

When the current issue is available you will be notified.

# Contending FOR THE Faith™

FOR THOSE WHO LOVE THE TRUTH AND HATE ERROR

## WHAT HIGHER “CHRISTIAN” EDUCATION IS DELIVERING AND HAS PRODUCED #5

Dub McClish

*[We remind our readers that this series of articles first appeared ten years ago (2009) as a chapter in the book for the annual Spring Church of Christ, **Contending for the Faith** Lectureship, Religion and Morality—From God or Man. However, in the intervening ten years nothing has changed for the better in the schools discussed therein. Errors have only become more entrenched and departures from the New Testament multiplied as they have continued to depart from the apostle Paul’s directive found in Colossians 3:17. Also, some mentioned in the original publication have died in the last ten years.]*

*In his final article in this series, brother McClish focuses on Freed-Hardeman University, Henderson, TN, emphasizing in detail what his alma mater has meant to him, his late wife, Lavonne, and their immediate as well as extended family. But he hastens to point out and emphasize that his support for F-HU has and does not move him to continue to support the school as it moves further away from the teaching of the New Testament.*

*Due to space limitations, we have taken the liberty to edit out some of brother McClish’s material. However, we have been careful not to remove anything that would detract from why he wrote this material in the first place. As noted at the end of the article, the complete article may be found at the **Scripture-cache website, [thescripturecache.com](http://thescripturecache.com), under “manuscripts”** and the title, “What Higher ‘Christian’ Education is delivering and has Produced.”—**Editor**]*

### Freed-Hardeman University

I have a special fondness for Freed-Hardeman University (F-HU) in Henderson, Tennessee. As I earlier stated, I chose

Freed-Hardeman College (long before it achieved university status in 1990) over Abilene Christian College through the influence of the late Guy N. Woods. My father dropped me off in front of Paul Gray Hall in September 1954 and turned around and began the long drive back to Boise, Idaho, where he was preaching at the time. I was a green 16-year-old, who had been allowed to enroll in spite of not having finished high school. The three years that ensued proved to be pivotal not only in shaping the course of my convictions regarding the Bible, but also regarding the principal practical details of my earthly life. I shall ever be grateful for the men and women on its faculty who unwaveringly exalted the Bible and the church, whether in Bible classes or in classes in the sciences, history, literature, music, or other disciplines. ...

My family has “Freed-Hardeman” stamped all over it, spread over four generations. My father-in-law, the late B. B. James, attended the school while he preached in Henderson from 1950–54. Lavonne and I met on campus when she began her freshman year at the beginning of my second year. Her three siblings all graduated from F-HC. Two of our three children and one of our daughters-in-law attended F-HC. A granddaughter and grandson also attended the school.

I state all of the above to help the reader see the long and deep roots of connection and confidence that I have had with and affection I have had for the school. I cannot express, therefore, the sadness I feel in having to lodge criticisms against my first college alma mater. The Freed-Hardeman University, as in the history of other such brotherhood

(Continued on Page 3)

#### IN THIS ISSUE.....

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

*For we must all appear before the judgment seat of Christ: that every one may receive the things done in his body, according to that he hath done, whether it be good or bad.—2 Cor. 5:10*

# 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](http://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...

### “LET US REASON TOGETHER” (ISA. 1:18)

There are fundamental laws governing reality and thought. Western culture did not arbitrarily construct them, as some falsely claim. Neither did God arbitrarily create them. These laws govern all reality and thought, deriving from the very essence of God. From the divine essence, God’s nature derives and is seen in His attributes. *Thus, laws of thought do not exist outside of God’s being.* Some think “**In the beginning was the Word [logos]**” (John 1:1) is more accurately translated, “**In the beginning was Logic** (the divine, rational mind).” Be that as it may, all is governed by the laws of thought because said laws are part of God’s divine being.

The laws of thought are not like God’s natural laws, such as the law of gravity. In times past, God altered the laws of nature. God’s power to alter nature’s laws is seen in John’s statement of rebuke to the Pharisees, “**God is able of these stones to raise up children unto Abraham**” (Mat. 3:9b). Of course, when the world ends, God will destroy the whole natural system, and with it, the laws that govern it (2 Pet. 3:7-10; also see Heb. 1:3).

Further, God cannot lie, because He is truth (Heb. 6:18; John 14:6). *God cannot alter His essence or suspend the nature of His being.* Thus, He swears by His own being, for there is no greater than He (Heb. 6:13)—the uncaused first cause of all, the greatest of which there is no greater. As Paul declared: “**Now unto the King eternal, immortal, invisible, the only wise God, be honour and glory for ever and ever. Amen**” (1 Tim. 1:17).

The fundamental laws of logic are known to be true for at least two reasons: (1) they are self-evident, and (2) those who attempt to deny them use them in said attempts. Thereby, they demonstrate that said laws are unavoidable and self-refuting. Let, us therefore, look briefly at three of the basic laws of thought.

1) *The law of identity* says that if a statement such as “In the Christian age baptism in water is essential for salvation from sin” is true, then the statement is true. Generally speaking, it says that said statement about salvation is the same thing as itself and it is different from everything else. When applied to all reality, the law of identity says that everything is itself and not something else. It is what it is.

2) *The law of noncontradiction* says that a statement such as “In the Christian age baptism in water is essential for salvation from sin” cannot be both true and false at the same time in the same place. Thus, for those great and faithful servants of God, Abraham and Moses, who lived during the Patriarchal and Mosical ages respectively, baptism in water was not essential for their salvation from sin, for neither man lived in the Christian Age.

3) *The law of the excluded middle* says that a statement such as “In the Christian age baptism in water is essential for salvation from sin” is either true or false. There is no other alternative—no middle ground, no shadowy areas.

Although God does not act in ways that mere finite humans always understand, nor as we would in given circumstances, He never acts contrary to the laws of logic. God always acts in concert with His being and, thus, according to said laws. Thus, when Paul preached to Felix, one whose spirit bore the stamp of God’s image, the apostle “**reasoned of righteousness, temperance, and judgment to come**” (Acts 24:25; also note 2 The. 3:2).

—David P. Brown, Editor

(Continued From Page 1)

schools, has evolved into an institution little resembling the beloved Freed-Hardeman College from which I graduated over fifty years ago. ....

I have included F-HU in these detailed reviews for three reasons:

1. I am deeply grieved by the compromises the trustees and administration have been making for several years, which are definitely contrary to the convictions of the founders

2. I hope that someone (trustee, faculty member, alumni, parent, or generous donor) might read these words and be alarmed enough at the evidence to take action and perhaps be instrumental in calling the school back to its uncompromising moorings

3. I believe that parents, who may be under the impression that there are no doctrinal or philosophical problems on this storied campus, need to be informed of at least some of these symptoms.

During my tenure as editor of *THE GOSPEL JOURNAL*, I made the following observations in one of my columns:

While it is necessary on occasion to highlight the extreme departures some who once were among us have made, there is room for genuine optimism. One of the encouraging things I experience in my travels to various places is meeting saints I had not known before, who love the Truth and who are determined to uphold it. There are many, many more such “out there” who faithfully make their appointed rounds each day, living uprightly, teaching those who will listen, and contending for the faith. They would sooner be shot than compromise. We need to guard against the “Elijah Complex.” There are far more than seven thousand who have not “bowed the knee” to the damnable philosophies and influences all about us.

A climactic division occurred in the church a century ago. The symptoms were the use of instrumental music in worship and the employment of missionary societies in evangelism; the cause was rebellion against Scriptural authority. When the dust had settled, a scant fifteen percent of those who had once been united in the Truth had withstood the onslaught of digression. A percentage far greater than this remains steadfast now, and I believe will continue to do so.

But, someone may be thinking, “There has been no such division since then.” That is correct, but it is on the horizon. The sundering is not yet so universal as to enable a census of congregations and/or Christians as either “conservative” or “liberal.” However, the distinction between two contradictory spiritual postures in the church is so clearly definable as to be undeniable. The deniers would feel right at home in Alice’s Wonderland, which is where they are already living, at least spiritually.

The division is clear in many cases and places, involving schools, papers, and congregations. For example, who can rationally gainsay that Pepperdine, Abilene Christian, and Lipscomb Universities have utterly severed themselves from

sound and faithful brethren? Further, who would dare argue that they can ever be turned from their leftward agendas? The other schools have apparently hitched their wagons to them. (The silence of the other brotherhood related universities concerning the egregious departures of these bigger schools is deafening. It can only be interpreted as tacit agreement and endorsement.) The boards of the “wannabe” schools would do well to look a bit more closely at PU, ACU, and LU and reassess whether or not this is really what they “wannabe” (May 2003:28).

Suppose with me that a trustee of F-HU had written me in response to my statement relating to the “wannabe” “other schools,” sincerely feeling the weight of his responsibility to keep the school sound and asking me to relate to him some of my concerns about the school. I would likely have responded somewhat as follows:

Dear brother \_\_\_\_\_:

Thank you for the very kind and encouraging remarks. I appreciate and accept your expression of love for the school and your determination to do your part toward its faithful adherence to its charter, and more so to the Word of God. I assure you that I have no desire to criticize F-HU (or any school for that matter) just for the sake of being a critic. My criticisms have arisen from my own deep well of love for the school and the fear that it is increasingly slipping from its moorings. I pray that it may be returned to the place of unquestioned commitment to Truth and righteousness that it occupied for so many, many years. I must admit that I am not optimistic about the prospects. The historical evolution pattern of faithfulness/compromise/digression/blatant apostasy in schools begun and supported by our brethren suggests anything but optimism. How greatly I wish it were not so, especially for the school to which I owe so much. I appreciate and accept your statement of feeling a keen responsibility for the soundness of the F-HU I believe we both dearly love.

I count it providential that the late Guy N. Woods came on the scene at just the right time in my life. I remained in close contact with him until his death. Without doubt, my life would have taken a decidedly different course had I not gone to F-HC before I went to ACC (I would not have met my beloved Lavonne, for starters). I have a great love for the school because of the things for which it stood for so many years before and for a number of years after my time there as a student.

Before going further, let me state unequivocally that I have never been and I am not now opposed to Christian education in principle—as long as it remains just exactly that. However, I freely admit not only to “dissatisfaction” with most of what are now called “Christian” universities, but my abhorrence at the path almost all of them have taken.

Historically, schools established by faithful brethren have proved themselves to be fertile breeding grounds for apostasy and digression in the church for at least 150 years. Notable examples are A. Campbell’s Bethany College and Kentucky University in the mid-19th century with its College of the Bible. Pepperdine, ACU, and Lipscomb have led the way in the same direction over the past few decades. Rochester College, formerly Michigan Christian College (of which Rubel Shelly



serves as president—enough said), no longer even pretends to stand for the Truth.

I have documentation that Ohio Valley University and York College have made serious compromises. A quick look at the list of lectureship speakers at all of the aforementioned schools reveals the names of men well-known for their liberal views and influences. Lubbock Christian University and Oklahoma Christian University are not far behind ACU at all. OCU cannot separate its direction from the Christian Chronicle, the primary propaganda organ of brotherhood change agency, even if it had no problems on campus—which it indeed does. Its board plucked its current president from an administrative post at Pepperdine. Harding University has likewise shown itself to be susceptible to the virus of liberalism. It kept James Bales, with his grievous errors on marriage, divorce, and remarriage, on its faculty for years. Then there's Jimmy Allen, still teaching there, in spite of his error concerning the purpose of baptism, his justification of social/cultural drinking, and more recently, his annihilation doctrine. Further, HU can hardly have a function without Jeff Walling, the whiz kid pied piper who ridicules sound brethren, but has difficulty finding a false teacher he's unwilling to embrace. Jack Wood Sears was for years chairman of the science department, all the while he was adamantly arguing that the days of creation may have been vast eons of time (a blatant and unnecessary denial of the Biblical record and accommodation to evolution). Schools don't retain such faculty by accident.

I agree for the most part that F-HU and Faulkner are not in the category of these other schools—yet. They are definitely the best we have left, and that is precisely why I (and many others) are so alarmed at the signs that we may be losing—or may have already lost—they also. With all of the potential they have for good, schools may have even more potential for evil. They must therefore be carefully observed and scrutinized (and yes, criticized) for the first signs of drifting from their moorings. And “drift” is what they do. School administrators do not suddenly jump with all four feet into the cesspool of compromise and liberalism. But little by little, they either cause or allow (there is often little perceptible difference) changes to occur until the departure from the Truth is so plain that even the blind cannot deny it, by which time there is insufficient influence or will to withstand it.

I was a student at ACC (ACU) in 1957–59 (immediately following my years at F-HC), and in my wildest dreams I would never have imagined how far to the left it has now veered (although it was already not as strong as F-HC was at the time). Far too often (in fact, I would say, usually), by the time brethren begin to recognize the signs of drifting from original intent, the die is already cast. When brethren begin to approach administrators with concerns over such changes, administrators tend initially to deny the accusations (as with the Bible versions issue at F-HU, and as with the Chairman of the Bible Department's defense of the modernistic views of one of his professors, both mentioned below; ACU so acted initially concerning its theistic evolutionist biology professor in 1985–86). The next step is to defend the very practice they have earlier denied or the faculty member who was proved to be in error (I suppose F-HU long ago ceased to require or forbid any specific Bible version).

The exercises in compromise generally continue in small increments (just as change agents in the church work their agenda in local congregations) until the founders' original emphasis and purpose are completely swept away in the sweet smell of “success” (as gauged by such things as growing enrollment, accreditation, and revenue raised). Loyalty to the old paths of Biblical doctrine gradually become secondary. Brethren who raise objections don't usually have much money, so they can be disregarded as old fogey troublemakers. By this stage the school has begun serving the opposite purpose from that for which it was founded and for which many stalwart saints sacrificed much over many years. My understanding is that the boards of schools are appointed specifically to keep the schools true to their foundational charters and to hold administrators accountable for doing so in the operation of them. The appearance to many of us on the “outside” of academe is that boards all too often “rubber stamp” and defend almost anything administrators choose to do. (Admittedly, I say this as an outsider. I do not know the discussions and debates that occur behind closed doors of board meetings.)

As you will see from the information below, the concerns for my beloved alma mater are neither recent nor few. While I speak only for myself in these concerns, rest assured that I am not alone in them. They began more than thirty years ago. I therefore fully realize that many of the concerns I will voice to you will involve occurrences that predate your election as a trustee. I was deeply grieved at the death of brother Dixon (1969, I believe). I thought that brother Gardner was a good selection to succeed him, for I believed he had the same strength of conviction so many of us appreciated in brother Dixon. I told brother Gardner so at the time. I believe he did well for a few years (e.g., his procurement of Thomas B. Warren as Chairman of the Bible Department was a spectacular achievement), but I came to be sorely disappointed in his leadership, as explained below. I have no reason to doubt your sincerity in feeling a responsibility to keep the school sound and whole, for which I again sincerely applaud you. Therefore, I trust that you will be interested in some of my concerns, as enumerated below:

1. Some serious lapses in either attention or in knowledge (or both) began to manifest themselves in the lectureship line-up in the early 1970s (e.g., Landon Saunders [who drew strong protests for expressing his equivocation about instrumental music in worship] and Ira North [perceived by many faithful brethren as more promoter than Gospel preacher]).

2. By 1976, some serious concerns about the school began to be voiced. Franklin Camp (a lectureship “fixture” of several years) and Harrell Davidson, both of whom worked full-time with the church in Adamsville, Alabama, were among those invited to speak on the 1977 lectureship. They both determined they could not accept their invitations in light of some of the men who had appeared on the school's recent preceding lectureships, lest their appearance be perceived as an endorsement. Franklin Camp's call to William Woodson, declining their invitations, caused Woodson (then Bible department head and lectureship director) to suggest that some representatives from the school and some brethren selected by Camp and Davidson should meet to discuss their concerns. In the meeting (which included Gardner and Brad Brumley, whom

I will discuss later), Woodson and Gardner promised they would cease inviting objectionable men. Things improved for a while, but since that time matters have become far worse concerning speaker selections than they were earlier.

3. More than one event in 1977 proved to be “red flags” concerning the school’s direction. The first thing that caused me concern that year was the appearance of certain speakers on the lectureship (lectureship rosters are reliable barometers of a school’s stance, almost without exception). Joe Barnett, a “dynamic” Texas preacher, was a featured evening speaker, yet it was no secret that he was closely allied with liberals and their causes in his home state (I was well familiar with this fact because it is also my home state and was my place of residence at the time). Likewise, Batsell Barrett Baxter was on the program, and his reputation had been tainted by his continued work with and endorsement of the Herald of Truth radio and TV programs, the liberal bent of which had been fully exposed in a marathon 1973 meeting of a few hundred concerned brethren with representatives of the Herald of Truth. At the time, completely unaware of the action of Harrell Davidson and Franklin Camp regarding the 1977 lectureship, I dared express in the Open Forum my concern over what I perceived to be a dangerous trend (i.e., inviting men to speak on the lectureship more because of their names and “dynamic” delivery rather than their convictions in the Truth). I pointed out that I lived (at that time) about three hours’ drive from the campus of ACU, where Barnett and others of his doctrinal softness had been featured speakers and faculty members for several years, but I chose to drive twelve hours to hear men speak who love the Truth. I wondered aloud if I may as well begin making the short drive to Abilene in February each year instead of the long drive to Henderson. My comments drew a number of “amens” from those attending the Forum. Many came up to me through the remainder of the Lectureship and expressed their appreciation and their similar concerns, including Franklin Camp (again, I was not aware at that point that brethren Camp and Davidson had lodged their objections to Woodson concerning some of the speakers). However, William Woodson, then Chairman of the Bible Department, was decidedly not pleased with my comments. He caught me later in the day and he strongly expressed his displeasure at my criticism in about an hour-long spirited discussion between just the two of us. He did not even try to counter or calm my concerns, but only sought to defend brother Gardner (whose leadership he said my comments impugned) and to let me know he had no appreciation and very little tolerance for any criticism. I suppose that, after the concerns expressed by Camp and Davidson only a short time before, my comments were like salt in a wound to Woodson. In this same year, and largely because of some of the lectureship speakers, the late Ira Y. Rice voiced his concerns in the Open Forum and declared that his repulsion was so great that he would not set foot on campus again until these trends/problems were addressed and corrected.

4. Yet another event in 1977 drew considerable attention. By December, almost a firestorm had arisen over which version(s) would be and were being used for the school’s Bible courses. Clyde Woods (an F-HC classmate of mine) was accused of using the RSV in his courses. President Gardner denied that any teachers were so doing, but it was plain from student class

notes that Woods was doing so in his classes. A group of men (B. B. James [my father-in-law] and the late J. Noel Merideth were among them) met with Gardner, which meeting resulted in a “Versions Policy,” formulated and adopted by the school, specifying that only the KJV and ASV would be used as texts in the school’s courses. As you may know, that policy has long since been abandoned.

5. Each year’s lectureship only seemed to get worse instead of better regarding speaker selection. In 1981, I expressed during the Open Forum my concern relating to the content of one particular speaker that year. In his chapel-hour speech, Stephen North, son of Ira North, had praised the Salvation Army highly and had labeled drunkenness (alcoholism) as merely a disease. There was no rebuttal or disclaimer of any sort from anyone connected with the school. Brother Gardner got up behind him and praised the speech! When I expressed my concern, numerous “Amens” could be heard in the auditorium. Various ones told me that what I said needed to be said. (In a tragic and ironic footnote, a few years later, Stephen North, a judge in Nashville at the time, was arrested for drunk driving.)

6. In 1982, I was shocked at the announcement that Brad Brumley (mentioned above), director of the school’s summer on-campus Christian Training Series, had invited John Allen Chalk to be the featured speaker during that year. I knew that Chalk was Brumley’s nephew. The first person I met when I set foot on campus, September 1954, was Chalk, who, as I, had arrived early. None could question his brilliance, even as a student, but by the mid-1960s, none could question his conversion to liberalism. Herald of Truth hired him as its radio speaker when he was still a young man, and many of us believe this “went to his head.” He quit preaching in about 1972 (in the face of strong criticisms of some of his unorthodox statements), went back to school for a law degree, and began practicing law in Abilene with little activity in the church thereafter (even in liberal congregations). My point is that his liberal reputation of several years was widespread by 1982. I thought it strange that Brumley had not kept up with his nephew better than this. I therefore wrote brother Brumley to express my shock and alarm, and he responded very defensively, self-righteously asserting, “I don’t keep files on brethren like some people do.” I was even more alarmed at Brumley’s response. I called some other brethren whom I knew would be equally concerned (e.g., Winfred Clark, Bobby Duncan, Noel Meredith, Robert Taylor). We appealed to those in charge (some appealed directly to brother Gardner), and Chalk was cancelled. However, this episode further revealed the existence of a systemic weakness in the invitation process for school-sponsored programs.

7. Few indeed know of the following conversation I now confide to you. In 1986 the late Guy N. Woods preached in a Gospel meeting at the Pearl Street Church in Denton, Texas, where I was local evangelist at the time. Brother Woods’ love for and support of F-HU were well known for decades. During the last several years that he conducted the Open Forum, he always stayed with Claude and Delores Gardner. Shortly before the Gospel meeting here, brother Woods’ mother had died, leaving him her estate of several tens of thousands of dollars. He told me he did not have a need for the money, and was considering how to put it to the best use. I was humbled

by his asking my advice on the matter. He confided to me that he had thought of giving it to F-HU, but he feared that it would not be put to the use he would intend for it because he no longer had confidence in the direction of the school. I told him that I shared his misgivings.

8. Many alumni have been concerned for several years over the seeming total lack of discrimination exercised by those who manage the campus bookstore. Admittedly, students who want to buy books written by Max Lucado, Rubel Shelly, Lynn Anderson, F. LaGard Smith, and numerous other apostates, can find places to buy them. The same is true of such perverted Bible “versions” as the NIV. The school’s justification for making such works—that absolutely undermine the faith—readily available to young, pliable minds is beyond my understanding, however. The implied message to students is that the faculty is unconcerned about either the error or the potential harm in such books. Is the bookstore so financially strapped that it must sell such trash to survive? If so, it should perhaps close its doors. Do the administration and/or Board have no concern about the implied endorsement of these materials? If they do not, then they have surely lost their way. Do the administration and/or Bible faculty see no danger or harm in this practice? If they do not, they have serious perception and/or conviction problems. Worse still, do the administration and/or Bible faculty agree with the poison such books contain? If they agree, then F-HU has already caught up with PU, ACU, and LU. If they do not agree, they should not be implying that they do.

9. Our youngest son and his wife began their freshman year together at F-HU in 1985. He majored in Bible and additionally took every pre-engineering course offered. They both graduated with honors (he with a 4.0 GPA). The late Dowell Flatt was head of the Bible department during those years. It was sad that in one of Andy’s courses under him, he left the authenticity of Mark 16:9–20 “up for grabs.” One of Andy’s serious and capable classmates wrote a paper for the class,

defending the authenticity of the passage and on which he received a “C.” The classmate was convinced that his MS was downgraded because he presented a strong case with which Flatt disagreed. It has since become public knowledge that Flatt also held and was teaching the old modernistic theory that the inspired writers of the synoptic Gospel accounts depended on a mythical “Q” document as their source. Winford Claiborne (one of Dowell’s fellow-teachers in the Bible department for several years) stated to me in a telephone conversation that “there is no doubt that” Dowell taught this heresy. Furthermore, I have a copy of the class notes he distributed to his students that verify this fact. Yet, when this sad circumstance finally became publicly known in 2002, Earl Edwards, current Bible Department Chairman, forcefully defended Flatt and denied that he held or taught such. So we had an administration that tolerated the Chairman of its Bible Department who taught a modernist heresy concerning the source of the Gospel accounts and cast doubt on the authenticity of a major portion of one of those accounts. Further, when Flatt’s unfortunate complete emotional breakdown forced his resignation as chairman, his successor Chairman defended his predecessor when he had sufficiently recovered to return to teaching. Such matters do not exactly inspire confidence in the school’s Bible department, which for generations was the heart and soul of the school.

10. Several years ago, the school chose Dave Hogan of Singapore as its “Missionary in Residence” for the year. At this announcement, several of us who have made numerous preaching trips to Singapore and who knew the church situation there well, wrote to brother Gardner, appealing to him to reconsider the Hogan choice. It had become necessary for faithful brethren in Singapore to withdraw from him and from the congregation with which he worked some years before. There was no indication that any of the F-HU personnel who selected Hogan had ever been to Singapore or knew anything about the situation among brethren there, but knew of him only as one who had done “mission work” for several years.

**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





The school persisted in its honoring of brother Hogan, and our appeals were ignored. While I realize fully that “the school is not the church,” surely the matter of recognizing the teaching of Scripture on the subject of fellowship enters in at some point for a school whose faculty is composed of members of the church and which depends primarily upon said members for its support.

11. I have no personal axe to grind with brother Gardner. As earlier indicated, I congratulated him when the board chose him to succeed brother Dixon. However, I was sorely disappointed in his presidency overall. Ultimately, the responsibility for all of my concerns must lie at his feet. His accepting a phony “honorary doctorate” from Pepperdine University, the seat of radical liberals on the west coast for decades, was hard for many alumni to stomach or rationalize. That anyone officially connected with F-HU would have any agreeable association with Pepperdine was inconceivable, yet here was the president of our school, prostituting himself by accepting its praise and plaudits. The speech by Stephen North (cited above) is a case in point and is illustrative of a serious weakness I believe brother Gardner evinced. North got up and taught things that were false, and brother Gardner got up behind him and commended the speech. Brother Dixon (or brother Hardeman before him) would never have allowed any such thing to pass without letting the audience know on the spot that those comments did not represent the position of F-HC/FHU. This (and actually all of the other things I have mentioned and will mention), seems to be a reflection of brother Gardner’s unwillingness or inability to provide leadership that was unquestionably on the side of doctrinal Truth. The ironic thing about brother Gardner (and many concur in this observation) is that since retiring from the presidency, he suddenly found his voice for Truth and for exposure of error. Amazingly, he is now able to see the serious and destructive inroads liberalism has made in the church in the last four decades, and he has written (and perhaps spoken) forcefully against many of the very things he at least allowed, if not endorsed, while he was president. This phenomenon has been so evident that numerous ones have remarked with downright amusement at the “coincidental” nature of it. It was almost as if a switch was thrown. Very soon after his retirement, these strong doctrinal articles from his pen began to appear in various brotherhood journals. I can say a hearty “amen” to every one of them that I have read. But why, oh why, did he wait to find his backbone until he was out of the position of influence the presidency afforded him? Was the solicitation of revenue for the school important enough to make such compromises (to ask the question, I fear, is to answer it)? The question I have (and again, I am far from being alone) is why could he not perceive these dangers and speak and write about them while he was president? Had he done so, he may have turned a few squeamish brethren off and forfeited some financial support for the school, but I guarantee you he would have had many, if not most, alumni of pre-1970 and many of later years backing him all the way (as well as attracting many faithful brethren who are not alumni). Instead, so many have lost respect for the school. I must confess that I have great difficulty not construing his long silence on such matters, followed by this sudden, new-found strength, as a demonstration of hypocrisy.

12. Milton Sewell has raised millions of dollars and built several buildings, but I see sad signs that the spiritual weakness of the school has accelerated during his tenure. As important as endowments, buildings, and a large student body are, the strength of F-HU is in its unique spiritual heritage and emphasis that are unabashedly founded upon the Bible. Having lost these, it will be just another small school with some “Christian” accents, and its powerful history and heritage will have been consummately squandered. This very danger is what many of us see in the slow, steady, but sure changes that we continue to observe. I don’t know brother Sewell well at all. He was a classmate of my wife’s younger sister in the mid 1960s. I have met him only once that I can recall. He and his wife dropped in on a Gospel meeting in which I was preaching in Paris, Tennessee, a few years ago. By the exaggerated statements he made to and about me after my sermon, one would have thought that he and I were born the same day in the same hospital in which our mothers shared a room, that we have been chums ever since, and that I can just about out-preach anybody he ever heard. I appreciate genuine compliments as much as the next person, but I detest such fawning politics. He struck me as just that—an insincere politician and a backslapping glad-hander. I was impressed, all right, but not at all favorably. I do not see spiritual strength or leadership in such a man, but moral and spiritual weakness. The school has shown increasing signs of weakening and compromising under his leadership, some of which I will detail.

13. The Open Forum was in good hands and remained strong when Alan Highers succeeded brother Woods. Since Alan’s retirement, it has seriously floundered. For a time it appears that those in charge could not decide what direction to take it and even used a panel instead of a single moderator for a while. Ralph Gilmore, the current moderator, is nowhere near the caliber of man needed to conduct the Forum, neither in his Bible knowledge nor in the strength of his convictions. Furthermore, the school policy that was handed down (even before Alan Highers retired as Forum moderator), that there was to be no name-calling in the Forum, is ridiculous. False doctrines do not merely waft about on the breeze. They are conveyed by human carriers. The inspired writers did not blush to name such, but it seems that some policy-maker(s) at F-HU feel(s) that saints today must not be as “mean” and unkind” as they imply the inspired writers were. I am not at all advocating that slander or hearsay should be allowed to take place, but give us back the days when false teachers such as Leroy Garrett, Carl Ketcherside, Roy Cogdill, Max King, the Campus Evangelism/Crossroads Movement principals, Rubel Shelly, and a host of others were named and their false doctrines were identified with them and opposed in the Open Forum. (Perhaps the names of advocates of error can no longer be called because to do so would be to name some of those on the lectureship from year to year.) The student body and brethren who came from all over to the lectureship were greatly strengthened by such. This, in turn, strengthened the Lord’s congregations. This muffling is a telltale sign of insipidity and grievous brotherhood political correctness that was totally foreign to F-HU in the halcyon days of her great spiritual gianthood. It is also foreign to the straightforward emphasis of Scripture

14. The late Adron Doran was a long-time and dear friend of Lavonne's parents. Through this and other connections, Lavonne and I became close to brother and sister Doran in the last few years of his life. We still called and visited with the late sister Doran until her hearing totally failed. Afterward, we stayed in touch by mail, even when she had to get her caretaker to take dictation of her notes in reply to us. In a phone conversation with us soon after brother Doran's death, she asked if there was anything that belonged to "A" (her affectionate name for him) that I would like to have. She asked if I had copies of the books he had authored. I told her I had one or two of them. She offered to send me autographed copies of each one of them, which she promptly did. I mentioned his "trademark" bow ties (the only kind of tie he wore and always hand-tied). She enclosed one of them with the books, all treasured mementos of a great Gospel preacher and scholar. Brother Doran, ten or more years ago, while still on the F-HU board, confided to me his concerns over the pressures from some of the board members to take the school in a leftward direction. Sister Doran remembered his concerns well and brought them up to me on occasion after his passing. My point is that other concerned brethren and I are not imagining that some significant changes of the wrong kind have been going on at F-HU over the course of several years. I am well acquainted with two additional trustees who are greatly concerned about the school's direction, one of whom is so discouraged that he had decided once in recent years to resign in utter frustration and dismay, but changed his mind and decided to fight on. Perhaps the encroachments have been so many over so long a time and have already gone so far that it is already too late to stem the tide. As earlier observed, the devil always takes short steps, but he never ceases to march. I am strong in the opinion that FHU is at a crucial crossroads in its history with the selection of a new president. Only a man of great spiritual depth, Scriptural knowledge, unwavering conviction in the old paths of Truth, and stiff backbone will be able to stem the tide that continues to swell. Brother Gardner had the Scriptural knowledge and the convictions in the Truth, but he simply lacked the backbone to stand. I did not see any of these qualities in brother Sewell. I have serious doubts that the majority of the board have either the courage or the wisdom to seek the sort of man who can bring the school back to its moorings on the solid rock of Truth. Joe Riley, the new president, surely has academic credentials and administrative experience, but you've made the unprecedented move this time of selecting a man who has no former connection with the school. All he knows of its heritage and history, of its founders and the convictions of its dedicated faculties over several decades, and of the generations of stalwart Gospel preachers who sat in its classrooms for their preparation is what he has read or been told (Sewell at least had the advantage of being an alumnus). And what does Riley know of the fellowship firestorm that has been gathering steam for thirty years or of the more recent fellowship crisis that has developed since 2005? Does he have any idea what any of the significant brotherhood "issues" are? If so, where does he stand on them, and what will he do about them in relation to his imprint upon the school?

15. John Dale's 2001 appointment to the board raised additional concerns. He has earned the reputation among faith-

ful brethren in the area of Murray, KY (and well beyond) for several years of being sympathetic toward Rubel Shelly and his errors. Ironically, only a year before his appointment, he engaged in a shameful ecumenical exercise with the Roman Catholic Church in Murray. Men such as Jay Lockhart and Jeff Jenkins, two other recently appointed trustees, will not help bring the school back to its roots. Get a few more men like these on the board, and there is no hope for the future of the school as far as Scriptural soundness is concerned. I have been told that there were already some men of a considerable liberal bent on the board before Dale's appointment. If so, then you and your fellow trustees who really stand in and for the old paths and intend to keep the school therein have a most difficult task ahead of you. I pray that you will not falter.

16. Whoever planned the 2005 Discussion Forum on fellowship and instrumental music in worship missed a golden opportunity. It could and should have been much stronger for the Truth than it was. I don't suppose Marlin Connelly taught anything that was untrue, but he had neither the reputation nor experience as a polemicist the occasion called for. Actually, he carried some rather heavy baggage, having spoken on the Nashville Jubilee a few years back, and taught at Lipscomb several years, neither of which exactly commend him as a tower of strength doctrinally. Further, as it turned out, he and Phillip Morrison, his (and the Truth's) opponent, are apparently big buddies in their Nashville associations. These matters were exacerbated by the selection of Phillip Slate to assist Connelly. Slate, like Connelly, has hardly distinguished himself as a defender of the faith. In fact, when I saw that he was going to be one of the participants, I was surprised that he was not assisting Morrison. The school had the best qualified man available right in its own back yard in Alan Highers. This fact is so obvious that it could not have been a mere oversight not to call on him. The fact that he is an alumnus of some distinction would certainly have enhanced this choice as a natural one, not to mention the fact that he had defended the Truth on this very subject in a major oral debate as well as having had other considerable polemic experience. It appears almost as if whoever planned that discussion did not want the case for Truth to be made as strongly as it could and should have been made—one more sign of weakness and carelessness on the part of someone(s).

17. I have publicly expressed my dismay that Walter Cronkite was invited to be the featured speaker at the December 2004 Advisory Board Benefit Dinner (Nov. 2004:30–31). There could hardly have been a greater contrast between his "values" (religiously and morally) and those for which F-HU should be standing without equivocation. It is bad enough that he is a leftist politically, but if possible, he is even further left in his theology. His appearance, with the implicit (if not explicit) endorsement by the school, sent a very mixed signal at best. Whoever came up with him to speak to a captive audience of Christians could have done little worse had they secured Bill or Hillary Clinton. Cronkite defamed and sullied the proud name of the school as far as I'm concerned. His presence there as the carrot for bringing in the big bucks would have been downright amusing had it not been so tragic. It gave every appearance that the administration believes the end justifies the means when it comes to attracting money.



18. The Bible Department was for several decades the heart of the school, and it had men on its faculty whose unflinching stand for and defense of the Truth were unquestioned and well-known. These included such respected names as Freed, Hardeman, Brigance, Hall, Dixon, Van Dyke, and Wallace. Even when those not so well known are considered, there was not a compromiser tolerated among them. Apparently, for years, the late Dowell Flatt (as noted above), with his modernistic views on textual criticism, was not only tolerated on the Bible faculty, but for some time chaired the department while holding and propagating these views. The present chairman (as earlier noted) defended Flatt when he came under fire for so teaching, denying, against the evidence, that Flatt held or taught them. Now the school not only tolerates, but features a faculty member who is extremely unstable doctrinally, if not guilty of compromise (as some believe him to be) as the “answer man” on the fabled “Open Forum.” Ralph Gilmore has no problem with combining two acts of worship simultaneously (singing and the Lord’s supper). The year 2003 was a banner year for demonstrating a major reason he is not qualified to moderate the Open Forum. He gave credence to a suggestion by Todd Deaver that spirit in John 4:23–24 refers to the Holy Spirit, and that the Holy Spirit therefore directly aids us in our worship. He gave his imprimatur to the unauthorized elder reaffirmation/re-evaluation procedure as taught and practiced by Dave Miller and the Brown Trail (Hurst, TX) congregation. Gilmore glibly called the program a matter of “speculation” and then added that it might be good to set term limits and re-evaluate elders at the end of the set term. Further, he sought to justify addressing prayers to Jesus, on the basis of a misapplication of Acts 7:59 and Revelation 22:20. If these were not enough, in response to a question relating to Jesus’ statement warning the disciples about the doctrine of the Pharisees and Sadducees (Mat. 16:12), he completely wrested the passage from its meaning. As an excuse to excoriate brethren whom he styled as “sin-smellers” and “inspection experts,” he said that Jesus was merely condemning the attitude of the Pharisees and Sadducees. It is evident that this brother is in way over his head as the Forum moderator. Surely there are men better qualified on the Bible faculty to fill this very important position.

19. I realize that none of us is omniscient. I do not know everything about everybody, nor does anyone else. In fact, I don’t even know everybody. For twenty-one years I planned and directed the Annual Denton Lectures, considered a major lectureship by many brethren. This lectureship featured 35 speakers each year in a Sunday morning–Thursday night, all day, every-day program. We required a MS in advance of the program so that a book of the lectureship could be published each year. Anyone who directs such a program and who has a principal part in selection of speakers can/will make an occasional mistake. I have done so in this respect on a few occasions. In fact, I have had the distasteful task a few times of calling men and “uninviting” them after they had already committed to come and had submitted a MS—and after I learned some things about them and/or their doctrine I did not know at the time I invited them. However, I don’t believe anyone who is sound in the faith and who is a careful observer of our program through the years would even begin to accuse me of being involved in a pattern of inviting questionable men. I

regret to say that I see not just an isolated factor or two in the items I have discussed above (including the lectureship), but a pattern stretching over more than three decades. The factors I have enumerated are evidence of either gross dereliction of duty or a deliberate agenda in the wrong direction. In either case, these things have hurt the school with many who were, for a number of years, among its strongest supporters. Some will not send their children there because of these factors. Others will not send their money. I must confess that when I get money appeals from F-HU in the mail, I regretfully discard them unopened. Likewise, when I get calls from students soliciting money for the school, I politely tell them I cannot make a contribution. Lavonne and I do not have much money, but if we felt differently about the school, we would likely find a way to help with some amount.

You mentioned that in my comments in the issue of *THE GOSPEL JOURNAL* to which you responded that I made some “broad brush” remarks about schools. It is difficult to avoid doing so for the very reason I mentioned in my comments there—the deafening silence of any school administration concerning the great and evident departures in other schools such as PU, ACU, and LU. The appearance is that the schools are a fraternity as closed as the legal or medical professions, in which it is verboten for one member of the fraternity to express any concern or criticism concerning any other member. As I earlier mentioned, I know that “the school is not the church.” However, if the administrators and faculty of F-HU are all Christians (as I assume they are), and the administrators and faculty of ACU or DU are all likewise Christians (perhaps assuming way too much in some cases), then are not Biblical principles of Christian fellowship relevant to these relationships? Do such passages as Ephesians 5:7, 11 and 2 John 9–11 apply only to saints who are not part of the administrations or faculties of Christian universities? If some of us “paint with a broad brush” when we discuss the rampant apostasy on the campuses, it could be because the schools have given us the “brush” and several gallons of “paint” with which to apply it. In one of your statements, I believe you have identified a significant factor in the concerns I have for the school: Many of the board members are simply businessmen (likely most are men of above-average means). They are much more versed in business matters than in Scriptural and/or brotherhood matters. I have no doubt that a major cause of the problems I see has to do with a lack of awareness. It seems to me that it should be incumbent on every board member to feel a responsibility to become and remain “aware” (as obviously you do). They should read books and periodicals that will inform them concerning important issues in the church. They should attend some other lectureships besides the one on campus. If they did, they would soon learn who is teaching/doing what. Of course, many, even preachers and elders, pride themselves on their ignorance of such *matters*. Like Brad Brumley, as mentioned above, they sort of draw up in a self-righteous posture as if keeping track of such matters is beneath them and somehow ungodly. That’s just for “mean-spirited watch-dogs and witch-hunters.” But didn’t the Lord command us at least to be wolf-detectors and fruit inspectors (Mat. 7:15–16)? If matters were left up to these “ignorance-is-bliss” types, I hate to think what shape the church would be in today. While our son and daughter-in-law were students, Lavonne and I continued to at-

tend the lectures each year, although we became increasingly disenchanted with the strength of them. Since their graduation in 1989, we have not set foot on the campus, having neither time for nor interest in doing so. I do, however, closely read the list of speakers on the lectureship and other campus programs through school publications and the Website. The lists are invariably a “Duke’s mixture” of some men who are known for their faithfulness and others who are either known liberals, amicable associates of liberals, or compromisers otherwise at best. I have been told that lectureship attendance has been on the decline over the last few years. It would not surprise me if it is so. I know many who, like me, do not believe it is worth the time or effort to attend anymore. But enough! I close not for lack of material, but because of weariness with the recitation. I pray that you will use your influence in the right direction, as you pledged you would, and that your influence will really count in your board meetings. Who knows but that you are come to F-HU for such a time as this? It would be wonderful beyond description if the trustees would give President Riley a mandate to take the school back to its roots. Yours for the Cause,

s/Dub McClish

Actually, an F-HU trustee **did** respond to my comments in *The Gospel Journal*, and the foregoing was my response to him. No, F-HU is not as far gone as PU, ACU, and LU, but she is well on her way—just lagging a bit behind, all the while apparently remaining chummy with the worst offending schools. Will brethren never learn? ...

So, in answer to the question in our title, “What should you expect your child to be taught by Higher ‘Christian’ Education?,” it is clear that parents should expect them to be taught to love and honor the Bible as God’s infallible revelation, to cherish and obey their Savior, and to respect His will faithfully concerning His church and its boundaries of fellowship. It is a disaster and waste beyond reckoning that, in the largest of these schools, they may generally expect to get the opposite and in the rest of them, they may expect to get little more than insipid versions of those crucial subjects.

All of the evidence I have provided relates directly to and results in tearing down of the limits and boundaries of fellowship as set forth in the New Testament. When the Scriptural doctrine of fellowship is surrendered, everything has been surrendered. The late W. B. West, Jr., long-time educator and Dean of Harding Graduate School of Religion for several years, stated in a 1967 letter to Ira Y. Rice, Jr.: “Unless the schools operated by our brethren stay true to the Book there is no reason for their existence” (Rice, *Axe*, 156). I know of no better way to conclude this chapter.

#### WORKS CITED FOR ALL ARTICLES

- Campbell, Alexander.** “Remarks.” *Millennial Harbinger* May 1836:200–02.  
 —. “Literary Institutions—No. II.” *Millennial Harbinger* Aug. 1836:375–79.  
 —. “Our Colleges.” *Millennial Harbinger* Sept. 1845:420.

**Foster, Douglas A.** “Abilene Christian University.” *The Encyclopedia of the Stone-Campbell Movement*, 4ed. Paul M. Bowers, Anthony L. Dunnivant, Douglas A. Foster, D. Newell Williams. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2004:1–2.

**McClish, Dub.** “Editor’s Clippings.” *The Gospel Journal* May 2003:28–30.

—. “Editor’s Clippings.” *The Gospel Journal* Nov. 2004:30–31.

**Osburn, Carroll D.** *The Peaceable Kingdom*. Abilene, TX: Restoration Perspectives, 1993.

**Rice, Jr., Ira Y.** *Axe on the Root*, v. 2. Nashville: Willams, 1967.

—. “Pepperdine(\$) Christian(?) University(!) Peppergate, Watergate—Which \$?!” *Contending for the Faith* Dec. 1973:1–8.

—. “Will Banowsky’s Leaving California for OU Presidency Help Pepperdine?” *Contending for the Faith* Sep. 1978:1.

**Rushford, Jerry B.** “Pepperdine University.” *The Encyclopedia of the Stone-Campbell Movement*, ed. Paul M. Bowers, Anthony L. Dunnivant, Douglas A. Foster, D. Newell Williams. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2004:592–94.

**West, Earl Irvin.** *The Search for the Ancient Order*, v. 1. Nashville: *Gospel Advocate*, 1949.

—. *The Search for the Ancient Order*, v. 2. Nashville: *Gospel Advocate*, 1950.

—. *The Search for the Ancient Order*, v. 3 Indianapolis: Religious Book Service, 1979.

“Financial Endowment.” *Wikipedia, the Free Encyclopedia*. 6 Nov. 2008. Wikipedia: [http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Financial\\_endowment](http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Financial_endowment) 8 Dec. 2008.

**Young, M. Norvel.** *A History of Colleges Established and Controlled by Members of the Churches of Christ* Kansas City: Old Paths, 1949.

[Note: I wrote this MS for and I presented a digest of it orally at the *Contending for the Faith* Lectures, hosted by the Spring, TX, Church of Christ, February 22–25, 2009. It was published in the book of the lectures, *Religion and Morality—From God or Man?* ed. David P. Brown (Spring, TX: *Contending for the Faith*.)]

—908 Imperial Drive  
 Denton, TX 76209

YOU HAVE BECOME BLIND  
 WHEN YOU SEE NOTHING  
 WRONG WITH SOMETHING  
 GOD HAS CALLED SIN



# Some FALSE Concepts OF TRUTH

## Spring Contending For The Faith Lectureship February 22-24, 2019

David P. Brown ~ Lectureship Director

### FRIDAY, FEBRUARY 22ND

- |         |  |                |
|---------|--|----------------|
| 6:30 pm | <i>Congregational Singing</i>  | John West      |
| 7:00 pm | <i>It Is False That Some Things Can Be Removed From The Truth And God Accept It</i>    | Danny Douglas  |
| 8:00 pm | <i>It Is False That Scriptural Fellowship Can Exist Without Adherence To The Truth</i> | Bruce Stulting |

### SATURDAY, FEBRUARY 23RD

- |          |  |             |
|----------|--|-------------|
| 9:00 am  | <i>It Is False That Arriving At Truth Has Nothing To Do With Reasoning Correctly</i> | Geoff Litke |
| 10:00 am | <i>It Is Unacceptable To God For A Preacher To Teach Anything But The Truth</i>      | Wayne Blake |
| 11:00 am | <i>It Is False That One Thing Is The Truth To One Person But False To Another</i>    | Lee Moses   |

#### LUNCH PROVIDED BY SPRING CONGREGATION

- |         |  |                 |
|---------|--|-----------------|
| 1:30 pm | <i>It Is False That Truth Does Not Need Defending</i>                          | David P. Brown  |
| 2:30 pm | <i>It Is Unacceptable To God To Believe That Truth Is Humanly Unattainable</i> | Michael Hatcher |
| 3:30 pm | <i>It False That People Have The Right To Be Wrong About Truth</i>             | Bruce Stulting  |

### SUNDAY, FEBRUARY 24TH

- |          |  |                 |
|----------|--|-----------------|
| 9:30 am  | <i>It Is False That Truth Is Not A Powerful Force In Today's World</i>                       | Michael Hatcher |
| 10:30 am | <i>It Is False That Truth Is Not The Exclusive Avenue To God's Forgiveness Of One's Sins</i> | Lee Moses       |

#### LUNCH PROVIDED BY SPRING CONGREGATION

- |         |  |               |
|---------|--|---------------|
| 1:30 pm | <i>It False That Truth Can Be Diluted And God Accept It</i>      | Danny Douglas |
| 2:30 pm | <i>It Is False That Truth Can Be Perverted And God Accept It</i> | Wayne Blake   |

LECTURES CAN BE VIEWED LIVE OR IN ARCHIVE AT:  
[www.churchesofchrist.com](http://www.churchesofchrist.com)

- Previous lectureship books still in print
  - CD of all lectureship books in PDF
  - CD of individual lectureship books in PDF
- Available by contacting:  
*Contending For the Faith*  
(281) 350-5516 or [dpbcftf@gmail.com](mailto:dpbcftf@gmail.com)
- NO book, CDs, or DVDs for this lectureship

#### ELDERS:

David P. Brown ~ Kenneth D. Cohn  
Buddy Roth ~ John West

#### EVANGELISTS:

David P. Brown ~ Geoff Litke

### SPRING CHURCH OF CHRIST

Phone: (281) 353-2707 ~ [springcoc@gmail.com](mailto:springcoc@gmail.com) ~ [www.churchesofchrist.com](http://www.churchesofchrist.com)  
P.O. Box 39, Spring, TX 77383 ~ 1327 Spring Cypress Road, Spring, TX 77373



---

## 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](http://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](http://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](mailto:allenlawson@earth-comm.com).

### **-South Carolina-**

**Belvedere (Greater Augusta, Georgia Area)**—Church of Christ, 535 Clearwater Road, Belvedere, SC 29841, [www.belvederechurchofchrist.org](http://www.belvederechurchofchrist.org); e-mail [belvecoc@gmail.com](mailto: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](mailto:northpointcoc@hotmail.com). Website: [www.northpointcoc.com](http://www.northpointcoc.com). Sunday: 9:30, 10:30, 1:00; Wednesday 7:00. Contact: Dub McClish: (940) 218-2892; [dubmcclish@gmail.com](mailto: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](http://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.

**New Braunfels Area**—Church of Christ at New Braunfels, Meeting at Baymont Inn, 979 N IH-35 New Braunfels, TX, (Take exit 189 located on the South bound access road next to Applebees) Mailing Address: P.O. Box 31m64, New Braunfels, TX 78131-0064, Sunday 9:30 a.m., 10:30. a.m.

**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](http://nktchurchofchrist.org)