

*Frank Dunbar*

CONCERNING  
CHRISTIAN  
COLLEGES

*By W. Carl Ketcherside*

# CONCERNING CHRISTIAN COLLEGES



A reply to an article by A. G. Hobbs, Jr.,  
entitled "Concerning Colleges," and published  
in "*Christian Worker*," Jan. 25, 1945



By W. Carl Ketcherside



MISSION MESSENGER

7505 Trenton Ave.,

St. Louis 14, Mo.

## Chapter I

# History of Institutionalism

The gravest threat faced by the church in any generation is that of institutionalism. This insidious foe to the maintenance of purity of doctrine strikes at the heart of the church by tampering with the organization of the divine body. Cleverly supplanting "the simplicity that is in Christ" with complex human machinery, it bogs God's system down in a welter of confusion, and hopelessly entangles the church in a labyrinth of humanisms out of which it cannot pick its weary way. The fight against the encroachment of scholastic institutionalism upon the territory ceded by the King of kings unto His own bride is not of modern origin.

The first "Bible College" was established at Alexandria, Egypt, almost under the shadow of the apostolic era. This city was the seat of pagan culture and philosophic reason. Men of wide training and cultivated intellect attacked the doctrine of the lowly Nazarene with such rhetorical skill, that the converts to Christianity smarted under the whip-lash of their learned dissertations. They considered it indispensable to their perpetuity that they meet Grecian culture upon its own level. Forgetting that the Holy Spirit forbade "speech and preaching with enticing words of man's wisdom . . . that your faith should not stand in the wisdom of men, but in the power of God,"<sup>1</sup> the brethren inaugurated a catechetical school to provide defenders of the faith who could match in appearance and skill the most haughty critic among the philosophers.

Its earliest teacher was the venerable Pantaenus, a convert from the Stoic philosophy. He reasoned that the gospel must be adapted to the age or condition with which it was faced, and concluded that it must be clothed in a more

---

<sup>1</sup> 1 Cor. 2: 4, 5.

intellectual and cultured dress if it was to woo and win the hearts of Greek communities. Accordingly, he regarded the philosophy of the Greeks, especially that of Plato, as an instrument of God, to prepare the Hellenic race for a reception of the gospel, as the Mosaic law was a schoolmaster to bring the Jews unto Christ. Under the subtle influence of this ideology, philosophy became the handmaiden of Christianity, rather than its foe, and the preachers trained in the school became suave, polished apologists who could make the cross appear as a shining standard rather than an instrument of death. Alexander Campbell said,

“Mosheim, from the mass of evidence upon this subject to which he had access, satisfactorily shows that the first ‘theological seminary’ established at Alexandria, in Egypt, in the second century, was the grave of primitive Christianity. Yes, it appears that the first school instituted for preparing Christian doctors was the fountain, the streams whereof polluted the great mass of Christian professors, and completed the establishment of a paganized christianity in the room of the religion of the New Testament.”<sup>2</sup>

Human nature does not change. The desire to crystallize and preserve inviolate the gains of human reason seems to motivate the acts of all who by wealth or learning are elevated to positions of prominence in the church of the living God. When Campbell had sounded the clarion call of restoration, which brought the eager response of thousands who deserted the expiring formalism of the sectarian world, he repeated the error of second century Christians, and established Bethany College. Then David Lipscomb wrote

“We think the most fatal mistake of Alexander Campbell’s life, and one that has done much and we fear will do much more to undo his life’s work, was the establishment of a school to train and educate young preachers.”

Again, he said

“Brother Campbell in his later life, when his great mind had much failed, was used by those around to seemingly approve much that he had condemned in his early days of vigor. He probably conceived the idea in his vigor that he could have the Bible taught to men who would

---

<sup>2</sup> Alexander Campbell, *The Christian Baptist*, Vol. 1, No. 10 (May 3, 1824) pp. 61, 62.

teach others also without them becoming a separate order of clergy. If so, the result proves how sadly mistaken the great man was."<sup>3</sup>

The above was penned in 1875. Sixteen years later, David Lipscomb wrote in the same paper:

"It is proposed to open a school in Nashville, in September next, under safe and competent teachers, in which the Bible, excluding all human opinions and philosophy, as the rule of faith and practice; and the appointments of God, as ordained in the Scriptures, excluding all innovations and organizations of men, as the fulness of divine wisdom for converting sinners and perfecting saints, will be earnestly taught. The aim is to teach the Christian religion as presented in the Bible in its purity and fulness; and in teaching this prepare Christians for usefulness in whatever sphere they are called upon to labor. Such additional branches of learning will be taught as are needful and helpful in understanding and obeying the Bible, and in teaching it to others."<sup>4</sup>

Four months later, James A. Harding, a collaborator in founding the school had this to say:

"A tuition fee of three dollars a month is charged in the case of those able to pay it. There is a great need in all the land of evangelists, elders, deacons and Bible teachers. Our school is designed to supply this need. We hope that the churches will encourage their young men to attend and that they will when help is needed, help them to come."<sup>5</sup>

Let us summarize the facts set forth in the preceding quotations:

(1). Alexander Campbell acknowledged his belief in the testimony of Mosheim to the effect that the first theological seminary was the grave of primitive Christianity. Then Campbell proceeded to establish another such school which became the grave of the restoration movement.

(2). David Lipscomb declared that the establishment of a school to train and educate young preachers was the most fatal mistake of Campbell's life. He intimated that this mistake was not made until Campbell's giant mind had much failed in his senility. Then David Lipscomb proceeded to establish another such school to teach the Bible, designed to supply the need of the churches for "evangelists, elders, deacons and Bible teachers." Had his giant mind failed?

<sup>3</sup> David Lipscomb, *Gospel Advocate* (1875) p. 345.

<sup>4</sup> David Lipscomb, *Gospel Advocate* (June 17, 1891).

<sup>5</sup> James A. Harding, *Gospel Advocate* (Oct. 21, 1891).

Was he "used by those around him to seemingly approve much that he had condemned in his early days of vigor"?

On what grounds do men justify the host of so-called "Christian colleges" which have sprung up since David Lipscomb duplicated the fatal mistake of Alexander Campbell? It is time for those who love the Lord to sit down calmly and dispassionately and weigh these human institutions in the balance of God's revelation. Only narrow-minded bigots hide behind an iron curtain and shout "anti" at those who differ with them. The scientific method of analysis is to examine everything and cling only to what is good. Even that which is opposed to previous assumptions must be sifted and weighed. This is also the Biblical formula for determining truth. "Test all things, retaining only that which is good."<sup>6</sup>

In any presentation such as this, both sides deserve to be heard. We propose to offer in our next chapter, an unabridged and unexpurgated article in defence of the colleges. It was written for the specific purpose of justifying the schools. It was published in "*Christian Worker*," a paper of wide circulation in the brotherhood. It was produced from the fertile brain and facile pen of A. G. Hobbs, Jr., a graduate of Abilene Christian College, and it is calculated to paint the college story in as roseate a hue as possible. We urge a careful reading and a close study of his article.

We propose further to dissect this article as with a surgeon's scalpel. We shall do it impartially and objectively, unmoved by prejudice and bias. We expect to show that the article is misleading, non-factual and unscriptural. We shall not concern ourselves with the purposes of the writer, neither impugning his motives nor impeaching his purposes. But we shall deliberately, critically and relentlessly pursue the task of replication to show that the writer of the article demonstrates his lack of qualification to write on a matter so serious, by his utter disregard of fact. Only God has the right to "call things that be not as though they were." No man should publish a defense of a human organization unless he is prepared to have it scrutinized and challenged.

---

<sup>6</sup> 1 Thess. 5: 21.

## Chapter II

# Concerning Colleges

A. G. HOBBS, JR.

(Reprint of article appearing in the "Christian Worker,"  
January 25, 1945)

It is the duty of parents to provide for the education of their children. State schools are contaminated with infidelity and evolution. The child that can go through a state school and listen to the Bible and Christianity criticized and made light of and come out with his faith as strong as he went in is the exception. Many are led astray completely from faith in God and the Bible. Parents with a vision can see this and have been able to do so for years. As a consequence, colleges have been established that make it possible for boys and girls to receive a college education under teachers who are members of the church of our Lord. Thanks to those noble souls who have labored long and hard to make this possible.

Jesus, the only perfect man was opposed, and the church of Jesus has been opposed almost from its earliest history until the present; so the colleges that have been established have not been without opposition. It is through ignorance mainly that the church is opposed; and it is through ignorance that the colleges have been opposed. The opposition has been from sections of the country where there is no college. Those who love the truth will no longer oppose the church of Christ after they weigh all the facts. After all the facts are weighed, those who love the truth will no longer oppose the colleges where all the teachers are members of the church of the New Testament.

The enemies of Jesus lay in wait to catch Him in his talk. The enemies of the colleges gather every little state-

ment that they think they can criticize. Friends of the school have made careless statements that have been misunderstood and misconstrued. But all lovers of fairness and truth will face the facts squarely and not fight smoke screens and straw men.

Schools and colleges are not religious institutions but educational institutions. They are not rivals of the church, and do not rob the church of its glory.

#### PURPOSE OF THE SCHOOLS

The schools are maintained in order to provide a place where parents can send their children to receive an education and be under teachers who are members of the church of Christ, and not have to be subjected to false teaching and evil influence that abounds in state schools. The primary purpose is not to teach the Bible. The Bible is only one among hundreds of other subjects. Colleges are an adjunct to the home and not to the church. Strong Christian homes and faithful boys and girls indirectly add to the stability of the church. It would be a loss to the church if our boys and girls who are members are sent to a state school and are led astray from the faith. The schools exist to aid parents—but not to do their work or the work of the church.

Colleges cannot be compared to missionary societies. Missionary societies do the work of the church in supporting preachers to hold meetings and to establish congregations. I never heard of a college supporting preachers in mission fields to establish new congregations. This is the work of the church and colleges do not infringe on this work.

#### NOT OWNED BY THE CHURCH

Schools are individual enterprises. Here is proof that they are neither owned nor run by the church. The church can stop anything that it is doing. If it is conducting a meeting, it can close the meeting. But there is not a congregation, or group of congregations that can close the schools.



## SUPPORT OF THE COLLEGES

I do not know of a congregation that has the support of a college in its budget. The colleges do not ask congregations to support it out of the church treasury. They are supported by individuals. It has been eleven years since I graduated from Abilene Christian College. Not one time has the college ever asked a congregation with which I was working to put the school in the budget. May I here deny the charge that the school dominates the churches. I affirm that religious papers have done more to dominate the churches and mold the thought of the brotherhood than all the schools.

## NOT PREACHER FACTORIES

Both boys and girls attend the colleges; and the courses are open to any who desire to take them. The boys who plan to farm sit side by side with the ones who plan to preach. But with the present shortage of preachers it appears that we need a factory somewhere to train and make available more preachers. The preachers that have attended college are helping to evangelize the world—much more so than the “anti-college” preachers. Did you ever hear of an “anti-college” congregation sending a preacher to a foreign field to preach? Did you ever hear of an “anti-college” preacher going to a foreign field?

## GLORY TO THE CHURCH

Opponents of the colleges cry that they are robbing the church of its glory. They also argue that the colleges are run and owned by the church—which I have already pointed out is not true. But to try to take both positions is inconsistent. Who gets the glory for hospitals and schools operated by the Catholic Church? Many praise the Catholic Church for the good deeds done in her hospitals. Who gets the glory for the orphan homes that the Masonic lodge builds and maintains?

If the church of Christ owned and run the schools, it would only reflect glory on the church and not rob it of glory.

However, the schools are supported by individual members of the church, and all the teachers are members of the church; and since what a person does as an individual Christian, if it be right and praiseworthy, brings glory to the church, so the great good the schools do brings glory and praise to the church. I know this to be true in Abilene and all west Texas.

Members of the church, as individual Christians, have a right to teach school. They also have a right to teach the Bible. When both are being done in the same building but in separate rooms, it surely does not become wrong. It is a wonderful thing that boys and girls can receive a college education studying under members of the church, and also be in Bible class and study the Bible for one or more periods each day.

#### THOSE WHO OPPOSE

Those who oppose the colleges are opposing the only places that boys and girls can secure a college education and be under safe influence and wholesome environment. They teach that boys and girls should attend state schools and sit at the feet of infidels and evolutionists.

The schools that are maintained by members of the church, as individual Christians, are needed. Not only are they needed but they have a right to exist. The way they are supported does not violate any principle or passage of the Bible. Hence, those who fight the colleges are fighting something that is right—fighting that which brings glory to the church. It is just as wrong to oppose that which is right as it is to uphold that which is wrong. Therefore, those who oppose the colleges are wrong in their opposition.

#### MARK THEM

“Now I beseech you, brethren, mark them which cause divisions and offenses contrary to the doctrine which ye have learned; and avoid them.” Rom. 16: 17.

The doctrine of Paul was that we should “be ready to every good work.” Tit. 3: 1. To provide opportunities for Christian boys and girls under the influence of Christianity

is certainly a good work. To oppose a good work that is being done in a scriptural manner, and to cause division over it is certainly contrary to the doctrine of Paul and the other Apostles.

There is a small faction that keeps alive division over opposition to colleges. There are two papers used as divisive organs which should be marked and the brotherhood warned against. They are the American Christian Review and the Macedonian Call. Both are published in Indianapolis by brothers in the flesh—but neither the brothers nor the papers are in fellowship. Shades of Christianity!

If you encourage or support these papers, you are supporting papers which are causing division and hindering the unity and progress of the church of our Lord.

## Chapter III

# Who Are The Skeptics?

"It is the duty of parents to provide for the education of their children. State schools are contaminated with infidelity and evolution. The child that can go through a state school and listen to the Bible and Christianity criticized and made light of and come out with his faith as strong as he went in is the exception. Many are led astray completely from faith in God and the Bible. Parents with a vision can see this and have been able to do so for years. As a consequence, colleges have been established that make it possible for boys and girls to receive a college education under teachers who are members of the church of our Lord. Thanks to those noble souls who have labored long and hard to make this possible."

According to the reasoning in this paragraph the Bible college advocates have no worries about future opposition, as all of the children of the ones opposed, with few exceptions, will become infidels and skeptics, and the "anti-college" congregations will fade away. Statistics show, however, that such congregations are increasing, and the hireling ministry system engendered by the colleges, is now engaged in its most intense fight. That fight is not against skeptics or agnostics but against consecrated men pleading for a return to the "old paths." Most of those men attended schools supported by general revenue taxation; many of them have degrees from state universities. Are they the exceptions?

Who are the *real* skeptics? Whose faith is the weakest in God's institutions in these days? Those opposed to human institutions established to teach the Bible have confidence that the divinely ordained institutions of home and church can provide a bulwark against the encroachment of Satan in any field. They do not believe that Christians thrive in a hothouse environment protected against all storms of doubt, but in face to face combat with the enemy.

Timothy was taught by a godly mother and saintly grandmother, in whom dwelt an unfeigned faith. As a Christian he travelled with an older gospel preacher who said of him, "He worketh the work of the Lord as I also do." Will that same system produce gospel preachers now? It required no huge appropriations, no mammoth campus, no elaborate buildings, no complicated curriculum. It begged no money from churches or individuals. It sought to transmit only the deep faith of a mother to her son, and to commit what a faithful gospel preacher knew to another who was able to teach others also. Here was a plan with apostolic approbation. Did it work then? Did it produce the desired result? Will it do so now? *We believe* it will! We are demonstrating that it does!

The Bible college enthusiasts are skeptical. They *do not believe* that the home and the church are capable of protecting the hearts and souls of our offspring. No Bible college was ever born of faith in God's plan. Such institutions are monuments to the lack of faith which prompts unreasoning fear, and lack of faith in the divine organizations to accomplish the divine purpose. Bible colleges are walls built to keep the devil out, but when the devil gets inside he uses the very walls to exclude Christ and His doctrine. They are the upper segment of a parochial school system which has always gone hand in hand with crystallized sectarianism.

"Our schools" originate in the same spirit which produced the parochial schools of Roman Catholicism and Lutheranism. The factors which combine to foster such institutionalism are: fear, regimentation, and ambition. Their protagonists have a deep-seated fear that they cannot meet the encroachments of skepticism, infidelity and immorality with the divinely ordained institutions—the home and the church. Like men who see the waters beat against the levees and frantically seek to strengthen them with sandbags, these feel that the heaven-sent bulwarks which stood the test against the unparalleled attacks by agnosticism and atheism in other years can no longer survive without these

human expedients. Thus, instead of Bible colleges comprising a monument to industry, sacrifice and strength, they stand as a mute testimonial of our weakness and inability. No longer able to conquer the Goliaths which threaten the armies of God, with the stones of the brook, we must now put on the armor of Saul. So heavy is the burden that the church requires all of her energy and strength to even move, and her financial blood is drained away to maintain ponderous bureaucracies.

In Roman Catholicism there is a definite attempt to hold youth by a regimentation of both body and mind. This takes the form of *compulsory* attendance at daily mass or chapel, required study of church history favorably slanted by the hierarchy, and development of strong ties of school spirit which act to check those who might otherwise rebel. This is enhanced by subtle, but nonetheless effective censorship, which erects an iron curtain against free discussion. Thus the sectarian concept is gradually instilled until the students act as a mass and the interpretation of departmental heads becomes the law from which no dissent is tolerated. If an occasional dissenter does arise, he is effectively squelched by ridicule, boycott and mob psychology.

The spirit of each individual must be so cultivated that he can withstand the attempted inroads of Satan's shock troops upon the basis of personal convictions. Parents need to realize that in bringing up their children "in the nurture and admonition of the Lord," they have at their disposal two divine institutions adapted to all the spiritual needs of mankind. The invasion of this realm by any other organization may transfer allegiance from the "Jerusalem which is above, the mother of us all," to another "alma mater" or "benign mother," which we will reverence even more than we do the church.

Colleges are not for boys and girls, but for men and women. They are not for little children but for adults. Brother Hobbs writes as if they were for tiny boys and girls. That they are not is evidenced by the ill-disguised hints in their propaganda, that you can virtually assure

your daughter marrying a Christian man by sending her to one of the schools. While such marital bureau influence is a by-product of the schools, it serves to prove that they are not being run for boys and girls. Psychological statistics prove that by the time one is ready to enter college his ideals are well-formed and his life course fairly well determined. In view of this it would appear that most of those who enter Abilene Christian College would already have their faith shaken and their religion impaired.

We may expect, in view of the reasoning of the college advocates, that soon the churches will be solicited to start a high school in each community, after which an intermediate school will become a necessity, then a kindergarten. This will mean that in a community having a Roman Catholic, Lutheran, Baptist church, and a church of Christ, there will be four school systems; one maintained by the Catholic church, one by the Lutheran church, another by the church of Christ, and a fourth by the state which will be attended by the Baptists. This will foredoom all of the Baptists and others unattached, to become skeptics and infidels, but three-fourths of the blame will lie with the other three groups whose taxes supported the state school the while they enjoyed segregated schools. In some communities the church of Christ will have to maintain two school systems, one for the children of white Christians, the other for children of colored disciples. Both schools, which will no doubt have a white superintendent, will teach that Jesus died for all and wants us all to be one! Thus brethren will not only build schools to segregate the devil and sectarians, but also their own brethren who have more pigment in their skins!

Do you think the above is the exaggerated daydreaming of a distorted and prejudiced mind? Then listen!

**"It may never come true, but every person should have a religious setting for all learning—from the first day in school to the finish of the doctorate degree. . . . For these reasons, there should be a Christian secondary school in every large city. . . . And wherever possible, in addition, accredited Bible classes should be established and taught by good teachers. Churches would do well to undergo the expense of**

erecting small buildings where such classes could be taught for credit. Or, again, we might do well, as money becomes available, to establish *more junior colleges*. I would not recommend too many, but I would recommend a few wisely spaced geographically. It would be wise, furthermore, to go out into new territory and establish a few standard colleges—in the north and east, especially. . . . And, finally, we need two or three graduate schools of standard rank and fundamental in faith, conferring standard degrees in *distinctly religious fields*.<sup>1</sup>

Who wrote that? Were those words the fulminations of a Catholic bishop or a Lutheran pastor? Did they appear in the diocesan magazine of some Romish parish? No, they were written by a gospel preacher and appeared in the *Harding College Bulletin*. Indications are strongly in favor of the assumption that the time is not far distant when the churches of Christ will start a school in a new community *before they start a church*. They are already following that procedure in foreign lands. In several cities of our own country they already have parochial schools, and in other places are negotiating for grade schools and high schools. The church can no longer walk without a crutch. The Lord cannot add to His institution without bringing those added through another devised by man. In another article which does not pertain especially to the format of this book we shall diagnose the result of the parochial system now being advocated.

Before us lies a catalogue of Abilene Christian College, from which A. G. Hobbs graduated. Almost without exception the faculty members received their degrees from or did special work in a state college such as the University of Texas. Did they become contaminated with infidelity and evolution, or were they all exceptions? Why was it right for them to go to such state schools, but wrong for you to do so? Jesus said of the scribes and Pharisees, "All therefore whatsoever they bid you observe, that observe and do, but do ye not after their works; for they say, and do not."<sup>2</sup> "Thou therefore which teachest another, teachest thou not thyself? thou that preachest a man should not steal, dost

---

<sup>1</sup> E. W. McMillan, "Christian Education," *Harding College Bulletin* (Dec. 15, 1945).

<sup>2</sup> Matthew 23:3.



thou steal? Thou that sayest a man should not commit adultery, dost thou commit adultery? thou that abhorrest idols, dost thou commit sacrilege?"<sup>3</sup> To which may be added, "Thou that sayest a man should not attend a state university, dost thou attend a state university?"

'Tis wrong to send your children  
To secure their education  
In schools maintained by taxes  
Of state or of the nation.

'Tis wrong to let them go also  
To sectarian institutions  
For they might teach them falsely  
Thus ruin their constitutions.

Send them to Abilene Christian  
Where—do not indulge a laugh—  
Every teacher went to state schools  
Or to a sectarian teaching staff.

---

<sup>3</sup> Romans 2: 21, 22.

## Chapter IV

# Why The Opposition?

"Jesus the only perfect man was opposed, and the church of Jesus has been opposed almost from its earliest history until the present; so the colleges have not been without opposition. It is through ignorance mainly that the church is opposed; and it is through ignorance that the colleges have been opposed. The opposition has been from sections of the country where there is no college. Those who love the truth will no longer oppose the church of Christ after they weigh all the facts. After all the facts are weighed, those who love the truth will no longer oppose the colleges where all the teachers are members of the church of the New Testament."—A. G. Hobbs, Jr.

The fact that a thing is opposed does not argue that it is either right or wrong. It is true that Jesus was opposed but the same may be affirmed of Adolf Hitler, Josef Stalin and Napoleon Bonaparte. Does this fact put all of the latter three in the same class with Jesus? It is true that the church has been opposed from its inception, but that is also true of the Missionary society. Are they both in the same class? The saloon has always been opposed. Is it in the same class with the church? It would probably have been a little nearer correct if the writer had stated, "It is through ignorance mainly that the church is *opposed*; and it is through ignorance that the colleges have been *established*." It appears that the thing which troubles the Bible college defenders is not that the opposition knows *too little about them*, but rather that they know *too much on them!*

What difference does it make as to what sections of the country produce the greatest opposition? The question is whether or not the colleges have a scriptural right to exist in any section. One does not have to see a missionary society to oppose it, any more than he has to have measles in order to try and avoid them. The opposition against Communism is from those sections which do not have it, and for a very

good reason. In those sections where Communism has taken over it is dangerous to oppose it. The opposition to Catholicism is strongest in those sections where it does not rule, for the simple reason that it crushes out all opposition when it takes over. Is such opposition to Catholicism and Communism based upon ignorance? Shall we wait until we get smallpox to get vaccinated? Shall we wait until we see a tornado approaching before we dig a storm cellar? The question is not from what section the opposition *comes*, but if it is justified when it *arrives*.

With a disarming gesture, Bro. Hobbs seeks to drag a red herring across the trail, by his statement, "After all the facts are weighed, those who love the truth will no longer oppose the colleges where all the teachers are members of the church of the New Testament." The question is not how many teachers are Christians, but if Christians have a right to establish a human organization through which to teach God's word, edify one another, and develop preachers, elders and teachers for the church. The fact that every member of the *missionary society* is a Christian does not imply it is right for them to preach the word through that institution; nor does the fact that every member of an *educational society* to teach the word is a Christian argue that it is right to teach through such an organization. This assumes the very thing to be proved, and is a notable example of the fallacy of "begging the question."

"The enemies of Jesus lay in wait to catch him in his talk. The enemies of the colleges gather every little statement that they think they can criticize. Friends of the school have made careless statements that have been misunderstood and misconstrued. But all lovers of fairness and truth will face the facts squarely and not fight smoke screens and straw men."—A. G. Hobbs, Jr.

It is true that the enemies of Jesus tried to catch him in his talk. It is also true that Jesus did not make "careless statements." But He did endorse the principle of judging a man upon the basis of what he said. "By thy words thou shalt be justified, and by thy words thou shalt be condemned." "And he saith unto him, Out of thine own mouth

will I judge thee." It is an established basis of legal testimony that the official documents of an organization are to be accepted as authoritative statements of the tenets and principles of such organization. If we quoted from the enemies of the schools our testimony would be ruled out as prejudiced, but it is admitted that we quote from the friends of the schools, that is, from those who would be most liable to tell the truth about them. It may be that the truth about the schools is the very thing which their supporters do not want revealed. And those supporters are the last persons on this earth to talk about another gathering every statement to criticize. The school defenders are notorious for the fact that they "compass sea and land" to get something on an opponent, and to develop a "smear campaign" when they cannot defend their extraorganization. Witness their eager searching of the writings and documents of such men as the teachers of pre-millennialism and other such deviates from God's plan. "Sauce for the goose is sauce for the gander!"

It may be mentioned that defenders of the schools have recently said in a burst of magnanimous spirit that they appreciate the opposers of the schools because such opposition will make their brethren guard their statements. Remember that a man may not reveal his true position in the presence of opposition when he guards his every word. It is in his unguarded writings and casual statements that he reveals the real thinking of his heart.

The attitude of the college advocates toward the opposition is that of all sectarianism. The sectarian spirit never changes. It is the same in all generations! It is the same whether in the church of Christ or out of it! That spirit is the spirit of dogmatic, arrogant, arbitrary rule over the hearts of men. When it cannot dominate it seeks to crush! When it cannot rule it seeks to ruin. Sectarianism has its slogans for propaganda, just as every false "ism" in the world employs the tactic. It cries "anti," with prejudicial intent and purpose. It twists and wrests the writings of the opposition. It cannot and will not meet on a fair and open

plane the opposition. It seeks to defend what it holds by defaming those who denounce it. It operates on the basis that if you cannot kill the truth, you may destroy its advocate. But "truth crushed to earth will rise again!" Let no one be deceived by the pious platitudes of those who run for cover and cry about "smoke screens and straw men." Their house is built of bricks made without straw!

## Chapter V

# Nature And Purpose Of Schools

"Schools and colleges are not religious institutions but educational institutions. They are not rivals of the church, and do not rob the church of its glory."—A. G. Hobbs, Jr.

If the schools are not religious institutions, on what basis do they sponsor gospel meetings and missionary rallies under the guise of lectureships? Before me lies a bulletin entitled "Abilene Christian College Annual Bible Lecture-ship, February 21-25, 1937." At the top is the caption: "Please Announce to Your Congregation." The frontispiece contains the following:

GENERAL SUBJECT: *The Church and Its Great Mission: To Preach the Gospel to the Whole Creation.*

"Go ye into all the world and preach the gospel to the whole creation."

"Lift up your eyes and look on the fields, that they are white already unto the harvest."

"The harvest indeed is plenteous, but the laborers are few."

"How shall they hear without a preacher? And how shall they preach except they be sent?"

The purpose of this series of lectures is to arouse a greater interest in and enthusiasm for sounding forth the word of the Lord, and in preaching the gospel to those regions where it has never been preached.

\* \* \*

The program included among others, addresses on "The Perfected Church—For What Purpose?" C. A. Norred; "How the Church Went in the First Century," Homer Hailey; "The Urgency for the Church to Go Today," R. C. Bell; "Ripened Fields," John Wolfe; "Responsibility of Each Congregation in Sounding Out the Word," E. C.

Coffman; "Workable Plans," George S. Benson; "Awakening the Churches," B. D. Morehead. There were round table discussions on "Neglected and Needy Fields in the Western Hemisphere," with Don Hockaday presiding; "The African and Australian Work," with Dow Merritt presiding; and "Missionary Work among the Oriental Peoples," with J. M. McCaleb presiding.

It seems to me there is quite a bit of "religion" mixed up in that program for something that is "not a religious institution." If Abilene Christian College is not a religious institution why did it sponsor such an event? In the *Firm Foundation* and *Gospel Advocate* appear announcements of various lectureships arranged by local congregations. No one can detect an iota of difference between them and the one arranged by this non-religious institution. Either the churches or the colleges are out of their sphere. If the planning of missionary work belongs to an institution that is "educational and not religious," then the church ought to get out of the missionary business. Do not the churches and colleges have visiting missionaries come back and report to them? Do not both put on drives for funds to support the work of such missionaries? Is not much of the mission work planned for the churches during the college lectureships? What business does a school which is not a religious institution have to plan for "awakening the churches"?

Bro. Hobbs says of the schools, "They are not rivals of the church." He no doubt expects us to take this naive statement as fact without examination. What is a rival? Is it not a competitor? Does the college not compete with the church in the sponsorship of missionary rallies, gospel meetings and lectureships? Does it not compete with the churches for the money which individual members allot to the work of training and developing Christians? Does it not seek to get this money in its grasp before it can get into the treasury of the church? Does it not compete with the church in training workers for the Lord, and imply the inability of the church to perpetuate itself without the school? Read what Robert Alexander said in *Firm Founda-*

tion, under the heading "Why Abilene Christian College Is Asking for \$3,000,000." Here it is: "We have long since found out that state schools are not in the business of turning out preachers of the gospel. Congregations cannot and homes cannot properly prepare young men for the ministry. There is only one place that congregations desiring men well prepared in intellect and in heart to preach the gospel must turn, and that place is the Christian college."

That statement affirms the helplessness of the divine institutions of home and church to train gospel preachers. Fortunately Eunice, Lois and Paul did not know this, so they trained a fairly good one in Timothy. Or did he get a degree in theology from the "School of Tyrannus"? The church is now helpless in the hands of a competitor. It is the obligation of the church to train men to preach the gospel. A rival has arisen in that field declaring the church is wholly inadequate to the task and has only one source of supply—the Christian college. Can men longer deny that Abilene Christian College is "a preacher factory"? Can they affirm that it is an adjunct to the home when it admits to being the nursery to the pulpit? Who prepared the preachers before David Lipscomb started this licensed hatchery in 1891? If the home and church could prepare them before that day, why not now? Has the arm of the Lord become shortened? Does the body of Christ need an artificial limb?

**"The schools are maintained in order to provide a place where parents can send their children to receive an education and be under teachers who are members of the church of Christ, and not have to be subjected to false teaching and evil influence that abounds in state schools. The primary purpose is not to teach the Bible. The Bible is only one among hundreds of other subjects."—A. G. Hobbs, Jr.**

We rather imagine that the expression "hundreds of other subjects" is a slight exaggeration. But we know that another statement is a positive misrepresentation. We shall prove by the literature of the colleges that Bro. Hobbs is absolutely wrong. He has declared that "all lovers of truth will face the facts squarely and not fight smoke screens and



straw men." Is he a lover of truth? Will he face the facts squarely? He makes a blunt statement regarding the schools that "the primary purpose is not to teach the Bible." Let us investigate!

First we shall consider David Lipscomb College:

*"The supreme purpose of the school shall be to teach the Bible as the revealed will of God to man and as the only and sufficient rule of faith and practice, and to train those who attend in a pure Bible Christianity, excluding from the faith all opinions and philosophies of men, and from the work and worship of the church of God all human inventions and devices. Such other branches of learning may be added as will aid in the understanding and teaching of the Scriptures and as will promote usefulness and good citizenship among men."*<sup>1</sup>

Brother Hobbs did not state the facts with reference to David Lipscomb College. He threw up a "smoke screen." Now let us consider the school of which he is an alumnus, Abilene Christian College. In a bulletin bearing a letter with these words from President James F. Cox, "We are asking that you distribute these bulletins among the members of your congregation," I find the following:

*"Abilene Christian College exists for the teaching of the Bible."*<sup>2</sup>

Now if that is the reason why it exists, it certainly must be its primary purpose. Listen again:

*"First and foremost, Abilene Christian College proposes to emphasize the study of the Bible as the inspired word of the living God. It is the purpose to get the great truths of the Bible into the hearts and minds of the students who attend it in order that their lives may be influenced, guided and directed by its sacred teachings."*<sup>3</sup>

This is listed as one of the "two outstanding reasons for the existence of Abilene Christian College." Since it is "first and foremost" it must be the primary reason. So Brother Hobbs did not state the facts with reference to his own college. He erected a "straw man." Now let us look at Freed-Hardeman College. Before me lies a catalogue of this school. Its introduction declares: "There are two features of this catalog to which we call special attention. The first one is that we have made a sincere attempt to state facts just as they are." Under "PURPOSE" appears the following:

---

<sup>1</sup> *David Lipscomb College Bulletin* (1946-1947) p. 17.

<sup>2</sup> *Abilene Christian College Bulletin* (May 1933).

<sup>3</sup> *Abilene Christian College Catalogue* (June 1936) p. 13.

“Unless a college has some great aim, purpose, objective toward which it is constantly laboring there would seem to be no justification for its existence. . . . There are enough public and private schools of the usual kind to take care of all who will attend them. It is not, therefore, because of any lack of room or facilities that Freed-Hardeman exists, but because it is rendering a badly needed service that is not rendered by other schools. . . . It seeks, therefore, to develop and train man’s moral and spiritual nature as the surest guarantee of his success and happiness both in this world and that which is to come. The means by which to accomplish this most important end is the daily teaching of the word of God as the only standard of religion and morals.”<sup>4</sup>

After going on to show that it is “trying to stem the tide and stay the departures” from the “ancient order of things” on the part of churches of Christ, this page closes with the following:

“While its academic work is of the highest order and its literary courses are standard and in no sense neglected or minimized, yet the objectives mentioned above are *the primary purposes* for which the school exists and we believe their importance is such as to justify every effort to maintain and enlarge the work of Freed-Hardeman College.”

A. G. Hobbs says, “The primary purpose is *not* to teach the Bible.” The college bulletins uniformly say that the primary purpose is to teach the Bible. Which tells the truth? If Brother Hobbs is correct, then the schools have misrepresented their primary purpose for existence. Who would want to go to a school to learn Christian ethics where the very purpose of the school was misrepresented? Can schools which prevaricate about their purpose teach honesty and integrity? Is the vaunted “Christian atmosphere” one of intrigue, chicanery and conniving? If Brother Hobbs is not correct, then he ought to apologize to the brotherhood for trying to fight a smoke screen and a straw man!

The schools correctly stated their primary purpose. It is to teach the Bible! Why did Brother Hobbs deny it? For the simple reason that teaching the Bible is as much the work of the church as preaching the gospel. He cannot consistently fight a missionary society, the primary purpose of which is to preach the Word, and uphold an educational

---

<sup>4</sup> Freed-Hardeman College Bulletin (April 1936) p. 12.

society, the primary purpose of which is to teach the Word. Therefore, he had to deny the real purpose of the schools. He strives to make it appear that the school is an individual enterprise like a filling station or sawmill, and that it was established to peddle arithmetic, geography and science, and throw in a little Bible teaching, just as a filling station operator would sell high octane gas, windshield wipers and spark plugs, then have a noonday Bible class for his employees. But the colleges are not individual enterprises. They are "brotherhood" enterprises, brought into existence to teach the Bible. All of them admit that without that as their primary purpose they would have no right to exist. Will Brother Hobbs argue that a filling station or a sawmill has no right to exist unless it has a daily Bible class?

**"Colleges are an adjunct to the home and not to the church. Strong Christian homes and faithful boys and girls indirectly add to the stability of the church. It would be a loss to the church if our boys and girls who are members are sent to a state school and are led astray from the faith. The schools exist to aid parents—but not to do their work or the work of the church."—A. G. Hobbs, Jr.**

Now we come to the "adjunct argument." "Colleges are an adjunct to the home and not the church." This is relatively new. It is the history of all innovationism that it is introduced contrary to God's word, then seeks to find justification within it. The argument for instrumental music in the worship of the church has completely changed base. It was uncharitably introduced over the protests of godly men and women, on the basis that it was included in the Greek word "psallo." Now it is defended as an expedient to maintain pitch and tempo. The chief modern defence is that if it is right to use a tuning fork to get the pitch, it is right to use a piano to keep it. The instrumentalists have fled from "psallo."

In the same way the college apologists have lost their "Heartbreak Ridge" and have dug new foxholes for defense. The present colleges can refer to David Lipscomb College as "the mother of us all." We have already shown that its co-founder James A. Harding said: "There is a great need in all the land of evangelists, elders, deacons and Bible

teachers. Our school is designed to supply this need." Then it was an adjunct to the church!

What is an "adjunct"? It is something joined to another thing, but not essentially a part of it. Certainly a Bible College is no essential part of the church, for had it been, our Lord could not have established a church without a college. In that he would have been like some of His present foreign missionaries. But the Bible college has been tacked on to the divine building as a smokehouse in which to prepare and properly season workers for the church. It is the "intellectual dressing room" for the pulpit. The plea for \$3,000,000 to finance Abilene Christian College was made on the basis that, "There is only one place that congregations desiring men well prepared in intellect and heart to preach the gospel must turn and that place is the Christian college." That makes Abilene Christian College an adjunct to the church. It is the warehouse for talent upon which the church must draw. It is the depository of public workers from which the church must obtain assistance. It places the church in a state of absolute dependency upon a human organization as a source of supply for its workers! It is the spiritual vestry where men are clothed in talent ere they are allowed in the sanctuary!

Here is another statement worthy of consideration:

**"What we do for the cause of Christ, by providing well-trained preachers, missionaries, song directors, and elders largely depends upon the efforts of our Christian Colleges . . . our future success in this training program depends largely upon what we do through the Christian colleges."**<sup>5</sup>

If the schools are not adjuncts to the church, please explain why in one Thanksgiving lectureship at Harding College, the following transpired.

**"The reality of the responsibility placed upon us by the great commission was emphasized by many of the speakers . . . in harmony with the emphasis of Harding College Bible class work . . . On Thursday morning at the close of the service President Benson asked for those who had definitely decided to work in foreign lands to come to the front and eleven young people made their way through a packed auditorium to stand and make their intentions known. . . .**

---

<sup>5</sup> Quoted in "*Bible Banner*" (May 1947) p. 2.

One said it was in reality a unity meeting, bringing together so many preachers from so many parts of the brotherhood. Over five hundred dollars was given to the church building fund for Germany and eleven hundred and twenty dollars was given to build a school building in Africa.”<sup>6</sup>

The colleges persistently lay claim to credit for spreading the gospel and advancing the church. J. B. McGinty, a member of the Board of Trustees of Abilene Christian College, declared, “ACC has done much to build up the church and advance the borders of the kingdom in Texas and bordering states.”<sup>7</sup> Another trustee, J. W. Watson, said, “In my opinion the greatest service rendered by ACC is sending out young men and women to be loyal workers in the church.”<sup>8</sup>

The argument that the colleges are mere adjuncts to the home, breaks down when you consider the following:

1. The colleges hold missionary rallies to plan concerted action in new areas of the world.

2. The colleges conduct gospel meetings under the guise of lectureships.

3. The colleges take credit for converting to Christ students who are non-members, as evidenced by the literature distributed by said colleges.

4. The colleges have special training classes for preachers, elders, deacons and Bible class teachers.

5. The colleges in many instances have “preacher clubs” forming an exclusive clerical caste of what they designate “ministerial students.”

6. The colleges ask support of the brotherhood on the basis of what they do for the churches.

---

<sup>6</sup> *Harding College Bulletin* (Dec. 15, 1945) p. 3.

<sup>7</sup> *Abilene Christian College Bulletin* (May 1941) p. 2.

<sup>8</sup> *Abilene Christian College Bulletin* (May 1941) p. 3.

## Chapter VI

# Colleges And Missionary Societies

"Colleges cannot be compared to missionary societies. Missionary societies do the work of the church in supporting preachers to hold meetings and to establish congregations. I never heard of a college supporting preachers in mission fields to establish new congregations. This is the work of the church and colleges do not infringe on this work."—A. G. Hobbs, Jr.

Colleges can be compared to missionary societies! The comparison was made by the very man who was responsible for the inauguration of Abilene Christian College. His was the maiden speech which incubated the school. Later he wrote:

"F. B. Srygley takes the position that men have a right to run 'Bible Colleges' and teach the Bible as a private enterprise; and while I am just as big a fool as he is, yet I have looked in vain for such a 'Bible College' in the Church of Christ and fail to find it! It was J. D. Tant who lectured in Abilene on 'Bible Colleges' and persuaded old Bro. Gilbert to give his home and thirteen acres of land where the old 'Bible College' was located. I, like Srygley, thought it was a private enterprise. But when Bro. Sewell resigned as president he told the churches what 'your' college was when 'I' took it; and 'I' have given \$10,000 and so many years of my time, and now I turn it back to you. Which to my mind, proves the College Society with its president, board of directors, secretary and treasurer, was just as much a society tacked on and getting its support out of the churches of Christ as the Endeavor Society is among the Digressives. How can I fight one and defend the other?"<sup>1</sup>

Brother Tant again wrote as follows:

"The digressives have an organized missionary society with its president, secretary, treasurer and board of directors. Its object is to beg the church for money to support the society whose object is to preach the gospel and do other good works. From the time we divided in Austin, in 1866, I have fought that society as an unscriptural institution. Now we have the college society with its president, secretary, treasurer, and board of directors. Its object is to beg the churches

<sup>1</sup> J. D. Tant, *Apostolic Review* (Sept. 16, 1930) p. 9.

for money to preach the gospel and do other good works. How can I fight one and build up the other?"<sup>2</sup>

On what ground does A. G. Hobbs argue the alleged discrepancy between the missionary society and the college? He says, "Missionary societies do the work of the church in supporting preachers to hold meetings and to establish congregations. I never heard of a college supporting preachers in mission fields to establish new congregations. This is the work of the church and colleges do not infringe upon that work." Such reasoning is puerile. No one has affirmed that the college and missionary society were identical *as to work!* To do so would be to argue that the college was not a college at all, but a missionary society. We affirm that both are *in the same category*, not that both do the same work. If I were to assert that one man was a human being just as another man is, Brother Hobbs would no doubt deny it because one operated a streetcar, whereas the other was a shoemaker!

Is the supporting of preachers to hold meetings and establish congregations the only work of the church? Does not the work of the church also include the care of the needy and the edification of the saints? Is not the work of the church threefold: missionary, charitable and educational? Is it right to establish a human organization to do the first? If not, what makes it right to establish human organizations to do the last two? Is it any more a violation of Scripture to establish a human organization to rescue people from infidelity than to organize one to keep them from it? What makes it wrong to organize a society to bring men and women to the remission of sins, and right to organize one to keep them from future sins?

Jesus said, "Go ye, therefore, and *teach* all nations, baptizing them . . . *teaching* them to observe all things whatsoever I command you."<sup>3</sup> The Christian Church establishes a society to take care of the first "teach." That is wrong! Our brethren establish a society to take care of the second "teach." That is right!! Why? By what logic can we

---

<sup>2</sup> J. D. Tant, *Apostolic Review* (Jan. 19, 1932) p. 10.

<sup>3</sup> Matthew 28: 19, 20.

justify such a contention? We do not argue that the missionary society and the schools are doing the same work, but we do say they are in the same genus; they are both human organizations established by Christians to do a part of the work of the church. They stand or fall together insofar as principle is concerned.

**“Schools are individual enterprises. Here is proof that they are neither owned nor run by the church. The church can stop anything that it is doing. If it is conducting a meeting, it can close the meeting. But there is not a congregation, or group of congregations that can close the schools.”—A. G. Hobbs, Jr.**

Surely our brother wrote the above with tongue-in-cheek. As to the schools being individual enterprises, I think another statement from the venerable and lamented J. D. Tant may be in order.

**“If they are not church institutions, then to whom do they belong? When Bro. Jesse Sewell, president in Abilene ten years resigned, why did he publish a letter to all churches, telling them he took their school under certain conditions and spent his time and ten thousand dollars and then returned it to them?**

**If the Bible college is not a church institution, why did a Bible college send out agents to get church elders to make a twenty year pledge for the church to give so much each year for twenty years to keep up our colleges?**

**If they are not church institutions, then why were churches of Christ called on recently to raise two hundred thousand dollars to keep our school from going to the wall? Why did a certain church raise two hundred dollars at once to help save our school?**

**If our Bible colleges are not church institutions, why was a brother selected at a salary of four thousand dollars a year, and sent out to beg churches for a million dollars to endow our Bible college?”<sup>4</sup>**

If Abilene Christian College is an individual enterprise, what individual or individuals own it? I can determine who owns a sawmill or flour mill. Who owns Abilene Christian College? Name the man or men who do so! W. W. Otey declares, “Disavow and disclaim as all we may, yet it remains true that these colleges are church institutions.”<sup>5</sup> An editorial published by Freed-Hardeman College says:

**“Until 1919 the school was privately owned by Bro. Freed and Bro. Hardeman, and the brethren realized that Bro. Freed and Bro.**

<sup>4</sup> J. D. Tant, *Apostolic Review* (Jan. 10, 1932) p. 10.

<sup>5</sup> Bible Colleges, p. 14.



Hardeman could sell the school or do anything with it that they wished; therefore, some of the churches bought the school in 1919 and put it under a board of directors.”<sup>6</sup>

Let us summarize. Until 1919 the school was privately owned. The owners were A. G. Freed and N. B. Hardeman. The school could be sold. The owners could do anything with it they wished. Then some of the churches bought it in 1919. Since that time it has not been a private enterprise. It cannot be sold. Herein lies a grave danger. Every one of those churches may perish by time, but this human institution which they purchased will be perpetuated with all of its accumulating evils.

Let us examine Brother Hobbs' proof that "they are neither owned nor run by the church." It consists of the masterful postulate: "The church can stop anything that it is doing. If it is conducting a meeting, it can close the meeting. But there is not a congregation, or group of congregations that can close the schools." That's a good illustration of the fallacy of *non sequitur*—it does not follow! Just because a man cannot stop his car is no sign he doesn't own it. It may rather indicate faulty brakes. In a recent Arkansas tornado a man tried to close the door of his house. He couldn't do it, but the fact that he couldn't close it was no indication it was not his door; rather it indicated there was too much adverse pressure. I'm reminded of the man who bought a lion cub and carefully reared it. One day when it had grown to huge proportions, it became enraged and began to maul its owner. With a slap of one paw it sent the owner reeling. A passerby shouted, "Is that your lion?" The man mumbled through swollen lips, "I'm not sure whether he's mine or if I'm his!" The fact that the churches cannot close the schools may only indicate that the schools have grown more powerful than the church. The Christian church cannot close out the missionary society. No group of their churches can do so. Does this prove that the missionary society has become an "individual enterprise"? Brother Hobbs will have to do better than this. His logic is no credit to his "alma mater."

---

<sup>6</sup> Freed-Hardeman College, "The Sky Rocket" (Feb. 1951) p. 2.

But I am prepared to prove that the churches can control the colleges, and fire trustees by a majority vote of the members of the church called together in a mass meeting to consider what to do about the college. Such a provision is contained in the very deed of some of the colleges. Here it is as it appears in the deed conveying Freed-Hardeman College from the private owners to the churches:

**“Whenever it shall appear to the Elders of at least twelve Churches of Christ whose faith and practice is above described, that the Board of Trustees is endeavoring to divert the purpose for which this conveyance is made, said Elders may request the President of said Board of Trustees to call a general meeting of the Churches of Christ, within 60 days.**

**In case said President of the board refuses to make such a call, the Elders themselves may proceed to call such a meeting. And if it is decided by a majority of those attending said meeting that the Board of Trustees is disloyal and not carrying out the purposes set forth in the deed, charter and by-laws of the institution to be established, said meeting shall have the power to remove the then existing board and to elect their successors.”**

Now you have it! The churches can certainly stop a board of trustees from functioning, fire them, boot them out and put in another bunch. And all of this is to be done by a majority vote of church members summoned by elders of not less than twelve churches of Christ. Of all the sectarian proposals ever dreamed and drummed up, this is one of the worst. The trustees of Freed-Hardeman College, the faculty and the student body are part and parcel of one of the worst conglomerations of sectarian union of church and state ever known. And to think that it is to such an arrangement as this the church must look for its future teachers and preachers! Here is a clear provision for elders as officials of twelve congregations to act in collusion to call a mass meeting of churches, put a matter to a majority vote, oust the trustees of an institution that Brother Hobbs says is not religious but educational. In the balmy days of papal power nothing exceeded this. Has it come to pass that once again “No man might buy or sell without the mark in his forehead and in his right hand”? If Brother Hobbs protests that Freed-Hardeman College is alone in this we deny it!

## Chapter VII

# Who Pays The Bills?

"I do not know of a congregation that has the support of a college in its budget. The colleges do not ask congregations to support it out of the church treasury. They are supported by individuals. It has been eleven years since I was graduated from Abilene Christian College. Not one time has the college ever asked a congregation with which I was working to put the school in the budget. May I here deny the charge that the school dominates the churches. I affirm that religious papers have done more to dominate the churches and mold the thought of the brotherhood than all the schools."—A. G. Hobbs, Jr.

The fact that Brother Hobbs does not know of a congregation that has the support of a college in its budget does not mean there are no such congregations. It may signify a limitation of his knowledge. Perhaps we can give him a "refresher course" in college finance. The above was printed in 1945, and that was 11 years after Brother Hobbs graduated from Abilene Christian College, which would mean that he graduated in 1933 or 1934. On January 26, 1937, Ben F. Holland writing on the topic "Concerning Christian Colleges," mentions Abilene Christian College and *Firm Foundation*, and says:

"At any rate, the brethren at the Southside congregation in Austin have had both items in the 'budget' with the full consent and cooperation of the members and the encouragement of the minister. If we are drifting, we are drifting in a very desirable direction."<sup>1</sup>

One week prior to the above, on January 19, 1937, and under the very same heading appeared this from the pen of Foy E. Wallace, Jr., which you should read:

"Many of the churches of Texas, and perhaps of Oklahoma and other states, have recently received official requests from Abilene Christian College, so urgent indeed as to almost constitute a demand, for an Abilene Christian College Sunday in the churches. The announcement was headlined: 'Abilene Christian College Asks That the Congregation in Your Community Take A Special Contribution for

---

<sup>1</sup> Ben F. Holland, *Firm Foundation* (Jan. 26, 1937) p. 1.

the College on November 22—A. C. C. Day.’ How does it sound—what kind of parlance is it—to designate a certain Lord’s Day as Abilene Christian College Day in a church of Christ?”<sup>2</sup>

That this was not limited to one year, and was not abandoned after that time is obvious from the Abilene Christian College Bulletin, November, 1941, which contains three notices in boldface type: “SPECIAL CONTRIBUTIONS! Don’t forget the date—December 7. Many congregations are taking special contributions as their part in the drive to remove the ACC debt.” However, lest there be a quibble over whether this was in the budget or not, let me present some additional proof. I have already shown that congregations have had the school in their budgets. Under the heading “Bible Colleges: The Budget,” G. C. Brewer says,

“All of the schools from Bethany in Campbell’s day, down to these schools we now have, have solicited and accepted contributions from churches. And I am prepared to show that they still do this. During the time that Abilene Christian College has been raising an annuity to pay interest on Mr. Hardin’s gift-loan which only ceased with the death of Mr. Hardin, a few weeks ago, a considerable number of the best churches of Texas have been contributing from their treasury to this annuity. . . .

Moreover these brethren or some men from their schools—every one of them—have come to the churches where I serve as preacher and have gone into my pulpit, with my introduction and commendation, to address the church when assembled for worship and have made appeals for their schools. They have also accepted money from churches for which I preach and are doing so even now. The money being voted to them by the elders and the check being written by the treasurer. If it should become necessary I can produce documentary evidence of this and in some instances I can produce the cancelled checks.”<sup>3</sup>

Now for some even more interesting revelations. At almost the very time that Brother Hobbs was in Abilene Christian College, perhaps during the time he was there, the college authorities were providing “canned sermon outlines” to their preacher students and sending them out to solicit the various congregations for contributions. Such an allegation should be proven unquestionably. Here is the proof.

<sup>2</sup> Foy E. Wallace, *Firm Foundation* (Jan. 19, 1937) p. 1.

<sup>3</sup> G. C. Brewer, *Firm Foundation* (Aug. 16, 1938) p. 6.

"In 1932 I was a freshman in Abilene Christian College. During that school year, *under the auspices of the school* the preacher boys were sent out to various points in Texas to preach that the churches ought to support A. C. C. We were given a form sermon outline, with A. C. C. for a text and invitation; and transportation was furnished us. I was dropped off from Dean Adams' (or it might have been Bro. Morris') car at De Leon, Tex., where I preached A. C. C. that Sunday morning instead of Christ. I went back to A. C. C. on Monday and told Brother Cox that it just didn't seem right to me."<sup>4</sup>

It is altogether possible that Brother Hobbs, in spite of his posing as an authority on the college question, may have been the victim of the hoodwinking policy of the schools. Perhaps he gullibly swallowed their pious protestations that they do not take money from the churches. If so, he should not feel that he is alone in thus being deceived.

"The information has come to us from an official source that previous to 1918 churches all over the country adjacent to the Freed-Hardeman College were solicited for contributions. Brother I. A. Douthitt was field representative for the Freed-Hardeman College, and he tells us that churches not only made contributions to the Hardeman College, but gave notes for thousands of dollars, payable to the college, signed by the churches, with a notation on the note that notice should be sent to a certain elder. Brother Douthitt not only cited in private conversation the above fact but repeated the terse statement of H. Leo Boles, who said in reference to the colleges soliciting support from the churches, according to Brother Douthitt, that 'they all do it, and they all deny it.'"<sup>5</sup>

Now in view of the glaring discrepancy in the statements of Brother Hobbs and the proven facts concerning the colleges in the church budgets, we should no doubt dismiss the rest of his article and his denials as inconsequential. Let us note, however, the statement he makes, "May I here deny the charge that the school dominates the churches." Now for the real facts.

The college domination danger is not imaginary. The current campaign to put Abilene Christian College in the budget of the churches of Texas is one example of it. When it is said that 'the church that does not put the college in its budget does not have the right preacher'—that is college domination. It means college control of preachers with a threat. When the ban of boycott is placed on gospel preachers who do not 'cooperate' with the college, or who

<sup>4</sup> W. Wallace Layton, *The Bible Banner* (July 1947) p. 16.

<sup>5</sup> Foy E. Wallace, Jr., *The Bible Banner* (July 1947) p. 15.

criticize anything the college does, and who oppose the church-budget scheme of linking the church and college together—that is college domination with vengeance. When the president of the college can sit in his office and dictate letters to young people in various churches who belong to 'The Ex-Student's Association' and through them influence the policies of a certain congregation on certain issues, even to the point of who shall or shall not preach in certain places—that is college domination. When these young people in the church, whether preachers or not, feel that they are obligated to the institution that graduated them, and they become virtually an auxiliary of that college in the church where they are—that is college domination. In other words, when it comes to pass that 'Our Alma Mater which art in Abilene' can command the loyalty and devotion from an alumni equal to the homage due 'Our Father which art in Heaven'—that is college domination plus. There are those who measure a man's loyalty to Jesus Christ by his loyalty to the college. This attitude is tested by the fact that he may criticize the church and bring no censure from college devotees, but if he criticizes the college, let him be anathema! These are some of the dangers in this form of institutionalism growing up among us, the gravity of which cannot be denied."<sup>6</sup>

One more bit of testimony upon this subject may substantiate the warning that should be issued to every faithful Christian, unto whom "the one body" is dear and sacred. It does not come from an enemy of the colleges, but from one who has been a defender of them. Surely it cannot be said that he writes through prejudice. Read the following very carefully:

"It has come to pass. Now, one college is issuing beautifully decorated, embossed certificates to churches that 'cooperate with the college.' A few years ago, when the college wrote letters to churches asking that a certain Sunday be set aside as College Day in the churches, C. R. Nichol asked: 'How long will it be before placards will be seen in the churches saying, 'This church is cooperating with the college.' Not long, Brother Nichol, it is already here, better than placards—embossed certificates, to be framed for hanging on the wall. It is the twin sister to 'the college in the budget.' The church budgets the college and the college certifies the church! A blind man at midnight ought to see where such is headed. When Brother Nichol's prediction was made, some waved it aside, as a passing remark—but already it has come true. Some who are not farsighted enough to see tendencies, and where departures will eventually lead, could well

---

<sup>6</sup> Foy E. Wallace, Jr., *The Bible Banner* (July 1938) p. 3.

afford to listen to men who have witnessed digression in all of its forms and save the church from the disaster of history repeating itself. But some people learn only by experience."<sup>7</sup>

It may be added that some do not even learn by experience. The churches are headed down the same weary road to apostasy which they have taken before, and they are going by the same method—institutionalism born of man's belief that his way is better than God's way!

---

<sup>7</sup> *The Bible Banner* (Sept. 1938) p. 14.

## Chapter VIII

# Preacher Factories

"Both boys and girls attend the colleges; and the courses are open to any who desire to take them. The boys who plan to farm sit side by side with the ones who plan to preach. But with the present shortage of preachers it appears that we need a factory somewhere to train and make available more preachers. The preachers that have attended college are helping to evangelize the world—much more so than the 'anti-college' preachers. Did you ever hear of an 'anti-college' congregation sending a preacher to a foreign field to preach? Did you ever hear of an 'anti-college' preacher going to a foreign field?"—A. G. Hobbs, Jr.

The fact that the colleges are coeducational does not prove that they do not offer specialized training for a professional ministry. Many sectarian theological schools admit persons of both sexes. *It is possible for a factory to manufacture more than one product.* There is an intimation that some attend the colleges to make preachers exactly as others do to make farmers, in the statement, "The boys who plan to farm sit side by side with the ones who plan to preach." If a man spends six years in a law school, he expects that the world owes him a living from his profession. He has an investment in it and obviously will go where he can secure the greatest returns. The same is true of a professional physician, dentist or farmer. But such a spirit of professionalism is repugnant to every faithful gospel proclaimer when it affects the field of religion. The gospel is not to be commercialized, nor the souls of men become merchandise. In Christ men do not make a profession of preaching, but the Christian profession makes preachers of men!

The original intent of Abilene Christian College was to become a theological seminary, to manufacture preachers, as the following statement issued by the school, fully demonstrates.



"In addition to the College of Arts and Sciences we will have a complete, thorough seminary, in which work for preachers and others who desire to become efficient church workers will be given. This work will lead to the B.Th. and Th.M. degrees."<sup>1</sup>

Under the heading, "Abilene Christian College Bible Department," Heber Taylor wrote in the *Gospel Advocate*, January 18, 1951, "Over two hundred fifty ministerial students are now enrolled in Abilene Christian College." That is sectarian terminology, as in God's word every child of God is recognized as a minister. But the quotation shows that the school makes a distinction between "ministerial students" and others. Even if it made no such distinction, it might still build up a clergy system by special emphasis. J. N. Armstrong, long a president of Harding College, saw this danger before he died, and wrote:

"I feel distressed sometimes over the condition of the church everywhere. For instance I think that our schools are all in line to build up the clergy and that the church in general is trending toward denominationalism. I do not know what can be done, maybe nothing, but I do think there is a need for us to put on the brakes, and warn the brotherhood about the definite trends of these times. I am not pessimistic, but my optimism does not keep me from facing facts. I think, as I said above, that all our schools are set for the training of professional preachers. I tell them at Harding College that we are also being influenced by these trends. For all these years the schools have not offered separate courses for preachers, and in the schools in which I have taught, we have stressed the teaching of the Bible to all students. I am still trying to stress this. We have never had a class here that was not open to any and all students, both boys and girls. But still there is a stress here toward preacher training. I do not know that it does any good for me to write these things to you, but I do believe that you are in sympathy with the ideas I express."<sup>2</sup>

Brother Hobbs is a product of Abilene Christian College and exhibits the tendencies of every sectarian. He says, "With the shortage of preachers it appears that we need a factory somewhere to train and make available more preachers." It is amazing how men whose minds are warped by extra-institutionalism can never see a need without plugging for a human organization to fill it! If the gospel needs to be preached abroad they must organize a

<sup>1</sup> "A First Class College," *Firm Foundation* (April 8, 1919).

<sup>2</sup> Letter to W. W. Otey, *Bible Colleges*, p. 15.

centralized control system; if there are two orphans in a community they must organize a home and expend thousands of dollars for physical equipment, if there is a shortage of preachers they "need a factory somewhere" to produce them. It seems never to occur to such men that God's church is perfectly adapted to all that He wants done in any of these fields. The organizational "bug" infects men with a vicious virus.

The statement quoted is an admission that with ten colleges representing untold millions of dollars, running full blast, there still is a shortage of preachers. Yet the early church took the gospel to all of the world in a single generation, and did it with no college, Bible school or seminary. How did they train men? By the application of a now forgotten scripture: "The things which thou hast heard of me, among many witnesses, the same commit thou to faithful men who shall be able to teach others also."<sup>3</sup> If each evangelist unselfishly took with him a young man as a student, and taught and trained that student diligently, the number of gospel preachers would double in a year. Each capable evangelist should be an individual "Bible college" transmitting and committing to others the things learned from God's Word. Thus were Timothy, Titus, Mark and others prepared. The plan of the apostles is the plan with divine sanction. God's plan will work, if we will work God's plan! We need no other!

Brother Hobbs wishes to know if we ever heard of an "anti-college" congregation sending a preacher to a foreign field? I answer, "Yes!" He wants to know if we ever heard of an "anti-college" preacher going to a foreign field? I answer, "Yes!" So what? Suppose we could point to no such example. It would only prove our negligence; it would not prove the scripturality of his organization. Is the laxity of an opposer a scriptural justification for establishing another organization? This argument is the same one used by the missionary society advocates. It is the moss-covered excuse of fraternal order devotees who declare the church

---

<sup>3</sup> 2 Timothy 2: 2.

does not take care of the aged, therefore they have organized the lodge to assume the burden. The fact that some *fall short* of doing their duty gives us no license to *go beyond* God's Word. If another is disobedient, I am not thereby authorized to transgress! The question is not whether preachers who have attended college are helping to evangelize the world, but if Christians have a scriptural right to establish a human organization to do the work of the church.

“Opponents of the colleges cry that they are robbing the church of its glory. They also argue that the colleges are run and owned by the church—which I have already pointed out is not true. But to try to take both positions is inconsistent. Who gets the glory for the hospitals and schools operated by the Catholic Church? Many praise the Catholic Church for the good deeds done in her hospitals. Who gets the glory for the orphan homes that the Masonic lodge builds and maintains? If the church of Christ owned and run the schools, it would only reflect glory on the church and not rob it of glory.

However, the schools are supported by individual members of the church, and all the teachers are members of the church; and since what a person does as an individual Christian, if it be right and praiseworthy, brings glory to the church, so the great good the schools do brings glory and praise to the church. I know this to be true in Abilene and all west Texas.”—A. G. Hobbs, Jr.

The statements above ignore the fact that the Bible does not say “Unto him be glory *to* the church,” but “*in* the church.” God has ordained an institution in which glory must be given unto Him throughout all ages. Will he accept glory through another organization? It isn't a question of whether the college does a good work in Abilene and all west Texas. The missionary society has done a good work in feeding, clothing and doctoring savages in dark, dank jungles. The Roman Catholic church has done a good work in its ministry to the forgotten leper colonies of the world. Does the good done by them, argue the right of these institutions to exist? David was intent upon a good work when he built the new oxcart to transport the ark of God, but the death of Uzzah demonstrated that it does make a difference “how” you do God's work.

Brother Hobbs demonstrates his sophistry when he as-

serts that it is inconsistent to say that the church owns the colleges, and at the same time say the colleges rob the church of its glory. Has he never heard of a "parasite"? Does he not realize that a parasite "lives in, on, or with some other living organism at whose expense it obtains food, shelter, etc."? The fact that the "host" gives willing shelter to such a parasite does not alter the relationship. Does the college not plead for support because of what it does for the church, and does not the money given for that purpose represent a draining away of the resources of the church? It is silly to argue that it does not affect the body of Christ to withhold money from it and give it to a human organization to do the work of developing Christian character. If a soldier was bleeding to death and a medical assistant came running with a bottle of plasma for transfusing into his veins, the enemy could just as effectively kill the wounded man by shooting the bottle of plasma from the hand of the attendant as by further riddling of the soldier's body.

There are two kinds of tumors which may affect a body. Not all are malignant, decaying and consuming tissue as cancers. Some are benignant, but they displace the regular organs and affect their functions, often placing them in a position where they cannot continue their work. It isn't necessary for the colleges to be antagonistic to the church in order to decimate its powers. They may maintain friendly relations with the church and still sap its strength. Nor does the fact that the churches in Texas do not oppose this parasite imply that the school is not inimical to the church. A dog may quit scratching fleas, because he is tired, lazy, or thinks it unavailing!

We cannot ignore another sample of specious reasoning! "The schools are supported by individual members of the church, and all the teachers are members of the church, and since *what a person does as an individual Christian*, if it be right and praiseworthy, brings glory to the church, so the great good *the schools do* brings glory and praise to the church." Notice the subtle shift from "an individual

Christian" to an organization in that statement. Suppose we start a missionary society supported wholly by individual contributions, all members of which were Christians. Would Brother Hobbs tolerate it? He would not! Would such an organization not bring glory and praise to the church? The truth of it is that A. G. Hobbs opposes an organized Sunday school with a superintendent, secretary and treasurer, operating for teaching only God's Word on the Lord's Day, and endorses an organized Bible College to teach a little Bible during weekdays "among hundreds (?) of other subjects." He says the first is an organization which robs the church of its glory, while the second is another organization which brings glory and praise to the church.

## Chapter IX

# The Right To Teach

**“Members of the church, as individual Christians, have a right to teach school. They also have a right to teach the Bible. When both are being done in the same building but in separate rooms, it surely does not become wrong. It is a wonderful thing that boys and girls can receive a college education studying under members of the church, and also be in Bible class and study the Bible for one or more periods each day.”—A. G. Hobbs, Jr.**

Certainly Christians have a right to teach school. They also have a right to teach the Bible. But they have no right to organize another institution through which to teach the Bible. A man who teaches the Bible at Abilene Christian College may be a Christian, but his teaching is done because of his organic connection with that institution. To prove that, we need only remember that every Christian has a right to teach the Bible, but not every Christian has a right to teach it at Abilene Christian College. If you think they do, you encourage a few of those who have no scholastic degrees to apply for a job as teachers of the Bible and see how quickly they are rejected. The qualification for teaching at Abilene is not that one is a Christian but that he has met certain arbitrary requirements of the state and college associations. None of the apostles could teach the Bible in Abilene Christian College today if they returned to earth exactly as they were when He commissioned them to “teach all things whatsoever I have commanded you.” Here is an organization set up by Christians to teach the New Testament as our sole rule of faith and practice and not one of those upon whom the church is built would be allowed to teach in the school unless he first attended it or some other, and got permission from the state. Jesus Christ could not teach the Bible in Abilene Christian College today until he received the approbation of “Caesar” and a degree

from some earthly organization. No one who is a simple Christian, and nothing more, can teach the Bible in Abilene Christian College—to do that he must be a “master” or “doctor” of something else. I would not want to be associated with a “Christian” College which would bar the author of the Christian religion from teaching the Bible within its walls!

Let us test the logic of Brother Hobbs. “Christians have a right to teach school. They also have a right to teach the Bible. When both are done in the same building, it surely does not become wrong.” Christians have a right to travel. They also have a right to preach the gospel. When both are done in the same country it surely does not become wrong! But it does become wrong if they do it as members of a missionary society. It is not the act of preaching the gospel that is wrong. It is the fact that the one who does it, does so by virtue of his organic connection with a human institution established to do that work. Likewise, it is not the act of teaching the Bible in Abilene Christian College that is wrong, but the fact that the one who does it, does so by virtue of his organic connection with an educational society set up for that purpose. The truth preached by a missionary society advocate in Africa is just as much the truth as if preached by Brother Hobbs in Texas; the truth taught in Abilene Christian College is just as much the truth as if I teach it in Missouri. No missionary society advocate will be condemned because of the truth he preaches; no Christian College teacher will be condemned because of the truth he teaches. Both may be condemned for their lack of respect for the authority and sovereignty of our Lord, which causes men to presume to substitute their institutions for the divine institution. David was not condemned for bringing the ark of God to Jerusalem, but because he substituted his own instrumentality for God’s way of doing it!

It is not a “wonderful thing” for boys and girls to be affiliated with an organization that has no right to exist. Before Brother Hobbs can pick the fruit he has to plant the tree. The Bible college is a tree which the heavenly

Father hath not planted. As such it will be rooted up! It is not a wonderful thing for boys and girls to be perched in a sycamore tree which a tornado uproots, nor is it wonderful to be connected with a plant to do God's work which God has not planted. The appeal to sympathy, the stirring of the tender emotions of a parent's heart (the same psychology used by every insurance agent) in order to justify an unscriptural organization is demagoguery. The Lord said, "Come now, let us *reason* together," and not, "Come, let us cry on each other's shoulder!" Dressing a crow in peacock feathers does not change the nature of the bird. No Christian has a right to go to a place that has no right to exist, and no human organization established by Christians to do the work of the church, or any part thereof, has any right to exist.

**"Those who oppose the colleges are opposing the only places that boys and girls can secure a college education and be under safe influence and wholesome environment. They teach that boys and girls should attend state schools and sit at the feet of infidels."**—A. G. Hobbs, Jr.

Those who advocate Christian Colleges scoff at the divine institutions and decry their ability to provide protection against temptations and false doctrines. Why did not all of God's people become infidels and skeptics before 1891? In the nineteenth century skepticism was more rampant than now, yet the church survived and brethren were made stronger by the very opposition of agnostics and infidels. The reason is that consecrated Christian homes and faithful churches acted as a bulwark against "the overflowing scourge."

Now the Bible College advocates preach a doctrine of weakness and debility for those divine organizations. They seek by clever subterfuge to undermine faith in God's system. Never before has the church been subjected to such raw fright propaganda, or to such threats, intimidation and cajoling. Men are made to believe that their very hope of eternal life depends upon their shelling out hard-earned cash to build up human organizations. The president of one of the schools wrote:



**"Your salvation may depend on your gift, but the school does not."<sup>1</sup>**

It is no longer enough to be faithful to your home and the church of the living God. Before 1891 when David Lipscomb established his dream house as a reality, men could die and go to heaven without knowing anything about a Christian college, but since that time a new dogma has been issued. Belief in and support of "one body" to build Christian character is not enough. Now one may be lost if he does not support "another body." This is not the "careless statement" of a "friend of the school." The quotation is from one of the presidents.

Another school president has more recently issued an ultimatum to the effect that:

**"If Christian people do not build and operate schools wherein they may train their own children, we might as well give up the fight for New Testament Christianity altogether."<sup>2</sup>**

According to this, the church is helpless to preserve and protect New Testament Christianity. The perpetuity of truth on earth lies with a human organization. How gullible can brethren become? How long will they be pushed about by men who establish a money-making scheme, put in Bible study for a religious angle and as window dressing, then threaten with perdition those who do not rake out the shekels to provide them jobs with high-sounding titles?

A prominent scribe in the brotherhood issues the following threat to those who do not cough up \$2.00 per month on the installment plan:

**"Our workers in Japan contend that four persons out of five who attend Ibaraki Christian College become Christians. You can send a boy or girl to this college for \$2 per month or give a youngster an education with room and board for \$100 per year. How many of you are listening to this call of a lost soul for eternal life? Turn your back and his blood will be on your hands; give as you have prospered and you will live forever."<sup>3</sup>**

The apostle Paul tells us to give as prospered to the church. These brethren urge that it is wrong to take from the church treasury to support the school. Now they tell us

---

<sup>1</sup> J. N. Armstrong, *Primitive Christianity* (Oct. 27, 1904).

<sup>2</sup> L. R. Wilson, *Firm Foundation* (June 12, 1951).

<sup>3</sup> James Lovell, *Gospel Broadcast* (Feb. 21, 1952).

that we must give as prospered to the school, and if we do not send a youngster through this college, his blood will be on our hands. If we give all that we can spare to the church, that is, all we are prospered, and do not send anything to the college, will we be lost? Will the blood of someone be upon our hands if we give all that we have to the Lord's institution? Either the church or the human organization is obtaining money under false pretence, for both demand that we give as prospered, and both promise we will live forever if we give to them! Which one is guilty of exaggeration, mendacity and fabrication?

With few exceptions the college defenders send their *boys* and *girls* to "attend state schools and sit at the feet of infidels and evolutionists." It is only after they are grown up that they cart them off somewhere to a college. The writer heard plenty of evolution taught in high school in Zoology, General Science, and other classes. Instead of shedding "crocodile tears" the college advocates should keep their children out of school until they are old enough to go to college. Instead they expose them to infidels and evolutionists during the onset of adolescence when their minds are most impressionable and ductile, then condemn us for allowing our offspring to continue in the very same state school system which they patronized for twelve years.

"Now I beseech you, brethren, mark them which cause divisions and offenses contrary to the doctrine which ye have learned; and avoid them.' Rom. 16: 17. The doctrine of Paul was that we should 'be ready to every good work,' Tit. 3: 1. To provide opportunities for Christian boys and girls under the influence of Christianity is certainly a good work. To oppose a good work that is being done in a scriptural manner, and to cause division over it is certainly contrary to the doctrine of Paul and other Apostles."—A. G. Hobbs, Jr.

A. G. Hobbs, like every other factionist, makes a test of fellowship out of something not in the Bible. He only refers to two scriptures in this whole article and both of them are in the paragraph above. The first one he mentions is to ride out of fellowship those who believe and contend that "there is one body." Who caused the division over the colleges? Was there an "anti-missionary society" group be-

fore someone introduced the missionary society? Was there an "anti-instrument" group before someone introduced the organ? Was there an "anti-college group" before someone introduced the college? Then who caused these divisions? Certainly we are told to "mark them which cause divisions and offenses *contrary to the doctrine.*" What offense contrary to the doctrine is committed by those who plead that "the manifold wisdom of God is to be known by the church?" Of what offense contrary to the doctrine is he to be deemed guilty who contends that the church is "the pillar and ground of the truth," and any other organization established for this purpose is a usurper?

How can one cause an offense contrary to the teaching *he has learned*, by opposing something neither advocated, recommended, prescribed, suggested, or hinted at in that doctrine? If it is an offense contrary to the doctrine to oppose Bible colleges, as Brother Hobbs alleges, then it must be a part of the doctrine to uphold them. Where did Paul or the other apostles ever do so? Could a man teach all of the apostles' doctrine, uphold every good work demanded by that doctrine, die and go to heaven, before 1891 when David Lipscomb established the first school such as these brethren *now* advocate, according to their testimony? If such schools are a part of the doctrine, why did Brother Hobbs completely ignore that doctrine in his attempt to justify the colleges? It is the history of all innovationists that they introduce a human invention, then use God's Word to browbeat, blackball and proscribe all who will not endorse it. I am guilty of no offense contrary to the doctrine which *I have learned*, for nowhere in that doctrine do I find a hint of a school such as Abilene Christian College. In opposing that organization, I oppose not something in the doctrine, but something not in the doctrine!

I deny that the doctrine of Paul to "be ready to every good work" implies or includes the establishing of another organization through which to do that work. I do not oppose preaching the gospel when I oppose the missionary society. Preaching the gospel is a good work. Organizing

a missionary society to do it is not. It is a divisive work! I do not oppose taking the gospel to foreign fields when I oppose "centralized control of a sponsoring church." Taking the gospel to foreign fields is a good work. Setting up a "central control board" is not a good work. It is factious! I do not oppose the care of orphans when I oppose an "institutional orphan home." Caring for orphans is a good work. The institutional home system is not! It is divisive. I do not oppose teaching the Word and developing gospel preachers when I oppose organizing schools such as Abilene Christian College to do that work. Teaching the word and developing preachers are good works. Organizing a school through which to do either or both is not scriptural. It is divisive! No man can be contrary to the teaching of Paul and the other apostles by opposition to something that Paul and the other apostles never taught.

Inasmuch as the writer is not connected with either of the papers mentioned in the article of Brother Hobbs, he does not deem it requisite to refer to his final paragraph. Suffice it to say that it is not a question of who opposes a thing, or the size or influence of the group doing the opposing. The only question is whether or not the opposition is justified.

## Chapter X

# Conclusion

The movement to restore the New Testament church which received such impetus in the last century is being halted, as all such previous movements have been, by the sectarianizing tendencies of those who have enlisted in it, and who are seeking to promote New Testament Christianity by "big business methods." Men who have been successful in the realm of economics, seek to employ the same techniques to produce expansion in the church. They forget that God's ways are not the ways of men and his thoughts are not the thoughts of men. True Christianity can only thrive in an atmosphere of humility and earnest consecration. That these things are undervalued today is apparent when one views the huge cathedral-like edifices erected as places of worship, the rise of the special clergy which through "preacher's meetings" and "lectureships" dominates the thinking of the church and constitutes a policy-making hierarchy with power of boycott, and the emphasis placed upon "our institutions" with their high-salaried propaganda machines running day and night to grind out reams of materials.

Pictures of the laying of cornerstones featuring the mayor and city dignitaries, news blurbs about the choir of an orphan home singing for the governor of a state, special features in national magazines slanted in such fashion as to make it appear that the church has great organizations at her command; all of these demonstrate that power-hungry publicity agents have taken over and are utilizing a lesson from Rome's copybook. Add to this that when the names of elders are given in reports, special mention is made of the executive positions they hold in worldly concerns, as if such

positions better qualified them for greatness in the kingdom, and you can understand why the word "pride," never used in commendatory fashion in the Bible, has found an increasing usage in our vocabulary.

Foremost in leading the march toward digression are the parochial schools among us. The Bible Colleges control the source of supply for preaching talent in many of the churches. To do this it was necessary that they first convince the churches that the modern world demanded an educated ministry, and that a knowledge of the Bible coupled with a desire to pass that knowledge on to others in simple language, did not qualify a man to meet the exigencies of this intellectual age. Next they sold the churches on the idea that the home and the church were no longer capable, as in apostolic days, to produce qualified laborers in the vineyard, and unless the churches built up, at a cost of many millions of dollars, other organizations hatched by fertile human brains, the cause of Christianity was doomed. When the institutions were begun, pressure groups went to work to enlarge them. All of the appeals common to such groups were employed. The appeal to sectarian pride was made by pointing out how inferior our schools were in endowments to those of the Baptists and Methodists, and by calling attention to the per capita contributions for "Christian education" so much in excess of ours.

The propaganda made use of all of the basic motivations such as love of offspring, patriotism, fear of damnation, etc. The literature became ever more appealing, with experts devising new uses of color and the photographer's art to entice the shekels from wary souls. Buildings were named after generous contributors who sought thus to perpetuate their memory by such piles of brick and mortar. Alumni groups became forces to reckon with in local churches, banding together to get graduates from "our school" into the controlling offices of the churches. Exploitation of power through the devious methods of underworld politicians is no longer an unknown thing in the churches of God.

The church in many places has fallen a victim to paper or preacher groups, and an iron curtain has been erected to bar infiltration of adverse criticism. By one means or another, "the located minister" can apply the boycott to any paper which does not kow-tow to the particular segment of the church with which he is affiliated, and the membership in general is kept in complete ignorance of the developments in the brotherhood at large. Clergy domination forces the churches into fawning, lickspittle helplessness, and the threat that the congregation must either "play ball" with the clergy class, or no preacher will preach for them, acts as a club to keep the congregations in subjection.

It is time for "a restoration of the restoration." The first such movement got under way by taking the Bible out of the hands of the clergy and placing it in the hands of the people, thus restoring to them the freedom to think for themselves. The next such movement must rescue from the clergy the right or freedom to worship and act for themselves upon the part of the congregation. It must be undertaken by men of courage who will not be afraid of what other men may do unto them, nor be ashamed to suffer reproach for the Savior of men. We must rescue the right to exhort, edify and admonish the church from a special class of hirelings, and restore it to the hands of all, so that "every man who received the gift may minister the same one to another, as good stewards of the manifold grace of God."

We must create again the concept of the church as God's Bible college for the training of Christian workers. Of this school Jesus is the head, the elders are the local superintendents, the evangelists are the recruiting officers, every Christian is an enrolled student, the Bible is the only textbook, and love the only tuition. "Owe no man anything but to love one another." Each local congregation must be so trained and so developed that those who are members will not have to travel thousands of miles to develop for Christian service.

The hireling minister system must be overthrown as belonging to the daughters of the "mother of harlots." It is unscriptural, enslaving and degrading to the church. It steals the rights of free men, and arrogates to a special class the privileges and liberties belonging to the whole body. "Cast out the bondwoman and her son: for the son of the bondwoman shall not be heir with the son of the free-woman." The clergy system is the result of our advances toward the bondwoman of sectarianism. "Brethren, we are not children of the bondwoman, but of the free." The crusade against an entrenched clergy will be a long and bitter struggle. It is no task for compromising, pussyfooting, thin-skinned lovers of ease. But as certainly as God's Word is true, that certainly will He be with those who grow not weary in well-doing! To the arduous task before us we cheerfully dedicate our lives, knowing that our God will watch over His own, for "He doth not slumber nor sleep."

\* \* \*

Other books now in preparation by the same author include:

"The Parochial School System in Churches of Christ."

"The Kingdom of the Clergy vs. the Kingdom of God."

"The Ministry of the New Testament Church."