummation of this program.” (Apr. 1937)

At this point I asked to be allowed to withdraw myself from the “program.” I had not ap-
plied for the editorship of the Gospel Advocate at all. In the “midnight letter” over which he has tried to create such a nightmare I referred to myself as the “clay in the potter’s hand” because the details of the plans which I did not fully know at the time, proposed to restore me to a current financial basis, in return for which I was to cooperate editorially in “all the program” involving the Gospel Advocate, I believed I was in the “house of my friends” as well as “in the potter’s hand,” and for Brother Hardeman to take advantage of a time of adversity, when I was in the depths, and wading deep waters, to make it appear that I had sold myself to him personally to be molded as clay in his hands, reveals his own unscrupulous intentions. I did not know that men in high places in the church could become so unconscionable as both Brother Brewer and Brother Hardeman have shown themselves to be in the perversion of letters. My only recourse is to give to the readers the contents of their own letters to me in proof of the plain facts in the case.

After the plans shifted from the Gospel Advocate to the Firm Foundation, no such stipulation being in our first agreement, I asked to withdraw from the “program.” Brother Hardeman wrote me that he did not want me to withdraw from the negotiations. I was not a candidate for the editorship of the Gospel Advocate or the Firm Foundation, I had certainly made no such application and I plainly said so, but Brother Hardeman wrote me as follows:

“I really believe you will have to exercise more patience in the matter ..., It is hard for him (Brother McQuiddy) to get any satisfaction out of Brother Showalter and this is holding matters in the present state. If I were you I would just let things rock without withdrawing negotiations and go on with your engangement. He fears the deal is off at Austin ..., I will be at 212 Alamosa in San Antonio. It is possible that Brother Showalter may be down and that I can listen and learn some of his plans.”

So Brother Hardeman was going to “listen” in order to “learn” some of Brother Showalter’s “plans” without letting Brother ‘Showalter know what he was doing! He was doing espionage work for “the speedy consummation of all the program.”

The “plans and purposes” regarding both the Gospel Advocate and the Firm Foundation eventually “miscarried” and as a subtitute, the publication of a monthly magazine was proposed with me as editor and Brother McQuiddy as publisher. This was done, and The Bible Banner (the name I gave to it) came into existence. Brother McQuiddy agreed to back it, and the first four issues were printed on the presses of McQuiddy Printing Company in Nashville, Tennessee. At this time Clinton Davidson appeared on the scene with his New Christian Leader movement, and when the Bible Banner took up the task of exposing him, he threatened to sue us all-and Brother McQuiddy wanted to be released from all connection with the Bible Banner. Another meeting was called at Henderson, and I was offered a $150.00 per month editorial salary to discontinue the Bible Banner and write a one-page-a-week article for the Gospel Advocate. Brother Hardeman advised me in the presence of several witnesses to take it, and stop the Bible Banner. When I asked him why, he replied: “You need the money, Brother Foy.” I answered, “Yes I do; but honor is more than money” and I told them that I would crawl back home and live on crackers and water before I would submit to such a deal. I returned to Oklahoma City, determined to find a way to publish the Bible Banner according to the public promises that had been made regarding it.

At this point I received some interesting letters from Brother Hardeman.

“You have ground for the sentiment that you have expressed, and I am in the same opinion that you hold, viz., that Brother McQuiddy never really intended to carry out what was agreed upon in my home. I feel that all else has been a substitute, a postponement and an effort to get released from you. I think you have indeed been done an injustice. You have grounds to publish in the Banner the whole procedure and thus explain why certain steps have been made and announcements appeared. I think, however, it might be better to suffer the injury than try to explain all things that lie back of it. I am sure that Brother McQuiddy has lost some friends but I do not believe it right to try to injure the Gospel Advocate because of such steps as he has taken.” (Feb. 1939)

It was all right for me to suffer injury, but the Gospel Advocate must not be injured! I think the reader can now begin to see the background of the Gospel Advocate’s attitude and of some things that have “resulted since.”

But hear Brother Hardeman again:

“I am sorry that Brother McQuiddy has lost the confidence that Brother Akin, Austin Taylor and a host of others, who know the facts, had in him. I think this was unnecessary.” (Feb. 1939)

Wonder what Brother McQuiddy will think of that, coming as it did from N. B. Hardeman, the man whom he has accommodated with all the space he wanted to carry on his present campaign of calumny! And what will Brother Showalter think when Brother Hardeman goes to Austin for that meeting in March-will Brother Hardeman “listen” and “learn” some more of Brother Showalters plans while he is there?!

Next came the anonymous circulars, obviously promoted by Clinton Davidson, carrying a series of attacks on me-the same kind of attacks Brother N. B. Hardeman is now making. So it will be in order to hear what Brother Hardeman had to say then in contrast with what he is saying now.

“I have seen the circular put out by Davidson and can appreciate fully how this affects you. I could not blame you for making a statement as you indicate and I would of cow-s ear him gram article as to what my understanding was of the original plan.”

Thus has it been necessary through all of these years for me to fight off repeated attacks, and no sooner has one attack been repulsed than another comes from another flank.
Of their continued attacks Brother Hardeman wrote:

“To a member of the board of the Leader has written Brother Leon to know if he would be interested in taking it over. I think the thing will fail and I pray that it may. It was conceived in sin and brought forth in iniquity. Davidson leaves behind him a sluice of slime wherever he goes.” (July 1939)

But it is the same “sluice” that Davidson leaves behind him “wherever he goes” that Brother Hardeman is “sluicing” in the Gospel Advocate and the Firm Foundation. If it was Clinton Davidson “slime” then, is it not N. B. Hardeman “slime” now?

Concerning these attacks Brother Leon McQuiddy wrote me as follows:

“It is true that, according to every preacher in this territory, you are being helped rather than hurt by the anonymous attacks being made upon you.” (April 1939)

But now N. B. Hardeman is making the same attacks with his name signed to them now that Clinton Davidson was making without his name signed to them then. Do the publisher and editor of the Gospel Advocate think the Hardeman attacks are “helping” rather than “hurting” now?

Hear Brother Hardeman on this point again:

“I really believe that the war being waged against you is proving advantageous both to you and to the cause, I said such to Brother Leon (McQuiddy) and he agreed. With all I have to give I have an idea his original intent would be carried out.” (July 1939)

But the same “war” is being “waged” by Brother Hardeman now that was being waged by those to whom he referred then. Does Brother McQuiddy think it is “advantageous” both to me and the cause now, and for that reason allows the editor to publish it?

These are some of the facts regarding “the plans and purposes” and the “consummation of all the program” about which Brother Hardeman first “hesitated to write me”-proving plainly that his assertion that I “begged” and “pleaded” with him, or with anybody else, to help me is absolutely false. Brother Hardeman has not told the truth about the matter at all, and he knows it.

In the same connection he makes the untrue statement that when I asked him to join the staff of writers on the Gospel Guardian, and later the Bible Banner, he refused. The opposite is the truth. He accepted the place on the staff of the Gospel Guardian, and his name was on the masthead as long as it was published, as anybody having copies of it can easily verify. As for the Bible Banner, Brother Hardeman again testifies against himself in a letter to me, Feb. 4, 1939:

“It is perfectly all right for you to let my name appear in your paper (Bible Banner) with the understanding that you will use material that I have already delivered. It might be possible that I would send you an article occasionally.”

This was his acceptance of my invitation and request for him to be on the staff of the Bible Banner. But he wanted me to copy material out of his published books! I afterward wrote him that I would not under the circumstances place his name on the staff. Now he says that I asked him and he refused. So he has not told the truth on that incident, as his own letter proves. He has mis-stated everything he has mentioned and has not told the truth about anything he has related in all that he has written.

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 have before me at this writing the files of my letters to my creditors, containing the indisputable proof that I had paid more to some of them than the actual balance that I owed them, and that I assured them all of my intention to pay all in full asking only their cooperation. Some were considerate, some were inconsiderate, and because of the latter I was forced to use legal means of protection and self-preservation for my family until I could get my affairs in control and fulfill the pledges I had made to my own heart and to God in heaven. If a discount on any debt was mentioned, it represented the attitude of some of the creditors and not my own idea. I never proposed such a thing. I do not believe Brother Akin would have had confidence enough in me to help me with the matter “if I had proposed such a thing. I further believe that Brother Hardeman knows that I did not propose it. Like everything else he has said, this statement of his is absolutely untrue.

The only reason he has made such accusations is because he is mad, so mad according to his own admission that he has “descended” very “far below” the plane of an honorable man, and I certainly do agree with him on that admission.

3. It is not true that I schooled a son at Freed-Hardeman College on N. B. Hardeman’s charity.

In proof of my statements and in disproof of his I submit the facts.

In July 1934 I received from Brother Hardeman the following offer in a letter:

“If you can manage to pay your daughter’s board, books and incidentals, her tuition and fees won’t cost you a penny. I shall be more than glad to do this for you. Should Taylor decide to come, the same will be true of him.”

The above offer was not accepted. I had made no such request. It was Brother Hardeman’s voluntary proposition made by him in consideration of my friendship for his school and the fact that I had sent him many students. But we did not accept his offer of “tuition and fees”-and in the light of present developments I am mighty glad we did not. It was four years later that my oldest son attended the Freed-Hardeman College
four months, from February to May. In the meantime the Gospel Guardian had been published by me. It was a magazine of class and had a wide circulation. In every issue of this magazine, month after month, even the Extra Special Edition covering the U. S. A. and Canada, Freed-Hardeman College received a full page display ad in two-tone color. For these ads I received not one dollar from Freed-Hardeman College. It was expensive space, precious space, and no other school received it. Later when the Bible Banner was started the Freed-Hardeman College continued to receive these ads for which no bill was ever sent to them and for which not one dollar was ever received from them. Brother Hardeman made use of this space in person as indicated in his letter of March 3, 1936: “Brother Brigance will send you matter for the inside cover by the 12th.” That was matter for the full page ad in the Gospel Guardian. This was not done once in a while, nor occasionally, but every month for months, and then more months in the Bible Banner.

So what? In 1938 when I mentioned the expense of sending my son to Freed-Hardeman College for the spring term, it was Brother Hardeman who suggested that the cash value of the ads in the Gospel Guardian exceeded the total cost of the spring term of school, and the deal was put on the basis of “value received, paid in advance and in full.” It was so stated and understood by N. B. Hardeman, by me and by my son.

Brother Hardeman now says he “allowed” my son to attend his school. I invite him to submit the expense of the 1938 spring term of school, and I will count up the ads in the Guardian and the Banner, and whoever owes the difference will send the other a check for it—at once. We can quickly ascertain who has allowed what.

4. It is not true that I have been the mere object of N. B. Hardeman’s grace.

In his classes, with various students, visitors in his office, preachers and elders in the churches, Brother Hardeman has attempted to leave the impression, and on everybody he could, that Brother Akin’s philanthropy in my behalf was due altogether to his friendship for Brother Hardeman and Brother Hardeman’s “influence” on him. He has been entirely unethical in his representations to say nothing of his untruthfulness. The fact is that Brother and Sister Akin were steadfast friends of the Wallaces many years before they even knew N. B. Hardeman. ‘My father taught Brother Akin out of the digressive church when they were both young men, and Brother Akin has often expressed to me his undying love and gratitude to my father for this cause. As to my own relations with him they extend back as Ear as my earliest recollections as a preacher, and we have always been con-
dential friends. Some years ago he told me that he wanted to educate some young preachers, and had about decided to send them to Abilene Christian College, unless I knew of a better place and that he would leave the decision to me. I advised Brother Akin to send the boys to N. B. Hardeman at Henderson, Tennessee. This was before ‘Brother Akin had ever met Brother Hardeman, he was not even acquainted with him, and knew little or nothing of his school. It was through my personal influence that J. W. Akin became interested in Freed-Hardeman College, and had I not done what I did then and afterward Freed-Hardeman College would not have had his support, nor N. B. Hardeman a dollar of his money.

I have never taken advantage of Brother Akin’s love and ‘loyalty to angle contributions out of him. But I do recall very vividly the remark that Brother Hardeman made to me more than once, so vividly that I can put it in quotes and notarize it—that “Brother Akin’s all-absorbing desire to go to heaven is the most effective avenue of approach to secure contributions from him.” I was shocked and stunned at what I considered such a coldly calculating analysis of the best way to capitalize on the God-given instincts of a good man’s heart, and I afterward told Brother Hardeman that in his efforts to sell Brother Akin a $200,000.00 ticket to heaven he ‘might stand in grave danger of forfeiting his own.

As for “sinful extravagance”, I do not own a prize winning horse and have never won prizes at horse shows on Sunday. The Memphis Commercial Appeal reportedly featured Brother Hardeman as the winner at a Sunday horse show. For a gospel preacher to own a $25,000.00 horse is, to say the least, “extravagant”, and to win a prize at a horse show on Sunday would be considered by pious members of the church as “sinful.” Yes—he really is the wrong man to talk about “sinful extravagance.”

It is my firm conviction that the trustees of his school knowing some of them as I do, will not approve the course he has pursued. He has reapportioned the institution; he has lost for it the patronage of hundreds and the respect of thousands. Take my old father, for instance, whose influence is still widely felt, and who sent his son, Paul L. Wallace, to Brother Hardeman’s school. Of him Brother Hardeman wrote in this vein to me in a letter several years ago: “Your father spent three or four days with me to my greatest delight. I certainly did enjoy our talks.” At a later date he wrote again: “Your father was over with us for two or three days and I thoroughly enjoyed his presence and the short time spent in talking to him about matters of mutual interest. He is a grand old man and you boys have every right and reason to be proud of
him.” But in recent articles Brother Harde-
man has stooped to slur him, and after what has
occurred the past few months, “the grand old man”
now says that if N. B. Harde-
man came to the
town wh. re he lives to hold a meeting, he would
not walk across the street to hear him preach.
There are thousands of others who feel the same
way about it.

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 ac-
cusing. All during the war I received letters
from him of commendation, praise and appreci-
ation. If he is sincere now, he was hypocritical
then, and his attitude was feigned.

The diplomacy and duplicity of Brother Harde-
man on the war question have already been
exposed. He cannot lay the present situation to any
“change” of ours on that or any other question.
He makes himself ridiculous posing as a consci-
entious objector.

His former students testify against him. L. N.
Moody and Thetus Pritchard, now middle-
aged and respected gospel preachers, state in
writing that in World War I Brother Harde-
man said in chapel that he believed in “shooting every
German that shot at us” and that he could have
“struck the match that lit the fire that burned
the negro” that was mobbed for murder.

“Dear Foy: Several years ago when I was in Freed-
Harde-
man College, I heard Brother N. B. Harde-
man say that he preached the funeral of a man and his wife
that had been slain by a negro, and that negro was mobbed and
burned. He said he could have ‘struck the match that lit
the fire that burned the negro—yes, I believe in capital
punishment.’ Yours truly, Thetus Pritchard.”

Also, I have a copy of a letter written by
Brother Pritchard to Brother Harde-
man, a few
days ago, from which the following quotation is
taken:

“Next, on the civil government and war question, I was
taught by you the same position that Foy Wallace now
holds. If you have changed your belief on these questions
why not just say that I do not believe the position that
I wed to hold.”

Thus a former student writes his former teach-
er. Now, in addition to that read N. B. Harde-
man’s own words from page 142 of his book of sermons, volume four:

“If the Italian ships were to land on our eastern shores
and want to plant their flag on the soil of our country,
premillennialists cannot fight them. Therefore, I am charg-
ing tonight that all premillennialists have become traitors
to the government of the United States. Friends, let me
ask you in all candor, do you subscribe to a doctrine of
that kind.”

A pretty poser as a conscientious objector he is!
And he has the “gall” to say and repeat to the
readers of the papers that his refusal to
take a stand on the war issue was the beginning
of all of this! Brother Harde-
man has demonstr-
ated that he is utterly unreliable and no de-
pendence can be put in anything he says.

He hoped the feeling on the war question would
be high enough to capitalize on it and ride out on

the prejudice, but the reaction is not what he
wanted. First, there are too many Christian
parents, whose Christian sons served in the de-

fense of this nation. They have not felt to see
Brother Harde-
man as he is in this matter, an
unenviable position, indeed, he holds. Second, his
school is full of “G. I.’s.” Some of them are al-
ready ‘commenting on Brother Harde-
man’s po-
sition in this matter—they have no confidence in it.
Third, his chief difficulty in posing as a con-
scientious objector is himself—he knows he is
not one. His own views so long repressed and
suppressed have ‘blocked him in his run for ref-
uge to the arms of the conscientious objectors in
Nashville who oppose participation in civil
government. Brother Harde-
man is not even comfort-
able in his company. He is in a sorry mess be-
fore the eyes of many intelligent men of business
and industry who are the back ‘bone of both the
church and civil society in their communities.
They are surely ashamed of him, and I verily be-

lieve that in his heart he is ashamed of himself.

III. “THE MEETING NEVER HELD”

The closing paragraph of his article refers to a
“separate” letter from “two” friends who pro-
posed a meeting to discuss “estrangement,” and
he feels absolved from all “responsibility” in the
matter.

As I was not consulted before such a proposal
went to him it was without my knowledge or con-
sent, and I am not “responsible.” But I do know
what Brother Harde-
man said when E. R. Har-
per allowed the president of Harding College to
draw him into such a meeting. I quote from his
letter to me, dated April 3, 1940:

“I read the recent Banner last night. I think you were
perfectly in order in publishing further articles from Har-
pers. It puts him on the spot and I see nothing for him to
do except to write a brief article admitting the egregious
blunder and the serious mistake he made. I believe him to
be perfectly honest and sincere and that he verily thought
he was doing the right thing, but you have stated it right
when you said they ‘out-generated’ him in the conference.”

That is what N. B. Harde-
man thought when the
president of Harding College stripped E. R.
Harper in a conference, and now the president of
Freed-Harde-
man College wants to call one to
“out-general” me and side-track the issue!

A few years ago I received the following tele-
gram from someone, sent from Lubbock, Texas:
“YOUR FRIEND IS PLANNING TO GET YOU
INTO A MEETING. THE INVITATION IS
SLATED TO COME VIA NASHVILLE. THE
CARDS ARE STACKED AGAINST YOU.
WATCH YOUR STEP.—GUY.”

That was another meeting somebody was man-
uevering to get me into. It is evident that the
Lubbock “friend” was C. C. Brewer. I have never heard who “Guy” was, but he was someone who
wanted to warn me that the “car-
da” were “stacked.” They usually are in such meetings. So some-
body else can join with Brother Harde-
man in lamenting the “failure”* of a conference to ma-

---
terialize and claim that he is not “responsible.” Brother Hardeman had “broken relations” with A. G. Freed, abused him for years, and then attempted to “out-general” him in a conference. Exactly what N. B. Hardtman with all his might once tried to do to Freed and Calhoun, he is trying to do now. For fifteen years different ones sought to make the issue personal, and force me into arbitrations, but these issues have nothing to do with personal estrangement. I have nothing to compromise across a conference table. If he calls one I will just go on with my preaching and let him hold it in his high office at Henderson without me. I can thereby avoid the “egregious blunder” and “serious mistake” that he said E. R. Harper made when he let the other college president pull him into a meeting. Whether they be premillennial sympathizers, unity meeting compromisers, Clinton Davidson assassinators, or the institutional promoters of the present controversy with all of their personalities, there are no compromises to make.

acted on the judgment of my best friends as well as my own heart in staying out of their conferences, and shall continue to do so.

IV. “NO NEW ARGUMENT”

In a final word he refers to the “issue” but avers that he has seen nothing in the way of an argument to convince him that a church cannot contribute to a college.

Of course, he has not “seen” it, because he is looking the other way. But again he has the procedure reversed. It is his duty to show us the scriptural precept or principle to prove that the church can scripturally do so. As the matter stands their arguments (?) have all been repeatedly answered.

(1) They argued that the church is but a collection of individuals and can therefore do congenationally anything that can be done individually. But that is all a missionary society is— a group of individuals, so the church can contribute to it. And if a group of Christian individuals compose a life insurance company, according to that sort of reasoning the church can contribute to a Life Insurance Company!

(2) It has been argued that the whole matter should be left for the elders of each church to decide. That is exactly what the digressives have always argued on the questions of the societies and instrumental music in the worship. But a point of New Testament teaching on the worship or work of the church cannot be decided by men, whether they be elders or not elders. That type of reasoning lowers the guards against all innovation and opens the gate to every promotion to which the church may become the prey.

(3) It has been argued that it is scriptural for the church to make a contribution to the college but unscriptural to put the college in the budget. But when they show the scripture for one, they will have shown the scripture for both. Anybody knows that what a church may scripturally do once it can scripturally keep on doing.

(4) They have called for a “list of things forbidden” and have thereby surrendered the whole ground of opposition to the innovations of the digressives.

(5) As a matter of policy they have announced that they will not “solicit” contributions from the churches, but if it is wrong for the church to make contributions to colleges, it is wrong for the colleges to accept the contributions from the churches. Such policy is an evasion and shows a lack of conviction on the subject.

V. “THE BEGINNING OF WHAT HAS RESULTED”

First: A late development which has a decided bearing on the present situation is the statement drafted some months ago by N. B. Hardeman as a basis for the settlement of the “Boll trouble.” Brother Hardeman was proposing that the presidents of the colleges, editors of the papers and a few prominent brethren sign this statement for the brotherhood in general. The statement was sent to R. L. Whiteside by Brother Hardeman himself with a request, or a “feeler,” to ascertain if Brother Whiteside would sign it. Brother Whiteside not only rejected the statement itself, but his remarks about the purpose of it and the plan suggested caused Brother Hardeman to write him again “backing up” and hedging about, Hardeman fashion. His sphere was about to expand. He had volunteered to state the “policy” of the whole “Church of Christ” on the “war question” to a draft board, and now he was about to draft a document for editors and college presidents to sign for the brotherhood! Brother Whiteside and a few other brethren killed the statement and stopped the attempted “settlement” dead in its tracks.

But here is a statement in the first paragraph of the Hardeman document suggested as a “basis”-written by N. B. Hardeman himself, and sent to R. L. Whiteside with an accompanying letter bearing his signature:

“Every one has a right to his own opinion, but he has no right to propagate it or urge it upon others. ‘Math thou faith (opinion) ? Have it to thyself alone before God.’ Rom. 14:22.”

The statement starts with an untrue assertion, namely, that everyone has “the right to his own opinion”—a denominational error that any young preacher among us ought to know better than to repeat. And, what right did Brother Hardeman have to put the word “opinion” in parenthesis after the word “faith” in Rom. 14:22? He makes it read, “If thou has faith (opinion) have it to thyself before God.” Well, take a look at the next verse, and see what it does to it. “And whatsoever is not of faith is
sin.” The two verses are connected, and if “faith” in verse 22 means opinion also, and Brother Hardeman makes Paul say, “And whatsoever is not of opinion is sin!” Now that is a great “statement” to be used as a basis for a “settlement” of the Boll question! If that represents his “best to teach” the young preachers “about 200 in number” for the sake of “the truth on all matters” they had better go to school somewhere else.

Second: The Davidson letters published in the Bible Banner, which N. B. Hardeman sent to me but afterward told Leon B. McQuiddy that he did not know how I obtained them, has had something to do with “what has resulted since.” The letter that Brother Hardeman wrote Brother McQuiddy about that matter was handwritten, and the purported typewritten copy that has been handed around is not it. The original letter, written in Brother Hardeman’s hand, intimated that someone had sent the letters to me from his office, without his knowledge or consent. But Brother Hardeman sent them to me, enclosed in a letter hearing his signature. Though Brother McQuiddy had Brother Hardeman’s letter to him before him when he showed it to me, he still did not know how I obtained the Davidson letters until I showed him Brother Hardeman’s letter to me! But Brother McQuiddy placed the subscription list of the Gospel Advocate at the disposal of Norman Davidson for the circulation of that falsehood in Davidson’s letter to the brotherhood, charging that I had obtained his letters fraudulently, through Brother McQuiddy knows now and knew then exactly how I received them-direct from N. B. Hardeman himself, in person. It now becomes the duty of Brother McQuiddy, according to all honor and ethics, to make public the Hardeman letter to him, the original handwritten letter, alongside with the Hardeman letter to me, and let the brethren see them both-side by side. I saw it; others saw it; and I have already by competent and credible witnesses verified its contents.

These developments have much to do with things that have “resulted” recently. It reveals an “unstable” attitude on the part of Brother Hardeman on various things. It explains why he has never taken the lead in exposing the errors of Bollism and Davidisonism and did not come out on premillennialism until the issue was decided, and then said that he could write his position on a ‘postcard.” It indicates rather clearly that he did not have serious convictions in the beginning of the matter, and would yet settle it on the basis of an opinion that would not hurt anybody to believe provided he does not agitate it. But if premillennialism denies the gospel, which it does, nobody can believe it without denying the gospel, and it is therefore not an “opinion” which any one has a “right” to hold, whether urged or not, propagated or not propagated.

Brother Hardeman has “closed” his part of the discussion two or three different times since it started. If he is now satisfied to let his “part” of it stay closed, very well—we have stated the facts in reference to all the personalities.

This controversy has brought to light a new threat to the church of Christ—the threat of subsidizing the church to human institutions and private enterprises. We are in a fight “against spiritual wickedness in high places,” the forces of which are being mustered and marshalled in the schools. It calls for the unified and determined opposition of elders and preachers everywhere who believe that the divine institution of the church should be kept free of human authority and organization. On this issue they have not “passed” and personalities or no personalities—they shall not pass!
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