

When the current issue is available you will be notified.

Contending FOR THE Faith™

FOR THOSE WHO LOVE THE TRUTH AND HATE ERROR

In the fourth installment in his series on higher educational institutions operated by members of the church of Christ, brother McClish continues this study under the title:

WHAT HIGHER “CHRISTIAN” EDUCATION IS DELIVERING AND HAS PRODUCED

Dub McClish

We begin this section with the sober realization that this assertion will be far from popular with many, if not with most of brethren. The fact that one invites all sorts of censure, accusation, and motive judgments when he dares raise questions about or criticize a “brotherhood” school only demonstrates how dangerously powerful the schools have become. In some circles, one is far more likely to be vilified for criticizing a school than for saying all sorts of uncomplimentary and shameful things about the church of the Lord or a faithful brother who may dare raise questions about said school.

We realize that this assertion indicts numerous brethren (particularly at trustee and administrative level). Without hesitation, we charge that such brethren have led, are now leading, or have surrendered their schools to a grievously compromised posture that countermands the very fundamental truths these schools were established to inculcate and perpetuate (i.e., inspiration and authority of the Bible, Scriptural identity of the church, Biblical hermeneutics, Scriptural worship and organization, et al.). We further charge that the evidence is incontestable that the foregoing statement represents exactly what has occurred and is occurring on these campuses.

We do not come at this subject from the “anti-college” perspective of a Daniel Sommer or a J.D. Tant. Rather, we believe the Bible generically authorizes schools at whatever level that have the Bible as their foundation. We favor more

of them and have enthusiastically supported, endorsed, and praised various schools in years past—as long as they remained true to the Bible and the Biblical aim of their founders. We would still support and recommend any of them that met these criteria—if we could find such a faithful institution. This writer is in some respects a “product” of Christian colleges, earning degrees as a Bible major in two of the universities founded and operated by brethren, which were colleges at the time. The education I received at both of these schools has been a great blessing to me. Brethren who have operated these schools the last few decades have not done me any personal harm, so I have no grievance of any sort on a personal level against anyone connected with any of them or against any of the schools.

It will give me no pleasure to set forth even a small portion of the abundance of evidence that demonstrates how deeply ingrained compromise and liberalism have become throughout brotherhood academe. Pepperdine University has been a bastion of error and compromise on the West Coast for almost six decades. The other colleges were generally perceived as conservative, with some more so than others, until the 1970s. Space will not allow me to give detailed reviews of all of the schools. I will give attention primarily to three schools that in various ways are representative of the others. In fairness, although compromise is discernible on all of the campuses, it has been going on longer, is more deeply

(Continued on Page 3)

IN THIS ISSUE.....

WHAT HIGHER ED. IS DELIVERING & PRODUCED—DUB MCCLISH.....1
EDITORIAL—DAVID P. BROWN.....2
CHURCH DIRECTORY.....12

Not every one that saith unto me, Lord, Lord, shall enter into the kingdom of heaven; but he that doeth the will of my Father which is in heaven.—Matthew 7:21

Contending FOR THE Faith™

David P. Brown, Editor and Publisher
dpbcftf@gmail.com

COMMUNICATIONS received by CONTENDING FOR THE FAITH and/or its Editor are viewed as intended FOR PUBLICATION unless otherwise stated. Whereas we respect confidential information, so described, everything else sent to us we are free to publish without further permission being necessary. Anything sent to us NOT for publication, please indicate this clearly when you write. Please address such letters directly to the Editor David P. Brown, P.O. Box 2357, Spring, Texas 77383 or dpbcftf@gmail.com. Telephone: (281) 350-5516.

FREE—FREE—FREE—FREE—FREE—FREE

To receive CFTF free, go to www.cftfpaper.com and sign up. Once done, you will be notified when the current issue is available. It will be in the form of a PDF document that can be printed, and forwarded to friends.

SUBSCRIPTION RATES FOR THE PAPER EDITION

Single Print Subs: One Year, \$25.00; Two Years, \$45.00.

NO REFUNDS FOR CANCELLATIONS OF PRINT SUBSCRIPTIONS.

ADVERTISING POLICY & RATES

CONTENDING FOR THE FAITH exists to defend the gospel (Philippians 1:7,17) and refute error (Jude 3). Therefore, we advertise only what is authorized by the Bible (Colossians 3:17). We will not knowingly advertise anything to the contrary and reserve the right to refuse any advertisement.

All setups and layouts of advertisements will be done by CONTENDING FOR THE FAITH. A one-time setup and layout fee for each advertisement will be charged if such setup or layout is needful. Setup and layout fees are in addition to the cost of the space purchased for advertisement. No major changes will be made without customer approval.

All advertisements must be in our hands no later than one month preceding the publishing of the issue of the journal in which you desire your advertisement to appear. To avoid being charged for the following month, ads must be canceled by the first of the month. We appreciate your understanding of and cooperation with our advertising policy.

MAIL ALL SUBSCRIPTIONS, ADVERTISEMENTS AND LETTERS TO THE EDITOR, P. O. Box 2357, Spring, Texas 77383-2357. COST OF SPACE FOR ADS: Back page, \$300.00; full page, \$300.00; half page, \$175.00; quarter page, \$90.00; less than quarter page, \$18.00 per column-inch. CLASSIFIED ADS: \$2.00 per line per month. CHURCH DIRECTORY ADS: \$30.00 per line per year. SETUP AND LAYOUT FEES: Full page, \$50.00; half page, \$35.00; anything under a half page, \$20.00.

CONTENDING FOR THE FAITH is published bimonthly. P. O. Box 2357, Spring, Texas 77383-2357 Telephone: (281) 350-5516.

Ira Y. Rice, Jr., Founder
August 3, 1917-October 10, 2001

Editorial...

In closing out *Contending for the Faith* for 2018, we take this opportunity to wish everyone a joyous holiday season and a happy new year. May God bless all in their faithful service to Him.

In the coming year, as the Lord allows, we will continue upholding the truth, exposing and refuting error, and marking false teachers. We engage in this Godly task without fear, favor, or respect of persons and truly appreciate your messages of encouragement in our work. We covet the prayers of all those who love the truth and hate error. —Editor

The apostle Paul wrote to the young preacher Timothy, admonishing him to:

Let no man despise thy youth; but be thou an example of the believers, in word, in conversation, in charity, in spirit, in faith, in purity. Till I come, give attendance to reading, to exhortation, to doctrine. Neglect not the gift that is in thee, which was given thee by prophecy, with the laying on of the hands of the presbytery. Meditate upon these things; give thyself wholly to them; that thy profiting may appear to all. Take heed unto thyself, and unto the doctrine; continue in them: for in doing this thou shalt both save thyself, and them that hear thee (1 Tim. 4:12-16).

In his second letter to Timothy, the apostle directed him in his work as a gospel preacher to “**exhort,**” “**young men... to be sober minded.**” Continuing, the apostle, in almost the same pen stroke, addressed Timothy’s personal conduct when he wrote:

In all things shewing thyself a pattern of good works: in doctrine shewing uncorruptness, gravity, sincerity, Sound speech, that cannot be condemned; that he that is of the contrary part may be ashamed, having no evil thing to say of you (2 Tim. 2:6-8).

Our Lord had taught, “**But those things which proceed out of the mouth come forth from the heart; and they defile the man**” (Mat. 15:18). Also, Paul wrote the church at Ephesus, saying, “**Let no corrupt communication proceed out of your mouth, but that which is good to the use of edifying, that it may minister grace unto the hearers**” (Eph. 4:29; Also see Eph. 5:3-5).

About two months ago, we learned of a “pulpit” preacher (what other kind there is, we do not know) who engaged in conversations with certain preacher training school students and other young men in the church where he preached. In these conversations, filthy language involving crude sexual words were used. It was learned that such conduct had been ongoing for many months. Furthermore, the elders of the church knew about these matters and they were confirmed by many witnesses over a lengthy period of time.

(Continued on Page 10)

(Continued From Page 1)

rooted in, and has made greater inroads in some more than in others. I now proceed to produce some of the testimony that demonstrates how far from their original purposes these institutions have departed and what peril they hold for the souls of the young people entrusted to them.

PEPPERDINE UNIVERSITY

George Pepperdine's school had been in existence a quarter of a century at the time of his death in 1962. With hardly any interruption, once it started deviating from the Truth, Pepperdine University has continued to be the nerve center and wellspring of liberalism in California and the western United States. Its apostasy over several decades is so generally acknowledged by those who have even a smattering of Bible knowledge and respect for its authority that said apostasy hardly needs documentation. Nonetheless, we shall furnish some, especially for the benefit of the young and/or uninformed who may be reading these words.

Even before George Pepperdine's passing, his school was perceptibly listing leftward. It took less than twenty years for it to become the pioneer in campus liberalism in the twentieth century, moving far more quickly to that status than any other such school. In 1954, at the age of sixteen, this writer attended a Christian camp in Idaho. Hugh M. Tiner, Pepperdine President at the time, was one of the camp's teachers/speakers. My father, who at the time preached in Boise, revealed to me his unflattering evaluation of brother Tiner from having preached in Gospel meetings in California in the early 1950s. My father had little confidence in brother Tiner's strength of convictions.

Tiner served as Pepperdine's president from 1939 to 1957, and the soft, loose, and liberal drift began and accelerated on his watch. To be fair, this drift perhaps occurred by default as much as by intent, but at best, he allowed it to occur. Soon after Tiner became president, E.V. Pullias, already teaching at Pepperdine, was elevated to the position of dean. He apparently became the tail that wagged the entire Pepperdine dog for the remainder of his tenure, with "President" Tiner little more than a figurehead and fundraiser. Pullias was much concerned with achieving academic reputation for the college (which he did), but little with its doctrinal direction or reputation (Rice, *Contending*, 1). Under his guidance, by 1957, Pepperdine College was so doctrinally corrupt that few Christian parents would risk sending their children there.

With the trustees forced to recognize the need to "clean up" Pepperdine, Tiner and Pullias were relieved of their posts in 1957, and M. Norvel Young and J.P. Sanders (then Dean of David Lipscomb College), both of whom had reputations of soundness, were installed as president and dean, respectively. There was some movement in the right direction for their first few years, but faithful brethren, hoping

this would continue, found themselves disappointed within a few years. In the 1960s, Harding College dismissed several teachers because of their doctrinal corruption, and Pepperdine signaled its sympathy for error by hiring five of them. About the same time (1968), Young brought Bill Banowsky to Pepperdine to be his principal assistant, and he became Pepperdine's fourth president when Young retired in 1971, at which time Young became chancellor.

By the beginning of Banowsky's administration, the ultra-liberal, subversive-to-the-Truth *Mission Magazine* had been in publication four years. Banowsky was one of its founding trustees. Although he eventually resigned, he never disavowed or hinted at any criticism of the publication's destructive agenda. Furthermore, Frank Pack, head of Pepperdine's religion department since 1964, also one of *Mission's* founding trustees and a member of its board of editors, continued his *Mission* affiliations.

The indications of a liberal agenda became more undeniable with each passing year under Banowsky. Frank Pack, with his liberal connections, was apparently not liberal enough for the new president, who brought in Tony Ash to head the religion department in 1972. Were there no other proofs by this time of Pepperdine's abandonment of any pretense at moving back to the Truth, the succession of rank liberal religion department heads for the next quarter century would convince anyone aware of the errors long associated with their names: Ash (1972–75), Carl Mitchell (1975–80), Frank Pack (1980–83, second tenure), Carroll Osburn (1983–85), and Tom Olbricht (1985–96). The religion department has not moderated in this regard in the intervening years.

Further miscellaneous indicators of the degree of Pepperdine University's nonstop deviation from the Truth through the years include the following:

From the 1970s to present, the annual lectureship has been a veritable "Who's Who" list of the most liberal men and women the school could find who still pretend to be part of the Lord's church. Even worse, in 1973, a Christian Church preacher, who was a Pepperdine sociology professor, taught a class on occultism. Just to be "fair," he lined up a psychic, an "alchemist," an Episcopal "priest" who spoke in "tongues," a "faith healer," and a witch as lecturers in the course. The professor was rewarded by being selected Pepperdine's "teacher of the year."

In 1975, Chancellor Norvel Young (yes, the same one from whose 1949 book, I have quoted), under the influence of alcohol (over twice the California blood alcohol level for drunkenness), collided with another automobile that burst into flames, killing two ladies and critically injuring a third in the car that he hit. He pleaded guilty to vehicular manslaughter, was sentenced to a year in jail (suspended), was fined \$2,000.00, and had his driver's license suspended for four years. We commend him for making a forthright con-

fession of his sins, but that tragic episode did nothing to bolster the confidence of sound brethren in the school or their support of it.

By 1978, contrary to an explicit requirement of the original Articles of Incorporation that “each of the trustees must be a member in good standing of the Churches of Christ” (as cited earlier), forty percent of the board was composed of those who were not members of any church of Christ—not even a liberal one (Rice, “Will Banowsky’s...?”, 1). Entertainer Pat Boone, disfellowshipped by all faithful brethren in the late 1960s (and finally even by his liberal “home congregation,” Inglewood, CA, in 1971) for his defection to Pentecostalism, has long served on and even chaired Pepperdine’s Advisory Board. Part of that time he was concurrently on the Board of Regents of Oral Roberts University. In 2006, he and his wife, Shirley, gave \$3 million to Pepperdine.

By the 1980s, all expectations of even a desire on the part of the Pepperdine trustees or administration to stand for the founder’s aims and loyalty to the Bible had become manifestly futile. Liberal highlights of this decade included hosting the 1985 “Restoration Forum” with many of the most radical liberals in the church engaging in fellowship and urging unity with the Independent Christian Church through compromise. Also, in 1989 Pepperdine hosted one of the notorious “Christian Scholars Conferences,” the main purpose of which is to provide a platform for the most hardcore liberal voices in the church to present their heresies.

Matters have only “waxed worse and worse” in the intervening years. More recently, contrary to its generally conservative political and moral reputation, Pepperdine has signaled some decidedly liberal postures. In the 2008 presidential campaign, a conservative student group was forced to remove a poster identifying Barack Obama’s campaign promises with Socialism and urging people not to vote for him. Soon after that incident, Andrew Benton, Pepperdine’s president, yielded to political correctness and the California homosexuals. One of the school’s law professors appeared in a TV ad urging people to vote for Proposition 8, which was a referendum against legalizing marriage between homosexuals. Benton labeled the issue “partisan politics” and apologized for Pepperdine’s being perceived as taking a position on the issue. This school has long been lost beyond reclamation to the Truth and to the purpose of brother George Pepperdine.

ABILENE CHRISTIAN UNIVERSITY

Although Abilene Christian University (ACU) took much longer to stray so far to the left as Pepperdine has, the two schools have been traveling on parallel paths for the past three decades. For some years liberalism and apostasy have been so pervasive at ACU that it has caught up with Pepperdine in this regard. This writer is an alumnus of ACC, as it was known when he received a B.A. degree in Bible there in 1959. It is, therefore, particularly painful for me to chronicle

her doctrinal departures, [however—*Editor*] duty demands it.

My father and I originally planned for me to take my senior year of high school at the ACC campus school in 1954 and the next fall enroll in ACC to begin work on a degree in Bible. Providentially, the late Guy N. Woods, a friend of my father’s, spent a few days in our home while he conducted a debate in Boise, Idaho, where we lived at the time (I was then 16 years old). We told him of our plan, and he recommended that we consider Freed-Hardeman College (now University) instead. Because we took his advice (for which I will ever be grateful), I arrived at ACC in 1957 with three years of solid Bible teaching already completed. The venerable Don Morris was president and the staunch Paul Southern was head of the Bible department. Although my wife and I both noticed a much more “relaxed” atmosphere regarding student regulations than we were accustomed to, I did not detect any liberal teachings in any of the Bible classes necessary for completion of my degree. I did notice that the ACC teachers were not as forthright in identifying and refuting erroneous concepts as those at Freed-Hardeman had been.

1969 proved to be a crucial year in ACU’s history and future. It lost the faithful leadership of its president and its Bible department head, respectively, as Don Morris and Paul Southern both retired. John Stevens, the new president, increasingly allowed the door of compromise to be opened during his twelve-year administration. Several things indicate that J.D. Thomas, the new Bible department head, consciously opened the door to more than compromise. With a PhD from the University of Chicago, he began teaching at ACC in 1949 and was given direction of the lectureship in 1952. His first year in that post he assigned G.C. Brewer the subject of “Grace and Salvation,” admitting that he did so because he knew that Brewer agreed with the apostate K.C. Moser’s “grace only” heresy. In fact, in retrospect, the Brewer invitation may be one of the earliest omens of the drastic changes that would occur at ACU over the next half century.

As can be imagined, Brewer’s lecture caused quite a ruckus among brethren, but Thomas counted Brewer’s lecture to be a doctrinal “turning point” for the church. Moser’s final book, *The Gist of Romans*, was published in 1957, my first year at ACC. An anonymous benefactor furnished me (and I assume all Bible majors) with a copy of the book, which contains much of Moser’s error. Obviously, someone wanted to influence the minds of young would-be preachers with Moser’s doctrine. In later years, learning of Thomas’s sympathy with Moser, as well as other indicators of his liberal position, I have wondered if Thomas may have been the benefactor. In very recent years, he was interviewed by a brother who could not believe he would sanction the gross digression of ACU. The querist was shocked to hear Thomas give his full approbation to the liberal posture of the school. Thomas had apparently been very patiently and covertly concealing a liberal agenda for several years.

Some of us who have had a “vested” interest in ACC/ACU as alumni or for other reasons have seen coming for almost four decades the rampant apostasy that presently characterizes this school. As in every outright departure from the Faith, whether in an individual, a congregation, or a school, the shift is never abrupt. The devil always takes short steps when leading men astray. Both the ones being led and observers of their egress usually long deny there is any such drift until finally the metamorphosis is so complete that denial is folly. Such has been the history of the evolution of the once sound and solid ACC to the ACU that revels in its incurable digression.

Often the earliest indicators of a compromising philosophy in the schools is seen in the speakers invited to speak on annual lectureships and workshops. At least, by the early 1970s such indicators were visible at ACU. J.D. Thomas placed direction of the lectureship in the hands of Carl Brecheen in 1970, but about the same time Thomas initiated a series of workshops, originally inviting preachers and elders to attend, and (two of which I attended). Some of the most notorious liberals of that time (e.g., Roy Osborne, Carl Ketcherside, Roy Bowen Ward, et al., who were liberal before liberal became “cool”) were invited to speak. No recordings, questions, “amens,” or other visible signs of agreement or disagreements were permitted (rules which at least one ACU Bible professor ignored). These were continued only three or four years, but they gave numerous liberals a valuable platform with an implied neutrality at best on the part of ACU. Ere long some of the very liberals on this program were eased over into the lectureship lineup.

At about the same time, more liberals began to be seen on the lectureship roster each year. I became so dismayed by 1974 that I wrote two letters of concern to ACU. The first one, in response to an ACC Alumni Fund appeal, dated November 1, reads as follows:

Sorry, but I cannot conscientiously support ACC by sending either money or students there as long as it continues to feature men such as Jim Reynolds, Don Finto, Stanley Shipp, Roy Osborne, and several others who are subversive to true New Testament Christianity. My support and encouragement will instead be directed to schools that have not forgotten their original purpose and the thousands of dedicated saints who sacrificed to establish and maintain them.

Someone who read my handwritten note on the backside of the funds appeal thought President Stevens should see it. Accordingly, he wrote me on November 12, 1974, in part:

Dear Dub:

I appreciate your note in connection with this year’s annual fund.

Dub, our friendship has been so good that I hope you will come by and talk with me personally about these problems, or I shall be pleased to come by Granbury [TX, where I lived at the time, DM] at the first opportunity.

Abilene Christian College does not desire to feature those individuals who are doctrinally unsound or morally questionable. You know, for example, that for the last two or three years we have not had the men you have mentioned on our lectureship programs.

Yet—so far as I know—none of these men has been withdrawn from by the church.... I do not like to put people on the black list just because there are some who raise questions about them.... Therefore we cannot afford to say that we wouldn’t use anybody at all who had any kind of criticism against him.

But—you know us, and we know you, and we have been friends for a long time, and I don’t know of any reason we can’t get together and discuss the cause of Christian education and the work of the church and what we are supposed to be accomplishing. Let me know when you are coming through Abilene.

Sincerely yours, s/John C. Stevens

The Stevens letter reveals the “response which is no response” that seems to be inbred in school administrators. Note the reference to the false teachers I mentioned as not being on the lectureship the last two or three years. If they were not invited back because of their liberalism, why were they invited in the first place? He also implies ignorance of their errors, but is it not incumbent upon those responsible for planning such programs to know the doctrinal stance of men or women who will be addressing large audiences with the implied endorsement of the ones who invited them (that is, if they are concerned about such matters)? Note the defense that none of the liberals I mentioned had been withdrawn from. Of course, they had not. They all preached or taught in situations that fully endorsed their liberalism. I never had any sort of close friendship with brother Stevens, though I suppose he knew me when we would very occasionally see each other. From the tone of his letter, however, one would think that we had grown up from boyhood together. His “good buddy” approach came across to me as political backslapping and favor-carrying.

That same month, the ACC Bible Department mailed a five-page, two-section questionnaire to alumni Bible majors. Section one related to biographical information, which, of course, had my name attached. The final question on this section invited suggestions and recommendations, which I answered as follows: “I recommend that ACC take a firmer stand against liberalism and false doctrine, rather than giving their purveyors a platform, as has often been the case in the past few years.”

The second section was arranged so that all of the responses would remain anonymous. It invited recommendations, criticisms, suggestions, or comments. Accordingly, I expressed far more extensively my concerns over the school’s direction than what I wrote earlier. I prefaced my remarks as follows: “I am deeply sorry that I cannot feel good about supporting ACC with my money or my influ-

ence. I have not been able to do so for the past 3 or 4 years. My principal reasons are as follows:" I listed and discussed six areas of concern:

1. The intimate connection between *Mission Magazine* and ACC faculty and board members for several years. I pointed out that the faculty members who had dissociated themselves from its board had done so very quietly and had never disavowed its agenda and that no administration-level repudiation had been made of the paper. This left the impression that the administration and Bible department were in full agreement with the subversive direction of *Mission* or that they did not care, neither of which was acceptable.
2. Numerous speakers over the past four or five years who would hardly have been allowed on the campus twenty years earlier had been given a platform on the lectureship. I suggested that if Carl Brecheen was not aware of the errors of these men before inviting them, they should get a new lectureship director. I chided the school for pleading ignorance of the liberalism of these men on the one hand although they had invited some of them to defend liberal principles on the Preachers/Elders Workshops.
3. Sitting behind John Willis, ACC Bible professor at the time, in the 1971 school sponsored "Preachers' Workshop" and watching him nod assent to blasphemous statements of the rankest liberals on the program.
4. Steady relaxation of student dress and behavior codes.
5. That some of those who had graduated with Bible degrees in the previous four or five years did not seem well-grounded, except in a lot of modern theological jargon. In fundamental doctrinal issues (e.g., undenominational nature of the church, instrumental music, plan of salvation, premillennialism, restoration history, et al.), they were very weak. Furthermore, these alumni seemed to consider themselves "above" such issues. These factors imply a change in the Bible faculty's emphasis

and educational philosophy over the previous several years.

6. The cumulative effect of all of the above, plus other nuances and impressions that were difficult to identify precisely, but that were nonetheless real.

I concluded with the following comments:

I am sure that you are aware that many are concerned about the direction of the school, which seems to be more and more, however gradual, toward a liberal and hypertolerant stance. Please do not ignore our pleas. Thousands of men and women who wanted to provide a genuine Christian education for their children and for others have poured their efforts and millions of dollars into the school. Many of these have long since died, but if they were able to do so they would weep to see the spirit of compromise and tolerance that has been increasing during the past few years. Many of us who have supported the school and who are still living, but feel we can no longer support it, feel deep sorrow with each reflection on what it could be when measured against what it has become.

By this time I had ceased attending ACC lectureships and publicizing or advertising any of their workshops. I have been on the campus only once since 1974.

Between 1974 and 1981, I had no communication with anyone at ACU except to receive an occasional fund raising phone call or letter. In that period, the number of unsound men and women appearing on the lectureships and workshops steadily increased. Upon seeing the lectureship roster for 1981, I wrote my concerns about two of the most pronounced heretics who spoke. I addressed my March 17 letter to Carl Brecheen, director of the lectureship, and wrote in part as follows:

I am sorry to have to write in a critical vein, but I feel that I must. I was terribly disappointed that on this year's lecture

LET THE BIBLE SPEAK
TV Program presented by Spring Church of Christ
on *Houston Media Source*
View on:
AT & T U-verse Channel 99 ♦ Comcast Channel 17 ♦ TV Max Channel 95
Suddenlink Channel 99 ♦ Phonoscope Channel 75
or online at: HMSTV.org
Times will vary each week ♦ Check station listing for schedule



program there were two men about whose names and work there are some serious clouds. I refer to Lynn Anderson of the Highland Church in Abilene and Richard Hughes, Editor of *Mission Magazine*. I cannot rationalize why the school must continue to invite men who have built a reputation over a period of time by either leading in or associating themselves with unsound causes and uncertain sounds.

I then mentioned that Anderson had made such statements and associated himself with such people the several previous years that they did not need to be documented again. I called Brecheen's attention to a recent Abilene denominational "unity service" in which Anderson participated and Anderson's conducting a "church growth" workshop for various denominational "pastors" a few months earlier. Hughes had recently become editor of *Mission Magazine*, and it had been rumored that he would change its direction. However, in its January issue (two months before my letter and under Hughes' editorship), I quote to Brecheen from an article in which Victor Hunter referred to his "ministry" to "Christians from Anglican, Methodist, Baptist, and Mennonite churches, as well as Churches of Christ."

I asked Brecheen how he could justify inviting such men as Anderson and Hughes, and inquired, "Do you not understand that, by placing them on the ACU Lectureship, they are being given credence in the eyes of brethren who are not informed?" I allowed that any lectureship director could make an occasional mistake, but that the "mistakes" involving false teachers on ACU Lectures had long ago become an annual pattern. I closed by begging him to respond with some words of reassurance.

Brecheen responded promptly (March 20) and said he was distressed to receive my letter and to read the remarks critical of Anderson and Hughes. He admitted to having received "several" letters about Hughes' appearance on the lectureship, but none before mine critical of Anderson. He claimed he invited Hughes on the recommendation of Stanley Lockhart, long known for his doctrinal softness and compromises, and a member of the ACU board (in 1981 he preached for the Westbury Church in Houston, TX). Brecheen claimed to have "great confidence" in Lockhart, which told me how shallow, imperceptive, ignorant, or liberal (or all four, perhaps, as subsequent years seem to indicate) Brecheen was. I was amazed that he said he had never read an issue of *Mission Magazine*, but that Lockhart had told him that he "felt that [Hughes] was in the process" of changing its direction. Brecheen expressed "sore disappointment" at the statement I quoted from Hunter's article in the January 1981 issue and added, to his credit, "Such statements cannot be justified Scripturally." (I doubt, however, that Brecheen would have any problems with such statements today.)

Amazingly, Brecheen said he was not aware of Anderson's involvement in any recent "unity service" (though in my response I pointed out that he should read his local paper, sending him a copy of the dated clipping from the *Abilene*

Reporter-News). He said he asked Lynn about the "Church Growth Workshop" for the denominational preachers. Lynn said he "expressed his Biblical convictions on fundamentals with regard to scripture, the church, baptism, etc., from the very outset of the meeting." He also told Brecheen that he did not know how to turn down the invitation "without appearing to be unloving and terribly offensive" (never mind that his behavior was "unloving and terribly offensive" to the Lord and His Truth). Brecheen then defended Anderson by saying he was not sure what he would have done in that situation, which again, told me much about the weakness of Brecheen's convictions, and closed by saying, "but we are still deeply committed to the church, the scriptures, and the fundamentals of the gospel."

I responded on March 25, assuring him again of my distress at feeling the need to voice the criticisms of my earlier letter. As earlier mentioned, I enclosed a copy of the January 17, 1981 (*Abilene Reporter-News*, p. 9-A), on which I circled Anderson's involvement in the local "unity meeting." I chided him for not reading his own newspaper. I then told him that Anderson's statements about his comments in the "Church Growth Workshop" did not jibe with what one who attended the workshop saw and heard. Rather, when Anderson got to the point of speaking of man's lost condition and telling one how to become a Christian, he said that "this would be up to whatever our various doctrinal understandings may be as to how a person becomes a Christian." I asked Brecheen, "Have I been laboring under a wrong impression all of these years that we are to be helping denominational groups go out of business," instead of teaching them how to grow? I then quoted Anderson's infamous 1973 calumny against the church, describing it as "a big, sick denomination," and then stating, "I meant exactly every one of those three words, big, and sick, and denomination." I pointed out that Anderson had never repudiated his statement, though eleven years had passed, and his use by ACU implied its endorsement of such. I also chided him for never having read an issue of *Mission Magazine* to keep abreast of the views of various heretics and learning who some of them were. He did not respond to my second letter.

Following Don Morris's retirement in 1969, with each succeeding ACC/ACU president, compromise became more pronounced. Bill Teague succeeded John Stevens in 1981. While the religion department continued to add liberals to its staff and the lectureship was increasingly filled with liberal speakers, 1985 occasioned a well-publicized scandal involving the Biology department that occupied the better part of that year. Students in the classes of Dr. Archie Manis and Dr. Kenneth Williams accused them of overtly teaching the anti-Biblical theory of evolution as factual science. Moreover, Manis was accused of depicting the Genesis creation account as a "myth" and a "hymn" rather than as a literal description of what occurred as God spoke the universe into being. Students had class notes to prove their charges. They

contacted Bert Thompson, then Co-Director of Apologetics Press, for assistance. Thompson and his Co-Director at the time, Wayne Jackson, took up the matter after extensive investigation that proved the students' charges beyond doubt. Thompson took the matter through proper channels all the way to the president and the board. In what has become an all-too-common response by school administrators to criticisms, they first denied the overwhelming evidence and then defended the guilty professors. From top to bottom, at all administrative levels, with the board's backing, ACU sacrificed all integrity in a well-orchestrated whitewash and cover-up. Eventually Manis and Williams were allowed to resign quietly. Now it was obvious that there was not only a problem with theological liberalism at ACU, but a problem with simple honesty and accountability, as well.

Several years ago, ACU "achieved" equality with Pepperdine as a proponent of apostasy and an encourager of unscriptural unity and fellowship. It has moved from having a few heretics on its lectureships, workshops, and seminars in the 1970s to having many on them in the 1980s.

With the inauguration of Royce Money to succeed William Teague in 1991, the accelerator pedal on the liberal agenda has been all the way to the floor with no let-up. From 1990 forward, school programs have rarely had any besides liberals on them, plus a sprinkling of denominationalists thrown in for good measure. Money defended the appointment in 1992 of a Methodist preacher, enrolled as a student at ACU, as editor of *The Optimist*, the school paper. The school hosted "Unity Forum XII" November 1–3, 1994, in which a group of liberal brethren played their continuing annual game of compromise with those in the Independent Christian Church.

Coincident with the beginning of Money's administration, ACU Press began publishing a profusion of books by liberals (many of them on its faculty), which books seek to revise history, push for broad fellowship, and attack the concept of restoration. Their titles and authors are revealing enough to the perceptive reader: *The Cruciform Church*, *The Worldly Church*, *Will the Cycle Be Unbroken?* *American Origins of the Churches of Christ*, *Discovering Our Roots*, *Distant Voices*, *Hearing God's Voice*, *Reclaiming a Heritage*, *Renewing God's People*, *Reviving the Ancient Faith: The Story of Churches of Christ in America*, *Unfinished Reconciliations*, *The Main Thing*, and *Women in the Church—Reclaiming the Ideal*. The list of men who wrote these books is a veritable "rogue's gallery" of liberals and change agents, including: C. Leonard Allen, Douglas Foster, David Edwin Harrell, Jr., Gary Holloway, Richard Hughes (mentioned above as *Mission Magazine* Editor in the 1980s), Thomas Olbricht, Carroll Osburn, Darryl Tippens, and Michael Weed. ACU Press outdid itself by recently publishing *Lovers' Quarrel*, Leroy Garrett's autobiography, dean of living apostates who "voted" against liberalism in the 1950s

before he began "voting" for it in the 1960s (and has continued to do so).

In November 1992, Andre Resner, ACU professor of religion and preaching, published a blasphemous piece titled "Christmas at Matthew's House" in a subversive-to-the-Faith magazine called *Wineskins*, edited by Rubel Shelly. In his article, Resner labeled Mary as a "sexually questionable woman" and described the Lord's birth as a "scandal." In spite of these and other irreverent and ridiculous statements in the article, Resner assured questioners, "I believe in the virgin birth." Money, almost humorously, quipped that he was shocked "that some people would readily believe that we would tolerate anyone in our Bible faculty who denied something as fundamental as the virgin birth." The more appropriate question is why would some of us believe anything but that he **would** tolerate such on the Bible faculty?

From 1983–85, Carroll D. Osburn chaired the religion department at Pepperdine University, after which he became a Bible professor at ACU (his replacement at Pepperdine was Thomas Olbricht, an ACU Bible professor, so in effect they swapped roles). By 1993, when he wrote his book, *The Peaceable Kingdom*, Osburn had become more than a mere ACU professor; he was "Carmichael Distinguished Professor of New Testament"—quite a distinction. Rarely have we seen as small a book (138 pp.) packed with so much error. In it, he rejects "arrogant exclusivism," advocating that "Christian fellowship [be] extended to a broader arena" (64). He further pontificates:

There should be room in the Christian fellowship for those who differ on...whether the Lord's Supper must be taken every Sunday, or whether instrumental music is used in worship. There should be room in the Christian fellowship for those who believe that Christ is the Son of God, but who differ on eschatological theories such as premillennialism...or soteriological matters such as whether baptism is "for" or "because of" remission of sins (90).

Osburn then has the temerity to describe himself as a "conservative," labeling those who take a "propositional truth approach" (which, incidentally, is inspiration's approach to truth) as "fundamentalists" (65). Although ACU Press did not publish this book, perhaps thinking it moved the change agenda along a bit too swiftly and openly (Osburn published it privately), ACU's administration gave his heresies its implied endorsement by never disclaiming any of his radical statements or censuring him for making them. He continued his exalted professorship several years thereafter, retiring by his own volition.

In 2001, Money gave discerning listeners a window to his deep-down convictions as an ecumenicist and unity-in-diversity devotee through and through. In his ACU Lectureship speech, after referring to John 3:5, he said:

I assume it's still true. That's the rule, but what about the exceptions? What about countless believers...whose spirituality

and Christian virtues at times far outstrip mine? What about all that? I don't know, but the Lord knows exceptions, and I hope He makes a lot of them. Our job, it seems to me, is to teach the rule and let the Lord make the exceptions [after which there was long and loud applause].

As a true-to-form liberal, he surrendered to sheer emotional impulse. Money's convictions are so corrupted that he perhaps did not even recognize his words as vintage denominational tripe. Such is the theology of the president of ACU. The very passage with which he prefaced his "exception" statement is one in which the Lord **denied any exception** to His rule for entering the kingdom. Money got it totally wrong. It is not our job to teach the rule **and** suggest that the Lord will make exceptions. It is our job to teach God's rule—**period** (Mat. 28:19–20; Mark 16:15–16).

Various ACU faculty members (particularly Douglas Foster) have been leading the way to what they eagerly seek soon to effect—"unity" with the Christian Church (after all, to them the church of our Lord is merely a denomination, one of three equal parts of the "Stone-Campbell Movement"). One of the first concrete steps they took in this direction was to host "Unity Forum XII" November 1–3, 1994, in which liberal brethren played their continuing annual game of compromise with those in the Independent Christian Church. The itch for unity has grown increasingly severe with the passing of years, reaching its zenith in ACU's February 2006 Lectureship.

It was the made-to-order year in the eyes of Money and his campus accomplices. 2006 was the 100th anniversary of the founding of ACU (as Childers Classical Institute). It was also the 100th anniversary of the federal census that recognized the division caused by the instrumental music/missionary society liberals, resulting in the denomination known as the Christian Church. Money was so aglow with his "unity" mania that he invited Don Jeanes, president of Milligan College (affiliated with the Independent Christian Church [ICC]) to help him deliver the opening speech of the lectureship. The lectureship also featured another "Restoration Forum" with panels staffed by some of "our" unabashed liberals and some ICC men. The lectureship was obviously planned as a watershed event in the crusade for unity and fellowship with the ICC, while ignoring the "elephant" in the powwow room—instrumental music and its implications relating to Biblical authority and hermeneutics.

Along with its earlier efforts, climaxed by the 2006 lectureship, ACU has defined what liberals mean by "unity in diversity"—ignore doctrinal error and its implications and pronounce "unity" and "fellowship" achieved, notwithstanding. The gargantuan irony of the dual centennial as it relates to ACU is that, as quoted earlier from the school's 1906 charter, its founders sought to protect it from just such evil men as Royce Money. Its trustees were required to be members of a congregation that "rejects from its faith, wor-

ship and practice everything not required by either precept or example," a qualification aimed specifically at the pro-instrument/society malefactors who had just split the church wide open. Money and his cronies have in effect handed this once magnificent school (as they would the entire church) over to these folks.

Money has, perhaps more than any other (due to his position of immense influence), whether consciously or unconsciously, established himself as the rightful heir of the late Carl Ketcherside's insidious fellowship heresy. Were he living to observe the 2006 ACU Lectureship, Ketcherside would be immensely gratified at the progress of his unity philosophy over the past forty years among those considered to be "somewhat" in the kingdom. His comrade-in-arms, ACU, just will not let up on its unity-at-all-costs theme. Leroy Garrett (mentioned earlier in connection with his iconoclastic autobiography, published by ACU Press) was Ketcherside's closest partner in theological crime, and besides Ketcherside, has been a principal in the efforts to blur the line of fellowship with the denominations in general (including both versions of the Christian Church). He lives in a retirement home in Denton, Texas (my home since 1980) and still occasionally "preaches" for his brethren in the Disciples of Christ Christian Church locally. **Money, through his current lectureship director, invited Garrett to deliver the opening address of the 2008 ACU Lectures.**

Additional evidences of departures by the ACU administration (and behind it, the ACU board of trustees) are abundant, but space fails us to report—much less discuss—others. If the instances we have documented are not sufficient to convince one of the loss of this once powerful force for the Truth to the forces of error and sin, then more evidence would be pointless. We have devoted this great amount of attention to ACU because of its century-plus longevity and because it has grown in both size and influence to become one of the most powerful thought-shapers among brethren over the past half-century. It not only exerts great leadership on congregations through its graduates and its status, but it also exerts considerable influence on its sister institutions. Unfortunately, its vast influence has been an exercise in theological suicide when the purpose of its founders and its founding documents are weighed. It has for at least two generations been destroying the very purpose for which it was established—inculcation and propagation of the unadulterated Truth of the Bible. (*To be continued*)

— 908 Imperial Drive
Denton, TX 76209

[Brother McClish's manuscript was published in early 2009. During the intervening 10 years ACU and her sister institutions have waxed worse and worse, deceiving and being deceived—2 Tim. 3:13—Editor]

(Continued From Page 2)

At first, when the sin-ridden preacher was made aware that his corrupt actions were known beyond those initially involved, said preacher attempted to dodge his personal responsibility in the matter. Finally, like some worldly politicians, the preacher was pressured into admitting his guilt as set out in the preceding material. He no longer is the preacher for said church, but remains a member of the same.

Some years ago, a prominent member of the church was actually found to be a pedophile of long standing. Following this erring brother's confession of his sins, it was said of him by some that he needed to bring forth fruit suitable for repentance (Mat. 3:8). Sadly, those believing that the repentant sinner must bring forth such fruit were criticized unmercifully. They were maligned as unforgiving and evil for expecting the repentant sinner to do what John the Immerser said the Pharisees must do if their baptism was to be effective (Mark 1:4).

One of those, who boldly and erroneously criticized those who taught that any sinner must do as John instructed in Matthew 3:8, is the said preacher previously noted in this article. In a lectureship sermon, wherein he criticized those brethren who taught that one must bring forth fruit suitable for repentance, he said such brethren would have shoved Peter under the water when he called for Jesus to save him from sinking into the sea (Mat. 14:24-31).

Interestingly enough, the former director of the aforementioned lectures where said preacher made his criticisms as noted is the director of a preacher training school where said preacher once taught, which school is the work of the church where said preacher once preached. When asked about the former preacher's conduct since his confession of sin, the director of the school said he was being observed to see if he would bring forth fruit suitable for repentance. Hmmm!

—David P. Brown, Editor



**2019 SPRING CHURCH OF CHRIST
CONTENDING FOR THE FAITH LECTURESHIP**

SOME FALSE CONCEPTS OF TRUTH

February 22-24, 2019

David P. Brown, Director

It Is False that Truth Can Be Diluted and God Accept It—Danny Douglas

It Is False That Some Things Can Be Removed From The Truth And God Accept It—Danny Douglas

It Is False That Truth Can Be Perverted And God Accept It—Wayne Blake

It Is False That Truth Is Not The Exclusive Avenue To God's Forgiveness Of One's Sins—Lee Moses

It Is Unacceptable To God For A Preacher To Teach Anything But The Truth—Wayne Blake

It Is False That One Thing Is The Truth To One Person But False To Another—Lee Moses

It Is Unacceptable To God To Believe That Truth Is Humanly Unattainable—Michael Hatcher

It Is A False That People Have The Right To Be Wrong About The Truth—Bruce Stulting

It Is False That Truth Does Not Need Defending—Terry Hightower

It Is False That Arriving At Truth Has Nothing To Do With Reasoning Correctly—Terry Hightower

It Is False That Truth Is Not A Powerful Force In Today's World—Michael Hatcher

It Is False That Scriptural Fellowship Can Exist Without Adherence To The Truth—Bruce Stulting

The weatherman says, "a storm is coming" and everyone panics. The preacher says, "Jesus is coming" and no one cares.

CONTENDING FOR THE FAITH RADIO

24 hours a day ♦ 7 days a week
[www/contending4thefait.org](http://www.contending4thefait.org)

- ♦ Listen to Biblical Lessons
 - ⇒ Different programs with different speakers
 - ⇒ Various Biblical subjects studied
- ♦ Take an online Bible Study Course
 - ⇒ 27 Lessons
 - ⇒ Read online; submit answers online
 - ⇒ Assistance available when needed
- ♦ Compatible with mobile devices
 - ⇒ Instructions on website

Visit The Scripturecache Website!

Exposition, Exegesis, and Commentary on a variety of Bible Topics and Passages

Over the past half-century-plus, I have had the opportunity to write hundreds of articles and manuscripts. My late beloved wife, Lavonne, and our son, Andy, have written a considerable body of material as well. These documents treating various Bible and Bible-related subjects total several thousand pages.



Dub McClish



Lavonne McClish



Andy McClish

At the urging of others we are making these materials more widely available than possible by printed media. Through our Website, these are accessible at no charge to Bible students everywhere. If the things we have written help even one person to a better understanding of the Sacred Text and to a closer relationship with its Divine Author, we will feel amply rewarded. Please visit thescripturecache.com soon. —**Dub McClish**

DIRECTORY OF CHURCHES

-Colorado-

Denver—Piedmont Church of Christ, 1602 S. Parker Rd. Ste. 109, Denver, CO 80231, Sunday: 9 a.m., 10 a.m., 6 p.m., Wed. 7 p.m. www.piedmontcoc.net, Lester Kamp, evangelist. (720) 989-8155.

-England-

Cambridgeshire—Cambridge City Church of Christ, meeting at The Manor Community College, Arbury Rd., Cambridge, CB4 2JF. Sun., Bible Study--10:30 a.m., Worship-- 11:30 a.m.; Tue. Bible Study--7:30 p.m. www.CambridgeCityCoC.org.uk. Contact: Inside the U.K.: Joan Moulton - 01223-210101; Postal/mailling Address - PO BOX 1, Ramsey Huntingdon, PE26 2YZ United Kingdom

-Florida-

Ocoee—Ocoee Church of Christ, 2 East Magnolia Street, Ocoee, FL 34761. Sun. 9:30 a.m., 10:30 a.m., 6:00 p.m. Wed. 7:00 p.m. David Hartbarger, Evangelist, (407) 656-2516.

Pensacola—Bellview Church of Christ, 4850 Saufley Field Road, Pensacola, FL 32526, Sun. 9:00 a.m., 10:00 a.m., 6:00 p.m., Wed. 7:00 p.m. Michael Hatcher, evangelist, (850) 455-7595. <http://www.bellviewcoc.com/>

-Montana-

Helena—Mountain View Church of Christ, 1400 Joslyn Street, Helena, Mt. 59601, Sun.: 10:00 a.m., 11:00 a.m., 6:00 p.m., Wed. 7:00 p.m., Matt Bidmead (406) 461-9199.

-Oklahoma-

Porum—Church of Christ, 8 miles South of I-40 at Hwy 2, Warner exit. Sun. 10 a.m., 11 a.m., 6 p.m., Wed. 7 p.m. Allen Lawson, evangelist, email: allenlawson@earth-comm.com.

-South Carolina-

Belvedere (Greater Augusta, Georgia Area)—Church of Christ, 535 Clearwater Road, Belvedere, SC 29841, www.belvederechurchofchrist.org; e-mail belvecoc@gmail.com, (803) 442-6388, Sun.: 10:00 a.m., 11:00 a.m., 6:00p.m., Wed. 7:00 p.m.,

Texas

Denton area—Northpoint Church of Christ, 4224 N. I-35 (Greenway Plaza, just north of Cracker Barrel). Mailing address: 4224 N. I-35, Denton, TX 76207. E-mail: northpointcoc@hotmail.com. Website: www.northpointcoc.com. Sunday: 9:30, 10:30, 1:00; Wednesday 7:00. Contact: Dub McClish: (940) 218-2892; dubmcclish@gmail.com.

Houston area—Spring Church of Christ, 1327 Spring Cypress, P.O. Box 39, Spring, TX 77383, (281) 353-2707. Sun. 9:30 a.m., 10:30 a.m., 1:30 p.m., Wed. 7:30 p.m., David P. Brown, evangelist. Home of the Spring *Contending for the Faith* Lectures. www.churchesofchrist.com.

Huntsville—1380 Fish Hatchery Rd. Huntsville, TX 77320. Sun. 9 a. m., 10 a.m., 5 p.m., Wed. 7 p.m. (936) 438-8202.

Richwood—1600 Brazosport, Richwood, TX. Sun. 9:30; 10:30 a.m., 6 p.m., Wed. 7 p.m. (979) 265-4256.

San Antonio/Seguin Area—Nockenut Church of Christ, 2559 FM 1681, Stockdale, TX 78160, Sun. 10:00 a.m., 11:00 a.m., Wed. 7:30 p.m., nktchurchofchrist.org