JEHOVAH-NISSI

The place where Abraham obeyed the divine command to offer his son upon the altar was called Jehovah-jireh—"the Lord will provide." At the scene of his call to deliver Israel from the hands of Midian Gideon raised an altar and called the place Jehovah-shalom—"the Lord send peace." The Lord provides for those who obey his will and sends peace to his people, but through conflict, not compromise. It was by the "sword of the Lord" that Gideon drove the Midianites out of the land. New invasions are being made by numerous innovators today. It is not the time to dispense with the sword and dismantle the armour.

When Amalek fought against Israel Moses stood on the mount of battle with "the rod of God" in his hand and "discomfited" the foe, and he called that place Jehovah-nissi, which meant "the Lord is my banner." God is our banner now and the "rod of God" is in our hand—his all-prevailing word. "Thou hast given a banner to them that fear thee that it may be displayed because of truth"—"Lift ye up a banner upon the mountain, exalt the voice unto them." It is in the spirit of these sublime sentiments that this paper is published in this day of need.

In the decade of publication behind us It has been our aim to wage war on error, not on men. It is only when forced on the defensive that we have had to fight men. We have never sought nor desired such a fight, but when it means fight or run, we prefer to fight, because it is right—and we believe we are right. We are "set for the defense of the gospel" and want to keep to the issues, but when occasions require it and the circumstances necessitate it, we 'shall take time out to defend ourselves in all righteousness.

Ten years the Bible Banner has been published without organization or 'company to back it. It has existed by the power of truth alone, supported by friends of the truth. It has no capital, no endowment, no resources, but is simply printed and paid for from month to month. The preachers who stand with us can help us by sending us lists of subscribers, and the readers in every place can help us by sending prompt renewals and mentioning it to others.

It has been conceded by the strongest preachers and ablest elders in the church that the influence of the Bible Banner during the past decade has been of inestimable worth to the cause of truth. Important issues are before us now; they are not imaginary; they are real. Let us awake from lethargy, gird our loins with truth, and arm ourselves for battle.

Faithfully and fervently yours,

FOY E. WALLACE JR.
THE ISSUE-THEN AND NOW

As a matter of record and a reminder of the facts in the case request is here made for all to refer to the May and July issues of the Bible Banner, in which will be found editorials of my own dealing with the church-supported college question. These editorials discussed the issue, injecting nothing unrelated to the issue. But the ire of certain brethren was aroused, precipitating the onslaught of personalities, and a veritable barrage of character assault was laid down against us. We have replies. We stand by the replies. We have stated the facts and told the truth about all matters related. From these positions we shall not recede, and not one point at issue shall we surrender.

It is now proper and appropriate, in order to further clarify matters, that articles which appeared several years ago in the Gospel Advocate and in the Bible Banner be reprinted in these columns. They not only bear directly on the church-college issue now, but they hold the evidence that the present controversy is but a repetition and renewal of the campaigns that the colleges have made at intervals through the years. We made the fight against the church-supported college in 1938 in Texas. The colleges retreated from the issue then. When their campaign was renewed in 1947, we again took up the fight against their aggression and everybody knows what has happened.

I submit now a reprint of the editorial section of the BIBLE BANNER published September 1938, that all may see that the issue now was the issue then and that we stood then exactly where we stand now. Furthermore the editorials reprinted from the 'Gospel Advocate, written while I was its editor, prove that in those years between 1930 and 1934 the issue then was exactly what it is now, and that I stood editorially then where I stand editorially now. In proof of this the following reprints are submitted:

CONCERNING COLLEGES

In the current controversy among the brethren over the sphere of the school, the college and the church, certain colleges are themselves the aggressors. The controversy will be just as easily stopped as it was started—just let the schools abandon their departures, discontinue their objectionable practices, reform their worldliness, cease to infringe on the divine principle of the independence of the church from all human institutions, and quit imposing on congregations, and all will be well. In short, let the college stay in its place, and let the church alone.

For an example of the aggression mentioned, one of the leaders of the campaign to put the college in the budget of the churches closed an article with the statement that if it is not right to put the college in the budget, then he would join Daniel Sommer and be done with it. In other words, he will have it this way or no way! It is that “this way or no way” spirit that has always driven the wedges, forcing issues upon the brethren, then blaming those in honest opposition to their schemes for resultant dissensions. It was so in the digressive movement that split the church. It has been so in the “Boll movement” which says “we will have our theories.” It is now so in the present controversy with the colleges whose leader and mouthpiece says “we will have the budget or nothing.” In that case the brethren should see to it that it will be nothing—from the churches. With this announced attitude the colleges can blame no one but themselves for the growing opposition to them or for any division or alienation that may arise over the discussions.

We are charged with having attacked the colleges, with being anti-college, and withal of an attempt to destroy these institutions. But to the contrary this editor himself attended one in early life, has for several years had his children...
in them at intervals, and if when his younger children grow up there is yet one of the colleges true to the principles we believe he will likely continue his patronage.

Nobody engaged in the present controversy is fighting the college. Neither THE BIBLE BANNER nor its editor is. The Firm Foundation and its editor are not. We are simply opposed to the extremes to which the colleges in question have gone, to their worldliness, to their tendency toward ecclesiastical control, to their doctrinal weakness, and to their general departures. We are not alone in this. Some of the trustees of these institutions admit the things that have been charged, recognize the conditions as they exist and have expressed themselves as desiring to perform the needed reforms. If all those in the high places were of the same mind, and others upon whom they have apparently depended for leadership, were of the same disposition, the institutions could speedily win back the individual confidence and support of that great host of brethren who are now set against their practices.

Since it has been charged that the present writer is creating an issue and misconceptions on this question are of recent origin, it will not be considered amiss, perhaps, to reproduce some editorials which appeared in the Gospel Advocate several years ago while the editor of the BIBLE BANNER was then editor of the Gospel Advocate. That all may know that no change in positions has been made, and in refutation of such charges as are going around that "thou art mad" and "thou art (beside thyself)," and to show that the attitude held now toward the colleges is precisely the same as the attitude held then, the following editorials are resubmitted.

THE CHURCH AND THE SCHOOL

The subjects of man and education are very intimately related, if not inseparably connected. The interrogation of David, "What is man?" has become the question of the ages and the problem of the sages. But David did not leave it for the 'worldly-wise philosopher, by his own rationalization, to determine; for he answers: "Know ye that Jehovah, he is God: it is he that hath made us, and we are his." Man is not the creature of chance or evolution. Made in the image of God, he possesses reason, affection, and conscience. Lifted above the creature of automatic instinct, he is more than a creature; he is a child of God. What, then, should his education be? And here, alongside the question "What is man?" is presented another of but little less importance - What is education? The word signifies complete development. It does not consist merely in the art of learning to read and write or to cipher. It is not the acquisition of languages, living or dead. It involves the development of the whole being-body, mind, and soul.

This view of man and his education leads to the subject of the "Bible colleges"—their place and work in the field of education. If education consists merely in the training of the intellect, we need have no concern for the establishment and maintenance of such colleges. It is the keenly felt need of heart training that has brought the "Bible college" into existence. Education has its degrees; and, grammatically speaking, physical culture is the positive degree, intellectual culture is the comparative degree and moral culture is the superlative degree. Hence the demand for schools that will give emphasis to the moral above every other line of human development. The Bible being the greatest textbook of morals in the universe, it is but a matter of simple reason that it should be prescribed in the course of study by a school seeking to reach the heart, as well as the mind. Because the Bible has thus been adopted by such schools, they have been denominated "Bible colleges," while in fact, every other branch of learning found in all colleges of arts and sciences is also taught.

But the name "Bible college" has caused so much confusion in the minds of so many that it becomes necessary to discuss the relation of the school and the church. Let us compare the work of the church with the work of the school in seeking to obtain the correct answer to the question involved. The Bible teaches that the work of the church is twofold. First, missionary, pertaining to the spread of the gospel—the salvation of souls. Hence, the church is called "the pillar and ground of the truth." Second, benevolent, pertaining to the care of the poor, orphan, or aged. This is referred to as "pure religion." The Bible further teaches that the church is all-sufficient to carry out this divine mission without the aid of human machinery. Any organization larger or smaller than the local congregation is an unscriptural organization through which to do the work of the church, and takes away from it the praise and glory. Therefore, we condemn the missionary society as an auxiliary to the 'church, a human machine seeking to do the work that God has commanded his church to do. We pronounce it, without further argument here, unscriptural.

What, then, is the 'Bible college?' It is an auxiliary indeed, but not to the church. Let us observe in this connection the mission of the home and the duty of parents toward their children. Solomon said: "Train up a child in the way he should go." Paul said: "Bring them up in the nurture and admonition of the Lord." This is the solemn obligation of the parent and the sacred mission of the home. But when the child reaches a certain 'school age, when it must pass from the home into the school, does the respon-
sibility of the parent cease? Is it not still the serious duty of the parent to select the school where the influence of the home is continued? In this matter, then, the school simply takes the place of the home and the teacher assumes the responsibility of the parent. So the "Bible college," or the "Christian college," or whatever you may please to call it, is no more than auxiliary to the home. It supplements the work of the home. Some who have not made proper discrimination have wrought confusion by associating the "Bible college" with the work of the church. Others have, therefore opposed it on the ground that it is a "church school," while others think it is wrong and sinful to teach the Bible in school. Such a conclusion should drive the Bible from our homes also and force the conclusion that it can be taught only in the meetinghouse on Sunday!

These principles are fundamental. Let us draw the lines clearly. We have pointed out the central thought of the subject—namely, the school as an auxiliary of the home. This being true, it is not the business of the church to run it. The church is not in the school business. The only way the church can Scripturally do its work is through the elders of the local congregation. Appeals made to churches, therefore, in behalf of schools are wrong—fundamentally wrong in principle. Let the school stand where it belongs, apart from the church, as an aid to, and adjunct of, the home. Let parents and individuals realize their duty and feel their responsibility in the support and maintenance of them, thus making it possible for our children and our neighbors' children to have the training and influence they so much need and deserve.—(In the Gospel Advocate, 1931)

The foregoing editorial did not create any stir, nobody accused the writer of being angry, but the articles were read apparently with considerable interest, judging from a volume of letters that were received at the time. Some of them were in approval, others in wholesome, not partisan, criticism.

A second editorial appeared shortly afterward in answer to some questions elicited from the first article. As further bearing on the purposes above stated it is also reproduced.

THE HOME AND THE SCHOOL
The following from W. H. Thorp, Middletown, Ky., touches some vital principles. It manifests sincerity and the questions indicate thought. We are glad to insert the criticisms with further remarks on the subject.

In an editorial in the Gospel Advocate of June 4, 1931, on the subject, "Man and Education," I find some statements and reasoning that seem to me not to be above criticism.

You say that the Bible teaches that the work of the church is twofold—first, missionary; second, benevolent; would it not be more exact to say that it is threefold—missionary, benevolent, and educational? The work of the missionary is primarily the making of disciples, which requires only such teaching as makes known the terms of discipleship; but "Teaching them to observe all things whatsoever I have commanded you" is a service of the church which requires Christian instruction through the years.

Now, it seems to me that the Bible college is auxiliary to the church in this very work of Christian education, since the Bible is the central subject to which all others are subordinate and auxiliary.

But, granted for argument's sake that the Christian college is an adjunct to the home instead of the church, is it not then auxiliary to a divine institution? The church and the home are both divine institutions, and your plea is that such institutions need no auxiliaries, but are complete in themselves for the work for which they were organized.

If, then, it is permissible to have a Bible college as an adjunct to the church in the work of education and an orphans' home in the work of benevolence, why not a missionary society in the work of evangelization?

It seems to me the same principle which allows the one will allow all.

The foregoing represents a common failure to make proper discrimination. Innovation in church work and worship has often found impetus in the erroneous idea that whatever is proper in the home is permissible in the church. On that fallacy some have sought to justify the use of instrumental music in the church. When Paul heard that the Corinthians had turned the Lord's supper into a church dinner, he scathingly asked: "What? have ye not houses to eat and drink in?" What would have been entirely proper in home life was not at all permissible in the church. The same principle will apply to the work of the church as well as its worship.

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

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

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

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

But individuals have certain rights and privileges. Individuals may publish papers or establish schools. They do not have to bar the Bible and religion from such in order to have the right to operate them. But such endeavors thus conducted are private enterprises, and the individuals conducting them have no right to 'adjunct' their own enterprises to the church.

If it were "permissible to have a Bible college as an adjunct to the church in the work of education and an orphans' home in the work of benevolence," we quite agree that it would also be "permissible" to have the "missionary society in the work of evangelization." But the question assumes the point to be proved. Nothing is "permissible" as an auxiliary of the church which is not Scriptural. And it is not Scriptural for the church to delegate its work, either missionary or benevolent to boards and organizations other than the church. Bible colleges and institutional orphans' homes cannot be made adjuncts of the church, Scripturally. The only way the church could Scripturally run a school or a home would be for the local church to undertake such work through its local organization—elders and deacons—in which case it would be the work of that congregation.

Institutionalism has been a menace to congregational independence as taught in the New Testament. It has wrought havoc in the church in the past and growing tendencies present hazards for the future. The writer has never at any time, in capacity of editor of THE BIBLE BANNER, or any other capacity, said anything more direct on the subject than the above statement. It precipitated no fight then, brought no accusations, and the writer was not charged with attacking the colleges. Why should such be done now? There must be a reason.

In response to still further inquiries and requests a third article on the same subject appeared almost in successive issues of the paper, and it is also reinserted here as proof upon proof that the position maintained by THE BIBLE BANNER now is not a late creation of an issue by the editor. We ask of the reader this further indulgence.

A DISTINCTION WITH A SCRIPTURAL DIFFERENCE

The letter inserted below is from a man who is true to the word of God, who is interested in every good work, but concerned about a certain tendency in the church to drift from New Testament principles:

Have re-read your editorial in the gospel Advocate of July 2, and received new encouragement in my feeble efforts as well as an increase of interest in the Advocate.

Now, may I ask you to go a little further with the subject under consideration, as there are a few points I am unable to clearly settle?

Since Bible colleges and institutional homes for orphans are not adjuncts of the church and since the church holds funds in its treasury contributed as a part of its religious duty as a church, can the local congregation spend such funds to build up the educational and benevolent institutions? Is there a distinction with a Scriptural difference in contributing money to these institutions and contributing money to the support of an orphan? Can a church not pay the hospital bill of one of its members in an institution of which it dare not become a stockholder or contributor to its building program? Is it not also true that a worthy boy or girl may be educated in our "Bible colleges," and yet wrong to use treasury funds of the church to aid in buildings?

1. The Mission of the School. It has been previously set forth that the school is auxiliary to
the home, not the church. It is not the duty of the church to teach sciences, mattematics, history, economics, athletics, etc. Individuals may establish such schools and by the same right teach the Bible along with other courses. Wise parents choose schools that furnish such teaching that the religious influence of the home may not be counteracted, but continued. But such schools being on a par with other secular and individual enterprises, such as religious papers and publishing houses, it is not the mission of the church to maintain them. There is certainly "a distinction with a Scriptural difference" between the mission of the home and the mission of the church, though they may touch at certain points affecting right teaching and Christian living.

Since to establish and maintain such schools is not the mission of the church (such schools not belonging to the church, and therefore not "church schools"), the church should not be called upon to support them nor church funds diverted to maintain them any more than religious publishing houses and numerous other things an individual may have a perfect right to do.

Another letter, from my long-time friend and colaborer in the gospel, Austin Taylor, of Texas, makes the proper distinction:

It is plain enough to see that the church is to support the truth-the teaching of the gospel of Christ. But if the church is to support the teaching of athletics, mathematics, geography, etc. I would certainly like to know it. I am sure schools do not always make enough money to satisfy those who are running them; neither do papers receive enough money to satisfy the publishers. I have worked for months on songbooks that did not pay me anything. Should I call on the church to continue financially the work which I am doing in such work? I believe the work of the church is one thing and the Christian's life in dealing with individual affairs is another thing. There are many good things people may do as Christians that the church is not instructed to engage in.

If the foregoing statement does not represent sound reasoning, I am ready to admit confusion on the point.

2. The Mission of the Church. It has also been previously set forth that the mission of the church is twofold-missionary and benevolent. Any organization that supplants the church, takes over its functions, and as an organization does what the church is commanded to do, is in violation of a plain New Testament principle. Such organizations cannot be defended on the ground of system or method. The missionary society is not a method. It is an institution with its own working units and organization, and uses methods, or system. It usurps the functions of the church, taking the oversight of the work and the management of the funds out of the hands of the elders and deacons of the church and placing them in an entirely different organization.

The missionary society, therefore, supplants the church in that phase of the work the church is commanded to do.

But the church as such is also commanded to do benevolent work. It is, therefore, on a par with missionary work, and for the same reason the church cannot Scripturally transfer the work of benevolence to any agency or institution that takes the work out of the hands of the elders and deacons of the church-the local church. Such organizations would supplant the church in benevolent work exactly as the society does in mission work.

This does not mean that a church cannot provide homes for the orphans and aged. The Charlotte Avenue Church, in Nashville, has several cottages built on their own property and is providing for several fatherless families, keeping each home intact, and it is all being done by the church through the divine arrangements of elders and deacons. Other churches can do the same. And if the burden of one church is too heavy, other churches can relieve the burdens of that church (Acts 6:1-7, 9, 30); for anything that one church has a right to do, another church has the right to help it do, provided that in so doing the elders of one church do not become agents for all the churches in certain undertakings that extend beyond the limits of the local church.

3. Helping Those in Need. The command to "do good unto all men, especially unto them who are of the household of faith." (Gal. 6:10), makes it the duty of the church to help those in need. If a family is in need, the church may surely pay the grocery bill, without going into the 'grocery business. If a poor man's rent is due and his family must have shelter, for the church to pay his rent would not put the church in the tenement business. Likewise, if a poor person is sick, the church may surely pay the doctor or the hospital. On the same principle the church may help some worthy young preacher go to school without going into the school business.

In each instance the church is in direct contact with the individual and the thing being done. It is the church helping the one in need—the very thing commanded. Nothing comes between the church and the thing done.

Individuals may become interested in certain worthy enterprises, such as publishing religious papers and running schools, and if they have the wherewith to engage in such, or can legitimately get it, well and good, but they have no right to start anything and make it the charge of the church.

May Christians learn the divine mission of the church and realize the error of devising human agencies to supplant the church in fulfilling that mission. "Unto him be glory in the church
by Christ Jesus throughout all ages." (Eph. 3: 21.)—(In the Gospel Advocate 1931)

These articles written in 1931, brought apparently no rise from the heads of the same colleges that are taking such great exceptions to the same criticisms now. Indeed, so sensitive now to criticisms have they become that two college presidents wrote demanding letters to me because of certain things they had heard were said in some public address. A correspondence followed. In order to counteract so much misrepresentation, and that others might see for themselves what was said, it was necessary to mimeograph the correspondence for general circulation. And now because the letters from these college presidents were answered with proof documentary of statements challenged, the presidents retreat and their partisan followers begin to cry persecution and charge that we have attacked the colleges. But ours was the defensive; theirs the offensive. These colleges are themselves the aggressors in the controversy. Their aggression must be repulsed, for if their present extremes are tolerated further more serious extremes will surely follow, as was so ably pointed out by the veteran W. W. Otey in the Firm Foundation of recent date, in an article all lovers of truth should read and appreciate.

Who are the enemies of the college, and who are its friends? Some of us believe that we who oppose their errors and seek to correct their evils are the real friends of the schools. We are not their enemies. The real enemies of the college are those who so loudly profess to be the friends of it. By their very efforts to affiliate church and school by the budget system, and other objectional things, they are driving way the patronage of many brethren whose influence and support they need; and thereby they become the school's enemies; On the other hand, if the colleges would listen to reason and sincerely right their wrongs they would receive the unanimous support of those individuals among the brethren who are interested in the causes espoused by the colleges. It is a case therefore of the friends of the colleges becoming their enemies, for as surely as these departures continue there will be a steady, determined and unrelenting opposition and if the torch falls from the hand of one, it will never hit the ground, for the hand of another will bear it upward and forward. So help us God, Amen.

Now that is the record. It yields the facts. It tells the truth. It denies the charges that have been recently made in all of their falsity. On this we stand.

But I want to repeat with emphasis, brethren, that we are in a fight "against spiritual wickedness in high places!" It is no longer a tendency, a trend, or a threat. It is here. The church is being made a mere subsidy of men's organizations. We are fighting organized efforts to subsidize the churches of Christ to human institutions and private enterprises, and to keep it free of institutional domination. A few of us alone cannot continue to win this fight. It has been won again, but only for a time. Before 1958, if history is repeated, it will come again. It calls for the unified and consistent opposition of all faithful elders in the churches as well as preachers of the gospel, and now and all the time, in order that members of the church may know the issues and be ready to stand against this spiritual wickedness in the high places whenever and wherever it appears.

The source of "Christian Education" is not the college—it is the church. The edification of Christians is Christian education. The churches are engaged in Christian education in Bible classes on Lord's Day and through the week, in prayer and study meetings, in gospel meetings, wherever the gospel is preached and whenever the Bible is taught. Christian teachers in various schools and colleges are merely (or should be) exercising their rights and prerogatives as individuals to teach the Bible in the schools they are conducting. But when these colleges are turned into seminaries, schools of theology, and become the organized agencies of the church for its work of "Christian education," they do not differ from a missionary society either in principle or in practice. In so doing the very purpose of such schools is perverted, and they forfeit the right of even the individual support of those who believe that the work of the church belongs to the church and cannot be delegated to boards or done through human institutions.

There is need for some teaching on what "Christian education" is and in what it consists. We expect to deal with these vital principles. We are not even about to surrender these issues.
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REQUESTED REVELATIONS ON THE COLLEGE QUESTION

JAMES W. ADAMS

Two articles have appeared in this journal from the pen of this scribe on the "college question." One of these articles produced some unfavorable reactions along with an abundance of favorable ones. The charge of misrepresentation has been made and corrections requested. Inasmuch as it is not the purpose of this writer nor of the Bible Banner to misrepresent any man's position on any question, it has become imperative that these matters be dealt with at length. Your scribe and the Bible Banner stand ready at all times to correct any statement which they have made that is not in harmony with facts whenever proof is submitted that such a statement has been made.

QUESTIONED STATEMENT NO. 1

In the June issue of the Bible Banner, this writer made the following statement in an article entitled "The Voice Of Jacob But The Hands Of Esau:" If it is not the policy of A.C.C. to solicit churches nor seek a place in the budget, why is it commonly reported that Brother W. R. Smith, vice-president of A.C.C., advocated such from the pulpit of Southside church in Forth Worth some weeks past.

Brother Smith's Reaction. Soon after the appearance of this statement, a letter came from Brother Smith containing among other things the following information:

"Your informant was inaccurate in that I have not visited the Southside congregation within the 'some weeks past' as stated in your article. He is also in error as to my advocating from the pulpit there that Abilene Christian College should be placed in church budgets. It may be of interest to you to know that I have never advocated this "manner of support for Abilene Christian College in Fort Worth or elsewhere, either publicly or privately."

The Basis of my Statement Relative to Brother Smith and Southside. I was informed by several reliable preachers in the Fort Worth area prior to the writing and publication of my article in the Bible Banner that, Brother Robert C. Jones, preacher for the Southside church, had a short while before made a public or semi-public statement to the effect that "while he was in the North in some mission work, W. R. Smith preached in his place at Southside, and that at the very hour in which he stood in a pulpit in the North seeking to prove to the Sommerlices present that 'our colleges' in the South are not supported by the church, W. R. Smith was in the pulpit at Southside trying to get them to do so."

When Brother Smith's letter came to me, I did not know what to think, so I got in my car and drove to Fort Worth. Robert C. Jones was out of the city, so I contacted several reliable preachers of the city and asked them if they had ever heard Jones make a statement concerning W. R. Smith and his preaching a college sermon at Southside. One of the leading preachers of Fort Worth answered by quoting almost verbatim the statement of Jones which had come to me from other sources. Others corroborated the statement. I knew then that Brother Jones had indeed made the statement which was the basis of the "common report" of my article.

I came home and wrote Brother Jones in the Northwest where he was holding meetings. In the letter I called his attention to the statement he had made concerning Smith and asked for particulars. He was long in answering, so I drove to Fort Worth again. I found him at home, and in the presence of a mutual friend and reputable preacher, talked with him concerning the matter. He verified his statement and affirmed that it had happened just as the statement indicates. He did qualify his statement, however, by saying that he did not think that Brother Smith used the term budget or in so many words asked that the college be placed therein. Too, it had been longer than my "some weeks past" indicated. Brother Jones did say, however, that he had read my article in the Bible Banner and had not considered it a misrepresentation. He then told me the particulars of Smith's visit to Southside and that it was his judgment that Bro. Smith's speech under the circumstances was a solicitation for church support of the college. Before preparing this article I wrote Brother Jones and asked for the particulars in writing. His letter to me, which is not
so complete or strong as his personal statements to me, follows:

"Two or three years ago, while I was doing mission work in the Northeast, Brother W. R. Smith preached at the Southside church in Fort Worth, Texas. According to several members of the church, Brother Smith made a typical college speech on Sunday, morning and some individuals made contributions to the school at that time."

"Several members of the church complained of the speech to me upon my return, their criticism was not of the speech itself but they thought that the speech was made at the wrong place and the wrong time. I immediately prepared and preached some sermons on the relationship of the church to the college and other human institutions. I did this because we were afraid some would think the college should be supported by the church."

"On the Sunday Brother Smith made this school speech at Southside, I was in the Northeast trying to convince some Sommerites that our colleges were not church, or church supported institutions."

Letter from the southside elders. While I waited for an answer to my first letter to Brother Jones, I had another letter from W. R. Smith containing a photostatic copy of a letter addressed to him and signed by the elders of the Southside church in Fort Worth. The letter follows:

"Dear Brother Smith:

"We commend you in correcting the charges which were made concerning you and the Southside church in the June issue of the Bible Banner. The things said in this article were as much a reflection upon the Southside church and its leaders as against you."

"We herewith approve and confirm in every detail the statements in your letter to the author correcting his representations of your visit with this congregation in Fort Worth.

"Your last visit with the Southside church was September 30, 1945. You did not on this or any other date advocate from the pulpit or privately in the presence of the elders, placing Abilene Christian College in the budget of the Bible Banner. Had you done this our disapproval would have been registered with you at once and in no uncertain language. If reports have been circulated that you did this, we say here and now they are without any truthful basis. We believe, in fairness to you, the Southside church and the Bible Banner, that a correction and an apology should be made by the author of this article and published in the Banner. We shall hope and pray that he will do this."

Fraternally yours, Elders of the Southside church, Fort Worth, Texas

Signed By: Wm. A. Pearson, Freeman Lacy, H. C. Sanders.

You may well imagine my surprise on receiving this letter in view of the statement of the preacher of Southside church, Robert C. Jones, concerning Smith's visit there. The letter has a very pious tone and unquestionably burns with the righteous indignation of offended dignity. Note especially the militant opposition against church support of the college and the grave concern for the continued good reputation of the Bible Banner. The letter would be all right too, if it were all one knew about these men and this church in their relationship to the support of the college by the church. It so happens that your scribe has access to other information. Due consideration will be given this letter later in the article.

Discussion With Don Morris and W. R. Smith. In August, I prepared an article for the Bible Banner concerning this matter and wrote Brother Smith that I would publish it. I then felt that Brother Smith was trying to hide, as some others are doing, behind a limited meaning of the term "budget." I firmly believed, at that time, that Brother Smith 'believed in and had solicited church support for the college. Before the publication of the article, however, while I was in a meeting at Merkel near Abilene, Brother Don Morris, President of A.C. C., called me by telephone and asked if I would meet and confer with him and Brother Smith. I accepted on the condition that Brother Roy L. Hooten who was leading the singing at Merkel be permitted to sit in on the discussion. In this discussion, Brother Smith very plainly and 'strongly affirmed that he did not believe in or advocate church support for the college, and that he had never intentionally implied that he desired it. I asked permission to quote him to this effect and it was granted. Having had this understanding with Brother Smith, I decided to withhold the article which I had prepared and to write another (this one). Before writing this article, I wrote Brother Smith as follows:

"I am now ready to write an article in the Bible Banner in which I deal with the matter about which we have corresponded and talked. I want to set matters before the brethren in as clear a manner as possible and be fair with all concerned as it is possible for me to be.

"In our conversation at Abilene, you made a very plain statement concerning your personal attitude toward the support of the college from the church treasury. As I now remember it, you said, 'I do not believe in it. If I have ever given the impression that I was advocating such, I want it understood that no such impression was intended.' I understood this statement to indicate your opposition to the support of the college from the treasury of the church. Will you please confirm the above in writing?"

Brother Smith has answered my letter as quoted above. His answer follows:

"Dear Brother Adams:

"Thank you very much for your kind letter of recent date. I am very much pleased that you are making ready to prepare an article for the Bible Banner treating the question we discussed during your visit in President Norris's office last summer. I am glad to make a statement summing up as nearly as I possibly can the discussion to which I have just referred. I want this state-
ment to be viewed in the light of your statement which appeared in the Bible Banner last June.

"You said: (There followed my statement already set forth in this article J. W. A.).

"I did not at the time referred to above or at any other time or place solicited donations for A. C. C. from funds regularly contributed upon the first day of the week by Christians for the support and furtherance of the work and worship of the church. No one connected with A. C. C. has ever so much as intimated I should do so. I have refrained, therefore, from this course of action because, first, it is not the policy of the school so to do, and second, it is my conviction that this is right in the sight of God."

"The statement above covers the issue as accurately as my vocabulary will permit me to say it. I feel sure this will be acceptable to you."

"With very best regards, I am Yours truly,

W. R. Smith, Vice-President."

THE EVIDENCE ANALYZED AND CONSIDERED

The Letter From The Southside Elders. These indignant brethren advise your scribe to correct and apologize. Well, bless your hearts for your interest in me brethren, but I have nothing to correct nor anything for which to apologize, so I am afraid your fervent hopes and your prayers will neither be realized nor answered. I did not affirm that Brother Smith had done anything at Southside. I only recorded a report circulating in the Ft. Worth area concerning the matter. The report was circulated because of the statement of your preacher, Robert C. Jones, which statement, I have verified and he does not deny. I am not responsible for your allowing W. R. Smith, at his request, to make a college speech on Lord's day morning at the hour of worship (according to the testimony of your preacher). I am not responsible for the resulting complaints from some of your best members, nor for the semi-public statement of your preacher to which said complaints gave rise, which statement, occasioned my report in the Bible Banner.

It seems that you elders need to apologize to someone. Now, you could apologize to Brother Smith for letting him do it, or you might apologize to the offended members who complained. On the other hand, you might apologize to your preacher for taking advantage of his absence to permit a thing to which he is undoubtedly opposed on what he conceives to be scriptural grounds. I am not responsible for Brother Smith's asking for the privilege and making the speech in question nor for impressions made. Perhaps he should apologize to Southside church, its offended members, and your preacher in whose place he spoke. Now, if you brethren must have someone apologize, Brother Smith might do it. If he will not, perhaps you can get your offended members who complained to Brother Jones and occasioned his statement to apologize for getting the wrong impression from Brother Smith's speech and passing it on to Jones. If they feel, however, that they are justified, I suppose, being elders, you could try to get Brother Jones to apologize for believing what some of your best members at Southside told him. Now I am not advocating this, and I am sure that Brother Jones feels perfectly justified in his course of action in the matter, but you, brethren, I presume are still hoping and praying for an apology, so I am trying to be helpful. I'll tell you what, perhaps all of you should just apologize to me for occasioning a report that involved me in this "mess" of political maneuvering that is utterly nauseating to anyone with an ounce of spirituality. It could be, however, that you would be willing to settle for less than an apology now.

As to correction, I have none to make. The report to which I made reference in my article was circulated because of a statement made by your preacher. I have verified the fact that he made the statement. He made the statement because of reports and complaints from some of your best members at Southside. They made the complaints because of impressions received from and objections to Brother Smith's speech which you permitted and indorsed. There is nothing for me to correct. May I repeat, I am not responsible for the speech, its being permitted, the impressions that were made, the objections to it and the complaints regarding it, nor for your preacher's statement which grew out of them. Yes, brethren, I have no correction to make.

Your letter sounds good with reference to your attitude toward church support of the college if your practice in the past were consistent with it. Have you been converted to this view since 1937? I have a letter from Brother C. A. Norred, a former preacher of the Southside church, which confirms in detail the fact that: In 1937 there hung upon the wall of the study of the Southside church building a Certificate of Honor issued to Southside Church by Abilene Christian College in recognition of contributions made by said church to the college. You may remember that C. A. Norred took this certificate into the pulpit of Southside church and condemned the practice that caused it to be given to you; namely, the support of the college by the church. Some of your "no uncertain language" would have been most appropriate then, but enough about your letter, brethren. I bid you an affectionate farewell and trust that you may find someone to correct and apologize that your hopes may be realized and your prayers answered.

Brother Smith's Letter of Correction. While I have nothing to correct, I am abundantly willing for Brother Smith to correct any wrong im-
pressions that may have been made by his speech at Southside. To that end, I have included his own statement in his letter in this article. I could only wish that Brother Smith's writing vocabulary were as broad and as expressive as his speaking vocabulary. In my talk with him at Abilene, I was impressed with the fact that he not only did not believe in but actively opposed church support for A.C.C. I gathered that it was a matter of conviction with him. Referring back to my recent letter to him, you will note that I asked him to confirm that impression. His answer, as you can plainly see by referring to his letter, does not confirm nor deny my impression. He said that he had refrained from soliciting donation from the church treasury because (1) that it is not the policy of A.C.C. so to do, and (2) that it is his conviction that this is right in the sight of God. Now, what does Brother Smith's statement actually say that indicates his or the college's position with reference to church support for the college? He says that he refrains from soliciting donations from the church treasury because it is his conviction that this is right in the sight of God. He does not say that it would be wrong in the sight of God for a congregation to make such a contribution. He does not say that he believes it would be wrong in the sight of God for the college to solicit and accept such donations. He simply says that it is right in God's sight to refrain. I think everyone would agree on that. I presume that even G. C. Brewer and Robert M. Alexander believe it is right in God's sight to refrain from soliciting the church treasury.

However, Brother Smith, on the basis of my conference with you at Abilene, I am going to ask for granted that, if your vocabulary had been sufficiently large, you would have said that you do not believe in and are opposed to church support of the college. Now we are getting somewhere. George Pepperdine has never endorsed church support of the college; Florida Christian is on record against it; Abilene Christian is at least partially committed against it (the Vice-President). If we can get Freed-Hardeman, Harding, and David Lipscomb on the right side of this issue, everything will be right, everybody will be happy, and we can quit talking about the colleges and do something constructive to help them perform the great work which they can do in their proper sphere.

QUESTIONED STATEMENT NO. 2

It has come to me that Brother J. B. Collins, former President of the Board of Directors of A.C.C., is telling that I misrepresented him in the same article in which the Smith statement appeared. Here are the facts, I said:

“If it is not the policy of A.C.C. to seek a place in the budgets of local congregations, why does Brother J. B. Collins, President of the Board of Directors of A.C.C., urge it? I am reliably informed that he not only believes it should be done, but urges that it be done. He says that the same opposition was made to orphan homes several years ago and argues that it will be but a matter of time until the placing of the colleges in the budget will be the settled policy of the churches.”

This is not the statement verbatim as it appeared in the Bible Banner but I have furnished Brother Collins with a copy of this statement as I wrote it.

Brother Collins wrote me that I was misinformed and demanded that I divulse the name of the party who gave me the information and make the correction in the Bible Banner. I answered by refusing to divulge the source of my information, feeling no ethical obligation to do so, and by offering to make full correction in the Banner and even apologize if Collins would furnish me with a specific denial of the statements and views attributed to him. I asked for a direct answer to four questions covering the matter:

1. Do you deny that you believe it is scriptural for a church to contribute from its treasury to the Greater Expansion program of A.C.C.?
2. Do you deny ever having expressed to any man your belief in the scripturalness of such a practice?
3. Do you deny ever having urged that a congregation make a contribution to the Greater Expansion program?
4. Do you deny ever having said that the same opposition was made to the support of orphan homes by the churches several years ago is now being made against the colleges implying that just as the churches now support orphan homes, so will they support the colleges in a few years?

To date, such a denial has not been received from Brother Collins. It may become necessary for me to publish a complete file of the correspondence which passed between Brother Collins and me. I stand ready to do so. A complete file of the correspondence has been sent to the man who furnished me with the information concerning Collins. I promised Collins that I would do so, and I have.

If Brother Collins does not believe in and opposes church support of the college, why is he loathe to say so? If he does not believe in it, and never has, and will say as much, I will know for certain that he never made the statements attributed to him. If he will specifically deny the statements attributed to him, his denial will be published and with it my apology for being too quick to believe and report such regarding him. I am ready, Brother Collins, what do you say?
A little more than eighteen years ago I gave up what is known as the Christian Church. The principles I gave up then I have never seen reason to re-embrace. I have never regretted one moment of service I have rendered in the church of the Lord. Today I see no reason to go back to the “Christian Church” and see no reason to accept the principles, advocated by some now, which would lead me back into the practice of the same things I practiced in the “Christian Church.” Do we need some other organizations within or without the church to assist us in our educational, benevolent and “missionary work?” If we think so let us say so-let us take a stand in the open and be just what we are-preach and declare publicly that which would we like to advocate privately.

Before leaving the “Christian Church” I learned many lessons concerning the evils of the United Christian Missionary Society (UMCS). I learned that the thing itself was evil and amounted to nothing more or less than a political machine with all the ruthless tactics of the same, rendered more evil because of the guise of religion. The UMCS was a giant octopus with tentacles running out in every direction-into every congregation grasping and choking until what little respect for New Testament authority remained was released. The manhood of the preachers and elders was sapped and their faith in God drained off until what started out to be a movement to advance the Cause for which Jesus died ended up in decay and death. The only advancement made is material unless it is in the realm of worldliness. They advanced now to where the inspiration of the Bible and the divinity of Christ is denied by many of the very ones who launched the program to advance the will of God on earth.

The result of the local autonomy destroying society is an old story. The destruction was not accomplished overnight. It took years of subtle planning and constant work of some of the most influential men-the so called “Broad-minded.” Those who knew just how “broad-minded” to be or appear to be and where. In some places one could hear them all but preach it straight, while in other places where they felt they were among the “more learned” they would come out in the open more.

I say I learned these things before coming out of the digressive church. Who would expect me to forget their manner of working? This thing nearly cost me my soul, for if I had not found out I was being deceived by these affairs-if I had not learned the truth and separated myself from this religious farce I would have been lost. I would have deceived others, myself, and spent eternity in a devil’s nell.

I struggled and tried to reform the congregations where I preached. However, I found then what I know now. It is all but impossible to reform any institution which has left the very principles that brought it into existence. Men seldom reform churches. In such work there must be some destruction before one can do much construction. It is impossible to have a New Testament church resting upon the doctrines and commandments of men-or to have a New Testament church where the principles of men crowd out the simplicity of the gospel. All I could do eighteen years ago for the Christian Church where I preached is what I am now try to do, point out the evils of such and try to save some individuals within and keep as many as I can from going into institutions not approved in God’s sight.

Much has been said recently concerning the right of a local congregation to support institutions. Institutionalism has such an evil reputation and has resulted in such great corruptions, especially when connected with churches or religious movements, that it seems to me we should know enough without further discussion to turn away from them. Speeches supporting the idea of the “College in the budget” come with very poor grace from those who are to be benefited. Why not leave the discussion to those whose motives can not be charged? Oh, I see now! You say if we did that there would be none to make the speeches!

There is no scriptural argument for a local congregation, as such, supporting any kind of an institution, as such. When churches of the Lord become tributary to an outside institution, by whatsoever name called, it will eventually become subsidiary to the same. Who was it in the “policy making committee” where it was urged to appeal to the congregations for direct support from their budgets and when one attending asked: ‘What if the local preachers oppose it?” the answer was returned by some one there to the effect: “Put it over any way?” Who said that? The congregations, these days, write often to the colleges for recommendations of preachers. Suppose Don Morris found out in some way that I opposed the idea of the church supporting “our” educational institutions from our treasury? Would he not be in position to do me much harm with those whom he knows among the churches? Could he not pass out the information that Decker is all right but——?” That is the way the digresses worked and work today to keep their preachers in line. I love peace but when
I see that the price for peace is the compromise of God’s will, I would rather have war. No Christian will pay that high a price for peace for it is much better to have “tears and sweat and blood.” **Want** a good reference? Here it is Matt. 10:34—There are times when God wants us to have trouble. “A man’s foes shall be they of his own household”—applies to ones own immediate family all right but also to the family of God. When we remember this maybe we will not be so bitter against those who attempt to correct the errors within the church as well as without the church.

If **and** when the congregations generally put the colleges and other institutions in their budgets it is only a matter of time until they appoint congregational representatives to meet once a year to help form the politics and guide the institutions. They would be foolish if they did not! Who wants to continue to contribute but have no voice. This would be as silly as sending the contribution in the first place. But let me tell you now before it gets that far that you might as well not attend your representative meetings for the “Executive Committee” will meet within three weeks to decide what the general conference meant by its resolutions and interpret the resolutions made by the “General Educational Conference” out of existence. This will come to that sooner than you expect. Well, you say, will we then have preachers who will claim this procedure scriptural? Oh, yes! Why by that time they will be quoting book chapter and verse. I venture this though, they will never get around to II Jno. 9 which would keep them from taking the first step toward destruction. This condition will not come about in four or five years, but come it will unless the support of institutions by local congregations is stopped. Alma mater zeal rather than love for the truth seems to be the rule of the day. About all the trouble the churches have ever had, I mean serious errors concerning the truth, has come through educational institutions. It will continue to come that way. This is the reason I would not give even a good word toward the endowment of one. As long as they are poor and struggling for existence they do good—but when the day of prosperity comes and they are able to get more “big shots” in the trouble starts. (Hos. 10:13.) They get too big to look up to God, if they see Him at all they have to look down for there is nothing above them.

Is it God’s will to support colleges through the churches? Did God create the church for that purpose? Has the purpose of the church changed since God gave it to the world? Would you state while preaching on the work and purpose of the church: “It is God’s will, and the God given purpose of the church is to support the colleges so they can educate our preachers, elders and deacons?” Is it not indeed sad that the churches had no elders Until we developed our present educational system? When the colleges finish making elders for the churches will those elders be smart enough to have the colleges in their budgets. And too, for it does come in the realm of possibilities, what if the congregation won’t have these elders you have produced for them? Will they put the pressure on through other former students in the congregation and force the issue over the will of some ignorant preachers and members who do not have their special brand of education?

This is my first article for the Bible Banner. I have read and enjoyed the Banner for a long time. The reason I have said but little in days gone by is for the simple reason that others were doing a better job than I thought I could do. I still think so but want all to know where I stand. I have not always agreed with all I have seen in the Banner or anywhere else except in the Bible. However, I have known Foy E. Wallace, Jr. since I have been in the church of our Lord. I want you to know and I want him to know that I stand with him on the issue and on most of the other issues which have confronted the churches from time to time.

May God help Us take the warning from the Christian church. They have gone far astray from the word of God. **Since** I left them they have gone farther faster than I thought they would. There is yet hope for many individuals within that body but as a body there is no hope of recovery. Brethren let us think now and stop the downward plunge. We are not drifting—we are plunging! Back to the Bible, back to the church of the Bible, back to the organization of the Bible, back, back, B A C K to where we started and where we must be found and where we will wish we were when the world is on fire.

---

### BAPTISMAL SUITS

We have recently purchased a considerable number of government surplus waders that make excellent baptismal suits. These waders are manufactured by U. S. Rubber Company and are excellent quality. They are black with suspenders across the shoulders and straps. Under the arms to make them fit snugly. They are durable and will outlast the regular baptismal garment. We have them in two sizes-large and medium. The medium size is for a man 5 ft. 8 in. to 5 ft. 10 in. The large size is made for a man 5 ft. 10 in. to 6 ft. 2 in. The boot is large enough to accommodate shoe and all. **These** suits have been bought so they can be sold at a bargain. $17.50. Send in your order right away if you want one.
CONSISTENCY

(The following article was sent to the editor of the Gospel Advocate weeks ago for publication. It was rejected and sent back to Brother Whiteside. Comparing it with the other articles appearing in the Gospel Advocate at the same time it will not be difficult for readers to judge what kind of articles the Gospel Advocate indorsed and preferred to publish.)

R. L. WHITESIDE

Some one said, "Consistency, thou art a jewel," and many have repeated the statement as if it always expressed gospel truth. A man's teaching and practice should be consistent; that is, he should practice what he preaches, in so far as what he preaches can be practiced. It is foolish for any man to try to make his teaching and practice consistent with what he taught and practiced in the past. A Christian should start with the high and holy purpose of learning all the truth he can, eliminating all errors as he finds them, and of practicing every practicable thing he learns. If he conscientiously follows that course, he is still consistent, even though he finds it necessary to make changes in both teaching and practice. A man who never looks back to see if he is consistent with his past teaching and practice. To strive to be consistent with the past is not a jewel; it is folly.

A man of sense changes when he finds that he is wrong; only a fool would refuse to change. And what is the matter with a man who thinks a man who makes radical changes is unreliable, unstable, and unsound? Many of the great men who adorned our holy religion made radical changes.

After Saul of Tarsus became a mature man he changed from the most bitter persecutor the early church had to its most ardent and determined defender. Nor was he two years in making the change. The late standard for testing character would make him an unreliable weakling! But his former admirers and supporters became his bitterest enemies. To them he was a deserter, a pestilent fellow, a mover of insurrection, a ringleader of the sect of the Naz-
at Guilford, North Carolina, with a view to qualifying himself for the legal profession.” Here for a time he tried unsuccessfully to be antagonistic to religion. Then he became deeply interested in salvation; and after the fashion of the times he mourned and agonized, for about a year before he felt that he was saved. He then decided to be a preacher. While studying Presbyterian theology he became confused and decided not to preach. He went down into Georgia, and taught in a Methodist academy for a while. He again decided to preach, and went back to North Carolina. He received his license to preach Presbyterianism and was assigned a territory in which to preach. But a few days after he reached his appointed territory, he left to go to Florida; but after going a short distance, he decided to go West. He finally, after preaching at several places along the way, reached Bourbon County, Kentucky, where he was ordained as pastor of Caneridge and Concord Presbyterian Churches, but he had outgrown some of the Presbyterian doctrines. He then lacked but a few weeks of being twenty-six years of age. Concerning his own ideas at that time Stone said, “I at that time believed, and taught, that mankind were so totally depraved that they could do nothing acceptably to God, till his spirit, by some physical, almighty, and mysterious power, had quickened, enlightened, and regenerated the heart, and thus prepared the sinner to believe in Jesus for salvation.” At this time Stone needed some radical changes. Soon a great religious revival spread over southern Kentucky and northern Tennessee. Stone attended one of these great revival meetings in Logan County, and saw strange things. Some became cataleptic, some had the jerks, and some swooned away. Stone decided it was the work of God. Soon the same things began to happen under his own preaching. He needed another radical change.

The rigid Presbyterian of the Lexington Synod did not like the way Stone and some others were preaching. They put one preacher on trial, and the others knew they would also be tried. They withdrew from the Synod and formed the Springfield Presbytery. They still needed to change, and soon did so-they dissolved the Presbytery. But Stone still needed to change in his ideas as to the conditions of salvation, and he made that radical change. How many changes—some minor and some radical—did he make? I have not counted them. But he was not a weakening.

Thomas Campbell and his son Alexander were strict Presbyterians (strongly Calvinistic in belief) when they crossed the waters to this country. They made some radical changes before they got their feet on the solid rock of God’s truth. They gave up the Presbyterian Confession of Faith, and turned to the Bible as the only rule of faith and practice. This led them to give up infant sprinkling, then adult sprinkling. They, with several others were soon immersed, and then formed themselves into a church called the Brush Run church. For a while they had no affiliation with any denomination, but later became a part of the Redstone Baptist Association. Later Alexander was connected with the Mahoning Association, till by consent of all the churches in that Association, it was dissolved. They were then without denominational connections. They also changed on the place and purpose of baptism, and on the operation of the Holy Spirit.

Walter Scott, one among the greatest of preachers, a Presbyterian from Scotland, gave up infant sprinkling, adult sprinkling; gave up Presbyterianism, and was immersed by a Mr. Forrester, an independent thinker. Later Scott became an evangelist for the Mahoning Association, and took part in bringing about its dissolution. And he, as did the Campbells, changed on the design of baptism, and on the operation of the Holy Spirit. And they changed from the idea of one pastor for two or more churches to two or more elders for one church. These great preachers made more radical changes than anyone ever charged Foy Wallace with making. Surely Brother Hardeman will use the language about them that he used about Wallace, and say, “Due to their radical change on these important issues, they must be considered unstable, unsafe, and unsound.” But with his standard of judgment, why not?

‘George Campbell, who did a great work in Indiana and Ohio, was born in Maine in 1807. His mother was a congregationalist, but at the age of twenty-three George broke away from congregationalism and became a preacher of the type of universalism called restoration. About two years later he returned to his mother’s church, “and in 1833 received licence to preach from the congregational association in Boston.” He then went to Indiana where his preaching gave great satisfaction to the congregationalists. But after hearing some plain gospel preaching he was led to do some intensive Bible investigation, and was then baptized by Brother Longley. So he made radical changes on important issues—from congregationalism to universalism then back to congregationalism, then to the plain gospel. And so, if any one had been sufficiently angry with him for these radical changes, he might have said: “Due to his radical change on these important issues, he must be considered unstable, unsafe, and unsound.”

And there are preachers still living who changed from denominational preachers to gospel preachers; among them several who changed from “organized effort” to the sufficiency of the
Brother Hardeman's charge against Foy Wallace could as truthfully be applied to these and to all the great men I have mentioned. And there are many others, among whom was "Racoon" John Smith who changed from a Baptist preacher of the Calvanistic type to a preacher of the gospel of Christ, and that was a radical change on an important issue.

Benjamin Franklin was born in 1812, and was about twenty-two years old when he became a Christian. He was never a member of any of the denominations, yet he made some radical changes. "In 1849 a large concourse of people, including many prominent preachers assembled in Cincinnati, to attend the "Anniversaries." These "Anniversaries" were meetings held jointly by a Bible society and a tract society which the brethren had been operating for some tune. These societies were strengthened and the American Christian Missionary Society was organized. Brother Franklin was elated over these matters, and supported the Society in his writings for a number of years, and at one time he was Corresponding Secretary. After about ten years he began to lose interest in it, as did many others. By the time the war of the sixties was over, it had about played out. It was dissolved, and the Louisville Plan was organized, in 1869. For a while Franklin supported this plan, and says he tried to make it succeed. His biographers say: "Mr. Franklin endorsed the plan as a good compromise measure and tried to make it succeed. But he could not work in such spirit and hope as he had done for the Society, and the Disciples would not give it their moral and material support. Finally, Mr. Franklin turned against this new arrangement and pronounced it a failure. The outcry at this change of front on the part of the Review was very great. A flood of discussion followed, a great deal of which was wholly uncalled for and very intemperate." Brother Franklin wrote a long editorial about his change. Here are a few extracts from that editorial:

"In another column the reader will find an article from our worthy brother, John B. Corwine, and we have two more from him, equally as clear and conclusive as the one we publish, in which he proves beyond a reasonable doubt that the editor of the Review is not infallible, or certainly that he has not been in his past history; that he recommended the Louisville Plan in 1869, but now opposes it! This he has shown up with much ability, and greatly to the disadvantage of the editor of the Review. True, that matter has been explained in our columns again and again; but, then, it must be explained and discussed more and more. When other men commit a blunder, and afterward confess it, they are generally forgiven, but there appears to be no pardon for the editor of the Review! He has made a blunder and the law is, "The soul that sinneth, it shall die" (Ezek. 18:20). If the editor of the Review once went for the society scheme, wrote and published many things in favor of it, and thought it was right, he must think so forever, in defiance of all his experience in the matter, the demonstrations he has had, a more mature study of the "Scriptures and thorough knowledge of them, and the history of religious operations; and though fully convinced that the whole of these schemes are wrong, he must continue to write and publish as much as ever in favor of them. Is not a man to be allowed to learn anything in a public life of forty years? Or may all other men learn something, and when convinced of error, turn from it, but the editor of the Review must never learn anything, nor change his course from wrong to right?"

To use harsh language about a living brother that could with more reason be applied to the great men of last century seems to be the result of anger. Some day Brother Hardeman will regret that harsh language. There are other great men to whom this language can as reasonably be applied. Were these men I have mentioned consistent? They certainly were.

"THE NEW TESTAMENT CHURCH"
By ROY E. COGDILL

is the title of a 125-page book containing a series of 52 Bible outlines on the church. This book is being widely used in Bible classes as a year's course of study. It has found favor wherever it has gone. There is nothing in print as complete and exhaustive on this theme. A wealth of material outlined in simple form which requires a study of the Bible in its use.

An edition of "The New Testament Church" has just come off the press. The increased cost of paper, labor, and other materials, and the tremendous increase in the cost of binding would have necessitated an increase in the price of the book bound as it was in the last edition brought out more than two years ago. Rather than bind this edition in cloth and have to increase the price of the book we have bound it in leatherkraft paper of the best quality and left the price as it was, $1.25 per copy.