

*INTEGRITY is published each month and seeks to encourage all believers in Christ to strive to be one, to be pure, and to be honest and sincere in word and in deed, among themselves and toward all men.*

## Integrity

8494 Bush Hill Court  
Grand Blanc, Michigan 48439

ADDRESS CORRECTION REQUESTED  
RETURN POSTAGE GUARANTEED

Nonprofit Organization  
U.S. POSTAGE  
PAID  
Flint, Michigan 48501  
Permit No. 239

---

hornets' nest the day he spoke about how susceptible church people were to hypocrisy. It was his challenging of the reality of their faith that made them the maddest. They simply couldn't and wouldn't accept that. He didn't have the right to question their traditions. It was his rocking of their boat, his disturbance of their status quo that brought the controversy out into the open.

The opposition called him all kinds of names, vilifying his character, his morals and his attitudes, but that didn't bother him; he seemed to be oblivious of it as he plunged on. Secret meetings were held on how to stop him. They had to get rid of him; he was destroying the church, undermining the truth (which he said was merely traditions), and even drawing some of

the town's undesirables into their church. That little proverb of his—"the Alcohols Anonymous and Call Girls will be a part of God's Movement before you"—rubbed them the wrong way!

The plan was simple. They would harass him, trip him up and create such a hell for him that he would eventually blow up under the pressure and give them a just cause for giving him the "axe." The time finally came. It was at one of the great brotherhood assemblies in a major southern city. One of the deacons of his church, a close friend to him, at the last minute betrayed him, and then somewhere off of the church property, one dark Friday afternoon, near the city garbage dump, they strung him up. The place is yet called to this day Golgotha! □

April 1976

# Integrity

---

### Editorial: In the Garden

*Hoy Ledbetter*

### The Big Mistake

*W. Carl Ketcherside*

### The Search for Self-Understanding—Part 3

*Norman L. Parks*

### The Lectureship

*Don Haymes*

### Preacher Murdered

*Michael Hall*

# Integrity

APRIL 1976  
Volume 7  
Number 10

EDITOR-IN-CHIEF  
Hoy Ledbetter

EDITORIAL BOARD  
David F. Graf  
Joseph F. Jones  
Dean A. Thoroman

CONTRIBUTING EDITORS  
S. Scott Bartchy  
Bill Bowen  
Dan G. Danner  
Don Finto  
Don Haymes  
Maurice Haynes  
Elton D. Higgs  
W. Carl Ketcherside  
John McRay  
Norman L. Parks  
Jim Reynolds  
J. Harold Thomas

EDITORIAL ADDRESS  
8494 Bush Hill Court  
Grand Blanc, Michigan 48439

SUBSCRIPTIONS: Names may be added to our mailing list by writing to the editor. There is no subscription charge (we depend on contributions from readers and God's grace). However, contributions are necessary for our survival. Since we are approved by IRS, they are deductible.

BACK ISSUES: Available back issues can be obtained from Amos Ponder, 1269 Pickwick Place, Flint, MI 48507.

MANUSCRIPTS written exclusively for INTEGRITY are welcomed.

WARNING: Readers who fail to notify us of address changes (even very slight ones) will be dropped from our mailing list.

## EDITORIAL

### IN THE GARDEN

Easter being so near, now is the time for all good preachers to meditate on the resurrection. I have done so, and have been seized with the thought of how we Christians can be so casually uncritical of what we do. My meditation began with John 20, where John records that Jesus' first appearance after his resurrection was to Mary Magdalene. That in turn reminded me of "In the Garden," a song that has been immensely popular, although it is quite nonsensical to many of its critics and devotees alike. It is regarded by quite a few serious Christians as a good example of what is wrong with church music today. I have some sympathy with that viewpoint, but I suspect that it may be based on the wrong reason.

When I took an unofficial poll of those who happened to be present at the moment, I discovered that supposedly mature Christians could sing that song for years without ever knowing—and perhaps never even wondering—what it is all about. However, when it is properly understood, it seems to me to be about as good as a lot of the contemporary tuneful trifles that atrophy the minds of Christians, especially the young.

When C. Austin Miles wrote "In the Garden" back in 1912, he attempted to portray the risen Lord's appearance from Mary's perspective. She is the one who "comes to the garden alone," and if one understands that the personal pronouns\* refer to her, the hymn makes a great deal of sense, even if it is not especially profound or is a bit too romantic for modern tastes. All in all, I have to give it a higher rating than some others which we loosely call Christian hymns.

\*One critic has noted that in order to sing the song through one must use the personal pronoun 27 times, the point being that such hymns focus too much attention on man and not enough on God. Perhaps so, but the personal pronouns represent 14.7% of the total number of words, which is a little higher than the 10.9% personal pronouns in the great "When I Survey the Wondrous Cross," and a little lower than the 15.5% personal pronouns we would have if we set to music Paul's exact words in Galatians 2:20.

The champions of women's rights are pleased to point out that Jesus' first appearance was to a woman. Whatever other significance this fact may have, it does show that he did not have some of our hang-ups. A lot of men apparently have trouble accepting women as friends, because they are so accustomed to thinking of them as sex objects that they are either too afraid or too covetous to have a genuinely friendly relationship with them. Obviously Jesus was different.

Which brings me to Marabel Morgan. She and *The Total Woman* have received a great deal of exposure in the media lately, along with some well-deserved criticism. What astonishes me is not that this mother of manipulators should have come on the scene (after all, she does allay the fears of a good many sincere people), but that she should be echoed by so many Christian teachers, for her starting point for an enriching marriage is not even in the general vicinity of Christian theology.

As I view it, the so-called total woman formula is not only degrading to women, but it is insulting to men. It is essentially selfish and appeals to selfishness. It grossly distorts Biblical teaching on submission and proceeds to encourage the very character defect which Jesus so severely condemned: hypocrisy. I suppose that the average man would welcome the kind of attention Ms. Morgan prescribes, but none except the most infantile would want it on any other basis than genuine feeling, and certainly not as a matter of policy. No mature, liberated husband wants a wife like Shakespeare's rogue Autolycus ("Though I am not naturally honest, I am so sometimes by chance"). Most of us may not be ready for total honesty, but neither can we tolerate indefinitely a big put-on (unless, of course, we have a neurotic need for being lied to). I suspect that marriages which require the "total woman" recipe also require a great deal more.

Surely most people will eventually see through this nonsense, but I am afraid it will only be after a good many have been hurt. (Incidentally, a very fine critique of the "total woman" concept, written by Dennis Shoemaker, appeared in the letters section of the December-January issue of *The Wittenburg Door*).

One of the biggest lies being told today is that those who uphold greater freedom for women are seeking to dissolve the home. Perhaps I live in a sheltered environment, but I know none with such a motive or tendency. Such accusations remind me of what the sluggard in Proverbs says: "There is a lion outside! I shall be slain in the streets!" They tell us more about the speaker than they do about his imaginary dangers. History has shown that some people cannot handle freedom, but the philosophy that stimulates such accusations as the foregoing seems to imply that Adam should somehow have corrected God's mistake of failing to put the cherubim and flaming sword before the tree of *the knowledge of good and evil*. That would have put Eve right where some husbands want to put their wives today.

It is not uncommon to hear someone remark on this issue, "I just take what the Bible says"—implying that only a very backward member of the Jukes family could disagree with his position. I can only predict that most Christians will eventually find a way to accept women as full persons, but unfortunately it will not be because we "just take what the Bible says." It will be because pagan society will have reversed the current of history and made it possible for us to drift in another direction. And the church—content as it so often has been with equating the status quo with Biblical teaching—will have avoided another opportunity to confront the world with the truth which makes men and women free.

What does all of this have to do with the resurrection? Very much indeed. □

# The Big Mistake

W. CARL KETCHERSIDE

St. Louis, Missouri

In the old days parents always knew when spring had arrived without looking at the Farmer's Almanac. They could tell by the muddy spot on one trouser knee and by the roughened, skin-cracked knuckle on the index finger of the right hand of their schoolboy sons. Boys had a built-in thermostat which sensed that the equinox was approaching and demonstrated it by starting marble games all over the place. In such encounters it was customary to try and unnerve an opponent when he was making a crucial shot and there were several approved methods of shattering his aplomb. One was to draw a straight line and a circle in the dirt between his taw and the ring while shouting, "Here's the river and here's the lake—and here's where you made your big mistake."

Most of the readers of this journal no longer play marbles. For one thing they can't bend down that far, and if they did someone would have to lift them up. But you don't have to play with "aggies, cat's eyes and steelies" to make a big mistake. I want to point out the biggest one made by the third and fourth generation heirs of the restoration movement launched by Barton Warren Stone, Thomas Campbell, and other genial and erudite Presbyterians.

I happen to be within the tradition of that movement which had such a noble aim and such worthy originators, so what I say is not intended to be carping criticism, but a gentle reminder that we jumped the track a few decades back and have been mired down in the mud along the right-of-way, huffing and puffing and getting nowhere. One does not show good judgment by taking an axe and smashing

the cradle in which he was rocked. What happened to us is not unique. It occurs in every movement to restore the primitive order of things. And the fault does not lie in the dream but in the dreamers, who are men of flesh, and act like it.

The time comes when those involved begin to equate the movement with the community of believers which Jesus planted. In their minds the movement becomes "the Lord's church," and no one outside the movement is considered to be in Christ. The movement crystallizes around the discoveries to date and comes to a screeching halt. It ceases to move and changes into a monument. A movement makes progress. It creates new and dynamic leadership attuned to the pulse-beat of its own era. A monument celebrates the victories of the past. It honors the heroes of yesterday. Men go to a monument, but they are caught up in a movement.

It was never the intention of those who originated our "project to unite the Christians in all of the sects," to form another sect under another title, to confuse the minds of simple people. Alexander Campbell declared that "the first piece written on the subject of the great position appeared from the pen of Thomas Campbell, Senior, in the year 1809." He said, "The piece alluded to was styled The Declaration and Address of the Christian association of Washington, Pennsylvania."

The fourth resolution in that *Declaration and Address* specifically says, "That this Society by no means considers itself a Church, nor does at all assume to itself the powers of such a society; nor do its members, as such, consider themselves

as standing connected in that relation; nor as at all associated for the peculiar purposes of Church association; but merely as voluntary advocates for Church reformation."

What a change hath been wrought! Not only do those who hail the *Declaration and Address* as launching the restoration movement, consider themselves as constituting a Church, but they consider themselves as comprising the only church. They are now the one specific organization and institution ordained by Jesus upon the confession made by Simon Peter, with Jesus as their head. They are now the one holy, catholic and apostolic church of God upon earth, a claim made by the Roman Church also. Our brethren "consider themselves as standing connected in the relation" of Church, although they have become disconnected over more things than you "can shake a stick at," as the old-timers used to say. We have not only turned the restoration

movement into a church, but we have turned it into a bevy of churches, each one affirming to high heaven that it is the one our Lord ordained, to the utter exclusion of all other brethren! "You've come a long way, baby!"

Our only concept of unity now is best described as "the snake-frog recipe." If others who love Jesus will sit still and not get jumpy, and let us swallow them we will be one. There is no way to be one outside of us, and those who become one with us must abandon any opinion which differs with ours, and not only forsake it, but come down the aisle and hold the preacher's hand and acknowledge it was a sin to ever think it. This is what happens when men lose sight of their goals and settle for something less—a lot less. I think I liked it better when we "did not assume the powers of such a society" as a church, and could just be a Christian association in this frightened, ripped-off, sect-ridden world! □

## The Search for Self-Understanding

PART THREE

NORMAN L. PARKS

Murfreesboro, Tennessee

When David Lipscomb, unmindful of the message of the book of Jonah, wrote in 1905 that God was an "exclusivist God," he was riding the tide that engulfed a sizeable part of the Restoration Movement in an unBiblical exclusivism and shattered the most significant American-born religious dream.

The vision of the millennial common man, freed from an exploitative clergy

and an aggrandizing aristocracy, fulfilling his spiritual and political potential in a society of justice and goodness was lost.<sup>1</sup> This exciting expectation had been sorely tried by the greatest war then known to man—the Civil War. It had been strained by new and conflicting values associated with a new class thrust up by the industrial revolution. It had suffered from the impact of war-caused poverty and the

1. Alexander Campbell's bright expectations for the future were embodied in the title of his periodical, the *Millennial Harbinger*.

## Exclusivism is an expression of the human psyche, regardless of time and culture.

clash of labor and corporate wealth in industrial strife. Most important, it had lost its greatest source of nourishment when the frontier faith in man's potential gave way to a growing sense of his perverseness and sinfulness. Generated by these currents there arose from the Restoration stream, as in Pharaoh's dream, the seven lean kine of exclusivism to devour the seven fat kine of Biblical inclusivism.

Exclusivism fed on the clash of values between the new middle class and the Western small farmer and Southern yeomen who continued to embrace the older Restoration values. The Southern yeomen, in particular, felt threatened. They had suffered great poverty and dislocation from the war and many took to the pioneering road again to Texas and Arkansas.<sup>2</sup>

### Pathology of Exclusivism . . .

Exclusivism is also an expression of the human psyche, regardless of time and culture.<sup>2</sup> Even the loving John could report to Jesus, "Master, we saw a man driving out demons in your name, but we forbid him as he is not one of us." Felt threats to the security of the individual or groups or to the possession of some end,

as Curtis Lydic writes, tends to provoke response at the instinctual level of unregenerate human nature. Concerning such spiritually deviant behavior he says:

At the primitive emotional level, we hate what poses a threat to us, whether it threatens our physical existence, our basic emotional security, or threatens to deprive us of something we wish to keep or to deny us something we wish to gain. In the face of threat, unregenerate human nature has two alternatives: control or eliminate. Gaining control over the threatening thing can actually produce gain, so that is normally preferable. But failing in control, the impulse to destroy is quick and powerful.

The pathology of exclusivism is most evident in the behavior within the Churches of Christ today in the authoritarian governance by the "eldership," the rigid enforcement of conformity, the exploitation of group status to suppress differing views, destruction of the individual who dares to think differently by the "silence" treatment or by excommunication, and the invocation of invective like "digressive" as a weapon against those feared or opposed. Judgmentalism and proscription are its lethal weapons.<sup>4</sup>

Exclusivism fears liberty and diversity. It rejects dialogue, but is comfortable with debate. It divides people into friends

and enemies. Those who differ are to be feared, and it is this kind of enervating fear, as Hoy Ledbetter points out, which draws us back from any kind of meeting with our brothers in the Restoration.<sup>5</sup> The exclusivist mind tends to see the spirit of God manifested as law, rather than creative activity which energizes, frees, and builds up the saints. Fused with authoritarianism it defines authority in terms of external command, blind obedience, and punishment rather than internalized truth and love which master the will and open the way to the free life.

The spirit of exclusivism was well illustrated by an exchange in the pages of the *Gospel Advocate* in 1883. J.W. Caldwell wrote that "it is not possible for any denomination to hold all religious truth. No body of believers has a monopoly of this precious revelation. When we speak and write as though we are infallible and denounce all who disagree with us as hypocrites, we are filled with the spirit of bigotry." To this an *Advocate* editor, John Poe, replied, "Get out, J.W.C., and go to your own. You are not one of us."<sup>6</sup> Since exclusivism tends to deal in absolutes and pat answers, Lipscomb's occasional admission of uncertainty and his fraternization across party lines were causes of discomfort to many of his contemporaries.

### Psychical Forces . . .

After due allowance is made for cultural and economic factors, it is most evident that the division of the Restoration Movement was the work of a second-generation leadership driven by powerful psychic forces. Still waiting to be done is a careful study from the psychological perspective of this leadership in promot-

ing the open break in 1889-1906. Much of this lies revealed in the pages of the rival periodicals of the period. Though Lipscomb was among the more admirable leaders of this generation, his defensiveness with respect to the *Advocate*, his unwarranted suspicions of Editor Isaac Errett of the *Standard*, and his acrid language—often corrected later—toward society leader Myhr had less to do with the basics of faith than with urges deep in his own psyche. The periodicals were decisive in this conflict and the geographical lines of the division corresponded roughly with the circulation zones of these papers.<sup>7</sup>

### The Intellectual Process . . .

We turn next to the intellectual process which produced the excesses of exclusivism. A heritage of Calvinism, legalism as it mounted became an inherently disruptive force in Restoration thought. Present from the beginning, legalism as the century wore on shifted the emphasis from an appeal to the religious world to join in a common pursuit of truth and union under Christ to the task of systematizing the faith into a legal body of authoritative do's and don'ts as the measuring rod of orthodoxy and fellowship. The method employed was the rigid and seriously deficient interpretation of the New Testament as a code book of commands, "approved" binding examples, and "necessary inferences."

The body of doctrine and dogma finalized by this process was denominated "the faith" or "the gospel." Every practice or expression of faith had to have a specific Biblical base established by this method of interpretation, and be a clearly identifiable part of a revealed "blueprint." Lacking this, it was a sinful innovation or

5. *Integrity*, August, 1975.

6. *Gospel Advocate*, 1883, p. 378.

7. Kentucky is an interesting case in point. Logically that state should largely have gone with the Church of Christ defection. Had Lipscomb succeeded in merging his paper with the *Old Path Guide* instead of it being acquired by the *Standard*, this would probably have been the result. Instead, his leadership remained minimal in that state.

2. Lipscomb raised \$100,000 and amounts of food, seed, and supplies, much of it from Northern brethren, for Southern victims of the war. His lack of sectional bias was exhibited later when he raised Southern funds for the victims of the Chicago fire.

3. See Curtis Lydic, "The Pathology of Exclusionism," *Restoration Review*, 1970, pp. 54-58. He writes: "So we see that the exclusionism (or exclusivism) which we usually deplore as petty and immature actually has its roots in a soul-sickness characterized by fear and hatred, both of which are ultimately directed to God Himself."

4. A personal experience illustrates the work of exclusivism among us. When an appeal was made for library books for the young churches in Hong Kong, this writer sent a check to buy several dozen books. Among them he asked that two books by Carl Ketcherside be included: *Simple Trusting Faith* and *The Royal Priesthood*. I thought that both works were ideal for new converts and contained nothing that any faction of the Church of Christ would find unorthodox. The preacher of the "sponsoring" church, without consultation with anyone, returned my check with a disparaging lecture. He admitted that he did not consult with the elders or with the Hong Kong missionaries who were to purchase the books, and also admitted that he had never read a word written by Ketcherside. It was enough for him that the editor of the *Firm Foundation* had called Ketcherside "one-eyed."

a false doctrine, for "whatsoever is not of faith is sin." Church members who were loyal to sound doctrine had no alternative except to separate themselves from all who believed, practiced, or even failed to condemn "innovations." Since there seemed to be neither direct command, nor approved example, nor necessary inference for the located hired pastor or "minister," Sunday schools, missionary societies, organs, "sponsoring" churches, seminaries for training preachers, choirs, fund-raising bazaars, or multiple cups, all of these fell under condemnation by the legalists. The development of this legalistic, exclusivistic set of mind created a yawning chasm in the critical Tennessee area before instrumental music, now almost the only distinction between the Church of Christ and the Independent Christian Church, became a widely agitated issue. Probably the finalizing act of separation was the publication in 1904 of a separate list of "loyal" preachers—largely the work of this writer's beloved father in the gospel, John R. Williams.

### "Innovations" Accepted Today . . .

It is worth noting that many of the "innovations" which drove the wedge of separation by 1906 thrive today in the "main-line" Church of Christ. Nothing is more predictable than that the pulpit will be filled by a professional clergyman, often boasting one or more divinity degrees and always denominated "the" minister.<sup>8</sup> If the church is large enough, the staff may include an "associate minister," an "assistant minister," a "youth minister," and even an "apprentice minister." David Lipscomb put the "sponsoring church" in the same category as the missionary society. We need only to mention Herald of Truth, World Radio, and Hong Kong Kall. The last named has featured a church which not only has supervised a mission program in Hong Kong, but has

asserted direct authority over the churches established there. Nor are other extra-congregational institutions lacking, such as Western Christian Foundation, Agape, Inc., Shiloh, Inc., and numerous schools, Bible chairs, and charitable organizations funded by the churches.

Lipscomb categorically denied that Bible schools, such as the one he established, carried on the work of the church, in spite of Daniel Sommer's challenge that it was as scriptural "to create a missionary society to send evangelists into the fields as to create an educational institution to train them." Yet Lipscomb College today is in the budget of numerous congregations—a practice completely in conflict with its founders' claims. The seminaries and programs for the education of a professional ministry fostered by the Disciples and denounced by the exclusivists of 1900 flourish today, both in undergraduate majors in religion and in graduate schools of religion at Pepperdine, Alabama Christian, A.C.C., and Harding, where theological degrees are awarded.

The exclusivists of that earlier period of strife would be stunned by today's vast church plants costing millions of dollars and the elaborate machinery for administering the institutionalized budgets. Lipscomb could probably see no difference between the consultative meetings which he condemned and the similar contemporary institutions called preacher workshops, mission workshops, and lecture-ships, except that the former were more subject to brotherhood control and more open to differing views. They would also be shocked by the fact that the Church of Christ has rejected the lower-class bias of its beginning, which had abetted its estrangement from the middle-class Disciples, and has moved to the suburbs, leaving the ghetto warrens to the poor-man faiths like the Pentecostals. These numerous changes in a group which professes an unchanging religion gives support to Har-

rel's characterization of the "main-line" Church of Christ as "well on its way to denominationalism."<sup>9</sup>

Yet these changes have come behind an almost impenetrable wall of exclusionism.<sup>10</sup> The Independent Christian Church is almost as unknown to people who have grown up in the Church of Christ as the Shi'ia Moslem Mosque. What little they have learned may have come from a "Bible" course at college called "Sectarian Errors." In the main, the exclusive mind has been turned inward to guard the citadel against the "Anti-institutionalists," the premillennialists, the charismatics, the women "libbers," and the growing number of Biblical inclusivists generally denominated "liberals." Under this spell congregational autonomy is meaningless. One Gainesville, Fla., congregation publicly announced "withdrawal of fellowship" from another congregation because it permitted girls to pray vocally in small group meetings.<sup>11</sup>

### Conclusion . . .

In conclusion, the trifurcation of the Restoration Movement and its subsequent splits into splinter groups was the work of a particular mentality which we call exclusivism. Exclusivism, in turn, has been rooted in (1) unregenerated human nature and (2) an unBiblical approach to the New Testament which we call legalism. Out of the latter has come a mass of man-made blueprints of religion requiring conformity or exclusion. The result has been the withering of interest in the unity for which Jesus prayed and for which Paul urged "Spare no effort." Exclusivism is a sickness of the soul, an unBiblical intrusion into the fellowship of the Redeemed. It is this sickness which must be the point of attack as a younger and hopefully better generation succeeds to the mission of the church. It must begin, as Ledbetter points out, by the banishment of fear through the cultivation of openness and love. □

9. David E. Harrell, Jr., *Quest for a Christian America* (Nashville, 1966), preface. Also see my characterization of it as moving into "mature denominationalism," Robert Meyers, Ed., *Voices of Concern* (St. Louis, 1966), 69-85.

10. How impenetrable this wall is institutionally was driven home to me a few years ago when a young Christian preacher and I planned to try to unite the Christian Church and the Church of Christ in a small West Tennessee town. Both churches were small and without influence mainly because of their division a generation earlier. After persuading his reluctant brethren that the organ was a poor reason for disunity, the young preacher was authorized to go to the Church of Christ and ask for union on a non-instrument basis, with the property of one to be sold and put in a common treasury. He got no further than the "minister," who laid down the unyielding law that the Christian Church must disband and each member come forward at the Church of Christ and declare that he had been living and worshipping in sin and ask for forgiveness.

The writer is quite aware that many church minorities withdrew and founded new churches because they regarded their preference for organ music more important than unity. He is also aware that Independent Christian and Disciples churches may pursue their way with the same total indifference toward the Church of Christ as the latter exhibits toward them. When this writer made an effort to bring together students from these groups to worship together on the local university campus, the Disciples church preferred to affiliate with the Methodists.

11. The "withdrawal" was not the act of the congregation, but that of the "authorities." The "withdrawal" was withdrawn without any consultation with the membership of either congregation, but by the decision of fourteen men (including preachers) who felt that they had the right to decide what all members had to believe. The offending church thus agreed to hamper the growth of its women by denying them the right to pray in groups where men were present. They agreed that God in no way intervenes in the affairs of men today. They agreed that the Holy Spirit is a "retired author," speaking to Christians today only through the printed page. Finally they agreed to apply the severest tests of exclusionism in choosing all future speakers for seminars, including banning some who have previously been guests. Astonishingly, this abject surrender was based on Rom. 14! The editor of the *Firm Foundation* placed his blessing on the written creed under the title "The Brotherhood's Finest Hour." See the issue of Dec. 16, 1975. What an irony that unity can be reached through exclusivism!

8. In the "Anti-institutional" churches the clergyman is called "the evangelist" or "the preacher."

# The Lectureship

DON HAYMES

Memphis, Tennessee

CONSIDER ALL OPPONENTS AS FRIENDS & GUESTS  
GOOD SPORTSMANSHIP—A SCHOOL'S GREATEST PRIDE  
NEVER HISS OR BOO A PLAYER OR OFFICIAL  
APPLAUD OPPONENTS GOOD PLAYS  
PLAY BY THE RULES TO WIN WITH FAIRNESS  
WIN WITHOUT BOASTING—LOSE WITHOUT EXCUSES  
COMPETE AS YOU WOULD HAVE OTHERS COMPETE WITH YOU  
—Sign in Bader Memorial Gym, Freed-Hardeman College

Tennessee 100 threads its way through the gently rolling landscape of west Tennessee toward Henderson, 84 miles and 95 minutes from Memphis. One may drive Interstate 40 to Jackson, and then take US 45 into Henderson, but Interstate travel, in Gerald Ford's America, is not what it used to be, and Tennessee 100 is smooth, two-lane blacktop, flawlessly maintained, dotted with picnic benches, lined with farms and forests. On a chill, dreary February morning, it is almost deserted. As the visitor nears his destination, he would find it no surprise to encounter a Model A or a '36 Chevy at the

---

**The psychological distance  
to Henderson is greater than  
the physical.**

---

crest of a hill; it is that kind of road, and the psychological distance to Henderson is greater than the physical. Tennessee 100 is the better way to go.

To enter Henderson (pop. 3,500) is to come upon a page from the American past—not the past of Paul Revere or the pioneers, but of Booth Tarkington's *Penrod* or Sinclair Lewis's *Main Street*, moved

south; the past when Americans lived in small towns and believed in God, and in an honest day's work, and in the President of the United States. It is late morning by the time the visitor slips down the narrow main street, past cafes and clothing stores, a bank, a cinema, a small supermarket, a courthouse, a service station, coming, at last, to a fork in the road, and Freed-Hardeman College.

In Henderson, Freed-Hardeman is not hard to find. Founded in 1908 by A.G. Freed and N.B. Hardeman, after another school had foundered in the division between the Disciples of Christ and the Churches of Christ, the college and its 1,400 students dominate the town in the way—in the public mind—the University of California holds sway in Berkeley. In fact, the influence of Freed-Hardeman extends far beyond the borders of Henderson and of Tennessee: its graduates are to be found on every Christian (meaning Church of Christ) college faculty and at not a few "secular" institutions, as well as in pulpits and mission posts throughout the world. They are, by and large, industrious and inexhaustible, plain-spoken and fiercely combative. They are taught to "contend earnestly for the faith"—a rigid-

ly formulated compound of Biblical interpretation and oral tradition—and they are prepared for the task with a rigor and precision that would awe an Aquinas. They are the Jesuits of the Church of Christ: "hard shell" Campbellites. To the uninitiated, they may appear harsh, mean-spirited, obsessed; but they see themselves as

---

**It is the misfortune of men  
trained to combat to be ever on  
guard, ever on the offensive.**

---

soldiers of the Lord of Hosts, and it is the misfortune of men trained to combat to be ever on guard, ever on the offensive.\*

Turning into a driveway, the visitor finds the campus packed with cars, parked every-which-way on every available patch of pavement. Nearly 6,000 people have made the pilgrimage to Henderson this week, from all over America and across the seas, for the Fortieth Annual Freed-Hardeman College Bible Lectureship. It is this event which has brought the visitor to Henderson for the first time, to see and hear for himself. With great fortune, the visitor finds a newly-vacated parking space and, at 11 a.m., makes his way into Bader Memorial Gymnasium.

At this hour, the last lecture of the morning is winding down; in his melodious Scottish brogue—hinting of the ancestry of the dialect of most of his listeners—Andrew Gardiner is discussing "The Restoration Movement in the British Isles." There is standing-room-only in the gym. Highly-polished wooden bleachers extend from all four walls, and folding chairs cover the floor space in front of

the speaker's platform. Lectures and classes have begun in this building at 7:30 a.m. The students in the bleachers are well-scrubbed and earnest; their hair is more closely cropped, on both men and women, than that of most of their peers in other places. There are, however, a few neatly-trimmed beards and a large number of "Afros." Most of the students are watching the speaker closely, and a few are using tape-recorders; most of them appear attentive but passive.

Andrew Gardiner concludes his remarks—"modernism," he says, has been the greatest problem in the British Isles—and turns the platform over to E. Claude Gardner, the President of Freed-Hardeman College. "This is not a conference," Mr. Gardner warns the audience. "We are not here to legislate anything. . . . God's book has already fixed these things. We are here to study it and to learn."

The crowd disperses rapidly; lectures may satisfy the soul, but now it is the stomach's turn. Seeing a few familiar faces, the visitor shakes hands here and there, exchanges a few pleasantries with strangers, and wanders uphill to the Lectureship Exhibit Tent, a fixture of most such gatherings among the Churches of Christ. This one is only medium-sized, small compared to the two tents used in Abilene, Texas, and is a garish affair in red, white and blue stripes. A few mission posts are represented, as are schools of preaching, camps, and homes for orphans and the old. There are many kinds of wares for sale, from (anti-) *Abortion Handbooks* to *Bus Ministry Coloring Books* to biographies and Bible commentaries to recordings of sermons to "Roman Crucifixion Nails" handsomely boxed.

---

\*And yet there are others in whom some chemistry of the spirit works a subtle change, even in the stereotyper's mold; they emerge somehow less rigid, more open to choice and chance; their world begins in Henderson, but it does not end there. Many more of these folk exist than the other image might suggest: there is Heber Taylor, who has won two Fulbright Scholarships in Journalism; Robert Meyers, of *Voices of Concern* fame; Mack Langford, who was on the staff of Crozer Theological Seminary (now defunct); Leroy Garrett of *Restoration Review*; and the editor of this magazine, Hoy G. Ledbetter.

Leaving the tent, the visitor walks to the basement of the Student Center, where women from churches in the area have provided a meal of fried chicken, rice, peas, rolls, and dessert for \$1.89. The visitor manages to by-pass, with abundant regret, the rich-looking slices of home-made pies and cakes, and finds a vacant seat at one of the tables. Preachers' wives and their children are much in evidence here. "We've been to every lecture this week," says one lady, trying to corral her well-mannered but restless daughters, age seven and five. These women appear more relaxed and at ease than others the visitor has seen at other recent gatherings. Beyond doubt, they and their children

---

**These women do not appear  
to be up-tight about their place  
in the world.**

---

are disciplined and patient, and they do not appear to be "up-tight" about their place in the world. An older woman at the table has engaged a preacher she knows in an earnest conversation about the views of another preacher encountered by a friend of hers in Denver. The food is simple, down-home, and good.

It is time to return to the gym, where workmen have straightened the rows of folding chairs, cleaned the shiny surfaces of the bleachers, and removed the detritus of the morning. The floor is covered with heavy butcher-paper, to protect it from the chairs and the crowds. A closed-circuit television camera broadcasts the lectures in this building to three other locations, including the auditorium of the Henderson Church of Christ. During the rest of the year, a student explains, the equipment is used to perfect the oratorical style of student preachers; the student's sermon is video-taped, then played back for a critique by the professor and other members of the class. "They work on

gestures, facial expressions, everything," the student says. "And it really works. Somebody can criticize your work, but there's nothing like seeing it for yourself. You get the message a lot faster." The visitor can only marvel.

Promptly at 12:50 p.m. (the programs run on time in Henderson), the doors to the gymnasium close, and a young song leader calls for Number 212, "Wonderful Words of Life." After a prayer, Danny Cottrell, a Freed-Hardeman professor, mounts the platform to deliver a lecture entitled, "Christ Has Made Us Free: Motivation for Mission Work."

Mr. Cottrell begins by stressing that his approach to the subject will be through the Bible. "The Bible is God's inspired, infallible, inerrant . . . authoritative word. . . . And when I talk about inspiration, I am talking about *verbal* inspiration."

"Modernism," Mr. Cottrell says, "is simply not conducive to mission work." He charges that "80 per cent of the work being done is social work," not gospel preaching. After listing and explaining in detail some of the names of the Son of God given in the Bible—Jesus, Christ, the Word, only begotten son, beloved son, Lamb of God, mediator, high priest, Lord, Master—he concludes that "if we have the exalted view of Jesus that the Bible has, we will have no trouble getting mission work done."

Mr. Cottrell then traces a relationship between Jesus' role as "Redeemer" and the doctrines of Reconciliation and Atonement, which he explains as "at-one-ment." God's aim is to free man by redeeming him—"buying him back"—and reconciling him—"bringing him back"—to himself. "Christ is the agent, God the subject, man the object."

From Jesus, Mr. Cottrell turns to the Church. "Missionary thrust," he says, "is an important index of its vitality." He thinks that the mission zeal which arose after World War Two "has waned," in part due to "modernism" and the "ef-

forts of some to establish a new image," as well as "internal strife," which is "a bodily sickness."

"But modernism cannot bear all the blame," he adds, striving toward a conclusion. "Materialism and secularism" have meant less money for missions. "When money is taken from the mission field to build bigger buildings, put soft cushions on pews, and repave the parking lots, then our priorities are all mixed up." Not only is money a problem, but "we can't find people to go . . . who will leave the comfort of Saturday afternoon at McDonalds. . . . Are we that much in love with the Big Mac?"

Outside, a persistent drizzle has turned into a downpour. The visitor retrieves his overcoat from his car, and hustles

---

**White preachers followed Keeble  
and baptized hundreds who  
would not submit to the rite  
at the hands of a black man.**

---

through the campus and down the street to the Henderson church building. Twelve people, two of them black Freed-Hardeman students, have gathered for a class on "Restoration History Among Blacks," taught by a young black minister named David Meek, who also serves Freed-Hardeman as an "Admissions and Financial Aid Counselor."

Mr. Meek's approach is to offer brief lives of various preachers, many of them unknown among whites, and trace their influence. Today, he is listing disciples of G.P. Bowser, some of whom are still alive: Alonzo Jones, M.F. Holt, R.N. Hogan, G.E. Stewart ("The Blind Wonder"), the brothers S.L. and A.L. Cassius, and John Hannon. He concludes this list with a brief overview of the career of the late Marshall Keeble, "the sum total of Campbell, Womack, and Bowser." A turning point in Keeble's career came in Henderson, when a black farmer named Crooms

obtained permission to use the Oak Grove school house for a Keeble meeting. Beginning the third Sunday in July, 1918, Keeble preached for three weeks and baptized 84 people. He went on to baptize 40,000, both black and white, and establish 400 churches. White preachers followed Keeble, Mr. Meek says, and baptized hundreds who would not submit to the rite at the hands of a black man.

After summarizing the careers of four of Keeble's disciples—Luke Miller, John R. Bonner, O.L. Acre, A.C. Holt—Mr. Meek looks to the future. "We've got to get together," he says, "as God intends for his people to get together. . . . 'Let there be no divisions among you.' . . . There's a gap between our preaching and our practice. We need to close the practice gap."

"We already passed up one of our greatest opportunities," Mr. Meek continues, "in the Freedom Movement of the sixties. We could have stood up then, we could have said that's what we've always believed, that all men are equal in Christ. . . . But brethren said, 'Don't get involved—that's political.' Yet when John F. Kennedy was running for President, they were preaching against him in the pulpit, because he was a Catholic. It's amazing to me, how we can get involved in some political ideas, and not others."

Someone raises the question of "intermarriage." Mr. Meek smiles. "I guess everyone on this campus knows how I feel on that subject," he says. "Two white people get married, they'll have problems. Two black people get married, they'll have problems. So will a black person and a white who get married. Race relations is a matter of faith. There are problems, but the Gospel is the same."

"It was hard for me when I first came here," says a white Freed-Hardeman student. "I'm from Pittsburgh, and I never went to school with any blacks, I was never in an integrated situation like we have here. I just never met any *nice* black people until I came to Freed-Hardeman."

One of the black students rises, struggling for the right words; for him, perhaps, nice *white* people have been few and far between. "I was not a Christian when I came here," he says. "I'm not the same person I was. . . . I'm glad I came here."

There is good conversation after the class; one young man, a Freed-Hardeman graduate, rides a circuit for five black congregations he has helped plant in rural Georgia. By the time the visitor gets back inside the church building, C.W. Bradley, a minister in Henderson, is wrapping up his class on "Unity." Pentecostalism, gifts, and claims of miracles in the Churches of Christ have been a great concern to him; "I never thought I'd see the

---

**Mr. Woods has  
confined his practice of law  
to the Church.**

---

day come that our own people in the Church would be claiming these things." He offers 1 Corinthians 13 as a guide to "essential attitudes for unity in a congregation." In conclusion, he says that "Most of our splits arise . . . over personality and power struggles, over who's going to rule. . . . Until we're humble enough to get ahead of self, we'll not work together in unity."

The rain has stopped, and there is a great rush back to the gymnasium for what is, to many, the main event of every day at the Freed-Hardeman Lectures: the Open Forum. Again there is standing-room-only; the visitor is fortunate to find a seat in the bleachers, by two older friendly black preachers. People are still coming in, peering anxiously about for a seat, as the song leader calls for Number 25, "Worthy Art Thou."

\**Entia non sunt multiplicanda praeter necessitatem*; "entities are not to be multiplied beyond need." William of Ockham (ca. 1280-1350) used this "razor" to revolutionize philosophical theology in the fourteenth century and prepare the ground for the Reformation, presaging John Locke's empiricism and Schopenhauer's philosophy of the will.

The Open Forum began as the exclusive domain of Nicholas Brodie Hardeman, who brought to it his considerable skills as an orator and debater, and in it honed his own, pragmatic version of "Ockham's Razor": "If you can't answer any Bible question on a post-card, and have room to tell about your family and ask about theirs, then you're not a Gospel preacher." He created an atmosphere in the Forum part "Problem Page," part Roman Circus, part Day of Judgment. He could be as pleasant or as pugnacious as a questioner or question seemed to demand. Taking on all comers, Hardeman gave, year after year, a virtuoso performance.

Guy N. Woods is a worthy heir to the Hardeman tradition. At 68, he is short, balding, and owl-eyed, not a physically imposing presence, but he possesses a diamond-hard intelligence, lightning-fast mental reflexes, and an unerring instinct for the jugular. He is the author of 12 books and uncounted articles, and is booked in advance for 200 "gospel meetings." On the platform now, soft-voiced and solemn, he thanks his hosts for the various courtesies of the week, and sails directly into a question posed about a speech of the previous evening. He argues for varying degrees of punishment and reward in the life to come, parsing the texts—"Watch the comparative adjective"—with all the skill of a corporation lawyer dissecting a contract. (The analogy is useful, for Mr. Woods studied law and is a member of the Tennessee bar, although he has confined his practice of law to the Church.) Another question: Is the office of elder part of the age of miracles which has passed away? "If this were true, then preachers would have passed away."

Laughter. But there is a tension in the air—something is about to happen. . . .

*(To be continued next month)*

# Preacher Murdered

MICHAEL HALL

*Niles, Michigan*

Preachers and prophets have often found themselves opposed by the world, and no few of them have lost their heads (literally) for preaching like John the Baptist. The following is a true report of a preacher who was actually murdered by some members of his congregation. It is not pleasant, but it should make us re-evaluate the danger of legalistic attitudes.

It is true that the preacher was somewhat of an upstart and didn't have a lot of experience. He never attended any college among us or any "School of the Prophets." He did not have the "proper" theological training that might have made the difference. He was a "lay" member for many years and had just gotten sick and tired of the deadness and apathy of the church and wanted to get into the ministry because he had a burning fire in his heart and a good understanding of the Word in his head.

The most tragic aspect of this whole direful situation was the church with which he first located. Talk about a legalistic, dead and sterile church! It wasn't that they didn't have the truth; they were plenty orthodox. But they had forgotten the Good News of God's saving activity that had brought them together nearly 2,000 years previously and had molded them into a special people for God's possession. That original liberating act of God had over the years been reduced to mere forms and rituals. The first-love and initiatory spirit of it all was lost in the modern structure. It would have been a very discouraging work for the most experienced preacher!

The first year really wasn't all that bad. In fact, the growth in numbers was simply unbelievable. It was beyond the wildest dreams of the most optimistic. Everyone said that this new upstart preacher would be going places. His name began to be mentioned everywhere. Of course, everyone understood that this was the "honeymoon" period of his work. Yet in spite of that, the success, the power, and the growth of it seemed so undefeatable. What could stop it?

The turning point in his career was in the second year when some of the older members and a couple of the elders began detecting traces of liberalism. At first they couldn't really pinpoint it; it was just a feeling. His emphasis upon forgiveness, his constant talking about Good News, his acceptance of men and women without shock or probation and his declaration that "God is love" was too dominant for their tastes. It was when he began a series on grace that his liberalism was confirmed! It drove them up the wall every time he repeated that "man can't be saved by law, but by grace." Their purpose became singular in their elder meetings: his liberalism had to be stopped. They tried to talk with him, but he was too headstrong to listen. They asked him to preach from some of the older preachers' sermon outline books. They threatened to fire him. But they soon came to realize that he couldn't be bought or bullied. And they knew they couldn't fire him, for a major division would occur, since the people took him as the greatest thing that ever happened to their church.

The preacher was aware of the rising opposition, yet, because he didn't have the formal education which might have prepared him for handling power structures which arise in a church, he dived right into the controversy, showing little tact or smoothness. He even tried to point out to the elders some of their faults! He preached a few lessons on the deadness of that church and then really stirred up a