DISTURBING REPORTS FROM THE WEST

FOY E. WALLACE JR.

When a report is a matter of rumor it should not be repeated much less printed to the hurt of an institution. But when the things said are verified by men of integrity, they should be given necessary and impartial attention. We should not be respecters of institutions any more than of persons. The high regard that this editor has for Brother George Pepperdine, recognition of his fine character, unquestioned integrity and genuine sincerity, have all been affirmed with emphasis in this paper. This personal attitude toward the founder of George Pepperdine College and faith in his pure intentions, are here reaffirmed. But the philanthropies of Brother Pepperdine are being directed away from the interests of the cause of Christ, due largely to the fact that his agencies and institutions have been in the hands of men who themselves are not grounded in the fundamental principles of the church and in the knowledge of the truth.

The reports from sources that have been verified as trustworthy are as follows:

1. That most of the guest speakers at chapel services have been sectarian, denominational preachers—Baptist, Methodist, Presbyterian, Jew, and Catholic. That the plan of rotating the city preachers puts members of the church, gospel preachers, very much in the minority, as much so as in any public school adopting that plan of chapel services.

2. That the president of the college introduced the denominational guest speaker as "Reverend." Upon one occasion a Presbyterian minister was allowed to teach in chapel exercise his theological doctrine of Calvinism without reply, but later a member of the faculty, who is a member of the church, was rebuked for reading a text on baptism and commenting on it for his chapel talk. The president of the school called him down for doing it.

3. That students have left the school because of low standards of conduct, worldliness and lack of spirituality in the school.

4. That some of the things being done are defended on the ground that the college is a secular and "not a church school."

5. That the main source of trouble seems to be in having a young president who craves popularity and publicity, belongs to many clubs and organizations of social, political and religious nature, and is so full of the "Dale Carnegie" idea of selling himself that he can do nothing except "pat everyone on the back."

(Continued on page 16)
BROTHER RUBY MISREPRESENTED?

ROY E. COGDIll

In a recent issue of the Gospel Advocate Brother Wade Ruby of George Pepperdine College, Los Angeles, has an article in which he claims that he has been very badly misrepresented. We are not in the least surprised at the article appearing in the Gospel Advocate for that periodical has delighted in furnishing a medium for anyone on any subject who in any way took issue with the Bible Banner or anything published in it, while steadfastly refusing the publication of articles by almost anyone who appeared in any way to be allied with the Banner or anything published in it, while steadfastly refusing the publication of articles by almost anyone who appeared in any way to be allied with the Banner on any issue. If such a policy is deemed by the Advocate Editor to be the course to pursue, he is certainly at liberty as far as we are concerned to do so. When sufficient evidence can be produced by him or anyone else to successfully dispute anything we publish, we will be just as graceful as he has been recently and "retract an apology" but he should know by this time that it takes more than just "spitting" what is said to disprove it. We try to know where we stand on matters before they are printed so that retraction and apology will not be necessary, but if it becomes necessary, we can do it just as gracefully as any one.

The first thing I would like to say about the article which Brother Ruby wrote is that it was not necessary for him to seek out the Advocate in order to have a medium for reply. The report of the Long Beach meeting was written out and a copy of it put in the hands of Brother West of Pepperdine College to be shown to Ruby, Whitten, and Derrick and these men were told that if they had anything they wanted to say about the written report of the meeting they would have the privilege. They indicated that they would have something to say but didn't. They can't cry as they usually do that they were mistreated by not being put on notice and given an opportunity for reply. If they do, it isn't so.

Brother Ruby has been accused of some things that I had not heard about. I don't know who accused him of being a Communist nor do I know upon what such an accusation was based. I hadn't heard that one. I do not know why that part of the article was mixed in with the attempt he made to deny the Long Beach statements. The report of the Long Beach meeting had nothing to do with either Communism or Premillenialism.

Since he mentions in his article his attitude toward premillenialism it might be enlightening to many to read just how he feels toward the premillenial issue stated in his own words. We have these original letters, signed in Brother Ruby's handwriting, which will at least make it a trifle harder to claim misrepresentation on this matter though a man who will deny what he says in the presence of a whole company of people probably will not hesitate to deny that he wrote the letters also. These letters will definitely identify Brother Ruby and his attitude on premillenialism.

3764 Shafter Avenue
Oakland, California
May 9, '35

Dear John,

"I am like you in feeling that the church is facing a dangerous situation right now. I am always for peace, if it can be obtained without sacrificing the truth. I feel that Brother Boll and others have pushed their doctrine too much and deserve reprehension—but in a spirit of gentleness and love. I also feel that many have been unchristian and unfair in their opposition to them. I feel that we should oppose false doctrine, but love and be gentle toward those in error that we eventually might save them. I feel that the methods of some have only driven the wedge deeper and tended to widen the breach. I feel just as Brother Armstrong expressed the matter in his last front-page article in the F. F. I also feel that Brother Armstrong has purposely been persecuted, and that some have
pursely failed to understand him. In his first article—which he waited too long to publish—stated his position clearly, but some tried to cry "on the fence." He has never been on the fence. He definitely stated in his first article that he did not believe as Brother Boll, that he believed that he had pushed his ideas too far, and that some had been too severe—not too earnest—in their opposition to them. That was clearly stated, but some have insisted on claiming unfairly so, that he is "with Boll." He is only for truth and peace. I believe that there is possibility still of peace on the matter, but I believe that peace will never come of it. The primary fault is with those who prosecute their "non-essential beliefs" to the point of causing trouble, and secondarily, fault is with the ungentle method some have used in opposition to this teaching. So I believe that in most points the truth is with Brother Wallace, but I admire the gentleness with which the author of R. H. Boll more than I do that of Wallace, who is unkind and sometimes unchristian in his manner if I understand Christianity.

Your friend and brother,

Wade Ruby

3764 Shafter Avenue
Oakland, California
February 27, '36

Dear John,

"I plan to be in Oklahoma City for two weeks this summer, preaching for the congregation for which Bill Mattox is preaching. I preached there two years ago, and found a church very spiritual and wide awake. Of course, I am aware of the fact that there are some who hold their brethren in the same way he rules now. All of us can mention in our prayers with the apostle Paul, 'Praise the Lord, who has not changed, and who is the same yesterday, today, and forever.' We had a fence-rider, or would say that I am allergic to the Premillennial question, which means as I feel that the things which are being enlarged now to such a high point of pre-eminence will lead to a slowing up of the growth of the church both in numbers and in spirit. We are prone to become so engrossed in such things that we neglect "the weightier matters of the law", whereby growth results.

Your friend and brother,

Wade Ruby

Excerpts from these letters were quoted in articles in the Bible Banner September, 1940, with the following comment from Brother Wallace.

"But Premillennialism has its personal representatives in the College through Wade Ruby, head of the English Department, and an ardent disciple of J. N. Armstrong. He believes what Brother Armstrong does on the Premillennial question, which means that he is a premillennialist. I told Brother Baxter this (when he asked me) and he afterward found it out for himself. In a letter to John Bannister, of Oklahoma City, Brother Ruby wrote:

"I am one of the accused weaklings who believes that the dangers of Premillennialism have been magnified, and even misrepresented. Brother Wallace can cry out 'Premillennialism dethrones Christ' — and make it look like a very scary thing. But after all we all look forward to a time when
Christ shall reign differently from the way he rules now.’

The letter continues in that vein. While Brother Ruby is not in the Bible Department, he is nevertheless a preacher and a teacher in the College and will impart that attitude to those whom he influences the most. There is no excuse for any of our colleges retaining men of such weak attitude on important questions. Those who went to school with Wade Ruby, and even some of his relatives, know and admit that he is a premillennialist, and say that he got it from J. N. Armstrong. At least for “Brother Wallace” crying that “Premillennialism de-thrones Christ”—both Brother Tiner and Brother Sanders have recently “cried” the same thing. Yet they have a man on their faculty who charges that they have “magnified, and even misrepresented” it when they did so. It is of little use to declare against a thing if we turn right around and compromise the issue by retaining men who declare against what has been declared. (And that goes for present-day modernism in Q. P. C.) Our schools should be renovated of premillennial influence and softism from the attic to the cellar. They cannot have both of these trumps and it unless it is done. It is wrong to make public statements that a school is sound and at the same time keep unsound teachers in it.”

Cut of the report of the Long Beach meeting Brother Ruby picked one matter to dispute. He denies that he said in that meeting that there are Christians in denominational churches. He says that he was misrepresented in having such a statement attributed to him and that such is not his attitude. He always has believed in the oneness of the Church, he tells us. He denies that he said in response to the question, “Will these children of God be saved in these denominational institutions if they continue in them until death,” “It depends upon their attitude”. Of course in this denial the readers have Brother Ruby’s word against more than a dozen others who heard him say it. He considers such a source as the word of a dozen preachers of the gospel, most of whom live in the vicinity of Los Angeles, as unreliable. He charges all of them with misrepresentation. He is telling the truth about what he said, and all of the rest of us, who heard what he said have falsified about the matter. That is the best he can do toward defending himself in this matter. If any falsifying is being done about the Long Beach meeting, Brother Ruby is doing it. There is no basis for explaining such an attitude upon Brother Ruby’s part. All the charity that can be exercised still does not erase some pertinent facts:

1. If the statement which he made at Long Beach does not correctly represent his attitude, why hasn’t he been man enough to say that he misrepresented himself instead of accusing the rest of us of it. If there has been any misrepresenting, he has misrepresented himself. He might have been beside himself, under pressure, excited, or in the heat of discussion he could have made a statement that did not correctly set forth his views. Any of these explanations could have been made with grace and would have been accepted at face value with a retraction of what he said. But instead of such an explanation, he prefers to charge all of us who heard him say what he said with misrepresentation. Remember too that this comes from one of the brethren who believes in being sweet, generous, liberal, and manifesting the spirit of Christ and who are always talking about it. Rather an ugly spirit for such a sweet disposition, don’t you think?

2. What Brother Ruby means by misrepresentation and unreliable sources can include two or three things. He could mean that we are willfully falsifying the whole matter and maliciously misrepresenting him. He can hardly bring himself to make such a public charge though beneath the surface a disposition has been shown to want to do it and wish that it were so and could be established. Is Brother Ruby arrogant enough to believe that brethren will take his word against the testimony of all who signed the report of the meeting? Surely not. What would be the motive behind such malicious misrepresentation upon our part? I am sure that he has nothing that any of us want and as far as a reputation for truth and veracity is concerned, which one of us could not compare favorably with him? The charge is without foundation of fact or reason. It simply is not so.

Does he mean that he did not make himself clear and that he misrepresented his own attitude? If so, whose fault is that and what would the unreliable source be in that case? He repeated his position under questions which were directed to him. If he can’t state what he believes under such circumstances, he is the unreliable one in the matter.

Does he mean that we did not or could not understand what he said about what he believes? These super-educated brethren often take the attitude that the common herd simply does not possess intelligence enough to understand their deep mental attitudes. The most of us, however, think we have sense enough to understand anything they have sense enough to say. Why are they being so often misunderstood anyway? If it is so difficult for them to make themselves clear they are at poor business trying to preach the gospel or teach in any body’s school. This cry of misunderstanding has been raised too often by them. If a P. H. D. can’t help a man be understood, and it looks like it doesn’t very often, then he should stop short of it if he wants to be understood, The trouble
with the most of us is that people understand us without any trouble.

The whole thing resolves itself into a matter of fact. Did he say such a thing or didn't he? You saw the report where twelve of us say that he did. Others present will say the same thing. We still say he said it. We heard him say it. If what he said doesn't correctly represent what he believes, that is his fault and failure and not ours but he should be honest enough to say so.

The peculiar thing is that before he finishes his article he admits what he is denying in effect. He states that we would not say that there will be no Baptists in heaven. Well! Does Brother Ruby believe that there will be some Baptist saved? He won't say that there won't be. That means that he won't say that a man can't go to heaven and stay in the Baptist church all of his life. Who is Brother Ruby to judge whether or not Baptist will be saved? He won't say that there won't be. That means that he won't say that a man can't go to heaven and stay in the Baptist church all of his life. Who is Brother Ruby to judge whether or not Baptist will be saved?

The following quotation from a letter written by Brother Whitten will endorse this. This excerpt from a long letter from Brother Whitten will show you what I mean. I do not quote the whole letter for it would be necessary to show that Brother Whitten is beside himself, ugly in his disposition, and hurls a lot of charges against those who heard him say what he said in language too plain and positive to be misunderstood. These brethren deny that they said what our ears heard them say simply means that they are impeaching their own testimony. No wonder they are misunderstood in their own eyes. It is utterly impossible to determine when to believe them and to know when they are telling the truth. A man who will deny what a whole company of people heard him say is either entirely beside himself or has absolutely no regard for his reputation as to truth and veracity much less for truth and veracity itself. But here is Brother Whitten's admission that he believes what Brother Ruby says he did not say. Yet these brethren were entirely in agreement in the meeting as far as anyone could tell.

"There are some of God's children—Christians-Members of the Lord's Church—people who have obeyed the Gospel in

(Continued on page 10)
SOME OLD DOCTRINES RESTATED AND EXAMINED

R. L. WHITESIDE

Hereditary Total Depravity—Some Arguments Examined

We are asked, “If people are not born totally depraved, how comes it that all people sin?” In reply we ask this question: “If Adam and Eve were not made totally depraved, how came they to sin?” So far as the record shows, they sinned the first time they were tempted; none of us now do any worse. Adam and Eve were as human before they sinned as after.

In a radio speech, Mr. Ben M. Bogand accepted the scientific dictum that acquired characteristics cannot be transmitted to the offspring. Then he added that as righteousness is an acquired characteristic, the righteousness of parents cannot be transmitted to their children. He evidently did not see what that was doing to his ardently advocated doctrine of inherited depravity. All the depravity or sin that Adam and Eve ever had was acquired. This no one can deny. Sin was not a part of their nature; it was acquired. How then could they transmit it to their offspring? But though sin, or depravity, was an acquired characteristic, I shall call attention to the misuse of some passages that are used in an effort to prove the doctrine of hereditary total depravity.

“And Jehovah saw that the wickedness of man was great in the earth, and that every imagination of the thought of his heart was only evil continually.” (Gen. 6:5). I think these people were totally depraved—there was no good in them. How came they to be so depraved? Verse 12: “And God saw the earth, and, behold, it was corrupt; for all flesh had corrupted their way upon the earth.” They corrupted their way. And it will be noticed that God did not send a direct operation of his Spirit into their hearts to cure them of their corruption; but he did send a flood, and destroyed them. God does not regenerate totally depraved folk.

Much relied on by the advocates of inherited depravity is Jeremiah 13:23: “Can the Ethiopian change his skin, or the leopard his spots? Then may ye also do good, that are accustomed to do evil.” But this text does not say anything about inherited depravity. To help the depravity argument it would have to read, “…then may ye also do good, that were born totally depraved.” Neither are people accustomed to evil when they are born; to become accustomed to anything requires a period of practice. These people had practiced evil till reformation was impossible. Nor does the record say that God would send his Spirit to regenerate them and change their accustomed evil.

It is argued that nothing less than the mighty power of God can change a leopard’s spots or an Ethiopian’s skin; neither can examples be found where he ever did so. He leaves them as they are. But because their case was hopeless, the Lord says in the next verses, “Therefore will I scatter them, as the stubble that passeth away, by the wind of the wilderness. This is thy lot, the portion measured unto thee from me, saith Jehovah; because thou hast forgotten me, and trusted in falsehood … Woe unto thee, 0 Jerusalem: Thou wilt not be made clean; how long shall it yet be?” But their destruction was coming and so would end another group of depraved people. Read the whole chapter. They could not have forgotten Jehovah, unless they had once known him; they were not alien sinners, but Israelites, God’s chosen people.

Another favorite text of total depravity advocates is Ps. 51:5: “Behold, I was brought forth in iniquity; and in sin did my mother conceive me.” Psalm 51:5 is David’s confession of sin and plea for mercy after his sin with Bathsheba. His guilty connection with her husband’s death. He was in a distressing emotional state of mind. He certainly did not charge his mother with sin: neither did he implicate Adam in his sin. He was brought forth in this world, where iniquity abounds. It would save us from many blunders if we would give more attention to the language used. To say that he was brought forth in iniquity is quite different from saying he was brought forth with iniquity in him. I was brought forth in a log cabin, but-well, surely no one will accuse me of saying that I was brought forth with a log cabin in me! On Pentecost, when the multitudes from many countries heard the Apostles speaking with other tongues, “As the Spirit gave them utterance,” they were amazed and said, “Behold, are not all these that speak Galileans? And how hear ye, every man in our own language wherein we were born?” Each one was born in a territory where a certain language prevailed, and therefore they grew up speaking the language of their territory. They were not brought forth with that language in them.

It seems that the main interest the advocates of hereditary depravity have is that they can use it as a supposed basis for their doctrine of the direct operation of the Holy Spirit; but if they could prove their depravity doctrine, they would then have to prove that the gospel was not sufficient to regenerate such sinners. The theory belittles the gospel, and makes the sinner feel that he can do nothing and is therefore not responsible for his condition. It does more than stupefy; it paralyzes.
A favorite argument is based on the fact that the alien is spoken of as dead, but the Bible represents the sinner as being dead through his own trespasses. (Eph. 2:1, 5; Col. 2:13). But even if we had inherited this dead state from Adam, we are no more dead to righteousness than Adam and Eve in their state of innocence were dead to sin. The Devil led them into sin by placing motives before them; he did not have to perform some direct inward change in their hearts to enable them to act. God places the highest imaginable motives before the sinner; but we are told that God cannot undo by motives what the Devil accomplished by motives!

Several years ago I had a debate with B. M. Bogard. As a basis for his claim for a distinct and direct work of the Holy Spirit in conversion, he put much stress, as they all do, on the fact that the sinner is dead in sins, and therefore must be made alive before he can obey the gospel. I replied, "One objection I have to Mr. Bogard's argument is, he limits the power of God; he makes the sinner so dead that God could not have made a gospel that would reach him." He came back with a great deal of bluster, saying, "It is not a question of what God can do; he can do anything he wants to do; he could have made a gospel that would reach that dead sinner, if he had wanted to." I replied, "Oh, well, the sinner is not as dead as we've been hearing he was. We might as well leave off all this talk about depravity and the dead sinner. The trouble is not with the sinner at all; according to Mr. Bogard the inability is in the gospel, and not in the sinner. I say God made the very gospel Mr. Bogard said he could have made, and I will proceed to show that he did."

Ephesians 2:3—"were by nature children of wrath." But nature may be inherent or acquired. By nature a person does what he is in the habit of doing. When you began to drive a car, you were awkward; but by practice you reached the point where it became a part of your nature to do things a certain way. You were not born talking; you learned to talk, and then it was natural for you to talk. If you will read verses 1, 2, 3, of Eph. 2, you will see how these people became children of wrath by nature. But even if by birth we inherited the wrath of God, that does not mean that it requires a direct impact 'of the Holy Spirit on the sinner to remove God's wrath. God's wrath is not in the sinner. Does it not sound absurd to say that a direct operation of the Spirit in the sinner's heart would remove wrath from God's mind? In Eph. 5:1-5 Paul mentions a number of sins, and then adds, "for because of these things come the wrath of God upon the sons of disobedience." It is not because of what we inherit, but because of what we do, or fail to do. (See also Col. 3:5, 6).

Some confusion arises from putting undue stress on certain terms used in reference to the process of becoming children of God. Here are some of the terms used: born again, created, conversion, turn from darkness to light, turn from power of Satan Unto God, translated into kingdom, obey from the heart, believe and be baptized, repent and be baptized, believe and turn to the Lord, baptized into Christ. All these terms refer to the same thing, that is, how people become children of God. To give a meaning to any of the terms that makes void the other terms, or any one of them, is, beyond question, wrong. And every advocate of the direct operation of the Spirit does that very thing. As an illustration, take "born again" and "created." When they talk of being created, they put a stress on it that puts born again out of the picture; and the reverse when they talk about being born again. A literal birth and a literal creation are two different things. The change in becoming a Christian is so great that it may be figuratively spoken of as being born again or as being created. Neither term, when applied to becoming a Christian, expresses a literal act. So far as the record shows, the apostles never told sinners that they must be born again, or that they must be created. To sinners they said, "Repent ye, and be baptized every one of you in the name of Jesus Christ unto the remission of your sins; and ye shall receive the gift of the Holy Spirit." (Acts 2:38). "Repent ye, therefore, and turn again, that your sins may be blotted out, so that there may come seasons of refreshing from the presence of the Lord." (Acts 3:19). Inspired Ananias said to Saul, "And now why tarriest thou? Arise, and be baptized, and wash away thy sins, calling on his name." (Acts 22:16). They called their converts saints, new born babes, children of God, and new creatures, and told them that they had been baptized into Christ, and had been translated out of the kingdom of darkness into the kingdom of Christ.

There is one truth which is necessary to observe in studying the Bible, which denominational preachers seem never to learn, and that is, that commands are given in plain, unfigurative language, but conditions and relationships are frequently expressed in highly figurative language. No inspired man ever commanded an inquiring sinner to become a branch of the vine, or to become a sheep, or to become a child of God by being born again, or to become a member of the Lord's body, or to become a new creature, or to become a stone in God's temple, or to become an epistle of Christ, or to be a graft; but these terms are all applied to Christians. Figures of speech abound in the epistles; but if you want to read what inspired men in plain unfigurative language told sinners to do, read the (Continued on page 13)
A WITHDRAWAL AND RETRACTION

L. W. MAYO

Mr. Roy E. Cogdill
Editor Bible Banner
Lufkin, Texas

Dear Brother Cogdill:

I am sending an article which I would like to have in as early issue of the Bible Banner as possible. If you can't get it in the next one please insert a note that it is coming out. I think this article is self explanatory.

Faithfully,

L. W. Mayo

Porterfield, California

A copy has gone to the Firm Foundation. L. W. M.

In the Firm Foundation March 2, 1948 there occurred an article by this writer under the heading “My Findings At George Pepperdine College”. That article was written as a result of the exchanging of several letters, a telephone conversation, and a visit to George Pepperdine campus. I had heard so many criticisms of the school I felt it my duty to go to these brethren, believing them to be honest, and talk these things over. My object was to save the school, in the eyes of the brotherhood, if at all possible. It was my desire to hear both sides of the matter before I reached any definite conclusion. The truth was my main object and not to please any man or group of men living. I believe that the members of the George Pepperdine Faculty would testify that my deportment in our conversations was humble and characterized by an earnest desire to have the real facts. After I had spent a few days on the campus I returned to Winslow, Arizona, (my home at that time) and wrote the article which Brother Showalter gave editorial recognition as it appeared on page nine of the March 2 issue. (For that consideration I am grateful).

Lest someone should think that I failed to give the information just as I got it at George Pepperdine College I wish to state that after I had written that article It was sent to Brother W. B. West Jr. and it was checked, corrected slightly in a place or two (these corrections not changing the tenor of the article) then retyped and mailed back to me with an expression of gratitude for the contents. In other words, it became an expression of George Pepperdine College with my name signed to it. I have letters from W. B. West, Ralph Wilburn, E. V. Pullias, Hugh M. Tiner, and George Pepperdine commending me for the article.

Several have been the times that I have taken the part of the school when some one would attack it in my presence, but, as I wrote Bro. West I only wanted to do so by being able to tell the truth.

My knowledge of accusations against the school was not very broad at the time of the investigation. That is many of the things that have come out since the lecture program I knew nothing about whatever. It, therefore, must be concluded that I did not investigate those items. It is also true that, in the meantime, I have tried my best to get the brethren at the head of the school to invite a full, open, fair, and public investigation of all those charges. My recommendations have been to find all the error possible and to fire whoever was guilty of the error and clean up in general. Also I felt that I must warn them that unless they would stand back of the things they told me, as they appeared in my former article, that I would be forced (and I do not mean by the pressure of brethren but by what I found out to be the truth) to retract my former article and withdraw my moral support from the school. Every letter has suggested that they did not think that it was wise. Ralph Wilburn said that he would submit to an open investigation if the officials wished to call one. Brother Pepperdine suggested that he was not convinced that one would do any good. brethren West, Pullias and Tiner thought the matter to be “unwise”.

The reasoning that my letters to them on the matter has carried with them is this. “The Brotherhood is certain to turn against you everywhere, if indeed they have not already. When such has been done all of your students will be drawn from the outside. A large portion of them will learn that the church no longer respects you and then they (the students) will either disrespect the school or the Church-the truth is they will disrespect the Church for which Christ died-It is too much-you cannot afford to let such come to pass-you must have the investigation”. So far this appeal has done no good whatever. Also this line of reasoning was advanced to them. “You know how that the school started by Bro. McGarvey and Alexander Campbell drifted off. You must beware lest this school do the same”. I might as well have saved that breath also. Everything that I have done in the matter was done because I see the possibilities of an institution which the assets that George Pepperdine College has. I could not see why the two million dollars George Pepperdine has spent on that campus should be wasted in vain. I can't see why a school could not be so accredited as to confer a doctor's degree and still be sound as the proverbial silver dollar.

My effort to save the school has gone much further than I have stated in this article
but to no avail. It is my conviction that any man or group of men should be ready, willing, and anxious to have their teachings investigated fully and also to correct any error that may appear in the investigation. The man who Will not submit to a full ‘investigation admits his guilt at least to a great degree. This final statement comes as a result of study, gathering information, meditation, and earnest prayer. It is hard to make (not because of the mistake in the former article, because any one should be glad to correct a mistake, but because it is hard to think that brethren in whom I placed my confidence evidently betrayed me and will not stand publicly behind what they told me in private). I wish here and now to RETRACT my article of March 2, 1948 in the Firm Foundation and to announce that I have WITHDRAWN every form of fellowship with George Pepperdine College. I further recommend that brethren should not trust their sons and daughters with them in school, for if they were not honest with me for just a few days and would not stand behind what they told me in those few days how can they be trusted with the next generation of the Church of our Lord for four years. If they led me wrong in a few days how far could they lead some one in four years? I also wish to apologize to Brother John F. Wolfe, who wrote an article in the Bible Banner, ‘What I Found at Pepperdine’, of which my article stood (not intended by me) as a rival. I believe that every preacher, group of elders and church leaders over the land should notify them that they will not support them till this matter is cleared up.

---

COLLEGE EXPEDIENCY ARGUMENT

**PARALLELED WITH DIGRESSION**

The following letter and reply will be understood by the reader. I give it to the Bible Banner readers. I am sure that many read it with astonishment. (W. W. Otey)

March 2, 1948

Mr. W. W. Otey

Belle Plaine, Kansas

Dear Brother Otey:

You have written much on the current college issue and have said quite a bit about a debate on the question.

Enclosed I am sending you some propositions and asking you to meet Brother G. C. Brewer in a debate at a place to be decided upon later. Brother Brewer will affirm proposition number one, and we shall expect you to affirm number two. Number two is a reproduction of the proposition that you affirmed with J. B. Briney except we substituted the Bible college for instrumental music. It is no more a negative proposition than was your ‘proposition with J. B. Briney.

If, as you seem to think, this question is as detrimental to the church as instrumental music, surely you will not be reluctant to again affirm a proposition of the same nature as the one you affirmed with Briney.

The only qualification that we ask is that you get Foy E. Wallace, Jr. and Cled Wallace to endorse you for the debate.

Please let me hear from you as soon as it is convenient.

Fraternally,

W. L. Totty

**PROPOSITIONS FOR PUBLIC DEBATE**

1. The New Testament law of expediency permits a church of Christ to contribute to a Bible college and orphans home.

Affirmative

Negative

2. The contributing of money by churches to schools and orphans homes operated by Christians and in which the Bible is taught is opposed to New Testament teaching and sinful.

Affirmative

Negative

---

Mr. W. L. Totty,

Indianapolis, Ind.

Dear Brother Totty:

Will wonders never cease? Just recently G. C. Brewer wrote me that, “Daniel Sommer and others,” had told him that I never should have agreed to affirm a negative with J. B. Briney, on instrumental music, forty years ago; that it was unfair. Now Brewer demands that I affirm exactly the same form of negative in regard to contributing from the Lord’s treasury to support human organizations in their work. What has become of his sense of fairness, and what has caused his former courage to vanish? When did anyone know of Brewer ever before hesitating to affirm in clear terms anything that he taught and practiced? When did Brewer ever demand that an opponent affirm a negative?

Yes. I did affirm the same form of negative with Briney. But that was his own wording. It required a whole year pressing him to know what had happened to his well-known courage to affirm his own practice. He knew so well the weakness of his position that he utterly refused to affirm his practice. Yes, I signed and debated it, and have never regretted so doing. It accomplished at least one good. The greatest living exponent of instrumental music in the worship and defender of doing the Lord’s work through human organizations was literally forced to defend their practices. It opened the way for Hardeman, Brewer and others, to get debates based on fairer propositions. That marked the turning point in staying the tide of innovations.

The principle now at issue-supporting human organizations from the Lord’s treasury—is exactly the same principle then involved. And the advocates of supporting schools from the Lord’s
treasury are using exactly the same tactics innovators then practiced. Not the least difference. They demanded that we affirm a negative. The same men who criticized me, affirming a negative then, now demand that I affirm exactly the same form of negative. I knew then that it was unfair, even as Brewer and Hardeman have said. But now they demand that I affirm the form of proposition that they then said, and still know, is unfair. Why this reversal of position?

Still more surprising, Brewer offers to affirm: "The New Testament law of expediency permits a church of Christ to contribute to a Bible college and orphans home." Preachers, cut this out and paste it in your scrapbook, and label it: "Formed by one who has been a leading debater in the Church of Christ." Who ever heard of anyone proposing a debate based on "expediency"? And when did anyone ever insert the word "permit" as the key word? "Expediency," "permit," the two words of measuring the scripturalness of the practice of the church of the Lord! Who knows what interpretation a skillful tactician would give to the word "expediency"? Same men who so cavalierly use the word "expediency," the two words of measuring the scripturalness of the practice of the church of the Lord! Who knows what interpretation a skillful tactician would give to the word "expediency"? Surely Brother Brewer never thought for a minute that only man of ordinary discernment would sign such a meaningless proposition. Or, rather, one that can be made to mean anything the affirmant will conclude it to mean.

Some have criticized me for my statement that the issue now involved is the same principle involved from the beginning of trouble with digressives, and that the same tactics are now employed. That I am correct in this statement, is abundantly evident. They refuse to affirm their practice and demand that those who oppose them affirm a negative. This is an exact parallel. They plead "expediency." Till about forty years ago "expediency" was almost the only argument offered in defense of their practices. Now Brewer, Hardeman and a student of Freed-Hardeman college have again started the soothing song of "expediency" that was sung to quiet disturbed minds and troubled consciences many years ago. That song so sweetly sung silenced the conscience and lead astray many good people. So far as I know the digressives have not been singing that bewitching melody for many years. Little did those still living think that the day would ever come when "our brethren would sing the song, originally borrowed from the denominations, not to support any truth, but to render palatable the nostrums, not emanating from Jerusalem, but from the daughters of Rome.

Another exact parallel needs to be noted. We then begged the digressives to cease pressing their unscriptural things, and save the church of the Lord from certain division. They loved the unscriptural things above all else. They closed their eyes, stopped their ears, and pounced with all their might the wedge of humanisms. The church was split. Then they cried out: "You split the church by your opposition." We have now been pleading with our brethren to cease to pound the wedge of supporting human ideas against the Lord's teaching, and away from the church from another division. Some are even now charging that those who oppose this recent practice are to blame for the widespread disturbance to the peace and unity of the church of the Lord. When the division is complete God will know who drove the wedge. Fair minded people will know who is guilty of splitting the church and I am persuaded that the brethren who are now driving that wedge know in their hearts they are responsible for all the alienation that will most surely come. What a load of responsibility men assume when they disturb the peace and unity of the body of Christ by pressing the practice of contributing from the Lord's treasury and save the body of the Lord from strife and division?

W. W. Otey

It becomes increasingly evident that the "college in the church budget" brethren are not at all satisfied with their part in the discussion that was carried on through most of last year on this question. As for our part, we are satisfied with the debate we have already had on the question. Not a position was taken that wasn't exposed, not an argument was made that wasn't answered. It is pretty well evident that they did the best they could to uphold their teaching and practice on this question and miserably failed. They could do no better the next time. Their continued letter writing and challenging evidences only thdr genuine dissatisfaction over the way the whole matter ended. However, from Brother Otey's attitude it can be seen that they could get a debate on their hands yet if they would affirm what they teach and practice in terms unambiguous and unmistakably drawing the correct issue. We have never heard anything from the offer to publish the discussion between Brother Brewer and Brother Cled Wallace in the Bible Banner if the Gospel Advocate would also print it. Bro. Otey draws a parallel in his letter to Bro. Totty that even Bro. Totty should be able to see.

R. E. C.

BRO. RUBY MISREPRESENTED?

(Continued from page 5)

human denominations—Methodists, Baptists, etc. Brother Whitten cited his father who is in the Baptist Church and said that he wouldn't judge him. This statement very nearly expresses my opinion, although I am sure that the Methodists were not mentioned at the meeting. I cannot specify with exactness all of God's people and neither can you. I can and do affirm with the Scripture that baptized, penitent believers of the Gospel of Christ become members of His body, the church, Christians only. If thereafter they become denominational and sectarian in attitude, faith and practice they are in error and need correction. I condemn this error but God alone shall reign them to their ultimate will not.

Yet they stood together in the Long Beach meeting and came to each other's rescue repeatedly. Maybe these boys had better get together in a Bible class and be taught the truth instead of trying to teach it to others.
THE SKEPTICAL RELIGIOUS STUDENT

JACK G. DUNN

(A review of an article appearing under the above title in CHRISTIAN EDUCATION Vol. XXX, No. 3, September, 1947; and reprinted with an Addendum dated January 12, 1948, for the consumption of brethren. It was written by Brother Ralph Wilburn, Professor of Religion at George Pepperdine College.)

Brother Ralph Wilburn, Professor of Religion at George Pepperdine college, has written an article praising the “skeptically religious student,” in which he quotes ninety words from David Hume, eighty-two words from Nels Ferre, fifty-five words from Sir Isaac Newton, and forty-one words from Michel de Monaigne. He also quotes or refers to Rene Deoartes, Augustine, Walt Whitman, Socinus, and Socrates. Moreover, he mentions Jesus (twelve words), Paul (three words), and quotes ten words from James. He doesn’t mention James by name, except in the footnote, “but simply states ‘we are told.’

Brother Wilburn’s idea seems to be that the religious student should presuppose nothing; he should accept nothing on the say-so of the ‘authoritarians.’ He states: “The kind of skepticism about which I am concerned in this article has to do with the method of inquiry in one’s quest for truth.” Later on he elaborates: “I am arguing that the weighing, sifting, and testing of various ideas and points of view by a wholesome methodological skepticism is indispensable in valuable religious thinking as in all valuable thinking about reality.”

So far, I agree; but this idea sincere brethren recognize in Paul’s statement which Bro. Wilburn quotes, “Prove all things,” and the part which he doesn’t quote, “hold fast that which is good.” (I Thess. 5:21)

I do not agree, however, with some statements loosely thrown around. In making his point that no one group has “priority on religious truth,” he wants his “skeptically religious student” to “...explore the entire range of the history of religious thought and experience, knowing that a broad historical approach to ‘the pursuit of religious truth is the surest way for one to transcend religious sectarianism and provincialism.”

Now that, brethren, is a large dose. If Brother Wilburn means that his “skeptically religious student” must explore all man has written on “religious thought and experience,” he would just be started when he celebrated his 100th birthday. An aged, bed-ridden Baptist preacher told me one time that he was just beginning to learn the will of God, “because all his lifetime he had read what man hauled said about the will of God. And I would venture to say he had not read one per cent of the “entire range of the history of religious thought and experience.” Now this Baptist preacher, too odd and intemperate to preach, had begun to read the Bible. Jesus said, “If ye abide in my word, then are ye truly my disciples; and ye shall know the truth, and the truth shall make you free.” (John 8:31,32.)

Brother Wilburn also writes: “Christianity has always stood like a rock for the victory of this religious faith in the ultimate goodness of the world (God).” I take it that, by enclosing “God” in parenthesis, he means that the “goodness of the world and the goodness of God are the same thing. Since when has the goodness of God been identified with the goodness of the world? Christians, the saved, are those who have been called out of the world, and only that part of the world which is “called out” can be saved. If the present world is so good, why should we look for a “new heaven and a new earth, wherein dwelleth righteousness”? (2 Pet. 3:13) Even babes in Christ know that the world is not good.

It may be that Brother Wilburn means something else; I do not wish to do him an injustice. He may mean that Whatever goodness is in the world is of God. He may mean that God is the goodness of the world. But you would never gather it from the context, which, without qualification, speaks of “the ultimate goodness of the world (God).”

In fact, the article is either deep in spots, or muddy in spots, or I am stupid in spots. He says, for instance: “Thus in the literary deposit of the historic wisdom of Christianity one frequently encounters the fundamental belief of the debilitas rationes of the natural man.” As soon as that soaks in, we will go to further elucidation: “The self-transcendence which lies at the center of the Christian idea of redemption is construed in the intellectual as well as the volitional dimension.” Get it? No? Then come on with me to the back seat, where you belong.

Brother Wilburn thinks that the learning of truth is progressive, that each century should know more truth than the preceding century. He writes: “Human truth is a growing body of insights and formulations. Ones “perspective” is enlarged by the discoveries of men through time. He says: “It would hardly have been possible, for example, for an 18th century thinker to have seen the truth that individuals become persons only in the societal context of a community with the clarity which a twentieth century man perceives this truth, thanks to the nineteenth century developments of an awareness of the organic character of human exist-
ence. Our progeny of the 25th or 30th century (we hope) will have acquired a global perspective which will enable them to attain unto a vision of truth that considerably transcends our present ‘scale of observation’.

I hadn’t thought about it much, but just supposed that man was always aware of the organic character of human existence. And I never did know before that an “individual” could not become a “person” except in the societal context of a community; but then I’m learning things. You see, Adam, the “individual” did not become a “person” in the garden of Eden, for he did not then fit into a “societal context of a community.” But during the 930 years of his life he begat sons and daughters, and they in turn begat sons and daughters, until finally there was the “societal context of a community.” Then, presto! Adam the “individual” became a “person!”

Is Brother Wilburn speaking of progressive knowledge in religion, or in scientific and philosophical fields, when he speaks of “human truth” as a “growing body of insights and formulations”? If he means religious truth, he is as wrong as the Mormons, for Jude 3 mentions the “faith which was once for all delivered unto the saints.” The word “faith” does not refer here to the act of believing, but to the body of matter ‘believed; and that had been “once for all delivered.” I contend that Jude, over 1900 years ago, knew as much about that faith as Brother Wilburn does now, and as much as his progeny will in the “25th or 30th century.” It could be, however, that Brother Wilburn has turned to some other kind of “truth.” If so, he has jumped the track; for he started out talking about the skeptically religious student,” who, I take it, would naturally be pursuing religious truth.

This is cleared up somewhat in the Addendum of January 12, 1948. Here, Brother Wilburn writes: ‘Putting the same thought in other words, we could say that Christians should be absolutely sure about the revelation of Christ (the victory of Christian faith), but only relatively sure about their own understanding of Christ. The latter must be continuously examined and re-examined by each individual and by each generation, in the light of the Truth — the word of God, revealed by Jesus Christ through the pages of the New Testament.”

Now the peculiar thing is that nowhere in the first article did Brother Wilburn identify Truth as the “word of God.” He didn’t even hint that Truth is that which is “revealed by Jesus Christ through the pages of the New Testament.” He rather spoke of exploring the “entire range of human thought and experience.” Yes, in the earlier article he says of man that “over a period of three thousand years his philosophical inquiry has uncovered much truth.”

I cannot understand why this shift in stating the fountain ‘and source of religious truth. Could it be that he shifted with his readers? Remember, the first article appeared in CHRISTIAN EDUCATION, September, 1947. But the reprint, with the Addendum, was for the brethren to read. I am not stating this is why Brother Wilburn shifted his source of truth. I am just wondering if that could be the reason. Could it be?

A CASE OF MISTAKEN IDENTITY
GEORGE T. JONES

In the last issue of the Bible Banner, this writer replied to an article appearing in the Gospel Advocate of February 18, by Woodrow C. Whitten of Los Angeles. The title of Bro. Whitten’s article is “An Open Letter To Religious Dictators.” In introducing my article, I wrote: “We were in school together at Freed-Hardeman College a few years back.” Upon reading my reply to his article, Bro. Whitten wrote me that he had never attended Freed-Hardeman College and that I had confused him with another Bro. Whitten.

Under the foregoing circumstances I feel obligated to make this explanation. The Bro. Whitten with whom I attended school at Freed-Hardeman College is listed in the college yearbook of 1940 as “C. W. Whitten”. It was stated in my previous article that we had not met since our college days. I had learned that Bro. C. W. Whitten had gone to California, and it was reported to me that he was connected with George Pepperdine College. With their last names being the same and their initials being interchanged, I leave it to the readers to determine how easy it would be to confuse these brethren.

Therefore, I am happy to learn and glad to state to the readers of the Bible Banner that the Bro. Whitten to whose article I replied is not Bro. C. W. Whitten with whom the writer attended Freed-Hardeman College. Bro. C. W. Whitten preaches at Oxnard, California. Inasmuch as this scribe was not replying to the writer of “An Open Letter To Religious Dictators” but to the article, not one word of the reply is affected. The article would need replying to regardless of its writer. This writer is not even mildly sorry for the truth in his reply and has no apology to offer for it. He is glad to have the readers of the Bible Banner know the difference between Woodrow C. Whitten of Los Angeles, California, and C. W. Whitten of Oxnard, California.
PROFESSIONALISM IN PREACHING
ROY E. COGDILL

A professional attitude is one seriously destructive mistake that especially needs to be avoided. When a preacher begins to feel in some respects toward his work as a doctor or lawyer does toward his profession he ceases to be a safe teacher for anyone. The promotion of my own welfare and position into the highest possible plane from the Viewpoint of influence, popularity, demand, earnings, or rank is an ambition that evidences a professional disposition that is unsafe and unsound all the way through.

Some indications of such an attitude can be seen in the way a preacher talks about his work. When you hear one talking too much of "my work — "my job" — "my usefulness" — "my influence" — "my elders" — "my church" — "my members", etc., you may know that he is at least in danger and likely has already contracted the ailment.

When a preacher becomes a hireling, paid so much to do what the brethren want done, rather than supported that he might give his time to reading, exhortation, or wholly to the work of the Lord, both the preacher and the brethren will be more agreeable. Some have about the same attitude toward the elders of the church that a corporation president has toward the board of directors. If one or more will not go along with his "program" he is minded to start a campaign of maneuvers that will get him or them out of his way and others in who will be more agreeable.

The preacher's attitude toward his support sometimes betrays that he is a "professional". The temptation seems to be to measure it by what another preacher is getting or by what some other church might pay rather than the need and ability of the church where he is laboring. Some are on a constant search for a higher salary and such a consideration will move them almost inevitably. Then too, if he can get an offer of a higher salary from some other congregation, he can probably get a raise for preachers are not so easy to find.

The idea of "making tents" to enable him to do a greater work in some needy field or place would be beneath his dignity for that would seem to put him in the class of "part time" preachers and besides he wouldn't have enough time to study though he doesn't use his time that way when he has it.

"Professionalism" is the primary cause of jealousy among preachers. If one really loves the cause of Christ and wants to see the truth advanced he would rejoice to see all other preachers more successful in accomplishing good than he. But as we measure ourselves by others, we can see many reasons why we should be recognized above others. A preacher who has a degree and has attained quite a standing scholastically frequently will resent the fact that he isn't called for as many meetings, or doesn't preach for as big a church, or receive as large a support as one who doesn't have those attainments. He has been educated to think that such attainments in the sight of the world are really the measure of greatness in the Kingdom of God.

What is my purpose as a preacher anyway? Is it to "guard my influence and usefulness" so as to be kept busy and have a good living out of my work as long as possible? Is it to advance myself in the eyes of the brethren until I am in demand and can require the most liberal support? Is it to be recognized as a scholar and ranked high in the esteem of men? Is it to be able to control others and wield the greatest power? None of these are worthy of even our weakest efforts.

They should not enter into our consideration for a moment. Surely we need to use the best possible judgment in all our affairs and with the utmost skill strive to serve the greatest good of the cause of Christ. But can we say with Paul, "I hold not my life of any account as dear unto myself, so that I may accomplish my course, and the ministry which I received from the Lord Jesus, to testify the gospel of the grace of God." Acts 20:24.

SOME OLD DOCTRINES—
(Continued from page 7)

book of Acts. Figures of speech abound in many speeches Jesus made, but there is no figurative language in the commands he gave the apostles in the great commission. Yet people will turn away from the plain commands and promises of Jesus and his apostles and hang their hopes of heaven on fanciful interpretations of figures of speech. These figures of speech enlarge the views of the Christian and comfort him in his struggles and trials, but no figure of speech tells a sinner what to do to be saved. Think on these things.
The basic principle of all obedience is understanding. "He that heareth the word and understandeth it"—Matt. 13:23. "Go preach the gospel—he that believeth (the gospel) and is baptized shall be saved"—Mark 16:15-16. Believing that Jesus Christ is the Son of God is not all that must be understood in rendering obedience in baptism—there are other essential principles of a gospel faith.

Institutions with design carry the necessity of understanding the design. Example: The Lord's Supper—"Do this in memory of me." No man can observe the Lord's Supper "in memory" of Christ without knowing it. The proposition "for" in Acts 2:38 is "EIS" in the original, and the proposition "in" of 1 Cor. 11:23 is the same "EIS" in the original. No man can take the Lord's Supper in order to, unto or into, the memory of Christ if he does not know it, and for the same reason no man can be baptized in order to, unto or into the remission of sins or salvation, if he does not know it. One cannot accidentally obey God.

If it is not necessary to understand the purpose of baptism, why is it in every case emphasized from the preaching of John to the last verse on the subject in the New Testament? If it is not to be understood, then, that part of the subject is non-essential and when we preach the design of baptism we are preaching something not necessary to be believed, therefore, preaching a non-essential. Why debate with a Baptist preacher on the design of baptism if its design does not have to be believed or understood? Why debate on a non-essential?

Is there a single case in all the New Testament where the person baptized did not understand the purpose of the act?

It is sometimes said that the purpose is not a part of the command. Let us see:

Acts 22:16 "Arise and be baptized and wash away thy sins." The subject understood is you—with the triple predicate—and fully rendered with each part supplied it reads: You arise and be baptized and you wash away your sins. Arise is part of the command: be baptized is a part of the command; wash away your sins is part of the command. No man can say that who believes his sins have already been washed away.

It is said that "to obey God" is the main purpose of baptism. Then why is that purpose never stated? Is it not singular that the New Testament failed to mention the main purpose in connection with the command, but on the other hand emphasized the non-essential purpose, or the purpose not necessary to be believed? "Remission of sins", "into Christ", "shall be saved," "newness of life," and all other expressions are just one design stated in different ways. Baptism has only one design. Alexander Campbell established this premise, and lays it down in that very proposition, in his book on "Baptism." I mention this because so many refer to Campbell on the subject.

We are sometimes asked: If it is necessary to believe that baptism is for the remission of sins then should we not make it a part of the confession and ask every one "Do you believe that Jesus Christ is the Son of God and do you also believe that baptism is for the remission of sins?" This is dodging the issue. Try it on the other contention. If the main purpose is "to obey God," then, the argument would require that it also be made a part of the confession: "Do you believe that Jesus Christ is the Son of God and are you being baptized to obey God?" It's a poor rule that will not work both ways. As a matter of fact, all sincere people in religion perform every act of religious service with the general motive to obey God. Baptism has a very specific purpose—just as does the Lord's Supper—and the general idea that it is a command, but not essential to salvation or that it is a duty but the duty of one already saved is a perversion of Bible teaching. If one can be scripturally baptized with such a belief then all our preaching on the subject is inconsistent.

To say that a man can believe that he is saved before he is baptized, and then be baptized to be saved, is to argue that what a man believes has nothing to do with what he does.

It is frequently said that if one is satisfied we have no right to question them. Why should we hold an inquest? Paul evidently "held an inquest" over the twelve in Acts 19. True, the same thing may not be wrong in the case before us—but something was wrong there and something else just as vital may be wrong now. Satisfaction is not salvation. Apply the argument to other things people believe and do in religion and where would it lead to? If it can be applied to baptism why not to everything else?

It takes more than the right act to constitute valid baptism. The right act based on the right belief: Error preached, error heard, error believed, is error obeyed. Truth preached, truth heard, truth believed, is truth obeyed.

Jesus said, "Ye shall know the truth and the truth shall make you free." This cannot be made to mean "You may believe error but if in your error your aim is to obey God, then your error will make you free, anyway." Such apologizing for denominational error cannot advance the truth. It is much easier to teach people to obey the gospel than to defend them in their error.
Church Furniture -::- Seating Equipment

TOMPKINS MANUFACTURING COMPANY

Business Phone 2462-3R- Res. Phone 1702W

Route 3 - Box 221A

LUFKIN, TEXAS

Contact us about your Church Furniture needs. Our field representatives will meet with your committee to discuss your plans.

We manufacture all types of Pews, Communion Tables, Pulpit Sets, Choir Railings, Altars, and Lecterns. We can supply all your Church Furniture needs.

COMPETITIVE PRICES

REASONABLE DELIVERY
DISTURBING REPORTS—

(Continued from page 1)

6. That the president of the college spoke for the Methodist Church on Easter Sunday and **excused** it on the ground that “he spoke as a representative of the college and did not represent the church.”

7. That the Dean is a “modern” from Duke University, with ideas of the “new approach,” does not believe in discipline, and the word “don’t” is not in his vocabulary. In short, the trouble is in having a young president that is “carried about by every wind of doctrine” and a modern dean who is not grounded in the truth, and both of them “flirting with the denominations.”

8. That a number of faculty members are plainly distressed with the conditions, some have quit, others are trying to make things what they should be, and that young preachers who have gone out from the college do not give it their support, and that unrest and confusion prevail in faculty and student body.

9. That the college conditions have been transferred to the church because the president and faculty members preach for the church, and in one instance have attempted to depose elders and replace them with men who were favorable to the college and its policies. This congregation, near the college, has had endless trouble from men who have collaborated to bring the congregation under the domination of the college. They have maintained that the church is a democracy and should be ruled entirely by the majority vote of the members and not by the elders. They asked the elders to resign, contending that any decisions should be made by the whole group of members and of the college, including the president and dean, with the exception of one, and he is Jimmie Lovell.

The Bible Banner has no desire to harm any worthy institution nor hinder any legitimate endeavor. But public institutions that involve the cause of Christ and effect the future of the church through young people influenced by them, should not be shielded from criticism when conditions become as badly mixed up as they appear to be in the California College. If Brother Hugh Tiner, the President of the college, wishes to distinguish himself by service to the cause of Christ rather than popularity with the California public, he will set himself to the task of rectifying these conditions. If it is denied that these **things** exist, then we can only say that **something** exists that has disturbed and distressed some mighty good people of both mental and spiritual discernment, in and out of the college. It would be difficult to make the public believe that there is nothing to it.

If the colleges among us continue to look to the members of the church for patronage and support, it is their solemn duty to make these schools worthy of the trust and confidence of all Christian people, rather than the objects of distrust and suspicion.

F. E. W. Jr.

In 1942 from the pen of Brother Foy E. Wallace, Jr., came this appeal above to George Pepperdine College. Instead of working toward the correction and elimination of these points of criticism, those **responsible** for the college have rather taken the attitude that the college does not belong to the brethren, it is privately endowed, and its affairs are run by a Board of directors, some of whom along with some of the officials of the school and some of the teachers are reputed to have life time positions; they are not amenable to anyone and do not propose to listen to ‘anyone but will direct the affairs of the school to suit themselves whatever the brotherhood thinks. Of course, that is all right and none of us would presume to tell them how to run the school, but if they expect to maintain the good will and patronage of the brethren, and have the opportunity to do good, they will have to maintain the school in such a way as to merit and retain the respect of brethren. They cannot have their cake and eat it too. If they expect all of us to sit quietly by while they advertise a school with influence, environment and teaching that is Christian, when it is everything else but that they have another think coming and the high handed attitude that they ‘take in telling us that they will run the school to suit themselves will not prevent our telling the brethren that the school is not the place to send their children for training in Christian character and usefulness and that the teaching there will do everything else but strengthen faith. If our young men who are planning to preach the gospel want to go to school where the teaching will be weakening to their own faith to the, point that they will soon neither know what they believe or what the truth is that should be taught to others, they couldn’t choose more wisely this side of Chicago University. All of us had rather see the school **eliminate** all these criticisms and objections and accomplish the great good that it could do. There is certainly nothing personal in any objection that has been raised. Our interest in the whole matter is the effect on truth and the souls of men as well as the cause of Christ in general that such teaching will have.

R. E. C.