

A REPORT of SKIRMISHES

Between a Religious Journal and a Religio-Secular College

Introductory to Another Skirmish between Daniel Sommer
and J. N. Armstrong, concerning Religio Secular
Colleges to teach persons in Religion, and to
furnish Secular Employment for
certain preachers

A debate, in strictness of speech, is a polemic battle in which the lines of discussion are definitely drawn in one or more definite, affirmative, propositions. Every other kind of discussion may be designated a "skirmish" or "a running fight" :-: :-: :-: :-:

INTRODUCTORY

READER, you are hereby introduced to certain discussions. They were intended to be a debate between Daniel Sommer and B. F. Rhodes concerning Religio-secular Colleges, but became what I prefer to designate SKIRMISHES between the OCTOGRAPHIC REVIEW and the mentioned colleges. For if the OCTOGRAPHIC REVIEW had not been introduced there would not have been any discussions worthy of the reader's notice. At the utmost they would have been of short duration, for they would likely have been ended the very day they were begun.

Whether the OCTOGRAPHIC REVIEW was justly introduced and honorably treated is a question I shall not venture to decide, for I do not wish to bias the reader's mind in regard to the merits of the mentioned discussions. But in order that a just decision may be rendered on this question I now offer the DEFENCE which that journal makes of its existence, as that DEFENCE has been published in its columns, also an Appendix which has been made in view of recent developments. The reader will do well to consider that DEFENCE, and its Appendix, with care. I may safely say that the merits of the discussion set forth in this volume can not be understood if that to which attention is now invited is disregarded. Therefore, reader, I appeal to your just judgment, and to your honesty, to consider the DEFENCE to which I now invite your attention.

THE REVIEW'S DEFENSE OF ITS EXISTENCE.

Inasmuch as a few persons have questioned whether the Octographic Review is a scriptural enterprise, several statements, on that subject, are now submitted to its readers.

1. Inspired men preached inspired sermons, and wrote inspired documents. As those documents were committed to the Church of God, the pillar and ground of the truth, every congregation of Christians, and every individual Christian, may be safely regarded as authorized to repeat, advocate, and defend those documents.

2. Inspired men traveled to preach, and they sent their documents, according to the economy suggested by the principle of economy which the Savior mentioned when he commanded, "Gather up the fragments that remain, that nothing be lost." (John 6:12.)

3. A religious journal, "devoted to truth and righteousness as taught by the apostles of Jesus Christ," has the same authority for its existence that a religious preacher, who is ""devoted to truth and righteousness as taught by the apostles of Jesus Christ," now has for his preaching. The same scripture examples which authorize a man to go and preach uninspired gospel sermons certainly authorize him to write uninspired gospel documents, and send them to those for whom they are intended.

4. As a strictly gospel journal this paper is about one-half devoted to affirmative teaching, and the other half is devoted to negative teaching, even as is the New Testament. (See 2 Tim. 3:16, 17; 4:1-4.) This accounts for its opposition to error as well as for its advocacy of truth.

6. The postal laws of the United States require that the Review shall have a definite subscription price in order to be carried in its mails at their most economical rates, and the Savior's principle of economy, also the command which requires Christians to submit to civil governments, together make it necessary, for the managers of this paper, to have a definite subscription price. (See John 6:12; Rom. 13:1) The Octographic Review exists, is advocated, and defended, on the same principle that uninspired preaching exists, is advocated, and defended. A definite price for the Review is defended also on the same principle that a definite price for a hymn book is defended. That principle requires Christians to provide for honest things in the sight of men as well as in the sight of God, and thus requires them to avoid falling under reproach by business failures.

6. The ownership of the Review is legally in the Sommer family, but morally and financially it belongs to the brotherhood that patronizes it, for that brotherhood could end its existence, at any time, by uniting to do so. It is not like a secular paper, nor like a grocery store, nor like a college building and its grounds, which can be sold to another party, and even be changed, without losing its value. The Review has much Doctrinal value, but very little Commercial value.

7. The Octographic Review is a documentary gospel teacher, and, therefore, it may be supported with the Lord's money—the prosperity of the church—even as the preaching of the gospel is supported with such money.

With the foregoing statements of facts and truths before the minds of the Review's readers, I think it may be safely said to them, that this paper is above comparison with any and all secular, and secular advertising, enterprises. As a documentary gospel teacher it is strictly within the limits of the gospel sanction for its existence, and for its

support. Moreover, it can not be handled with success by any one who does not fully understand the position it advocates, or who lacks ability to advocate and defend that position successfully. It is not like a secular enterprise, nor like a college building, nor even like a meetinghouse, which may be sold to outside persons for secular purposes. Therefore the Octographic Review is of very little commercial value, especially as it advocates and defends the most unpopular doctrine. It is like a gospel preacher who can not do anything except preach and defend the gospel, and whose brethren will not support him if he does not preach and defend the gospel aright. Such a preacher is bound up, and down, and in, and under, to the gospel. The same is true of the Review. Its gospel relation is the only relation which it has to its friends, and its friends are such that they do not care whether it lives, or dies, except as it is used to advocate and defend the gospel.

The Review has received many gifts, and I am sure that not one of them has been misspent, for it is "devoted to truth and righteousness as taught by the apostles of Jesus Christ." This being true, I again say, it is altogether above comparison with religio-secular enterprises, whether they exist in the form of newspapers or colleges. It was founded by an honest man; it never wasted any money belonging to stockholders; it never had any stockholders; it has always paid its debts, except when a friend has canceled what it owed him, because of the good he thought it was doing. Moreover, the Review has been in existence for fifty years, but, in that entire period, has never given rise to innovation in the brotherhood by which it has been supported. The religious college, on the other hand, has been in existence among disciples for about sixty-five years, and has proved to be the hot bed of innovationism!

In view of that which has thus far been stated what may we safely say concerning those persons who class the Review with religio-secular colleges, and try to defend the existence of those colleges by offering objections to the Review? We may safely say, Those persons do not compliment either their head or their heart. On the contrary, they seem disposed to discard their common sense and common honesty. Notice the differences between the Review and the mentioned colleges, as I now state them.

1. The apostles wrote religious documents, and sent them to those for whom they were intended. The Review's editor does the same.

2. The apostles did not advertise secular things for money in their religious documents. Neither does the editor of the Review advertise such things for money.

3. The apostle Paul declared that he determined not to know anything among the Corinthians except Jesus Christ and him crucified, and to the Galatians, he said, "God forbid that I should glory save in the cross of our Lord Jesus Christ." The Review's editor declares that the paper he sends forth is "devoted to truth and righteousness, as taught by the apostles of Jesus Christ. "

4. The only points of difference, worthy of mention, between the documents written and sent to Christians by apostles, and those sent to Christians through the Review, are expressed by the words Inspiration, Messenger, and Price. The apostles sent inspired documents by private messengers, and without special price. We send uninspired documents, by public messengers and at a special price. But some one had to bear the expense of the private messengers who carried the inspired documents, and on the principle of "equality" (2 Cor. 8:13-15) it was the divine will that several should be required to bear it equally. On that very principle the Review is sent to all who feel able to bear the expense of sending it, and the expense of putting it in printed form. Its special price, as previously stated, is

also justified on the same principle 'that a special price for a hymn book, sent by mail, is justified, or for a printed copy of the Bible, sent through the public mails, is justified. Finally, the Review has never given rise to an innovation, while to the religious college may be traced the missionary society, and every other phase of innovationism by which the disciple brotherhood has been disgraced! This one fact should cause all those to blush and drip with shame who class the Review with religious colleges. If they be incapable of feeling ashamed their friends should feel ashamed in their behalf, and should rebuke them for their disregard of the right use of reason.

But what shall we say to those who declare that we are authorized to imitate the apostles in speaking, but not in writing, the gospel? We should refer them to Mark and Luke who imitated the apostles in writing the gospel. Then we should refer them to the book called "Apocryphal New Testament," and show that others besides Mark and Luke imitated the apostles in writing the gospel. Finally, we should say to those who frame and urge such objections to the Review, as we have just exposed, that they should not discard their common sense and common honesty in framing and urging objections to this paper and its editor. Yet that is exactly what the innovators of the Christian church have done. After vainly trying to make a show of defense for their innovations they have turned against the Review, as their most formidable enemy, and have tried to condemn its existence. Advocates of colleges, to teach pupils in religion, have generally, done the same, except that they have seldom tried to make a show of defense in favor of such colleges, only by trying to condemn the Review.

If there is any objection in the mind of any one to the Review's existence, which is not met in that which has been set forth in this "defense," I shall be pleased to learn what it is. The Review has been in existence about fifty years, though its volumes did not begin to be numbered till it ceased to be a monthly. It does not own a printing press, nor a folder. Its fixtures, type, and furniture, would not, likely, bring a hundred dollars if placed on the market. Its books, and files, are not of commercial value, and would, likely, bring only the price of waste paper, if offered at public sale. Its stereotype and electrotype plates would only bring the price of the metal that is in them, if offered for sale. Its present editor is not aware that he ever received a dollar from its treasury, beyond the cash that he placed in it from other earnings. "What he has received for preaching has, generally, if not always, been sufficient to support his family. Therefore, I again say, The Review is not an enterprise of commercial value. It has been under my control nearly twenty years, and two hundred dollars will probably represent its worth on the market, as a commercial enterprise! All that has been put into it has gone forth doing good. Thus it has been; thus it is; and thus it will be.

And is such an enterprise to be classed with a religio-secular institution with buildings and grounds worth ten, twenty, thirty, forty, or fifty thousand dollars to any one who is capable of managing with success a college of any kind? Such a classification of the Review can not be made without a discarding of those excellencies known as common sense and common honesty; that is, if I know What those excellencies are. College buildings and grounds are, generally, in demand, but who wishes to purchase the Review? Innovators would likely purchase it, if they could, in order to crush it. But it is not for sale to them.

Finally, those who subscribe for the Review year after year do not put money enough into it at any time to build up anything which is liable to get beyond their control, nor anything which will be

rich enough for those who love wealth or power to desire it. On the contrary, the Review was founded by a man who was, financially, poor, and for nearly twenty years it has been under the control of a man Who is, financially, poor. I don't even own the house in which my family lives. All that has been given, and all that may be given to the Review, or to me, as editor of the Review, will be used to extend the Redeemer's cause as set forth in the New Testament.

Reader, I would not have thought of writing this article if I had not learned that certain advocates of colleges to teach persons in religion have tried to justify their advocacy of such institutions by referring to the existence of this paper, and some of them have spoken of it as a "rich concern." Unhappy men! Undiscriminating men! The absence of divine sanction for their darling device they try to compensate for by casting reflections on the Review and its editor. This is an unmistakable indication of a deeply dyed innovator. Such, at least, has been a common resort of innovators for nearly a half century. To every one who Judges that those who urge innovations upon the worship and work of the church are wrong, yet contends for religious colleges and tries to besmirch the Review and its editor, I may safely say, "Therefore, thou art inexcusable, O man, whosoever thou art that judgest; for wherein thou judgest another thou condemnest thyself, for thou that judgest doest the same things." (See Rom. 2:1.) The religious college, established and supported by the church, is an innovation upon the work of the church; and the spirit by which it is advocated, and defended, is the innovator's spirit. To such an innovation, and all other innovations, to such a spirit, and every other wrong spirit, the Review is unalterably opposed. It is a documentary advocate and defender of the entire Bible, as God's written revelation to mankind, also of the family, and the Church of God, as the divinely ordained societies for mankind as social and religious beings.

APPENDIX.

The foregoing DEFENSE was published in the OCTOGRAPHIC REVIEW for August 28, 1906, and, with but few exceptions, well received by those to whom it was offered. Those exceptions, I regret to say were among advocates of Religio-secular Colleges. Some of them discard all that is set forth in the mentioned DEFENSE concerning the differences between the REVIEW and the Religio-secular College, and they reason after this manner:

The REVIEW has a head, and the College has a head; the REVIEW has an assistant head, and the College has an assistant head; the REVIEW has helpers, and the College has helpers; the REVIEW has patrons, and the College has patrons. Therefore the REVIEW and the College are of the same order of enterprises.

The fallacy in the foregoing consists in reasoning from a few real, or imaginary, resemblances to prove sameness. The argument is that things which resemble each other in a few particulars are the same, at least, in principle. In logic such reasoning is exposed after this manner:

Herod is a fox.

A fox is a quadruped.

Therefore, Herod is a quadruped.

Sir William Hamilton, on the 327th page of his work on LOGIC speaks of the foregoing as "this contemptible fallacy." Yet it is used by advocates of Religio-secular Colleges to make a show of resemblance between this paper and their institutions. But let us try it further for the purpose of showing the defect in such education as Religio-secular College advocates have, and to show their lack of honor.

Man has a head, and a donkey has a head; man has ears, and a donkey has ears: man has eyes, and a donkey has eyes; man has a nose, and a donkey has a nose. Therefore, man and a donkey are of the same order of animals.

Such reasoning as the foregoing is just as good as that used to show to those who can be imposed on by such fallacies, that this journal and Religio-secular Colleges are of the same order of enterprises.

But the REVIEW has made certain admissions in favor of school-teaching. Those admissions are as follow: (1.) Christians may band themselves together to teach school. (2.) They may teach the Bible a part or all of the time. (3.) They may do this to make a living or as an act of charity. From those admissions certain college advocates have drawn the following conclusions: (1.) Christians may withhold from the Lord's treasury sufficient money to build a Religio-secular College. (2.) They may beg sufficient money to build such a college. (3.) They may give to such a college a misleading name. (4.) They may try to convince persons that such a college is necessary to prepare men for the ministry, or to take mankind back to Jerusalem. All such reasoning is like this: Man is an animal; a horse is an animal; therefore, man is a horse. Or it is like this: A quadruped is an animal; man is an animal; therefore, man is a quadruped.

'Such reasoning should be regarded as beneath the conscience of a Christian, and beneath the honor of a man. The REVIEW is an uninspired documentary gospel teacher, and has the same authority for its existence that the uninspired oral gospel preacher, as such, has for his existence. But this is not true of the Religio-secular College, especially when presided over by men who have appended to their names pompous and foolish worldly titles.'

One other fact should be here mentioned. In their efforts to defend themselves against the charge that they recommend ungodly fiction certain college advocates positively deny that Shakespeare's writings are ungodly. Sometimes they declare that the editions of those writings that are used in their institutions have their ungodly expressions "expurgated." Let us see about that. In the "Merchant of Venice," as used in Odessa, Mo., College, I find this on the 16th page: "Now by the two-headed Janus;" which is a species of profane swearing;. On the 17th page of the same document I find this expression: "Would almost damn those ears." On the 32nd page, I find the following: "She's a good wench for this gear." Then on the 39th page this is recorded: "Oh hell! what have we here?"

If the expressions just quoted are not "ungodly," then I know not the meaning of the word, and we may infer that the use of profanity itself is not ungodly. But this is not all. The story titled "The Merchant of Venice," is a lie from beginning to end, and tends to beget a hatred for the Jews, of whom Paul wrote thus: "They are beloved for their fathers' sakes." (Romans 10:28.). On the 40th page of "The Merchant of Venice," of the "Ten Cent Classics" series, I find the expression; "the dog Jew," and such a description is given of Shylock, the Jew, in that document that not only Shylock, but the Jew, generally, is made to appear as a contemptible character. At the same time the declaration of Jehovah, "I will bless them that bless thee, and will curse him that curseth thee," (Genesis 12:3), remains unmodified. Therefore, "The Merchant of Venice," as a document, is unscriptural, untruthful, ungodly, and in its authorship is corrupt and abominable. Yet "The Merchant of Venice" is one of the classical documents recommended in the Religio-secular Colleges that are considered in the discussion to which the reader is hereby introduced.

AN EARNEST REQUEST.

After having read the foregoing DEFENSE the reader is now prepared to consider the discussions as such. While doing so I earnestly request that these questions be earnestly considered:

1. Which disputant always represented his opponent correctly and which one, in almost every instance, represented his opponent incorrectly?
2. Which disputant was never convicted of anything resembling a falsehood, and which one was convicted of several falsehoods?
3. Which disputant never assailed the personal character of his opponent, nor cast reflections on his age nor on his intelligence, and which one was guilty of thus assailing his opponent and reflecting upon him?
4. Which disputant always considered seriously what his opponent presented, and which one resorted to ridicule and endeavored to belittle what his opponent had presented?
5. Which disputant introduced a question of personal veracity between himself and his own moderator while making his last speech?

DANIEL SOMMER.

SOMMER-RHODES DISCUSSION.

On Monday, the 18th day of February, 1907, at two o'clock P. M., in the Chapel of the Western Bible and Literary College, at Odessa, Missouri, begin the debate between Mr. Daniel Sommer and Mr. B. F. Rhodes.

The Moderator:—Brethren, Ladies and Gentlemen: I thank you for the honor you have conferred on me this afternoon in choosing me as your Moderator to preside over this occasion, and I hope that you, as the audience, will give earnest attention to the speakers as they shall proceed to discuss this important question. Our time is about up, and one of the brethren here says to read the rules and regulations which shall govern us during this discussion. (reading)

AGREEMENT FOR ORAL DISCUSSION.

We, the undersigned, Daniel Sommer and B. F. Rhodes, agree to debate orally the Bible school question according to the following specifications:

1. There shall be two of these oral discussions.
 2. Daniel Sommer shall open each discussion with a speech of thirty minutes, and B. F. Rhodes shall respond in a speech of equal length, and so the discussion shall proceed until the full time is used.
 3. Four sessions of two hours each shall constitute one discussion.
 4. Each of these disputants agrees to furnish a suitable place in which to hold one full series of this discussion, in a community in which the sentiment in favor of his teaching and practice prevails.
 5. The oral discussion herein provided for shall precede the commencement of a written discussion between, J. N. Armstrong and Daniel Sommer, and the first of the series shall be begun at a date not earlier than February 15, 1901
 6. If either disputant shall wish a stenographic report of this discussion, he may obtain it at his own expense.
 7. The Bible shall be the only standard of appeal for authority in this discussion, and, therefore, all personal matter and all human standards of appeal shall be excluded.
 8. The usual arrangements for moderators shall be observed in this discussion
- Signed, B. F. Rhodes, Daniel Sommer.

Signed with the understanding of No. 7 as made in letter to Daniel Sommer, bearing date of January 1, 1907, which is explained by this note:

Rule 7. By "authority" I mean not the authority I shall claim for baptism or the Lord's supper, but such authority as I should claim for any honest, honorable avocation in life, as running a farm or a publishing house. I have made myself sufficiently plain in regard to the expression "personal matters" and shall add no more on that point. Without this explanation to Rule 7, I could not sign this agreement, for I could not consistently commit myself to a principle that I do not believe.

B. F. RHODES.

The letter referred to says:

"No. 7 is not so clear. Whether I can accept it depends on the meaning given to the terms 'authority' and 'personal matters.' I do not believe that the work we do is authorized in the same sense that baptism and the Lord's supper are. Never so believed, and hence will not accept a rule that will in any way commit me to such a principle. I want our discussion to be a fair and honorable discussion of principles, but I also want it to be a full discussion, and so if we have the discussion we must be free to use your written and published teachings on the subject discussed. If by 'personal matters' you mean to withhold from the investigation your own conduct and teachings, we shall never consent to that term. We must be free to use such matter from your pen as, in our judgment, the cause of truth demands. If you do not mean to shield your own practice and teachings by the term 'personal matters,' then I have no objection to that part of Rule 7. "

Ladies and Gentlemen, we have assembled here this afternoon to hear the discussion on the question that will be stated to you presently. We have the principal disputants, Brother Rhodes and Brother Sommer. Brother Sommer will now address you.

DANIEL SOMMER'S FIRST SPEECH.

"Mr. Chairman, Gentlemen Moderators, Ladies and Gentlemen: Our best friends are seldom our most pleasant companions, and the most wholesome medicine is sometimes very bitter. Our best friends are those who are wise enough to know our mistakes, and are good enough to tell us concerning them plainly. As I glance back over the past of my life, I recall that the best friend in my early years was an aged brother in Christ. He heard me attempt to preach on a certain occasion, twice on a certain Lord's day, and then he went home. A few days afterwards I received a letter in which I found the following: 'Your forenoon discourse was only ordinary. At night I knew you would make a failure as soon as I heard you take your text. Your gestures were stiff and awkward, your intonations of voice were forced and unnatural, the outlines of your discourse were only tolerable, and the filling up was miserable.' With that man I lived on the most intimate terms for years through my early life as a preacher. He never flattered, and as memory serves me, he never offered me but one compliment, and then he immediately said, jovially, 'If you don't think you can stand that, I will balance it with a criticism.' When he came to die I was sent for to speak at his burial, or, after he had died I was called upon to speak at the time that his body was laid away, and as I glance back over the past I recall that aged brother as among my very best friends, if not the very best, that I ever had in my early years among men.

"Now, I am here today as among your best friends. The strong probabilities are I shall not have very many compliments to offer. The

probabilities are that I am here chiefly for the purpose of drawing discriminations and offering criticisms, it may be, for which very few of you are prepared. But I remind you that our best friends are seldom our most pleasant companions, and I again say that the most wholesome medicine is frequently very bitter.

"I don't like to debate, and I have never done much debating. In thirty-seven years of preaching I have only had about half a dozen discussions of one kind and another, and dear friends, I may say to you, that I don't mention this as a matter of self-gratulation on the one hand, nor as a matter of reproach on the other. I simply have not been numbered with debaters, and just here I am reminded that I have heard, since I came into this place, that my respondent on this occasion is one who was spoken of by Prof. Harding, of Bowling Green College in Kentucky, as the best debater that he had turned out from his institution, up to the time that my respondent left. I may say to you that has given me some satisfaction. I am gratified to understand that he is on this platform today with that much of a reputation as a debater, for certainly this is today a very serious occasion, and I did not come here for the purpose of trifling, nor to be trifled with. And, therefore, I am gratified to learn that he has some standing as a debater.

"I just said to you that I don't like to debate, and I may now say, especially with one who professes to be a Christian. The scripture requires that all Christians shall be united; that they shall be bound together in the unity of Spirit in the bond of peace, even that their hearts shall be knit together in love. And when they are not thus united there is an indication that somebody is wrong, and, my hearers, inasmuch as the differences between my respondent and myself are so great and so serious that we have been brought together on this occasion in solemn debate, and on opposite sides of a question, I say this fact indicates that somebody is wrong. For the present occasion, I think it may be safely said, is as widely separated from the unity, the peace, which the gospel of the Son of God requires that Christians shall be united in, as darkness is separated from light, as Tartarus is separated from Paradise, as Hell is separated from Heaven, as far as principle is concerned. And now, the question for you to decide, ladies and gentlemen, is who is responsible for this state of affairs? If, upon investigation the best that we are able to give these questions, you find that I am responsible because I have advocated something unknown to the Word of God, an institution unmentioned, directly or indirectly, in precept, example or intimation in God's Holy Word; an institution for which not the slightest example has been set, especially in the New Testament scriptures, if I am guilty of that, then you are called upon as Christians to apply to me this scripture: 'Mark them which cause division and offences contrary to the doctrine which ye have learned; and avoid thorn. For they that are such serve not our Lord Jesus Christ, but their own belly.' 'their own appetite' is a later translation, 'and by good words and fair speeches deceive the hearts of the simple.' But if on the other hand you find that my respondent, by advocating an institution unknown and unmentioned in God's Holy Word, not even intimated in favor of by anything (hat inspired men ever did, if you find that he is responsible for this occasion, and those who are associated with him are responsible for this occasion of division, then you, as Christians, are called upon to apply to him this scripture: 'Mark them which cause division and offences contrary to the doctrine which ye have learned; and avoid them. For they that are such serve not our Lord Jesus Christ, but their own belly,' or appetite, 'and by good words and fair speeches deceive the hearts of the simple,' that is, of the uninformed.

"Now, here is the question, ladies and gentlemen, for you to decide on this occasion. I was not in favor of this oral discussion. When the

president of this institution wrote me an article entitled 'His Practice,' I published it in the Octographic Review of October 23, 1906, and I stated the discussion should be written and not oral. I gave one or two reasons why I thought it should be written and not oral. One of them was the expense that would be required. I might now say that I am scrupulous in regard to the use of the Lord's money, and I had in my mind, whether I had stated it or not, the time that would be taken in calling preachers and others from their work to come to a place like this for the purpose of appearing at such discussion. But the president of this institution waived that, and spoke of it as rather a trilling matter, compared with the interest of the truth, as he expressed it, and over and over again in his correspondence with me called my attention to the oral discussion. He and I were corresponding with reference to a written discussion, but he insisted upon the oral discussion and I found that I could not even intimate in opposition to the oral discussion without, perhaps, being misunderstood by him, to say the least of it, and so I finally yielded, and I am here, and just as an ancient warrior said, though he said it after a battle, 'They would have it so.' So then if there be any truth made known, error exposed, the cause of truth advanced in this discussion, beyond what could have been done in a written discussion, you may charge that to Prof. Armstrong, president of this institution. I am here just simply because I could not avoid being here without, as it seemed to me, being misunderstood.

"Having said this much I now come to the task of setting before you what this discussion is not about, then I am to tell you what it is about. In the first place, this discussion is not about a personal matter. Prof. Rhodes and I are but slightly acquainted personally. We had a little talk in Kansas some years ago with reference to the college question which is now in controversy between us, and if he ever had any hard feelings toward me by reason of that discussion, he never made it known to me, and, therefore, it is not a personal matter. It is not a legal matter. It is not with reference to legal affairs in the ordinary sense of the term. It is not a question of moral matters, though the question of morality is involved at a remote angle. Neither is it a question of educational matters. It is not concerning whether we have a right to be educated or not. I believe in as much education as my respondent does, not to speak of believing in more, in view of the years of experience that I have had, beyond what he has been privileged to have. It is not a question of education between us, as far as real learning is concerned. Nor is it a question of the right of a Christian to establish a school for a living, to teach a school in order to make a living. Nor is it a question of the right of Christians to teach persons in the Bible in schools. I have, if memory serves me, never intimated with reference to any of these things. It is not a question as to the work of this college in teaching Greek and Latin, Hebrew, German, and music, nor in teaching persons in the Bible. **THAT IS NOT HERE INVOLVED.** And so, just as I stated to someone today, for the last five years I have been represented east, west, north and south as opposing this college's work, as opposing the work done here—'Sommer is opposed to our work,' in the very latest publications that have been made on this subject, as coming from this source and others of a similar character. All of these representations have been not true, to say the least, and, in, the mildest term., incorrect. **FIRST, MIDDLE AND LAST THEY HAVE BEEN INCORRECT.** I will not speak of them now in severer terms, though I believe that the terms that I use are the mildest that truth and righteousness will permit. But, ladies and gentlemen, this is a discussion with reference to **THE BIBLICAL RIGHT TO ESTABLISH AN INSTITUTION OF LEARNING WHICH IS CHIEFLY SECULAR, IN ORDER TO FURNISH AN OCCASION TO TEACH PUPILS IN THE BIBLE.** Also, the Biblical right in advertising such an institution,

to call on Christians to pray for it, to work for it, patronize it and give money to establish and support it, and yet DENY THAT IT IS A RELIGIOUS INSTITUTION. Likewise, it is concerning the Biblical right to have such an institution presided over by a man who has loaded himself with pompous, worldly, absurd titles—notice what I say—YET CONFESSES THAT HE IS YET IN HIS SPIRITUAL BABYHOOD. Don't suppose I am suffering from an aberration of the brain, I am measuring my words with just as much care as you ever heard men measure them in your life.

"Now, that is what our discussion is about, and thus it is about the existence of the institution commonly called 'Western Bible and Literary College,' as it has been projected and as it has been advertised, as it has been pleaded for, and as it is presided over. That is the question. Not whether you have the Greek, the Latin, the Hebrew, the German, nor any other language taught here correctly, but it is concerning the BIBLICAL RIGHT TO ESTABLISH SUCH AN INSTITUTION AS THIS, after the manner that it has been established by professed Christians. We are supposed to be here without a definite proposition, and why? Well, in the mildest and gentlest manner I shall just state we are here without a definite proposition, to begin with, because those who are logically and morally in the affirmative would not, and would not, and would not affirm the scripturalness of their position on the very and only point where I attacked them, but each time they offered a proposition it was with reference to something in regard to which I had not assailed them. That is the reason. That is the question. We have the documents to prove exactly what we have said. So I am here, to my reproach from one standpoint, to my honor from another, I AM HERE TO AFFIRM A NEGATIVE. While it is said we are without a definite proposition, we can't have a discussion worthy of the name without an affirmation, so I lay down this affirmation: THE INSTITUTION KNOWN AS WESTERN BIBLE AND LITERARY COLLEGE IS UNSCRIPTURAL. Wherein it is unscriptural I shall endeavor to tell you as the discussion advances, more than what I have already stated.

"First of all, then, I set before you as my first reason for declaring it to be unscriptural, that it violates the fundamental principles of the Church of Christ, namely, 'Where the Bible speaks we speak; where the Bible is silent we are silent.' If my respondent and his colleagues had only been faithful to that principle they never could have made one single speech, public or private, in favor of an institution of this kind, because it is NOT EVEN INTIMATED in favor of in God's Holy Book. 'Where the Bible speaks we speak; where the Bible is silent we are silent.' That is the declaration upon which the Church of Christ is founded, and that is the principle upon which my respondent and his colleagues have been ruling out man made missionary societies and mite societies, and ladies' aid societies, and other human institutions for the worship and work of the Church of the living God, and here they have violated that principle by proceeding in favor of this institution as they have proceeded.

"Second. My second reason for opposing this institution and declaring that it is unscriptural, is that it violates what the apostle Peter says in his first letter, fourth chapter, eleventh verse. He there says, 'If any man speak, let him speak as the oracles of God; if any man minister, let him do it as of the ability which God giveth; that God in all things may be glorified through Jesus Christ, to whom be praise and dominion for ever and ever.' If that scripture had been adhered to closely and strictly by my respondent and his colleagues, they never could have made even one speech, public or private, in favor of such an institution as this that is now in controversy.

"Third. Then my third reason for declaring this institution unscriptural is, that the apostle Paul, in Colossians 2nd chapter, 10th

verse, declared, 'Ye are complete in him, which is the head of all principality and power.' He here declared that Christians are complete in Christ, and inasmuch as Christ does not provide for any such institution as this, consequently completeness in Christ does not demand any such institution as this to be established for the purpose of teaching persons in religion.

"Fourth. Then, in the next place we oppose this institution and pronounce it unscriptural because of what the apostle Paul says in his first letter to Timothy, third chapter, 15th verse, where he says to Timothy: 'But if I tarry long, that thou mayest know how thou oughtest to behave thyself in the house of God, which is the church of the living God, the pillar and ground of the truth.' So then, my hearers, he says the Church of God is the house of the living God, and adds, which is 'the pillar and ground of the truth. 1. So, if the Church of God, without any such appendage as this, is the pillar and ground of the truth, we object to this institution, established for the purpose of teaching mankind in religion. That same apostle said, in the second letter that he wrote to Timothy, third chapter, 16th and 17th verses, that the inspired scripture is given to perfect the man of God and furnish him to do all good works. But the inspired scripture does not furnish the man of God an institution of learning like this, here in controversy, and therefore, friends, it is unnecessary in order to perfect the man of God and thoroughly furnish him to do good works.

"More than that, we object to this institution in the next place, because the apostle Peter said, in so many words in his second letter, first chapter, 3rd verse: 'According as his divine power hath given unto us all things that pertain unto life and godliness, through the knowledge of him that hath called us to glory and virtue.' Now, according to this scripture the divine power furnished the primitive Christians with all things necessary unto life and godliness—'all things, you see, 'through the knowledge of him that called us to glory and virtue,' and, my friends and fellow travelers to the bar of God, the inspired scripture never made mention of such an institution as this.

"With this much before you, seeing that my time has nearly expired, I refrain from presenting any other scriptures, but call your attention to these. I have defined the position that I occupy, wherein I have assailed this institution and others of a similar character. I have pointed out that I have assailed it strictly from a Biblical view point. I invite my respondent, then, to meet me in the Biblical field which I have opened up before him, and I now say to you beforehand, that this is not a question to be determined by human consistencies or inconsistencies, from the standpoint of anything that men may do, but it is a question of whether the word of God authorizes anything of this sort, and whether we, as Christians, are called upon to engage in anything of this sort, or may we scripturally do so. I again say that I invite him into this open Biblical field. If he will meet me here we shall have a Biblical discussion, or a discussion with reference to scriptural authority. If he varies from this and goes off into some other field, he will undoubtedly violate the rules of honorable debate, and more than that, my friends, you may rest assured he will very soon be called to account if he engages in anything of that sort.

"In conclusion, I again remind you that I am here as your best friend, or, at least as among your best friends. Ladies and gentlemen, as I stated before, our best friends are seldom our most pleasant companions, and likewise remember, that the most wholesome medicine is sometimes very bitter. On the contrary, the man who flatters you, the man who simply tells you what you would wish to hear, in all probability is the one who either has deceived you or is planning

to deceive you. And such being the case, I refrain from being numbered with that class, but I call your attention plainly and strictly and emphatically to the controversy that is before you, and propose to guard the lines of this controversy with the utmost, care. I leave this question with you.

B. F. RHODES' FIRST REPLY.

"Gentlemen Moderators, Ladies and Gentlemen, Brethren in Christ: It affords me great pleasure to meet you under the present circumstances, as the respondent in this discussion. The subjects to be investigated are important, or rather, the subject under investigation is important. The proper education of the physical, mental and moral powers is a very important subject to all right thinking men and women, and since this investigation involves the question of the attitude of Christians towards schools conducted by Christians, it partakes of the importance of the subject of education itself.

"I am no less happy in the reputation and ability of the man whom we have with us as the leader in this investigation. The ranks of those who oppose us in this school and its work, do not afford a man, I presume, who, in ability and power, physical and mental, is worthy to be compared with my opponent. And if he fails to make his case it will be not because of the weakness of the man, but of the weakness of the cause he pleads. My very earliest recollection,—going back to my childhood days, before I was even a member of the body of Christ,—among these early recollections are recollections of hearing the name and fame of our worthy hi other who leads in this discussion. From my early youth I have been taught to respect him as a man of great ability and great power. A man of worth in the army, of the Lord, able in counsel, fearless in action, and magnificent always. Consequently I say, if he fails, the failure will not be the failure of the man, but the failure of the cause. But knowing the mighty power of truth, and knowing, too, the promise of almighty God to be with his faithful children, I not only willingly, but cheerfully, enter upon the investigation with my worthy opponent and brother in Christ with unfaltering feelings, for I am assured of the unfailing power of truth, and I am conscious within myself that I represent the truth on this occasion. Did I feel otherwise I should never appear before you for that purpose, and I profess to you here, in all the ardor of my heart, that I esteem the truth, the truth of God greater than anything else in the whole world. And if victory were to be secured without truth, I would say, 'Let victory go and let me have the truth of God.' Not that victory is inconsistent with truth, but above everything I want, I love the truth. I profess to you again, dear fiends, that I am here to learn,— here to learn. I hope that when I shall have had the experience,— the experience that my worthy opponent has had, that still I will be open to receive the truth. I hope that he will still be willing to learn, and I profess to you here to-day that I expect always to sit at the feet of those who can and will, and to drink in from them the unfailing fountain of divine truth, and believe all truth. Now then, it is a blessed thing for me, because I am assured that if I be wrong in the position I occupy that my worthy respondent will be able to set me right.

"I want to briefly notice the remarks of my friend and brother. 'I am here mainly to offer criticisms.' Well, brethren, friends, I profess to you that I have a higher conception of the issues than as an offer of criticism. It is true that perhaps with the 37 years of preaching and speaking experience he may represent a condition of heart and mind when I feel otherwise. It is true that my worthy respondent has been a speaker, a proclaimer of the Word for a length of time as long as I have lived. So, if there be any advantage in the point of ex-

perience it is with my brother, but I am not saying this for the sake of any sympathy. I don't want your sympathy, I want your ears, I want your hearts, and I pray God that they may be kept tenderly open to receive all truth, and that your minds may be discriminating enough that they may make comparisons, to weigh, judge and decide, and I leave the event of this discussion with you.

"I am not aware that I am worthy of the compliment which it is said Brother Harding has paid me. It is the first time I ever heard it, but it is worth knowing. It indicates, if it is so,—and I don't question that it is not so, I don't know anything about it,—but it indicates only that from Brother Harding's judgment of what he had seen me do in little schoolboy debates that I might some day be a debater. That is all it means, for that is all the experience in debating I have ever had.

"My opponent says, 'This may indicate that some one is wrong. Who is responsible for this state of affairs?' Certainly, and I don't ask you to judge now, I only ask you to open your hearts, to weigh, to consider and decide when this discussion shall have finished. 'Institutions unauthorized in God's Holy Word.' Now then follows a number of passages of scripture, which I have, perhaps, in proportion to the length of my ministry and the feebleness of my efforts, impressed as earnestly and as faithfully as my worthy respondent. I believe every word, every principle, and every fair deduction that can be drawn from these passages of scripture. But I want to say to you that I shall oppose UNAUTHORIZED AND UNFAIR DEDUCTIONS drawn from these passages of scripture, and in so doing I am defining, not questioning, the authority of God's word. 'I was not in favor of this oral discussion,' and then follows reference to the correspondence. Now, it would be unprofitable, it would be unwise to deviate from the very purpose of this debate to enter into an investigation and crimination and recrimination about the way this discussion commenced, and I shall not give any of the particulars, nor draw upon the correspondence as to which one should be in the affirmative and which one in the negative. The fact remains that my opponent has signed this agreement to enter into the discussion, and all of the correspondence leading up to it is not a subject of investigation at this time, for we have neither the time, nor is it our desire or privilege to investigate the correspondence. The only way in which a fair idea, a fair judgment of the correspondence, and upon the cause or reaction of these causes, upon which each other can be understood is that the correspondence may some day be printed, and that is the only way it can be understood. It will never be understood by reference to it in this debate.

"'What it is not about.' It is not a question of personalities, as my worthy respondent very clearly and forcibly set forth. He says it is not a question as to establishing a school to make a living, neither is it to object to the teaching of the Bible in that school. Of course, that is from memory, and I have not completely gotten it. I don't have it complete upon my paper. It is not a question of objecting to establishing a school to make a living, nor is it a question of objecting to teaching the Bible in that school. I have something on this line, and I want to invite your attention to it, because I think that by appealing to the eyes and ears both we can perhaps get a better understanding of the subject. In this, now, I agree with my friend and brother, that that is true,—that it is not a question with regard to the right of Christians to establish a school, nor teach the Bible in that, and he says he believes in that. It is admitted (reading from chart) that 'Christians may band themselves together to teach secular knowledge. They may teach the Bible a part or all the time. They may do this to make a living or as an act of charity.' You are familiar with the Octographic Review, of which my respondent is the owner and publish-

er, in which that appeared in the issue of August 29th, in the year 1905, written by W. W. Otey, a worthy friend and brother to us both I believe, and it was endorsed,—I "should not have used it had it not been endorsed,—by my respondent by an editorial in the same paper in the issue of September 5, 1905. Now then I plant myself right here. That is it exactly,—what we did exactly. No more and no less. We did all that is involved in those things, for if it be admitted that Christians may band themselves together to teach secular knowledge, we have done so. If it is admitted they may teach the Bible a part or all of the time, that is what we are doing. What is the fuss about? We shall wait until that point, perhaps, is a little further developed and then we shall meet him on the issues.

"It is not a question, now mind you, of the institution as we are. It is not a question of institutionalism, either, and all of that discussion and all those threatenings and warnings,—that we are establishing an institution,—with reference to the Missionary Societies, those things fall upon my worthy respondent with all the force that they do on me, for he admits that Christians may band themselves together to teach secular knowledge, that they may do it to make a living or as an act of charity. Now then, when he gets his school established like that he has all the institution we have here to-day. I CHALLENGE HIM IMMEDIATELY UPON THAT POINT. When he gets his school established I show him all the institution that we have. He dare not come and face this issue or I will prove to this congregation that that is the truth of it. Let him do it.

"'Misrepresented for five years.' If Brother Sommer has been so unfortunate in his expression of his sentiments and his convictions and charges, that these readers, friends and foes, have been unable to understand him all these years, who is to blame but himself? This is a discussion with reference to the Biblical right to establish schools in which,—chiefly secular,—to teach the Bible. 'Christians may band themselves together to teach secular knowledge. They may teach the Bible a part or all the time.' There he has his school, institution, academy, college, or whatever you want to call it, and it is to teach secular knowledge, and the Bible part of the time or all of the time, and do it as an act of charity or to make a living. I am quoting from the records, and if that be challenged I will read them. The Biblical right in this investigation is to test the Biblical right to have a college.

"'An institution presided over by a man who has loaded himself with pompous titles, and still confesses that he is a spiritual babe.' Is it a crime against God and man for a man to confess that he is a spiritual babe? Is that which would be all right in my worthy respondent, should he have done so, all/wrong because Prof. Armstrong has done so? True it is that compared with those who are more experienced than we, we are only neophytes. But still, when obliged to do that which is admitted Christians may do, why the charge of that as a crime?

"Has sinned as tending towards Hell, for the contrast was brought out between Paradise and Tartarus, between Heaven and Hell.

"'Why no proposition. Would not affirm the scripturalness of their position.' To enter upon the investigation of the righteousness of that charge would be to enter a sea of correspondence. Some of you may say it is sufficient to say that our friend has signed an agreement to enter into this oral discussion without a proposition, and let him come up to the work.

"My affirmation. The institution known as Western Bible and Literary College, is unscriptural.' First reason. It violates the fundamental principle of the church of Christ Where the Bible speaks we speak, where it is silent we are silent. Second reason. It violates

1st Peter 4:11. 'If any man speak, let him speak as the oracles of God.' I prefer saying what I shall say on this at the present time from this text, rather than the others, because the one is of man and the other of God. 'If any man speak, let him speak as the oracles of God.' Truly. I do not allow my worthy friend to go beyond me in respect and reverence for that portion of the scripture, only in so far as he may by superior ability have the power to go beyond me in their dissertation. When he gets his school where Christians band themselves together to teach secular knowledge, and where the Bible is to be taught a part or all the time, all the objections he can find against what we have, he will have against what he has in his own practice. I only do this to show you that he is making an unwarranted use of these scriptures.

"Second chapter Colossians, 10th verse. 'And ye are complete in him.' Certainly, I believe in our completion in Christ. Certainly I do, certainly. 'Ye are complete in him.' Of course. But when we are doing only what we found Christians may do, with what right does he come here and charge that we are violating the principle of that scripture?

"And '1st Timothy 3:15 and 2d Timothy 2:16-17; 2d Peter 1:3,'—all of these scriptures I am familiar with somewhat, and I am, a firm and devout believer in them all. I believe that Jesus is the head, and that He is the head over all things to the church, and, therefore, that in all matters of religious work and service Jesus must rule. And I profess to you here to-day that if I could not teach and work in this school, recognizing the headship of Jesus Christ and His supreme authority, I would leave it to-morrow. But Brother Sommer believes in schools in which the Bible is taught. Yes, he does. So then, when he believes in a school in which the Bible is taught, that involves everything that is necessary to the establishment of that school. If he believes in a school in which the Bible is taught, it involves every essential thing to the establishment of that school, and to establish schools takes some money, little or much. And if it be admitted that Christians may establish schools and teach secular knowledge, and in them teach the Bible, and if it is a necessary essential that they have some-money, then it is only a matter of judgment about how much money shall be invested. If I could go out and in conjunction with a brother buy a tent and in that tent teach grammar and arithmetic and other useful branches of secular learning, and in connection with that teach the Bible,—if I could do that much, then I could join myself with more men, put up a more pretentious building and teach more students in a more permanent way. I don't wonder that my worthy respondent said that this was not a matter of consistency, for he cannot but be aware how weak he is along that line. He can not but be aware how weak he is along that line.

"Now then, we shall doubtless have repeated over and over again, as we have had in the published discussion of these things, the term 'religio-secular.' We propose to ask our friend this question: What do you mean by the term "religio-secular?" Define the term. Second. What feature or features are necessarily present in a school or its management to make it a religio-secular school? Now, when these questions are answered we will be getting at something tangible. But his declarations and all the glittering generalities about the sufficiency of the scriptures, until these questions are answered are worth nothing in this investigation. These are vital, I think. I propound these questions because they come right down and dig at the very root of the matter. They will go to the" real ground of contention. There is not and can not, in view of my worthy friend's publication,—there can not be a real question between us as to the right of Christians to establish a school and teach secular knowledge and the Bible in con-

nection with that knowledge. But now there are certain features, he says, of these schools to which he objects. And he calls them 'religio-secular' schools, and he objects because they are 'religio-secular', and so this question is pertinent to the issue, and when it is answered we will be on a fair road to some intelligence in this discussion.

"Third question. If a Christian parent, having a child that has finished the local school, should ask you 'Where shall I send my child to school?' what would you answer? I submit the questions to him.

"Now then, we want to take up some matters in view of what we have on our chart. It is said that Christians may band themselves together to teach school, to teach secular knowledge, in which the Bible is taught a part or all the time; they may do this to make a living or as an act of charity. Some five or six years ago, Brother Armstrong and Brother R. N. Gardner were taking a walk one day. Some one, one or the other, suggested to the other one, in a sort of tentative way, 'What do you say some time going out farther west and establishing a school?' He says, 'That is what my wife and I have been thinking about for some time, and had been talking about the matter for some time.' It dropped then. Some months later, just before the closing of the school year in Bowling Green, long about in May, Brother Armstrong and I took a walk across the field to a colored washwoman, and during that walk I had the same thought in my mind, and during that walk I asked him what he thought about leaving Bowling Green some time and going farther west and associating himself with other brethren in establishing a school. He said he had been thinking about it, but did not say anything to me about Brother Gardner having spoken, to him on that subject. The next year, probably, Brother Bell came into the arrangement or agreement. The results were uncertain, vague, indefinite, but we had in our hearts that purpose some time. "

DANIEL SOMMER'S SECOND SPEECH.

"Mr. Chairman, Gentlemen Moderators, Ladies and Gentlemen: In view of the fact that you have heard a discussion on this question this afternoon for the first time, and many of you have not read with reference to it hitherto, I suppose that a majority of you actually think that my respondent has been responding to me; that he has had something to say in opposition to the position that I have taken. Now, I am to show you that he has missed the very point in controversy, first, middle and last. Be and his associates have been missing it for five years, and in writing I could not, and could not, and could not, bring them to the question in controversy. But now we have an opportunity on, this platform, in the presence of this audience, to point out wherein he has missed the very question at issue between us, and consequently everything that he has said has been so widely separated from the objections that I made that, to use an illustration which I have sometimes heard, his subject and mine might be married to each other without violating the laws of consanguinity. For, the point of controversy is, as I stated, near the conclusion, or in the next to the conclusion of the speech that I delivered.

"I wrote down this morning, because I thought that here the battle would rage, just what I ought to say in regard to this, so that I might read it over and over and over again, if necessary, in order that the audience might be able to see, and, if possible, that I might open up an entrance into my respondent's brain so that he might see the point in controversy.

"This debate is concerning the **BIBLICAL RIGHT** to establish an institution of learning which is chiefly secular, in order to **FURNISH AN OCCASION TO TEACH PUPILS IN THE BIBLE**; also, the **BIBLICAL RIGHT** in advertising such an institution, to call on Christians

to pray for it, work for it, patronize it and give money to establish and support it, and yet DENY THAT IT IS A RELIGIOUS INSTITUTION! Likewise, the BIBLICAL RIGHT to have such an institution presided over by a man who, after loading himself with pompous, worldly, absurd titles, confesses that he is yet in his SPIRITUAL BABYHOOD.

"MY PROPOSITION FOR DEBATE IS THAT SUCH AN INSTITUTION IS UNSCRIPTURAL.

"Now, he asks you with reference to that, 'Is it a crime for a man to confess that he is a spiritual babe, even if he occupies the position of a president of a college?' We are not talking about CRIMES. We are talking about SCRIPTURAL RIGHT.

"And I now take up the Bible, which my respondent professes to have so much reverence for, and I call your attention to first Corinthians, third chapter and the beginning of that chapter,—first, second and third verses: 'And I, brethren, could not speak unto you as unto spiritual, but as unto carnal, even as unto babes in, Christ. I have fed you with milk, and not with meat; for hitherto ye were not able to bear it, neither yet now are ye able. For ye are yet carnal:'—which means fleshly,—fleshly minded,—'for whereas there is among you envying, and strife, and divisions, are ye not carnal, and walk as men?'

"The babes in Christ at Corinth were CARNALLY MINDED CHRISTIANS. Not a crime, but undoubtedly a very unfortunate condition to exist in the president of a college. I turn next to Hebrews, fifth chapter, and there I read the following,—12, 13 and 14th verses: 'For when for the time ye ought to be teachers, ye have need that one teach you again which be the first principles of the oracles of God; and are become such as have need of milk, and not of strong meat. For every one that useth milk is unskillful in the word of righteousness; for he is a babe. But strong meat belongeth to them that are of full age, even those who by reason of use have their senses exercised to discern both good and evil.

'Now, the apostle Paul says here in this scripture, that those who are babes are UNSKILLFUL IN THE WORD OF RIGHTEOUSNESS. In 1st Corinthians, third chapter,' he says the babe is CARNAL. I am not charging a crime, but I will say that it is a burlesque on this age to have any such state of affairs. Mr. Chairman, would it not be a burlesque on this age if a slimy eel, while yet in its native mud, should lift its head aloft, like the serpent of old, with words of pretended wisdom in its mouth? And so I say to you, ladies and gentlemen, it is a burlesque on this age for a man, who confesses himself,— as I am prepared to show the president of this college has confessed in his own handwriting,—that he is a babe in Christ—it is a burlesque on this age for him to lift his head aloft, loaded with worldly, pompous titles and occupy the position of the presidency of a college called Western Bible and Literary College, which has been established FOR THE PURPOSE of teaching persons in religion, and yet who declares that it is NOT A RELIGIOUS INSTITUTION. I am not at liberty to go back and attack the Nashville school,—that is not in controversy here except in principle,—nor the Bowling Green school, nor the colleges down in Texas. I could wish that it would be my privilege to extend to these and to point out the procedure at these several colleges, and to show to what this one is destined to lead. But I am bound up and bound down, and bound in and bound under, in this discussion, to the Western Bible and Literary College, so called. And the apostle Paul says, that this college is presided over,—in view of his confession,—by a man who is CARNALLY MINDED and, furthermore, who is UNSKILLFUL IN THE WORD OF RIGHTEOUSNESS—and I submit to you that it is a burlesque on this age to have any such arrangement

for the purpose of teaching people in religion, and yet declaring that the institution in which this is taught is NOT A RELIGIOUS INSTITUTION.

"Now, I call your attention to PURPOSE. I understood, incidentally, that my respondent had been making a chart, or that somebody had been making a chart for him, and I thought possibly there would be a picture gallery here this afternoon. I am not disappointed. But look at that statement there. 'Christians may band themselves together to teach secular knowledge.' I say that, but that is not in controversy. 'They may teach the Bible a part or all of the time.' If they are going to teach it part or all the time, they are banded together to teach the Bible. I don't recollect when or where Brother Otey said that, but I don't question it, nor do I criticize the third declaration, that 'They may do this to make a living or as an act of charity.' Where is there a statement in there 'FOR THE PURPOSE OF TEACHING RELIGION,' especially, to teach religion BETTER THAN THE CHURCH CAN? That is the point. The church of the Lord Jesus Christ has been ignored by these gentlemen, and I am prepared to show it, if it is called in question. I have the documents here. I have their own writings on this subject and I will read them at the proper time. But possibly I should give a little attention to these notes which I have here, to see if there is anything in them.

"My opponent says he believes all that I have said, but adds, 'I am going to expose your unauthorized deductions' Well, I made the deductions that those scriptures are against this kind, of institution, and the kind of institution I oppose is such as I have defined here, and such as you have here. His chart does not touch this question. I do not believe that it is touched by anything that he has just said or shown by his picture gallery.

"Then, we look on the question of being here without a proposition. I waive that. He said it would take too much time to enter into the correspondence. I just simply make the statement and you can draw your own inferences with reference to it. I affirm, with reference to the position that I occupy, that it is scriptural. My respondent does not object to that. When I question the position of my opponents, they don't affirm that that is scriptural, and consequently as they would not affirm it we had to enter into a discussion, without a definite proposition. But I am here with this negative proposition: THAT HIS POSITION IS WRONG, AND THAT THIS INSTITUTION IS UNSCRIPTURAL. As I told you before, his speech was not a speech that bore on my speech, so you will not be surprised that I don't give any attention to what he says, except to these questions'

1. "What do you mean by the term religio-secular?" I answer just exactly what that form of expression means,—partly religious and partly secular, without saying how much religion and how much secular. I never opposed such an institution because it is partly religious and partly secular. It is the PURPOSE for which it is established, the essential declarations made concerning it, and the declarations made with reference to it—there is where the controversy comes in.

2. "What feature or features are necessarily present in a school or its management to make it religio-secular?" I answer, partly religious and partly secular, without saying how much in one direction or how much in the other.

3. "If a Christian parent, having a child that has finished the local school, should ask you, "Where shall I send my child to school," what would you answer?" I believe I saw something of that kind a good while ago, in a certain paper, and the one who wrote it thought there was something in it. The apostle John declared that 'This is the victory that overcomes the world, even our faith,' and the church of the living God is intended to be the teacher of faith. Send that

child to some place where there is a first class school, and at the same time a good church of Christ. Not one like the institution where, as I learn, a certain young man recently spent two and a half years and then when he went to another school that was responsible, and had better or maturer standing, he found he had lost one year. He could not get credit for more than a year and a half,—that is, in a school of higher grade they would not give him credit for more than a year and a half when he had spent two years and a half in the former school. If that is challenged we can give names. Now, friends, this is what I say, go to a first class school where there is a good church of Christ. It is the business of the church to teach faith, and this is the victory, says the apostle John, that overcomes the world, even our faith, and the child by being taught in the faith would be able to overcome the world with all the temptations that might be in any particular school where the child might be sent. I would like to have a few more of those questions. If my respondent can think of anything more I shall be glad for him to do so.

"Having given that much attention to his speech, I now call attention to something beyond that which I have previously mentioned. I turn to Revelations, 22nd chapter, and I read the 18th verse: 'For I testify unto every man that heareth the words of the prophecy of this book. If any man shall add unto these things, God shall add unto him the plagues that are written in this book' Now friends, if an interpretation of the law, either human or divine, shall ignore the well established law, or create new law and new institutions, it is itself vicious. Lay that before any judge of the court that you may see fit to select, and he will tell you that it is correct. My respondent says he only objects to those interpretations, or those inferences, or those deductions which I make that are unscriptural. I point out to him that I don't make any inferences or any deductions or intimations in favor of anything to establish any institution separate from, the church for the purpose of teaching religion. He, on the other hand, does that, and he makes an interpretation that establishes an institution not mentioned in all of God's Holy Book, especially with its purpose and the manner in which it has been advertised, the manner in which it has been established, and I am the one to object to any such interpretation because it is vicious in itself and needs only to be mentioned in order to be understood and admitted as vicious. If we are at liberty to make an interpretation of the law, human or divine, which will establish new institutions, and which will establish likewise the necessity for new laws, new rules, new regulations not contemplated in the original law,—if one can do that another can do the same, and another can do the same, and it 'would be subversive of all rule and all law and all regulations.

"I brought before you these scriptures in their plain, evident meaning. First, 'If any man speak, let him speak as the oracles of God.' I pointed out that if my respondent had spoken simply as the oracles of God he could never have made a speech in favor of any such institution as this

"I next pointed out that the apostle Paul says that Christians are complete in Him, who is the head of all principalities and power. But as the New Testament scriptures does not contemplate any such institution as this, and does not say anything in favor of it, nor intimate anything in favor of it, you see very clearly that this is an addition and implies that Christians are not complete in Christ, for here is an institution that was established FOR THE PURPOSE of teaching persons in religion, and that is not going to be denied, that this was the LEADING, the CHIEF purpose, THE PURPOSE without which this institution would not have been in existence. THERE IS THE POINT OF CONTROVERSY.

"Then, in the next place, we find that the apostle Paul says that the church of the living God is 'the pillar and ground of the truth;' not one of the pillars. But here is an institution which is declared to be 'a permanent influence,' and which proposes to do a work better and more permanent than the "church of the living God, with reference to which Christ said, 'Upon this rock I will build my church, and the gates of Hell shall not prevail against it.' I am here prepared to show, and at the proper time will read the document, which declares that this institution was intended to be 'a permanent' institution, or 'a permanent influence' for God and for the advancement of the gospel, which implies that the Church of Christ in this town, and the Churches of Christ elsewhere in this state, were not 'a permanent influence.'

"Then we find that the apostle Paul says that the inspired scriptures perfect the man of God and thoroughly furnish him to do every good work. The inspired scriptures don't contemplate any such institution as this, FOR THE PURPOSE of teaching people in religion better than the church can teach them.

"We look again and find that the apostle Peter declared that 'according as his divine power hath given unto us all things that pertain unto life and godliness through the knowledge of him that hath called us to glory and virtue.' Friends and fellow travelers to the bar of God, if the apostle Peter told the truth in that instance, and neither he nor any other inspired man ever intimated in favor of such an institution as this, for THE PURPOSE of teaching people in religion, don't you see very clearly that these gentlemen, who are represented by my respondent, have engaged in something which is a violation of the scriptures?

"Then we find that the apostle John says in the second letter, ninth verse, to which I omitted to call attention in my previous speech,—he says: Whosoever transgresseth, and abideth not in the doctrine of Christ, hath not God. He that abideth in the doctrine of Christ, he hath both the Father and the Son.' He lets go his hold on God. A transgression of the divine law is not simply to do what the divine law forbids, but it is going beyond that which the divine law authorizes. Now, my respondent in this case, with his colleagues—I say these gentlemen—have GONE BEYOND what the divine law authorizes, and I might say that they have transgressed some of the features of the divine record and believe that I could maintain it. We look again, and I may say they have transgressed in doing some things that the divine law has forbidden. They have transgressed in going beyond what is divinely authorized.

"Next I come to the scripture which I read in another part of this speech, where the apostle John says, that whosoever shall add to the prophecy of this book, God shall add unto him the plagues that are written in this book. Now, undoubtedly that curse of God, as it may be called properly a curse, is applicable to every one who adds a new institution FOR THE PURPOSE of teaching mankind in religion. God ordained the family as a social institution, and it is likewise spoken of as a religious institution. He ordained the church, and the church, my friends, is undoubtedly the religious institution above all others, and it is declared to be perfect for the purpose for which it was ordained. Now, where is the place, where the room, where is the need, where the occasion for any other institution to be established FOR THE PURPOSE of teaching mankind in religion? Let my respondent give his attention thereto. He quotes from the Octographic Review, and the more he quotes from it, the more truth he will bring before you, and the more I shall have an opportunity to point out that he has, up to this date, it seems, missed the very point in controversy, and as it has been with him, so it has been with all his colleagues for the last five years. I believe I may safely say that their misrepresentations

have been sufficient to send a whole generation of people to perdition if they be not repented of. Over and over again for the last five years I have pointed out what they were doing in establishing these colleges FOR THE PURPOSE of doing the work of the church, at least in part, and FOR THE PURPOSE of doing the work of the church EVEN BETTER than the church could do it, and they have refused, and refused, to look at what I have said in that respect, but even in their very latest publication that has been made on this subject it has been stated, 'those who object to our work,'—'those who are objecting to our work.' That is misleading, first, middle and last. That may mean that I object to the manner in which they teach here, and the fact that they teach the Bible. That never was in my mind, as a point of controversy, nor as a reason why I assailed these institutions.

"I am about to close my second speech, and if my respondent does not give attention to the point of controversy here, you will see very clearly that he is a defeated man; and more than that, I am persuaded to think that all of his preparation has been along the line of his misconception of the real position occupied by those who have opposed this institution.

"Remember that our best friends are seldom our most pleasant companions, and the most wholesome medicine is sometimes very bitter. I am here for the purpose of befriending you. My respondent endeavored to make light of the idea that I said I was here chiefly to offer criticisms. But the very clear rules of the agreement say I should proceed and offer my objections to this institution and my respondent should follow. I should have the privilege of a half hour's speech in offering objections, and when men offer objections what do they do? Why, they offer criticisms, that is all they do to object. So you see how much there was in that remark. Now, I wish you to watch and see how much there is in every other remark that my respondent may make, and see whether in his speech he dodges the question to which I call 'his attention. If he dodges, see how much he says with reference to it. Ladies and gentlemen, I thank you for your attention, and now give way to my respondent."

B. F. RHODES' SECOND REPLY.

"Mr. Chairman, Gentlemen Moderators, Ladies and Gentlemen: First of all I want to notice the answers to those questions, if I can find them. Question,—'What do you mean by the term religio-secular? Define term.' I handed my respondent that question written out as plainly as I can write. I don't say plainly, but as clearly as I can write. He says it means what the words import. Grant so, but this audience has a right, and I have a right to have this question defined,—that term defined, religio-secular. That is like saying that it is so just because it is so, or something like that. That is all it amounts to.

"The second question,—'What feature or features are necessarily present in a school or its management to make it religio-secular?' Definite question, and the answer as I got it,—of course, I wrote it as rapidly as I could,—'It is partly religious and partly secular,—partly religious and partly secular.' Was that answering that question? What particular feature or features are necessarily proper or are present in a school or its management to make it a religio-secular school? It was not answered, and this audience knows that it was not answered. I would be afraid to presume on your ignorance that way. Then he goes on to say that he don't oppose this school because it leaches religion and secular things. He said that a religio-secular school,—and THAT is what he makes his fight on, THAT is what he wrote his tract against,—is PARTLY RELIGIOUS AND PARTLY SECULAR, and he says he don't oppose it because it teaches religious and secular things.

It is because of this confusion that I ask him to define this question definitely and plainly. I ask him to come out and define this term, religio-secular, definitely and plainly, and what particular features must be present in a school to make it religio-secular, and you notice how gingerly he touched it. I am not going to prophecy but when he answers that question and answers it fairly and openly and definitely, he will wish he had answered it the other way.

"Third question. If a Christian parent, having a child that had finished the local school, should ask you 'Where shall I send my child to school?' What would you answer? A reference was made to First John 4:5,—'This is the victory that overcomes the world, even our faith.' Of course it is,—of course it is. What had that to do with the answering of this question? He did say that he would send it to a school,—to a good school,—in a place where there was a Church of Christ. Now, let him name his school and we will notice the conditions present there. Now you let him name it. That is his business. Let him name that school in the town where there is a Church of Christ. Why, this is a school where there is a Church of Christ, as far as that is concerned, and we could take his answer, as far as he gave it, and claim that this is that school. There is a Church of Christ here and there is a school here. If he wants to attack the character of the school and the work it does, let him do so. Let him waste his time that way if he wants to debate and quibble over incidentals, and not include the principles involved. Let him do so, and I promise you I will point out such quibbling. I knew about what to expect. I may be an onus, but I knew something of what was coming.

"Now, going back to the beginning of his speech. 'He has missed the very point in controversy. The point in controversy is not that Christians may band themselves together to teach secular knowledge, or that they may teach the Bible a part or all of the time.' I knew that was not the point of controversy, because I said that was admitted. He says that the point of controversy is that they can not PURPOSE to teach the Bible in such a school. My dear friends, my Christian brethren, I challenge the right of any man to enter into any business where he does not PURPOSE to teach God's word. I say that we have a right to teach school,—it is an honorable avocation,—while our vocation is being Christians. While our vocation is being Christians, and being Christians we are obligated to God to teach the Bible if we have the opportunity. I don't say that our ability is equal to our respondent's, I should be ashamed to claim such for one so young as I. But I do say that the same principle that will allow him to teach the Bible will allow me to teach the Bible to the extent that I know it.

"'But concerning the Biblical right to establish a school presided over by a president loaded down with pompous, worldly titles, who is a self-confessed babe in Christ, and therefore carnally-minded.' Now, then. Sometimes a little thing left out makes a great deal of difference. Prof Armstrong said,—I presume he was quoting from a letter,— that he was a babe in Christ compared with Brother Sommer, and those of you who know him at all, know that while he may not have the ability of Brother Sommer,—I don't claim that he has, as we know he has not had the experience, but those who know him know that he has some ability to teach, not only secular knowledge but the Bible, and teach it well. This audience knows it. But, 'loaded down with pompous titles' Now, then, our worthy respondent ought to know that an A B or an A. M. is not a pompous title,—it is not a title that would bear a man down to the ground. It does not mean very much. Our respondent knows it does not mean much, and its value depends wholly upon the school issuing it. It may be worth very much, and it may be worth very little, but that is not the question, whether our worthy Brother Armstrong is an able and qualified man, fitted for the

purpose of teaching school. That is not the question. As a Christian he has the right to teach secular knowledge and to teach God's word. And as a true Christian, he has not the right to go into any business when he does not have the purpose to go into that business in order to teach God's word. I say that our vocation in life is being Christians, and one of the obligations resting on us, big and little, male and female, is to teach God's word in proportion to ability, opportunity and with regard to such restraints as are placed around us. An old shoe maker sat pegging away on a shoe at his bench. Some one came in and said to him, 'What is your business?' And he says, 'My business is being a Christian,—my business is being a Christian.' 'Yes,' said the man, 'I don't doubt you are a Christian, but what is your business?' 'My business is serving God,' he answered. 'Yes, of course, but how do you make a living?' 'That is what you mean,—well, my business is being a Christian, but I peg shoes to pay the expenses of my business.' And that is just exactly what Brother Armstrong is doing. Our business is being Christians, and I have a loss of faith of Christians, or any man, whose chief purpose is not to glorify God and not to teach God's word. Yes, it is all right to have schools to teach secular knowledge, and Christians may teach in those schools,—they may teach the Bible in those schools, but, perchance, they must do it **INCIDENTALLY**, without any **PURPOSE**. Do it **ACCIDENTALLY WITHOUT A PURPOSE** OP DOING IT, for woe betide the Christian that would enter the school **FOR THE PURPOSE** of teaching the Bible. He may do it incidentally,—he may do it like the child says, 'Mama, I didn't aim to do it,'—but **HE CAN'T AIM TO DO IT**.

"To call on Christians to give money to such work because they do that.' When it is admitted that a Christian may engage in such work,—give his time to such work,—his time is no more his than his money. His time belongs to God, the same as his money. Just exactly. Whether a man plows or whether he paints, whether he farms or whether he sells goods, or whether he doctors or whatever may be his avocation in life, it is his obligation and his duty, as God's child, to teach God's word. I would be afraid to go into any business without in my heart the view of teaching God's word in connection therewith. I will have more to say on the subject of money and things of that kind when it shall please our respondent to get to that part of the subject. I want to spend the time to dig down around the base roots of this question. I want to get to the truth,—that is what I am here for, and I have the right to suppose that my respondent is here for that same purpose. I suppose he is. It does not matter, so far as the principle is concerned, whether our Brother Armstrong is a very able educator, or a feeble educator. He is responsible to God for what ability he has. I notice a manifestation on the part of my friend to trying . Brother Armstrong. I don't doubt it is fortunate for him that he did not. He is on the agreement,—both having to sign the agreement,—to enter a written discussion, so let him attend to the matter in hand.

"My respondent says: 'To be a babe in Christ is not a crime, but a very unfortunate condition for a president of a college.' A babe in Christ compared with Brother Sommer,—that is all the statement was any way. Of course. I suppose our worthy friend thinks that every one should be as **INFALLIBLY CERTAIN** and as **ABSOLUTELY PERFECT**, and as **UNFAILINGLY CORRECT** on all kinds and sorts of questions as he, himself **FEELS HIMSELF TO HAVE BEEN**, before he undertakes to do a humble work for God. Of course, if we were to set up for ourselves such a standard as that, we know we never would do anything.

"Then we have Revelations 22:18, which says if any man adds to the words of the prophecy, etc. Then we have this statement: 'Any

interpretation which creates institutions that are new are vicious,— 'any interpretation that creates institutions that are new are vicious.' Now, he believes in schools. He believes in schools that teach secular knowledge, and that teach religion, and, of course, any school is some sort of an institution, and he is as much obliged to defend his institution, his school that teaches religion, as I am to defend mine. He believes in schools, but the only difference that has appeared so far in this discussion is that we **MUST NOT ENTER** into this arrangement **WITH A VIEW OF DOING IT**. Do it accidentally, incidentally or **WITHOUT PURPOSING IT**. Oh, the childishness of it!

"If any man speak let him speak as the oracles of God.' Certainly, I believe it with all my heart. That is what I purpose to do, whether in this school, whether teaching before my class, whether on this rostrum, whether out in the hedges and byways teaching the Christ, I speak as the oracle of God. But when it is admitted that Christians may band themselves together to teach school, and those schools teach the word of God. Will he hang the issue upon **PURPOSING TO DO IT**? What do you think about it now? 'You can do it, but you **SHOULD NOT PURPOSE TO DO IT**.' I will tell you the kind of teaching that is done **WITHOUT ANY PURPOSE** is a very poor, kind of teaching, and you all know it. But we are told that we were, in establishing this work, proposing to establish a work more permanent than the church of the living God. Now, I say that can never be so. Now, mark you the words, 'A work more permanent for righteousness than the church of God.' We never purposed any such thing. **WE NEVER SO PUBLISHED TO THE WORLD**. Not at all. I know about what I said. I know that it never entered the heart of any member of these Christians, who have banded themselves together to enter into this work, to establish a work more permanent than the church of the living God, neither by their statement nor by necessary implication, and I defy any man under Heaven to show it. Let him come to the task. He has made his statement, I challenge its truth. 'Which implies that the church of Christ in this town and the Church of Christ elsewhere in this state, were not a permanent influence.' It is said that is a permanent institution, and that it necessarily follows then, that something else is not a permanent institution. Oh, the logic of it! Shades of Aristotle! Because a thing is said to be a permanent institution, therefore, every other thing is not permanent. I may not be as old as my respondent,—I know that is so,—he has preached, of course, for a length of time as long as I have lived in this world, but I have learned a few things.

"Again we are told, 'He that goeth onward and abideth not in the word of God has not God.' Certainly. I believe it out of my heart. I say we have not gone onward and have not failed to abide in God's word. I say we are abiding in God's word when we are doing things that Christians may do. Only with the exception he says that you should not do it and **PURPOSE** to. Is it true, that all this smoke and dust, that all this bitterness and strife, that all this confusion for the last two years, hangs on that one thing,—that you may teach the Bible but you should **NOT PURPOSE** to teach it? Do it accidentally. I knew about what was coming. I have seen that before. It was not new to me.

"Then the statement about the family as a social institution and their life is spoken of as a religious affair, and those who object to our work as misrepresented. This about closes up.

"Those who object to our work.' Well, don't our respondent object to our work? Isn't that the idea you have this afternoon, that he is objecting to our work? What is he here for if he is not here to object to our work? He says he is here to criticize and one of die rules were that he was to speak his objections against our institution here,

and now then bo says that it is necessary to object; he says that he is here to object to our work. It is mighty hard to understand some great men.

"And I was about, when I closed up,—I was just stating how that we,—some four or five of us,—had at different times our hearts stirred in this line of work, and how we agreed to enter into this work, and at first, as you know, it was proposed to establish this work at Paragould (?) Arkansas, and then, providentially, it seems to me,—I don't know, I don't claim that is so, don't claim to prove it,—we were led to this place and the offer of this building was made up, and we accepted the offer, and in pursuance of that agreement of certain Christians, not as great, not as able, not as mighty as other Christians may be, perhaps, but at least having some little ability to teach, we are willing to let our students test us and judge us in that matter, and we are here, and we are doing that work, and the only criticism that really is at all in the nature of a principle, that has been offered yet, is the one that we are here WITH THE PURPOSE Of teaching the Bible. We have established a school for the purpose of teaching the Bible. If we could go into a public school I would go there with the purpose of teaching the Bible as far as possible. If I should go into a mercantile house I would go there as far as possible with that purpose. The professions that were open would be instruments in his hands for teaching the way of life and salvation. Whatever I do as a Christian man, whatever business in life I might follow, I should most certainly follow that business in order to glorify God, in order to teach His word. And that is the only thing that has really been offered that is worthy of a name of a criticism upon principle. We are here, we are teaching the Bible. Not doing it with the ability of some men, but we are willing, and I believe I am stating,—when I said that I am stating the convictions of every heart, every member of this school that is connected with the responsible management of it,—when I say that we are ready to turn the work over to any men who are more competent than we, who are willing to assume the responsibility. We are here for the purpose of glorifying God, and I don't want to stay a minute longer than I can subserve that purpose. If anybody else, any other man, can do it better, I am willing that he should do it. I have no desire for position, nor for place. It is not for honor, it is not for money, it is for the glorifying or glory of Christ that I am engaged in this work, and if I would leave this work, turn it over to some one who is more competent and who is willing to assume the responsibility that I have held, if I could do that, I would go out and whatever business I might follow I would enter into that business, heart and soul, with the sole purpose of living for the glory of God. I affirm that point, I assume that position. I would enter into that work for the purpose of teaching God, whatever that business might be. I boldly avow that purpose. I would be ashamed not to. I would be afraid not to. Some men can deny their responsibility. Some men may wish to deny it, but I want everything that I do to be for the glory of God. And we are willing to admit that we make mistakes, but the fact that we make mistakes does not touch the principle involved in this matter. We may have made many mistakes, we are conscious that we have made some, and possibly many more than we are conscious of. But those mistakes are incidental and not vital in the principles involved in this work. And you all know that, too. Don't you make mistakes in your business and in your life as Christians? Certainly. Does not our worthy respondent make mistakes? I presume he does. I suppose he does. Of course he does, unless he is infallible, and I don't think he makes that claim. I know he does. Then mistakes we grant we may say they are only incidents, they are not vital, they don't touch the principle. We are here

to discuss the principle, and I take my stand on the principle and I intend to stand on it until the discussion closes.

"Now then, I believe we have noticed all that really demands attention until there is more presented. Of course, we shall have more on the subject of money, and more on other subjects connected with the work, and I am satisfied that I have met every one of these objections that have appeared up to this time, and I am satisfied that you people who sit in this audience know that I have. But let that be as it may, you are responsible to God, and I am responsible to God, and we leave the matter to you until the other questions are brought into further prominence. It is his to lead, mine to follow. Of course, if I were leading I could pursue a more connected, or more related or logical plan, but I must, indeed, follow,—at least I shall do so for the present.

Thereupon the meeting adjourned to meet again at 7:30 p. m. on the same day.

At 7:30 P. M., the discussion was resumed, as follows:

DANIEL SOMMER'S THIRD SPEECH.

"Mr. Chairman, Gentlemen Moderators, Ladies and Gentlemen: Thus far our discussion has proceeded just about as I expected it would, with one exception. I expected that my respondent had made all of his preparation on the basis of a misconception concerning the real controversy between us, judging by what I had previously seen from the pens of those who have been contending for such an institution as the Western Bible and Literary College, so called. In this I have not been disappointed. An exposure has been, made of his misconceptions, as he has hitherto set 'them forth. And I calculated that he would endeavor to keep away from the main issues just as far as possible, and that I would have considerable difficulty in bringing him up squarely to the point of controversy. In this I have not been disappointed. But in one respect I have been disappointed, and that is the manner in which he repeated certain scripture when he was making his last speech. I calculated that he might ridicule or burlesque something that I had said, but I had not calculated that he would drawl out, to a ridiculing or burlesquing manner 'all scripture is given by inspired men' and 'you are complete in him,'—'if any man speak let him speak as the oracles of God.' I had not calculated that he would venture in that direction at all, but he did, and there are scores of witnesses here who would testify, if it comes to a question of testimony, that he did this. And they were surprised, they were astonished that he would do anything of that kind, while professing great reverence for God and His Word. In order to make something of a show of defense he would belittle the Sacred Text of the living word of the living God by that Kind of speech. Look at the 137th division or 138th division of the book of Psalms and 2nd and 3rd verses, and there you will find that David said to God, 'Thou hast magnified thy word above all thy name,' and yet my respondent, in order to make some kind of a show of defense, would belittle the scriptures that I brought before you in opposition to this institution. I was surprised there, and I was also surprised that his sympathizers would accept that with a kind of jocularly as though they thought he was actually saying something. Now, friends, if there is anything more of that I shall call my respondent to order, because I will not tolerate for God's word to be ridiculed or burlesqued in my presence at any time nor under any circumstances So I warn him not to go any further in that direction. If he sees fit to ridicule me or what I say, that is a point where I have a right to call him to order, but when he ridicules or burlesques any part of God's word, by repeating it in the contemptuous manner

in which he repeated several passages, I shall call him to order and we shall have controversy on the question of whether any man, professing to be a Christian, should be allowed to palm off anything of that kind, and impress upon the young people who may be present, and may not be able to see through that kind of irreverence, that kind of sacrilege,—making light of sacred things,—so that they may be impressed in the same direction and may trifle with God's word. I was disappointed there.

"Having said that much, I now state that, take out of his last speech what I have just exposed in regard to his irreverent manner of repeating certain passages of God's word, and take out of that speech his dodge with reference to the word 'PURPOSE,' which I am going to expose, and there is not anything left, except where he intimated that I had omitted something in that Which I had quoted with reference to Prof. Armstrong of the confession of being in his spiritual babyhood. And I am going to expose that. And then his direct challenge, what he said that I could not prove that they had attempted to establish this institution as a more permanent influence than the church of the living God. Now, these are the outlines. There are a few other items to which I wish to call your attention.

"He said my answer to his question about religio-secular was very much like 'it is so because it is so,' and challenged me for a more definite definition. It is just about like this, dear friends,—suppose somebody would say to you, two feet by two, tell what the result is. You would say four. No, he says, I want a definition of it. That is about what it amounts to. Religio-secular is just what I say as to the Jewish law,—it was a politico-ecclesiastic law. We say ordinarily that, 'it was a political law and religious law combined,' and we never think it necessary to say anything more than that, and consequently my respondent's demand for a more definite definition of religio-secular, than that it means partly religious and partly secular, is just simply an effort to confuse, and if he wishes to indulge in anything of that kind, he is welcome to do so, and make all the capital out of it that he can.

"Next, he says I wrote a tract on religio-secular schools and against such schools. I suppose I might as well tell you, my hearers, another reason why I don't like to debate. I don't like to debate because my opponent is ALWAYS WRONG, and consequently has not anything to say except WHAT IS NOT TRUE. "

Mr. Nay:—"Mr. Chairman, I object. One of the articles of agreement was that no personalities should be indulged in, and that statement that he is always wrong, simply states a fact that he never is right, therefore, I object because I know that Brother Rhodes has made some true statements. The statement made by Brother Sommer is too comprehensive. "

Mr. Roberts:—"Chairman, I understand Brother Sommer to refer to what Brother Rhodes had said concerning Brother Sommer personally defining these words, and that respondent was wrong always in referring to Brother Sommer's definition and his explanation of the school that we had before us, and concerning that I understood Brother Sommer to mean his opponent had always misrepresented him. Was that correct?"

Mr. Sommer:—"Not concerning him personally, but as a respondent. "

Mr. Nay—"That is not all right. He did not say that he referred to that definition. "

Mr. Roberts:—"Mr. Chairman, we have Brother Sommer talking on that very subject. We also consider the purpose of the warning he spoke, and of what he spoke. It was concerning that tract he wrote about the school. That is what it was. We had that as the subject.

'Now,' he says, 'I will tell you another reason why I don't like to debate,—because my opponent is always wrong.' What was the subject? Always wrong concerning this subject. There is the subject and there is the purpose. And now then, we have Brother Sommer as the speaker,—I want to impress that,—the writing of this tract as a subject,—Brother Sommer having exposed two of the misrepresentations comes to the third, and says, "my respondent always misrepresents me, "—always wrong, as misrepresenting him every time. (To the audience.) You see that?"

Mr. Nay:—"The matter at issue is this Brother Sommer was calling in question the absurdity of Brother Rhodes asking him to define religio-secular. Brother Rhodes put no construction at all upon the meaning of that term, but he asked Brother Sommer to make a more definite explanation of what he meant. Therefore, if he put no construction upon the meaning of religio-secular, he could not have said anything that was wrong concerning it, because he said nothing that differed from what Brother Sommer said. It meant only he asked for a more full explanation "

Mr. Sommer:—"I beg to state that Mr. Nay is wrong in the point he makes. I read in my notes just this: He said I wrote a tract on religio-secular and against such schools. I then said, reaching after these documents, that I might as well tell another reason why I don't like to debate That is, that my respondent is always wrong. I was going to show you and show the audience where he was wrong, with reference to his statement that I wrote against such schools. The tract which I wrote I had here and I was going to present that when I was interrupted by Mr. Nay in his misconception of what I was going to present. I referred to the statement in regard to the tract, and was going to show that he had misrepresented me on the tract question. "

The Chairman—"Go ahead. "

Mr Sommer:—"Here are the headings of the tract: 'Concerning the unscripturalness of establishing religio-secular schools with the Lord's money' Not concerning the establishment of such schools,— I did not stop there,—but I said 'WITH THE LORD'S MONEY,' and the entire bearing of the first part of the tract is on that question.

"Second. Concerning the unscripturalness of applying sacred names to things of human origin.' Now, I submit that when my respondent said I had written a tract against religio-secular schools he stopped said I had written a tract against religio secular schools he stopped short of telling the truth in the case, for it was not against such schools AS SUCH, but against establishing them WITH THE LORD'S MONEY and applying to them, and other human institutions, SACRED NAMES. So I say that he is WRONG AGAIN Now, the statement that my respondent is ALWAYS WRONG, I know very well among the uncharitably minded, will be like this: That speaker regards himself as infallible But, the very reverse of that is true. I became acquainted with myself many years ago and saw I was so fallible, so liable to en or, so liable to make mistakes, that I determined in the questions of morality and religion that I would not, and would not, diverge from the divine testimony, and so I don't have any controversy with people who occupy the same position. I only have controversies with those who diverge from that position. As David said in the 119th division of the book of Psalms, and 63rd verse: 'I am a companion of all them that fear thee, and of them that keep thy precepts' I don't have any controversy with men who bind themselves up, and down, and in, and under, to the divine testimony, Never have had any controversy with them, and never calculate to have. Only with those who diverge from the divine testimony and establish

institutions that are unmentioned, and are not intimated in favor of, in the Divine Record,—only with these do I have controversies.

"My respondent said, in regard to my statement that 'the president of this institution was loaded down with titles and had confessed himself to be a babe in Christ,'—it is said a little thing was left out. Whether some one prompted him to tell what that little thing was or not, I don't know, but he exposed himself after this manner: My respondent said the little thing left out was in 'comparison with himself.' In other words, that Prof. Armstrong meant to say he was a babe in Christ in comparison with me, and very likely many of the audience who did not know what the interpolation was, supposed that I had made a mistake. So I take up a letter written to me by Prof. Armstrong, which is dated January 3rd, 1907, and I turn to the 13th page of that letter, and I read the following: 'And although I am but a babe in Christ,'—didn't say in comparison with you,—'and entreat you',—now, I would rather avoid reading the rest of this sentence if I could without being suspected, uncharitably, with regard to it, but I will read it and comment upon it,—'And although I am but a babe in Christ, and entreat you as a father in Israel, to beware of your present course towards disciples of Christ who may differ from you, but who are as honest and sincere as you are, and who are as loyal to God as you dare to be.' Now, my hearers, I must say that as far as a babe is concerned, those are the **BOLDEST AND MOST PRESUMPTUOUS WORDS** that I ever knew of a babe expressing. 'I entreat you as a father in Israel, to beware of your present course towards those disciples of Christ who may differ from you, and who are as honest as you are, and as loyal to the cause of Christ as you dare to be.' **ARE THOSE THE WORDS OF A BABE, OR OF ONE WHO PRESUMES THAT HE IS A MASTER?** What does he know about my degree of loyalty? What does he know about the depth and 'intensity of my honesty? How can he sit in judgment upon me, and make a speech of that kind? Now, we have the full sentence before you, and you see that the little something that was charged that I left out, was not left out, and **MY RESPONDENT IS WRONG AGAIN.**

"Now, we have an opportunity to sum this matter up. You see very clearly that he has opened up in making his speech, and has made two speeches before this audience, and in those speeches he has shown his purpose and shown what he can say, and what he must say in opposition to the truth which I am advocating, and what is the result? We now have him exposed here tonight very openly, as guilty of **IRREVERENCE** in reciting certain passages of the word of God in a **RIDICULING AND BURLESQUING MANNER**, which I had quoted in reference to the truth which I had asserted, and we have him exposed of another direct misrepresentation in declaring that I had **LEFT SOMETHING OUT** of the passage which I quoted, or intimated that I had, in my speech this afternoon. That is not all. He made a direct challenge near the latter part of his speech, and I noted it down, for the challenge was that which I had hoped that he would make, and he said that it 'can never be shown that we intended to establish a work more permanent than the church of the living God',— 'I defy any man under Heaven to show it. He has made his statement, and I challenge him to prove it.' He uses ridicule, quotes about logic, and in another place he said, 'Oh the littleness of this, the littleness of this' Well, we shall indulge such expressions perhaps, in his debating Hitherto he has been going along that line, and that has passed off for argument, but I forewarn him it will not pass for argument here.

"Now friends, while I was reading those notes just then, and reading his challenge, where he defied me with reference to this, I thought of something else that I had overlooked in my notes, and that

is in regard to the word 'purpose',—'purpose.' I pointed out to you in my second speech that he had omitted to consider what I had set forth as the point above all others in this controversy, namely, **THE PURPOSE OF ESTABLISHING THIS SCHOOL**, and he passed from **THE PURPOSE OF ESTABLISHING THE SCHOOL** to **THE PURPOSE OF TEACHING THE BIBLE IN THE SCHOOL** after it is established. I call that a **DODGE**. I don't know any other word for it. I don't mean to say he intended to dodge, nor that he didn't intend to dodge. I think it was the best he could do under the circumstances and not come up to the questions fairly and squarely,—that which is the chief point in the controversy here in this case.

"Now, having called your attention to that, I say that he was **WRONG THERE AGAIN**, and now I am going to read to you what is found in the publication to which I had referred, on this very subject. In which journal, titled *Primitive Christianity*, published in Wichita, Kansas, the number for Thursday, October 27th, 1904, we have this:

"In September, 1905, the Lord willing, Brethren A. D. Gardner, R. C. Bell, B. F. Rhodes, R. N. Gardner and myself, with others, will open a new school at Odessa, Mo. For about six years some of us have purposed to establish in a new field another "Bible school," and it now seems that God is giving us the desire of our hearts.

"The purpose of the school is to educate every student under its care, physically and intellectually, to the highest degree possible. We expect to do as thorough work along literary lines as any other school of like grade. Besides the regular college work there will be a special course for those preparing to teach, in which special attention will be given to those preparing for a state certificate. We also offer to our students a thorough business course, including penmanship, stenography, and typewriting. But this is not the ultimate end sought; through all this training we expect to keep before us the 'one end for which the school is established, namely, that of training the heart to love and honor God, and to devote its energies to his holy service. We are fully persuaded that all physical and intellectual education should be only preparatory to the great spiritual development towards which all growth should tend. Every teacher is full of zeal for this final step of all true education. Take from us this final purpose of the school and there remains no desire in my heart to start the work.'

"This is the final purpose,'—their readers know it is in my heart to start the work.' I pointed out to you that what we object to was starting a school of this kind **FOR THE PURPOSE** of teaching religion. My respondent passed over this, yet this, is the very point in controversy. I object to establishing a school for the purpose of teaching religion. My opponent dodges this and he tries to make this audience think that I object to teaching the Bible with the purpose to teach it and represents me as being just like the child that said, 'I did not mean anything of this kind.' The time for flippancy is ended, and in proportion, as my respondent indulges in anything of that kind, he certainly will not elevate himself in the estimation of all those who are capable of proper thinking. We read further:

"Remember that the school is a certainty whether you help or do not help. The starting of the work does not depend upon your gift for God's hand is not short; he has Other servants that he can stir up to furnish the means needed to begin this work and we believe that he will do it. Your salvation may depend upon your gift but the school does not. If you have means in your hands and are a servant of God, it is God's money, and to be a faithful servant you must use it where you believe it will do the most toward building up the kingdom of God. Our school is located in one of the greatest missionary fields in the United States. There are but few loyal preach-

ers in the state and a very few loyal churches and so brethren of more favored conditions should bend their energies to help plant a permanent influence for the cause of God in this great North and West. We appeal to brethren to lay this work on their hearts and prove the sincerity of their love for Christ and his cause by helping to support it. It is not like supporting one meeting but it is planting a "colony," from which influences will be constantly radiating for God. It is an abiding work. There is no way of estimating what such a school will accomplish in ten years of work. I do believe that there is not work open to the disciples to-day so great and so lasting as the teaching of God's word to the young as they grow up into manhood and womanhood. In no way do I believe can we "go back to Jerusalem" so fast as to teach the Bible daily to the children in our schools, from the primary work up to graduation.

"Our faculty is made up of true men, faithful to the word of God; and all of them are experienced teachers and preachers and know this work well.'

"Notice he did not say, 'establish another permanent influence', and if he had said that he would have placed this institution on a par with the church concerning which Jesus Christ said, 'The gates of Hell shall not prevail against it,' and that would have been wrong. But he says a 'permanent influence,' implying thereby that there was not any permanent influence in the state.

"Notice that he didn't say it is 'another abiding work.' The church of the living God, I repeat, is left out entirely here, and here is something that is going to be 'a permanent influence' and 'an abiding work,' implying that there was not any permanent influence in this town, in the church that exists here, nor any permanent influence for God anywhere else in the State of Missouri. Didn't say 'another influence,' but a 'permanent influence.'

"And he ignores all that the family can do under God's direction. It ignores all that the church was doing and can do under God's direction. Here is the way, then, he is going to substitute something, or going to aid the divine arrangement by establishing 'a permanent influence', and he does not believe that in any way people can GO BACK TO JERUSALEM SO FAST as by teaching, in such a school as this, the word of God to the pupils. I submit whether I have or have not proven that this was intended to be AN INFLUENCE, and was intended to be a work SUPERIOR TO THE CHURCH of the living God in this town and every where else in this state.

"Now, here are not less than five prominent particulars in which he makes mention of this as a religious institution,—highly religious and it has a religious name in part. Religious institution. Calling on the brethren to aid it by their prayers and by their contributions and by the pupils they will send, because of these religious features! Now, prepare for the GREATEST ASTONISHMENT THAT YOU HAVE HAD YET. In the paper called Primitive Christianity, in the copy issued for Thursday, January 2, 1905, we have this from the same writer, Prof. J. N. Armstrong:

"As has been announced in these columns, some brethren will, the Lord willing, begin a school next September at Odessa, Mo., and in order that the work may be fully understood, I am pleased to set it before you in the true light.'

"I want first of all, to emphasize the fact that our work is a school and not a religious institution. It is neither more nor less a religious institution than every Christian's farm should be. It is simply a private school. It has no connection with the government, but is as private

as any Christian's farm or store, and sustains the very same relation to the church as the Christian's blacksmith-shop.'

"That is the kind of a school I object to, friends,—that is the kind of a school. My respondent challenged me on that point. I give him the documents. We have convicted him of **FOUR OTHER MISTAKES**, and now here we meet him on his challenge and lay this matter before him, and call your attention to its consideration. It has been necessary to listen to what he said on these previous occasions, and he has exposed himself to these exposures which we have just made, and we call upon you to consider and see whether he still denies that **THE PURPOSE** without which this school would not have existed was a **RELIGIOUS PURPOSE**, and then to explain to this audience why it should be declared that it is **NOT A RELIGIOUS INSTITUTION**. Now, I challenge him to do that. I call your attention to it, and wish you to watch, notice, and see what he does with reference to it. Bear in mind that if he will venture to repeat God's word in a ridiculing and burlesquing manner, in a sacrilegious manner, as he did this afternoon, we shall have a controversy which will perhaps be more serious than this between the moderators a while ago. I can't stand it,—he must not ridicule God's word in my presence. We leave this matter with you.

'I told you in my first speech that I don't like to debate, especially with one who professes to be a Christian. I told you that all Christians should be united, and when they are not united, but are like they are in this case, somebody is **CERTAINLY WRONG**, and on this occasion the difference or state of affairs is as widely separated from the peace and unity which the gospel of the Son of God requires that Christians shall be united in, as darkness is separated from light, as Tartarus is separated from Paradise, as Hell is separated from Heaven, and I challenge my respondent to show that I am responsible for this. **I CHARGE THAT HE AND HIS COLLEAGUES ARE RESPONSIBLE**, inasmuch as they have established this institution which the word of God does not mention or intimate in favor of."

B. F. RHODES' THIRD SPEECH.

"Mr. Chairman, Gentlemen Moderators, Ladies and Gentlemen: There are some things I want to notice, and for the present, for a few minutes, I shall defer considering the speech to which we have just listened, and go back just a little way in our investigation, to the speech this afternoon, and read from the third chapter of the First Epistle to the Corinthians; 2nd and 3rd verses: 'I have fed you with milk, and not with meat; for hitherto ye were not able to bear it, neither yet now are ye able.' 1st, 2nd and 3rd verses: 'And I, brethren, could not speak unto you as unto spiritual, but as unto carnal, even as unto babes in Christ. I have fed you with milk, and not with meat; for hitherto ye were not able to bear it, neither yet now are ye able. For ye are yet carnal: for whereas there is among you envying, and strife, and divisions, are ye not carnal, and walk as men?'

"Now, I submit a question,—Are all babes in Christ necessarily carnal?

"Next, I want to go to Colossians 2:10, 'And ye are complete in him',—'Ye are complete in him.' I believe that statement with all my heart, for we are complete in him. I believe we are complete in Christ before—I believe Christians are complete in Christ before they band themselves together to teach secular knowledge, and the fact that they band themselves together to teach secular knowledge does not add to their completeness in Christ. The fact that they, after having so banded themselves together, teach the Bible in those schools,

is not an addition to the completeness in Christ. A man would be complete in Christ, in the sense in which the apostle meant it, if he never saw inside of a school room of any kind, whether a secular or a sacred school room,—if we be permitted to use those terms.

"Now, then, we notice, Christians may band themselves together to teach secular knowledge. Admitted. Admitted that they may teach the Bible a part or all of the time in those schools. They may do this to make a living or as an act of charity. "When they have done this are they any more than complete in Christ? When they have done this with this purpose, are they any more than complete in Christ?"

"Now then, we want to notice what the apostle Paul says in the Philippian letter, 4th chapter and 8th verse: 'Finally, brethren, whatsoever things are true, whatsoever things are honest, whatsoever things are just, whatsoever things are pure, whatsoever things are lovely, whatsoever things are of good report; if there be any virtue, and if there be any praise, think on these things.'

"Isn't it pure to teach useful secular knowledge? Isn't it pure,— isn't it a matter of purity to teach the Bible a part of the time in connection with that secular knowledge? But it may be urged that Paul says, 'The things which ye have seen and heard,—those things which ye have both learned, and received, and heard, and seen in me, do; and the God of peace shall be with you.' Now then, on that text of scripture I proceed, I expect to base an argument. Now, so much has been admitted, but it is said that they may not establish,— that they may not build up a work in which to teach the Bible in connection therewith, and it was, in the first place, said that I had dodged the point. Now then, I want to submit to this audience to-night that if there has been any dodging it was not I. He said I dodged from establishing a school to do that, and then having a purpose not to do it. Now then, 'The things which ye have both learned, and received, and heard and seen in me, do; and the God of peace shall be with you.' I say on this I propose to base an argument.

"The apostle Paul did honorable, secular work, with the purpose and object of teaching the word of God, or of furthering the cause of Christ. Now, it may be said that this honorable, secular work in which the apostle Paul engaged was simply for the purpose of making a living, but I state to you tonight, I say that he did that work with a view of teaching righteousness, with that end in view, with that purpose in heart,—that he did that work for that purpose.

"Now then, I want to cite your attention to the 20th chapter of Acts and the 33rd to 35th verses. The 20th chapter of Acts, Paul's address to the church at Ephesus. After a long address, a part of which I shall read, we come now to the 33d verse and read to the 35th verse, inclusive: 'I have coveted no man's silver, or gold, or apparel. Yea, ye yourselves know that these hands have ministered unto my necessities, and to them that were with me.' You may think that clearly shows that I am wrong in my statement. Well, it might be so, were it not that the apostle goes on: 'I have showed you all things',—in all things I give you an example,—'how that so labouring ye ought to support the weak, and to remember the words of the Lord Jesus, how he said, It is more blessed to give than to receive.' Not only did Paul's work minister to his own necessities and the necessities of those with him, but it served as an example to them, how they ought to do. Give you an example that so laboring you ought to help the weak, and remember the words of the Lord how He said, it is more blessed to give than to receive. So there was an additional purpose, that he might by example teach good. How they should conduct themselves in their various avocations of life as Christians, and so he did that work that he might give them an

example to act as Christians. He established that work for that purpose, did it for that purpose. Now who is wrong?

"Again, I want to read from the 1st Corinthians, 9th chapter, to show you that the apostle Paul did not engage in the secular work in which he engaged, in order to make a living solely, 1st Corinthians, 9th chapter, and I read from the 9th to the 11th verses;—I have not time to read it all,—Paul is here in this chapter demanding his right as a minister of the word of God to be supported from among those with whom he labors, that is what he is doing. 'If others be partakers of this power over you, are not we rather? Nevertheless, we have not used this power; but suffer all things, lest we should hinder the gospel of Christ.'

"Paul made not only to them an example how they ought to act, ought to remember the words of the Lord Jesus Christ, but he also did it that he might cause no hindrance to the gospel of Christ, and here is a deliberate precept in refusing to demand the support, and entering into the work that he might not hinder the work of Christ. I say it is right and proper for a man to enter into any honorable business in which he may engage, and may establish that business, and he should have,—if he follows the example of Paul,—he should have THE PURPOSE in mind in establishing it, or entering into it, that he may cause no hindrance to the Gospel of Christ, that he may be an example, that he may teach God's word.

"Well, I am not surprised that my worthy respondent should be surprised in me, or even that he should be disappointed in me. I did not expect to please him,—I had no intention of pleasing him,—that is, I did not have any expectation of pleasing him. Of course, I want to please him if I can. Now then, friends, if I seemed to burlesque the scripture I assure you it was only a seeming, for there can be no sacrilege,—harsh words, too,—there can be no sacrilege, there can be no burlesque where the spirit of sacrilege and burlesque is absent from the heart, and as I know my heart I know there was no spirit, not even the intimation of any spirit of burlesque or ridicule for God's holy word. I know that is so. I was not surprised that my worthy respondent should make such charge, indeed, I should have been surprised and shall be surprised over and over again if we did not have more and more of such charges from the source. 'Belittle the sacred text' and so on. Now then, 'take out of his last speech what I have just, exposed and the dodge on the word "purpose" and there will not be anything left in it.' The 'dodge' on the word 'purpose' I have just attended to.

"Now, we come to a 'more permanent influence than the church of God.' Did you follow him very carefully? Did you follow him right carefully in that? Did you find it there and did you hear it? You did not,—you did not. It was not there,—it was not there. And I contend again that his inferences drawn from those statements are illogical and he should have known it. Now then, we will see again. Of course, I did not have the paper before me, but I jotted down a little and I remember some what is in it. 'On September, 1905, the Lord willing', etc 'The purpose of the school is to educate) to the highest,' etc. 'There are but few loyal preachers in the state and a very few loyal churches, and so brethren in more favored conditions should bend their energies to help plant a permanent influence for the cause of God in this great North and West.' Did you notice the inference? Because Brother Armstrong said they could plant 'a permanent influence,' it was inferred that there could not be a permanent influence. Because I say 'plant a permanent influence,' it is conclusive evidence in the mind of the writer that there is no permanent influence. Is that necessary? Could not there be two or three permanent influences? Such inferences are not necessary,—not

at all necessary inferences. But it was said that it implied that there was not "a permanent influence." I know that the author of this article had no such meaning, and it is only by drawing unnecessary inferences and conclusions from it that any such meaning can be ascribed to it. The inference is not there. It is far fetched. 'It is an abiding work,' and because it is said to be an abiding work it is concluded that the expression meant there could not be any other abiding work. Not at all. That equals this: Suppose a man should say 'this is a strongly built house.' 'This is a strongly built house,'—or 'Help us to build a strong substantial house,' and it would be concluded then that that meant there was not any strong, substantial houses in the whole town, but that was in purpose. The very same inferences, the very same logic,—if it be right to dignify it by the term logic at all,—would apply.

"Yes, of course, in that article it was stated that the only purpose in all of our hearts in establishing this work was to teach God's word, and I shall never have to go back on that statement, for that is absolutely the truth. That was the purpose, and as Brother Armstrong said, I should never have attempted the work, but I believed from the example of Paul, from the teaching of Holy Writ, that men may engage in honorable avocations in life, while their main vocation is being Christians. We have, indeed, a purpose in establishing that honorable vocation in life, that through it we may have opportunity for teaching God's holy word. I avow all about it, never will deny it.

"Of course, I was accused of misrepresentation. I didn't intend any misrepresentation,—I am sorry of that, and I am glad to have my attention called to it. 'Concerning the unscripturalness of establishing religio-secular schools with the Lord's money.' That is about the way this is stated. Frequently our worthy respondent in writing does not include all of that statement. He frequently speaks of them as religio-secular institutions, without any qualification about being established by the Lord's money, so if it be a sin in me to do so, what is it in him when he does that? But it reads 'concerning the unscripturalness of establishing religio-secular schools with the Lord's money.'

"He says that if Brother Armstrong,—coming back to this line of argument I just left,—this line of assumption I just left,—if Brother Armstrong in that article should have said 'another permanent work,' if he had he would have placed it on the oasis with the church. That is not necessarily so, either. There can be two things, as far as that is concerned, and still not be another permanent work, not be on the same basis. Another incorrect inference.

"Now then, 'It has been announced',—this is a statement from the Primitive Christianity of January 12, 1905,—'It has been announced in these columns that the school will begin next September. Our work is a school and not a religious institution.' Now, in the sense of being a church institution, in the sense of being, presuming to represent the church as such, or speak for the church as such, it is emphatically not, a religious institution; but that there is religion taught in it, that the Bible is taught in it, in that sense it is a religious institution, and in that sense only is it a religious institution. It is not a church school in the usual sense, as people understand church schools. It is in school, of course, in which all the teachers are Christians, or presumably so,—we are all striving to be, I am sure. And it is a private, personal enterprise in which we teach useful secular knowledge, and in connection therewith teach the word of God. That is what it is, and just as we began it as earnest Christians, or as earnest Christian brethren just beginning it. That we are not in this work for money, that we have as the highest ultimate object in our purpose the teaching of God's word, is true and we boldly avow

that purpose, and it belongs to that class,—it is a real manifestation of the high Christian sense of obligation to God to devote the life to him as a vocation, and to follow farming, merchandising and milling and such like honorable occupations, each to assist in making a living and afford opportunity for teaching God's word."

DANIEL SOMMER'S FOURTH SPEECH.

"Mr. Chairman, Gentlemen Moderators, Ladies and Gentlemen: I would rather have heard all of that song sung, that the audience was singing, than to go on with this debate, and that brings up again the difference between the unity of the spirit and the bond of peace, which the Lord Jesus Christ intended that his people should have, in which they should be bound together, in which they should grow up, and in which they should manifest before the world what may be called the standing miracle, for which the Saviour prayed in order that mankind might believe in him as the Son of God. And this shall be my course of thought, at least, in the beginning of this speech. It will be twenty years, ladies and gentlemen, this coming fall, since I first entered the state of Missouri for the purpose of preaching the gospel, for the purpose of helping to strengthen the things that remained after the ravages of the innovators, that had started with the religio-secular school, called Bethany College, which was started in the year 1840, and has given rise to about a score of other schools, with which originated and continued a defection known as the Christian Church. I say it was about twenty years ago, or will be this coming fall, since I came into the state of Missouri for the purpose of assisting the despised and rejected Churches of Christ to defend themselves against innovators, and from time to time, I have visited this state since then and continued the same work. And if my respondent, with his associates, had only come into this state as humble, devoted preachers of the gospel of Christ, binding themselves up, and down, and in, and under, to the divine testimony, they would have received a warm welcome by these churches, and they would have had my hearty co-operation in proclaiming the unsearchable riches, and in maintaining the truth as it is in Jesus. But instead of that they came into this state as a company of titled gentlemen, most of them at least. Some of them came loaded with titles, and I tell you what I mean by that. Those of you who are acquainted with college titles know that A. B. means Bachelor of Arts, but you have never been able to tell what that means, except that form of degree conferred by colleges; and when those who become worthy of such degree, in the estimation of the institution that confers it, and then will take another year, a post-graduate course, then they are designated A. M., and the A. M., covers the A. B., and until I looked in the year book of the Odessa institution, I think I never saw an instance of a man holding to the old title, which was covered by the new. 'A. B., A. M.' That is an evidence of a love for titles unbecoming in any Christian, man. And here is the impression of this institution, from the stand-point of these preachers, coming as titled gentlemen instead of humble Christians, and as a result division has been introduced in various places, in Kansas City, by reason of a college diverting from the living word of the living God and the truth that he authorized. The church there now, is rent in twain, and tears are being shed day and night, by reason of certain teaching of the school that is established here. That brings us to 1st Corinthians, third chapter, which was read by my respondent and commented upon, and the question was asked, 'Are all Christians who are babes necessarily carnal?' I answer him, 'That work division.' Those were the kinds of babes that the apostle Paul addressed. He said, 'Ye are yet carnal,'—'ye are babes,' he said,—'for whereas there is

among you envying, and strife, and divisions, are ye not carnal, and walk as men.'

"I make the charge that division is in the church of Christ here in Odessa, by reason of the wrong notions that have been advocated; here by these college gentlemen, and thus they show that they are the carnally minded babes that the apostle Paul referred to when he said to the Corinthian brethren what he did in the third chapter, third verse. That is not all. I call your attention again to Hebrews, fifth chapter, where we have this declaration;—Paul said to these brethren: 'For when for the time ye ought to be teachers, ye have need that one teach you again which be the first principles of the oracles of God; and,' he says, 'are become such as have need of milk, and not of strong meat. For everyone that useth milk is unskillful in the word of righteousness; for he is a babe.'

"If the maturest of these men, as Prof. Armstrong has been designated by one of the faculty, is but a babe, and unskillful in the word of righteousness, how can you have confidence in him as a competent teacher in the word of God? So you see, this institution originated with men, the maturest of whom declared in his letter that I read, that he is a babe in Christ, and as a babe is unskillful in the word of righteousness, and as a babe is working division here, and from these two principal points of view he shows himself to be the very kind of character that I had pointed out. I mention that only because of the fact that I am challenged to show wherein this institution is unscriptural, and it involves the character of the men who had started it, not personally nor morally, but from the view point of their religious position and the confessions which they make concerning themselves.

"Having disposed of that, we come back. It was stated that I had added, or I had left out, something in what I had quoted with reference to Prof. Armstrong's confession, and the declaration was made in the last speech of my respondent this afternoon, that I had, in a measure, misrepresented the statement. I read it to you in the letter dated January 3, 1907, and it was in the latter part of it even worse than I had designated, but since quoting the former part of that letter, it remains unnoticed by my respondent and consequently it is fastened upon him and upon his college friends here who are united with him in this institution.

"Now, in regard to the word 'purpose.' I said it was a dodge. My respondent said in reply if there was any dodge it was not 'I.' Well, I will give him the benefit of the English and call your attention to this, that he has passed from what I had stated in the plainest possible manner in regard to the PURPOSE with which this institution was established, to THE PURPOSE in teaching the Bible after it was established. And he said the Bible taught without any PURPOSE is very poor teaching, and I repeat that this was a dodge unworthy of one who occupies the position of a defender of the truth. That remains, and that continues, and that is fastened upon him in this debate.

"But that is not all. He said that there could not be any sacrilege when it was not in the heart. There can be sacrilege in FORM as well as in PURPOSE. I did not charge that he purposed to be sacrilegious, but I charge that his sacrilegious manner in repeating certain scripture was belittling that scripture and making light of those sacred things. What I stated remains unshattered and unshaken. It remains and will remain because there is no possibility of breaking the force of it.

"Nor is that all. We come now to notice what my respondent said with reference to the apostle Paul working, not simply for a living, but for the purpose of setting an example, and from that basis he argues that he and his associates have a right to work in this school, not sim-

ply to make a living, but for the purpose of setting an example. WHERE IS TUB NEED FOR THIS EXAMPLE? Paul had need for it, but WHERE IS THE NEED FOR IT HERE? Paul did work to support himself. He might have demanded a support. But he did work for various reasons, not simply the one that was mentioned, but I find by turning to 2d Corinthians, 11th chapter and 9th verse, and following—he says: 'When I was present with you, and wanted, I was chargeable to no man; for that which was lacking to me the brethren which came from Macedonia supplied; and in all things I have kept myself from being burdensome unto you, and so will I keep myself. As the truth of Christ is in me, no man shall stop me of this boasting in the regions of Achaia. Wherefore? Because I love you not? God knoweth. But what I do, that I will do, that I may cut off occasion from them which desire occasion; that wherein they glory, they may be found even as we. For such are false apostles, deceitful workers, transforming themselves into the apostles of Christ.' And the apostle Paul indicates that it was to stop the mouths of certain false teachers that he wrought with his own hands, and one or two other purposes that he mentions he had in mind when he wrote this. Are you aware that this is a change of base on the part of these college men?

"My opponent says, 'Paul worked with his hands to make a living and we have a right to do so. We teach the Bible in connection with our school teaching.' I don't know how many were with us, that are here, when this plea was first made, and I will now state to you it was somewhat against their interest. I could not get my respondent to take an affirmative position, but he forgot that in the first part of his last speech and he got into the affirmative, and was endeavoring to do some work in that line, which would have been very much to his credit if he had made an affirmation to this effect and taken that position in the first place, and not come before this audience as a negative to a negative, as an objector to objections. He should have come here AFFIRMING THAT THIS INSTITUTION IS SCRIPTURAL, and I would have said it is not, and we could have had a fair debate along the line of that which is honorable in Christians. BUT I COULD NOT SECURE SUCH AFFIRMATION. I had to come before you with the affirmation that this is UNSCRIPTURAL, and he, while endeavoring to show that my objections are not correct, drifted over on the affirmative and made what might be called an effort in that direction. This is a change of base.

"Finally, brethren, whatsoever things are true, whatsoever things are honest, whatsoever things are just, whatsoever things are pure, whatsoever things are lovely, whatsoever things are of good report; if there be any virtue, and if there be any praise, think on these things.' The apostle Paul said THINK on these things. My respondent says, is it not pure to teach secular knowledge? That depends on the secular knowledge, dear friends. It depends on how much ungodly fiction is recommended by the catalogue, and it depends on how much of a theatrical arrangement we are going to have in connection. I have here a handbill of a theatrical performance, in which we have Mr. Osgood as Uncle Reuben. That is the essential feature of it. That was performed here a few nights ago. I charged that—some time ago—the fiction that was recommended in this college prepares people for the theatre and theatricals, prepares them for the saloon, for the card table, for the dance hall, and for all the different phases of vice and immorality. And now here we have the theatrical performances, the essential features of a theatrical performance right here in this building. A certain man dressed himself up and appeared as Uncle Reuben. Fun and music along the line in connection with a Bible school! So whether it is pure to teach such doctrine or not depends on what is taught in connection with it.

"Just here I feel strongly tempted, to take Prof. Armstrong's first catalogue that he issued, and point out that it is a burlesque upon the correct use of English, from the standpoint of grammar and from the standpoint of rhetoric and the standpoint of logic, and a burlesque upon truth from the standpoint of the Bible, and if I did not have a hope of bringing this before you in the written form, by written discussion, which I am to have with him, I would enter upon it, but I shall read you one statement that is found on the 47th page of this first year book: 'We should be educated that we may be men and women and not mere animals.' Ladies and gentlemen, that is a reflection upon your father and mine, your mother and mine, upon all of our friends and relatives, and all the generations of men and women who have not been educated in any such sense as this document here recommends education. And what do we find? He says we should be educated 'that we may be men and women and not MERE ANIMALS.' That means that if we are not educated in a sense as he sets it forth in this year book, we are not; men and women,—we can't be 'men and women.'—but we are 'MERE ANIMALS.' I say that kind of teaching is NOT PURE; it is NOT WHOLESOME; it is NOT GODLY; it is NOT ELEVATING; it is NOT CORRECT. It is a burlesque upon TRUTH, as well as upon what you might call DECENCY.

"Now then, I turn a little further to look at these notes, and I find here a little that I have not fully exposed. My opponent illustrates in regard to this college by speaking on the question of 'permanent work.' I bring before you this language again and call your attention to it. As it is here stated it cannot mean anything more nor less than what I have stated, if language be taken at its proper value. Now, it is a question as to whether this is the inference,—not only the inference, but your unavoidable conclusion. First of all we find here that this is declared to be religious. This is THE PURPOSE,—this RELIGIOUS PURPOSE. 'Take from us this final purpose of the school and there remains no desire in my heart to start this school. Since this is the purpose for which the school is to exist, the Bible will be taught to every student daily,' and he proceeds and mentions the church. Now, if he had not mentioned the church, what Brother Rhodes says might have some necessity, but he mentions the church and he says, 'there are a very few faithful churches in this state,'—'loyal churches,'—and having made mention of these and the loyal preachers, he goes on then to say this: 'That brethren in more favored condition should bend their energies to help plant a permanent influence for the cause of God in this great north land west. We appeal to the brethren to lay this work on their hearts and prove the sincerity of their faith by helping to support it. It is not like supporting one meeting, but it is planting a colony from which influences will be constantly radiating for good. It is an abiding work.' Notice the two expressions,—'help plant a permanent influence for the cause of God;' 'it is an 'abiding work.' Now, with this much before you. I state that if the church had not been mentioned then there might be some plea of a reasonable kind in favor of what my respondent says, for he declares that the inference is not necessary and you might so conclude, but it stands in this position: As the churches were mentioned, and not the slightest intimation given that there was ANY PERMANENCE in their work, and the call was made to help to establish 'A PERMANENT INFLUENCE,' and the remark made that this is 'a permanent work.' you see very clearly it implies that the church is NOT A PERMANENT WORK, and that CAN'T BE BLOTTED OUT. Now, he illustrates by a building and asks: 'Suppose we should call somebody to help establish a strongly built building, would that imply there was not any other strong building?' Suppose that we should first make mention of all the buildings in this town and then say that, 'we appeal to you to help put up a

strong building,' would not that be a reflection on all the other buildings? If he did not make mention of the other buildings than the strong building it would not be. I believe the one who wrote that will be held accountable in the last great day for the reflection he made against the church, of which Jesus Christ said the gates of Hell or Hades shall not prevail against it.

"Notice how much of my former speech stands. Not a single position has been shattered nor even shaken, but everything remains just as I stated, and the little jostling that my respondent endeavored to give it has only made it stand out more emphatically, when we come to examine it.

"He said the only purpose in undertaking this work was to teach God's holy word. It was the purpose, and he says: He will never deny it. Did you notice that he never touched the question I asked him to explain? Why should this very emphatically religious institution be declared 'NOT A RELIGIOUS INSTITUTION?' I say he did not touch it,—he did make mention of it, and said it was not as a church institution. He did not add, not in connection with the church or as an addition to the church, or as under the supervision of the church, nor anything of that sort. But Prof. Armstrong said: 'We wish it distinctly and emphatically understood that our school is a WORK, and is NOT A RELIGIOUS INSTITUTION.' In a previous paper it was to be accepted by the brethren, to be upheld and advertised and patronized and prayed for because of its religious features, and then he says, 'IT IS NOT A RELIGIOUS INSTITUTION.' My respondent never will be able to extricate himself out of this difficulty and the result into which he has now been thrown, or thrown himself, by the unguarded statements which he made in order to make some kind of a showing, thus far, inasmuch as he was called upon to support it. I again submit that he has not said anything except as a misrepresentation or dodge, or in some way or other an evasion of the real point in controversy. I see that I have five minutes time yet, and I believe I will state before you again, and perhaps in a little different form what this debate is about.

"1st. This debate is about an institution known as Western Bible and Literary College or school, which has been established for the purpose of teaching persons in a certain religion,—not only in religion, but in a certain religion as its CHIEF PURPOSE, and to bestow pompous titles on its highest graduates.

"2d. This debate is concerning a school or college which declares itself to be NOT A RELIGIOUS INSTITUTION, though established to TEACH A CERTAIN RELIGION AS ITS CHIEF PURPOSE OR END.

"3d. This debate is about a school or college which pretends to be MORE OF A PERMANENT RELIGIOUS INSTITUTION than the church of God, and yet declares it is NOT A RELIGIOUS INSTITUTION.

"4th. This debate is concerning a school or college which pretends to excel the family and church in teaching religion and in leading people back to Jerusalem, and yet pretends it is NOT A RELIGIOUS INSTITUTION.

"5th. This debate is in regard to a school or college which indirectly threatens Christians with the loss of their souls if they do not give to its support, and yet pretends it is NOT A RELIGIOUS INSTITUTION.

"6th. This debate is in regard to a school or college which has in part a very religious name, 'Bible,' and yet pretends that it is NOT A RELIGIOUS INSTITUTION.

"7th. This debate is concerning a school or college which appeals to the church of Christ for money land pupils and patronage because of its religious features, and yet declares it is NOT A RELIGIOUS INSTITUTION.

"8th. This is a debate concerning a school or college which teaches that in every child there is an embryo God,—that is in the introduction of that year book,—and the college is set for the development of this embryo, and if this embryo is not developed by an education, human beings cannot be men and women, but are MERE ANIMALS.'

"9th. This is a debate in regard to a school or college which is presided over by a president who confesses that he is in his SPIRITUAL, BABYHOOD, and who shows that he loves pompous, worldly titles.

"10th. This debate is about a school or college which implies that inspired men WROTE FALSELY when they declared that the inspired scriptures perfect the man of God and completely furnish him every good work; that they WROTE FALSELY when they said that Christians are complete in him, who is the head of all principalities and power; and that they WROTE FALSELY when they said that God's divine power has given unto us all things that pertain to life and godliness. It is about an institution which implies that the inspired apostle WROTE FALSELY when he said that 'if any man speak let him speak as the oracles of God; if any man minister, let him do it as of the ability which God giveth; that God in all things may be glorified through Jesus Christ, our Lord; and that John WROTE FALSELY when he said that he that transgresseth and abideth not in the doctrine of Christ has not God, and if any man adds to the words of this prophecy God shall add unto him the plagues that are written in this book. ANY INSTITUTION THAT HAS ALL OF THESE IMPLICATIONS IN IT IS UNSCRIPTURAL. That is my proposition. I thank you for your courtesy."

B. F. RHODES' FOURTH REPLY.

"Gentlemen Moderators, Ladies and Gentlemen, Brethren in Christ:

I want to call your attention to the fact that the questions,—three questions,—submitted by me in my first response this afternoon yet remain unanswered. "

Mr. Sommer:—"I rise to a point of order. I answered those questions. "

Mr. Rhodes:—"All right. Certainly Brother Sommer answered those questions in a way. Certainly that is so. I didn't mean to charge that he had not noticed them, don't understand me that way. I did not expect for him to understand me that way. But so far as any real definite answer, one has not yet been heard. The questions are, 'What do you mean by the term religio-secular,' and he never has done anything more than give a general definition of the term. Now, I don't put so much stress on that as on the next question. 'What feature or features are necessarily present in a school or its management to make it a religio-secular school?' What feature or features are necessarily present in a school or its management to make it a religio-secular school,—does it consist in the fact that it teaches religion and secular things? Is that it? I presume he would say, no. Does it consist in the fact that money is given to aid other Christians in establishing such a school? Does it consist in the fact that it has,—as he puts it that way,—a sacred name? In what particulars, I want to know, makes it a religio-secular school, and I insist on a definite and specific answer to these points. Be specific. What are the essential features that make it a religio-secular school?

"And third, if a Christian parent, having a child that had finished the local school, should ask you 'Where shall I send my child to school,' what would be your answer? And you remember that that

answer was, 'This is the victory that overcometh the world, even our faith.' Send him to a school in a town or place where there is a good Church of Christ. "

Mr. Summer:—"I rise to a point of order. I stated this: I would say send him to a FIRST-CLASS school. That was omitted before, it is omitted again. I wish that to be included. You accept the correction?"

Mr. Rhodes:—"Yes sir, and meant no misrepresentation whatever. 'Where there is a first-class school in a town where there is a Church of Christ.' Little things may be lost out or put in with no intention of misrepresenting at all, and no one knows it better than my worthy respondent. Now, I call you to witness tonight, before we go on, that that place, that town, has not been mentioned, and that school has not been named,—has not been named. Let him name the place, let him name the town, and name the school and we will consider it. Now, you will bear witness he has not done so.

"Bethany College,—charge of being cause of innovation. I presume my worthy respondent will make a stronger argument on that point perhaps later in the discussion than for the present, as it was just an allusion at this time.

"And for the benefit of my worthy respondent in the matter of what he calls 'pompous' titles and a man wearing, in a college catalogue, the title A. B. and the title A. M. following it, you recall he had never so seen, and, he suggests that he has not seen it, except in this one instance in the year book of the Western Bible 'and Literary College. Now, I suggest that he has not possibly looked in very many of the modern catalogues. I know whereof I speak when I say that that is the custom in the university of the state of Kansas, I know that it is the custom, and have seen it in the catalogues of many other first-class schools, I presume. Enough for that. There is no value to that one way or another. It does not affect the righteousness of what we are contending for, I call you to witness to that fact. Suppose it be an exhibition on the part of Prof. Armstrong of a love for pompous titles, and an ungodly love of pompous titles,—suppose it be that,—still it does not affect the principle of Christians banding themselves together with the purpose to teach secular knowledge, and with a purpose to teach the Bible in those schools that they establish. That is the principle. The fact that a man wears one title, or two titles, or no title, does not affect that principle.

"Let us go back to Corinthians, third chapter and from the first to third verses. Well, I thought that I could bring my respondent out on that, and you notice he made a statement this time that he did not make before,—that babes in Christ were not necessarily carnal, but it was only when they were in a divided state. When there was envying or division, when there was strife and contention. So that it is not necessarily true that a babe in Christ is a carnal being. I am glad he made the correction. Now then, I was reminded that I had paid no attention whatever to that statement quoted from Prof. Armstrong's letter, in which he stood as a self-confessed babe in Christ,—that is, in the last speech I made in response. You know I had said it was a comparative sense, that he was a babe in Christ in comparison with men like Brother Sommer and others like him, who had been preaching the gospel for a term of years equal in length to the natural life of Prof. Armstrong, and he said that Prof. Armstrong's letter showed that that was not so, and he read on,—'as a babe in Christ I entreat you as a father in Israel.' Now then, was not the comparison there? 'As a babe in Christ I entreat you as a father in Israel.' There is a comparison. 'A babe in Christ' in comparison with you as a 'father in Israel,' and my statement stands and will stand. I intended to notice that the other time,—I had it in my notes,—but some way I overlooked

it, but as my respondent expects to have that debate with Brother Armstrong, why does he lug in all these things in this debate with me?

"I admit there might be sacrilege in form, but a sacrilege in form hardly deserves the awful condemnation with which I was consigned tonight.

. "He comes now to notice what Paul said. Well, how does it affect my argument to show that Paul had still further purposes, or still additional purposes? How do they affect my argument? He might have had a dozen purposes. I said he did not work solely for a living, I supposed, and he presented one or two things for which he had labored, and he seemed to think that some answer to that,—to show that he worked for two or three other things. What kind of an answer is that? I say Paul entered into that work to help in various ways in the Christ life. He had that pin-pose in view. And Paul's example of engaging in work with his hands, while he at the same time engaged in that work in order that he might have a Christian influence, in order that he might have a religious influence, in order that he might get hold of the hearts of the people, that he might impress divine truth, is an example for us as an honorable, honest, secular avocation, and we have entered into such a one.

"My opponent said: 'Would not affirm.' Now, I submitted to you several times that we could not settle this question about who would affirm and who would not, unless we should take the time to read over the whole mass of correspondence that has been passing between Prof. Armstrong and Brother Sommer for the last few months. You know we can't do that, and Brother Sommer knows we can't do it, and so it suits his purpose to say 'would not affirm,—would not,—would not,—would not.' But he may repeat it until the debate closes and repetition don't prove it,—don't prove it.

"Is it true that it is pure to teach secular knowledge? My opponent says: 'That depends on the kind of secular knowledge.' He may not have gotten it in his notes, but didn't I say 'useful secular knowledge?' At least, I know I intended that,—that was in my mind. I think I said it. I know that I say it now,—'useful secular knowledge.' Secular knowledge that is useful to men, and just so much as is useful to them. Then he says,—then he comes with his charge of teaching demoralizing and debasing fiction. Well, I very cheerfully admit that there is outlined in our English course a course of reading in the English classics, and some of them are fiction. But don't you think that bears directly upon the question, 'Where can a Christian send his child to school?' Find me the first-class school in the whole broad domain of the United States that does not include in its English course a course of parallel reading, and some of that reading is fiction. Where is it? It can't be found, and my worthy respondent knows that it can't. Is it worse for us to teach the classics of the English literature, to have those classics of English literature read in class where they are presided over by a teacher who reveres and respects God's word, and loves his word, or to have it read and studied by a teacher who has perhaps no reverence nor respect either for God or His word? He stands committed to schools, too. Let him name his school where to send their child. Let him do it. That is not all. Now, I know it must come as a surprise to you after the tirade we have had about fiction, in the last few months in the writings of my worthy respondent,—and after that awful denunciation of the demoralizing and corrupt influence of fiction in his Hast speech, after that I know it must come to you as a surprise to be informed that for four months he kept in his columns regularly set up an advertisement in which a clubbing offer,—in which there was an offer in connection with three new subscribers to the Octographic Review, a fiction as a premium. I am prepared to show it. Four months that stood. Listen now,—I read now

from the 6th page of the Octographic Review, number of August 13, 1901: 'We will send the Review to two new subscribers for a year and will send a copy of our American Pure Food Cook Book or,—a copy of Hydrophobia and its Cure,—a copy of Rachel Reasoner, is that it? A copy of Life and Sketch of Benjamin Franklin, is that it? No 'We will send to you as a premium, or for the two new subscribers and to the sender a copy of our American Pure Food Cook Book or a copy,"—whisper it not in Gath,—publish it not in the streets of Askelon, lest the daughter of the Philistines be provoked to scorn,—'or a copy of Uncle Tom's Cabin.' And that stood four months in his columns in a clubbing offer with the Octographic Review. He that lives in glass houses should not throw stones. Happy is he that does not condemn himself in that which he allows. 'Fiction fits men for the theater, dance halls, etc.' 'Fiction fits men for the theater, dance hall, etc.,' and here we have in conjunction, or in combination with the securing of two subscribers to the Review, to the sender of those subscriptions with a certain sum of money, will receive, in addition to the paper, a copy of Uncle Tom's Cabin, purely a work of fiction and which we have here denounced as fitting men for the dance hall and theater. Now, I submit that the literature in our classics, in our English course, is classic literature of the very highest kind of literature of its class, and superior to,—as far as literary and artistic standpoint is concerned, the literary critics being the judges,—to the work of Uncle Tom's Cabin.

"'Take from us this final purpose and we should not enter into the work.' Certainly. He does not need to read that any more. I have avowed that principle in almost every speech that I have made.

"And then with reference to the Primitive Christianity. I can not at present quote it exactly,—'He mentions the churches and the fact that he mentions the churches proves that he does mean to ignore the churches.' The fact that he mentions the churches is proof that he means to ignore the churches, that is strange indeed. If he had not mentioned the church, then perhaps my respondent would have understood, but since he did mention the church at the same time that proves he meant to ignore the church. I say it is a strange kind of logic, and you folks know it is. 'By mentioning the church proves that he means to ignore them.' 'Strong building,'—again, it is not a necessary inference. Even if he mentioned other buildings in town and then appealed for men to help build a strong building, it would not prove that other buildings were not strong. It is not a necessary inference and you can't be made to believe it was a necessary inference. It is not hard to understand, is it? I say that he has wrested the meaning of those sentences,—the meaning of those words, and has put upon them a forced and unnecessary construction, and has drawn from them conclusions that are not at all warranted by any process of logic or reason. It reveals the fact that he stated in the opening of this discussion, that he is here to criticize,—here to criticize me.

"'In no way do I believe we can go back to Jerusalem so fast as to teach the Bible in our schools from the primary work up to graduation.' I have read it, and I have no purpose whatever in ignoring that. I had no fear of reading that, none whatever. Of course, that is written by Prof. Armstrong and he might be called upon to explain his own language, but I am not averse to considering it and to defending it from unnecessary and unjustifiable attack. 'In no way do I believe we can go back to Jerusalem so fast as to teach the Bible in our schools from the primary work up to graduation.' Does that ignore the work of the family or the work of the church? If Christian men, as Christians, as disciples of Christ,—if they, with a view to their responsibility to God to be teachers of His word,—if they have then this obligation resting heavily upon their hearts,—see in the school room an opportunity to

teach God's word and to impress young, plastic minds with the divine truth of Almighty God, and go as Christian men under the headship of the Lord Jesus Christ and responsible to him, and to him only through the church, may those teach God's word? Who shall say them, nay? I say to you that when I teach the word of God, whether it be in the school, whether it be from this rostrum, whether it be under the spreading branches of the trees, whether it be in the waste places, wherever and whenever I lift my voice to teach God's word, I do it as a Christian,—simply as a Christian and I am responsible to no one but Christ and the elders of the church where I have my local membership, so far as I know. Who shall say me nay?

"Then followed a long statement of what this debate is about, a number of which I obtained, but which came so fast that I could not get them all down in the confusion, and I am not sure about them, and I will give all of them full benefit. 'This debate is about the Western Bible and Literary College, which has been established to teach religion and bestow pompous titles on its highest graduates.' There was not a word about pompous titles. Those titles mean only to convey in a short and concise way to the mind of the reader, that the person who has the title has finished a certain line of work in some school. That is all it means. That is all it means,—that is all. And I know that my worthy respondent would have hard work making the people around here, who know Prof. Armstrong, whom he has singled out especially,—making them think that they love pompous titles and that they are pompous men.—and that they are pompous men."

Mr. Roberts:—"I rise to a point of order, so much time is spent in casting reflections upon Brother Sommer for referring to Prof. Armstrong. It is impossible to take up the body without discussing the head of the body. He is president of the body, it would be impossible to discuss the body without referring to him. It is not meant personally nor for reflection."

Mr. Rhodes:—"I was not aware that he was criticised on that point just at present. It seems to me that the point of order was not necessary, but then I don't care for that. Now then, I had a right, since he had talked about pompous titles and Prof. Armstrong, to speak about Prof. Armstrong and to make that appeal to those who know him. I was not talking at this time,—when I was interrupted I was not talking about the way Brother Sommer was conducting the debate with me and conducting it when he gets into the debate, with Brother Armstrong. I did not discuss it with him, I was not talking on that subject at all, and the interruption was uncalled for.

"This debate is concerning a school which pretends to excel the family and church in teaching religion, and in leading people back to Jerusalem, and yet pretends it is not a religious institution.' 'This discussion is against such a school, and so on, and a Bible name.'

"Well, he has only just indicated his objection to a Bible name, and I shall let that go until later, and I presume I shall get him to state his objection and criticism to the Bible name.

"A school that appeals for money and the prayers of Christians.' Well, now then, if it be admitted that Christians may establish a school, then what one Christian may do he may rightfully offer to another Christian a chance to help him do. We compel nobody,—none whatever. I have a good deal to say on the money question when the fight comes on that question. I have something to say on that line myself. I drop this remark, that the objection to the money and appealing to the Christians for money, consists in the direction in which that money goes and the one who handles it, rather than any other principle. I offer that as a suggestion and we will see if the facts do not bear me out when this discussion closes. And the 'embryo' point, I will let him, if he has a charge to make on that, I will let him bring it out before I mention it.

"His self-confessed babyhood,' as I have said it is self-confessed comparatively speaking. 'I as a babe in Christ entreat you as a father in Israel,' And surely a man who has not lived longer than another man has been proclaiming the word, may fittingly address the other man as a father in Israel, and in comparison name himself as a babe in Christ. If not, why not?"

Thereupon, further discussion was postponed until Tuesday, the 19th clay of February, 1907, at 10:00 o'clock a. m.

On Tuesday, the 19th clay of February, 1907, at 10:00 o'clock a. m., the discussion was resumed at the same place.

DANIEL SOMMER'S FIFTH SPEECH.

"Mr. Chairman, Gentlemen Moderators, Ladies and Gentlemen:

I don't feel very much like debating this morning. I didn't sleep very well last night. "Very naturally my mind drifted over the work of yesterday, and, by the blind laws of association, my thoughts drifted over a race that I saw several years ago in Kansas between a stag hound and a Jack rabbit. It was a splendid lace, and the hound had to run that rabbit some three or four miles, I judge, before he got him. The rabbit was a splendid runner and a splendid dodger, but finally he was taken in. And that race came up before me and occupied me for a good while. Then after a while I heard some cats around the house making a noise, and my mind, by the blind laws of association, went over into what Mark Twain says about cats making a noise. He says some people think that the annoyance is by reason of the noise, but he says it is not,—it is the bad grammar that they use. And I thought about cats using grammar and sleep was disturbed.

"But the time has come for me to address you, to talk to you about the questions that pertain to the controversy that is now before you. I believe that first of all I shall give attention to the last speech of my respondent.

"He began that speech by saying that his questions remained unanswered. He wanted to know what religio-secular means, and how much should be religious and how much should be secular, definitely, in order to determine what is religio-secular. Specially anxious about the second question. I did answer them in a general way, but that didn't seem to be satisfactory, and he wants the specific features that are essential. But I stated to you, on a former occasion, that I am bound down to the questions in hand, and when I began to use the expression religio-secular I shall now say I had before my mind an institution of learning that was three-fourths secular and about one-fourth religious, and I shall give that as a definite definition. If he does not know what that means, why let him confess his ignorance before this audience, and let him be estimated accordingly. If that is not sufficient I shall let him consider an institution that is three-fourths secular and one-fourth religious, and that one part of the time holds up its religious features as a BAIT for the educational features, and another part of the time holds up its educational features as a BAIT for its religious features. Let him consider that kind of an institution, then he will know what I mean by religio-secular. I MEAN JUST THE KIND OF INSTITUTION THAT IS HERE. An EDUCATIONAL TRAP with a RELIGIOUS BAIT for one class, and a RELIGIOUS TRAP with an EDUCATIONAL BAIT for another. THAT IS WHAT I MEAN. If he wishes me to be more definite, perhaps I can enlarge upon the peculiarities of this institution. While I have that in hand, I shall say, also an institution which has a theatrical performance, and has a man who calls himself Mr. Osgood, presenting himself as Uncle Reuben in a ridiculous manner, and I understand when he was asked who he was any way, he said, 'I am Jack Armstrong.' That kind of fun, and frolic, and

nonsense here. If he wishes me to be more definite, I can go over this list of lectures here, and tell about the lectures by sectarian teachers that are advocating doctrines the whole tendency of which, in many instances, is to modify the distinction between sectarians and friends of the church of the living God, by telling them that they differ religiously because of their temperaments, rather than because of their repentance, creeds or confession of faith.

"He says the town has not yet been mentioned in which there is this 'first-class school and church of Christ.' I am here contending for the truth, and he who will cross-question a truthful witness, will Always bring out the case more emphatically against himself. There is a Church of Christ in Kansas City, and a good one, except as the doctrine of no extending of the right hand of fellowship, advocated by this institution, has made it a divided and weeping church. That is the kind of church there in, other respects. It is a good church, and you can go to Kansas City and go to any kind of school you see fit, and the church will teach the faith that overcometh the world that may be in the school. Go to St. Louis, and you will find a Church of Christ there, and plenty of schools, and probably the very best kind. Come to Indianapolis. You will see a church that has been perfectly peaceful and united for ten years, in which the unity of Spirit in the bond of peace has been manifesting itself most gloriously. There we have any kind of school you wish. Then go to Bloomington, Indiana, where the Church of Christ is, and there is the State University established,—a first-class institution and where persons don't have to take two and a half years in the school in order to get credit for one year in some school that is in good standing before the state. If he needs any more,—wishes me to give names of any more,—I can very easily do it.

"He says, 'I suggest,' referring to me, 'that he has not looked into many of the modern catalogues, or else he would have seen that A. B. and A. M. are united.' What of it? Suppose I had not, or suppose I had. I made the statement correctly, that as far as I had seen. But suppose that worldly institutions will load men with pompous titles, and have tacked two, three, four or five titles, or spread those degrees after a man's name, what does it mean except a love of pompous titles, which are so absurd that even the dictionary can't express them with any degree of satisfaction to the reader. What does Bachelor of Arts mean? What does Master of Arts mean? How many arts are included in this? He says if it shows a love of pompous titles in Prof. Armstrong it 'does not affect the principle.' But Prof. Armstrong is the head of this institution, and he is the lover of pompous titles. On the other hand he shows that he is not a child of God, because pride and the love of the Son of God can't exist in the same individual at the same time. Pride is always used in a bad sense in the Bible, and it is of the Devil and surely not proper. If people have that in their hearts they are not children of God. Doesn't the head of a body affect THE PRINCIPLE that there is in the body? The head is the RULING ELEMENT, and if the head is wrong, WHAT ABOUT THE BODY?

"My opponent says of me: 'He referred again to 1st Corinthians, 3d chapter, 1st to 3d verses. He made a statement this time that he did not make before, and said that the word carnal was applicable; when there were divisions.' Yes, I did not need to go any further, because the division exists right here. It exists in a general way by reason of this institution. Divisions that never would have been thought of if it had not been for this institution, (advocated as a religious establishment; and the brotherhood was worked for support by the plea of the religious features here, and then when the attack was made upon it from that viewpoint, what was the result? Then the declaration was made, 'We wish it distinctly understood,' said the president Of this college, 'that our school is a work and not a religious institu-

tion.' I OBJECT TO THIS INSTITUTION THEN, BECAUSE IT DOES NOT TELL THE TRUTH ABOUT ITSELF. I didn't need to go any further. General division, and here is local division. Local division by reason of this institution. The facts CAN'T POSSIBLY, BE BLOTTED OUT, so I did not need to go any further. I confined myself to the case in hand.

"He said I spoke of 'demoralizing and debasing fiction,' and then he said, 'But don't you think that bears directly upon the question, 'Where shall a Christian send his child to school?' Then he added, Is it worse for us to teach the classics than to have them read and taught in schools where the teachers are of the ungodly kind?' I say YES, and I now tell you WHY. If an ungodly man teaches my child to read a novel I can say that THE TEACHER IS AN UNGODLY MAN, and I can oppose it because of his UNGODLINESS. But if a man, who has a reputation for RELIGIOUS STANDING, and as a CHRISTIAN GENTLEMAN, teaches my child to read a novel, he will very likely impose upon that child the idea that this novel is healthful and must be or else this Christian gentleman WOULD NOT ADVOCATE IT, and that man arrays that child against me, because of the confidence that the child has in him. So it is WORSE for this school to recommend novels than for any ungodly school to recommend them. Is it not worse for a nice ungodly person to advise your child to dance than it is for a blasphemer to advise your child to dance? You say yes, of course. Then is it not worse, for a church member to advise a child to dance than for an ungodly person to advise it? In the one case you can fight the dance because of the BAD character of the individual that advises it, and in the other case you are led to think that you can't oppose the dance because GOOD CHARACTER of the individual that advocated it, or you must oppose that individual. I heard a young man say some years ago, that he was raised in a Christian home, and he went off to some institution of learning where nice, and polite, and elegant, and polished, people, that were church members, advised the playing of cards, and had social games, and he was 'led to consider that possibly his parents had made a mistake. That is where the iniquity of it comes in. It is where men, who have reputation for piety, for learning, will ADVOCATE THAT WHICH IS WRONG.

"Now we come to something right highly interesting. If there was anything that had even a temporary effect in my respondent's speech, it was this: He said, after all the tirade we have heard about fiction, he said for four months a work of fiction was offered as a premium in the Octographic Review. And I was highly interested in my respondent's performance. He went up and he went back. He said, 'Tell it not in Gath, publish it not in the streets of Askelon.' He became oratorical. In thinking over it I thought of an incident that occurred where a murder had been committed, and where they killed the murderer by what I believe they called 'electrocution.' But a man who was not aware of that, said, 'What will they do with this fellow? They will hang him, I guess, won't they?' 'No', said another man, 'we don't hang them here, we kill them with elocution.' From the exhibition that ray respondent made, when he came to finish, I thought that he was trying to kill this audience, or to kill me off with 'elocution.' What do you suppose he found? He found Uncle Tom's Cabin advertised. Because Uncle Tom's Cabin was advertised for several weeks, or months, in the Octographic Review, why, I have been engaged in the same kind of business,—advertising fiction,—recommending fiction. Well, let us see what there was in that. I knew before I came here that the chief argument on the side of these institutions is that 'Sommer, who is chief in attacking them, is an inconsistent man.' Let us try that logic. 'Sommer is an inconsistent man, therefore, the Western Bible and Literary College is

right.' One premise logic, ladies and gentlemen, and is that the kind of reasoning that is done here? 'Daniel Sommer is an inconsistent man, therefore, the Western Bible and Literary College is right.' 'You're another!' One premise logic! Now, young ladies and young gentlemen, if that is the kind of teaching that is palmed off on you, I shall just simply say to you this: If you adopt it through life you will be ashamed of yourself every time you adopt it. But that is the kind of instruction we have on the platform, and the kind of argument that is opened up to the defense of this institution. Let us look again. Uncle Tom's Cabin, written by Harriet Beecher Stowe,—a majority of you have read it. You are aware, I suppose, that that work had more to do than, perhaps, all other publications combined, in liberating four millions of slaves in the United States, and my respondent is not the man to say that it is UNTRUE, TO THE FACTS IN ANY PARTICULAR. I lived in the South, I was acquainted with the negroes in the slave days, and when reading that book, I saw not only that it was NOT UNTRUE, but I said the case CAN NOT BE OVERDRAWN. Now, that was recommended,—offered in the Review for a period of months, I suppose,—for weeks, if not for months, before I noticed it. I was away from home. There is a lady there in Indianapolis who presides over the Review office, and has for nearly twenty years, and she esteemed that book so highly that she put it in connection with the White House Cook Book, and when I saw it I protested against it, and told her she ought to leave it out, and in the course of time it went out, and it was not a permanent thing. When I saw it, I called attention to it and IT WAS DISCARDED. Now friends, are you going to compare that with the works of William Shakespeare, who, according to his history, was a licentious wretch, whose plays prepare people for the theater? These other works are not any comparison. But while I have that in hand, I mention that when I bought the American Christian Review it was loaded, with worldly advertising. I could have had a thousand dollars, may be fifteen hundred dollars, a year, just by saying the word that I would continue those advertisements. I continued them, only about three months. Just as rapidly as I could fulfill contracts that had been made before I bought the paper, I ruled them out. I refused a score, or fifty, applications for advertisements in the course of these three months, but ruled them out at a loss of a thousand to fifteen hundred dollars a year, and in twenty years you see that would mean some twenty to thirty thousand dollars that I discarded because I would not be engaged in teaching the Lord's truth on one page and advertising the Devil's arrangements on the other, as we find done by those who have in connection with their school a theatrical performance like this which is here advertised.

"Now then, I call your attention, again to this,—I make mention of this: I noticed this morning those large volumes there, and I find out that my respondent has in bound form, and in good condition, six years of the Octographic Review, 1900, 1901, 1902, 1903, 1904, 1905, and thus I say to you that he and his colleagues will continue inexcusable for misrepresenting me with reference to the college matter. They have my writings, yet they have misrepresented me almost continually. I give you this while I have it in hand,—from my respondent himself,—in the journal called Christian Helper, of February 6, 1907. He says, 'These attacks seem to culminate in a series of articles by Brother Sommer in his paper. A series commenced last summer, in which we are freely charged with being innovators and moral cowards.' I did charge him with being an innovator, or engaged in this innovation. I now ask him to find the expression "'moral cowards.' It may be there, but I have been unable to find it.

Let him find it,—let him find it. He should have given the paper in which it is found,—the number in which it is found.

"And he made capital out of saying that he that lives in glass houses should not throw stones, and that happy is he that condemns not himself in that which he allows. But who is it that lives in the glass house, in view of this condition of things which I have just brought before you? He says this is a private personal enterprise. It is very personal and very private, indeed, when they get the money in their own pocket. Otherwise it is something to be recommended because of its religious features, and calling for the prayers and patronage and for the money of the brotherhood, and when they get it, then, it becomes a PRIVATE PERSONAL ENTERPRISE and it is NOT RELIGIOUS. Now let me tell you more about this, and there are witnesses here from Kansas City who will testify that it is so. A certain young lady last year, who wished to come back,—an orphan girl,—and when she made application to come back she was informed that it would cost her \$120. She would have to pay \$60 in advance, or \$60 down, and there are witnesses who will testify with reference to that, and furthermore, that when she could not raise the money she could not come, and one of the deacons of the church in Kansas City, offered her a home, and offered to furnish her with what he could furnish and some money needed for tuition to let her go to school in Kansas City. There is the arrangement, after begging the brotherhood and receiving contributions to establish this school. VERY PERSONAL, indeed!

"My respondent, I again say, is inexcusable for misrepresenting me in view of all the information he has had before him. More than that, he says it is NOT A RELIGIOUS SCHOOL. That is in so many words. My respondent said, in explanation, that it was 'not a church-school.' I don't know whether it is a church school, or a school-church, because a church has been established,—as an assembly, as the meaning of the word church,—right here in this house, right here in this room, and the brotherhood in this community can tell you whether it has been done with the full consent of the congregation, that has existed here for years, or not, and whether there is not division as a result of this church-school or school-church. What is it? I am not particular about the definition, but its leaders make appeals to the church for money, and they appeal to the church for patronage, and appeal to the church for prayer, and appeal to the church for preachers, and yet it is NOT A RELIGIOUS INSTITUTION, though it appeals in all those respects because of its religious features, then advertises itself in another column and says, 'Our school is a work and NOT A RELIGIOUS INSTITUTION.' I had given you various reasons,—a half dozen of them or more,—for exposing this institution as not being scriptural, and I now state that here is another. Just in proportion as an institution of this kind is contended for, when it is not mentioned or intimated in favor of in the sacred text, just in the same proportion these gentlemen are INCAPABLE of condemning the missionary society, the mite society, the ladies' aid society, or any other human organization. On the same reasoning any sectarian establishment, from Roman Catholicism down to the Salvation Army, can be defended by the same reasoning that is adopted here. Some years ago, a Christian Church preacher said to a man of a certain religious denomination, 'Where do you get your authority for infant baptism?' He said, 'Must where you get your authority for your Endeavor Society,' and thus slapped him in the mouth. And so if the people of the community become aware of the situation, and these gentlemen say, 'Where do you get your authority for the missionary society, or your organization of any kind of re-

ligious character,' they can say, 'JUST WHERE YOU GET YOUR AUTHORITY for the Western Bible and Literary College,' AND THEIR MOUTH IS STOPPED. "

B. F. RHODES' FIFTH REPLY.

"Mr. Chairman, Gentlemen Moderators, Ladies and Gentlemen: In appearing before you again this morning, and in contrast with my aged respondent,—I don't mean the term in the sense of infirmity, you are well aware he is not that, but aged in contrast with me,— I slept fairly well last night, and an uneasy conscience makes light slumber.

"I have something to say on the missionary society question, since he introduced it, but I am not going to take that up just now. I will take care of the consequences, and I am not afraid of any arguments that missionary societies will bring against me., and I will take care of all the consequences. I am not debating the missionary society question, but I wish to make some further reference to this later.

"And so we are told of a young lady in Kansas City, an orphan girl, who was so unfeelingly thrust out. It could have been wished that our worthy respondent had been more familiar with the facts before he made such a charge. He would have saved himself, at least he would have credit. I want to say that I respect and revere that young lady, and I am glad that she respects and loves and has a warm affection for all her teachers here. I am glad that she wanted to come back,—I am glad of that. It is true she made application for work to pay her way,—that is true. She made application for work to pay her way this year, but when her application was received, all the places were filled. We constantly have far-more applications for work than we can possibly fill. Now, what are the facts? Last year that young lady came here by the grace of this faculty, by the favor of these who are condemned so rigorously this morning, and that young lady has never charged us with baseness or ingratitude or heartlessness or hardness because she could not come this year. I know that I can speak for her, for I know her heart. She came here last "year, and with her own simple promise to pay when she could, we accepted it and we should have been glad to have done the same thing this year, had we seen our way clear to do so. Not only is it true in that lady's case, but it is true in many more cases of exactly similar nature. Young men and young women are in this school and were last year, who have not paid us a single cent, neither for board nor tuition. And this charge comes with a very unseemly grace. It shows that one who made it knew nothing of the facts or he would have mentioned these things. I don't mention them to exalt ourselves and our self-denial in this matter, but I notice these things because they have been unhandsomely injected into this discussion.

"My opponent says, 'Personal, private enterprise when they get the money in their own pockets.' We will have something to say on that line, too.

"I am going now, to take up a different line. You notice to those questions we did get an answer to where to send to school. Kansas City, Bloomington, Indiana; Indianapolis, Indiana, and St. Louis, Missouri, I believe, were the places named, and he has not mentioned a school. He says there are plenty of schools in those places. Of course there are, but he has not singled out one, and he has not shown us the catalogue, and we were offenders because there are some portions of the dramatic writings of Shakespeare taught in the literature course of the English course, for study in this school. But every one of those institutions leach the same thing,—every one of them, some of them far more than we do. And he could not have named

a school that does not. He can't do it. I will have something more to say along that line by and by. I believe I will take it up just now. I want to show you the gentleman's attitude toward schools. Of course, he does not like for me to refer to these volumes,—I don't blame him. He knows that they are loaded. Now, before I pass over any further, I want to mention that fiction, and when it is all explained and all summed up and everything said that could be said, it was a novel and was recommended and was used for clubbing purposes in the columns of the Review in case a person would get two subscribers. And that fact remains and it is fiction and he acknowledged it as such, and it stood there for months, and he says he supposed that is so. I know it is so. I say that the works which, we teach-in this school as literary classics, are no more ungodly than that. There is nothing ungodly in the teaching of the class room. There may be in some of Shakespeare's writings, but as the gentlemen well knows in the edition for schools all those are expurgated,—in the edition prepared for schools. But finally we get that the reason it appeared in there he was away from home and there was a lady presiding over the office and he did not say so, but he left it to be inferred, that she was responsible for its appearance, but he says that as soon as he found it out he had it taken out. I thought perhaps he was not an ordinary man, but I find he is. He is a genuine son of old Adam,—'the woman thou hast given to be with me, she gave me of the tree and I did eat.' I tell you Brother Sommer has hard work making these people believe that he is under any woman's thumb.

"Now we go to that point I promised, in regard to the attitude of Brother Sommer toward schools. I believe I will notice that at present. Page 1, July 18, 1905,—Octographic Review, page 1, July 18, 1905, we have the statement there in regard to schools. Second, he contends for the most accurate secular education which it is possible for mankind to receive. And universities. I wonder if those colleges and universities which he recommended, here this morning,—I wonder if in any of them the Bible is used as a text-book? Did he say it is? Did he contend for that and did he offer you such good things as that? If he would have shown by the comparison,—perhaps the gentleman is not aware of it, but it is true,—if he had said 'send your child to Abilene, Texas,' there we have a school presided over by a Christian gentleman, by a man who is worthy of the titles he bears, by a man who is capable, by one of the two men who stand alone among the disciple brotherhood, as having the necessary requisite qualifications for an educator. I refer to the Abilene school, of which Brother George Klingman is now the head, and I say further on that question, the brother who is at the head of that school is (here for the purpose of teaching the Bible, because I know he would not enter the school a year or so ago, and one of the reasons, why was it they didn't make the Bible study obligatory on every student. Now, let me read,—notice what he says about it,—notice the saving clause, it sounds awful good,—'This Journal favors and advocates all schools which do not oppose the Bible nor destroy the physical health nor mental development of their students.' I want to read another,—Page 1, Octographic Review, June 16, 1903,—bear in mind those saving clauses,—'those schools that do not oppose the Bible nor destroy the physical health and mental development of their students.' Page 1, June 16, 1903, Octographic Review:

'Before me lies a letter from Seattle, Washington, in which it is stated that evolution is taught in all the public schools there. In regard to this we state that the same is true in many other places. The people are taxed to support state universities and public schools, and then the children of those people are taught infidelity concerning the Bible in all those institutions of learning.'

"And he tells us, as an answer to the question, 'where would you advise a Christian parent, having a child that has finished the local school, to send his child to school,'—he referred you to Bloomington, Indiana, and any other place where there is a Church of Christ, and he says, 'people are taxed to support state universities and public schools' and infidelity is taught in all those schools. That is the answer he gives to our question, I am not through. I want to call your attention to a statement. He says he is not opposed to our school, but notice the saving clause. On page 31 of this tract concerning the unscripturalness of establishing religio-secular schools with the Lord's money: 'Before leaving this subject I wish to write it down as my deliberate conviction,'—it was not a hasty opinion, it was his 'deliberate conviction,' and the deliberate conviction of a man, who, though not infallible is very careful,—'I wish to write it down as my deliberate conviction that the crowded, hurried school and college life in America is unfavorable to both physical and mental health and development.' And so on, reading along much more of the same sort which I omit. 'Thus it is in modern school life generally, even as it is in army life. Anything to keep up appearances and get through, this is often, if not generally, the motto of crowded students as well as of crowded soldiers. Moral lectures and even Bible lessons to the contrary of this have but little effect on wearied brains, especially when not possessed of the overcoming faith.' He admits that moral lectures may have a little influence against these bad tendencies of these schools. Now then, we do have moral lectures and we do have Bible lessons. It would be better than the other kind of school where they are absent. But I read on: 'Confidence in God and Christ is supplanted by confidence in men. Students at college are generally so much crowded that they study text books as fawning sycophants, and not as independent thinkers. As a result their individuality is dwarfed and their admiration for learned authors is developed. The Germans are right when they say, "man is what he eats," and Paul is right when he says, "whatsoever a man soweth that shall he also reap."'

"Now what do we find? 'Therefore this journal contends for such schools and colleges as do not, "—as I have read it you know what it says. The substance is this,—this journal contends for such schools as are not opposed to the Bible, and that do not disregard the physical health and mental development of the students. But high schools do these things, and he states of the State universities that infidelity is taught in all of them. That is stronger than I would, put it, but that is what he says. So you see really that is true of state schools, and schools, and colleges generally, their course is so crowded that students are hurried and it dwarfs their mental power. There may be some truth in that. Would he' but examine our catalogue with care he will see that this course is not so crowded as these schools he represents. It is not so crowded. Brother Armstrong spends two years on White's 'First Lessons in Greek,' and his students will bear him testimony that he gives them plenty to do in the two years on that one book, that it takes about three, four, five or six hours a day to get the lessons. But now as a conclusion, he states that 'nothing which I have said on this subject is intended to have reference to secular colleges for secular purposes, at all.' After stating that the crowded school and college life in America generally is of this character, he says that, 'nothing I have said is intended to refer to schools for secular purposes, at all, but what I have written on this subject is intended to be solely and only against disciples of Christ using the Lord's money,' etc. In other words, this concluding paragraph means simply this,— all the charges I have been making about crowding and dwarfing the mind and disregarding the physical health and mental development, is? no more than so much to prejudice the mind of the people and pre-

judice them against schools established by Christians, established with the Lord's money for the purpose of leaching the Bible.

"I have some more things to notice, and I must hasten on. 'Division here in Odessa.' There is friction here in the church at Odessa, I am not going to deny that. Do you know,—any of you that have ever had any experience any where,—where there is a church, that has been established for any time, that there is not friction in? You name the place. As far as the friction is here in the church of Odessa,—so far as that is concerned,—we will attend to that and we don't need the work of an outsider coming in and stirring up strife" about such things. We can attend to our own affairs. Suffice it to say, we are satisfied with what we know of the brethren in this church. Knowing that they want to do right and knowing that I want to do right,—knowing that, we have the spirit of the gospel, and we are content to let the matter rest as it is and we are certain it will come out all right. I don't like to refer to such things, but my respondent makes it necessary for me to do so. We may be disturbers, we may sometimes do unwise things, I am willing to admit mistakes along that line, as well as along other lines. Will our respondent admit that he makes mistakes? But even though we make mistakes,—and people sometimes do wrong and admit they do,—we have heretofore kept ourselves from being publicly withdrawn from and have kept ourselves out of jail. Will our respondent say as much?"

Mr. Sommer:—"Mr. Chairman, I arise to a point of order. That is a personal reflection against me. Personal in my past personal history, and I call for the decision of the chair with reference to it, in view of these rules of order. "

The Chairman:—"Your point of order is well taken, and I hope the brother will desist from any such remarks. "

Mr. Rhodes:—"Now then, I have a precedent. When we have done personal things and personal offenses have been charged up against us. I have a precedent now. I would not have referred to this if he had not forced it on me. I have kept it hack in hopes that I would not have to do it. "

Mr. Sommer:—"I insist that this gentlemen has not any right to try to emphasize what he has said. If he wishes to get into a comparison of personal records I am prepared for that at another time, but not now. "

The Chairman:—"I hope you will keep yourself in due bounds, and act accordingly. "

Mr. Rhodes:—"Now then, "Uncle Reuben and acting a part, theatrical, and so on. I don't expect to put much time on this, because this is off of the main principle about which we are contending, but it is true we had an entertainment in this hall. It was not really a college work, but it was in connection therewith, of course. I will admit that, and most of you were present. Now then, we might admit that the whole thing was too light and frivolous. Perhaps it was, I won't admit it was or was not,—that don't affect the principle. But he said because this man, Osgood, came out and acted a part of Uncle Reuben, a farmer, that therefore it tended toward the theatrical. As I said, the man who lives in glass houses should not throw stones. Do you remember last night when I was so severely castigated and charged with sacrilege because I had quoted certain passages of scripture in a certain tone of voice, and there are plenty of men and women in this audience that told me afterwards they knew I was unconsciously imitating Brother Sommer's tone as he had used. It was plainly seen that it was the case. I unconsciously and unknowingly, imitated his tone. Now then, I unconsciously acted his part, but he gets up here and charges me with sacrilege for having done so, and he gets up here, and puts himself in my place and imitates my tone,

and quotes the same passages of scripture and it was all right for him, but it was sacrilege for me. He quoted the same passages that I did and imitated my tone, or tried to, and if it was sacrilege for me what was it for him? And if Mr. Osgood, in acting the part of Uncle Reuben, was theatrical, what was it when he acted my part? Of course, he is here mainly for criticism. I am glad he said that in his opening remarks, it is an index to the whole thing.

"'Religious institution' and 'ask for money to keep them up.' Yes, now then, we ask the assistance of brethren whose hearts are stirred, to help us to do this work. We are engaged in this work, and it is just as strictly personal and private as any man's farm or grocery store or mercantile establishment where there are two or more men joined together,—banded together,—in partnership to carry on that work. Just as strictly a personal and private enterprise, and if, because we teach the Bible, brethren and sisters in Christ, who want the Bible taught, are willing to assist us in that work, who has the right to say to them, nay? It is not a church institution. It is not a religious institution in any bad sense, not at all. Brother Sommer is not free along that line either. I want to draw a deadly parallel. We have all heard of a deadly parallel, we have it here, [referring to a chart]. I don't say these are all the points in which there is similarity or likeness, but it is some, between the Octographic Review and the Western Bible and Literary College. I say right here, he has just as much an institution as we have,—every bit,—and I stand on this to the close of this debate. He has all of the organization, all of the institution in the matter that we have, and he asks for money and he receives money and uses it in furtherance of this business. Let us draw some of this deadly parallel. He has every bit of such organization as we have. It is a personal, private enterprise in which a number of Christians are banded together as business partners in this work, and we receive help from brethren and sisters who are so disposed. Our work has a head, his has a head. We call ours a president, he calls his editor. His work has an assistant head or publisher, ours has an assistant head or vice-president that acts in the absence of the president. He has field editors and corresponding editors,—I could not put them all on the chart because it is too extensive,—ours has a business manager. He has contributorial staff, we have teachers. He has patrons, we have patrons. He teaches religious matter, we teach religious matter. He teaches secular matter, we teach secular matter. His institution furnishes work and support 'for him and his family, our institution furnishes us work and partly supports us and our families. That chart will hang there,—I never will take it down. Now, he says in the Octographic Review that it is a 'personal, private enterprise which has been made to furnish work and support for My family,'—December 15, 1904. Now then, we are getting down to business. I mention dates. 'The Review is strictly a personal, private enterprise, which has been made to furnish work and support for my family. The only basis on which it has a just plea for patronage among apostolic disciples is that it is used to advocate gospel truth, and is free from worldly advertising, and thus is not, in any sense, a secularized enterprise. Let all those remember this who endeavor to justify themselves in turning from, gospel preaching, a great proportion of their time, to teach what is secular, with only an admixture of what is religious.' We will take care of that, too; and he appeals to Christians to support him, help him in his work. He receives gifts and contributions from one dollar to one hundred dollars, and, as I am informed, he has received a gift as high as one thousand dollars. That is as big a gift as we have ever received from any one source. He has received it from one person or estate. It is sin for us, and condemns us to ask for money

and receive money, but it is all right for him. The difference is, to whom does the money go? Yes sir, our work is 'personal and private when they get the money in their own pockets,' and I thought with what force that would re-act upon his own head."

DANIEL SOMMER'S SIXTH SPEECH.

"Mr. Chairman, Gentlemen Moderators, Ladies and Gentlemen:—While that song was being sung, I thought of what took place just after General Lee surrendered. Among the federal troops there was much jollification. There was a chaplain with a certain regiment, who jollified with the others and got drunk, and as he was walking around he saw a young man, and said to him, 'To what regiment do you belong?' He said, 'I belong to the 91st Ohio,' or whatever it was, and turning he looked at the chaplain and said, 'Chaplain, to what regiment do you belong?' He said, 'I belong to the regiment of the Lord.' The young soldier took a second look at him, and said, 'All I have to say is you are a long way from headquarters.' So I say, that though we may sing 'Blest be the tie that binds,' we are a long way from the sentiment here expressed, and who is responsible? I said to you that the one who is found to be responsible for this state of affairs, who has advocated something unauthorized, directly or indirectly, in the word of God, to him should be applied the scripture, Romans 16:17, 'Mark them which cause divisions and offenses contrary to the doctrine which ye have learned; and avoid them. For they that are such, serve not our Lord Jesus Christ, but their own belly,'— or appetite,—'and by good words and fair speeches deceive the hearts of the simple.' Now you are called upon again to decide that question as to who is advocating something that is unmentioned in the Bible. My respondent in his last speech admitted mistakes with reference to causing friction and controversy, and it can not be blotted out, with respect to this place or with respect to the brotherhood. I said that twenty years ago I came into the state to speak in reference to the simplicity of God's word. If these gentlemen had come as humble gospel preachers, they would have found a warm welcome and all the encouragement I could have given them. But instead of that, they came as titled gentlemen, going to establish a 'permanent influence' here. Something more permanent than the church, judging by what they say, because the leader of this institution said, in so many words, that he didn't know of any plan by which the church could 'go back to Jerusalem so fast' as by the methods he proposed, by the teaching of the child as he was proposing to do. Consequently all the family could do under God's direction, all the church could do under God's direction, **WOULD NOT BE EQUAL** to what he proposed to do, and others of the same people, in teaching the child in the schools. Now, **WHO IS RESPONSIBLE FOR THIS?** Keep that before your mind. Here is division, here is separation, here are two men, professing to be Christians, arrayed against each other, and each following the other. I came here, I said previously, 'to offer criticisms,' and what is my respondent's contention except not to do anything but to **OFFER CRITICISMS UPON MY CRITICISMS**, and it is to his **SHAME** that he did not come with his proposition fairly and squarely affirmed, that this is a scriptural institution, and allow me to be upon the negative. He said yesterday they could not go through the correspondence to see who was to blame for this. **WE HAVE THE FACT THAT HE IS NOT HERE WITH AN AFFIRMATION, AND I HAVE TO AFFIRM A NEGATIVE.** We don't need the correspondence, all we need to do is to **CONSIDER THE FACT.** It is to his **POLEMIC SHAME** and **INTELLECTUAL SHAME.** It may be personally he is a very excellent gentleman, and his record may be-

'as pure as any young man's in this country, but polemically he is covered with INFAMY because he has NOT AFFIRMED HIS POSITION.

"Having said that much, I give attention first of all to this chart. You who have never heard about it, you may think there is something in it. It means that Daniel Sommer is an inconsistent man, and therefore, this institution is right. One premise logic, first, middle and last. It is to the shame of any man, especially who professes to be an educator, who will endeavor to prove his position by any such logic as that. Daniel Sommer is opposed to us, and he has been doing some things that are somewhat along the same line. 'Your institution has a head,' and the head of the O. R., is called the editor, and THAT TELLS THE TRUTH. The head of this institution is called B. A. and Mi. A.—ABSURD, POMPOUS TITLES, and which do NOT TELL THE TRUTH. The O. R., is a strictly religious institution, but he says it has secular matter. There is just as much secular in that as in the writings of the apostle Paul. I told you that 'we laid aside secular matters at a sacrifice of A THOUSAND TO FIFTEEN HUNDRED DOLLARS A YEAR on the subject, and yet he BRINGS THAT JOURNAL UP AFTER THAT MANNER. The Review professes to be strictly religious, and to be devoted to truth and righteousness as taught by the apostles of Jesus Christ, and, too, it TELLS THE TRUTH CONCERNING ITSELF. But this institution, after all that is there said about its religious features, it DENIES THAT IT IS A RELIGIOUS INSTITUTION, and DOES NOT TELL THE TRUTH ABOUT ITSELF. There is no more resemblance between the O. R., when justly represented, and this institution than there is between THE FALSEHOOD that Satan told when he received our mother Eve, in the garden of Eden, and THE TRUTH that God had given to our first parents. That is all I need to say.

"My respondent started out with a reflection upon my conscience in the beginning of his speech. He said he had an easy conscience and therefore he could sleep, and intimated that it was because of my conscience not being easy that I could not sleep. I told you what was the secret thereof, and by the blind laws of association there had been something that very much amused me last night when I should have been asleep. Well, when I was making my last speech, I thought that I could see that the stag hound over in Kansas was a little closer to the rabbit.

"He says, 'I am not afraid of all the argument of the missionary societies.' He has been tested on the subject, and others have been tested, and they have turned away from all those societies and planted themselves more nearly upon the Bible, or else, with one accord, they have gone into societyism, as the students from the Kentucky University have generally done.

"With reference to the orphan girl, I know it is always dangerous when we have not seen all the correspondence and all the facts, and the intimation was made with reference to her presence here last year, and with reference to others who are here without being able to pay their own way. But I ask, who was it that furnished the money for this institution, besides the gift that the town here gave? Who was it that furnished this actually, and for what purpose? That is the question, and we leave it to you. It is yours to decide for yourself, and whether, in view of the thousands of dollars that had here been furnished, and the thousands that are still being furnished or the thousand that was bogged for within the past few months, when Prof. Armstrong called for a gift from the church or individual Christians,—we say in view of that, have not orphans, or others who are too poor to pay their way, a proper claim upon this institution?

"He says I had not shown the catalogue of the school. He says the schools all teach the same literature. I don't know how he had the face to refer to that. I said, that for a man of the world to recommend the reading of Shakespeare, or any other novel, was one thing and another man, who professed to be a Christian, to recommend the reading of that same novel, that is very different. He did not touch that question, only he says they all teach the same. But I can confute and confound that kind of recommendation when it is advocated or offered by a man of the world, but when professed Christians offer it, then it sinks deep into the child and not unfrequently the child, is **ARRAYED AGAINST THE FATHER, AND MOTHER** because of the iniquity that he learns at these schools.

"He says he does not blame me for not wishing him to refer to those books, [bound volumes of O. R. I only blame him for not having referred to them much more diligently. He would have known what I said on this subject, and not come here loaded with a reply that did not touch the question, and I had to make two or three speeches in order to bring him to the question. You recollect the dodge he made on the question of the **PURPOSE**,—from the **PURPOSE OF ESTABLISHING** the institution to the **PURPOSE IN TEACHING RELIGION** in this school? He made that kind of a dodge to his polemic shame. I had to make three speeches in order to bring him to the question, and his preparation shows that he would not, or at least did not, study those volumes sufficiently to learn what the real position is which I occupy with reference to these institutions and all societies.

"As I said about Uncle Tom's Cabin, it was a work of fiction, but true to the facts from the beginning to the end. A work of fiction on the very same principles that we have in the Old Testament and in the New,—a work of fiction upon the principle of the parables of our Redeemer, and I have only protested against the **UNGODLY FICTION** such as is recommended by this institution. The Bible has godly fiction,—the truth,—unmixed with error,—for the purpose of illustration. The parables are of that kind, and some fables in the Old Testament. I have, written along that line myself, and calculate to do so again, and it is in harmony with the divine will. But where is the intimation in the entire Bible in favor of recommending such works as those of Shakespeare?

"He says, 'My respondent is a genuine son of old Adam. He will have hard work to make you believe him under any woman's thumb.' That is a very unfavorable reflection. It is just like all the rest of his talk, missing, missing, missing, what there was in it. I am away from home, and besides sometimes don't read a single article in the Review for a period of weeks. And especially don't look over and see the books that are advertised there. And when that was inserted by the publisher of the Review, afterwards I called attention to it and it was discarded. I didn't propose to cast any reflection on my wife, and for him to say I am 'a genuine son of old Adam,' that I was trying to find an excuse for myself, was to make a very unhandsome intimation, unworthy of him and the position he occupies, unless he wishes to occupy the position of a sophist.

"He referred to the Review of July 18th, page 1, and says it contends for the most accurate education. He says, do these schools use the Bible as a text-book? I don't know, but we depend on the church to teach the faith that overcometh the world. If they go after education that is secular, let them take the best, and not go where men will permit error in their catalogue, so that there is not a single page, and sometimes not a single paragraph, that may not be justly criticised from the standpoint of grammar and the standpoint of logic, and many of them from the stand-point of the Bible. I say this with refer-

ence to the first catalogue that was issued from the Western Bible and Literary College, so called. They have moral lectures and Bible lectures, because this school is better than the others, but when the moral lecturers and Bible lecturers culminate in Uncle Reuben, there is a burlesque upon the farmer,—a burlesque upon a farmer,—a burlesque upon a farmer. And Solomon says, "'The king himself is fed from the field.'

"I know of some of these lecturers, but I don't know whether they would be willing to endorse those expressions here, or that sentiment here expressed, but in some of these lectures they are full of the educational idea. 'Young men you must be educated or else you will never be anything but clod-hoppers; young women you must be educated or you will never be anything but pot-slingers.' Those are some of the statements that come from them,—casting reflection upon the very place from which they came themselves.

"He says, the schools generally teach infidelity. Schools oppose the Bible,—quoting from what I said on that subject. Yes, I wrote that and I now say this school confuses pupils concerning the Bible. I have a letter here from W. S. Gibbins, Barnesville, Ohio. He says: "Well, I have been in this part of the state about four months and I have heard of all sorts of teaching in these parts by all sorts of teachers. I find advocates of 'no voting and holding office,' dogma; no public confession for wrong,' dogmatist; 'no marriage of believers with outsiders,' dogmatists; 'special providence,' theories; 'no church discipline,' advocates; 'no meeting on Lord's Day to study the scripture,' 'dogmatists;' 'always kneeling in prayer,' 'dogmatists;' and, he says "'no right hand of fellowship" and 'order of worship,' 'dogmatists.'

"Three out of every four of these doctrines which are disturbing the churches in Ohio, I can trace directly to the college. They disturb and divide the churches all over the country, and when students leave these institutions, they go out and they are in confusion to such an extent that they hardly know which way to look. I heard a gentleman say, that in regard to this place, he had heard MORE THEORIES, more TECHNICAL IDEAS preached within the past two years than he had ever heard before in his life, especially by disciples of Christ. That is the way these things come up. What is going to become of these children unless the origin of the Bible, and unless the integrity of the text, or the right methods of procedure in order to learn what the text says, are preached? There is confusion in every instance, and Paul says that "'God is not the author of confusion.' So that is the way this matter stands, friends.

"He spoke of certain remarks I had made. Said my provisos are only intended, in my writings, to confuse the minds. You may ask, but what has my respondent been engaged in from the beginning of this discussion to the present?

"My opponent says this is a 'personal and private enterprise, even as the farm or store.' First, it was religious,—religious,—religious,— Bible,—Bible,—Bible,—and after thousands of dollars had been secured, and then when that idea of a man setting up an enterprise, and, because he had offered to teach the Bible in some measure in it, to call upon the brotherhood to support it, though it was largely secular,—when that had been attacked they turned around and said, 'OUR SCHOOL IS A WORK AND NOT A RELIGIOUS ENTERPRISE OR INSTITUTION,—NOT A RELIGIOUS INSTITUTION.' Now I submit to you, ladies and gentlemen, that designation of this institution was NOT CORRECT. It didn't say it is NOT WHOLLY RELIGIOUS, it is not WHOLLY under the control of the church. But I submit to you that that representation brands the publication as UNTRUE, and consequently you can estimate this institution by the manner in which its chief advocate changes base from one position to the other.

"My opponent says the Review, 'has a head that is called the editor.' That is true representation, and he has not any other title. The other has a head that is called the president, and if he had stopped there, it would have not be so objectionable, but when he says he has a B. A. and M. A., he shows himself linked with the world, because those are worldly titles and they are absurd. 'The Review has a publisher.' Yes sir, it must have. Caesar requires that there shall be an editor and publisher to the paper, that shall be known to him. Hence we must have something of that kind,—we are to submit to the powers that be,;—just and just only as the church has trustees. Then he says it 'has an assistant head, has teachers,'—or, 'has an assistant head, a vice-president.' I am not sure whether he has the pompous title or not. 'Field editors and contributorial staff,'—'business manager and teachers.' And there is not one of these field editors or contributors that sports a worldly title that he has not commenced with, I mean, when he is a field writer on the contributorial staff. 'Patrons,' yes. But our patrons don't pile up money in an institution like buildings or anything of that sort. They put on deposit a dollar, or a dollar and a half, and say, you send me this paper for a year, and thus they put money ON DEPOSIT WITH US. That is what it means.

"'Religious matter.' Ours is devoted to truth and righteousness as taught by the apostles of Jesus Christ, and it has excluded secular matter, as he knows, at the cost of a thousand to fifteen hundred dollars a year. But this institution gets in secular arrangements and makes a BID FOR PATRONAGE; by reason of its SECULAR FEATURES, and says we have secular features here, but excuses itself in the apostolic rights of the apostle Paul. That is where the difference comes in that which they present, and that which we offer to the people.

"And, 'furnishes work and support' for me and my family. You see they have that (in the chart) there. As far as I am concerned, I have never received a dollar from that. I know it has not been keeping, me or my family, so far as that is concerned. But my wife and children have been workers there in the Review office, and it has been religious first, middle and last. How about this institution,—you know he dodged it. I wish to say that I have given more attention to this 'deadly parallel,' as it is supposed to be, than it really deserves. Why did my respondent bring that up? I will tell you what underlies it. I affirm that the Octographic Review is a scriptural enterprise. Will my respondent deny it? If so, we can have a debate on that on another occasion. Well, I challenge him,—WILL HE DENY IT? If he does not, then, let me tell you why he presented it. I will tell you because he thought, as he mentioned, that they are on a par,— on an equality.—this institution with that. How he could have thought so I don't know. I don't know.—but he is one of those who can reason with a one premise logic. But if he mentioned it because he thought they were on an equality, and he will not deny that the Review is a scriptural enterprise, then WHY DIDN'T HE AFFIRM THAT THIS INSTITUTION IS A SCRIPTURAL ENTERPRISE? We would like to have that answer from him. He will not deny that the Octographic Review is a scriptural enterprise, and risk his reputation as a disputant on that. If he won't deny it, if he admits it, WHY DIDN'T HE AFFIRM THAT HIS POSITION HERE IS SCRIPTURAL? That is the predicament in which he has placed himself by bringing that picture here. And it is to his polemic shame for him to present anything of that kind before the audience, as defective as that and as misleading. But it is the best he could do. He could not have anything genuine in support of this position, nor in opposition to the objections I have urged, and consequently he had to present something that is NOT genuine.

"He made some capital, or tried to make some capital, out of my advocacy of schools, and what I had said about the hurried, crowded life of colleges being opposed to the best physical health and mental development of the student. I think he will find in the same connection that I pointed out the highest and best education could be secured by the lone student. L. P. Bittle, was one of the most excellent of all men with whom I ever became acquainted, and he became well educated as a lone student. And "what he did, can be done, in a measure, by the lone students all over this country. And I now say to you, ladies and gentlemen, that I don't believe there has been anything that has done more to paralyze true study, earnest investigation, earnest devotion to that which will educate in the highest and best manner, than the foolish notion that education and schools are inseparably connected. THEY ARE NOT. But that idea by the schools has been palmed off upon the people, and just in proportion as they have accepted it they have failed to be students, and have lived in ignorance of the truth they might have learned, if it had not been for that foolish notion.

"He says he is not afraid of the arguments in favor of the missionary society being urged against him, but, my friends you will find that every argument that he can use in favor of this institution can be used in favor of man-made missionary societies, and every other man-made institution for the purpose of advocating religion. The missionary societies will tell the truth about the society, and say it is a RELIGIOUS INSTITUTION, whereas this institution does NOT TELL, THE TRUTH ABOUT ITSELF, for it says it is NOT A RELIGIOUS INSTITUTION."

B. F. RHODES' SIXTH REPLY.

"Mr. Chairman, Gentlemen Moderators, Ladies and Gentlemen: There are many things that I had hoped would be brought out in this discussion, that have not been presented at all. Unless some of these things are brought out pretty soon I am going to present them myself. I want to just mention the very last thing, and then I shall take up some other line of work.

"Missionary societies again. I will take care of that. I will attend to that. "We are not debating that question. I will take care of it, too. I am not afraid to meet any advocate of man-made missionary societies. I am not afraid for one moment. He says that ours is like a missionary society, except that they tell the truth, that they were wholly religious and they said so. Now, ours is not wholly religious, and of course we can't say so. He says his enterprise is wholly religious, so then which then is most like a missionary society?

"I told you he would come out opposed to all schools, and I proved it, and of course, we know some men can get an education without going to any school. We know that is so. Some men can, but they are so few, so very few, he only mentions one man. I never saw Brother Bittle. I am willing to concede he was a very highly educated, polished gentleman in every respect. I don't know anything about him except the little I have seen from his writings. He impressed me as being an unassuming, devoted child of God. But you know and I know, and we all know, and Brother Sommer knows, that 999 out of every thousand won't get an education unless they are spurred on by school work, and he knows it. But it has only been a few months ago, or two years ago, that Brother Sommer said that 'preachers can have no excuse whatever for not knowing Greek and Hebrew and logic and English.' That is no excuse for him, and he cannot deny it, because he recommended the school which Brother George Klingman, W. D. Campbell and other men in the service of God whom I respect very highly, were proposing to establish in Detroit. Michigan, and he advised, all

young preachers, and all old preachers who had the time, to go and learn those things. Brother Klingman is the head of the work down at Abilene, Texas, and if he 'will recommend all young men to go down there I shall not have the least, bit of objection. If he sends every one of our students down there I will not cry. If you can find a better school, where they do better work than we do here,—a place where you prefer going, go and God's blessing upon you. I am not opposed to anything I am not connected with. I am prepared to show that my worthy respondent is, in regard to religious journals, and challenge him to deny it.

"How far are we? I want to call your attention to the things that are really fundamental in this discussion,—that our respondent has said are fundamental. He has never touched any of them in any other than an incidental way. What did he say was fundamental in this discussion,—the misuse of the Lord's money and the use of the word 'Bible' in naming the school. He mentioned those things incidentally, but he has not made an argument upon them, and these are fundamental, according to his own statement. I don't believe they are, but according to his statement they are, and here the discussion for him is three-fourths gone and he has not mentioned that at all. When are you going to get to raise these vital points,—when are you going to do it? That I am not misrepresenting him, listen: 'All that I have written on the subject,'—die had been writing a year or so then),—'has been under these two heads, namely, the mistake of those using the Lord's money, and the mistake of those naming such institutions,' and I know that his friends and his advocates and his allies have repeatedly said those were the two essential features in our school that they were condemning. And he says he does not condemn the school for teaching secular knowledge, nor does he condemn the teaching of the Bible in connection therewith, but he does condemn the use of the Lord's money for the building of such schools and the use of the word 'Bible' in naming" those schools. He is three-fourths done and has not made an argument on those yet. 'He has not told us what the Lord's money is. He has not done anything in the matter. When is he going to get to these' things? He, of course, has been dealing with things that are not essential, things that are only incidental, and this audience can see it, and I propose to help them see it. But he read a letter from W. S. Gibbins. I can read letters, too, and I can read a good many. I received one this morning from Kansas City, from a good brother up there, and some of us here, received a letter from Brother Joe S. Warlick, in which he commends me to God's grace and hopes I could do my work well, and I am trying to merit that approval in truth, because I believe Brother Warlick would not approve a man doing his work in confusion. But he will be satisfied,—be glad of it.

"Where are we,—how far have we advanced? We have not gotten very far in this discussion. We have many vital things that have not been brought out, and the gentleman has only two speeches in which to do it. Has he been holding this matter back? I don't know that he has. I demand that he come out on those things, and I call his attention to the things that are fundamental. If he don't do it I will do it for him. I know everything that he will say, I have it all. I know everything that he will say, except little incidentals. I know his main line. Let him come out on 'money' and 'name' ami we will have a fight,—I mean in a good spirit, I don't care what my respondent does, he can't make me mad.

"But we will have some more 'pictures.' Now, I want this audience to know something of what I am doing. We are accused of shifting ground,—I wonder if somebody else has not also. I wanted you to know something of what I have to meet, and so we have ar-

ranged a little chart on that matter, and we have named it 'preaching' and 'practice.' That is not probably the best name that could have been given for it, but we have it that way,—'preaching' and 'practice.'"Now, Brother Sommer says that religio-secular schools are bad things,—sinful things,—I could not put it all on there. Brother Sommer went to one such school, and one that he says is bad. Of course, we may excuse that on the ground that he was young and when he came out,—he left that school before he graduated and that explains why he does not have any titles,—he did it partly because he wanted to learn how to think. I don't know just how long ago that has been,—probably 35 years. He has been 35 years learning 'how to think, and it has taken him this much time to make the progress that he has. It is not a very good prospect to open up to a young man. 'Religio-secular schools are bad.' Of course, I left school before I got any titles, too, but I didn't do it to learn how to think. Now, somewhere in 1878 or '79,—I think perhaps it is his first article probably written,—published article,—so far as I remember, where he said to the world through the columns of the American Christian Review,— a, paper that our worthy respondent says is the predecessor of the one which he has the honor to preside over,—and in that journal, I don't know just what time, but some time in the years 1878 or '79, he came out with, substantially all of his present attitude towards religio-secular schools. That is what he says himself. Now, we know, then, that he occupied and has been occupying for something like 30 years from that time the same position he occupies now. When it was time to choose a place to send his own boys, where did he send them? Where did he send them? Religio-secular schools, established with the Lord's money are bad,' and he has been occupying that position for thirty years. When his boys, Fred and Frank were sent to Kentucky University, it was a religio-secular school, established with the Lord's money, according to my friend's definition. I don't wonder that he does not want these things brought out. But he said that is one premise logic. I have prepared a little along that line, because I had an awful good example in my worthy respondent in that, for that is what he has been doing a good deal of the time. I don't claim that proves we are right, but it ought to silence the mouth of our respondent in condemning our work. That is all I can say. I made the principle,—I have given the principle on which we are working, I stand on that principle and you know it, and it was a matter of record, and having done so I have a right to impeach him of inconsistency and I have used that right, too. He need not think he can scare me off. I am going to stay right with it. It is argumentum ad hominehi, and I propose to continue to use it.

"Second, it is sin to build colleges to the memory of men. Of course, that is not a full statement of it, but I am prepared now to read a full statement of it, in the issue of September 8, 1903, of the Octographic Review, first page,—August 4, 1903. 'Moses and Aaron in haste and anger did a good deed in their own name; men and women in modern times build colleges and other institutions as a most "appropriate monument" to their own name.' Now, in argument about, this catalogue,—he says, about the school at Bowling Green being an appropriate monument to the deceased son of Brother and Sister Potter, and he said something in that catalogue about it being an appropriate monument to that deceased son, and this is Brother Sommer's comment: 'Men and women in modern times build colleges and other institutions as a most "appropriate monument" to their own name.' Then he goes on further down and finds fault with that: 'God dealt with Moses and Aaron more severely than he did with the builders of the tower of Babel, and the danger is that he will deal with Christians who spend the Lord's money in building monuments to

their own names even more severely than he dealt with Moses and Aaron.' I don't believe that is the one,—September 8th,—I was reading from August 4th, that is the trouble. 'While considering,'—this is another article on that subject,—'While considering this I am led to reflect thus: When a poor man who is a Christian dies, there is no monument, built to his memory, it makes no difference how good he was; but when a rich man who is a Christian dies, there is built "an appropriate monument to his memory." This means not only glory to the man, but glory to the man because he was rich. For, if he had been a poor man no such "monument" would have been thought of.'

"It is right on the same subject, with regard to the name of that institution, and you would think that our respondent would not think of such thing as that,—naming a school to the memory of man. Christians using the Lord's money and building schools and naming them to the memory of men, you think that is awful, from what we have read. I read from a manuscript letter from Brother Sommer to Brother C. C. Potter, bearing date,—written on the letter-head of the Octographic Review in the well-known characters of Brother Sommer, dated July 3, 1901, addressed to 'Dear Brother and Sister Potter: I write you with reference to your new enterprise. If you have decided to expend means left in your hands by your dear dead, for the purpose of education, I have no criticisms on such a subject. It seems to me that the scripture, "Let every man be fully persuaded in his own mind," may apply. But in regard to the name by which you should call your enterprise, I kindly offer a suggestion which I trust you will kindly consider, that suggestion is, don't call it a Bible school.' Then, I will pass on down, for he gives some reasons for that. I will pass on down. "

Mr. Sommer: (interrupting) "Read the whole letter. "

Mr. Rhodes:—"All right. 'Neither Brother Harding, nor any other man can answer objections recently published in The Way, against such a name, though the mentioned objections were not set forth in their strongest form. I suggest that you call it Memorial Academy, Potter Memorial Academy, Elden Potter Memorial Academy, or by some other name. I entreat you not to call it by the name of Bible School,—an institution in which probably three-fourths of the time will be taken up in secular education.' He did not offer any objections to the use of the money. Suggested that the scripture, 'let every man be fully persuaded in his own mind,' may apply. It was to be three-fourths secular and one-fourth religious, and he suggested that it be called 'Potter Memorial Academy,' or some other name. Then in the light of that remember my reading here on September 8, 1903, first page of the Octographic Review. I did this not because it is vital to this discussion, in any other way than to show what we have to meet, and the line of the fight that we have. This contention is but a sample of the kind, of contentions we have had here during this discussion, on his part.

"I will notice some of these other notes that I took down. 'Our patrons do not,'—referring to the other chart,—'Our patrons do not pile up buildings,' etc. 'Our patrons do not pile up buildings, etc., but they just simply pay \$1. 50 and get the Review a year.' That is true, partly. But does he not receive gifts of \$100. 00 and \$1, 000, and does he not use those to buy buildings and pay off debts of the Review? Has not an appeal been made for money to pay off the debts, has he not received many thousands of dollars for that purpose, and has not that money been used to pile up buildings, printing presses, etc. ? Now, has it not? I don't know what use has been made of it, but I presume that has been the disposition of it. And they do it, too, because the appeal is made of them to give of their means to assist Brother Som-

mer in this work because it is a good work, because it is teaching religion, and they admit they teach secular things,—at least, he has not denied they are teaching secular things. There is enough secular matter to make it religio-secular, and it is established with the Lord's money. That is, I presume it is. He has not given us a definition of the Lord's money, and I presume it was.

"Now then, of course he did not want that parallel drawn. He says that he refused certain kinds of advertising, and he intimated that would make it not secular. He says it refused worldly advertising, and he intimates that if he had retained those worldly advertisements, it would make it a secular paper. He still retains enough. Brother Sommer maintains a book store, and he uses the Review and its columns as an advertisement for his book store, and you know he has a number of his own writings that he advertises through the columns of the Review, and he sells them for profit, and you know he does, and he runs that book store and it is a matter of profit. Isn't that engaging in secular enterprises? Let that fact be denied. I believe I will submit the floor now. "

Mr. D. W. Nay:—"By request of the elders of the Church of Christ, I ask Brother Sommer to state the exact differences which are being discussed at this time and place, for the benefit of a great many present, or some at least, who have said that they had not yet fully understood the issues of the discussion. We mentioned this to his moderator, and his moderator mentioned it to Brother Sommer. He may have forgotten this, not charging him with omitting it on purpose,—but we, by the request of the elders, beg of him to re-state, if he has stated, in his next speech, the beginning of it, the real issues involved in this discussion. "

Mr. W. G. Roberts:—"Mr. Chairman, just a word before we dismiss. I will say in regard to this, however, that perhaps the elder of the church that made the request, was not here last evening. Probably they were not here. You were not?"

Mr. Nay:—"Yes, they were. "

Mr. Roberts:—"The elders of the church were present while we were holding this debate, and the issues were read, but Brother Sommer will re-state them. You will hear them again. In his first speech he gave them, and Brother Rhodes, you remember, said he did not get them all down. I thought may be you were not here, but they say you were here. "

DANIEL SOMMER'S SEVENTH SPEECH.

"Mr. Chairman, Gentlemen Moderators, Ladies and Gentlemen: I suppose that many of you have read about the cuttle fish, and you are aware that the cuttle fish, as it is called, is provided with an ink sack, or a sack of some dark fluid, that is inky in appearance. When other fish get after it, then it emits that inky substance out in the water, makes the water murky and escapes under the murky water from the fish that is after it. I mention this because I believe that I may just state that in this debate, as in many others, the effort on the part of my respondent has been to act the part of the cuttle fish. And on that charge I calculate to arraign him this afternoon. Some of you may have wondered why, if truth be wholly on one side and error wholly on the other, as I have stated that we have had so much of a close tussle, and we now come to the conclusion, and while some of you may not have your minds entirely clear on the subject, I told you that I thought last night of the race that I saw in Kansas, between the stag hound and the jack rabbit, and though that stag hound was as fine a specimen as I suppose there was in the state of Kansas at the time, nevertheless he had to chase that rabbit from three to four miles before he caught him. He was by nature intended to catch that rabbit. The rabbit was a splendid runner and a splendid dodger, and

as a result had been successful for three or four miles. So don't be uneasy with reference to this. We have had a three mile race, so to speak, for we have had three sessions, and now we begin the fourth one, and you watch the result.

"I first give attention to what was the request made by one of the moderators in behalf of the elders of the church here, and some others, in regard to statements concerning the position really at issue, and I now proceed to read what I have hitherto read and which I shall read again, or read further. I read, after making an oral statement of the points in discussion here, the following:

"This debate is concerning the Biblical right to establish an institution of learning which is chiefly secular, in order to furnish an occasion to teach pupils in the Bible; also, the Biblical right in advertising such an institution, to call on Christians to pray for it, work for it, patronize it, and give money to establish and support it, and yet deny that it is 'a religious institution;' likewise, the Biblical right to have such an institution presided over by a man who, after loading himself with pompous, worldly, absurd titles, confesses that he is yet in his spiritual babyhood.

"MY PROPOSITION FOR DEBATE IS THAT SUCH AN INSTITUTION IS UNSCRIPTURAL.

"At a later date in this discussion I read the following:

"What this debate is about.

"1. This debate is about an institution known as Western Bible and Literary College or School, which has been established for THE PURPOSE of teaching persons in a certain religion,—not only in religion, but in a certain religion as its CHIEF PURPOSE, and to bestow pompous titles on its highest graduates.

"2. This debate is concerning a school or college which declares itself to be NOT A RELIGIOUS INSTITUTION, though established to teach a certain religion as its CHIEF PURPOSE OR END.

"3. This debate is about a school or college which pretends to be more of a permanent institution than the Church of God, and yet declares itself to be NOT A RELIGIOUS INSTITUTION.

"4. This debate is concerning a school or college which pretends to excel the family and Church in teaching religion and in leading people 'back to Jerusalem,' and yet pretends it is NOT A RELIGIOUS INSTITUTION.

"5. This debate is in regard to a school or college which indirectly threatens Christians with the loss of their souls if they do not give to its support, and yet pretends it is NOT A RELIGIOUS INSTITUTION.

6. This debate is in regard to a school or a college which has in part, a very religious name,—'Bible,'—and yet pretends that it is NOT A RELIGIOUS INSTITUTION.

"7. This debate is concerning a school or college which appeals to the church of Christ for money and pupils and patronage because of its religious features, and yet declares it is NOT A RELIGIOUS INSTITUTION.

"8. This is a debate concerning a school or college which teaches that in every child, there is an embryo God,—that is in the introduction of that Year Book,—and the college is set for the development of this embryo, and if this embryo is not developed by an education, then human beings can not be men and women, but are MERE ANIMALS.

"9. This is a debate in regard to a school or college which is presided over by a president who confesses that he is in his SPIRITUAL BABYHOOD, and who shows that he loves pompous, worldly titles.

"30. This debate is about a school or college "which implies that inspired men WROTE FALSELY when they declared that the inspired Scripture perfects the man of God and completely furnishes him

to every good work; that they WROTE FALSELY when they said that Christians ate complete in Him who is the head of all principalities and powers; and that they WROTE FALSELY when they said that God's divine power has given unto us all things that pertain unto life and godliness. It is about an institution which implies that the inspired apostle WROTE FALSELY when he said that 'If any man speak, let him speak as the Oracles of God; if any man minister, let him do it as of the ability which God giveth; that God in all things may be glorified through Jesus Christ our Lord;' and that John WROTE FALSELY when he said that transgresseth, and abideth not in the doctrine of, Christ hath not God, and if any man adds to the words of this prophecy, God shall add unto him the plagues that are written in this book. ANY INSTITUTION THAT HAS ALL OF THESE IMPLICATIONS IN IT IS UN SCRIPTURAL.

"Now then, I am going to read my final arraignment in regard to this institution, but before I do so, I mention, lest I should forget it, and I wish my respondent to note this down, that I have understood some have drawn the inference in view of what has been said, that the entire Church of Christ in Odessa is involved in the innovation which I have charged upon this college. Now, you will be charged with this innovation, ladies and gentlemen, who are members of the church here, provided you endorse this college, especially after the exposure which has been made and is still being made. But if the Church of Christ here will keep itself aloof from endorsing this institution, it will not be charged with innovation that is charged upon this college. And while I have it in mind, I also mention that my respondent, I trust, has either found the charge that he alleges I made, that he and his associates are 'moral cowards,' which though he gave it as a quotation from me, he has either found it or else he is prepared to apologize for it, not only here but in the papers where he made the charge. I call his attention to that.

"Now, I proceed with my arraignment of those who advocate such colleges as I oppose.

"1. They have ignored all that the New Testament teaches in regard to the perfection of the family and the church as divine institutions for the highest and best religious education of mankind, without educational appendages, arranged by mankind, to teach persons in religion.

"2. They have ignored the divine doctrine that faith will enable pupils, who are seeking education, in secular schools, to overcome the world, and thus overcome the infidel tendencies which may be found in such schools.

"3. They have ignored the silence of the New Testament in regard to Christians establishing colleges to teach mankind in religion.

"4. They have ignored all that human history sets forth in regard to the evil tendencies of such schools as they favor and advocate. They seem to 'scorn history.'

"5. They have ignored what common sense teaches in regard to the best method to secure the best education.

"6. They have exalted their schools and colleges above the church of God in regard to doing good, especially in taking persons 'back to Jerusalem.'

"7. They have endorsed, and, many of them, have adopted, the pride and folly of pompous, worldly titles.

"8. They have introduced and advocated that which they know is divisive of the church of God.

"9. They have refused to consider seriously any objection that is urged against the college to teach pupils in regard to religion, but endeavor to be artful dodgers of the real controversy.

"10. The presidents of those colleges recommend, and even re-

quire, their pupils to read much ungodly and insidious literature and thereby they train them to go in the way of ungodliness.

"11. They propose, in teaching pupils in the Bible, to do that which can be better done, and more safely done, in the family, and in the church.

"12. Presidents of those colleges show, by the errors set forth in most of their catalogues, that they do not understand the proper construction of the English language, and, thus, show that they are not fit for the position they occupy.

"13. As schools, of the best kind, may be established, by those who are competent to do so, without pompous, worldly titles, those disciples who have adopted such titles in their schools, show that they are partakers of the pride and folly of the world.

"14. Their disposition to avoid affirming that their schools are scriptural, shows that they either do not regard them as scriptural, or do not regard themselves as capable of defending scriptural institutions, and in either view of their condition of mind they are, evidently, unfit to occupy the position of educators.

"15. The chief advocates of colleges to teach pupils in religion, among churches of Christ, have adopted a course of unfairness, in controversy, which shows that they are not fit to be educators of the young, and those preachers who have endorsed that course have shown that they can not be, safely, recognized as safe preachers for the Churches of Christ.

"16. I also arraign the advocates of religious colleges among churches of Christ on the offense of introducing an occasion for controversy and division, which has already done more harm than the colleges have, thus far, done good.

"17. They have, by their colleges, made themselves inconsistent, and weak, in condemning humanly arranged missionary societies, and other human devices, in religious work.

"18. In trying to defend their colleges they have adopted methods of reasoning, and evasion, that are common among the advocates of musical instruments in the digressive Christian Church.

"19. The spirit which they have manifested in trying to advocate and defend the mentioned colleges, shows that they are innovators.

"20. Finally, the so-called Bible Schools and Colleges, to teach persons in religion, among the churches of Christ, are unscriptural in name, in the use which is made of the Lord's money, in establishing and supporting them, in the use made of the lime of preachers while teaching in them, in the pompous titles used by a majority of teachers in them, and which are conferred by most of them, and they are unscriptural in the use which is made of ungodly literature in them, and in the unsound speech used in the catalogues issued by several of them.

"I have the notes of my respondent's Last speech mixed up with some others. I may not be able to sort them out, so I shall just proceed as my memory may enable me to recall what he said in that speech, and give you the benefit thereof as best I may be able. All! I am in a little better position than I thought I was. I have been able to select the notes, so I shall give attention thereto.

"My respondent said in his former speech, 'I will take care of the missionary society. I am not afraid of any arguments that the missionary society advocates can bring against me.' If there are any advocates of missionary societies or mite societies, or anything of that kind helping the church to do the work of the church, here at this time. I will trust they will give him an opportunity. I am satisfied they have been taking notes of what has been said, and they will be able to take my respondent's own speech and break him down and compel him, in consistency, to accept all the societies of the innovators in

the Christian Church, and all the societies accompanying it from the Roman Catholics down to the Salvation Army. The same logic that will prove the one will prove the other. The same logic that will defend this institution, which is not mentioned or intimated in the Sacred Text, will defend those, and better, because those are genuine religious institutions, first, middle and last, and they tell the truth about themselves, and that is more than my respondent can say with reference to this institution. He says, 'Ours is not wholly religious,' and he does not admit that it is any wise religious. He says, 'The Octographic Review is wholly religious, which one is most like the missionary society?' And his friends thought he had said something, judging by the manner they expressed themselves. That is the kind of cuttle fish policy that my respondent has adopted from the beginning to the conclusion of this debate, as far as it has gone. 'What about the Review?' he inquires. It is a religious enterprise first, middle and last. It is a private, personal enterprise, and more than that, it does not go before the brotherhood begging in every direction for money. It gives people an opportunity to make contributions if they wish to give in that direction. It is neither like the college nor like the missionary society in the begging business.

"It is said that very few can be educated without schools. That 999 out of every 1, 000, won't get an education without being spurred on by school work. What is the spurring done in an institution like this? In a majority of the institutions it is rivalry, 'emulation,' and is so set forth in the catalogue. I say that this is a mark or an outworking of the flesh, so designated in filth chapter of Galatians, and thus it tends to break down the morals, the scriptural regard for truth, and the charitable regard for others.

"He says, I recommended the school in Detroit. Brother George Klingman, whose name has been so honorably mentioned here, said, and it was published in the Review, 'That there is no school in Detroit,' referring to what he was charged with presiding over, and that was published, and my respondent is wrong again. It was simply the Church of Christ offering, as a church, to teach persons to read the Bible in various languages.

"He says, 'I am prepared to show that my respondent is opposed to every religious journal not presided over by him.' That is a **BASE PERSONALITY**. He made a personal reflection and should have been called to order a third time. He reflected on me personally as a journalist. He has no right to reflect upon me except as a disputant to this debate. I am accountable before you in my character as a disputant, even as he is, and I calculate to arraign him and let you consider what his course has been. I call that an **UNMITIGATED SLANDER**, that I am opposed to every religious journal that is not with me. I am opposed simply to that which is found in religious journals that is **CONTRARY TO THE WORD OF GOD**. I am not the standard by which to measure. I had set that forth and had it in a rule for this debate, that personal standards of measurement are to be excluded, but my respondent would not go into the debate unless he could have an opportunity of using Daniel Sommer as the **PRINCIPAL STANDARD** by which to measure, showing that he had not confidence in the Bible as covering in any measure, or any condition, the work he is engaged in here.

"He said, 'The objections that are fundamental' I had not mentioned at all, and wanted to know whether I had been holding all this back. I think that we have presented fully **THE ORIGIN** of this school, and the purpose as the chief points. We have simply touched other questions, they can't all come up in a two days debate here.

"My opponent says, 'I have not told what the Lord's money is' and I 'have been dealing with things that are not essential.' I hold

before this audience that it needs only to be stated, in order to be understood and admitted, that **THE ORIGIN OF THIS INSTITUTION IS THE FUNDAMENTAL QUESTION**. If it has no right to exist, according to the word of God, if it has **NO SCRIPTURAL RIGHT TO EXIST**, then it does not make any difference how much money or how little money it has secured. That is a secondary question, though it pertains to the fundamental matter of the right of this institution, but if it has **NO RIGHT** to exist according to the Bible, at all, that is **THE REAL QUESTION**, that is **THE PRIMARY QUESTION**, and the others come in afterwards, though they were considered first when the discussion was first introduced.

"He mentioned Joe S. Warlick's letter, in which he commended him to God's grace. Those of you who have been readers of the Review, know that. Warlick acted the part of a challenger of the one who now stands before you, and said that he could not think of a single issue wherein I had differed from my loyal brethren, meaning those whom he called 'loyal' here, in which I was not in the wrong. I laid down eight propositions, four of which I affirmed and four I called on him to affirm, and I have published them twice and challenged his attention to them, and what has he done? As far as I have learned he has not given the slightest notice to them, and soon after I published them in the first place, his paper ceased to come to the Review office."

B. F. RHODES' SEVENTH REPLY.

"Mr. Chairman, Gentlemen Moderators, Ladies and Gentlemen: The first thing I would do is to notice the cuttle fish argument. It has been charged upon me that I am playing the cuttle fish, and the cuttle fish is a kind of fish that has a great big supply of ink or black substance that it squirts out in the water and hides itself. Now then, according to his argument about me in the matter, if I be the cuttle fish and if I have been using black ink, or inky substance, he has been furnishing the inky substance, for I have appealed all the time to his writings and his teachings. There is nothing in it one way or the other, and he knew there was not. But I am authorized,—Brother Sommer has charged there is a division here in the church in Odessa, and some of the elders of the church have called my attention to the fact that I admitted it was the case,—I may have done so, I know not as to that, perhaps I did,—but if I did I meant no organic division. I meant no more than the little friction that does come up almost universally in any and all churches or congregations. Now, of course, of course, there are brethren' here who have what all my friends call the rebaptism,—I don't say that disrespectfully,—some hold to what is called the re-baptism hobby, there are others that hold to the no-right-hand-of-fellowship hobby,—that is what I call it. Perhaps that is so, but with all that there is love, peace and forbearance. We do have some little differences and friction like that, but we are willing to bear and learn and grow up as perfect men in Jesus Christ, and I wonder if my brother, as he goes around preaching, does not find these things,—some of these things or all of them? Now, the elders say there is no division here, and they authorize me to make this statement.

"But I have stood just as long as I can, the insinuations that we are not here to do educational work, and that our school can't, in view of the fact that it is presided over by a gentleman that has shown he is deficient in the fundamental principles of the English grammar, therefore we can't do the right kind of work. We make mistakes in English, and with all the care of my worthy respondent I am here to say that he makes mistakes in English, but that does not say that he is not a learned man. We do these things, all of us. You do, he

does, we do, every one does. Now then, I want to read you a letter written to Brother John Dunn, and referring to the publication of the article in the Octographic Review on what Brother John termed 'Correct Education.' In that letter my opponent, says 'Just think of it, "in case your daughter spends more money than you think is necessary, find fault with him.'" Again, 'We should be educated that we may be men and women and not mere animals.'" What does all this imply? It implies that a daughter at Odessa. College will be designated as him. Also, that all those who are not educated can not be men and women, but are mere animals. And in this manner largely he refers to Brother Armstrong in regard to writing this, and accuses him of it. I don't know whether Brother Armstrong wrote that portion of our catalogue to which Brother Sommer referred or not. We all worked on it some. This is the latest issue of the catalogue and it has 'the same thing in it. I am glad to say it does. 'In case your son or daughter spends more than you think is necessary, find fault with him and not" with us.' I am glad it is there. Now then, that was made a very serious charge in this letter, and that,—in such things as that Brother Sommer has been referring to in his disparaging remarks about the kind of educating we do here. Now then, unfortunately or fortunately the English language was not made to order, and so there is no pronoun of common gender for use in such case as that. And what is done? Here is the general rule: 'A pronoun agrees with its antecedent in person, gender and number. In applying this rule remember that when a pronoun can't fully represent the noun, the masculine gender is to be preferred, as, "no boy or girl could do his work better.'" Page 107, article 283 of Rigdon's Grammar of the English Language, a standard of our daily work in the line of education of which it teaches. Now then, I WONDER WHO IS THE IGNORAMUS?"

Mr. Sommer:—"Just repeat that."

Mr. Rhodes:—"I WONDER WHO IS THE IGNORAMUS. But I was a little bit amused with Brother Sommer being brought to admit that in any measure whatever we are having anything like a close tussle. I think that a very wonderful admission on his part. It is a surprise to me, it must be a surprise to this whole audience. And he objects because when we are called upon to furnish authority I don't do it, but say 'you are another.' It is not because we say 'you are another,' that worries Brother Sommer,—it is not because we say It, but we prove it.

"I am not going to pay any attention to that long arraignment, because it does not touch the fundamental question, the things he himself has always advocated and set forth as fundamental in these things,—the method of using the Lord's money. He says he is not opposed to religio-secular schools, but is opposed to religio-secular schools that are established by the Lord's money to teach the Bible. He has not said anything about having a divine name attached, and has not done anything more than simply refer to these things, and he has but one speech of half an hour in which to divert, or put his time in, on the fundamentals. Why is it that he has not done so? Is his reasoning along that line such that it can be so easily met, that it is delayed? He has not presented it. I don't know why it is it has not been presented.

"I was asked to apologize to a charge, a charge that I had stated that we had been charged with being 'innovators and moral cowards.' I am certain about the innovators, and my impression is that it was 'moral cowards.' I have not looked over it since. I looked over the files some time last fall and I have not had time to do it since. It was there in the spirit, for he said he could not find a man that had the manhood to do it. The spirit of that charge is in there,—he knows

it is there. Perhaps the words 'moral cowards' are not there, but the spirit of that charge is there. But for the sake of pleasing him I will just grant that the term 'moral cowards' is not there, and that I have used, the term hastily, if that will be of any advantage. I don't know whether it is there or not."

Mr. Sommer:—"That is all right, if he will agree to do it in those two papers."

Mr. Roberts:—"I suggest that the expression,—if he is going to do it, that he leave off 'to please him if it will do him any good.'"

Mr. Rhodes:—"All right, I am willing to accommodate. I will just apologize. I don't know whether it is there or not, but I will apologize. Now then, in regard to Mr. Roberts' suggestion,—if upon examination it is not found in there I will apologize, but if on examination I find it is there, I won't."

Mr. Rhodes:—"Now then, we have to come down to the name, and I see I have got to introduce it and bring it out. In the Octographic Review, page 8,———1903, he says: 'Let sacred things be called by sacred names, secular things by secular names, and mixed things by mixed names.' Now, he says that we have a mixed institution here, and we have a mixed name. We tried to please Brother Sommer, perhaps not exactly with a view to pleasing him, but also to exactly, as nearly as possible, name the kind of work we did. We would like to please him, but he is not satisfied yet. He still opposes us on this kind of a name.

"I must go now to the tract, on page 37, bearing designation 'Concerning the unscripturalness of establishing religio-secular schools with the Lord's money.'

"He says, 'Now in the light of what has just been submitted let us consider Rev. 20:12. "And I saw the dead small and great stand before God; and the books were opened; and another book was opened which is the book of life; and the dead were judged out of those things which were written in the books, according to their works." Here we find the Greek word biblos twice used in, a form of the plural of that word and applied by the apostle John to those books out of which, or by which, the dead will be finally judged, and those books we previously learned consist of both the Old Testament and the New.'

"Now, in the first place our brother errs,—I hate to say this,— in stating that the Greek word is biblos. It is not biblos, it is biblion, the diminutive of that word. Biblion, not biblos. It is true It occurs twice in that verse in a plural form, once in a nominative plural and once in a dative plural, if my memory, serves me right. And now he says we have,—what? 'We have previously learned that those books consist of both the Old Testament and the New.' Now, I say that the words there, biblios and biblion,—the two words there cannot be shown to be the Old Testament and the New Testament I stand on that. It can never be shown,—it can not be done. He may by force of reasoning do something that looks like it, but he can't show it, and when he goes on to binding of sacred names he is binding where God has not bound, he is being more strict in these things than God ever has been. Now, I hated to make this statement. He dare not meet them. Let him do it. He can't show it. But I have something more to read on this subject. Not only is the word biblion there used, but it is used in other places in the New Testament where it cannot refer in any way whatever to any part of the sacred books. The word is biblion, I have examined this word in 31 places in which it occurs in the Greek Testament. In 15 it is strongly probable that it refers to some part of the sacred writings. In three cases it is not certain to what it refers. Two of these cases are found in the 12th verse of the 20th chapter of the book of Revelations, and in eleven cases the word most

emphatically does not refer to the sacred writings or any part of them, and in no case can it be shown that a sacred writer has ever applied this word to the whole collection of sacred writings. Not one can be shown. Doesn't this look like the reason why these things had been neglected? I don't say it is, but don't it look like it may be? Though he is leading, I have had to bring this out.

"I am reminded that he has been charging me with not being willing to affirm. That I am not appearing here as leader, is due to his stipulation that he shall be. When it was agreed upon it was stipulated that he should lead both the written and oral discussion. I EXPECTED TO LEAD IN THE ORAL DISCUSSION, BUT HE STIPULATED THAT HE SHOULD LEAD. I appeal to the records on that, and it will be found that I will be sustained, yet I am charged in that way. But perhaps I might just as well go on a little bit further,—I don't know whether he is going to do anything about this,—and show you that God never has been so exacting as he has; that God has not bound on this point of the so-called sacred name; that in the Old Testament dispensation the name of Jehovah was coupled, with the name of man. Israel,—he who strives with God,—combining a human name with the name of God, that is in the 32d chapter of Genesis, 28th and 29th verses; and the place that Jacob wrestled with the angel he called Peniel, or meaning literally 'the face of God.' 'Face of God,'—called a place 'face of God.' Here we have a man that coupled God's name and his name,—coupled a place with God's name and face. And Isaac called it Bethel,—'house of God,'— Genesis 28:19. And Isaiah,—Jehovah, the Hebrew word, the name of Jehovah,—'salvation of Jehovah,'—Javeh, the short form for Jehovah. And Jeremiah,—'God will rise,'—combining at the close Javeh, the short poetical name for Jehovah, the name of God. And Daneha, or Daniel,—'call him judge.' And Hezekiah, in English, 'Jehovah is strength.' That is the way God has dealt;—that is the way God has dealt in regard to his name. Now then, why should Brother Sommer be more particular than God? Let him tell us. No wonder these things, have been held up or have not seen light, and seemingly would not have seen light had I not have drawn them out. I might have waited, but I had other matters in the last speech and I had to draw these things out.

"Now, the facts are these, with regard to the name 'Bible,' it is an anglicized form of the Greek word biblion, meaning 'little book,' the diminutive of biblos. You saw in the preceding text, too, and that name as I have said, never can be shown to have been applied by any sacred writer to the whole collection of sacred writings, and the word is almost universally used in connection with the word grapha, derived from grapho. And now, then, our name is no more a sacred name than Octographic, though they are just as much different. And there is no more change in grapho and graphic,—there is no more change in changing grapho to graphic than in changing biblion to bible, and not so much. I wonder how close the hound is to the rabbit now? And, by the way, while I am on this, in two places in the New Testament the term,—the very word, biblion which is found in Revelations 20:12, in two places it is used by the Savior in naming no part of the sacred writings whatever. It is referred to both in Matthew and in Mark,—in both the word occurs. I don't know that I can find the places. The word occurs in two places, one in Matthew and one in Mark,—some form of the word, and which is applied to a writing of the gospel, and in the Greek it is some form of the word biblion, the very word which is found in the 20th chapter of Revelations, 12th verse, and which Brother Sommer says is applied to the whole collection of the sacred writings, which he never can prove if he lives twice as long as he has lived, unless he gets a new Greek testament.

"Well, now, about our asking for money. He says the difference is that he gives an opportunity for them to give, but we BEG THEM. Well, we may be a little more intense than he,—that may be so,—I don't know whether that is so or not,—I will be willing to concede that; but that does not affect the principle, whether they are in one hundred dollar and one thousand dollar and one dollar lots, as it is.

"Here I am reminded to go back to my notes on the explanation of this worthy young lady who was here and could not come back here. He said we had money given to do this work, and he intimated strongly that we ought to receive everybody that came. Of course, we can't do that at all. There are a lot more people that need an education and have not the money to support themselves, than we are able to accommodate. We do the best we can. He receives money from persons who are disposed to do good with their means. He has a fund in the Review office for sending the Review to any of the people who are not able to pay for it, and when that amount runs out, does he still send it? We have students here that never pay and never have been paid for, and we keep all we can, but does he send the Review for the whole year to every man that may want it, whether he is able to pay or not? He may in some cases,—I don't doubt he does, but he does not in all cases. He is just the same as we. He is another. If I said 'he is another,' that is not so bad,—that is not what worries him, it is when you prove it.

"'Missionary societies.' I prefer to take care of all the missionary society advocates at the proper time. Has Brother Sommer ever found a missionary society advocate that would stand up before him and debate?"

Mr. Sommer:—"Yes,—and they affirm their position, too."

Mr. Rhodes:—"Now, I am not going to call him to order, no business what he does. I did not ask him a question, I just said, 'has he?' I am glad of his admission that that is so. When any are found who want to deal with it, and I am in a position to do so, I will see about it,—with an agreed proposition or without it.

"Referring again to emulation, that condemns all schools, it does not apply to our school only. And something was said about an unmitigated slander, but I didn't get enough of that to know what it was.

"Well, I believe that I have noticed everything in my respondent's last speech that deserves attention, and will probably have some other matters to consider at the close, so I shall submit the floor."

DANIEL SOMMER'S EIGHTH SPEECH.

"Mr. Chairman, Gentlemen Moderators, Ladies and Gentlemen: I arise to address you for the last time in what may be called the first series of speeches which I am engaged to deliver on the college question, and as I begin, there recurs to my mind my respondent's question in his last speech. Having made what he thought was some kind of a turn to his advantage, he said, 'I wonder now how close the stag hound is to the jack rabbit?' Well, he accepts that chase that I spoke of in Kansas as having application,—an expression applicable to this instance. Thus he will not feel offended when I say to him that the time has come now for the jack rabbit to be caught.

"My respondent said in the course of his speech that he was 'willing to accommodate,' and I thought of a little politician that I heard of over in Indiana, who was making: a speech and one of his listeners said, 'Mr. Speaker, are you in favor of such and such a measure?' He smiled as perhaps only a politician can, and he said, 'Well my fellow citizen, the truth of the matter is, I am in favor of almost anything.' You can make the application.

"My opponent, said that he expected to lead in the oral controversy, but I stipulated in the beginning. May be I did. I had tried so many of the college men and found not one of them willing to affirm his position that very likely I overlooked the possibility of my would-be respondent being willing to. Nevertheless, I do recall that I wrote to him and gave him an opportunity just before we closed the correspondence, and this was his response:

"'You are right' (his letter of January 7, 1907), 'in presuming that I do not care to affirm the proposition which you regard as involving the real difference between us.' I didn't propose anything of that kind, but I proposed to him to AFFIRM HIS POSITION,— a proposition that would cover it, but he gave it back to me In this form, this striped form of this cuttle fish policy, which has been manifested on that side of the question first, middle and last.

"He says with reference to me, in regard to giving, that I give an opportunity for persons to make gifts for the Review and he says they beg. That was not the point. It was that they THREATEN PERSONS WITH PERDITION IP THEY DON'T GIVE, and that has NOT BEEN DENIED. He says I receive money but do not send the paper to everyone. We do IN ALL CASES where persons say, 'I wish the paper, but I am too poor to pay for it.' WE SEND TO EVERY ONE OF SUCH. I don't believe there is one name that has even been taken off the list when a person has said that, and thus the difference between that arrangement and what we have here is as the difference between THE BENEVOLENCE OF THE NEW TESTAMENT AND THE MERCENARY SPIRIT OF THE WORLD.

"I now go back to the notes that I have of the forenoon speech, the last one that my respondent made. He says he had more pictures. I wrote down as he left the other, 'I made an exposure of the exhibit of what we have there and it stands.' My exposure stands, and the Octographic Review is strictly a religious institution,—I should say a religious enterprise, because it does not desire to be called an institution, nor it is not an organization. But he says with reference to this college that IT IS NOT A RELIGIOUS INSTITUTION, and so the difference between the two are as the difference the word 'religious' and the word 'secular,' and my exposure of that remains.

"He says that 35 years ago after I had returned from college,—or rather. I was at college. I did go, under the advice of friends, to an institution somewhat similar to this, and there I saw behind the curtain, and I left that institution, and as soon as opportunity offered for me to expose it I did so. He then says, 'But when he wished to send his sons to college, where did he send them? He sent them to a religio-secular school.' As I lived in Ohio, Kentucky University was near me, and I will give him a little more information. Two of my sons went to Millgan College, Tennessee. They were likewise in Kentucky University for a while. I sent them to both of those places for the purpose of securing Greek and Latin, because I did not have the time to stay at home and set it before them, and they needed a rest from the work in the office. They were sent to those institutions, remained there and secured a hold on those languages, and I might be regarded as full of vanity if I should tell you with reference to the progress they made even after being a few months in those institutions. I saw then that they did not need to continue there, to make successful students.

"He says that I can't scare him off from his one premise logic, because he says the Savior used that, charging the sin they had charged upon him. When the Savior made such a charge he told the truth, but my respondent has MISTAKEN THE TRUTH IN

EVERY INSTANCE, either in the words he has used or in the implication he has used in connection therewith.

"He read a letter that I wrote to Mr. G. C. Potter, of Kentucky. When I learned that that man, whom I highly esteemed as a brother in Christ, whom I regarded as a gentleman,—when I learned that he and his estimable lady were disposed to establish an educational institution I took the liberty of addressing them, wishing to keep them from the mistake of applying a sacred name to a human institution, and in that letter I said that the scripture, 'Let everyone be persuaded in his own mind,' may be applicable in this case. I did not say it WAS APPLICABLE, and that shows that I don't set myself up as a standard, though my respondent has charged it upon me over and over again. 'IT MAY BE APPLICABLE,' I thought the expression was in the letter, 'you assume the responsibility.' I don't find it there. That was in my mind, but it is not there. I suppose I am bound just exactly as that letter says, but there is the implication, 'It may be applicable in this case if you see fit.' And I suggested to them certain names, but why did I ever speak against a memorial institution with the name 'Potter' on it? Because they used the word 'Bible' in connection with that institution, which is three-fourths secular, and do NOT there use a word which indicates that there was ANYTHING SECULAR THERE, and inasmuch as they did that I saw very clearly they would proceed after this manner, and that I had even been too late when I wrote them the letter I did. More than that, it was the president of that college that made the publication that had reference to the young man, based on his piety. And I said, if the young man had been poor, however pious he might have been, there would not have been any institution erected to his memory and wearing Ills name, but as he was rich there was to be an institution erected, and that being the case, it was built to the man because he was rich, and if I did not express myself as fully as I should have done, I may be blamed for that, but I was writing to those whom I regarded as a hightoned gentleman and lady, and I gave just as delicate intimations as I thought the circumstances would justify. So you see how that stands. And in regard to sending my children to school, I affirm that I acted scripturally when I did so. The 'scripture read would justify me in that if there was not anything else in favor of it. Will my respondent now, or at any time, deny my previous offer? In regard to the Octographic Review, I affirmed it "as a SCRIPTURAL ENTERPRISE, and asked him if he would DENY IT. He has intimated that he would not deny it,—he admits that it is a scriptural enterprise. Then why did he introduce it by the side of this institution which declares that it is NOT A RELIGIOUS INSTITUTION?

"Now, I turn to my notes on his last speech. He says that if he has been acting the part of the cuttle fish, I have been furnishing the black, inky substance. THAT IS ANOTHER DODGE. He was reading awhile ago from the wrong page, and he was reading that which was condemning him so plainly that he felt self-condemned, and he rushed to another page. He has been scrapping my writings first, middle and last, and time does not permit me to show him up, and show that it was HIS MISREPRESENTATION, and not MY WRITINGS that has furnished the inky substance.

"On division he said he did not mean to admit that there was 'organic division.' The people of this town know how much there is in regard to that. He quotes the elders of the church. I don't suppose there has been a formal division, so far as a formal declaration of division is concerned. The church over across the road has not excluded this individual. There has not been that kind of division, BUT THERE IS DIVISION HERE. There are two worshipping as-

semblies here, the one that meets in this hall meets to the dissatisfaction of at least a part of the other. There has been a public arraignment of some of this congregation in the other congregation, and such being the case, you see very clearly there is division here, and I have been informed that a certain preacher in this town has had to go to one or two or more of the faculty of this college and urge them to come over there to the meeting. That is the state of affairs."

Mr. Nay:—"I rise to a point of order. In behalf of the elders' declaration, made by Brother Rhodes, in which they said that there was no division in the church as the result of the school, I claim that Brother Sommer is out of order, and should not further continue the argument that there are divisions when they positively say that there are not."

The Chairman:—"The point of order is well taken. The brother will proceed on the line of his argument without referring to that."

Mr. Roberts:—"Both the moderators have a chance to speak before the chair rules. But he did not know I was going to speak, you see, so the chairman and myself agree on this. Here is the idea: Brother Sommer has also been informed by part of the congregation that there was division, and Brother Rhodes informed by part of the congregation that there was no division, and I suppose every one who lives in Odessa knows that on Lord's day, part of the congregation meet here and part at the other place, and that was referred to as division. That is what he was referring to, as he stated, and that is what he is attacking the college for. As it is said, that is what they are discussing. That is what Brother Sommer has been referring to, what he has heard from part of the congregation, and they were referring to what they heard."

Mr. Nay:—"The elders' statement must stand, as I have been in this congregation for several months and am acquainted with the charge that Brother Sommer made concerning some of the brethren meeting here on each Lord's day. Now, I want to say that this faculty has never urged any one to omit the assembling of themselves together in the congregation, but the faculty itself and the majority of the members have come to that place and usually each recurring Lord's day, but on account of some brethren who could not conveniently, on account of ill health and surrounding circumstances, go there each and every Lord's day, the Lord's supper was observed here in order that they might have the privilege of partaking of the Lord's supper, and that contribution that has been given here during the supper was turned into the Lord's treasury at the meeting house, and it is simply the church at work."

Mr. Roberts:—"That calls for another statement, and that is, that Brother Sommer has made mention that there has been no formal public exclusion, but that part of the congregation meet here and part down there. And perhaps it was when some were sick,—that is very well, no one objects to that,—but if it has been on account of some of the members when sick, why was it then said they did not have time, they were very busy? That is not shown. We will just hear from both sides,—Brother Sommer and Brother Rhodes. Brother Sommer said while he was speaking, that there had been a public declaration, public speech made in the other meeting house against the division of the congregation in sentiment and in practice. That is what Brother Sommer referred to. Is it not a fact I, hat some of the members have at some time publicly spoken against it? Isn't it 5 fact, I ask them, that some person or any of the members of the congregation that meets across the road, has at some time publicly declared against some of the practice? That is what Brother Sommer referred to as a division? Is that a fact,—some one that knows? Just sit down (to Mr. Rhodes), I have the floor yet. He minds well.

He is a good boy. I like that. I want to say that if that is true, and one of the members speaks up and says it is true, Brother Sommer may proceed, as the chair will inform him. That is the very thing that Brother Sommer is attacking,—that part of the congregation was objecting to it, and had also publicly declared in the meeting house across the road,—I believe that is the way you refer to it. Just wait (to Mr. Rhodes). Now then, I am glad he minds well, though. Here is another thought,—that if the congregation met for the purpose of observing the Lord's supper, on account of sickness, or part of the congregation has met here for the purpose of observing the Lord's supper on account of sickness, that is not called in question. But if not, if it has been for other purposes and other parties have objected, there is division in sentiment, and that is what is referred to."

The Chairman:—"They were not discussing the condition of the congregation here at all. That don't enter into this discussion. The question is in regard to this college, and I shall rule that all out and proceed with the discussion."

Mr. Sommer:—"One of my charges is that the college is a divisional institution. I made that in regard to the local affairs. How much truth there is in the charge people here can judge. I will submit to the decision of the chair and proceed with my notes. Near about all the remainder of my respondent's speech was made up of information that he gave us in regard to the meaning of the word biblos and biblion, and so on and so forth. That will all be attended to in due time. I knew very well we could not discuss everything in the series of speeches that should be given here, and consequently I have not tried to do so. But now as my time is growing short, and I have met, I believe, and exposed every one of my respondent's objections to my objections to this institution, I proceed to arraign him as a disputant and point out what he has done and what he has not done.

"1. I arraign my opponent on the charge that he began his first defense by trying to show that because I admit that it is right to have religio-secular schools, I admit his position, and thus he was guilty of evading what I said about THE PURPOSE in establishing this school.

"2. I arraign my opponent on the charge that when I repeated what I had said about PURPOSE in establishing such a school as this, he dodged from the idea of PURPOSE IN ESTABLISHING A SCHOOL to the idea of PURPOSE IN TEACHING THE BIBLE after a school has been established.

"3. I arraign my opponent on the charge that he misrepresented me in regard to answering his questions, and was justly called to order by reason of his misrepresentation.

"4. I arraign my opponent on the charge that he was guilty of a personal reflection against me, and that he was called to order twice, and suffered two rebukes by the twofold decision of the chairman against him.

"5. I arraign my opponent on the charge of trying to defend himself, and the institution he represents by charges of inconsistency, and thus using one-premise logic like this: 'My opponent is inconsistent, therefore the Odessa College is right.'

"6. I arraign my opponent on the charge of trying to defend his one-premise logic by referring to the Savior's true charges against critics, whereas my opponent tries to defend himself by false charges against me.

"7. I arraign my opponent on the charge that he has been compelled to confess the part he and his colleagues have taken in dividing the church at Odessa.

"8. I arraign my opponent on the charge that he repeated certain scriptures in a sacrilegious manner, and then falsely tried to make it appear that he was imitating me.

"9. I arraign my opponent on the charge that he tried to justify himself in his sacrilegious tone, because I showed what that tone was, "10. I arraign my opponent on the charge that his so-called deadly parallel, or comparison, between the Octographic Review and the 'Western Bible and Literary College,' is a falsehood, because the Review is strictly a religious enterprise, while the college is chiefly secular.

"11. I arraign my respondent on the charge that he has failed to break the force of my charge against this college that it does not tell the truth about itself when it declares, as I have read to you, that 'it is not a religious institution.'

"12. I arraign my opponent on the charge that he has failed to break the force of my charge that this institution is presided over by a religious baby.

"13. I arraign my respondent on the charge that he has failed to break the force of my allegation that the head of this college is a lover of worldly titles.

"14. I arraign my opponent on the charge that the head of this institution does not know how to write accurate English. "15. I arraign my opponent on the charge that he has failed to break the force of my allegation that the head of this college denies that persons can 'be men and women,' but holds that they are 'mere animals' if they do not receive such education as he recommends.

"16. I arraign my opponent on the charge that he and his colleagues have caused division in the brotherhood generally, as well as here in Odessa, contrary to the doctrine of Christ.

"17. I arraign my opponent on the charge that he is connected with an institution that is a beggar, and that threatens Christians with perdition if they do not give to its support.

"18. I arraign my opponent on the charge that he was guilty of sophistry when he compared the Review to this college in getting money, for the Review does not threaten persons with perdition if they do not give to it, but this college does so threaten them.

"19. I arraign my opponent on the charge that he has acted the part of a cuttle fish throughout this discussion, in that he has chiefly depended on casting reflections on his opponent.

"20. I arraign my opponent on the charge that he is covered with polemical odium, and, even, infamy, because he would not affirm his position for this discussion, and, therefore, he made it necessary for me to affirm a negative in order to have any kind of a discussion with him.

"If there is any one of those charges that needs no modification, that is the one with reference to what I said in regard to education. He read from Rigdon's grammar a rule which in itself is an absurdity,—a rule which in itself is an absurdity. I question whether there is another grammar, especially that pretends to be reputable, that would give that. The way to avoid that kind of absurdity is to use the plural forms,—'in case your sons or daughters,'—Is the form of expression that will avoid everything of that kind,—'in case your sons or daughters spend more money than you think they should, blame them and not us.' And any grammar that will give a rule of that kind, which he read when everything of that sort of confusion can be avoided by referring to the plural, I say to you is not worthy of your confidence. I have examined Rigdon's grammar; I have the primary work, and I have the high school work, and I have the advanced work, and I have examined it and when the proper time comes I calcu-

late to expose it as unworthy of your confidence, as well as those who advance it.

"Now, with that much before you, I see that my time has nearly elapsed,—I have but five minutes more. Ladies and gentlemen, I leave you to consider my arraignment of this institution, which I made on twenty indictments in my former speech., which has not been touched. I leave you to consider the arraignment which I have made of my respondent in this last speech, which has not been or can not be broken in any measure nor in any degree by objections, by the sort of cuttle-fish policy which I have already exposed. And I call attention to the methods of my opponent from the beginning of this speech to the conclusion. I call your attention to the efforts that he has made to ridicule and burlesque and cast aspersions at me, in different remarks he has made not only to what I have said, but in some instances to what the word of God said. I call your attention to this, that he has only endeavored to paraphrase and pervert with reference to all the scriptures that I have pointed out as being in opposition to this institution, because they declared the perfection of the family and church as God's institutions for the purpose of teaching mankind in religion. I call your attention likewise to this, and trust that you will not forget it, ladies and gentlemen, that this institution has been advertised as something that will excel 'the church and likewise excel the family, inasmuch as it ignores both in the declaration with regard to going back to Jerusalem, and thus this matter stands, and thus it will remain. Every position which I have taken, remains not only unshattered, but it remains unshaken, and not one position that I have taken has had anything more brought against it than the besmirching and besmutting policy, or what I have designated as 'cuttle fish' policy.

"Now then, you are enabled to judge whether my opponent, who will not be permitted now to bring up anything new, new matter, new facts, or new argument, or anything of that kind, for he has come to the last speech,—I leave you to consider how he has maintained himself even when coming into this debate with the double advantage of being on the negative of a negative. And I leave you to consider whether or not I have made out my charges against my respondent's position, though I have come in under the double misfortune of having to AFFIRM A NEGATIVE. I leave you to decide whether you would accept my respondent's reasoning on this subject when I point out to you that he WOULD NOT AFFIRM HIS POSITION, though I gave him an opportunity in about the last letter that I wrote to him, and thus he has appeared before you under what may be called the POLEMIC ODIUM AND POLEMIC INFAMY OF FAILING TO AFFIRM HIS OWN POSITION, and of simply, occupying the position of AN OBJECTOR TO OBJECTIONS."

B. F. RHODES' EIGHTH REPLY.

"Mr. Chairman, Gentlemen Moderators, Ladies and Gentlemen: I am very happy to appear before you again. Now, in regard to the statement in the contrast, as my respondent tried to draw, between our practice in receiving persons without money and his practice in sending the Octographic Review to people without money, I have this much to say. We do the very same thing to the full extent of our ability, and if it were allowable for us to explain all the facts, I am sure there would not be found a man,—one man out of a hundred that would not say we did not do it far beyond our ability, and yet we are accused of having mercenary motives in this matter. I say if Brother Sommer would turn over to us, to this whole faculty, all of the money which he receives from his publishing house,—the profits, I mean, not

the money,—the profits he receives from his publishing house, agency of books, sale of books which he advertises in the Review, he can have every dollar that this faculty takes out of this school. We will take it and divide it up and live on it. I don't know how much he gets, but I am satisfied he gets more than we do.

"Now, he knows something about schools, and he knows that a school where there are nine or ten teachers and 140 students,—140, 150 or 160,—he knows that it can't pay much, when quite a number out of that number are not paying anything, and make our rates as low as possible and live at all. And yet we are mercenary. The 'Octographic Review is strictly a religious enterprise,' but he admits it contains secular matter, and I have shown in this debate that he carries on a publishing business and has a book store and advertises) that book store through that Review, and he never denied that charge and he never can shake it. Yet it is strictly a religious thing.

"Saw behind the curtains,' but still that peep behind the curtains did not keep him from sending his own boys to the same kind of place, and the fact remains, my statement is true.

"One premise logic, and that I said the Savior used that kind of logic. I did not say so. I did not say the Savior used one premise logic. I said I had a good example in the conduct of my respondent, and I was using an argument ad hominum and the Savior used that kind of argument. That is what I said. I am using the same kind of argument He used in many instances. That is what I said, the Savior used that kind of argument that would convict the person and He did it repeatedly, and all logicians,—the merest tyro in logic,—knows that is admissible. If he has a defensible position or defensible proposition he would not complain of such things. If I had the time and disposition to take up his tract concerning 'religio-secular schools, their establishment, the Lord's money, their unscriptural use of,' and examine the syllogism, it could be made very clear and forceful that he has used very wretched logic.

"Well, he thought there was something in the letter to C. C. Potter that was not there. He admits in that connection that he meant to say so and so, but he did not say it. It was in his mind. Yet he won't allow Prof. Armstrong to mean to say things that he wanted to say."

Mr. Sommer:—"After making mention of that I said, 'but I didn't find it and I am bound by the letter.'"

Mr. Rhodes:—"I accept the correction and will proceed. 'I haven't tried,'—with reference to my last speech,—the main features in my last speech, he passed over with this slight remark,—'I haven't tried to discuss all things.' 'I haven't tried to discuss all things,'—we know that. We know he has not reached what he said is really fundamental. He has been dealing with incidentals almost altogether,— this audience knows that. And he has not discussed the name. He has said that a Bible name attached to an institution of this kind was a matter of great importance, and that has been one of the greatest objections to this work heretofore, yet he never considered the thing, and he says that is the chief thing and yet in this discussion he has omitted to mention it. You understand why he has omitted to mention it. He promised that he would mention it sometime,—that this discussion was to be continued. Well. I was rather under the impression that it was to be repeated, not continued. We are not to commence on new objections, we are going to discuss the same objections under the same rules,—both names signed under the same agreement and both discussions held the same as here,—I don't mean repeat verbatim everything. He owes it to this audience to give them the truth on this thing, and to develop before this audience

that upon which he has placed so much emphasis heretofore., You understand why he did not do it.

"Then followed a personal arraignment of me as a disputant. Well, what does my conduct as a disputant have to do particularly with the questions involved? I don't claim to be an experienced disputant, perhaps I have made mistakes, but nevertheless I have kept sufficiently close to him that he agreed this afternoon that in some measure we are having a close fight or tussle. Now then, we are ready now.

"'Falsely tried to excuse himself by saying he was imitating me,' and 'I arraign him for his sacrilegious tone, and he falsely tried to excuse himself by saying he was imitating me.' Who made Brother Sommer a judge of my heart? Who gave him the power to look into my heart? I know that God is the God searching hearts, that God is the heart searcher, but I never knew before that my respondent was. I know he makes great claims, but I never knew before that he had claimed a thing like that. 'Falsely' tried to excuse myself, in face of my statement that I didn't mean any sacrilege, and that I unconsciously, I suppose, imitated him. Yet he says, 'he falsely tried to excuse himself by saying he was trying to imitate me.' Who made him a heart searcher? It may pass somewhere, but it does not pass before this intelligent audience. We know, you know something about that, and that he has that kind of disposition was manifested on previous occasions in this case. That is characteristic of him."

Mr. Roberts:—"Mr. Chairman, I have two points of order, That Brother Rhodes must remember he is in his last speech. Several times he made statements to which Brother Sommer will have no chance to reply. Secondly, the personal attack that he is just making on Brother Sommer. Do you accept it? The personal attack,—do you accept it, the personal reflection? Just now he was making the personal reference to Brother Sommer,—'as all of you know that he has had this name of being of that character.' That statement should not be allowed in here, and the chairman has ruled some half dozen times, and this man had been called to order and the chairman ruled against the personality, even as the chairman has ruled that out and Brother Sommer accepted it. That statement he just made, 'that we all know that he has this name,'—that is another attack on Brother Sommer's reputation."

Mr. Rhodes:—"I said that we all knew that this was characteristic of him,—that we all know that was characteristic of Brother Sommer. Everything I said is strictly all right. Now, he raised, a point of order that I was introducing new matter. No new arguments have I introduced. I have been answering Brother Sommer's personal attacks upon me. I have a right to answer these personal attacks. Is he allowed to go on and personal attack me, and I am to keep still and not reply?"

Mr. Sommer:—"Mr. Chairman, my attacks on my respondent are with respect to him as a disputant in this discussion, and in all of that which I have said here, I held myself strictly to what he has said and done here as a disputant, lie, on the other hand, has made a charge against me with reference to general reputation, and he says 'we all know that thus and so' is true concerning me, and so on."

The Chairman:—"There has been too much of a personal character and personality in this debate already, and in view of the signing up of the agreement that that should not be, I hope you will proceed with that argument without discussion."

Mr. Nay:—"I think it would be in order then to strike out the personal attacks made by Brother Sommer in his last speech against Brother Rhodes."

Mr. Roberts:—"Have the stenographers strike out the personal attacks on Brother Sommer."

Mr. Rhodes:—"And the statement, that 'he falsely tried to excuse himself by saying he was imitating me.' That is in there."

Mr. Roberts:—"Bless your sweet, pretty, little lite, we are not talking about something that took place here. We are talking about the past, something that took place before you was born."

The Chairman:—"The debate shall proceed, and keep away from personality as authority."

Mr. Rhodes:—"One thing more I notice and then I begin my summary. He arraigned Rigdon's grammar. That was not unexpected. Of course, I can't say just what I want, for fear that I would give rise I to another point of older. But you see from his arraignment,—I had better confine myself to this debate,—it is seen from his arraignment of Rigdon's grammar that he considers himself above criticism. That he considers himself as occupying a position qualified to criticize anything and everything under the sun. Of course, when a man knows more about grammar than the grammarians, they can't do anything with him.

"Now then, I want to proceed with my summary, and first of all we have on our chart these admissions. It is admitted that Christians may baud themselves together to teach secular knowledge. That they may teach the Bible a part or all the time. That they may do this to make a living or as an act of charity. Now then, these are admissions. Brother Sommer accepts them as such, and never questioned them for a moment, but he denied that I had any right to go into any such arrangement in order to teach the Bible, and I conclusively have shown you from the scriptures,—4th chapter of Philippians, 20th chapter of Acts, and 9th chapter of 1st Corinthians,—that the apostle Paul did that very thing, using secular work that he might teach by example,—that he might impress lessons upon the people, and I say, too, that a man that, didn't have that as the chief purpose in his heart in going into any business was not the thorough going Christian that he should be and the power of God would make him, if he would submit himself to the Lord Jesus Christ. Brother Sommer said I played cuttle-fish, or that I dodged. He said that before I made my speech, using the quotations from Corinthians and other scripture. He said before that, that I dodged. If I had dodged, he never attacked my position after I cited those scriptures and made my explanation of them, but he went on and affirmed it by showing that the apostle Paul had one or two other purposes besides that which I have mentioned.

"Christians may band themselves together to teach secular knowledge; they may teach the Bible a part or all the time, for a man has a right.—he is under obligation, in whatever business he goes, to make that business subservient to the work of God. We have entered into this agreement here as individual Christians, and feel our responsibility to go into this as a business, as an avocation in life, while we are engaged in the vocation of being Christians, and one of the responsibilities of our vocation is teaching the word of God, and I hope that we have this view of teaching the word of God. I should hesitate and fear to go into the school with any other purpose.

"But we are accused of asking for money, and threatening with perdition those who do not give. Perhaps I had better not say anything about it, because I did not say anything about it before. Let it go. Prof. Armstrong, I know he will attend to that in the written discussion. Yes, indeed, we give Christians an opportunity, and any

begging we have ever done has been no more than giving them an opportunity. We have always in our letters of appeals.—we always said that if your hearts are stirred, if you feel like you want to. We have never done more than that. Brother Sommer keeps the columns of his paper open to receive gifts and makes report of gifts to the Review fund. I notice in one issue \$100. 00 gift, and he received, according to my information, from one man or the estate of one man, a \$1000. 00 gift, and there are some others.

"Now then, we have,—so far as this discussion goes he has arraigned us on account of our name, but has not done anything more than arraign. He has not offered a single argument on the name. 'Let sacred things be called by sacred names, and lei secular things be called by secular names, and mixed things by mixed names.' I quoted that this afternoon. We have what I call a mixed thing, and we have a mixed name for it. Though we did it not especially to please Brother Sommer, we hope he will be pleased by it. But I must hasten on.

"Now then, our organization. Again, I say he has all the organization in his institution or journal,—his enterprise,—that we have in our enterprise, every bit. His organization has a head; ours has a head. We call him president, he calls him editor. He says that our head has a title attached to his name. That has not anything to do with his headship, he could be head of the school and have no titles. That is an incidental, that is all. He had those titles before he became head of this school. Brother Sommer could have had a title if he had stayed long enough to graduate. Has a publisher, or one who looks over things in the absence of the editor, as you were told this morning.—or an assistant head. We have an assistant head, a man that takes charge when the president is absent. He has field editors, we have business managers. He has contributorial staff, we have teachers. He has patrons, we have patrons. He has religious matter, we have religious matter. He has secular matter,—that is shown in the matter itself. He has admitted that in some degree he has, so that principle is there, and it is secular in that the Review is made the means of advertising a secular business, namely, book selling for profit, and these facts cannot be gotten around, and you have not seen anything mentioned here to defend that last indictment, not one. Not a word has been spoken on that subject by my worthy brother. He ignores it completely, more completely ignores it than the name, for he did mention that.

"And religio-secular schools are bad. That is, religio-secular schools established with the Lord's money. After he had seen behind the curtain he sent his own boys to Lexington. You have heard his explanation of it,—heard his defense of it,—and here is a man grown, and known for years and years and gone on record in the Christian Review, he states, in opposition to all such schools, yet in choosing a school, he sent them to that kind of a school. Now then, Christian fathers and mothers, what do you say to his answer, 'to send them to the state university,'—when he was pressed to tell you where to send your children,—'or to send them to some good school,' and when pressed to name them, mentioned Bloomington, Indiana, and the state university there. That was not his practice. He had not given an example of that kind. When he sent his boys away from home he did not send them to a state school. (Lexington University is a state school, D. S.).

"Now then, this C. C. Potter letter. The only objections he urged in that letter was about calling it a Bible school, and you know that is not so very important because he has ignored that part of the discussion altogether in this meeting,—just barely mentioned it, with a promise that at some future time it will be considered.

I have been calling his attention to that point this whole day. I had a fear that would not be considered and I had to introduce it myself. Now then, dear friends, we have before you these facts, that here in this place we have an institution or a school that teaches the Bible and in connection therewith,—teaches secular knowledge and in connection therewith teaches the Bible. We offer to all the advantages of this institution. We offer them free to those who are unable to pay,—to the extent of our ability. We are not in (his for the cash, we are in this for the good we can do, and if we could feed and clothe and educate every orphan boy and girl in the whole land, if we had the accommodations for them, and if we had the money to sustain them, our doors would be thrown wide open to all such. This is strictly a private enterprise. No corporation, simply a private body,—a private business. True, that we ask and receive help from those whose hearts are stirred to help us bear these burdens, and we thank God for such hearts, we thank God for such influences.

"I came here with a purpose of learning.—I came here that I might be led forward and further to the truth of God, and I pledge you my word as a Christian, that when I began this discussion, I did so to learn the truth, and if this discussion discloses that I am wrong I should cheerfully and gladly change, though it would be with reluctance in separating from those hearts that I love. I am open to receive the truth. I have been pleading for it through all this discussion and you are the judges of what I received. Of course, we do not expect our worthy respondent to be,—to feel the opportunity for receiving the truth that I did, seeing that he is so much older. Now then, in conclusion, friends, for I have said all that I believe is necessary to say."

Mr. Sommer:—"There was a reflection made there against my general standing by reason of my age. He did not calculate I would be as free to receive the truth because I was so old. I have dealt with him simply in regard to his polemical character,—his character as a disputant. He has referred to my general character time and again in a besmirching manner."

Mr. Rhodes:—"If by referring to Brother Sommer's experience and age I was besmirching his character, I am sorry I said anything about it. I didn't mean to cast any reflections on him."

The Chairman:—"He may have taken it that way, but I did not see it that way."

Mr. Rhodes:—"I meant nothing of the kind." Mr. Sommer:—"He said that he did not calculate or expect that I would be of the same disposition that he was, in regard to willingness to receive truth or be convinced. That was his statement, and the amplification of that statement was, because I was so much older. That implied that by reason of my age, I am not open to conviction. In that there is a reflection on me on both phases. First, on my general disposition; secondly, as a reason for that general disposition, my age."

Mr. Nay:—"The chairman was agreed upon by both disputants and by both moderators to act as presiding chairman in this discussion. We have believed that he has been fair and honorable, and I say this, that in due honor to him that each disputant should regard his decision as he shall rule, which he has done, and offer no rejoinder by way of trying to set aside his decision which he had made, and in this respect especially Brother Sommer has not shown to the chairman that due, honorable respect that he should have shown him, especially so after the chair had ruled on that question."

Mr. Roberts:—"Just a word. That is, that my brother moderator take some of the same medicine out of his own spoon. The chair ruled and when he had done so he got up and called on the chair

after the chair ruled. So Brother Nay should take some of his own medicine. Brother Sommer was not reflecting on the chair at ail. He was just simply explaining something that the chairman had said he did not understand. That is the way the chairman expressed it, and Brother Sommer got up to explain what he meant. I think he has a right to explain a point of objection, and my brother moderator ought to have understood that much, that a man has a right to make an explanation of something that he feels another does not understand, whether the other party expresses himself in that way or not. Brother Sommer explained to the chairman at this time. The chairman has been just, fair and honest, and I can say 'amen' to what Brother Nay has said concerning the chairman. And Brother Nay has been doing the same thing he charged Brother Sommer with doing."

Mr. Nay:—"I have long since ceased taking my food through the means of a spoon, and I am able to eat meat I deny the charge of the moderator that I did the same thing after the chair ruled awhile ago. I simply asked the chair if Brother Rhodes' criticisms were to be retracted, that the criticisms of Brother Sommer in his previous speech be also expunged. It was not pertaining to that,—it was not pertaining to that upon which the chair had ruled, but that in addition to retracting or expunging what Brother Rhodes had said concerning Brother Sommer, that Brother Sommer's personal remarks against Brother Rhodes in his previous speech be expunged. And that was new matter entirely."

Mr. Roberts:—"I was watching that. I am always on my guard. I have been there too many times. We will not discuss this further, as to what Brother Nay has said, it is so near our train time and we are under promise to leave on that train. And now, I want to re-state this, as to whether Brother Sommer had a right to make an explanation to the chair of what he meant. That is the only thing. It is useless for us to parley over the other statement. The question is as to whether Brother Sommer had a right to explain to the chair what he meant, and everybody in this house,—big, little, young and old,— knows that he had,—that was ever inside of a debating circle."

The Chairman:—"I recognize the fact that he had a right to offer an explanation, but I ruled that I didn't think there was any aspersion toward him in regard to his age, from Brother Rhodes. That was my ruling."

Mr. Roberts:—"Thank you for sustaining my position."

Mr. Rhodes:—"Now, we have had some scripture presented about being complete in Christ. About we are complete in Christ, and I say that the work in which we are engaged here does not in any sense militate against the statement of the apostle that we are complete in Him, and any attempt to use such scripture in condemnation of our work, which we have from admissions and from scripture shown to be a legitimate work, is out of order,—it is foreign to these scriptures and making a wrong use of them. So, too, 2nd Timothy 3:17, that it thoroughly furnishes the man of God unto all good work. In view of the admissions,—three of them,—which we have had before us ever since this discussion opened, and in view of the fact that everything we claim in that matter was admitted, except the purpose of those teaching the Bible in it,— everything has been admitted except that,— and in view of our purpose that we should, if we enter into a work, enter into it with a purpose of teaching the Bible, with the purpose of being Christians,—one of the obligations of which is to teach God's word,—and so 2d Timothy 3:17, DOES NOT MILITATE against the fundamental principle of Christians banding themselves together to teach secular knowledge, or to have the purpose of teaching God's word when they enter into it."

On Thursday, the 21st day of February, 1907, the second series of debate was commenced at Hale, Missouri.

After reading the rules of debate hereinbefore set forth, the chairman introduced the first speaker, Mr. Daniel Sommer.

DANIEL SOMMER'S FIRST SPEECH AT HALE.

"Mr. Chairman, Gentlemen Moderators, Ladies and Gentlemen: Of course, you have had a statement that we are going to have a discussion here concerning the college question. But why should we have such a debate, or discussion, may not be clear to you all, especially as my respondent and myself profess to be members of the Church of Christ. And thus I shall endeavor to explain, in the beginning of this address, why it is that we are here. The remotest reason that I can think of is that Solomon says, 'Iron sharpeneth iron; and so doth a man sharpen the countenance of his friend.' I am here to interest my friend, sharpen his countenance if I can, and

I suppose he will endeavor to sharpen mine. Another reason I express in the language of Alexander Pope. He says:

'By mutual intercourse and mutual aid,
Great deeds are done and great discoveries made.
The wise new wisdom on the wise bestow,
While the lone thinker's thoughts come slight and slow.'

"We can learn by investigation of this kind, if we are open to conviction, and the rule is, whether the disputants are in that frame of mind or not, nevertheless in the audience there are always those who can be convinced by a proper presentation of the matters involved. Having said this much, I now mention to you the closest reason why we are here today in this debate. The apostle Paul says, in 1st Corinthians, 11th chapter, 19th verse: 'For there must be also heresies among you, that they which are approved may be made manifest among you.' The word 'heresies' means option, choice, division, strife, contention, faction, and in the New Testament it is used with reference to the choice of man in opposition to authority, and thus Paul speaks of a heresy, and because a matter of choice, in opposition to divine authority, has arisen we are here today. And at this juncture I wish to present to you briefly the history of the Church of Christ from an early date in the 19th century to the present, in regard to the matter that is now involved.

"Early in the 19th century certain men arose, who looked over the religious world and saw the creeds and confessions of faith and clergymen and theological seminaries, that had divided the professed followers of Christ into many parties and denominations, warring and contending with each other, and as a result there were feuds and bitterness, strifes and contentions that were dishonoring to the Divine Master's name. Therefore these men began to plead for the oneness of all of God's people upon the Bible only, and early in that plea which they made, they adopted this declaration: 'Where the Bible speaks we speak, where the Bible is silent we are silent.' They adopted such a declaration because they believed that it was founded upon the Sacred Text, and they referred to many scriptures in order to show that it was certainly in harmony with the divine will. For instance, Colossians 2:10, says of Christians, 'And ye are complete in him, who is the head of all principality and power.' And the apostle Paul said in

2 Timothy 8:10, 17, that the inspired scripture perfected the man' of God and thoroughly furnished him to every good work. The apostle Peter said in his 2d letter, first chapter and third verse, that God's divine power has given to us all things that pertain unto life and godliness. These and many other scripture they held clearly authorized the aphorism I have mentioned, that 'Where the Bible speaks we speak,

where the Bible is silent we are silent.' As a result Alexander Campbell, who was one of those men whom I have spoken of, in the year 1823, in his first essay in the Christian Baptist, which began to be published that year, expressed himself after this manner concerning the primitive church.

"The order of their assemblies was uniformly the same. It did not vary with moons and seasons. It did not change as dress nor fluctuate as the manners of the times. Their devotion did not diversify itself into the endless forms of modern times. They had no monthly concerts for prayer; no solemn convocations, no great fasts, nor preparation, nor thanksgiving days. Their churches were not fractured into missionary societies, Bible societies, education societies; nor did they dream of organizing such in the world. The head of a believing household was not in those days a president or manager of a board of foreign missions; his wife, the president of some female education society; his eldest son, the recording secretary of some domestic Bible society; his eldest daughter, the corresponding secretary of a mite society; his servant maid, the vice-president of a rag society; and his little daughter, a tutoress of a Sunday school. They knew nothing of the hobbies of modern times. In their church capacity alone they moved. They neither transformed themselves into any other kind of association, nor did they fracture and sever themselves into divers societies. They viewed the church of Jesus Christ as the Scheme of Heaven to ameliorate the world; as members of it, they considered themselves bound to do all they could for the glory of God and the good of men. They dare not transfer to a missionary society, or Bible society, or education society, a cent or a prayer, lest in so doing they should rob the church of its glory, and exalt the inventions of men above the wisdom of God. In their church capacity alone they moved. The church they considered "the pillar and ground of the truth;" they viewed it as the temple of the Holy Spirit; as the house of the living God. They considered if they did all they could in this capacity, they had nothing left for any other object of a religious nature.'

"Now, ladies and gentlemen, consider these points. The primitive church, said this man, 'dare not transfer to a missionary society, or Bible society, or education society, a cent or a prayer, lest in so doing they should rob the church of its glory, and exalt the inventions of man above the wisdom of God,' and when they had done all that they were required to do as members of the church, he said they 'had nothing left for any other object of a religious nature.'"

"Now, that is where the disciple brotherhood started. That is the position which the disciple brotherhood took early in the 19th century, and such being the case they moved along holding that the church is 'the pillar and ground of the truth,' and that they should not, outside of the church,—without making mention of the divinely ordained family,—they should not go into any other society or arrangement of a religious nature for the purpose of doing good.

"Thus the disciples proceeded for a considerable period, but Alexander Campbell, unfortunately, became a popular man, and in the year 1840 so far deviated from what is here stated in this quotation which I have brought before you, that he secured a charter for a religio-secular college called Bethany College, situated at a place called Bethany, in Brooke County, of West Virginia, and when he established that college it was for the purpose of giving a secular education and teaching persons in the Bible in connection therewith. That college gave birth to another, called the Northwestern Christian University, and these to others, and to others, and to others, and just in proportion as the development was made, clergymen were trained that went forth from these colleges, the Christian Church division was established, and these colleges in the Christian Church, now amounting probably to twenty-five

or more, have been sending forth year by year a company of preachers—clergymen who have noted (he part of theological vipers,—whose business has been very largely made to consist in this,—to sting the Churches of Christ to death it' they could not turn them over to their innovationism. They are now engaged in stinging each other to death at the point of higher criticism, at the point of church federation, and various other controversies that have arisen among them. So that is the history there.

"About twenty years ago something else arose, the beginning of collegism among the churches of Christ, or those who professed so to be. In the meantime the two religious bodies had become very largely separated, one called the Christian Church and the other the Church of Christ. Alexander Campbell acted the part of a REFORMER and established the Church of Christ, then he changed and became a CONFORMER and established what we have generally known as the Christian Church, of the character I have mentioned,—the innovation part of the disciple brotherhood. But there were many of the brotherhood who would not go with him. They remained along the line of his teaching as a reformer, and these opposed the innovations generally. But about twenty years ago some of them began to discuss the question of starting Bible colleges. That was done down in the South. We shall have the history of them there at the proper time and shall bring the proof to show that the purpose of starting such a school was to train men for the ministry. Thus in Nashville, and soon the Bowling Green college, which was the offspring of that at Nashville, began to conduct the same kind of work. At a later date here at Odessa., Missouri, certain gentlemen, most of whom came up from the South, established themselves in what has been designated as the 'Western Bible and Literary College,' or rather, they banded themselves together for the purpose of establishing that kind of an institution. And when, in the meantime, their conformity to the order of things that Alexander Campbell started in the year 1840, was observed there began to be opposition to that sort of college business among the apostolic churches, and that, we may say, is the secret of this discussion here today. In other words, there were disciples of Christ who were NOT DISPOSED TO SCORN HISTORY, and they considered the history of Bethany College, with the colleges that sprang therefrom, and they saw that the tendency, as far as apostolic simplicity was concerned, was continually in the wrong direction, and they could not have confidence that any man could begin such a college, or any company of men could establish such a college, which would not do the same thing over again. Consequently these began to cuter their protests against that kind of an institution, and year after year it has been written against and spoken against, especially in private circles, until the writing and talking together culminated in a public oral discussion. Probably I ought to say this, just at this juncture, that there would not have been such a discussion here if those who wrote against such institutions could only have had a fair representation all the way through, of what they regarded fair with reference to the discussion, but we found that it was necessary to have a close, sharp conflict in order to have those who were favoring these institutions to subject their position to a close, critical examination, and that is a further reason why we are here today in this discussion. We have concluded a two days' discussion, of four sessions of discussion, over at Odessa. In that discussion we considered THE UNSCRIPTURALNESS OF THE ORIGIN OF A COLLEGE OF THIS KIND, with reference to which we are talking, or which is now under controversy, and we closed up the discussion there with an arraignment of the institution as such, and perhaps I can't do any better than to present it here. We had a discourse made over

there in regard to what the debate is NOT ABOUT, and what it IS ABOUT, and then we closer! up with an arraignment.

"WHAT THIS DEBATE IS NOT ABOUT.

"1st. This debate is not in regard to personal matters.

"2d. This debate is not in regard to legal affairs.

"3d. This debate is not in regard to moral questions except incidentally.

"4th. This debate is not in regard to educational questions as such.

"5th. This debate is not in regard to religious questions as such.

"6th. This debate is not in regard to the right to establish a school, nor to teach school for a living.

"7th. This debate is not in regard to the right of Christians to use the Bible in such schools.

"8th. This debate is not in regard to the right of Christians to institute a religio-secular school that is untitled and that does not confer pompous titles on its highest graduates.

"9th. This debate is not in regard to a religious school that is acknowledged as a religious institution.

"10th. This debate is not concerning a school that is true to the Bible.

WHAT THIS DEBATE IS ABOUT.

"1st. This debate is about an institution known as Western Bible and Literary College, a school or college which has been established FOR THE PURPOSE of teaching persons in a certain religion as its CHIEF PURPOSE, and to bestow pompous titles on its highest graduates.

"Now notice, the emphasis is placed here, 'FOR THE PURPOSE of establishing such an institution,—or THE PURPOSE of establishing such an institution having as its CHIEF PURPOSE to teach persons in a certain religion and to bestow pompous titles on its highest graduates.'

"2d. This debate is concerning a school or college which declares itself to be NOT A RELIGIOUS INSTITUTION, 'though established to teach a certain religion as its CHIEF PURPOSE OR END.

"M. This debate is about a school or college which pretends to be more of a permanent religious influence than the Church of God, and yet declares itself to be NOT A RELIGIOUS INSTITUTION.

"4th. This debate is concerning a school or college which pretends to excel the family and the church in teaching religion, and yet pretends that it is NOT A RELIGIOUS INSTITUTION.

"5th. This debate is in regard to a school or college which indirectly threatens Christians with the loss of their souls if they do not give to its support, and yet pretends it is NOT A RELIGIOUS INSTITUTION.

"6th. This debate is in regard to a school or college which has in part a very religious name, and yet pretends it is NOT A RELIGIOUS INSTITUTION.

"7th. This debate is concerning a school or college which appeals to the Church of Christ for money and pupils and prayers, because of its religious features, and yet 'declares it is NOT A RELIGIOUS INSTITUTION.

"8th. This is a debate concerning a school or college which leaches that in every child there is an embryo God, and the college is set for the development of this embryo, and without education human beings can not be men and women, but ARE MERE ANIMALS.

"9th. This is a debate in regard to a school or college which is presided over by a president who confesses that he is in his spiritual babyhood, and who shows that he loves pompous, worldly titles.

"10th. This is a debate concerning a school or college which implies that inspired men wrote falsely when they declared that, the inspired scriptures perfect the man of God and thoroughly furnish him to every good work.

"Arraignment of Odessa College in the conclusion of the Skirmish at Odessa, Missouri:

"1. They have ignored all that the New Testament teaches in regard to the perfection of the family and the church as divine institutions for the highest and best religious education of mankind, without educational appendages, arranged by mankind, to teach persons in religion.

"2. They have ignored the divine doctrine that faith will enable pupils, who are seeking education, in secular schools, to overcome the world, and thus overcome the infidel tendencies which may be found in such schools.

"3. They have ignored the silence of the New Testament in regard to Christians establishing colleges to teach mankind in religion.

"4. They have ignored all that human history sets forth in regard to the evil tendencies of such schools as they favor and advocate. They seem to 'scorn history.'

"5. They have ignored what common sense teaches in regard to the best method to secure the best education.

"6. They have exalted their schools and colleges above the church of God in regard to doing good, especially in taking persons 'back to Jerusalem.'

"7. They have endorsed, and, many of them, have adopted, the pride and folly of pompous, worldly titles.

"8. They have introduced and advocated that which they know is divisive of the church of God.

"9. They have refused to consider seriously any objection that is urged against the college to teach pupils in regard to religion, but endeavor to be artful dodgers of the real controversy.

"10. The presidents of those colleges recommend, and even require, their pupils to read much ungodly and insidious literature and thereby they train them to go in the way of ungodliness.

"11. They propose, in teaching pupils in the Bible, to do that which can be better clone, and more safely done, in the family, and in the church.

"12. Presidents of those colleges show, by the errors set forth in most of their catalogues, that they do not understand the proper construction of the English language, and, thus, show that they are not fit for the positions they occupy.

"13. As schools, of the best kind, may be established, by those who are competent to do so, without pompous, worldly titles, those disciples who have adopted such titles in their schools, show that they are partakers of the pride and folly of the world.

"14. Their disposition to avoid affirming that their schools are 'scriptural, shows that they either do not regard them as scriptural, or do not regard themselves as capable of defending scriptural institutions, and in either view of their condition of mind they are, evidently, unfit to occupy the position of educators.

"15. The chief advocates of colleges to teach pupils in religion, among churches of Christ, have adopted a course of unfairness, in controversy, which shows that they are not fit to be educators of the young, and those preachers who have endorsed that course have shown that they can not be, safely, recognized as safe preachers for the churches of Christ.

"16. I also arraign the advocates of religious colleges among churches of Christ on the offense of introducing an occasion for con-

trovery and division, which has already done more harm than the colleges have, thus far, done good.

"17. They have, by their colleges, made themselves, inconsistent, and weak, in condemning humanly arranged missionary societies, and other human devices, in religious work.

"18. In trying to defend their colleges they have adopted methods of reasoning, and evasion, that are common among the advocates of musical instruments in the digressive Christian Church.

"19. The spirit which they have manifested in trying to advocate and defend the mentioned colleges, shows that they are innovators.

"20. Finally, the so-called Bible Schools and Colleges, to teach persons in religion, among the churches of Christ, are unscriptural in name, in the use which is made of the Lord's money, in establishing and supporting them, in the use made of the time of preachers while teaching in them, in the pompous titles used by a majority of teachers in them, and which are conferred by most of them, and they are unscriptural in the use which is made of ungodly literature in them, and in the unsound speech used in the catalogues issued by several of them.

"This arraignment was made over at Odessa, and the very best that could be said against it, or the very worst that could be said against it has been said, and we have covered that much; We then dealt chiefly with THE ORIGIN OF THE INSTITUTION and now we come to deal with certain special phases of the Institution, and one of them is its misuse of the Lord's money. In order to bring before you what I wish to say along that line I shall read a little from a tract:

"'But if any provide not for his own, and especially for those of his own house, he hath denied the faith and is worse than an infidel.' I Tim. 5:8. 'Render therefore unto Caesar the things which are Caesar's; and unto God the things that are God's. Matt. 22:21. 'For this cause pay ye tribute also.' Rom. 13:6. 'Upon the first day of the week let every one of you lay by him in store as God hath prospered him, that there he no gatherings when I come.' I Cor. 16:2.

"The several scriptures just cited set forth the threefold financial obligations of Christians, namely, to their own dependent ones, to Caesar,—civil government,—and to God,—the cause of Christ. Our own dependent ones must be provided for, and Caesar must be paid what he exacts. If when this is done there is nothing left then we have not been prospered, and therefore we are not required to give anything to the Lord's cause. The Lord does not require us to give him what our dependent ones really need, nor what Caesar exacts. But all that those dependent on us for support do not need, and which Caesar does not exact certainly constitutes our prosperity. Supporting our dependent ones and paying Caesar what he exacts will be all that the Lord will require of us if that be all that we can do, after exercising due diligence and economy. God would not receive from the Jew as a gift to him what was due to parents (Mark 7:10-13), and he does not require that we as Christians shall give him what is due to parents or to any other dependent ones of our house, nor what is due to the civil government under which we live. To the Jew he said: 'I hate robbery for burnt offering,' (Isa. 61:8),—and there is no evidence that he has ever changed his sentence on that subject.'

"My time has about expired, ladies and gentlemen, and I will leave the floor for my respondent."

B. F. RHODES' FIRST REPLY AT HALE.

"Mr. Chairman, Brother Moderators, Ladies and Gentlemen:—I am highly pleased to be with you and to have the privilege of investigating this question, inasmuch as it seems to me to be a very important question, one affecting the welfare of mankind. And in prefacing my part of this discussion I wish to say that the sole purpose

for which I appear here before you today is to elicit the truth of God upon the questions involved. No question of personal gain or personal advantage, nor even a question of victory has brought me here. None of these have moved me in these matters, but it is to elicit the truth, and I profess to you here today, dear friends and many of you brothers in Christ, that I have a perfect willingness to be led anywhere and everywhere (that truth can lead me in this world, and I care not through whom,—who may be the instrument,—through whom that truth may come, and in this respect I take great pleasure in the fact that if I be in the wrong my worthy respondent will certainly be able to show it, and show it in such way that it will be unquestionably plain, not only to you but, I trust, to me also. Not that victory and truth are incompatible, but above everything else, above every other consideration, I want the truth. It is the only thing that is really worth having. I am happy in the goodness and mercy of God, who, though in spite of some degree of physical frailty, has preserved me with strength sufficient to enter upon this division of this discussion.

"We notice now some statements set forth by our worthy respondent. We are told that heresy is choice in opposition to divine authority. That is all right. I accept that definition. I profess to you here today that if, in pleading the cause I plead, I am working and acting in opposition to divine authority I want to know it more earnestly than anybody in this house possibly can, for it is of more importance to me than it can possibly be to you, and I profess a sincere earnestness in myself. It is to be shown that this is heresy, that my position, my work is choice in opposition to divine authority. My worthy respondent said that is why we are here. Now, I submit that the thing, that the work in which I am engaged does not rest upon such a basis as that. It is not a choice in opposition to divine authority, as we hope to abundantly prove to you before this discussion shall end. And he referred to the work of Alexander Campbell in connection with Thomas Campbell and other great men, who in the beginning of the 19th century did such a great work. And in that statement it was said that Alexander Campbell opposed theological seminaries, and with Alexander Campbell I stand today in opposition to theological seminaries.

"We were referred to scriptures,—Colossians 2:10, 2d Timothy 3:16, 17, 2d Peter 1:3 and perhaps one or two others, but these were the ones I noted. I shan't take up these scriptures at present, but we will wait until the argument is developed by my brother and applied in opposition to the work in which I am engaged and I pledge my word here today as an honest man, and as a Christian, who loves the truth, to **HARMONIZE MY PRACTICE WITH THE SCRIPTURE OR ELSE CHANGE MY PRACTICE,**

"We had a long letter, or rather, a long extract from a tract which is a re-print from some pages in the first number of the Christian Baptist, then we are brought down to 1840, Bethany College, and the charter which Alexander Campbell secured for the establishment of Bethany College. Perhaps these people have thought that since we were engaged in a college work that that had a probable application to us. But suffice it to say that such is not the case. We are not,—our school is not a chartered school. I don't say it would be wrong to be a chartered school, but our school is not a chartered school. In fact. When there was an old college in Odessa which had been established some 20 or 30 years, which had run down and the property no longer used for school purposes, and the citizens of Odessa proffered of their own will,—earnestly sought us to accept that building and the contents belonging to it, on condition that we would begin a school there, and they proffered to buy out the stock,—buy up the stock, buy up the stockholders holding the stock in that school, and turn it over to us. That school was chartered,—was a chartered school,—and as a condi-

tion of our accepting that offer we stipulated that they should disestablish the school,—dis-establish it and the charter. They bought the stock of other citizens, surrendered the charter back to the state and handed it over to us as individual property.

"And so we were informed that about 20 years ago, that at Nashville, Tennessee, a school was started,—a Bible school or Bible college,—and this school purposed to train men for the ministry. Now, I submit that in a sense the statement, 'to train men for the ministry' is not a bad insinuation,—has not a bad meaning. In a certain sense it does not, in a certain other sense it does, but I know that we do not propose to train men for the ministry in any offensive sense of that term whatever. I don't believe you can find a spot on earth where there are Christians, where the same number of Christians, taken together, have a less conception of the importance belonging to the pomposity that is usually attributable to clergymen, than we have in our association. I am sure that is so. Upon that point we believe that every child of God is God's minister to minister the word of God to the extent of his ability and in harmony with God's scripture and revelations. We do not believe in a special class devoted to the ministry. We believe that that class includes the whole Church of God, to the extent of the ability of the person and their opportunity, and in harmony with the scriptural regard that God has seen fit to place above the work of certain divisions of the Church of God. So, we are not in the work for the purpose of training a set of clergymen, and I may say to you, in regard to the Nashville school, that from the very first girls were admitted to that school, to the same classes with the boys, and surely, surely, it will not be charged that they were being prepared for the ministry. All the classes that were open to the boys were also open to the girls. But right on this point, I may say that granting that Bethany college was started right,—granting that,—and then it apostatized, that is no argument against a work that in itself is admittedly righteous. The fact that a thing apostatized is not an argument against the work itself. About the same time,—about the same time that Bethany. College became an apostate, I presume the Millennial Harbinger became a disseminator of apostatism, and if this be an argument against colleges because Bethany College apostatized, is it not equally a greater argument against journals because the Millennial Harbinger apostatized? If not, why not? Shall we cease to make Christians because of the apostatizing of Christians? Shall we cease to establish congregations because of the possibility of the congregation apostatizing? In fact, I am almost ready to say that, given time enough, any congregation will apostatize from the truth. For the church as it was perfected as a divine measure, as it was established by Jesus Christ and his apostles, itself apostatized, and I am not confident of my power, nor of the power of any man living today, to do much better work along that line than Jesus Christ and His apostles did.

"Then followed a long arraignment. Of course, it is not expected that I shall answer a, long arraignment. That was simply and solely an indictment and no proof, whatever, offered. It was a long document and, of course, looked like that it might have great weight when really there was not a single bit of proof offered in defense of that indictment. Not a single bit. So I am not bound to notice it.

"But before we proceed further we would point out before you today the term religio-secular schools, etc. Now then, I have these questions: 1st. What do you mean by the term 'religio-secular; define term. 2d. What feature or features are necessarily present in a school or its management to make it a religio-secular school? 3d. If a Christian parent, having a child that has finished the local school, should ask you 'Where shall I send my child to school?' What would be your answer?"

"Now, I submit these questions to my worthy respondent and hope that during the discussion, and in his judgment when it is best, he will consider them.

"Now then, we have here before you some matter that if it is established,—if it be established will set aside any and all objections that may be urged to the incidents of accomplishing our work, and in order that we may be able to address the eye as well as the ear, we have before you this brief presentation of the matter. (Exhibits Chart). In this we have three divisions. It is admitted that Christians may band themselves together to teach secular knowledge. 2d. They may teach the Bible a part or all the time. 3d. They may do this to make a living or as an act of charity. And these statements are statements taken from the Octographic Review of August 29, 1905, from the pen of Brother W. W. Otey. I selected these because they seemed to be the most definite of anything I could find upon any of these points. Now then, that I am not doing an unjust part, this was endorsed by Brother Sommer, himself, in the issue of the Octographic Review of September 5, 1905, offering but one criticism upon the article presented by Brother Otey, and that not affecting these statements. Now, what do we find? That Christians may band themselves together to teach secular knowledge; and after that is done, 2d., they may teach the Bible part or all the time; and finally, they may do this to make a living or as an act of charity; and it is admitted that such is the case. Admitted, mind you, admitted. So now then let us keep these facts in mind. But it may be objected that they can not, and it is not admitted that they may band themselves together with the purpose of teaching the Bible. True, that is not so stated in these admissions, but if they can establish that they may have that purpose when they enter into such schools, then my case is made and this whole controversy is settled. I will hang the whole controversy on this chart and the arguments I may make from it. Now let UP come up to the work and see what can be done. 'Christians may band themselves together to teach secular knowledge. 2d. They may teach the Bible a part or all the time. 3d. They may do this to make a living or as an act of charity.'

"Now then, dear friends, let me call your attention to Philippians 4:8, 9: 'Finally, brethren, whatsoever things are true, whatsoever things are honest, whatsoever things are just, whatsoever things are pure, whatsoever things are lovely, whatsoever things are of good report; if there be any virtue, and if there be praise, think on these things.' Now then, isn't it a matter of purity and virtue to teach useful secular knowledge? Certainly it is. Isn't it a matter of truth and virtue and honesty,—isn't it honorable? Yes sir. Isn't it a matter of truth and virtue to teach the Bible? Isn't it? Certainly. Isn't it proper and honorable to do this to make a living or as an act of charity,—wholly or partly free, just as circumstances seem to demand? Certainly. It is pure and honorable,—it is noble and there is nothing against it. It is virtuous, it is honorable, it is lovely, it is good, and it is of good report. But, says some one,—yes, but it says, we have not read far enough. Lots of things seem to be of good report, and seem to be honorable, that don't come under the proper head. Seems like you ought to read the next verse in order to get Paul's idea of what is good and honorable. 'Those things, which ye have both learned, and received, and heard, and seen in me, do; and the God of peace shall be with you.' Now then, we have banded ourselves together to teach secular knowledge. We have done this, too, with a view,—and I avow that purpose,—to using the opportunity at hand for teaching the word of God, and I should be ashamed,—I would hate,—I would be afraid to enter into any business or occupation in life where my chief purpose and object was not to build up God's kingdom,—where it was not to glorify God,—where I was not engaged in that business with a high aim to teaching

the word of God to all whom I might come in contact. I would be afraid not to do it, and I should hate to enter into any school where I would be hindered and bound down so that I could not do it. But now then, what is the evidence of Paul? 'Those things which ye have both learned, and received, and heard and seen in me, do.'

"School teaching is an honorable business, an upright business and a permissible business for Christians to engage in. Admittedly so. And now then, they may do it to aid them to make a living. It is all right to teach school to make a living, but they should not go into a school in order to teach the Bible in that school,—should not have that purpose. Now then, I want to see that we follow his example,—I have read this for that purpose: 'Those things, which ye have both learned, and received, and heard, and seen in me do.' Now then, what did Paul do? Paul worked at secular callings to make a living. Yes sir. Solely for it? No, no, no. He didn't engage in that solely to make a living, and I call your attention to 20th chapter of Acts, 33d verse and probably running down to the 35th verse. 'I have coveted no man's silver, or gold or apparel. Yea, ye yourselves know, that these hands have ministered Unto my necessities, and to them that were with me.' Certainly, he labored and supported himself, and also labored to support others. 'In all things I gave you an example, that so laboring ye ought to support the weak, and to remember the words of the Lord Jesus, how he said, it is more blessed to give than to receive.'

"So Paul had the purpose of making a living, of helping to support others, and of setting an example to them how they should do,—setting them an example how they should do. Now then, may I not follow the example of the apostle Paul? And he also adds further: 'In all things I gave you an example, that so laboring ye ought to support the weak, and to remember the words of the Lord Jesus, how he said, it is more blessed to give than to receive.'

"He did this to teach them by his life the power of giving,—of giving themselves, of giving their services,—and manifested the doctrine of Jesus Christ in his life. If it be right for the apostle Paul to enter into that work with that in view, why is it all wrong for me and my associates?

"Again, I want to call your attention, if I mistake not, to the 9th chapter of 1st Corinthians, and nth verse: 'For it is written in the law of Moses, Thou shalt not muzzle the mouth of the ox that treadeth out the corn. Doth God take care for oxen? Or saith he it altogether for our sakes? For our sakes, no doubt, this is written: that he that ploweth should plow in hope; and that he that thresheth in hope should be partaker of his hope. If we have sown unto you spiritual things, is it a great thing if we shall reap your carnal things? If others be partakers of this power over you, are not we rather? Nevertheless we have not used this power; but suffer all things, lest we should hinder the gospel of Christ.'

"Paul is here defending the right to demand a support from those among whom he labored. But he says he would not do it. Friends supplied part of it; he worked with his own hands to supply part of it, and why did he do it? 'Nevertheless we have not used this right, but we bear all things that we may cause no hindrance to the gospel of Christ.' He did it to further the gospel of Christ. Then, if the apostle Paul could enter into honorable business and support himself,—partly support himself,—in order that he might cause no hindrance to the cause of Christ, in order that I may draw on the gospel of Christ why is it wrong for me to have the purpose in my heart when I establish a work in which to spend my time?

"Now then, we have these points before us, and if this be established,—if this be established,—if this stands, the whole case is mine. Now, that is true, the whole case is mine. There may be incidentals

objected to; there may be little peculiarities and things of that kind that may be objected to, but the case on principle stands with the establishment of these admissions, and with these scripture that I have brought to bear. Equally, the purpose that a man should have to enter into any work. I say that a farmer who buys a farm ought to keep in mind to use that farm for the glory of God,—ought to have as his chief purpose, whatever business he undertakes,—whatever line of work,— he ought to have for his chief purpose to be a Christian, and one of the great obligations upon every Christian is to teach God's word. The Christian who enters into any business purpose without due regard to the fact is not the kind of a Christian that God wants him to be, nor the kind of a Christian that God's power will make him. In everything that should be the chief purpose,—the chief purpose of all our lives, to do whatever we do so that God may be glorified, that the cause of Christ may be built up. The chief purpose, I say, in every life, in every Christian's life, in every Christian's heart, should be to so devote his calling for work in life that he may do the most for the building up of God's cause, along their line of work,—that line of work where he can most effectually do work for God. And he should always keep in view and it should be the chief purpose every time, not to so hamper himself that he can not teach God's word. I would be afraid to enter into any association or band myself with any man in such a way that I would be bound or hampered in my labor and unable to teach God's word.

"But we are told something about the misuse of the Lord's money. We had a long reading from the tract,—quite a long reading from the tract, but if this stands then all that reading from the tract does not amount to anything. When this is overthrown then perhaps the reasons found in the reading may have some weight. And furthermore, just to take up the tract itself, and in this, of course, Brother Sommer has committed himself to the definition of the Lord's money as is laid down here, in that he says the first duty is towards one's family,—you are to supply the needs to the family. Another reason for assisting to start the school there which we planted is, it is not improper, and it is not out of harmony with God's arrangement, because one of the needs of a man's family is an education, or else you have no right to give it to them,—that is, according to Brother Sommer's speech. One of the needs of your children is an education, and it is just as real a need as clothes or food. Not for physical life, but real life. And right on that point, I don't mean a college education, but an education, and the college or the school is only a means to an end. Education, or improvement or power is the end, and the college or the school is the means to that end, so that then, if one of the needs of your child be an education, and you are allowed to supply your needs and the needs of your dependent ones, then certainly you may use money,—you may use part of your money in assisting a school work of that kind. If not, why not? Reasoning from his own premises,—from his own basis, I should like to know why not? No satisfactory answer can be given,—not one.

"I am glad from the indications we are going to get down to business in this discussion, and get down to the real, vital points. You know one of the vital issues, the things that have been emphasized over and over again in the discussion on the part of my worthy respondent is, 'the use of the Lord's money.' I believe my time is just out and I will submit the floor now."

DANIEL SOMMER'S SECOND SPEECH AT HALE.

"Mr. Chairman, Gentlemen Moderators, Ladies and Gentlemen:

"As your attention has been invited to this chart, as it may be called, and there are, I suppose, verbal quotations from the journal known as the Octographic Review, do you know what the purpose of

that is,—why that is introduced? Brother W. W. Otey is one of the writers for the Review, and I suppose that I endorsed his article. Consequently there are two references to the Review, and I am not going to question any of that charge. Why do you suppose that is brought up? He brings up the Review as a witness,—a witness in his favor. He calls up that witness. It is a witness on his side. Is he willing to take that witness all the way through? Here is a gentleman of law. He knows that very well, that when the plaintiff calls a witness and questions that witness, then all the testimony which that witness gives, however much it may be against the plaintiffs, that they are BOUND BY IT,—it is THEIR WITNESS. And so with the defendants. Now, the Octographic Review has been called as a witness in this case. Do you suppose my respondent is willing to take the Octographic Review all the way through on this subject? Certainly not. If he would, he would not have gone into this discussion. He would not have been a member of the faculty over at Odessa. What kind of reasoning is that when he proposes to take a witness and dip after a certain incidental expression, or even principal expression, and to throw overboard what the witness says in other respects? Now, that is the kind of procedure that is adopted by the college advocates, and my respondent here is a representative of them, and I have to deal with him;

"Now, that is not all. But the effort thus far has been to show that Daniel Sommer is an inconsistent man, therefore, what he says against colleges should not be received at full value. Well, let us see what kind of an argument that is. Daniel Sommer is an INCONSISTENT MAN, therefore, Western Bible and Literary College is RIGHT. The rules of agreement here say that 'human standards of appeal shall be ruled out.' Daniel Sommer isn't, then, a standard of appeal by which to prove the Western Bible and Literary College to be right, nor to be wrong, and we should appeal to another standard. That is not all. Suppose that Daniel Sommer had never written a line on this subject, and never said a word until he challenged for an investigation, and my respondent had been without anything whatever to bring up against Daniel Sommer, that Daniel Sommer ever said or admitted on the subject. If he hangs his case on what DANIEL SOMMER HAS SAID, what would he have hinged it on THEN? Where would have been his door for entrance? Now you see, friends, that would just take,—to use a common expression,—the bottom out of that whole business. But, you see, the apostle Peter, even after his conversion to Christ and after receiving the Holy Spirit, was AN INCONSISTENT MAN. See what he did over at Antioch. Therefore, all that the apostle Peter ever said for God and mankind should be received at a discount, or discounted! And after his conversion to Christ and after he received the Holy Spirit he was an inconsistent man, for he acted the hypocrite over there at Antioch. We know that you all understand that. Again, Alexander Campbell was a very inconsistent man, because he was first directly and intensely opposed to educational societies to do the Lord's work,—as I have brought before you, that was not the question,—and yet afterwards he established that kind of a society, therefore, all the truth that Alexander Campbell sets forth should be discarded or received at a discount, and all the error he reprov'd may be accepted as being true, because Alexander Campbell reprov'd it, and he was AN INCONSISTENT MAN! Benjamin Franklin advocated colleges and missionary societies for a time, and afterwards, having seen their outworkings, he turned against them. Therefore, all the writings of Benjamin Franklin in favor of truth should be received at a discount, and all he said against error should be received at a discount, because he was AN INCONSISTENT MAN! Now, what do you think of an institution that will reason after that manner—on one premise logic. A CERTAIN MAN IS INCONSISTENT, OR WE SAY HE IS INCONSIS-

TENT, THEREFORE, OUR INSTITUTION is RIGHT! A man ought to blush and drip with shame when he is exposed in a debate after that manner. I am dealing with him not personally, you understand, but I have a right to deal with him as a disputant. Polemically he ought to blush and drip with shame to come before the people with any such SOPHISTRY.

"Now, I am going to tell you more of what the Octographic Review says. I have been called upon lime and time again in the past to state what kind of a school I would recommend, and I stated it verbally over at Odessa, and coming over here one of my brethren said to me, 'What about this,—isn't there some way of getting together?' I said I have placed myself on record in regard to what kind of a school I would recommend, and then I made this additional statement: I said, but these recent college advocates have, by the course that they have pursued, shown themselves to be unfit to teach pupils. And I charge that now upon my respondent, on the evidence that he has given by this sophistry which he brings before you on this question. In the Octographic Review for September 25, 1906, I said this, under the heading, 'An Octographic Review of the educational controversy among Churches of Christ.'"

"IF ALEXANDER CAMPBELL HAD BEEN DESIROUS ONLY OF ASSISTING HIS BROTHERS AND SISTERS IN EDUCATING THEIR CHILDREN ARIGHT, HE COULD HAVE ESTABLISHED A GOOD SCHOOL WITHOUT POMPOUS, FOOLISH, WORLDLY TITLES, AND HE COULD THEREBY HAVE DONE MUCH GOOD WITHOUT, PERHAPS, DOING ANY HARM. THE SAME MAY BE SAID OF DAVID LIPSCOMB, J. A. HARDING, J. N. ARMSTRONG AND OTHERS. BUT JUST IN PROPORTION AS THE MENTIONED BRETHERN PROPOSE TO ARRANGE A COLLEGE COURSE LIKE THE WORLD HAS ARRANGED, AND GRADUATE PUPILS WITH WORLDLY HONORS, THEY SHOW THEMSELVES DETERMINED TO MAKE A BID FOR POPULARITY WITH THE WORLD. BY SO DOING THEY HAVE SHOWN THEMSELVES POSSESSED OF THAT SATANIC SOMETHING DESIGNATED PRIDE, AND THAT THEY WERE IN HEART GENUINE INNOVATORS. AS A RESULT THEY SEEM INCAPABLE OF CONSIDERING WITH CARE ANYTHING THAT IS SAID AGAINST THEM, AND AS A FURTHER RESULT THEY BLUNDER IN NEARLY ALL THAT THEY SAY ON THE SUBJECT, AND SEEM TO THINK THAT THEY ARE DOING GOOD SERVICE WHEN THEY MISREPRESENT THOSE WHO OPPOSE THEM.'

"Thus I placed myself on record, and thus indicated the kind, the shade, the grade of the school which, from a biblical viewpoint, I was bound to oppose. When the Nashville Bible School was started and I saw the notice or the announcement. 'Nashville Bible School,' I thought, 'Well, they are going to start a Bible School down at Nashville.' As far as the name indicated I could not see it meant anything but Bible school. Then I read a little further and I saw that they meant to teach some secular learning in connection, and I said, 'These good people wish to have their children taught in secular things, and have established this school.' And I think for about ten years of that school I did not send for a catalogue nor pay any attention to it. But when that school branched off, or rather when an offspring' of that, school, the so-called Bible school at Bowling Green, Kentucky, was projected, then I thought that it would better be looked into, and I inquired, 'Are we working to have another brood of colleges to send out another brood of preachers, trained very largely in the wrong direction and divide the Church of Christ again?' And having sent for a catalogue and looked into the case, then I found out that here was another heresy that was destined to divide the Church of

Christ if those advocating these things did not repent. And friends, I never found any persons on the face of the earth less disposed to show the slightest sign of investigating what was brought against them, until they were compelled to do so, than the college advocates, now represented by my respondent on this occasion. And yet I have never found any class of people that would tell more about their love for truth, and how they desire to know the truth, and what their heart's desire are with reference thereto. And along life's pathway I have, as a rule, found the man who says the most along that line, and who rolls his eyes towards heaven most while he is preaching, and while he is singing, and while he is talking about the truth,—I have found that one, as a rule, deserves to be most closely watched. Now, mark my words, I am considering them with the utmost care. Having said this much I now call attention to this,—this was all correct, just as I have stated here,—**IF ALEXANDER CAMPBELL AND THESE OTHER GENTLEMEN HAD ONLY PROPOSED TO BENEFIT THE CHURCH OF CHRIST AND ENGAGE, FOR MAKING A LIVING, in school teaching, or anything of that sort, all of which falls under that head, they might undoubtedly have done the churches much good without doing them any harm, it may be. But when they come to set up an establishment THAT RIVAL THE WORLDLY, POMPOUS ESTABLISHMENTS OF THE WORLD, and propose to unite the church and the world at the point of these titles, THAT IS WHERE THE INIQUITY COMES IN.**

'Now, having brought this before you, I mention that my respondent said, Paul engaged in secular work for the purpose of making a living, for the purpose of supporting others, he was setting an example and not to hinder the gospel. All that was said I sum up right here, and that is true. He might have added to the others, 'to stop the mouth of certain gainsayers.' But the question is, **DID THE APOSTLE PAUL ESTABLISH AN INSTITUTION IN ORDER TO DO THAT KIND OF WORK?** Did he beg the brotherhood for money to establish a tent-making establishment that he might in that establishment, make tents to set forth these examples? **NO.** I have been watching for my respondent to dig out the fact that Paul went to the school of one Tyrannus and taught there. I suppose that has been so exposed that he has given it up. He has seen the objections made in the prints. That was one of the chief arguments in favor of these institutions. Tyrannus, conducting his school may have been a Greek, I don't know, but he had courtesy enough to allow Paul to come into his school. Paul taught in the school of Tyrannus and we are willing to teach in a school any where and every where that they will allow us to teach the Bible. **BUT DID PAUL BEG THE BROTHERHOOD FOR MONEY TO ESTABLISH SECULAR SCHOOLS IN ORDER THAT HE MIGHT TEACH THE BIBLE AND RELIGION?** No. Then, you see, that case does not touch the subject. Did Paul call upon the brotherhood to give-money to establish a tent-making affair, **IN ORDER THAT** he might teach the Word there? **NO.** Then that does not touch the question. Did anything else that Paul did in secular labor,—does it indicate that he called upon the brotherhood for money and established a separate institution that was to be recommended for its religious purpose, and ye! declared to be **NOT A RELIGIOUS INSTITUTION?** Did he do that for the purpose of setting an example? **NO.** Then, you see, all this talk about what this case hangs on, and 'if this stands then I have established my case,'— why, **WE HAVE JUST TAKEN THE BOTTOM OUT OF IT.** Paul's example is as widely separated from the example of my respondent in the Western Bible and Literary College, so called, as light is separated from darkness, as Paradise is separated from Tartarus, as Heaven is separated from Hell, as the great God of the universe in spirit is separated from the arch enemy of our race. For God's doctrine is

UNITY, PEACE, AND ORDER among his people, and the doctrine of the Devil is DIVISION, AND STRIFE AND CONTENTION among God's people. Those who are contending against these institutions are contending for THE ONENESS OF THE BROTHERHOOD upon the institution of the family and the church as the divinely ordained religious institutions, whereas those who are contending for these religious institutions called colleges, are contending for the human arrangements which have connected with them A HISTORY OF INFAMY, from the Alexandrian school of philosophy in Egypt, which was a religious institution established in the second century, down through the apostasy, and down to the last one of these arrangements that has been established. Here is a catalogue of the Southwestern Christian College of Denton, Texas. If that institution is not endorsed,—if it is not established by what may be called apostate disciples, and they are not in reality apostates,—I say if they are not endorsed by my respondent I will give him an opportunity to show who did endorse it. In the catalogue of that institution; published by McQuiddy Printing Company, of Nashville, Tennessee, which is an indication that it is endorsed by Nashville brethren, at any rate, I find this on the 14th page: 'Not a church school.' Just what my respondent says about the school at Odessa. 'The Southwestern Christian College is controlled by a board of eleven regents. This board is self-perpetuating, no church has any control over it whatever. It was established by members of the church of Christ, not by the church as such. It is proposed there to educate young men and young women in the highest sense.' Now, listen. On the 30th page of this same catalogue we have the following: 'Exegesis and Homiletics,' and then we have the junior and senior classes in exegesis and homiletics. Then what is said? 'The course in exegesis and homiletics is strictly a preachers' course, and is intended to prepare a young man thoroughly for the ministry. Every young man who aspires to preach the Word, should labor earnestly to learn what to preach and how to preach. In this course we endeavor to prepare him to be a safe leader and effective teacher of the blessed gospel. The sainted Robert Graham said that it required three things to make a preacher,—the grace of God, common sense and training. All we can do is to furnish the training. Even this will amount to nothing if the young man lacks common sense or is destitute of the grace of God. This class is under the immediate charge of President Freed.'

"This is a specimen of the recently established institutions that profess to be of the church of Christ. It is one of the three colleges, if I mistake not, in Texas that have recently sprung up, and which have been endorsed by my respondent, or by some one of his colleagues. But we shall see Unit if I have made any mistakes in regard to the historical facts concerning this matter, friends, he will be able to state, and let him express himself on the subject.

"These questions which my respondent presents are the same that I dealt with over at Odessa. 'First, what do you mean by the term religio-secular? Define the term.' I said I referred to the Odessa institution as a definition,—three-fourths secular and one-fourth religious. Established to teach religion largely, and yet DENYING that it is a religious institution.

"Second. What feature or features are necessarily present in a school or its management to make it religio secular?' Just those features that they have over there,—three-fourths secular and one-fourth religious and advertising in catalogues or advocating about fifteen different ungodly fictitious works, and they offer that to the brotherhood here. I will again present this to you,—that it has entertainments there which are of a theatrical kind. There is the picture (referring to a hand bill) of a man by the name of Mr. Os-

good, who is represented there as Uncle Reuben, and Uncle Reuben is an old farmer, poor in information, poor in polish, if not in money, and here is a burlesque of the farmer. Solomon says that he that mocks the poor, reproaches his Maker. Here, the Odessa College is mocking a man who is poorly dressed, poor at least in learning. He that mocketh the poor, reproaches his Maker. That is itself a reproach to the Maker for this man to be burlesqued, and here are gentlemen who have performances over there that mock the poor,— whether the poor in polish, or poor in learning, or poor in culture. That can't be blotted out. That was a recent performance over there.

"Third. If a Christian parent, having a child that has finished the local school, should ask you where shall I send my child to school, what would be your answer?' I answered, I would say send that child to a school,—a first class school,—where there is a Church of Christ, and let the church teach the faith that is to overcome whatever is wrong in the school. That has been previously given. Then I was called upon for such school, or to name them, and I named four or five places where there are such schools and where there is such a church in each instance. Now, the question arises, friends, what is there in that? And I had previously placed upon the record what I believed with reference to such schools. I may now read you what Benjamin Franklin said with reference to that matter, in the sketch and writings, or rather, The Life of Benjamin Franklin, you find on the 397th page this,—and the next page:

"We quote first from the Review for Oct. 10, 1876:

"We do not disguise the fact that we are not working for Bethany College. We are taking no interest in it. We worked for it all the time till Brother Campbell died, subscribed and paid \$100 to its support since his death. Things have been occurring all along since to cut our affections off from It till we have no sympathy with it. We do not believe it is doing the cause any good. We are now measuring every word we write, and understand the meaning of every word. We can give reasons for what we are saying to any extent the reader may desire. We shall put down a very few things briefly here:

"1. We have become perfectly satisfied that education, in the popular sense, is purely secular, and is not a church matter. The church ought to be connected with no educational enterprise. We are in favor of no church college. This is a matter that may be discussed at length, but we enter into no discussion of it now. Still, this would not utterly cut off our sympathy with Bethany College, other matters being equal.

"2. One of the main pleas Alexander Campbell made for a college under the control of the Christians was, in view of the MORAL TRAINING, that no man was educated in the true sense who was not cultivated IN HEART. This we hold to be as true as any principle yet uttered. To this end there should be SOUND PROFESSORS to train students, and there should be a sound church in the vicinity of the college, maintaining the highest order of morality, order and discipline.'

"In the issue for Dec. 5, 1876., we find the following:

"The plain truth is, we have been most terribly disappointed and let down by the experiment we have made in colleges. We entered the work with the balance, many years ago, and plead for colleges for the education of our young men,—ESPECIALLY PREACHERS. We saw the disadvantage we had labored under, in starting in ignorance and without education, and thought if we had a college under the control of Christians, that our young men would not have to struggle under the same disadvantage. But our colleges, at least the most of them, have fallen into the hands of men that are not doing

the work Mr. Campbell intended, nor the work we want. They have disregarded the wishes of the people they were intended to bless, and are now giving pretty general dissatisfaction, and are running down.'

"It has been said time and time again that I was the first one that had spoken against these institutions. You see very clearly that I was not, but at the same time, even if I had been, that wouldn't prevent what I say from being true, and all the alleged inconsistencies of myself are in the imagination of my respondent, and I have exposed that to the satisfaction of my audience, and if he engages in any more I shall expose it further and, if possible, more forcibly.

"I now leave this matter with you and respectfully ask you to consider the question at issue, that is, **THIS INSTITUTIONALISM**,— not education as such, nor colleges as such, but **INSTITUTIONALISM** added to the church of the living God, for **TEACHING RELIGION**. That is the point in question."

B. F. RHODES' SECOND REPLY AT HALE.

"Mr. Chairman, Gentlemen Moderators, Ladies and Gentlemen: I am very much pleased with the course the investigation has taken, except that I should want, or I would like to have had a little different exposure or treatment of the argument that I made, but, however, I suppose my worthy respondent does not feel that he is obliged to please me, and if he keeps in view always, as I trust he may, his obligation to his God I will try to be content, even though in my judgment he may pursue the course that is not pleasing to God. I have to leave him to his own conscience and his own God for that. But in the very beginning of his second speech it was asked with great emphasis, 'What is the purpose of that chart? Why is it brought up here?' And it was stated that I brought it up here to prove that Brother Sommer was inconsistent. I DID NOT. I DID NOT. I didn't bring it up here for the purpose of showing that he was inconsistent, I brought it up here to hang it here because there were his admissions, and coupling the admissions with an argument drawn from scripture; they establish the very work we do. He says that I brought it as a witness, and of course, as I explained, and as he explained, it is Brother Otey and Brother Sommer both. He endorsed Brother Otey, and so instead of that weakening the case for it, if anything it strengthens it. He says when I bring a witness up I must take all he says on the subject. Now, these are admissions,—admissions that he has made. Now, if he will disavow the admissions, then let him say so. If he wants to disavow them, all right. If he don't want to stand by them, let him say so and I will proceed to establish the thing in another way. If he don't believe it now,—perhaps did" believe it then, but don't believe, it now,—let him say so. He may have changed his mind. If it is he has changed his mind, there is nothing dishonorable about changing his mind, as long as a man grows he will continue to change his mind. If he wants to disavow these things let him say so. If he wants to take them back that is his privilege, his own province. I claim them and they stand there and he can't touch them. He said that when a witness is brought up I have to take all that he says. Let us apply that. He brought Benjamin Franklin,—does he propose to accept everything that Benjamin Franklin ever said? I let him answer that. Benjamin Franklin had said he favored colleges once. I made no argument so far to show that Brother Sommer is inconsistent, not at all. I have not made such an argument. I have not appealed to Brother Sommer's inconsistency. Of course, perhaps feeling weak along that line, he may have felt it necessary to secure himself, but I have not made an argument on that point in this discussion. He

may have been inconsistent and may not. He says that is wrong reasoning,—that 'because he, Daniel Sommer, is inconsistent therefore the Western Bible and Literary College is right.' I dirt not make any such argument as that, neither directly nor indirectly. He says Daniel Sommer is not a standard of appeal. CERTAINLY NOT. He says the apostle Peter was inconsistent, and Alexander Campbell was inconsistent, and so on. Now then, he quotes from Alexander Campbell—he has done so here today. If he may quote from Alexander Campbell, why then may we not quote from Daniel Sommer? Why is it wrong for me to quote from Daniel Sommer to show good?

"Ought to blush and drip with shame to use such sophistry.' Well, I should like to know who,—if I be a user of sophistry, I should like to know, to say nothing more forcible, am I alone? Am I alone? And then it was he added, of course, that he was addressing or referring to me polemically and not personally. And so if I make any references to my worthy respondent it is to be understood that I am referring to him as a disputant, as a polemic, and not as a man.

"Then we had a long extract read from the Octographic Review of an educational controversy. I haven't that paper before me,—I think I have it in my room, and I will promise you to look over it and see what was in that. Lots of reading for the afternoon session. But there was a strong intimation there, and mind you now, all these things that have been brought in,—all these serious objections that have been filed, are simply incidentals.

"And there was a reference made to worldly titles, worldly titles. And in that reading, I remember that, that was emphasized very strongly,—worldly titles, worldly titles. Now, what are the facts in the case? What are the facts in the case? When your child goes down here to the public school,—I suppose you have a graded school in the town, of some three, four or five grades, I don't know how many,—and when that child has finished the year's work,—when he has finished the year's work in that grade, the teacher gives that child a card of promotion, stating that he has finished that work and is entitled to take the next class in the third, fourth, fifth, sixth or seventh grade, and so on until he finishes the whole course as outlined. Now, are those certificates of promotion pompous, worldly titles? Are they? They just simply indicate,—they simply indicate and nothing more than that,—that the person bearing that card is entitled to take up an advanced grade,—a class in advance of that they have finished. It just means they have finished a certain course of work outlined. That is all it means. A man's pomposity does not consist in having finished a course in a common school, a high school nor in a college. Pomposity consists in pride and uplifting of the heart, and pride and uplifting of the heart is found in persons who have finished a college course, and it is sometimes found in persons that never saw a college, so far as that is concerned. And yet if we should graduate some young man from our school and give him the title of A. B., what pomposity is there about it? It is just equal,—it is equivalent to the title which the teacher gives the child in the primary grade, a certificate that he has done a certain line of work,—an indication of the fact that he has finished a certain line of work, and it means that that man has finished a certain course of instruction in a certain school. THAT IS ALL IN THE WORLD IT MEANS.

"Then he told about the school at Nashville. When it first started he thought it was all right to teach the Bible, and then he looked a little further, and thought it was all right to teach other useful secular knowledge in connection therewith, and then he says he dismissed the whole thing for ten years. Now then, he says when he found out it was coming to Bowling Green he concluded it ought to

be looked into. He thought it was all right at Nashville, but when he found it was coming to Bowling Green he thought it ought to be looked into. If it was all right for the Christians at Nashville to have the advantage of a school where the Bible was taught and useful secular knowledge in connection therewith, why was it necessary to look into the fact that the people of Bowling Green, wanted something of that kind? If it was all right for Nashville to have something of that kind, why was it all wrong for Bowling Green, and for Christians to engage in a thing which required the use of money? For the Christians in Nashville to start that school it required money, and they used that money, they started the school where boys and girls are admitted upon equal terms in all classes. If one is right, why are two wrong?

"Then immediately he makes a charge of heresy. Now then, with these facts before us a charge of heresy comes. A charge of heresy is not conviction. I am glad of that,—I am glad I said it. A charge of heresy is not conviction. When he undertakes to prove the charge of heresy, then we will attend to the proof.

"Then there was a reference made to the chart again. A reference made to the chart again and then the facts remain that these are Brother Sommer's admissions. Until he disavows them,—whenever he wants to disavow them I will proceed on a different line. I am not going to hold him responsible for anything he does not believe now. If he wants to acknowledge he does not believe that way any more, then we say we will freely acknowledge that it is no crime for a man to change his mind,—nothing even dishonorable for a man to change his mind. But until he does that, those admissions stand and that argument stands. And when he does that, we will proceed on a different line.

"But we are asked about the case of Tyrannus and the school there. I have not made any argument on that. Whether I shall do so or not depends on how I feel as time proceeds. I have not said anything about it in the discussion across the river over there. 'Christians may teach school anywhere where they may teach the Bible.' That is just exactly what we are doing.—we are teaching the Bible.

"Now, I asked him to point out the specific things in a school that made it religio-secular, and he says, 'Why, just like they have over at Odessa.' Well, three-fourths secular and one-fourth religious, as he put it. But he says they may teach any where they may teach the Bible, and then it is not religio-secular schools he is opposing, and not opposing the use of the Lord's money, because he admits' that so far as the school at Nashville is concerned, they used the Lord's money, and Christians were doing it. At least, he did not have any objection to it. But we are assured that it was the Lord's money. But he says that does not justify Christians banding themselves together and asking other Christians,—begging other Christians,—to help them in the work. And he said that Paul never begged anybody to help him go into the tent business. Perhaps not,—perhaps not. But Paul, if he went into the tent business it took some money and it took some time, and if Paul could use money in his hands, or time that he had, in that work, I may. Isn't that so? And use it as a stepping stone to further the gospel of Christ. And we learn, too, that Paul did this work associated with Priscilla and Aquila, and the probabilities are that Priscilla and Aquila and Paul supplied the money. I don't know anything about that, but there was some money, little or much, that was required. That required some money. They could not go into the tent making business without some money. I don't care how little it was, it was money, and Paul and Priscilla and Aquila were engaged in it, and if three disciples may, five may, and if it is right for five to use money in their own hands, it is not

wrong for these brothers to help me in that matter,—for the brotherhood to give money to assist in that work. If so, why? If it is all right for me to use money, why is it wrong for Brother Brown to give me money to assist that aim, or place money in trust for that purpose? Why?

"'Begging the church, begging Christians.' WE NEVER HAVE BEGGED ANYBODY,—mark my words,—WE NEVER HAVE BEGGED ANYBODY TO GIVE ONE CENT EVEN, whose heart was not stirred to do it because he loved the teaching of the Bible. That is, WE HAVE NOT BEGGED ANY CHRISTIANS, and we NEVER HAVE BEGGED ANYBODY IN THE WORLD TO GIVE,—NOT A SINGLE ONE And there has been no desire to get anybody to give that didn't feel that he wanted to give. There has been an opportunity extended, THAT IS ALL. Anything that one Christian may do, another Christian may help him do if he sees fit. If it is not wrong for me to use money in my hands, it is not wrong for Brother Brown to help in that work,—that is, unless he would violate some other responsibility to do it.

"And again, we are assured that we have been failing to recognize the family and the church as a means to teach religion. Well, he admits,—and we are going to hold him to these admissions and going to presume that way until he tells us he does not,—that he believes in a school where the Bible is taught; believes it is all right to teach the Bible In schools, and that a Christian may teach in a school where they teach the Bible. Are those schools either the family or the church? I would like to know,—this audience wants to know about it? What does he mean by making such statements as that? I have a right to cross-question him and to draw him out on these points. I have a right to use his admissions and teachings. Of course, he may not wish it,—he may not like it. But I am here to please God, and I am here to elicit the truth and I don't propose to be scared off from these essential things by bluster. I am not talking about him as a man. If I speak about him as a blusterer I am speaking about him in his capacity 'as a polemic, a disputant.

"Then we are asked about the Southwestern Christian College down at Denton, Texas. I have never read that catalogue. I have seen it, but I have never read it. I presume the reading is correct,— I would not question it for a minute. But I am not defending that institution, perhaps. That is not a question so far as I am concerned. I told you very distinctly that we disorganized our school,—we had it disorganized,—before we accepted it at all. Surrendered the charter back to the state and we are running it strictly and solely as a private enterprise; and we are Christians banded together as private individual Christians,—just as private, just as strictly personal as any man's business,—as any two or three men's business house or firm in which two or three or more men are associated together in the work. And in doing that work we teach the Bible, and it is admitted that we may teach it.

"Now, if it is a matter of granting titles,—if that is the objection, let him say so. If that is the sole objection, let him say so. If that is not the sole objection, let him say what it is. I don't want these things confused and thrown in every direction. We want to get at the truth, and down to the basic principles and the facts. That is what we want.

"Then quite a long extract was read about 'exegesis and homiletics.' We don't have them,—we don't teach exegesis and homiletics. I don't know very much about either one. I don't suppose they are very harmful things. If we take a dictionary definition I do not think they are. I have never studied either one, so far as that is concerned, and we don't teach anything of the kind. Our

religious teaching consists in teaching the Bible, and I am just as conscientious when I go before my class to teach the Bible as I am when I go in a church to preach the gospel. I teach just what I believe the Bible teaches, and teach it just as conscientiously as I can. I am not there to teach my opinions, but I teach what I believe the Bible teaches, and I do it just as faithfully and conscientiously as I do when I stand before the public. I teach the very same things, honestly, earnestly. And thus since we have had the citizens of Odessa to surrender the charter before we took it, we are not bound to defend chartered institutions and boards of regents, so all that is not my business. The fact is that. I am not here to condemn or approve the work done down there. Particularly that is not my business here today. There may be some of the work done there that I would not like, but I see the same in almost any kind of enterprise. We are here committed to the belief for which we plead. I believe in the good work that Brother Sommer does in his enterprise, but there might be some little things in the way he conducts the work that I might criticize. But that is not the question, neither one way or the other.

"Now then, we had some statements made about the words 'religio-secular,'—three-fourths secular and one-fourth religious, but I don't believe he objected to teaching the Bible in connection with secular knowledge. He has not so said he did, and whether it is three-fourths one and one-fourth the other, or three-fourths on one hand and one-fourth on the other, I don't know that he objects to that.

"And then we had a reference to the ungodly fiction in the college. I just challenge him for the proof of that. I want to draw him out upon that line. Let him come out a little more clearly on that point. We have an English course and outline work in grammar and rhetoric and reading of standard classics and English authors, in order to develop a student in the choice of English and in the understanding and due appreciation of the work of English literature. We do that, certainly, and there is not a school that is really a first class school of English in America that does not have a similar work. Not one,— not one. If it didn't have that work I presume there would be an Objection because we did not teach English thoroughly. Now then, let him bring out his argument and discussion of our English course and the fiction that is in it. Let him shoot if he wants to. I SAY IT IS NOT AN UNGODLY COURSE. It has the best standard works in English,—standard English works, and it is not all fiction by any means. That is, not ungodly fiction, in the sense of being' corrupt or immoral,—not at all. It is just such fiction as you have in all school courses, in the English course, where they do anything like good English work. And now then, granting,—suppose now that,—suppose that is all he says it is, which is best,—for a Christian disciple of Jesus . Christ, who loves God and who loves the Bible, and loves truth, to conduct a class of young men and women through a book of standard classic English work, in order to teach them the real strength and beauty of the English sentence, and to illustrate the principles of grammar and rhetoric from the English sentence. Which is the worst, for you to send the child to that school where he will be led through the class work by an honest, conscientious Christian, or to that school where he will be led through that work by an ungodly man that don't believe in God or Christ, and certainly is not a member of the church of Christ? Now what do you say? Do you want to say anything more on the subject of fiction? We are perfectly willing for him to do so.

"Now then, we notice that in the closing speech of our friend,— our brother,—I want to be very respectful,—when I say 'my friend,' I don't mean any lack of respect. I esteem him as a Christian brother;

love him for his work, and the great good he has accomplished in every way. I hope I shall never be lacking in the due respect that should be tendered to him as a man and as a disputant in this discussion. But we have had nothing further on the subject of the Lord's, money,—nothing at all further,—and I should like now to have these points brought out a little more clearly and forcibly. Let us have light on this subject,—let us have light. All that our brother has said about inconsistency and everything of that kind, have no bearing so far as this discussion is concerned. I have not charged him with inconsistency. If he chooses to disavow his own statement, his own writings on this subject, let him do it. Let him do it. But let him not try to shift out of the responsibility of what he said on the subject. I want to know what he believes, I want to know what he teaches, and you have a right to know. We are here to elicit truth. What is his attitude towards schools? We want to get at these points. I am here contending for a school in which Christians have banded themselves together as servants of the living God, feeling their responsibility to God.—banding themselves together to teach useful secular knowledge and in connection therewith to teach God's word, and have strived therefor faithfully and diligently and earnestly and sincerely as we possibly can, but that is what we are trying to do. We use part of our own time, we use part of the money that comes into our hands that way from various sources, and we use money that Christians' hearts are moved to give to us to assist in that work, and if this be not right we want to know it. If I may use money by what right may not another brother give me money to use,—I want to know why not? As I said awhile ago, that is one of the needs of the family. It is right for a Christian parent, and for Christian people, to provide for an education of the entire family, and not wrong, not a violation of any principles of divine right or equity. I stand on that proposition.

"I am through for the present, as I have noticed everything that has been said up to this time, except the long reading from the Octographic Review, which I don't have right at hand now."

Mr. Sommer:—"There is one point I wish you would consider, and that is that I have been contending against the extra institution on the subject of education, and that is the subject of the controversy."

Mr. Rhodes:—"Of course, I expect to get to the institutional phase of the question. That is the important point, and it is rather an inopportune time to call upon me when I have only one minute to go on. I shall attend to that at the proper time, but suffice it to say now, we have no more of an institution than any man,—any set of Christian men who have banded themselves to sell goods, or to run a farm, or to publish or to keep a publishing house, and in connection with that honorable work, teach God's work. That is all the institution we have. We have no institution other than that. That is all the institution we have. We have had the citizens to disestablish the school as a chartered thing, in order that we could keep ourselves as far from anything like institutionalism as we possibly could."

Thereupon the meeting adjourned to convene again at seven o'clock P. M., on said day, at the same place. And at such time and place the discussion was resumed as follows:

DANIEL SOMMER'S THIRD SPEECH AT HALE.

"Mr. Chairman, Gentlemen Moderators, Ladies and Gentlemen' It devolves upon me to state again that we are in discussion here over what is called the college question. Not that any of us are opposed to education as such, nor opposed to educational institutions

as such, but because in the disciple brotherhood in the year 1840, a religio-secular college was started which became the training school for clergymen that in the course of time divided the disciple brotherhood, led off a great proportion of it and caused multitudes of humble disciples to become, innovators; and about twenty years ago another effort was made, which culminated about sixteen or seventeen years ago in a so-called Bible school in Nashville, Tennessee, which was a religio-secular institution, and since then about half a dozen other institutions of a similar kind have sprung up. There are disciples who are opposed to institutions of that sort because they are unauthorized by the New Testament, and they are fully confident, in view of past history, that they are a dangerous arrangement for many reasons, and one of them is that they are training schools for clergymen, who will sooner or later preach false doctrines for the sake of money and pervert the people who hear them. Briefly stated that is the reason for this discussion. It is because a proportion of the disciples, professing to be apostolic, have recently started into the college business, and there are those who are protesting against them and don't wish history to repeat itself, at least within a hundred years of the time that original record was made of an apostasy, we may say, from the primitive faith, in the disciple brotherhood. Indeed, we don't believe that such a repetition should be made at any time, nor that it is necessary, but we are particularly careful that it should not be made in our day. Having said this much, I now state that the TRUTH in this case is on ONE SIDE, and there is not anything but ERROR AND SUBTERFUGE ON THE OTHER. Somebody may then ask, how is it and why is it that it should take so many sessions, and so many speeches, in order that the truth may be fully manifested, and how is it that so much may be said on the side of error? I illustrated that over at Odessa by telling of the length of time that it sometimes takes a stag hound to run a jack rabbit down. Not because the hound can't out run the jack rabbit, but because the jack rabbit is a splendid dodger, and because of his dodging, especially when he can get in the prairie grass, it takes the hound a long time to catch him and if he is not very excellent he sometimes loses out entirely in the race. That illustrates how it is in this case.

"I say to you that truth is wholly ON ONE SIDE in this discussion, and there is not anything ON THE OTHER SIDE but error and subterfuge, and I now proceed to tell you more plainly about that, or to make, if possible, a demonstration thereof. I will begin in my remarks, after the preliminary to which you have just listened, by calling your attention to that with which my opponent ended. Paul worked at a secular calling with four or five different purposes or sets of purposes. This is admitted by both disputants in this controversy. Then Paul said to the Philippian brethren, 'Those things which ye have both learned, and received and heard and seen in me, do: and the God of peace shall be with you.' Philippians 4: 0. Now friends, this scripture has already been brought before you. Now, I am going to deal with it in its bearing upon the college question. I call upon my respondent to state to this audience WHEN AND WHERE the Divine Record shows that the apostle Paul ever BEGGED MONEY FOR THE PURPOSE OF BUILDING A SEPARATE INSTITUTION, even a personal enterprise, FOR THE PURPOSE of giving him an opportunity to work at secular labor. I call upon him to show where the Sacred Text informs him that the apostle Paul ever called upon the church or individual brethren, to send money to him to BUILD UP A SEPARATE SECULAR INSTITUTION in order to teach persons IN RELIGION. The scripture says, 'The things which ye have both learned, and received and heard and seen in me, do.' Now, I call upon my respondent to show where he has SEEN,

and HEARD, and RECEIVED and "LEARNED in the record that the apostle Paul established any such institution as that for which he is contending. Paul says, 'Those things which ye have both learned, and received and heard, and seen in me, do.' I call upon him to point out where Paul at any time or under any circumstances set the example in favor of a secular institution in which to DO SECULAR WORK, or a SECULAR INSTITUTION in which to DO RELIGIOUS WORK, and call upon the brethren to furnish him the money to BUILD UP SUCH AN INSTITUTION. My respondent said this forenoon that he would EITHER HARMONIZE HIS PRACTICE WITH THE WORD OF GOD OR CHANGE HIS PRACTICE. Now he is to be called upon here to do this. You may wonder why I may repeat this so often,—I may have to repeat it a half dozen times yet in order to hold my respondent to that point. I had to make three speeches at Odessa in order to have him observe the word 'purpose,' which I had presented in my objection to the institution with which he was connected, and even since then he has shifted from the uses that I then made of it. So then, here is my third speech and in this again I say that Paul declared, 'those things which ye have learned, and received, and heard and seen in me, do.' I challenge my respondent to show where the apostle Paul ever set THE SLIGHTEST EXAMPLE in favor of begging the brotherhood to furnish him money to build up A SECULAR INSTITUTION in which to TEACH RELIGION, or even a SECULAR INSTITUTION in which to furnish, himself SECULAR EMPLOYMENT. That is what he has done, according to his own confession, and according to the demonstration which he and his colleagues have made, and he is now called upon to furnish this in the divine testimony or else CHANGE HIS PRACTICE. My respondent said in the former speech that it must have required some money for the tent business into which Paul went. I turn to the Acts of the Apostles, 18th chapter and read the first, second and third verses. All notice: 'After these things Paul departed from Athens and came to Corinth; and found a certain Jew named Aquila, born in Pontus, lately come from Italy, with his wife Priscilla; (because that Claudius had commanded all Jews to depart from Rome): and came unto them. And because he was of the same craft he abode with them, and wrought; for by their occupation they were tent-makers.' DO YOU SEE ANY MONEY IN THAT? I read you the scripture without comment,—DO YOU SEE ANY MONEY IN THAT? Now, my respondent has entered a supposition and injected that supposition into this text in order to get some kind of a basis for his college business,—FOR HIS BEGGING OF MONEY. Now friends, what does a man's profession, as a debater, of love for truth, ami that his heart's desire is for the truth,—what does it amount to if he will actually read into the Sacred Text a statement concerning money, when the Inspired Record DOES NOT SAY A WORD HERE ABOUT MONEY? What does it amount to, friends, if a man will inject into the Sacred Record WHAT IS NOT THERE? I do not mean to say that he tried to palm this off on you for scripture. What did he do? He injected the supposition in order to make a basis, or furnish a, footing, for THE BEGGING PHASE of the question of money for his college. Now, the case simply BEGGARS DESCRIPTION. I have not any words with which to tell you my own conception of a man or a disputant, who will, in the face of an audience, and where he knows that whatever he Says will be critically examined, enter a supposition of that sort in order to find a basis for his erroneous supposition. I said to you there was not anything but error and subterfuge on one side of this question. I need not tell you that I regard that as my respondent's side. Now consider this: First. How much money does a man need to go into a store as a clerk? Second. How much money does

a man need in order to work on a farm as a hand? Third. How much money does a man need in order to work on the railroad as a section hand? Or as a brakeman or as a conductor? How much capital? How much money is necessary in order for a man to work as a journeyman blacksmith? How much money is necessary to work as a hand in a tent factory? NOW, YOU SEE HOW MUCH THERE IS IN HIS PROPOSITION. I might go on just after this manner the remainder of my half hour, and then I would not exhaust the catalogue whereby I could show that there are even scores of employments in which a man could work and not need any capital. But all the working that the apostle Paul did with his own hands is just as I have done time and again since I first began to preach. When my family would need aid I would go and help a man on the farm through the harvest,—may be just for his accommodation. I have done that kind of work time and again and calculate to do it again whenever the time and circumstances permit, and would not have to spend a dollar in capital as an investment in order to arrange for this. Well, that is what Paul did. His working was INCIDENTAL, he DIDN'T MAKE A LIFE BUSINESS OF IT. Here is my respondent, who contemplates with his associates,—they calculate to take Paul's INCIDENTAL working to support those who depended on him, to set an example for the brethren generally and for various other purposes of that kind,— he proposes to take tint INCIDENTAL SOMETHING and USE IT AS A BASIS FOR HIS LIFE'S BUSINESS. It takes himself out of the religious field for nine months in the year and then spoils him for the other three months, because in those three months he works as an agent of the college rather than an agent for Christ, as you know some of them have done that. There are some witnesses right in this town in regard to the college agents. My opponent takes Paul's INCIDENTAL WORK, perhaps of one or two years of his forty or fifty years of preaching, and using that as a basis for establishing a GREAT BIG INSTITUTION, taking, may be, half a dozen preachers out of the field and occupying them nine months in the year almost entirely in that school, with just a little occasional preaching, not to speak further of three months of vacation. Now friends, you are called upon to consider, and I mean that my respondent shall consider, where he can make Paul's INCIDENTAL WORKING,—occasional working,—possibly semi-occasional working, a foundation for him to turn aside from the evangelistic field in which he formerly labored, perhaps incessantly, and betake himself off within college walls. He says his farm is like a store, or his college is like a farm or store. Well, what right has any man to call upon the brethren generally to PAY FOR A FARM OR STORE for him in order that he may MAKE MORE MONEY to give to the Lord's cause, or in order that he may TEACH HIS CLERKS in the question of religion, or TEACH HIS FARM HANDS in the question of religion? Very likely here is a preacher who has a few acres of ground and sees forty or fifty acres of land near him, and he might argue that if he had that much money,— that much laud,—he might probably do more preaching in missionary fields. But has he any right, inasmuch as he is able to work for himself and the brethren are willing to support him,—has he any right to take himself out of the field and work upon that land and call on the brethren to pay for that land, so that perhaps at some future time he might give something that he could make? To ask the question is to answer it in the negative. I say that a disputant that reasons on that line ought to blush and drip with shame, in trying to palm that off on an audience as an argument on the fundamental principles. You are acquainted with the fundamental principles in this discussion.

"My respondent asked me if I proposed to take all that Benjamin Franklin said. He said I presented him as a witness. I presented him

as a witness on the COLLEGE QUESTION. I will even take all he said on the college question. After he knew what he said was wrong he counteracted and denounced it before he died. I will take all he said in the light of what he said on the subject. WILL HE DO THE SAME WITH THE OCTOGRAPHIC REVIEW, that he has been quoting here,—will he take it as a witness ALL THE WAY THROUGH ON THE COLLEGE QUESTION? If so, we shall very soon come together. Instead, he takes a few expressions and he endeavors to turn them in the direction of sanctioning the institution which he himself is now a member of. How much fairness is there in it? 'Christians may band themselves together to teach secular knowledge' AND TO BEG THE BROTHERHOOD FOR MONEY IN ORDER TO BUILD UP AN EXTRA INSTITUTION IN WHICH TO TEACH SECULAR KNOWLEDGE. In his mind he has all that there, which is not in the text, or what is further, not in the Octographic Review. 'They may teach the Bible a part or all the time,' AND MAY BEG MONEY FROM THE BROTHERHOOD IN ORDER TO BUILD UP AN EXTRA INSTITUTION IN ORDER TO TEACH THE BIBLE. He has all that in his mind, and tries to palm it off in between. 'They may do this to make a living or as an act of charity,' and he has it, in order to do this,—in order to make a living or as an act of charity,—THEY HAVE A RIGHT TO CALL UPON THE BRETHREN AND THE CHURCH FOR MONEY, by private letters and by private appeals, and appeals through papers that, will publish it. THAT IS NOT THE CONNECTION THERE, AND HE KNOWS IT.

Mr. Nay:—"I rise to a point of order. The point of order is this: Brother Sommer is misrepresenting Brother Rhodes' statement concerning soliciting money. In answer to those same questions he has time and again stated that that institution never has begged any disciple for money, never begged any congregation for money to support that object or to support that institution; but if they in their hearts felt as though they could do more good in giving their money, or doing to that cause, they would receive it, otherwise they would not. Therefore, he has never intimated, but denies, first, last and all the time, that they beg a single cent from any source."

The Chairman:—"Any question of propriety in introducing this argument?"

Mr. Nay:—"I question his statement that they do those things, and his using these arguments that they have done so, because he has fought against begging the money all the time."

Mr. Sommer:—"My respondent, will have full and fair opportunity to show what is incorrect, provided" what I say is incorrect, and I regard it as altogether improper for the moderator to interfere, for it was not a point of order it was an effort to make a speech."

The Chairman:—"You may go ahead."

Mr. Sommer:—"Ladies and gentlemen, I am glad that this has come up just in this form, though I regret exceedingly that the moderator on the other side has exposed himself after the manner that he has on this question. It now will enable us to bring out this question of begging money at the proper interval, when it will be very, VERY emphatic. I NOW REPEAT MY CHARGE AND STRENGTHEN IT. I wish to say that they have NOT ONLY BEGGED MONEY, but they have, indirectly, THREATENED THOSE FROM WHOM THEY BEGGED IT, WITH PERDITION IF THEY DID NOT GIVE IT. Now, MARK MY WORDS, and see whether or not, FROM THEIR OWN WRITINGS, I make out my statement. In the journal called Primitive Christianity, and in the number dated October 27, 1904, we have the following: 'Remember that the school is a certainty whether you help or do not help. The starting of the work does not depend on your gifts for God's hand is not short. He has other servants that he can

stir up to furnish the money needed to begin this work, and we believe that he will do it. Your salvation may depend on your gift, but the school does not.' **HERE IS AN INDIRECT THREATENING WITH A LOSS OF YOUR SOUL. IF YOU DON'T GIVE TO THIS SCHOOL!** That is as much as any Catholic priest, perhaps, ever did when he would talk the money question to his parishioners. This paper further says, 'If you have means in your hands and are a servant of God it is God's money.' Somebody wished to know what these friends thought on the question of the Lord's money. That is stronger than the truth is, because part of the means in your hands may belong to Caesar,—he may demand it for taxes; another part you may need to support your family, and if you don't support your family the apostle Paul says they have denied the faith, but this indicates that **EVERY DOLLAR AND EVERY CENT THAT YOU HAVE IN YOUR HANDS IS THE LORD'S MONEY**, and to be a faithful servant you must use it where you believe it will do the most towards building up the kingdom of God. What does the author of this, President J. N. Armstrong of the Odessa institution, regard as being the place to put it? He says,—"There are but few loyal preachers in the state and a very few loyal churches, and so brethren of more favored condition should bend their energies to help plant a permanent influence for the cause of God in this great North and West. We appeal to the brethren to lay this work on their hearts, and prove the sincerity of their love for Christ and his cause by helping to support it. It is not like supporting one meeting, but it is planting a colony from which influences will be constantly radiating, for it is an abiding work. There is no way of estimating what good such a school will accomplish in ten years of work. I do believe that there is no work open to disciples that is so great and so lasting as the teaching of God's word to the young as they grow up into manhood and womanhood, nor do I believe that we can go back to Jerusalem so fast as to teach the Bible in our schools from the primary up to graduation.'

"That not only **BEGS MONEY**, but **BEGS IT WITH A THREAT OF PERDITION IF YOU DON'T GIVE IT**. But that is not all. We have something far more recent on this question, for we have here in a journal titled 'Christian Leader and The Way,'"for Tuesday, December 11, 1906, the following from Prof. Armstrong: 'We do not ask you to give a costly present, but will you not make a small gift to this work, say \$1. 00? We appeal to everyone who may read this, to send us a Christmas present of \$1. 00 to help pay this note. We have already made an appeal, by private letter, to some of the special friends of the school.' Brother Bush, where are you? Did you receive a letter of that kind?"

Brother Bush:—"Yes sir."

Brother Sommer:—"Are you a special friend of that school?"

Brother Bush:—"No sir."

Brother Sommer:—"That is a specimen. 'Special friends of the school and this appeal has met with much favor, and if all who love this work, and who read this, will send a present of \$1. 00, the note can be paid by January 1, 1907. In making a list of those to whom you are going, to make Christmas presents, put on that list the "School at Odessa, " and then, on Christmas morning, put a dollar bill into a letter and address it to J. N. Armstrong, Odessa Mo.'

"There are four short paragraphs, and **THE DOLLAR** is mentioned in each of them, with a direct **APPEAL TO GIVE IT TO US**,—'send it to us.' If this is not **BEGGING** I would like to know what under the shining sun you **CALL BEGGING**. Friends, what shall we say of this, and what shall we say of the interruption? **THE CASE BEGGARS DESCRIPTION**. I am going to read to you something else that beggars description. That after all this begging for money because of the religious features of this school, Prof. Armstrong said in the paper

called Primitive Christianity, published in Wichita, Kansas, January 12, 1905, this: 'I WANT FIRST OF ALL, TO EMPHASIZE THE FACT THAT OUR WORK IS A SCHOOL AND NOT A RELIGIOUS INSTITUTION.' Again I say, the case BEGGARS DESCRIPTION. A man who will roll his eyes towards Heaven, as a debater, and profess great love for the truth and reverence for God, to be involved in the meshes of any such a combination of facts and degrading arrangements as these which I have just brought before you, I say again, IT BEGGARS DESCRIPTION and I don't see how my respondent, as a debater, can stand before this audience and endeavor to eliminate himself or excuse himself for having anything to do with a practice of this kind. HE SAYS HE WILL CHANGE HIS PRACTICE IF HE CAN'T HARMONIZE THIS SORT OF AN ARRANGEMENT WITH THE WORD OF GOD. I CHALLENGE HIM TO DO IT. I challenge him even to make a fair, square effort in the presence of this assembly to HARMONIZE such an arrangement with the word of God."

B. F. RHODE'S THIRD REPLY AT HALE.

"Mr. Chairman, Gentlemen Moderators, Ladies and Gentlemen: I suppose I ought to be crushed after all the weight, all the emphasis, the force and power of the words to which we have just listened, but while not very old I have long since learned that it is not the thunder but the lightening that kills. Brethren, friends, I didn't mean to make you laugh. But there seems,—there seems to be a change of base, and it seems to be evident that our worthy respondent is learning something. Up until these last few days almost everyone who has ever heard anything about the educational controversy, as it has been conducted by my worthy respondent, has been led to believe that the fundamental things are two. So I read: 'Near or about one year ago I began my recent writings in regard to Christians using the Lord's money to establish religio-secular schools and giving them a sacred name as though they were divine institutions. All that I have written on this subject has been under these two heads, namely, the mistake of thus using the Lord's money, and the mistake of thus naming such institutions.' This is a clipping from the Octographic Review of October 9, 1906, and it itself was a re-print of a statement made in the Review, I think, in 1903. So that up to last October all that he said upon this subject may be grouped under these two heads, namely, the mistake of Christians using the Lord's money to establish religio-secular schools and giving them a sacred name. Those two things. But how gingerly has he touched both of these questions! Nothing but references chiefly, and that just briefly. In one of his speeches he did mention or read a portion of his tract on the subject of the Lord's money, and I accepted the definition of it as he gave it, for the sake of the argument,—not that I believe the definition, but for the sake of the argument I accept the definition,—and showed that one of the most urgent needs of the family was an education. He has not denied it today, therefore it allows him to use money to assist in providing an education for his child, and nothing has been said about it. Furthermore, education is a need or it is not, and if it is a need then it is allowable for you as parents to supply it and to use money in providing an education for your children. If it is not a need then, according to Brother Sommer's logic and reasoning on the subject of the Lord's money, you have no right to spend money in educating your children. Now then, upon which horn of the dilemma will he impale himself? Now, all over this country, east, west, north and south,—here in Hale and elsewhere,—Christian parents are spending money to educate their children. Is it a need? If so, then it is right, and it is right for a Christian to spend money in providing for the education of his child, and if not, then they

are doing wrong by it. Which is it? Brother Sommer himself,—not to quote him,—not to try to make him inconsistent, I am not quoting this to make him inconsistent, but he did to some measure at least, I don't know how much, provide an education for his children, and he did it, to some extent by sending some of his children to college, and strange to say, too, he sent them to a religio-secular college established with the Lord's money, and after he had gone on record, as he says, in opposition to all such schools. Now then, that does not make it right because he did it, of course it does not, but it ought, to make him a little more careful about condemning in others that which he allows in himself. But as this subject has proceeded this far tonight it seems to me there has been a change of base. It is not misusing money, but it is begging he is objecting to. It is begging he is objecting to. Suppose we admit all that he says about begging, what does that affect the principle that Christians may establish schools, and establish those schools with a purpose of teaching useful secular knowledge and at the same time teaching the Bible, and with the purpose, too, of teaching the Bible? As I said this morning, **WHAT IS RIGHT FOR ME TO DO WITH MONEY WHICH IS IN MY HANDS, IT IS NOT WRONG FOR ME TO GIVE MY BROTHER AN OPPORTUNITY TO DO.**

Mr. Nay:—"Don't speak so loud."

Mr. Rhodes:—"Brother Nay has' my interest at heart and he wants me not to overtax my energies, and of course that is very kind and considerate in him.

"Now then, the relation to the church, or I mean the relation of our school to the church. A great many people want to know about that. A great deal of fog and dust has been thrown and confusion resulted, and I say here tonight that there is no more,—there is no closer connection between our school, the school in which I am engaged, and the church, than there is between any other business,—any other business enterprise in which any members of the church may be engaged. They are just as separate, every bit and grain,—every bit. It is strictly a **PRIVATE, PERSONAL BUSINESS.**' Strictly so,—a **PRIVATE, PERSONAL ENTERPRISE.** Having banded ourselves together to teach useful secular knowledge, and in connection therewith to teach the Bible a part of the time, and doing this partly to make a living and partly as an act of charity, that is what it is, and it is not,—it is **NOT A RELIGIOUS INSTITUTION.** It is not a church school. There is no connection between it and the church except this, that Christians are engaged in that work, and that will be just the same connection that would exist between the merchant who is a Christian, or the farmer who is a Christian, or whatever occupation the man might be in, who followed some useful occupation in life. Of course, we are responsible to God for our teaching, and we are responsible to the church through the elders, for our conduct,—the only relation in which we are bound up with the church itself. It is strictly a **PERSONAL, PRIVATE ENTERPRISE,** as strictly so as any man's family or store or publishing house. That we give opportunity to men to help us in that work, we don't deny. Are other men clear on the same line? Aren't there other men in this house tonight that give opportunities to other men to assist them in their personal, private enterprise? Will our worthy respondent deny the fact? Aren't there other men in this house tonight that have received gifts of one dollar, of five hundred dollars, and, as I have been informed, one thousand dollars from one estate or one man? How is that? Is that which is right in me, wrong in you? I would like to know. Now, you tell me. Or is that the reason, is that where the trouble comes? Is it, I say? I don't say it is, but I ask the question. That money goes to somebody else and does not come and **FILL MY COFFERS.** I don't say that is so,—I ask the question, you settle it for yourselves.

"Now then, in the last speech before dinner we had recounted for us the history of the Nashville school as all right,—didn't see any objection to it for ten years; heard about it, and heard they were going to start a Bible school, decided they were going to start a Bible school; read a little further, and saw they were going to teach useful knowledge, and thought that was very good; and then never paid any attention to it for ten years. Don't you know that required money,— don't you know it? It was all right, though. Actually it was called a Bible school, too, and the name was there. That name and the money, and he never said anything against it for ten years. Dismissed it from his mind and never did say anything against it until it started north. When it seemed to be growing,—one springing up at Bowling Green,— then they began to investigate, and it was not long until the fun commenced. Now then, that Nashville Bible School any time during those ten years, and at the very time when it started, had all of the organization and all of the institutionalism that we have, and that is simply nothing. Just as simple as it is possible to have and be banded together at all. Five men with nothing but a verbal agreement associated themselves together by that verbal agreement, entered into that arrangement and are responsible for that work. Five of us,—and no sort of a binding legal obligation upon us at all,—they remain together. That is the fact in the case. Yes sir, we have as little organization as it is possible to have and run a school at all. I am certain that there could not be less organization than we have. And in the speech of this morning you remember that he said when it started north, or when the report was received that a school of the same character had opened up at Bowling Green, he began to oppose it, and it was stated that he opposed it because it was the indication of a brood of such things. If the Nashville school was a good thing, where (he Christians had used their means and time and talents to establish a school to teach secular knowledge and teach the Bible,—if one was good why was not two or three or more better? If not, why not? Let's get down to fundamental principles, and remember,—remember,—remember that the opposition has been centered and concentrated upon the two things, the misuse of the Lord's money in establishing such schools, and the unscripturalness of naming such schools by a sacred name. Now, remember and bear in mind those two points, and I call upon my worthy respondent to come up to the work and face the issue and meet these things, and clear up the dust and cloud of misinformation and confusion that is in the mind of the people. These of all things the people want to hear the gentleman discuss. Why doesn't he do it? We were two days in debate at Odessa and not one single argument was offered upon either one of these points. There has been a feeble attempt upon the argument of the Lord's money, but only a feeble one. I demand that the issues be met,—the things that are fundamental, and the two points under which all that has been said in opposition to this work may be grouped. Why is it he will not come up and meet the issues? We have a right to expect it of him. He stands confessedly the very heart of the opposition and if he can't give you instruction upon this point, who can? I welcome the investigation, because I want to learn, because I want to have our mistakes pointed out, because we want to know the truth. We have a right to expect him to indicate it to us, we want him to get down to business and begin.

"But we are told again that in 1840 Alexander Campbell started a college that became the mother of a brood of colleges. That Alexander Campbell started a college and that it apostatized.—went away from the,—drifted away from the moorings and launched off into the perilous sea of speculation and opinionism, etc., and departed from the faith Now then, if that be a correct reasoning, if that be correct,—if that be sufficient evidence or sufficient reason why we should not

engage in a school of that kind or in establishing a school of that kind, it also ought to react upon my worthy respondent and cause him to have some doubt of becoming a journalist, because,—now mind you,—mind you, this proof that he is WRONG does not prove that we are RIGHT, but it ought to make him a little careful about offering criticism,—because,—my worthy respondent being the judge and jury and court and prosecutor in the case, too,—EVERY RELIGIOUS JOURNAL ESTABLISHED BY APOSTOLIC DISCIPLES HAS BECOME, in some measure at least, AN INNOVATOR, he said, except his own writings."

Mr. Sommer:—"Mr. Chairman, I rise to a point of order. This gentleman has left me as a debater and gone after my record as a journalist. I have been dealing with him as a debater."

The Chairman:—"You will please confine yourself to the subject."

Mr. Rhodes:—"Haven't I a right to make a statement before you make your ruling?"

The Chairman:—"Yes sir."

Mr. Rhodes:—"Now then, of course, I am aware the respondent may be a little nervous along this line, but I can't help that."

The Chairman:—"He has been referring to you as a debater, he has not referred to you in any other capacity whatever."

Mr. Rhodes:—"Certainly, I am willing to confine myself to the work in hand. That is true, but now then, the objection has been urged against me, Mr. Chairman, that we are engaged in a work that is apostasy. The objection has been made to our work on account of the danger of apostasy, and I certainly have a right then to point out the danger of his entering in that work in that it may, too, apostatize,—in that it is an apostasy,—in that, from his own investigation all of those who are associated with him in that work, or those who are engaged in a similar work have apostatized, and if it is an argument against me, it ought to be an argument against him."

Mr. Sommer:—"I would respectfully ask the gentleman whether we are discussing the college question or the journal question. If you are discussing the journal question as well as the college question, all right. I affirmed that my journal is a scriptural enterprise and he did not deny it, and I took that out of the discussion over at Odessa and said we would debate that at some other time. According to the agreement we are discussing the objections to the college and he is to follow. But he, in order to proceed after the manner he wishes,—he assails me as a journalist. Mr. Chairman, we think you should decide that"

Mr. Rhodes:—"Now, when I signed those articles of agreement you remember that I did so with this statement: that I would sign that about personal matters, provided, with this understanding, if my opponent did not wish to shield his own conduct and his own teachings from investigation, why then I would sign it, but otherwise not. I signed it with that reservation. Isn't that so?"

Mr. Sommer:—"Are you through?"

Mr. Rhodes:—"Yes."

Mr. Sommer:—"That is true, and let him deal with my writings. He has had free access to them. I have not objected to any quotation he has made, and he has had reference to my conduct in sending my sons to school, and I did not object to that, but when he goes back on my character as a journalist, he goes on the outside of the question, because that is not involved in this discussion. He has my writings and my conduct, even to sending my children to school, but he deals with my character as a journalist, which I am willing to defend at the proper time, but I don't wish that mixed with this debate."

Mr. Rhodes:—"I deny that I am questioning the gentleman's character as a journalist. I deny that. But I am drawing the parallel be-

tween the apostasy, as he called it, of the colleges and the apostasy of the journals, and if it be an argument why I should not engage in work through a college because colleges apostatize, then it is equally strong against my opponent that he should not work through his journal. That is the line of my argument."

Mr. Sommer:—"If that is the point, by his referring to journals generally in the disciple brotherhood, why then I concede the point, and say that I certainly was not engaged in that. But if that is the end he had in view, let him go on and state it and I will deal with that"

Mr. Rhodes:—"That is exactly the point I had in view, in this particular,—he had made an argument, as you all know, that it was dangerous,—that collegism was dangerous because a college had been instituted, and it became an innovator and apostate. Now then, I am answering that argument by showing that journalism, according to his own testimony is liable to the same thing, and according to his own testimony is not only liable to that, but it IS ACTUALLY TAKING PLACE WITH EVERY JOURNAL ESTABLISHED AMONG THE DISCIPLES, BUT HIS OWN.

"Now then, I hope we will have something definite, and some real downright argument upon the two fundamental objections that all of these people are expecting to hear something about, and unless my respondent does get down to business on that subject I will have to take the lead and do it myself, because I want his arguments that he has so abundantly repeated over and over again and scattered broadcast over the country. I want them here, and if he won't present them I will have to present them myself, though that is taxing me with double work, because he ought to present his arguments upon the fundamental things, and I am waiting to see if he will do it.

"But we are told that these schools are training schools for clergymen. Now, if he means the school with which I am connected, I emphatically deny it, and who has the right to know more about the work we do, be or myself? I say he has never been there a day at our school work, so far as that is concerned, and knows absolutely nothing about it as a school work. I have been in it every day since its beginning and I am personally conversant with the facts, as well as with the purpose of those who are engaged in that work. Now, I deny that it is a training school for clergymen. Are the representatives before you types of the class of clergymen? Of course, when our friend uses the term 'clergymen' he does it with a view to,—he does it with this in view, of some sort of pompous clerical gentleman that feels that he has a right to rule, and so on. Now, then, I appeal to your intelligence, honorable ladies and gentlemen, brethren and sisters in Christ, are the representatives of the school, which you have seen here,—do they bear any such indication? And as I stated this morning, if there is one purpose for which we do not exist, that is the purpose of making clergymen. We do not exist for that. Girls are just as freely admitted to every class as the boys are, if they are able to do the work, and we don't expect to make clergymen out of the girls, surely. But we expect to make clergymen out of the girls just as much as out of the boys, but we hope that we never will make clergymen out of either class. It is not our purpose, it is not our desire, and all of our influences are against every such thing.

"There is one other thing I intended to mention in the opening of my remarks, and that is that poster that Brother Sommer showed you this morning,—Uncle Reuben. Now, it is true that there was a musical entertainment before the school, or rather, in the school chapel and before the scholars that wanted to attend and those of the town that wished to attend, given just a few days before Brother Sommer got here. It was given by three or four gentlemen,—I think it was four,—

and was clean, pure, high class music, nothing low, nothing vulgar, not the least suggestive to anything vulgar, not the least suggestive to anything immoral, and Brother Sommer pictures us as a man trying to bring reproach on the poor. I speak as one who was there, and he states as one who was not there. There was no attempt to bring any reproach because of poverty. If it had been, those of us who are connected with the school would have felt the reproach, because we are as poor as the poorest, I presume. Nor was there any attempt or even the suggestion that looked like an attempt to bring reproach upon the honest, tiller of the soil. There is not a man who is connected with the school in any responsible position,—I mean any one of the five who are responsible for the existence of the school,—whose fathers were not and are not, in most cases at least, if they are still alive, farmers and tillers of the soil. We honor and respect the farmer. We grew up on the farm, our hands were horny with the toil of the fields and the swinging of the ax. We would have been the first to have resented anything of that kind. We believe in the dignity of labor and teach every student to respect and glorify it. Now then, but granting that,—now I will grant, just for the present,—that perhaps there might have been too much levity, or too much lightness or fun-making in that musical entertainment, suppose that is so. I have known a minister to come and hold a meeting there and then we would be disappointed because he is too light and frivolous. You have all had such experience. I don't doubt that this church has had such experience. Granting that is so, it is nothing more than a mistake, and after all some perhaps thought there was too much lightness and levity, I am sure that Prof. Armstrong felt that way about it, because he feels that about all kinds of entertainments, but other men's judgment differ, and it is only a matter of judgment, and why such a display, why so much venom when it was nothing but a matter of judgment. We are willing to admit that we make mistakes, but we always try to correct mistakes and it is a mere incident. Let us come down to the fundamental things, the things that are essential. Let us consider the Lord's money and consider the sinfulness or the sacrilege of attaching a sacred name to an enterprise that is partly secular,—the things that are fundamental, the two things under which all that has been said in opposition may be grouped, according to the testimony of my respondent. We have a promise from him that he will do so at this debate, at this session or series, but it seems that it is about time he was getting at it. Nearly half of his time is almost gone and the two essential things have not been touched, and one of them not touched at all. Now, I would like to get to business.

"It is said, the truth of this case is all on one side, and on the other error and subterfuge, and then that was repeated again, and he said, it is unnecessary to say that the truth is all on my side and the error and subterfuge on the side of my respondent. Of course that was unnecessary. Of course it was unnecessary from his point of view, because if he did not believe that he had the truth he would not be here. If I did not believe I had the truth I would not be here.

"My opponent asked, 'When and where did Paul ever beg money to give him an opportunity to labor at secular work, to build up a secular establishment,'—any way, that is the thought. 'When and where did Paul ever beg money to give him an opportunity to labor at secular callings,' or something like that. If Paul engaged in secular callings, if it was right for Paul to engage in secular callings, it was not wrong for another Christian to assist him. My friend will have hard work to make you believe that if you want to give me five dollars, that that is wrong."

DANIEL SOMMER'S FOURTH SPEECH AT HALE.

"Mr. Chairman, Gentlemen Moderators. Ladies and Gentlemen: I have a great deal of satisfaction, from one viewpoint, with the effect of my other speech. True, I don't like to bear down on a respondent as I had to bear down on Prof. Rhodes in my former speech, but it seemed to be necessary in view of the disposition on his part to call attention to some things that are not in the Sacred Text, and I believe that all this talk that you have heard heretofore, in opposition to my declaration that the college, with reference to which I have been speaking, IS NOT A BEGGING INSTITUTION, will henceforth be ended. If I didn't prove, notwithstanding the denials, that the president of that college has been a PERSISTENT BEGGAR, then I don't think I have ever proved anything by human testimony. That much may be regarded as SETTLED. And then if I didn't prove that after it had been PERSISTENTLY BEGGED FOR on the basis of its RELIGIOUS CHARACTER, that there was a mistake made of a very serious kind when it was declared NOT TO BE A RELIGIOUS INSTITUTION, which was repeated by Prof. Rhodes, or as he said awhile ago when he was on his feet, then I have never been able to point out a mistake with any degree of clearness. So those two points may be regarded as settled. It IS a BEGGING INSTITUTION, notwithstanding THE DENIALS THAT HAVE BEEN MADE, and it is a RELIGIOUS INSTITUTION, notwithstanding THE DECLARATIONS THAT HAVE BEEN MADE THAT IT IS NOT A RELIGIOUS INSTITUTION. Because if it is only one-fourth or one-fifth or one-sixth religious it is nevertheless religious in some measure or some degree, but the statement I read to you from the journal called Primitive Christianity, over Prof. Armstrong's signature, DOES NOT MAKE ANY MODIFICATION OF THE CASE. He says, 'our school is a work and NOT a religious institution.' That is the way the matter stands. And then if I didn't settle the question that the Octographic Review has been misrepresented in this debate, I have never settled anything. 'Christians may band themselves together to teach secular knowledge.' My respondent would have you to believe that on that account Christians MAY BEG MONEY FAR AND NEAR TO ESTABLISH A SPECIAL INSTITUTION in order to teach the secular knowledge and FURNISH THEM AN OCCASION to imitate Paul in doing secular work. 'They may teach the Bible a part or all of the time,' and therefore my respondent would have you to believe they MAY BEG AND BEG MONEY FOR THE PURPOSE OF ESTABLISHING A SPECIAL, SEPARATE INSTITUTION in order to do such teaching. And, says the Octographic Review, 'they may do this to make a living or as an act of charity.' Yes sir. We don't modify a single one of those statements, but we propose to prevent our respondent FROM ADDING TO THEM so as to cause anyone to think, as he set ins to have thought, that here is AUTHORITY for any such business as that in which he is engaged, to bog money anywhere and everywhere among the disciples, not only that are friendly, but trying to beg among those who are unfriendly, and establish such an institution three-fourths secular to furnish them an opportunity for secular work, one-fourth religious to furnish them an opportunity for religions work, and then say it is NOT A RELIGIOUS INSTITUTION. I again say that the case beggars description.

"My respondent asks whether because colleges apostatize he should not establish them, if the fact that journals have apostatized proves the same about journals, and in his last speech he said that they HAVE ALL APOSTATIZED EXCEPT THE JOURNAL WITH WHICH I AM CONNECTED. The audience recollects it.—I jotted it down."

Mr. Rhodes:—"I want to make a correction, if the gentleman will allow me to make a correction."

Mr. Sommer:—"You will have time to deal with it. I wrote it down in so many words, tic says that 'THEY HAVE ALL APOSTATIZED EXCEPT THE JOURNAL WITH WHICH MY RESPONDENT IS CONNECTED.' Now, with this much before you we come to this,— what are the facts in the case? The Christian Baptist began, was continued seven years, and ended without any apostasy. The Christian Record began, continued under the administration of old Brother James Mathews without apostasy. When it went out of his hands then it apostatized. And there was Brother Arthur Criffield, who ran a journal called the Heretic Detector. It began, continued its career, was ended without an apostasy. Alexander Hall's journal, the Gospel Proclamation began, continued its career, was ended without an apostasy. The Christian Age, which was in the hands of Benjamin Franklin for a period, began, continued its career, and ended without an apostasy. And the Octographic Review, which began as the American Christian Review in 1856, it began upon the apostolic lines and, though it was entangled for awhile, Benjamin Franklin recovered himself and came back to apostolic principles, and the paper seems less likely Co apostatize now than ever before. Here are the facts on the journalistic question. More than that, whenever the patrons of a journal see that it is apostatizing they can end its existence by ceasing their subscription, but when a man or a hundred or a thousand men put up an institution and put it in the hands of certain men, they can teach just what they please, and you remember what my respondent said awhile ago, that he was responsible to God for what he taught and responsible to the elders for his conduct. To whom is he responsible for the doctrines he preaches there? Here is a preacher, he is responsible to this church, so is every other preacher, he is responsible for his conduct. He can be brought before this church for any false doctrine, because he does this as a New Testament character and New Testament discipline can be exercised. But when a man becomes a professor in a college, and when he becomes an A. B. and A. M., to whom is he responsible for such an extra institution? That is the reason to which I have been referring. Is it not a training school for clergymen for one generation after another to engage in this business and get further and further away from the truth, and no church has the right to say stop? They don't pay any attention to the church, that is the reason of it. He says, 'the relation of our school to the church is not any closer than that of a farmer or any other Christian church member to the church!' Do the members of this church, who are farmers consult the church in regard to what kind of seed to sow, what kind of plow to use, how to sow the kind of seed that they wish to sow? They select the kind of farming implements that they wish to use, and thus they have that liberty, and upon this plea these gentlemen, and my respondent as representative of them, can proceed and SOW ANY KIND OF SEED, good, bad or indifferent, in that institution over which they preside, and the question arises, who is to hinder them? And as they can possibly lead persons to think that they are going along the right lines, they can have certain journals under their influence and publish what is favorable and withhold what is unfavorable, and that, is the way these things go, and thus they have gone there. Already there is the heresy of no voting and holding office in civil government, coming forth from Nashville and passing on and advocated at Odessa, and dividing congregations on that doctrine. There is the doctrine of no-right-hand-of-fellowship, set forth in that institution or taught by professors as individuals, and thus dividing the congregation on that term. And then by their procedure in begging money and using it after the manner that they are doing, here is the brotherhood divided generally. A general division, and then a local congregational division, and in some instances even a family division. The whole tendency of it is in

the wrong direction. Hear what the apostle Paul says in Romans 16th chapter, 17 and 18th verses: 'Now I beseech you, brethren, mark them which cause divisions and offences contrary to the doctrine which ye have learned; and avoid them. For they that are such serve not our Lord Jesus Christ, but their own belly,'—or their own appetites,—'and by good words and fair speeches deceive the hearts of the simple,'— the uninformed. Very likely those of whom Paul wrote would roll their eyes heavenward and pretend great reverence for the Bible, great reverence for God's word, and thus by good words and fair speeches deceive the hearts of those who are uninformed. That is the principle upon which wrong-doers have gone generally, and I fear that my respondent is endangering himself along that line. Consider, if you please, what we have presented along this line.

"Before I forget it, I read four questions which I intend to present to my respondent in written form, and demand that he shall answer them.

"1. When and where did Paul call on Christians to give money to him to establish an institution of any kind, even a private, personal enterprise, in order that he might thereby make an occasion to work at a secular calling?

"2. When and where did Paul establish such an institution in Older to make an occasion to teach persons in religion?

"3. When and where did Paul teach or set an example in favor of such an institution, and then teach Christians to say that it is not a religious institution?

"4. To whom are the professors in the Western Bible and Literary College responsible for the doctrines they teach in their college?

"He says that his respondent sent some of his children to school, and actually sent them to a school that had been established with the Lord's money,—a religio-secular school. Well, friends, we had that up at Odessa and I would have supposed that he had been sick of it, but he mentions it again. Without going any further I affirm that act scriptural. I call on him to deny it. If he won't deny it, what does he bring this up for? Just as he brings that (referring to chart) up from the Review. What is that for? To show that Daniel Sommer is an inconsistent man. The reasoning is that Sommer is an inconsistent man, therefore our institution is right. Sommer is an inconsistent man, and therefore he should not object to our institution. It does not make any difference how much truth he has, he should not bring it to bear against us, because he is an inconsistent man! The truth is, my respondent NEVER SAW ONE SINGLE SENTENCE from my pen IN OPPOSITION TO SENDING A CHILD TO SCHOOL or EVEN TO COLLEGE,—to any college where the child could secure the education that he needed. Lexington was nearer to me when I lived in Ohio than any school of considerable size that I knew. But I also sent to Milligan, in Tennessee. There was one young man who had gone there with whom I was acquainted in some measure, at least, acquainted with the family. I don't know that there was any other reason for sending' my sons to Milligan, except that of the facts mentioned, because Brother J. T. Showalter's son had gone there. But for Brother Showalter's children I would not have thought of sending them that far away. After talking with Brother Showalter and three, four or five of his children who went down there, I thought it would be a good place for my sons, who had been very busily engaged in the type-room, to go after an education, and that is in perfect harmony with everything I had said with regard to securing an education. But I am not aware that one of my sons ever took a Bible lesson in any one of those institutions, except on Lord's day morning in the Bible class,—didn't send them there

for that purpose. That is all this implies, and is immaterial, first, middle and last.

"All this talk about Christians furnishing an education for their children,—that it is a pan of their duty,—that they ought to provide an education for their children,—that hasn't the remotest connection with the controversy in which we are engaged. I stated to you this afternoon that this is NOT A QUESTION OF EDUCATION AS SUCH, nor SECURING AN EDUCATION, nor even GOING TO A SCHOOL WHERE THE BIBLE IS TAUGHT,—nothing of that kind at all. IT IS THE RIGHT OF CHRISTIANS TO ENGAGE IN ESTABLISHING SUCH A SCHOOL FOR THE PURPOSE OF TEACHING PERSONS IN RELIGION, AND THUS IMPLY THAT WHAT THE BIBLE SAYS CONCERNING THE PERFECTION OF THE CHURCH AND FAMILY FOR THIS END IS NOT TRUE, AND THAT WE HAVE TO BUILD UP ANOTHER INSTITUTION IN ORDER TO TEACH PERSONS IN RELIGION. That is the idea.

"He complains (hat I have not gotten after the fundamental question. I think I have gotten after it more closely than he desires. That is the money question. He and I are agreed that the money which is in the Lord's treasury is the Lord's money. I might take the time under other circumstances to show that everything is the Lord's money, which he claims, whether we give it or not, whether we put it in the Lord's treasury or not. But let me see,—here is an old paper of January 20, 1905, called the Christian Leader and the Way, and I read here of money that they received upon their begging scheme:

"From Jones Chapel congregation, through J. J. Chrisman, Clovercroft, Tenn., \$7. 00. Berea congregation, Sideview, Tenn., through Minnie Jones, \$4. 00. Church of Christ, Hopkinsville, Ky., \$7. 00. Church of Christ, Glass, Tenn., \$30. 00. Congregation at Fairfield, Tenn., \$7. 50. Horsecave, Ky., congregation, \$5. 00. Ellis Chapel congregation, through B. E. Rings, Antioch, Tenn., \$8. 00. Congregation at Tom Bean, Texas, \$7. 60. Little River congregation, near Hopkinsville, Ky., \$25. 08.

"What is the use of going any further? We both admit that is the Lord's money, which is put in the treasury, and I say it is an unlawful use of the Lord's money to build up an institution that is partly or chiefly secular, FOR THE PURPOSE of furnishing an occasion for certain preachers to do secular work to MAKE A LIVING, and to do religious work CHARITABLY. And it is an unlawful use of the Lord's money to give to such an institution for the purpose of teaching persons in religion. According to the Bible THE CHURCH and THE FAMILY, the divinely ordained institutions, are to teach persons in religion, and the Lord never intimated in favor of any other to teach persons in religion.

"Now, friends, you see very clearly that all this talk about fundamental questions has been met. I pointed out the UNLAWFULNESS of it. The Lord NEVER ORDAINED anything of that kind. He has divinely appointed the use that He meant the people to make of His money, and such being the case we find that this is on the outside of any New Testament arrangement, first, middle and last, consequently the objections that we urge on this subject are CERTAINLY CORRECT. My respondent ungraciously intimated that it is because the money goes in some other direction, and does not go into somebody's pocket, that may be talking on this occasion,—well, he can have the benefit of that.

"He represented me as saying that the Nashville school was ALL RIGHT, because I didn't say anything against it for ten years. I didn't suspect my apostolic brethren of being disposed of doing anything that was wrong, so I didn't propose to investigate the case.

I proposed to allow them to attend to their own business in their own way while it didn't affect the church of the living God. I had confidence in those brethren down there, at least in a considerable degree, and I didn't occupy myself along that line. But when my respondent intimated that I said it was Abb RIGHT, he says an ungracious thing. I said I didn't suspect it, or that there was anything wrong with it, but I NEVER INTIMATED THAT I REGARDED IT AS ALL RIGHT. That is another one of the ungracious intimations along that line.

"He says, 'When it started north then I began to investigate.' Well, I began to look after the history of collegism, and knowing what that history was, in some measure, I then began to enter my protest with reference to the so-called Bible school. And just here I shall mention one of the most formidable arguments, in favor of my respondent's position, and this only is a plausibility. The word 'Bible' is a very popular word in the United States of America, so is the word 'education,' and it is supposed that school and education belong together. Consequently when you name a school 'Bible-School,' you have something that at once calls upon the people of the United States quite generally, and especially disciples of Christ, to say that is a good thing. It opens the way to their confidence at once, and they are not disposed to suspect, because it is a Bible-School. And thus I believe the most formidable thing I have to combat is the idea of education, which is so popular, and the idea of Bible education, which is popular in theory, even though not in practice. For when you unite these, there is something that says, by implication, that a man who is talking against a Bible-School certainly must have something wrong with him.

"Uncle Reuben was brought up again. Yes sir, Uncle Reuben. It was a burlesque on a farmer, that is just what it was. This Uncle Reuben was presented as an ignoramus standing up with his fiddle in his hand, dressed up so that he could not be recognized. That is theatrical, representing somebody else, representing a part. Theatrical performers are trained liars, they are acting a part, and they are only successful inasmuch as they act a part well, there is Uncle Reuben standing up there. Some one said, 'Who are you, any way?' He said, 'I am Jack Armstrong,'—pretending to be the president of that institution. I said the novel would lead in the direction of the theater, and here, I believe it was about one week ago tonight, they had that sort of arrangement in Odessa. They don't wait until the pupils get away and go off to Kansas City to visit the theater.

"Their verbal agreement, of which mention was made some time ago, is embodied in the deed to the property and is on the county records in that county. That is a very good verbal agreement. It is a verbal agreement, of course, but it is written. He didn't say it is an oral agreement, but a verbal agreement. It can be simply oral, or it can be written. In this instance I learn it is written and contained in a deed to the property and recorded. Now, the idea of throwing anything of that kind' out before this congregation as a dodge. That is all it is.

"If it was right for Paul to labor INCIDENTALLY, it is right for somebody else to labor Abb THE TIME! If it was right for Paul to labor ONCE IN A WHILE, or OCCASIONALLY, that might be necessary for certain reasons he designated, it is right to ESTABLISH AN INSTITUTION and take four or five preachers here and four or five preachers somewhere else, and keep them occupied at least three-fourths of their time, or nine months out of the year, and thus be spoiled for the other months'. When preachers are kept occupied with that kind of learning for a period of nine months, when they go out among the churches what do you suppose they go as? As evangelists?

They may go as evangelists, but at the same time their heart is in the college work, as certainly as they are true to it. And what is the result? They are agents everywhere, and stir up all the agents they can, for that particular institution, and the whole tendency is in the direction of establishing a human institution to do the Lord's work, and it is on the same basis with a man made missionary society, only not one-half as defensible. Why? The man made missionary society of the Christian Church is ENTIRELY RELIGIOUS, but it is an extra institution on the outside of the congregation and not attached to them. My respondent has been speaking against them and those associated with them, and does not seem to know that the VERY SAME LOGIC which will condemn them will condemn his institution, or the one he is connected with, more intensely and more urgently. That can not possibly be blotted out.

"Now, ladies and gentlemen, you consider that question of begging and see if I haven't proved my case. Consider the use made of this chart, and see if it has been presented to show some inconsistency on my part, which was denied awhile ago, and consider it is only what is injected into what I have said that makes it appear in any way against me, and then consider what I state of the 18th chapter of the book of Acts and see what is injected in the text there."

B. F. RHODES' FOURTH REPLY AT HALE.

"Mr. Chairman, Gentlemen Moderators, Ladies and Gentlemen: We have had some very interesting things presented, but money and name have been very lightly touched. It is true the name has been mentioned in the last speech, but just touched easy, easy, and those of you who were present at the Odessa discussion know why, or have a reason for knowing. Name not mentioned, yet he not only charges directly but it is indirectly referred to, that our use of the name 'Bible' is sacrilege. If it is sacrilege, and that has been charged, and that name has been the basis of the grave objection that has been urged against our work, why don't he come out and attack it on that point? I DEFY HIM TO DO IT. But now, it is. NOT EVEN THE MONEY QUESTION. It would be all right if Brother Armstrong had the money so that we could just do it all, ourselves. So far as I can now see, it would be all right if we had the money to do it all ourselves, but when we don't have it and give opportunity to other people to help us, that is where the wrong comes. It is a begging institution. Now, I will promise you this, I am willing to make this statement,—of course, we have not consulted all those who are interested, but I believe that Brother Armstrong and I can speak for the others, and say that if it will cease the opposition and noise and confusion and bring peace and harmony and love and fellowship and unity, WE WILL PROMISE NEVER TO BEG ANOTHER DOLLAR SO LONG AS WE LIVE. If begging is the objection we can get rid of that. But there is no principle involved in the begging,—no wrong. If it is right for me to use the money it is not wrong for others to help me out, and it is not wrong for me to suggest that if you want to, you may.

"But we were asked some questions. 'When and where did Paul call on Christians, to give money to him to establish an institution of any kind, even' a private, personal enterprise, in order that he might thereby make an occasion to work at the secular calling?' Well, I don't know that he did. I never saw it, but if my brother had asked me if I could find a good example for anything of that kind I could tell you yes, and I would not! have very far to go. Because he says that his enterprise is a strictly personal, private enterprise that has been made to furnish work and support for his family, and he offers opportunity for brethren to help him in it, and he knows he does, and

you know it, and he receives gifts from one dollar up to one thousand dollars, as I have been informed. He made his application to a blacksmith or section hand, or tent making, but never once made an application to the publishing business. That would be getting close to home But he did say that the apostle Paul engaged in secular work to further the cause of Christ, for an example to me to do so, and if others are willing to help me, surely it is not wrong to do so.

"When and where did Paul establish such an institution in order to make an occasion to teach persons in religion?' The apostle Paul with his tent making, when he entered into that agreement with Priscilla and Aquila to work with them, had all the organization,— all the essential elements of, organization that we have, so far as that is concerned.

"When and where did Paul teach or set an example in favor of such an institution, and then teach Christians to say that it is not a religious institution?' Now then, we have explained over and over again that in the sense that the Bible is taught there IT IS RELIGIOUS, certainly. In the sense that Christians are engaged in it, IT IS RELIGIOUS. It is just as religious as any Christian's farm or publishing house, or business house of any kind, and ONLY RELIGIOUS IN THAT SENSE. It is not a church institution. That is what we have said over and over again, and this audience begins to understand it, I expect.

"To whom are the professors in the Western Bible and Literary College responsible for the doctrines they teach in their college?' Well, awhile ago I said they were responsible to God for our teaching. Certainly, that is so, and responsible to the church through the elders for our conduct. Of course, we don't mean we are not responsible to God for our conduct. Does it? You didn't get that idea, did you,—because I said we are responsible to the elders of the church that we are not responsible to God? Why should my brother infer he did not believe we are responsible to the church for our teaching? Of course, teaching is a part of our conduct, and we are just as responsible to the church for our teaching as teachers as we are preachers. Of course we are,—every bit as responsible to them. If I teach heresy, whether it is on the rostrum or where it is, or what in, I am responsible to God through the church, too, for it,—whether it is in school, on the road or from the pulpit.

"But we were accused of dividing the church at Odessa. Now, I am surprised that my worthy respondent would stultify his dignity as a polemic disputant by any such a statement as that, in view of his knowledge of the facts. It is a misstatement. Here is a statement from the elders of the church at Odessa. A statement similar to this was made by the elders of the church In the progress of the discussion over there, and we anticipated such a line of attack and we have this statement: 'February 19, 1907. To all whom this may come, greeting: This is to certify that the report which has been circulated that the Church of Christ is divided, is untrue,'—this means the local church, because it is headed 'Odessa, Missouri, "'and that we have publicly protested against such statement and do now jointly protest.' Signed by the elders, B. G. Hayden, P. W. Adams, T. V. Foster, elders of the Church of Christ at Odessa.

"Who is submitting to the elders? Who is submitting to the elders, I would like to know. Of course, these people know that men could come here in this community and go nosing around and could find little disputes and little differences and things of that kind. A preacher never went to a church in his life where he did not have people come and tell him about little differences and friction that was in the congregation, I call upon these preachers that have gene over the field to say if that is not so. Perhaps there may be something of

the kind, but there is no division. The elders have said so over their own signatures, and publicly protested against such report, and I trust our respondent will have the polemic honor and manhood not to make such a charge again."

Mr. Sommer:—"As there are many here who will not be here again, I wish to say that I calculate to deal with that and deal with it in due form."

Mr. Rhodes:—"I hope you reserved the minute or halt a minute, whatever it was, from my time. He didn't rise to a point of order, he just rose to reply to that. Now, he had no right to do so, and this audience knows it, and he knows it."

Mr. Sommer:—"I now rise to a point of order. The point is, when I was making a speech on a former occasion, the moderator rose to reply to me, which did not amount to a point of order, but was a reply to me, and he was ruled down in regard to it, and as far as I was concerned I said I would not reply to him, but would reply to him in due time."

Mr. Nay:—"I beg to differ from Mr. Sommer. I did from my heart arise to a point of order, not to reply, but to suppress his misrepresentation of Brother Rhodes, when he was saying that Brother Rhodes and the faculty continued begging when, as Brother Rhodes had said, that was not the contention. I did arise to a point of order."

Mr. Gray:—"Inasmuch as this subject has been brought out at this time, and as many in the audience will not be here tomorrow when this discussion is closed, this statement (that there is no division in the congregation of Odessa, will go down in the ears and hearts of many people as an incorrect statement made by Daniel Sommer. The statement was made in Odessa in a prayer that there was division in the Church of Christ, and the Lord was told of it in the opening service, that there was a division existing in Odessa. Brother Daniel Sommer made the same statement, and Brother Rhodes made the statement that 'we admit that.' That is on the reports here, and yet they come here and say 'there is no division.' We never did claim there was organic division, but there is division in sentiment on the very point this brother has brought forth."

Mr. Nay:—"It was not my purpose to defend the church at Odessa. That same question was sprung by Brother Sommer there, that there was division in the church at Odessa, and that the college had done it or caused that. Brother Rhodes in reply to that said he acknowledged there might be some friction on certain things. He stated that he did not deny. In return Brother Sommer urged the matter that there was division there that had been caused by these college brethren over the right hand of fellowship, and other matters. It became so revolting and so annoying to the elders that the elders came to the moderators there, both of them, and demanded a public correction of that through Brother Rhodes. They corrected that statement, saying that there was no division, and after that had been ruled by the elders, Brother Sommer in another speech urged the same argument, that the college had divided the church, or was causing division there. I rose to a point of order, and my assistant moderator knows that the chair ruled that out, because when the elders of the congregation decided the question and said that there was no division, no man, no person had a right to say that there was division. And now, on behalf of that church, of which I have been a member for several months, I want to say of my own personal knowledge that the statement is not true. There is no division in the sense in which he is trying to apply it to the church at Odessa. The faculty, the whole school, and the Odessa church work together in perfect harmony, live perfectly harmoniously; and I want to say, before I conclude, that I will defend the elders of the church at Odessa and at every time that

Brother Sommer brings it up and states that there are divisions, caused by the elders of the church, I shall arise and restrain him, and I demand that he be submitted to their declarations, as I shall be submitted to the declarations of the elders of this church."

Mr. Gray:—"I would like to ask this question, in connection with what has been said, if Brother Rhodes or Brother Nay will risk his reputation that there is NO DIVISION IN ODESSA, IN SENTIMENT, upon these points? You understand the question,—WILL YOU RISK YOUR REPUTATION as an honorable Christian gentleman that there is no division in the Odessa congregation upon this one point of the right hand of fellowship? Will you say YES or NO to it? Just say YES or NO. Then I want to read the statement that I took down in the prayer that was offered the service I was there,— 'We are divided over whether we shall send our children to a school presided over by brethren in Christ.' That is the prayer that,—the Lord was told that. Now, I ask the question again,—do they acknowledge that here tonight, or will they say that there is NO DIVISION in conformity to the two organizations? The congregation assembles at the meeting house in the morning, while the meeting was in the chapel on the afternoon. There is division on that line as well,— [have been there. It has been brought about by the statement,—it has been brought about by the teachings of those who are connected with the college. That is the point."

Mr. Rhodes:—"Now, then, I submit to your Honor this is all out of order. The condition of the church at Odessa is not in debate."

Mr. Gray:—"The point is this,—we want him to say WHETHER THERE IS DIVISION OR NOT, as he said he would."

Mr. Nay:—"Some one, I presume, was not praying when they took down this statement made in the prayer at Odessa."

Mr. Gray:—"I wrote it. I am the brother. I never pray when all kinds of talking is going on. There is a difference in praying and talking. I hear men talking that pretend they are praying, but I don't pray to that kind of prayer."

Mr. Nay:—"I was the man that uttered that prayer that he referred to."

Mr. Gray:—"I don't know whether it was a prayer or not,—you said those words."

Mr. Nay:—"He reflects on me as a Christian gentleman. I see it says here (reading Mr. Gray's note) 'We are divided over whether we should send our children to a school presided over by brethren in Christ or not,—D. W. Nay's prayer.' That was correct. Now, let me explain that. I was called upon by the chairman to offer prayer. We were all in joint session. I said that in speaking of the whole brotherhood at large, expressing that they were divided over the school question, and it was true. I did not say, I did not intimate that the church at Odessa was divided over this school question. I did not. I say it,—I say it PROUDLY, not in the sense of vanity,—I say it PROUDLY that the church is not divided over this. And furthermore, in regard to the right-hand of fellowship, it is an established fact that there has been difference of opinion in regard to the right-hand of fellowship in the Odessa church for several years,—four, five or six years before they ever saw Brother Armstrong, four, five or six years before a college man ever came there to preach. I get this, from the elders of the church. These are defections, but that was not a division. Some thought it was right to go forward and give the right-hand of fellowship, some thought it was not scriptural, but it caused no division only in sentiment. Some thought one way and others in another."

The Chairman:—"I suggest we drop this part of the discussion and go on with the debate."

Mr. Rhodes:—"I am glad to get started again. But I have been

sitting down and I am a little hoarse. I dislike this interruption because I don't know where I am. But I believe I had finished up answering these questions he delivered, didn't I, and read this statement from the elders, and I believe now I will take up the charge and argument against us,—as though it was a crushing blow,—that we teach school nine months out of the year and then preach three months out of the year and do it very imperfectly. Well, when I go out to preach the three months I do it as well as I can, and that is all I can do. I don't care whether it is perfect or imperfect, I do the best I can. 'And acts as agent for the college rather than the church.' I will say this much,—I am not accustomed to standing before the audience before I dismiss it, and handing out catalogues or saying 'if you know anybody who wants to come to school you send them around,' or anything of that sort, and I have known such things to be done in protracted meetings by an evangelist, for religious journals which are said to be strictly private enterpriser that have been made to furnish work and support for a certain man's family, and repeatedly done, and done almost every night. Now then, if acting as an agent for a college would interfere with one's evangelistic duties, why is it that acting as an agent for a publishing house or a religious journal won't interfere with his religious duties? Now, that was all assumption, so far as I am concerned,—all assumption. 'Takes preachers out of the field.' Well, I have known of a man who is connected with a religious journal, leaving the field or at least so publishing to the world that he left the field for a week, two weeks, ten days, or something of the kind, for he was needed very much in the office. If that is right why is it wrong for me to be needed in the office, so to speak?

"Now, then, we have heard a great deal about begging money for building up a private enterprise. Well, don't you remember a few years ago when the effort was made to buy the farm for Brother Fujimori, the Jap, over in Japan? Many perhaps will recall it, possibly many may have subscribed to that. I know the congregation that I was a member of at Winfield, Kansas, gave one Lord's day collection of \$40. 00 to help buy a farm for Brother Fujimori, and he is using that farm as a sort of colony to colonize Japanese and teach them to farm and teach them to be Christians. And Brother A. M. Morris, a man whom I respect, made appeals and reports,—reports of contributions and amounts received, and gave to that extent at least, encouragement and support to that work by Brother Sommer in his publishing enterprise. But if it is all wrong for us to receive contributions from Christians to build up a school in which to teach the Bible, to teach religion, why was? no objection filed and why were the columns opened to report contributions for buying Brother Fujimori's farm? And our enterprise is just as strictly a private enterprise as that and no more so. Of course, if any body wanted to give to Brother Fujimori it was all right) and wherefore is that? I don't believe I was there when the contribution was made, if I had been I would have given something, and I don't know that I didn't give something,—I don't know as to that. I was not there that day, though.

"Now, then, it is said that we deny it is religious. Over and over again we have told in what sense it was religious.

"Now, then, there has been a great deal said against begging, but a man can beg by implication as well as begging directly. Here is one. Page 1, January 6, 1903, of the Octographic Review, talking, if I remember correctly, on the subject of a political campaign, or something of that sort, that would claim the attention of the disciples,—'in that event widows, orphans, preachers and the Review will be forgotten.' Begging by implication. Then again we have something like this: 'If money unjustly held back by disciples who have no convenient place to worship for the last ten years, was given into my hands for the Review

we could probably double its influence in a few months.' I read it again:—'If money, unjustly held back by disciples who have no convenient place to worship for the last ten years, was given into my hands for the Review, we could probably double its influence in a few months.' That is in the issue of December 11, 1900. Why is it that righteous indignation is expressed against offering opportunity for people to give to other things, when so much can be said along the line of the personal, private enterprise in which the man himself is interested? Ours is a personal, private enterprise and we offer opportunity for people to help us. Those people, a great many of them, and especially,—I will say (his,—those who have been our heaviest contributors, have been the people who have known most about the work, because they believe that we can do good with it, and who is to say them 'nay?'

"Now, then,—oh, yes, I was about to forget this,— I was not allowed to make a correction at the time,—'all have apostatized except one.' It was said by Brother Sommer that I said, 'all have apostatized except one.' Whatever may have been my words I know I never said that from the heart, for you know,—this audience knows, Brother Sommer knew, I never intended such thing if I said it. You know, this audience knows, and I know, and I believe Brother Sommer ought to have known at least,—I will say that,—that I meant only to put myself in his place and to speak for him, for that is what I expected to do, you know. You remember I expected that, for I went right on and spoke about 'according to his own testimony they had all apostatized and his was the only right one.' Of course it was himself for whom I was speaking. I don't know how he could fail to have noticed that I was speaking for him in that matter. I was speaking for him. In other words, I was intending to quote him,—that is all. I NEVER SAID THEY HAD ALL APOSTATIZED. I don't believe anything of the kind.

"And it was said that patrons can end the journal if it apostatizes. Yes, but they don't usually do it. I don't know that I have known one to end on that account. Apostasy is usually more popular than real genuine scripturalness, so far as that is concerned. That don't prove that It is right or wrong, however. So patrons, I suppose, could end, a college. I know if people don't send their children to our school we will close up mighty soon.

"I acted scripturally in sending my boys to a religio-secular school,'—for that was the kind it was. 'I acted scripturally.' I am very glad that our respondent said that. You need have no fears at all to send your children down to us, because he acts scripturally in coming. If he acted scripturally in sending his boy to Lexington college, presided over by innovators,—bold, uncompromising, down-right innovators,—I don't know that you need suffer any loss of sleep when you send your boy down to us.

"Another thing,—'I don't know that they had ever taken a Bible class there.' He believes, you know, in having the Bible taught in schools. You know his own record,—he says he believes it and has never denied it,—you know that is what he says. Why would it have been wrong to have taken a Bible class? If it was not wrong, why should he insist that he don't know that they ever did? Another thing,—I had not thought about saying that, but it has been told to me that when those boys matriculated they matriculated in Kentucky university. You know the two schools are built up together. And hence they attended chapel services in Kentucky university, where in the chapel they use the instruments of the world, while if they had matriculated in the other department they would have attended downstairs where they do not use the instrument in the chapel services. These are the facts that have been reported to me.

"The church and the family are the two organizations for teaching religion!"—'two divine organizations for teaching religion.' But you know he says he believes in schools that do teach the Bible. When he gets his school that does teach the Bible in connection with secular things is that the family or the church? Which is it? When he gets the school that teaches the Bible and secular things in connection, he will have every bit of the organization and institution that we have, and he can't help it to save his life.

"Now, then, he went on back about the Nashville school; said he never investigated it, but the very first time he ever noticed it he said that he saw that they said 'Bible School,' and he thought it was a very good thing, and he road a little further and saw they were going to teach secular things, and he had no objection to that, and said that those 'apostolic brethren wished their children taught in secular things and have established a school. It was called a Bible School, and it is a name that has been such a bugbear and sacrilege,—urged as a sacrilege broadcast over the country from end to end with hue and outcry everywhere and it was the same name. He didn't take investigation to see that. That was the very thing he saw, and next he saw they were going to leach the Bible, and then he saw they were going to teach secular things in connection. There was a school with the Bible taught and secular knowledge taught, and named Bible school, and it wouldn't take any investigation to find that out, and yet it was ten years before he objected to it. And that is all we have. He is familiar with the history of colleges; he had been to Bethany college himself and left there in order to have time to think. He was acquainted with their history and had gone on record in the year, I believe it was 1878 or '79, he says, on these things.

"But we come to fiction,—ungodly fiction, and so on. Now then, I just say that the fiction we teach down there in the class of the English course IS NOT UNGODLY, it is NOT IMMORAL FICTION. It is just as moral, just as godly as the fiction that our friend has advertised and has clubbed in connection with the Octographic Review,—with his enterprise,—every bit and grain. There is not a particle of difference. I say Uncle Tom's Cabin is just as ungodly fiction, as much fiction and just as immoral as the fiction we teach and yet he clubbed it and carried the notice standing for months at a time, offering it to them as a premium for two subscribers to the Octographic Review. He won't challenge that fact. It stood there for months. I should have thought he would have,—as a polemic disputant he would have dripped with shame rather than have mentioned that here.

"Deed to the property. Verbal and oral agreement.' It is true that we have a deed for that properly down there. I told you this morning, I believe it was, that it was first in the form of a chartered institution, but the citizens of Odessa bought up the stock and disorganized it at a cost of \$50. 00 to us. It cost us fifty dollars to disestablish and surrender the charter back to the state. And we had it entered as individual property because we wanted to be very careful, and we were certain, having consulted with brother M. C. Kurfees and having his advice in the matter. We wanted to be very careful and certain in establishing no dangerous kind of institution. We were that careful that we spent fifty dollars and took the time and trouble to surrender the charter and get it as individual property, and we did that that we might not have any organization that would be unsafe. As informal an organization as we could have, and we have just as little bit as is possible for us to have and be banded together at all, and it does not exist 'as a corporate body at all. The school can't sue and be sued as a school.

'But I want to emphasize again (hat we want something on the name. We are anxious for something on the name, and if my respond-

ent don't bring something out in his next speech I will have to bring something pretty soon. I may not do it tonight, but he must take a stand. He has accused us of being sacrilegious in using the name as we use it, and such a charge demands consideration, and demands attention, and you people have been made to feel that, and felt that for several months. You have been believing that 'and feeling that, and some of you charging us with sacrilege for using the name as we do. Yet when he heard about the Nashville school and it was called a Bible school he was not troubled. Later it became sacrilege. If it was not sacrilege a few years ago may be it is not now. If he will say it is not, then that will end it. When he takes it back we will quit talking about taking a stand or I will do it for him. I will tell you what, a polemic disputant that will for years discuss a question in the published journals,— for years do it,—and say that all that he can say, all that he has said, may be summed up under the two heads, the misuse of the Lord's money and the sacrilege or misuse of the sacred name Bible,— adopting it in a name that is partly secular,—a man that has done that in his polemic writings on the subject, and when a polemic disputant will not come out on those things, what will you call him?"

Thereupon the discussion adjourned until 9:30 o'clock a. m., the next day, Friday, February 22d, 1907, at which time the debate was resumed as follows:

DANIEL SOMMER'S FIFTH SPEECH AT HALE.

"Mr. Chairman, Gentlemen Moderators, Ladies and Gentlemen: I wish first of all to refer in a few remarks to the meeting last night,— the last part of the discussion, I suppose that (here are several points that we may regard as settled. One of them is that when the Octographic Review is quoted on the college question it should be quoted FULLY OR NOT AT ALL, or at least quoted in harmony with what is said in the other part of its teachings; and in view of the especial matter of what was upon that chart last night you understand very clearly that it is only by injecting into that chart what is NOT THERE, that any sort of question can be made, or pretense can be set forth that what I have ever written has favored any such institution as I am now contending against. I have never changed what I wrote on the subject, and only when my words are wrested can any such appearance be made.

"Second. That all we have said about the begging business is STRICTLY CORRECT, notwithstanding all the POSITIVE DENIALS THEREOF. And then in the third place, it may be regarded as settled when we staled that our respondent had declared that every journal had 'actually apostatized excepting one. That is to say, that is his exact language. Looking over my notes I found the following,—referring to apostatizing, he says, 'actually taken place by every journal that has been established by apostolic disciples except his own.' Those are his words, and his explanation was that he didn't mean it in his heart, and if he said it, he was just simply quoting me, that I had said this. I had said that the Octographic Review seemed to be the only paper that was standing IN OPPOSITION to this college business, with reference to which we are debating on this occasion. But my respondent said SOMETHING ELSE. He said that EVERY CHURCH would apostatize in the com so of time, or if you would give it time enough. The church with reference to which Christ said the gates of Hell shall not prevail against it, he has passed that kind of a sentence upon it. I leave it to you and allow you to decide how much of the apostatizing spirit is behind that sort of a statement. But before I leave this, I wish to say that my respondent is a representative of a class of men who will apologize for their mistakes after this manner: 'I DIDN'T MEAN

IT, if I said it it was NOT IN MY HEART. The Lord knows it was NOT IN MY HEART.' And consequently he has not made any mistake and if so, it was not intentional, and they will go on and make any kind of mistakes they see lit and persist in them, and insist that those who oppose them, even with reference to the Word of God, should recognize them as brethren, and say, 'We are all brethren.' And notwithstanding all the mistakes that may occur, 'We are brethren.' Any kind of heresy can be introduced and, yet the plea made that 'we are all brethren.' That is DIGRESSIONISM first, middle and last. The position of digressionists is, 'We put in the organ, we put in the missionary society and mite society, let us do anything we see fit, and yet regard us as brethren, and if you don't you are guilty of making the very serious mistake of making this thin? a test of fellowship.' That is the Christian Church's position, that is their digressive idea, and my respondent and his associates are, I think it may be safely said, placing themselves on that side with that kind of pleading.

"Now, I come to deal with my respondent's last speech. He first made; mention of what I had said about the name Bible on a school that is chiefly secular. When I first began to write on that subject the schools that I had in view were' just simply called 'Bible School.'— Nashville Bible School and Bowling Green Bible College. They didn't have any other word indicating that they were three-fourths secular and one-fourth religious, and had the word 'Bible' used as a drawing card, it seems, for everything there was in them. I wrote with that in view. My respondent allowed the remark to drop the other day that the name Western Bible and Literary College had been chosen after that manner in order to please me. If my ears did not catch the idea right I wish him to correct it and tell me whether they did or did not give that a mixed name because it was a mixed institution.

"Now, here is another thought. The money question was very closely contested last night. My respondent said yesterday in so many words, 'We never have begged of any one whose heart didn't incline him to give.' But what time do they spend in trying to get a man's heart inclined in that direction? Letters written, arguments used, persuasion used,—you see what kind of arguments they used to incline them in that direction. And then came up the denial several times over that 'WE NEVER HAVE BEGGED,'—and denounced the truth of my charge. Then after we gave the evidence we had this from my opponent: 'If it will cause the opposition to cease we will never beg another dollar as long as the institution lives.' Now if that was not by implication,—the most certain kind of implication,—that they had been BEGGING, which they had DENIED and DENIED, then, friends, I don't understand the relation of thought to thought. I wish here to inquire if my respondent did not at one time draw up, or have something to do with a document in which he proposed that the name 'Bible' should be dropped from the Odessa institution in order to please somebody, or cause some opposition to cease? I heard of such a document and I would like to know if he is not acquainted with it, and whether he did nor did not sign it, whether he did or did not draw it up.

"In regard to the questions I asked and presented to my respondent in written form. I find the following in my notes. He says, 'I don't know that he did,'—that is, he doesn't know whether Paul did beg money to establish such an institution. Now, friends, I dislike to impeach the intelligence of my respondent, or his sincerity, but I can't avoid thinking that he DOES KNOW that according to the record that Paul DID NOT. And that is just the evasion of an unfair witness on the witness stand that an attorney some times has so much trouble with. He says, 'I don't know that he did.' According to the record Paul DID NOT, because there is not the slightest intimation in that direction. But he says, 'if my respondent had only asked for an ex-

ample I would say yes, and refer him to his paper.' There was another mistake. Why? The question there asks this,—I will repeat it exactly,—'When and where did Paul call on Christians to give money to him to establish an institution of any kind, even a private, personal enterprise, in order that he might thereby make an occasion to work at a secular calling?' Now, the Octographic Review is not an enterprise to make an occasion to work at a secular calling, any more than **THIS HOUSE WAS BUILT TO MARK AN OCCASION** for somebody to build fires here in the winter season, or to sweep it once or twice or three times a week. This is just the incidental or necessary phase or feature in order to accomplish the end which was necessary in building this house, and all the secular work, like setting of type and printing, that may be called secular work, though it is religious as far as the sentiment is concerned, first, middle and last,—that is just the **INCIDENTAL** part, and consequently the example was not correct, and my respondent is wrong in **TWO PARTICULARS**. First, in his reference to the scripture he is **CERTAINLY WRONG**, and I think now he knows it. Second. With the explanation I gave he must certainly know he is wrong, for there is **NOT THE SLIGHTEST RESEMBLANCE** between the Octographic Review, with its incidentals, to bring it before the public, and an institution established **FOR THE PURPOSE OF** engaging four or five men,—taking them out of the field—and engaging them for nine months in the year in a work chiefly secular.

"Second question. 'Paul in his tent making, when he entered into the agreement with Priscilla and Aquila, had all the organization that we have over there.' There is more injecting into the divine text. Was Paul's agreement recorded in the county seat in the form of a deed specially arranged? That is not in the text, why then presume that Paul had any agreement with those individuals, of a financial, or of money kind, or anything of the sort? You wonder, perhaps, why it is that so much can be said upon the wrong side. **IT IS BECAUSE THAT WHICH IS SAID IS WRONG**,—first, middle and last. In response then he said, that his institution is just as religious as any Christian's farm or publishing house. **I DENY IT**. I know one Christian that has a publishing house that is religious,'—first, middle and last. And just here I will mention that I have had it thrown at me that we are 'running a book store.' Our books are religious—first, middle and last. He referred to our offering Uncle Tom's Cabin, and he might have said the White House Cook Book, as a premium some years ago. That was offered for a time in my absence from the office, and when I saw it I suggested that it should be taken out, **AND IT WAS TAKEN OUT**. If he will take all of the secular features out of the Odessa institution, what will be left? We can take everything that is secular out of the Review and have a strictly religious journal, so that this statement is not true, that his institution over at Odessa is just as religious as any Christian's farm or publishing house.

"Third question. He said he was responsible to God for his conduct and to the church for his conduct, and 'so we are responsible to the church for our leaching.' I wish then it would be brought out on that that he recognizes himself as responsible to the church at Odessa for the foolish doctrine and speculative notions that he advocates, and we shall see what the result will be. He said, 'we are accused of dividing the church at Odessa.' That was brought out last night and introduced some controversy, which we don't wish to enter into on this occasion, because sufficient was brought out to indicate that this certificate which the elders signed was not such as to cover the case,—to say the least of it.

"He referred to my charge that they teach school nine months in the year and then preach very imperfectly. He said they preach the

best they can. And he said, 'if acting as agent for the college,'—which he by implication admitted that they do in the three months they are out of the college,—'interferes with our preaching, why not if a man acts as agent for a journal?' Because the journal for which they act as agent, provided it is the Octographic Review, IS JUST AS RELIGIOUS AS THE SERMON THAT THE MAN PREACHES IN THE MEETING HOUSE. That is the reason, and it is all along the line of truth and righteousness as taught by the apostles of Jesus Christ.

"Fujimori's farm over in Japan, is in a missionary field where there are churches not established to support a man. There was an appeal made,—and I don't question his statement about the report of the money received being made in the Review,—for a man over in Japan receiving money or being helped to pay for a farm over there so that he might help to make a living in a field where the churches are not able to support a man. And he did just what Paul did, as an incidental matter in a new field, and if the brethren helped him to buy that farm so that he might be self-supporting there while he engaged in missionary work, IS THAT LIKE THIS where the churches are not HALF SUPPLIED with the preaching that they wish? They are calling and calling for preachers,, and yet four or five preachers, in their early manhood, needed in the field as nearly as possible all the time, will betake themselves to teach secular learning that could be taught as well, not to say anything more, by those who do not know the gospel. THAT IS THE STATE OF AFFAIRS. He says that they do that in order to increase the number of workers by leaching the students, showing that the end he has in view is to TRAIN PREACHERS,—the VERY THING BE HAS DENIED.

"He said a man could beg by implication, and then quoted that the Review said in the course of a political campaign, 'the widows, the orphans and the Review are liable to be forgotten.' Yes sir, to plead for the widows, the orphans and the Review. The widows and orphans are divinely enjoined to be cared for, and here is a preacher of Christ that is divinely enjoined to be cared for, 'and here is a journal that is strictly religious and published as something that a preacher can take along in his hand to hand over to the brethren to help them in his absence.

"He said, in regard to all journals having 'apostatized but one, that I must have known that he was indirectly quoting me. I have told you what he said along that line, and that is what I repeated, and that is what is on record.

"I acted scripturally when I sent my boys to school. He said that school was presided over by innovators,—bold, uncompromising, and then what? Why he referred to this, that I said I didn't know that they ever took a Bible lesson there. I added, EXCEPT ON LORD'S DAY MORNING IN THE BIBLE CLASS. He didn't mention that then. He said, 'I have been told that, they matriculated in the place where they use music in the worship.' They didn't go there to take the preacher's course and they matriculated where they saw that the facts required them. But as far as I am concerned that is all news to me. I was never aware at what window they matriculated. They went there for the Greek and Latin that they might be able to secure. And I will state this, that after I went there and visited them and found Lexington, Kentucky, as a city dishonorable and abominable,—more so than I calculated it would be,—I went home, told their mother about it, and we called them home, because there was the race horse nearly always in sight, and if I had gone there and found the caricature of the farmer, in the form of Uncle Reuben, I would have placed that along the same line.

"He says, 'He believes in schools,'—he refers to me,—'He believes in schools which do teach the Bible.' He adds, 'When he gets the kind

of school he wants he will have the kind that we have.' I read to you yesterday what kind of a school I wrote in favor of, and that kind of a school is as widely separated from the one with which he is connected, I think it may be safely said, as light is separated from darkness.

"He used the expression 'drip with shame,' and I wrote down 'borrowed thunder.' He then said, 'we want something on the name.' Speaking of the name he said, 'he must take a stand on it. Got to come out and take his stand on it or I will do it for him.' That is what he should have done first, and just here I will make mention, friends, in the little time that is yet left for me to speak,—I will make mention of this, that if my respondent, if his college, if the Bible school advocates generally, when they found that we were objecting to the position they occupied, had only said 'The colleges which we are projecting are scriptural in purpose, in name, in origin, in work,' they would have done what they were MORALLY and LOGICALLY required to do, but instead of that they began DODGING, and DODGING, and DODGING, and up to this date have never offered a clean, cut proposition, or proposed to affirm one in which they plainly said this institution is scriptural. I, on the other hand, have found it necessary, in order to bring this before the public, to engage,—according to Prof. Armstrong's proposition 'to engage in a debate without a proposition.' Why? Because they said they would not affirm what I wanted them to affirm. I wished them to affirm that which just would cover the institution itself. On that they offered to affirm that their practice was in harmony with the word of God. They ought to have known that it was not their method" of teaching school that I had assailed, not how they teach the Bible, nor the doctrines that they taught I had not assailed at that time; but it was THE ORIGIN OF THE SCHOOL, it was the "USE THEY MADE OF THE LORD'S MONEY, it was the USE THAT THEY MADE OF THE NAME 'BIBLE;' and they never offered me any such proposition. My respondent says he will get over on that side. I hope he will do so, it is where he ought to have been at first. Instead of that I have been called upon to affirm a negative, for all of my speaking has been to the effect that THAT SCHOOL IS AN UNSCRIPTURAL INSTITUTION, and I have been called upon to affirm a negative in order to have a debate, or anything resembling a debate.

"He said a man must provide for his own, and a man should provide an education for his family. HOW MUCH? Take a community like this, and one can secure sufficient education to enter perhaps most of the high schools and colleges, in the land. How much education? Get enough to occupy him until he is sixteen or eighteen years of age. How much more? Let the child after that decide what education he needs and go where he can get that, if one wishes to go to a technical school of one kind and another to another. And consequently you see the government under which you live provides opportunity for us to educate our children as far as a man is required to do so for the benefit of the child. And if the child wishes to be a professional in some direction he can go and get an education somewhere else. A child can learn at home, and I submit that at home is the place for children, not crowded together with scores and continue together. But where one, two, three, four, five or more are in the family. In the family is the place for the child, and! not crowded together in any kind of arrangement where children are thrown together by the score and perhaps by the hundreds. In their ordinary life the home is the place for the child, and this whole arrangement first, middle and last is the real education,—what may be called the common sense of training children, in the common sense of educating them.

"And now, friends, I have just a few minutes left in which to talk to you on this question, and I wish to consider the utter confusion of

my respondent last night by reason of the plain, the direct, the close contradiction that we brought in by the very testimony that my opponents themselves have placed on record with reference to themselves. I am satisfied that he felt the force of those contradictions when they were brought against him last night, and this morning I first gave attention to every phase of the things,—it may be safely said of that,— which he presented, and now what is left? The money question is settled, with reference to which he protested so much, and settled, I think it may be safely said, to his shame as a debater. And what about the name question? We shall find out whether or not they didn't give that institution a mixed name because of the opposition to calling a mixed institution by the name 'Bible College.' One more thought. They have said 'Bible and Literary College.' Bible is a noun, literary an adjective, and thus we have a noun and an adjective modifying the word college. Those of you who have studied grammar,—just Took at that. Biblical is a dignified adjective and instead of saying Biblical COLLEGE, or BIBLE AND LITERATURE COLLEGE, and having something harmonious, they said 'Bible and Literary College,' and thus blundered from the standpoint of English when they named their institution. Now, I know just exactly what my opponent is going to say to that, but I am going to let him say it, and then I shall have the satisfaction of exposing it. But I wish him to commit himself on that question, and I make the bold declaration that they violated ordinary English in naming their institution.

"I leave this with you then, ladies and gentlemen, for you to consider while my respondent is speaking, and ask yourselves the question whenever he says anything, if it is not more of the same sort that has been exposed."

B. F. RHODES' FIFTH SPEECH AT HALE.

"Mr. Chairman, Gentlemen Moderator's, Ladies and Gentlemen: I am happy in the privilege of arising before you again to speak on this very important question, and I want to notice just one thing that has been said at the close, or about the close, of his remarks, and then pass to another line of argument.

"You remember that he stated just a bit ago that the home was the place to keep children, and educate them in the home at the home schools, and you know he said that was the common sense plan, don't you remember? But yet the words had not done ringing in your ears in which he said he would send his child away from home to school. Why didn't he follow the common sense method, I would like to know. Is he above all consideration of common sense? Are we only to be governed by common sense and he by uncommon sense? It seems that he has a different standard for governing himself than that which he wishes to impose upon others. And then he made a reference,—I suppose for lack of anything better to say,—to my quotation of 'drip with polemical shame.' and said it was borrowed thunder. Well, I never used it for anything else than thunder. I knew it was thunder the first time I ever heard it.

"'How much education,—how much.' That is a matter of judgment, that is all. This man may think his sons need a certain amount of education, this man another amount, but who shall say this man, nay, because he educates this son higher than somebody else does? It is a matter of judgment. Binding where God has not bound, binding where common sense has not bound, binding without reason, binding it seems from unworthy considerations, by arbitrary judgment.

"But I am not going to fool much time away on these exploded objections. I asked very earnestly last night that we get down to business. You remember I did ask very earnestly that we get down to busi-

ness, and you know the main leading questions that have agitated the people and have been agitated by my worthy respondent all through this discussion for the last, two or three years, which he has been so earnestly conducting, has been those two main things,—the misuse of the Lord's money, as he called it you know, and the misuse of a sacred name in connection with an institution that is partly secular. Not only the misuse, but actually accused us of sacrilege, but up to the present time not a single objection, not one, has been offered against our use of that name. Sacrilege, indeed! How grave the sacrilege when he does not dare,—shall I say it?—when he does not dare to face this audience and defend his use of the term sacrilege in applying it to disciples who are as honest before God, and who are as loyal in heart to Jesus Christ as this author, as he can dare be. But I promise that I will get to that name bye and bye if he does not. And further, for the first time this morning, it seems, it my memory serves me right, so far as I know, I have been addressed in speaking,—addressed directly in speaking to me as 'Professor' Rhodes instead of Brother Rhodes. Of course, if he wishes to draw the line I have no objection. If he didn't mean to, that is all right.

"Now, then, our organization. I know you people are interested in that because it has been heralded that we have some sort of dangerous organization. I know you people are interested. I have been trying to explain it to you. I have been trying to explain so that you will understand, and I hope if possible to explain it so that my worthy respondent will understand it, and it seems that in his case, at least, I can't get his understanding by words, or at least it seems he has not, and so I prepared to illustrate by comparison,—by a comparison, the kind of organization we have,—so far as organization is concerned, you understand,—and I prepared a chart that will illustrate this pretty well, by taking a familiar object, and you, are all more or less familiar with this object with which I compare our organization, and we have no more of an organization than the organization that is afforded by this familiar object. Do you observe this object, familiar to your eyes? The Octographic Review, as a publishing enterprise, has every bit of the organization that we have, so far as organization is concerned. It has a head, we have a head. It has an assistant head or publisher, that presides in the absence of the editor, as has already been explained in connection with the case of Uncle Tom's Cabin, but when he returned home and his attention was called to it, it was removed. It has field editors, we have business manager. It has contributorial staff, we have teachers. Has patrons, we have patrons. It has religious matter, we teach religious matter. It teaches secular matter, we teach secular matter. Now, do you remember that there was a statement that it was wholly religious,—strictly and wholly religious? Now, if I should make such a statement as that, in view of the facts, I should drip with worse than polemic shame. If I should do it I would feel duly called upon to drip with something else than polemic shame. This audience knows, the readers of this journal know that it is not strictly and wholly religious. It has dog stories and horse stories,—good stories, certainly,—advice to children, advice to parents, and various things of that sort, and has ANY AMOUNT OF SECULAR MATTER IN IT. Hundreds of items, and all these things, which I am prepared to prove, and by six volumes of the Octographic Review, if it is denied. But it may be said that just about the same amount of secular matter that there is in the epistles of Paul. I DENY THAT. That is no comparison, because there is one department that is almost wholly secular, and there is just as much secular matter on the editorial page as there is in any of the epistles of Paul. Just as much secular matter ON EVERY PAGE of that journal as there is in the writings of Paul, or any other sacred writer,—every

bit as much and mote, I may say, for does our friend believe that he and his worthy assistants.—and I have not a word to say against their ability,—but does he mean to say that they are more successful in teaching God's word and eliminating all secular matter than the divinely inspired men were, who spoke by God's spirit? But in addition to the specific matter—"

Mr. Sommer (interrupting):—"I want to know whether this controversy is concerning the Octographic Review or concerning the Western Bible and Literary College?"

The Chairman:—"I think they are both involved."

Mr. Sommer:—"As to organization, has it been denied in words that the Octographic Review is a religious institution,—has that been denied?"

The Chairman:—"I think not."

Mr. Sommer:—"Then it would not be involved in this controversy. We claim it is strictly religious; he claims his is not a religious institution."

Mr. Nay:—"He has shown by clippings and will show that it does teach secular matter. I think it is admissible to present it,—to compare it with his institution."

Mr. Sommer:—"If he wishes to read any clippings it will be all right."

Mr. Rhodes:—"Whenever my statement on that point is denied I will read them. I will read them when it is denied. But now then, your Honor, I didn't bring this in to place the Review in controversy, I brought it in as an illustration of the kind of organization we have. Using it as something familiar to my worthy respondent and familiar to those who stand with him, to illustrate the kind of organization. I don't blame them for GETTING UNEASY,—I don't blame them for feeling HOT ON THE CHAIR, it is hurting and I know it. It is not surprising to me that it is hurting them. You put a live coal of fire on a turtle's back and he will stick his head out every time."

Mr. Nay:—"Brethren and friends, we don't want anything to appear joking. We would rather that no one would respond by laughing or any signal along that line, and if there is any matter in what is being said, even of a joking character, we ask that you refrain from laughing."

Mr. Gray:—"I would suggest to Brother Nay that he keep this gentleman from referring to the turtle and those warm chairs."

Mr. Nay:—"Mr. Chairman, the other respondent has recently referred to jocular matter,—the chasing of the jack rabbit by the stag hound, and all such things as that, that was presented and people laughed. I don't endorse it, but it one indulges in a little quiet humor, if he desires to do that that is his privilege and his liberty, but we as auditors should not laugh to that extent that would create any mirth whatever."

Mr. Rhodes:—"I will just state for my part I didn't intend to say any of those things,—that is, before I got up here I had no intention to say those things at which there was a laugh, but in the heat, under the excitement of the moment that slipped out, and I will try to stop myself. But there was just as much argument in that as there was in the stag hound story."

"Has secular matter. Furnishes work and support,—as I have it here,—for Brother Sommer and his family, but he says they have not taken anything out, and we will consider that part out, but he does say it is property and has been made to furnish work and support for his family, and our institution furnishes work and partly support for us and our families, so we are just exactly equivalent,— it is just exactly, and he publishes a catalogue advertising his publishing house and

book store, and we publish a catalogue advertising our work, and I could go on and draw this parallel much longer than I have done it. I quit here because my chart ran out, that is 'all, and it is sufficient to illustrate it.

"Money,—and so Brother Sommer read yesterday morning,—I will not trouble you to read it now,—the character of the use of money in the Lord's name. That all the money you have, after you supply the immediate needs of your family and having paid that which Caesar exacts, or paid your taxes, then every bit that remains belongs to the Lord, and any use of that money by you in any private enterprise or anything of that kind is sinful. That is his argument. Then if that be so, let us see some of the consequences. A man can never have a farm of any size. He is allowed to have a farm that by careful tending will supply his wants, or rather the needs of himself and his family in a simple way. Now, I am not contending for men to grow rich,—I don't want them to,—but the amount of money that you can safely be entrusted with by the Lord depends upon the use you make of it. Certainly that is so. He says that if apostolic disciples had lived up to this principle of the right use of the Lord's money, which they lay down, there never could have been in the hands of any one man a sufficient amount of money to establish a Bible college,—\$20, 000. 00, or any other amount that might be necessary for any such" purpose. I want to get after the reasoning,—to get a hold on them on another line. If the proper use of the Lord's money prevents a man accumulating enough to establish a Bible college costing ten or twenty thousand dollars, why not just as good in preventing a man from accumulating enough to invest twelve thousand dollars in a publishing business? Why not? I say why not? It is a poor rule that won't work both ways.

"Now, then, just at this juncture I want to notice another point, and so we go back now to another chart, and we are introducing this as strictly relevant, because it is on the Bible school question, and it is Brother Sommer's teachings on the Bible school question and on the use of money and name, etc. We want to notice here that in a letter written by my respondent, bearing date July 3, 1901, written on the familiar letter-head of the Octographic Review,—you have seen the letter-heads and a great many of you are familiar with the handwriting, in the well known characters of my respondent.

"Dear Brother and Sister Potter:—I write you with reference to your new enterprise.' He had heard undoubtedly,—because Brother Potter said he was going to establish a school,—he had heard undoubtedly through the public, and probably in The Way, the paper of Brother Harding, that the disciples or brotherhood, in connection with Brother Potter was going to establish a college at Bowling Green and they proposed to call it a Bible college. 'I write you with reference to your new enterprise. If you have decided to expend means left in your hands by your dear dead,'—that is, their son had died and they expected to give about twenty thousand dollars to start him up in business when he became of age,—he had died before that time had been reached,—and so now they take that money and put it in that college. 'If you have decided to expend means left in your hands by your dear dead, for the purpose of education, I have no criticisms to offer on such a subject.' Now, remember,—'if you have decided to expend means left in your hands by your dear dead, for the purpose of education, I have no criticisms to offer, "—and he knew that the Bible was going to be taught in that school, I presume. 'I have no criticisms to offer on such a subject. It seems to me that the scripture, "let every man be fully persuaded in his own mind" may apply. But in regard to the name by which you would call your enterprise, I kindly offer a suggestion which I trust you will kindly consider,—that suggestion is, don't name it a Bible school. Neither Brother Harding or any other man

can answer objections recently published in *The Way* against such a name, though the mentioned objections were not set forth in their strongest form. I suggest that you call it Memorial Academy,'—now notice,—'Elden Potter Academy, or by some other name.' He had been there, he had held a meeting in that town,—he knew Brother Potter,— he knew the family,—he knew the situation so far as family schools,— and he suggested to call it 'Potter Memorial Academy, Elden Potter Academy or by some other name. I entreat you not to call, by the name of Bible school,—an institution in which probably three-fourths of the time will be taken up in secular education. In hope and prayer, Daniel Sommer.' If Brother Sommer wants to see this letter again he may. I showed it to him over at Odessa. Now, then, what do we find? That when the school was established at Bowling Green he didn't offer any objection to the use of the money,—didn't offer any objections on that score,—and the objection was made to the name,—the objection was made to the name, but up to this time, in this series of discussion, both here and at Odessa, we have had no argument offered against Chat name. What shall we say of the polemic conduct and courage of the man who will lay it all on the name and then say nothing about it? What shall we conclude about it? He said that neither Brother Harding nor any other man could answer the objections published against such a name, though the objections were not set forth in the strongest form. He is here to set forth the objections in the strongest form, and we are here to contest them with him. 'Neither Brother Harding nor any other man can answer objections recently published against such a name, though the mentioned objections were not set forth in the strongest form.' Why don't he set them forth in the strongest form? He is certainly competent,—why not do it?

"Now, then,—'when the *Octographic Review* is quoted it shall be quoted in full.' If at any time when I quote from the *Octographic Review* it is objected that I don't give a fair reading,—a fair idea of the subject quoted,—that does not mean that I will read the whole *Octographic Review* or that I am going to read the whole of the *Octographic Review* controversy concerning education,—I am not bound to do that, I am not going to. If he has not changed an iota on the subject, then, of course, the objection is still the name,—the objection is still the money. He said that all that he had said on the subject might be summed up under these two heads,—the name and the money. Why is it we don't hear anything about the name and very little about the money? Why is it? 'The begging question settled.' And then it was given as a poser that we had denied begging and now I had admitted it by saying we would give up the begging. When I used the term 'begging,' I used it in the sense in which he had applied it. He called it begging, and what he called 'begging' we would give up, and I explained what I meant by it. I always explained what I meant by it, and we offered opportunity and set the matter before them. I explained that, and this audience knows that. I said it was not begging, and it was always qualified by that statement or explanation I made. I wish to state that if that will stop the confusion and the fuss and the noise and disturbance and arraignments we never will make another appeal,—never. Now, will it do it? It does not seem to have. The name is not so objectionable, because we have the mixed name, and he wanted to know if we changed that name to please him. Suppose we did, would that be so awful bad? He has not convinced us in principle, but if we did change the name to please him, it would not be so bad,— in order to have peace,— certainly not. But I never said we did. I said that we changed the name,—that we used the name we did and gave it the name after careful studying the matter to please God, and if it pleased my respondent I was glad of it, and hoped we might please him. He does say in the *Octographic Review*,—if he washes the place

I will give it by referring to the paper,—that mixed things should be called by mixed names,—that sacred things should be called by sacred names, secular things by secular names, and mixed things by mixed names.

"'Document regarding the change in the name.' No, sir, I never got up that document. I was not present when it was originated,—I was not present when it was first suggested, but some one came to me and talked to me about it, but I didn't know what would be done with it. I didn't suggest it.—I didn't originate it,—I didn't encourage it, so far as I am concerned."

Mr. Gray:—"May I ask Brother Rhodes one question,—didn't you sign it?"

Mr. Rhodes:—"I believe I did. I believe I did, I am not sure. Brother Tinsley could probably tell me and assist me some in the matter."

Mr. Tinsley:—"That is my understanding."

Mr. Rhodes:—"I am rather inclined to think so, but I am not sure. But that wouldn't be so awful bad, that I did put my name to it in the interest of peace. I never agreed with any one that we had used that name sinfully.

"Now, 'the matter in the Octographic Review is religious first, last and all the time,' and here we have one from the present Review of January 22d, on Mental Culture, and it goes on then about how to educate girls, etc. Is that religious? Then we have Puritanism and Chivalry; two strange adventures; and a story about meeting a lion. Is that strictly religious? And 'bed-time for children,'—well is that strictly religious, though there may be morality there? 'Amusing children,'—in what way is that strictly religious? 'The nervous child's training.' Is that strictly religious? 'The correct education of boys.' Is that strictly religious? 'Politeness.' Is that strictly religious? 'Washing dishes.' is that strictly religious? I call that secular. And a story about little girls doing the house work and washing the dishes, and so on. Now, then, if he wants any more there is plenty of it,—a great mass of it, and you all know it.

"Now, in regard to that book house. It is a business,—it is a secular business. The fact that a man sells Bibles does not make it any the less secular because the thing sold is sacred. It is a secular business to make money out of. I want to know if on those books which he handles, some of which he sells at a dollar a volume, some of which,— and they are good books, too,—I want to know if he don't sell those books to publishing houses at a reduction of fifty cents, or in other words, sells them to publishing houses for fifty cents and he charges you a dollar for them? Of course, he does not sell them to publishing houses without linking a profit, so at least he does make a profit of one hundred per cent when he sells them to you. Don't that look like a secular business, and he advertises that in the paper. Week after week, month after month, and year after year those advertisements stand, and he is advertising his book store and making money out of it. 'Our books are religious first, last and all the time.' Perhaps so. That is to be taken with a grain of salt, I would presume, but I did not object to that because he used them to make money. If a man establishes a store and sells nothing but Bibles that does not hinder it from being a secular business if he does it for profit. He advertises those, and has a Bible, Testament, hymn books and song books and various kinds of books, and Mr. World and Miss Church-Member, and books slightly religious. That certainly is for a profit. If that is so, that he does make a reduction of fifty cents in the retail price of books to other publishing houses, you can form some idea of how much profit he makes when he sells you books.

"He may deny the authority of the elders, but if I should do so I would be rebellious. He may deny the authority of the elders and their statement, but if I should do so he would call that rebellious.

"Then we are accused of the offense of using a noun and an adjective to qualify the word 'school' or college. Well, suppose that is so,—suppose that he a blunder,—suppose we would admit it,—how much principle is involved in it? How much? And by the Century dictionary, and in fact, any good up-to-date dictionary, the word 'Bible' is used and given with an adjective meaning, as 'Bible-house' and so on,—'Bible-class.' And he uses that himself as 'Bible-class' and if it is denied I can appeal to his own writings to show that he vices it. And he speaks about a 'Bible scholar,' and that is using a noun as an adjective. If it be wrong for us to use a noun, as an adjective, why isn't it wrong for him? But he may say that we use a noun and an adjective in a qualifying way, as Bible is a noun and 'literary' which is an adjective.. What authority,—what is it that determines what part of speech a word shall be? Is it the use? There is no arbitrary grouping of words into class and saying this word is a noun and this an adjective. It is use that determines and good usage, and he does it in his own work, so that it is not so awful bad. If it should be a blunder, there is nothing,—no principle involved in it. If there is, what is it? He may possibly say we 'are not competent. Well, the fact that a man blunders in the use of English would not show that he is incompetent. If it did then my worthy respondent would be incompetent, and I presume, though he is very careful, though not infallible, that he may sometimes err in spite of all of his care."

DANIEL SOMMER'S SIXTH SPEECH AT HALE.

"Mr. Chairman, Gentlemen Moderators. Ladies and Gentlemen: I was gratified, at least from one view point, in respect to the physical health of my respondent this morning. Candidly I was uneasy last night about him, fearing that he might fail physically in this discussion and I might have to close up unceremoniously, or somebody else might . have to be substituted to take his place. So I have that much satisfaction in,, regard to his speech. Now, let me see if I can't get some satisfaction out of it in another respect.

"He quoted me as saying that the 'home is the place to keep children, and said 'yet he sent two of his children to college.' Now, you might have thought there was something in that if you hadn't known that each one of those boys was considerably larger than my respondent. I think the younger of the two weighed 160 pounds at that time, and without saying any more I will just let you draw your own conclusion in regard to it. You see that is another one of the mistaken efforts to break the force of what a man says. The fact remains and you will all allow, that when it comes to children from ten, twelve or fourteen years of age, home is the place for them, and: even at a latter date; and anything else is to the contrary of God's arrangement, not to speak of common sense. And yet he would try to break the force of that, and he asks, 'Is he above the consideration of common sense? Are we only to be bound by common sense?' I leave you to judge of the force of that, and that is the way he put in a great part of his time.

"Referring to what I said about borrowed thunder, he said he knew it was thunder all the time, and I suppose he thought that it was better to have borrowed thunder than no thunder at all. But bear in mind, friends, that this audience was impressed that there was some lightning last night, for I never knew an individual to be made so pale by thunder.

"'Binding where God has not bound.' I wrote down in my notes 'but how about his additions to scripture?' Taking the case of Paul's

agreement with Aquila and Priscilla, and injecting into that a money consideration in order to make out his case. Endeavoring to lead the people at least to think that he had something of a show there for his money arrangement with reference to that institution over at Odessa.

"I quote from him again: 'How grave the sacrilege when he does not dare,' he says, 'to face this audience and show his position against those who are as loyal as he dares to be.' How does he know how loyal I dare to be? How can he sit in judgment upon me by himself? Paul says, 'No man knows the things of a man, but the spirit of man which is in him.' He can speak for himself, but how can he speak for others, and if he is as loyal as any other man dares to be, why is he not willing to be bound as the scripture binds him, but is disposed to go beyond anything that the word of God authorizes. 'No man knows the things of man save the spirit of the man which is within him,' yet he would sit in judgment upon the great question of loyalty. That is more of the sort of speech that he gives to occupy his time in order to accomplish perhaps the end that he has in view.

"On our organization he says that he' would drip with something worse than shame if he had taken my position, in view of what there is in the Octographic Review. Well, I was just wondering what that something else would be, but of course I can't tell. He says of the Review, 'IT HAS ANY AMOUNT OF SECULAR MATTER.' Now, you see the extravagance in that. It takes time, however, to correct it. 'ANY AMOUNT OF SECULAR MATTER.' Where are you going to stop.—where is your limit? 'ANY AMOUNT OF IT!' Four-fifths, nine-tenths,—that would be some amount. See the extravagance of it. It takes time to correct that. And he says there is as much secular matter in every page as there is in all the apostolic writings. I leave you to decide that. All of you have seen the paper; and he has referred to several items like this; he found an article on Mental Culture. What is the mind but the spirit? The mind of man is the spirit of man, and it is the culture of the spirit. 'Puritanism and Chivalry,' in the home circle department There is occasionally an article that is specially intended for the home circle which hasn't the name of God in it, as a man once called my attention to it. Has not the name of Christ in it. Yes, and there is a whole book in the Bible,—the book of Esther,—that has not the name of God in it. Now, when I say that it is not more secular than even the New Testament writings, I did perhaps, or should say, the editorial part of it. The editorial articles are not more secular than the New Testament writings. But if I say it is not more secular than the Bible as such, taking it from beginning to end, I am certainly within the bounds of that which is correct. 'Politeness.' Peter says 'be courteous,' and that is a divine injunction,— 'In honor preferring one another.'" There is the doctrine of politeness in the Bible, and an article on politeness he says is secular matter. Again, 'Bed time for children,' secular matter. That is domestic and God ordained the family. Now, you see all that is thrown out by one who is endeavoring to do what? Prove that Odessa institution to be allowable because the man who opposes it is inconsistent. 'SOMMER IS INCONSISTENT, THEREFORE OUR COLLEGE IS ALL RIGHT.' Once or twice he has halted and said, 'No, that does not prove us right,' but why does he keep on advocating that which has NOT ONE FRAGMENT OF TRUTH IN IT? Just simply to cause the people to think that I have no right to criticize them, in view of the position that I myself occupy, and then STRAINS the truth and sometimes VIOLATES IT MOST GROSSLY in order to make an appearance of inconsistency against me. Interpolating. injecting into my writings what I never said, as I pointed out to you yesterday on that first chart. He referred to what I have said on the money question,—that all money besides the demands of Caesar and the needs of your family, belong to

the Lord,—and he says according to that a man could never own a farm of any size. But a little further on he says, 'the amount of money you can use. and are responsible for.' Now, that is just exactly the question. Whenever a man ventures to buy more land than is necessary for his family he, undoubtedly, is responsible for that in the sight of a high Heaven, and the use that he makes of it, and if he makes a use of it that enriches himself, he Aggrandizes himself. That is just exactly where he is liable to fall under condemnation. And I judge there is not much difference between my respondent and myself on this question. According to that, it when he has a second 160 acres of land, and has that much more, what is he to do with it,—or has as much as he can manage, then what is he to do with it? HE IS TO GIVE TO THE LORD'S CAUSE. In what direction? The Lord has SPECIALLY AND SPECIFICALLY directed how he desires that his people shall give. FOR THE SUPPORT OF THE POOR SAINTS, and then to have THE GOSPEL PREACHED TO THE POOR SINNERS, as is indicated by the support that the church at Philippi gave to the apostle Paul when he was preaching to the poor sinners. THESE ABE THE DIVINELY ORDAINED DIRECTIONS OF GIVING. Now then, where is the scripture, in precept or example or intimation, which indicates that there is ANOTHER CHANNEL OF GIVING, and that is to pile up brick and mortar or erecting buildings, some of them that cost five, ten, fifteen or twenty thousand dollars, FOR THE PURPOSE OF FURNISHING three, four, five or any other number of preachers of the gospel AN OCCASION FOR A SECULAR CALLING? We furnish an occasion ourselves to work to support our families, and where is the scripture which authorizes any such use of means to furnish an occasion to teach the Bible to a few children? These men might preach to thousands in the course of a year,—lead hundreds to obey,—and they get two or three score of them.—many and most of them members of the church, right under their control. From the standpoint of religious economy, both in respect to money and in regard to labor, the whole arrangement at Odessa, it may be safely said, is a BURLESQUE UPON COMMON SENSE, as well as a VIOLATION OF THE SCRIPTURE.

"He said, 'if the proper use of money would prevent a man from building colleges.' But he can't build it, don't you see, by making the proper use of it. Here he assumed the VERY DIFFERENCE IN CONTROVERSY. He then asked, 'Why would it not prevent him from investing twelve thousand dollars in a journal?' He actually thought he had said something. Why? Because when I bought the Review I agreed to pay twelve thousand dollars for it. I DIDN'T INVEST ONE SINGLE DOLLAR IN IT. I put my name down to twelve notes of one thousand dollars each and gave the man from whom I bought it a mortgage on the concern, and my subscribers have paid for that, in view of the hard work that I have done for them, by their contributions. I may say by their subscriptions and contributions that they have pleased to make in view of what I have said and done in their behalf. And so we have gone on in that direction, and I didn't invest a dollar in it, and now the concern from a commercial viewpoint is not worth five hundred dollars. Maybe it is not worth three hundred dollars from a commercial viewpoint. There is not a printing press that would bring twenty five dollars when placed on the market. Now, isn't that sort of enterprise and the Odessa college VERY MUCH ALIKE? I wrote down in my notes,—like two peas in a pod, resemble one another so much that you can hardly tell one from another, according to my respondent's idea.'

"That Potter letter was brought up. I had wished to save Brother and Sister Potter from the mistake that had been made in the Nashville school, putting the word 'Bible' on an institution which I had found was three-fourths secular. I regarded them as conscientious

disciples of high tone and excellence, and thus I ventured to write that kind letter, and just as delicately as possible I made the suggestion that I did. And when I said the scripture, 'Let every one be fully persuaded in his own mind' may apply in this case, I know what thought was before me, though I did not express it as fully as I thought it had been expressed, but I am bound by the letter. It 'may apply,'—they were to be the judges, they were to decide the question. It 'may apply, " that is, the verse I read. It 'may apply.' And then in suggesting the name that I did,—I had learned what they intended to do and calculated that they were going to join the name of the Bible, from what I had heard, and the name of the family together. I wished to save them from that, and wrote that letter just as delicately suggesting as I could. He may have all the advantage that there is in it.

"He wished to know why I don't set forth the objections to the name in the strongest terms. Ladies and gentlemen, I will read you the fifth item of our agreement. 'The oral discussion herein, provided for shall precede the commencement of a written discussion between J. N. Armstrong and Daniel Sommer, and the first of the series shall begin at a date not earlier than February 15th, 1907.' I suppose that my respondent would like for me just to RAMBLE over the whole field and allow him to RAMBLE over after me in this short debate, and thus have an opportunity to KEEP 'RAMBLING, and not. allow me to CLOSE UP THE QUESTION ON HIM AT ANY POINT. That would have suited him far better, I judge, from the manner in which he showed his confusion last night, but I didn't propose to do that. So we shall just give him sufficient on that subject. And why should he have said this about me, when, what the Lord's money is, was agreed to, at least in one particular. And we brought it forth and read from his own writings, or his colleague's writings, that he had been making use of the church treasury. or receiving from it what we BOTH ADMITTED to be the Lord's money and applying it to that institution.

"He said, 'If at any time I don't give a fair reading of what I read from the Octographic Review, I will quote it in full.' I just simply say that the extracts that he has given, with the interpretations that he has placed upon them, have been UNFAIR first, middle and last,— ALWAYS UNFAIR. The other day over at Odessa he happened to strike the wrong page, and he found he was reading something that was condemning him. He says, 'I am at the wrong place, ' and went over to another. Thus my writings have been scrapped and scrapped.

"Lest I forget it, however, we wish to go back and look at the picture business. The Octographic Review has a head, so has the Odessa college. The head of the Octographic Review is called editor. That is what he is, that is the truth. He has no other title. The head of the Odessa college is called president. That much would be in harmony with the facts in the case, but he has the titles A. B. and A. M.,—Bachelor of Arts and Master of Arts. Incongruous, absurd, foolish titles connected with the world. At this point just here I am reminded that last evening, I believe it was, mention was made of those titles and it was said that they were only like a certificate given of promotion from one of the rooms in a public school to the other. These certificates JUST TELL THE TRUTH, they don't have any pompous statements on them that a reader can't understand and that never did have any sense in them. They just simply TELL THE TRUTH in the case, and that is always scriptural. But when you have titles that DON'T TELL THE TRUTH,—and there is not a man on earth that can give any reason for the pompous titles that are here,—then the church and the world ARE UNITED IN THE COLLEGE. These gentlemen, who are assistants and the business manager and the teachers, they get their living, at least in part, they say, out of the Odessa school. We have field editors and contribute some of our own articles,. some of them

are here. Gentlemen, did you ever get anything out of the Review? Do you ever get anything for sending papers?"

Voices:—"Never one cent. I have some money invested in it."

Mr. Summer:—"Sometimes for a subscriber they would pay for the money order. Are not these assistants just like those teachers are,—just so much alike, in fact that you can hardly tell them apart. These men get A PART OF THEIR LIVING, and those OTHERS DO NOT. They invest in the Review sometimes out of their own pockets, instead of getting a cent out of it.

"'Religious matter.' HERE is a paper devoted to truth and righteousness as taught by the apostles of Jesus Christ. THERE is an institution that advertises itself as at least three-fourths secular, going to give you any kind of education that you desire, except the most technical. And HERE we have an article occasionally that pertains to domestic affairs, about the sleeping time for children and about politeness and various things which belong to the spiritual development, or, I should say, which belong to the department of education in the family or else it belongs to what is strictly domestic, and thus there is occasionally something that has not the name of God or Christ in it, or has not strictly a spiritual bearing. And because of this it is very much like this other which is THREE-FOURTHS, if not FOUR-FIFTHS secular. Just think of it, and think of that being palmed off here on this audience. The farther it goes the worse it gets.

"But he will quit the Begging if that will bring peace. I judge he would give up the name if that would bring peace. I suppose he would,—it was proposed once, and he signed the document to that effect. I suppose he would give up the titles to find peace,—if it would bring about peace. Might make some other changes if it would bring about peace. If these gentlemen had started out and affirmed their purpose to be scriptural, and allowed us to investigate that matter, we might have had confidence in them. But in view of the manner in which they have proceeded, that confidence has been so little appreciated in the turning and twisting that has been done in this debate, that I don't know whether confidence can ever be restored so as to show that my respondent is a fit teacher for your child or mine at Odessa or any where else, either religious or secular. There was a time when I supposed that these brothers were apostolic disciples, and were willing to be taught the truth, or to look at that which was presented in opposition to them in a candid manner, but it seems as if EVASION was the order before we came here and EVASION has been the order ever since.

"'Book house,—secular business,—even if Bibles are sold; does he not sell them for 50 cents to other publishing houses? Sell them for a profit.' I am not acquainted with the details, that is not under my control in the Octographic Review office, but I judge that in the majority of those instances we calculate to get a profit, or else the concern would not run. Just as if a man does not get enough to pay his car fare, or more than will pay his car fare, from place to place, he is not able to go from place to place to preach. Does that touch the question of begging the brotherhood for years for money to pile up in brick and other building material, to establish an extra institution to give those gentlemen AN OPPORTUNITY TO PROSECUTE A BUSINESS PURELY SECULAR THREE-FOURTHS OF THE TIME, and to mix some religion in it PART OF THE TIME? There is NOT A PARTICLE OF RESEMBLANCE between the two. The one is MERELY INCIDENTAL, and in the other case it is the CHIEF BUSINESS.

"He said, 'If I had denied the authority of the elders I would be rebellious.' I didn't deny that they signed it. I didn't deny that they told the truth from their viewpoint, but when I looked at that certificate I found it in the handwriting of Mr. Nay, if I mistake not, for I

compared it with one of his letters there, and I could understand how it was, why it was, that the elders were led to sign that document."

Mr. Nay:—"Mr. Chairman, I feel it my duty to protect myself. I rise to a point of order. I acknowledge that I wrote that statement, but I did it by the request of the elders, and they formulated it and I wrote it, but if the disputant wishes you to, you may read it and see that the signatures of those names are not in my handwriting. I rise as a point of protection to my correspondents, although I did it by their request and by their demand."

Mr. Sommer:—"Brother Nay didn't need any protection. I said we could understand why they did it. I didn't say that he had exerted any undue influence. I said we could understand why. I did not say the signatures there were in his handwriting. I said I saw he wrote the document, as we know who was present at the time, I

"Yes, I have one minute in which to speak of this word 'Bible.' That word 'Bible.' That is not the first time it has been brought before me, and when it was first brought, before me I took down,—not the Century Dictionary, that was not within reach,—but, let me see, there is another one that I don't recall now,—well, I looked at the Standard at a later date, and the New American, I believe it was, at the time and I found 'Bible-reader.' 'Bible-oath'. and such like words given as a compound noun, not an adjective at all,—given as a compound noun, and I thought it possibly the one with whom I was corresponding had overlooked the compound noun mark, and consequently had failed to read his dictionary aright, though the dictionary to which he referred may possibly have failed to give the compound noun mark. So that I stand, just as I stood before, that inasmuch as we have the word 'Biblical,' which is a clear, well defined adjective, I say that it should have been associated with 'literary' to designate the word 'college' or to modify it."

B. F. RHODES' SIXTH REPLY AT HALE.

"Mr. Chairman, Gentlemen Moderators, Ladies and Gentlemen: Now, whatever may have been the discovery of my worthy respondent in looking at the dictionary, I don't know, but. I do know how he uses it himself, and I know he uses such expressions as 'Bible-class' and 'Bible-scholar' with no distinguishing mark of a compound noun at all. That is his own practice, and if it is challenged I will show him the document in the Octographic Review, which I presume is set up with exceeding care. But I must go back to the beginning.

"Well, it was not anything; so very definite after all, for I have seen quite young boys that will weigh 160 pounds, and I have been informed that Sister Sommer is as large a woman as Brother Sommer is a man, and I would not be surprised that they would have a son that at a comparatively young age would weigh 160 pounds. But he might have been 25 years old, I don't know,—but he sent them. He advocated sending to the school at home and then after they got on farther if they wanted to go, that was their own choice. So far as that is concerned, we don't ask for children of tender age. We have a few that we took with extreme reluctance. They sought us to take them. In one case a widowed mother besought us to take her boy,—pleaded with us,—almost forced him upon us,—a holy of tender age. We don't ask for children of tender age. That is only an incident.

"How grave the sacrilege,'—yes, I say, how grave the sacrilege, when he has spent four days in discussing this question,—almost four days, almost gone,—and nothing has been said on the subject with any force whatever. But there seems to be now some sort of an indistinct, indefinite promise that some time or other in the course of the next two years, during the time it will take,—about the length of time,

something near that,—for the conclusion of the written discussion, which the agreement is they shall enter into, that something may be offered."

Mr. Sommer:—"Please don't strike the table."

Mr. Rhodes:—"I am willing, glad, to accept his advice in anything that is good, you know. I did not say there was as much in every page of the Octographic Review,—as much secular matter,—as there was in all the apostolic writings. I said that even in the editorial page there was the same per cent of secular matter and more than there was in the apostolic writings. Any one in this audience that is keeping his ears open to receive truth must know that this is so. I came to that phrase, 'mental culture.' 'What is the mind but the spirit.' Mental culture,—spiritual culture, therefore it is religious. Then according to that kind of reasoning our school is strictly and wholly religious. Mental culture,—mathematic, that is mental culture; classical matter, that is mental culture; logic and grammar,—everything is mental culture. Then the mind is the spirit and if mental culture is spiritual culture _ and religious, then our college is wholly religious, of course, arguing in" that sort of way. I have been always at a loss to understand why he could claim his enterprise is wholly religious. Why, upon that hypothesis 'politeness' and 'Puritanism' would certainly be religious matters, and 'bed time' and other domestic matters.

"But the issue about investing twelve thousand dollars in a publishing business is not cleared up yet, because he said, you know, that a man would have no right to more than what he could live on. We could live on much less than twelve thousand dollars invested economically, so could most of you. 'But that does not justify five, six, eight or ten men banding themselves together and absenting themselves from the field there when they could be preaching to thousands, and going and teaching a few children.' Who has the right to say whether I have the right to teach grown-up men or children? Does my respondent claim he has the right to choose my field? 'This Held,' you say, 'you can go where you have a hundred hearers.' Why haven't I a right to choose my own field of labor and labor in that field, subservient to God? I don't undertake to dictate to him that he must do like I did,—not at all. He can go where he pleases,—preach to one man, or a hundred or a thousand,—I don't care, but I resent his dictating in my case that I have to do just as he says I must do.

"When I bought the Octographic Review I bought it on lime. Didn't put a dollar in it. My subscribers have paid for it by their subscriptions and gifts.' Well. Now then, we did put a little bit of money in our work,—a little bit. I put in a few dollars myself. A very few other brethren did put in a little bit, too. After we come to once sum it down, his has been paid for by the Lord's money, secured in some way or the other from the Lord's people, to an extent even greater than ours, for he says they have done it all. 'Our concern is not worth more than five hundred dollars.' Now then, he said financially, of course. Now then, I should like to know what he would do if some one would come around and offer him five hundred dollars for it?

Mr. Sommer:—"I said 'commercially.'"

Mr. Rhodes:—"All right. That means in the market of the world. What is the commercial value of the paper? What is it? What is the first feature, the first thing that makes the commercial value of any journal? What is it but its subscription list? Will he take five hundred dollars for his subscription list? He knows it is the commercial value of any journal. He knows that point is there in the business. When a doctor goes into a place and puts an old desk and a chair in a little office, and another doctor comes and wants the place and elves a large sum for it, there is nothing turned over but an old desk and chair.

The business has a commercial value, and if his business commercially is not worth over five hundred dollars, he showed very poor financial judgment in investing twelve thousand dollars in it. Now then, he talks about that church treasury business. If it will settle the controversy, if it will stop the confusion and strife we will NEVER TAKE ANOTHER CENT FROM ANY CHURCH TREASURY.

"Back to the chart. 'Editor.' Yes, this thing has a head, that is so,—it is admitted that is so. There is the point of resemblance. Here in addition to this there is a president, and that corresponds to editor. All right. But then this man, he has not only president, but he has A. B. and A. M.,—'worldly,—pompous, worldly titles.' That does not affect the organization at all. The organization is just the same. Suppose I was, and I don't have any A. B. or A. M., _ either one, then I would be president, and the organization would be exactly like his, so far as organization is concerned. So far as organization is concerned it is exactly like his. Publisher,—assistant head,—, all these things, then I come down here,—'field editors' and 'furnishes work and support for Brother Sommer and his family.' I don't know whether his friends work for him for nothing or not. That is kind if they have. That is their business, and I don't have a bit of soreness with that. I am not trying to run his business, and that is their business. But I have been informed that in some instance? my worthy respondent has offered men per cents and commissions to work for him in securing subscriptions. Will he deny it?

"Then he spoke about this proposition,—he supposed they would be willing to give up name and titles and give up begging, etc. Have not those been the things he has been lighting and fussing about? But he intimated that even if we should he would not give up then. That is what we suspicioned all along. He refuses all settlement.

"He don't know about the details of the publishing business. Perhaps that is so. He is away from home a great deal, I know that is so, but I presume he has some sort of idea.—I presume he has. As he don't know about the details of the publishing business, of course, he could not tell me whether they sold books in some instances for fifty cents. At least, they charge you one dollar, and he don't, know whether they sell them to other publishing houses for fifty cents. He doesn't know anything about that, and he does not know the details. He does not deny that, for he is not in a position to deny it. About that book store, he does not know the details, and does not know what they make out of it. But I offered the other day, and I offer again today, that we will exchange profits with him. and we will divide the profits of his publishing house up among our nine or ten teachers and turn over all the profits we have on our business.

"Handwriting of Mr. Nay.' Well, Brother Nay attended to that.

"'Dictionary.' Let us see what our friend's usage is. 'Brother Campbell, with as good motives, perhaps, as any of those have who are now advocating religious colleges, raised an educational calf, putting a Bible collar around its neck. That collar proved insufficient to hold it in apostolic fields. Others have recently decided that they will raise other educational calves and put a stronger Bible collar around each one's neck.' Two times in that paragraph we have the term 'Bible collar,' and there is no mark to indicate that it is used as a compound or hyphenated name at all. Octographic Review, Tuesday, November 22d, 3904. And there is another reference in there about 'Bible class' just the same way, and I could find more about them. However, we feel we have pretty good authority, for our worthy respondent is a standard among such things.

"But inasmuch as it has been clearly intimated that there is to be no discussion of (he name upon the part of my respondent, and if he intends to do so before this discussion closes he should conclude

in due time and save" me the labor of doing it for him. As you are well aware we will have said something along that line ourselves, and so we turn to this tract, which sets forth the teaching concerning the unscripturalness of establishing religio-secular schools with the Lord's money, and also of applying sacred names to things of human origin. And then we have quite a long article on this subject, in which we are accused of all kinds of crime almost,—at least, accused of great crimes or great sins in thus applying a sacred name to things that are wholly or partly secular. Now then, as we have already quoted from our respondent, let sacred things be called by sacred names, secular things by secular names and mixed things by mixed names. Whether we did that to please him or not to, does not matter at all,—we certainly tried to indicate by our name the kind of work we do, so we called this Bible and Literary College. That undoubtedly meets the requirements, of calling mixed things by mixed names, but we are told now that in regard to that matter of name, the name 'Bible' is peculiarly a sacred name because it is applied by the sacred writers, or by at least one sacred writer he mentions, to the whole collection of sacred writings. Now, this statement I **EMPHATICALLY DENY**. I emphatically **DENY IT**. It can never be shown to be so, and the reference which he gives us for that, the 20th chapter of the book of Revelations, 12th verse,—'Now in the light of what has just been submitted let us consider Rev. 20: 12. "And I saw the dead small and great stand before God; and the books were opened; and another book was opened which is the book of life; and the dead were judged out of those things which were written in the books, according to their works." Here we find the Greek word biblos twice used in a, form of the plural of that word and applied by the apostle John to those books out of which, or by which, the dead will be finally judged, and those books we previously learned consist of both the Old Testament and the New.' Now, I deny it. I hate to do this,—I do hate to do this,—I hate to say anything that will have a tendency even to lower the standard or standing of my respondent polemically.—in regard to his polemic standing as a disputant. I hate to do it, with regard to that exceeding force which should characterize a man who writes and teaches polemically. But when such awful glaring mistakes are made it becomes my duty to hold them up for your consideration. Now then, he says the word Biblos is twice used in the form of the plural of that word and applied by the apostle John to those books out of which the dead will be finally judged. That word in the Greek text is not biblos, it is biblion, the diminutive of that word. It is not biblos, it is another word twice. Not the same word, and it seems to me that a man would not have to be infallible, it seems to me that just being very careful would prevent a in an from making such a mistake as that. If he had only carefully glanced at the Greek word he would have seen that it is biblion that twice appears in that 20th chapter of Revelations, 12th verse,—once in the nominative plural and once in the dative plural form. But they are forms of the word biblion and not, biblos. Granting that my Brother may make mistakes, and of course, he is liable to err like any of us, what of it? I deny that that word was ever used by any sacred writer and applied by any one of them to the whole collection of sacred writings. It is used by the sacred writers, but never was applied by any sacred writer to the whole collection. I have examined this word in 31 places in which it occurs. In 15 it is strongly probable that it refers to some pa. it of the sacred writings. In three cases it is not at all certain to what the word refers, and two of these cases are found in the 12th of the 20th chapter of the book of Revelations, above mentioned, and in eleven cases it certainly does not refer to any part of the sacred writings; and in no case,—now mark my words,—in no case can it be shown that a sacred

writer has ever applied the word *biblion* in any of its forms to the whole collection of sacred writings. In two specific occasions,—to show the use of it,—we notice in Matthew, fifth chapter, 31st verse, where Jesus gave his direction concerning divorcement, he uses that word in one of its forms,—*biblion*, one of the forms of the word *biblion*,—'and let him,'—in our English Version,—'Let him give her a bill of divorcement.' And up here we read again, 'give her a bill of divorcement and put her away,'—Mark 10: 4, same version, and the same word in the text. Then those two occasions refer to 'writing of divorcement.' Now then,—but after all, our Brother is binding where God has not bound, he is accusing disciples of the Lord Jesus Christ of using sacrilege in applying a name, which he mistakenly says was applied by sacred writers to the whole collection of sacred writings, to a thing that is not wholly sacred. But even if it were so,—even if it could be shown that a sacred writer has so used it, still it is not shown and has not been shown and I venture will not be shown that there is a sacrilege or that it is a misuse of the term. More particular than God Almighty. More particular and more exacting than High Heaven. God has sanctioned the use of combining his name with the name of a man, with the name of places and things of that nature. Bethel, the place where Jacob saw the ladder standing up, and he called it the house of God, because Bethel means 'house of God.' I have examined the Hebrew and I know what I am speaking about. And then Israel,— Israel, 'he who strives with God,' the one striving with God,—Israel, the name that God gave Jacob, the one striving with God, and the name combined the idea. Israel,—God's name incorporated with another word in naming Jacob, a man, and God gave it to him. And Jacob called the place Peniel, or 'face of God,' and so we go on,—Isaiah, 'salvation of Jehovah,'—Javeh or Jehovah, the proper name used by the Hebrews for God, on account of the short poetical form Javeh. And so we have Jeremiah, 'God will rise; ' and we have Daniel, 'God is Judge; ' and we have Hezekiah, 'Jehovah is strength,'—the name of God combined with another word and given to man as a name and no intimation upon the divine page that there is anything wrong about it at all. So by all the evidence in the case the name stands and nothing as yet has been offered against it, though there has been a vague and indefinite promise that may be some time something will be offered. Are we to wait upon his own good time and good pleasure in this matter? So now how does the case stand, after having made the fight for seven years. now,—nearly seven years, will be seven years in July since the first we know of, so far as has been brought out in this discussion,—against the use of the term 'Bible,'— that has been the main thing, the main' objection,—but now no fight is made on it at all. What are we to think about the polemical standing and polemic honor and the conduct of a disputant that will stir up strife and confusion and throw dust for seven long years, and when he comes face to face with a disputant won't say a word on the subject? What shall we say? What shall we say? What do you think of it? We have a right to expect better than that of him. I had hoped we would have something else, but it is not my fault, I have labored with all the earnestness I have had and tried to bring him to this point. We have heard something about turning and twisting, but he did not say who had done the turning and twisting, and,—I don't believe he did,—and I will not say, I will leave this audience to judge. I believe that is all I care to offer for the present. I am already in advance of my respondent, though he ought to lead, and I will submit the floor."

DANIEL SOMMER'S SEVENTH SPEECH AT HALE.

"Mr. Chairman, Gentlemen Moderators, Ladies and Gentlemen: Solomon said, 'Let us hear, the conclusion of the whole matter, fear God and keep his commandments, for this is the whole duty of man.' That is as true now as it was when he wrote it. And under that heading, why of course, we never would have had. any controversy such as we have had here, we may safely say, except by a violation of what the wisest monarch of Israel there set forth. But as I have not much time for general remarks and expressions, I call your attention first of all to one statement that has been several times made by my respondent, and I have been carrying it forward, but for some reason or another did not get hold of it until the present. 'Anything that one Christian may do, another Christian may help him in doing.' I have heard the expression in a stronger form, and it is supposed to be an aphorism,—self-evident, I have heard it set. forth in this form: 'Whatever is right for one Christian to do, he has a right to call upon other Christians to help him do.' That is supposed to be an aphorism,— invulnerable,—a self-evident proposition. My respondent, it seems, has depended upon that or something to that effect quite frequently. Let us see. It is right for every Christian to own a farm, and thus it is right, if he does not own a farm, to call upon other Christians to help him own a farm. It is right for every Christian man, who has not any wife, to get a wife, but there may be something so repulsive in his appearance that he can't get any woman to marry him. But upon my respondent's principle, you see very clearly, he has the right to call upon other Christians to help him get a wife. It is a right for a man who has a wife, to kiss his wife half a dozen times or more, each day, but suppose she turns against him? I suppose he has a right to call upon other Christians to help him kiss his wife. Now, we can just go on and we can see the absurdity of that just as soon as you begin to press it beyond the college question.

"But there is something else that has been slipping my memory time and again, in view of the subterfuges I have been dealing with, and that is this catalogue. I am afraid my respondent might imagine, and might say, I dodged the matter or passed over and missed dealing with it, and so I call your attention to the catalogue of the Odessa institution for 1905-1900. In the introductory we have this statement in the third paragraph,—I read the entire paragraph:—'Man is born an animal, but is capable of being a God. In every child there is an embryo God, and the college is set for the development of this embryo.' Look at the grammar of it first of all. 'Embryonic' is a well arranged and euphonious adjective, but he uses the word 'embryo,' which is a noun, to modify the word 'God.' That is along the same line of 'Bible school' instead of 'Biblical school.' But I am especially concerned with the doctrine that is in that paragraph,—'Man is born an animal but is capable of being a God.' That statement would imply that there is no God in him when he is born, but the next sentence says, 'In every child there is an embryo God, and the college is set for the development of this embryo.' Suppose a fellow does not get to college, the embryo will not be developed and what will take place? Here it tells, in this very document. Why, on the 47th page of it we read this sentence. 'We should be educated that we may be men and women, and not mere animals.' Now, ladies and gentlemen, if you are not educated in the sense that this author of this document sets forth, you can't even be MEN AND WOMEN, but are MERE ANIMALS. You can't blot that out. It is right in the document There is not anything to modify it. Now then, look back over the past, look at your fathers and mothers, and grand-fathers and grand-mothers, look around among your neighbors and friends who

have never been educated in any college sense, what is true of them? Can't be even MEN AND WOMEN, but, are MERE ANIMALS. Now, what becomes of this little embryo, or embryonic God with which the child is endowed? Why, that little embryonic God, if not developed by the college, yon see, must shrivel up, die out, blow away, or in some other way be eliminated from the individual, because if he is not educated he has not even the little God in him that he had when he started,—he is a M. ERE ANIMAL. But now friends, where did this doctrine that man is capable of being; a God, originate? I turn to Genesis, third chapter:—'Now the serpent was more subtle than any beast of the field which the Lord God had made. And he said unto the woman, Yes, hath God said, Ye shall not eat of every tree of the garden?. And the woman said unto the serpent, We may eat of the fruit of the trees of the garden; but of the fruit of the tree which is in the midst of the garden, God hath said. Ye shall not eat of it, neither shall ye touch it, lest ye die. And the serpent said unto the woman, Ye shall not surely die; for God doth know that in the day ye eat thereof, then your eyes shall be opened, and ye shall be as Gods, knowing good and evil.' So that doctrine originated with the Devil in the garden of Eden, only here it is in the worst form. Here it says that we 'are born with an embryo God in us, and the Devil just simply said, if you eat of this tree ye shall become a God, or as the statement is, 'Ye shall be as Gods, knowing good and evil.' Now remember that it was 'the tree of knowledge of good and evil' in the garden of Eden that was forbidden, and what is this over here at Odessa? Well, it is a TREE OF KNOWLEDGE in the shape of a college that is unauthorized,—UNAUTHORIZED BY THE WORD OF GOD. And the Devil said, if you eat of THIS TREE you shall be as Gods, knowing good and evil; and my respondent says, if you eat of THIS TREE OVER AT ODESSA the little God that is in you will be developed, but if it is not developed,—it can't be done by the church, the college is set for the development of this embryo. Not a word is said about the church nor the family, but he says if it is not developed,—then what? You are MERE ANIMALS. That can't be blotted out. There are the two documents,—put them together and they show just exactly what I have said, to be true, and furthermore, ladies and gentlemen, that is only a sample of the iniquity that is found in this catalogue, and I calculate that when I come to my debate with my prospective respondent, the president, of that college, I calculate to show that forth in its fullness and in its lowness. Now, you see what all this talk is about, when I said the truth is all on one side and error and subterfuge on the other. Suppose we had, a two weeks debate,—I believe we could catch my respondent in each instance in the kind of contradiction that we did last night, where we showed him up on the money question, after declaring over and over again that 'we have never begged,'—but note the modification,—'from persons whose hearts didn't incline them.' But they have tried to incline them in that direction by all the subterfuge that they knew how, if we may judge from the present circumstances, and then turned around and said last night, 'if you will only quit this controversy, or if it will cause the strife to cease, we WILL NEVER BEG ANOTHER DOLLAR.' A bad case,—a bad case.

"My respondent thought he had found something on my use of the word Bible-class and Bible-scholar in my writings. If I could get my respondent in the newspaper I could convict him of the utmost absurdity. I don't see my articles after they come from my pen in one instance out of fifty. What I called the rules in regard to printing or publishing hyphenated words and, such like, he just allowed that to pass, but I told you what the two dictionaries said. They said that Bible-scholar and Bible-reader and such words are COMPOUND NOUNS.

"He said according to my reasoning their college was wholly religious, because it referred to that which was training,—brain training. Possibly my tongue slipped and I said 'mental training.' Training of the brain, of that which pertains to the mind of man, and to the mind of man from a religious view point, and which belongs to the instruction of the individual's mind by religious thought, that may be designated religious. And his college is partly religious, and if he had only used his English aright I would not have quarreled with him about the name 'Bible.' That is one reason I have not been saying much about that. 'Bible and Literature College' would be a mixed name for such an institution, but when men have A. B. and A. M. and don't even know the use of English, that is another matter. He wishes to know if that involves a principle. It involves this principle,—it shows that the A. B. and A. M. are just simply a SUBTERFUGE, and the individuals that have them, they are not capable of teaching ORDINARY ENGLISH CORRECTLY.

"He wishes to know who has a right to say whether he shall teach grown-up men or children, the gospel of the Lord Jesus Christ. If he recognizes his obligation to preach, it tells him what to do. If he does not recognize his obligation, and thinks he can play with what the gospel requires, then that is another matter; and if he can dodge away from his obligation to go forth and preach, and can settle down and have children to come and listen to him, why, of course, let him go. I don't blame him for not going and preaching. That is a place where I will let every man, be convinced in his own mind. But if he thinks he ought to preach the gospel that is another matter.

"He said I exercised very poor judgment in regard to buying the Review, provided it was worth only five hundred dollars, and he said I brought it down to the financial idea. Here is the thought that was set forth in the Review in very clear terms. He has had access to the Review and can see, as a matter of fact, the commercial value of the Review is very little. It would not sell for five cents, you might say, on the market. The subscription list, of which he speaks, what could anybody do with that, who does not understand the doctrine of which the people believe? Who would subscribe for the paper? Here comes its value,—its DOCTRINAL VALUE. Because I understand the doctrine it was worth twelve thousand dollars to me when I agreed to pay that much for it, from a DOCTRINAL view-point giving me that much advantage; and what I say in regard to how that matter was paid for is just as true as any statement that I could possibly set before you, and it can only be made to appear otherwise by the kind of misquoting or insinuations that my respondent has been guilty of from the beginning of this discussion to the present. So, while its COMMERCIAL value is very little, its DOCTRINAL value is very great, and it is of advantage to the brotherhood by reason of somebody having it in hand that understands the DOCTRINAL teaching of the Bible, as they read the Bible. But upon these little references his judgment is poor. I did not intimate that his judgment was very poor in putting as much money as he did,—either his or for other people,—in that school. He was trying to reflect on my financial judgment, going outside of the controversy altogether. And we had to call him to order time and again since this debate began, not only here but elsewhere, by reason of that. Why, you can judge what this means.

"He said if it will settle the strife we will never take another cent from the church treasury. A while ago it was 'never begged,' now, 'we will not take money from the church treasury.' Remember what the church treasury is,—I brought that before you.

"When he says A. B. and A. M. do not. affect the organization. There on that chart you have an organization all wrong, as there is somebody who professes to be an A. B. and A. M.

"I have been informed that he has offered percentages,' he says. Yes, he has been informed of a considerable number of things that are not correct, but he presumes on the correctness of such things in bringing them before the people.

"We suspect that if we would be willing to give up the name and begging, that he would not be satisfied.' I stated that if they had proceeded in an honorable manner from the beginning of this discussion,—I mean the early beginning of the discussion,— that it would have been another matter. We could, when they break down, have contended that they were honest and that their professed reformation amounted to something. But when we have subterfuge and sophistry from the first, the question is whether we could have one fragment of confidence in them with any profession they could make. Just think of a man rolling his eyes toward heaven and professing great love for the truth, and yet injecting into the Sacred Text one statement. after another that is not there, but evolved out of his own heart.

"He says, 'Our worthy respondent is a standard in these things,' and would have it that I am a standard in a document that, in many instances, I never saw after it passed from my hands. 'He is a standard.' I resent that as having a false implication in it, just as it has been with just about everything else. I have for the last five years,— six years or seven years, studied the English language more closely than I ever did before, and when I came to look at the philosophic construction of the English language I found that these college pretenders are a set of blunderers. I have examined the Nashville catalogue and the Bowling Green catalogue and the Odessa catalogue, and I say to you, friends and fellow citizens, that they blunder in English almost from the beginning to the end. 'Does not involve a principle?' It shows that when they pretend to do thorough, correct work, as they say in their document, that they don't know what they are talking about.

"We had quite a parade here on the question of Biblion and biblos and so on. Well, unfortunately for me I am not near what little library I have, so that I am unable to show these gentlemen up and see wherein there is confusion on this question, or to see if they are correct in regard to their definition and all these other matters, but if you can't trust him in handling the Sacred Text, how are you going to trust him in regard to the Greek? How in the wide world are you going to trust him in reference to the Greek? He told you that biblion was a diminutive of biblios. Suppose it was a diminutive, you have right in that first syllable the meaning of the word,—the stem of the word, just like we have bapto and baptismo from the same stem and they all have in that the same idea, 'dip.' It can't be blotted out. So whether it is biblion or biblos, whatever it may be, there is the stem that determines the question, regardless of any little trivial criticism that may be made concerning the termination of the word. The word 'bapto' will dip a man just as deep as the word 'baptidzo' will.

"He says I am more particular than God. In what? In my use of words,—of sacred words. He brings up Bethel, which means House of God, and various other words where the word God in the Hebrew is used with another word. In Deuteronomy sixth chapter, the God of Heaven said, 'Thou shall fear the Lord thy God and serve him, and shall swear by his name,' and the Lord Jesus Christ says, "Swear not at all; ' and Paul says that 'Christ is the end of the law for righteousness to every one that believes.' And now, according to that, what do we find? We find a line of demarcation, and while the Old Testament has illustrations in it and is resorted to by the apostles on various questions, nevertheless we find that the Old Testament scripture is not the standard by which to measure ourselves on a question of that

sort. And even if he could find something of that kind in the New, if God ordains it that is one thing, but if man takes a sacred name and applies it to a human institution, that is something else. I arraign all who favor and endorse those colleges against which I contend, on the following indictments:

"1. They have ignored all that the New Testament teaches in regard to the perfection of the family and the church as divine institutions for the highest and best religious education of mankind, without educational appendages, arranged by mankind, to teach persons in religion.

"2. They have ignored the divine doctrine that faith will enable pupils, who are seeking education, in secular schools, to overcome the world, and thus overcome the infidel tendencies which may be found in such schools.

"3. They have ignored the silence of the New Testament in regard to Christians establishing colleges to teach mankind in religion.

"4. They have ignored all that human history sets forth in regard to the evil tendencies of such schools as they favor and advocate. They seem to 'scorn history.'

"5. They have ignored what common sense teaches in regard to the best method to secure the best education.

"6. They have exalted their schools and colleges above the church of God in regard to doing good, especially in taking persons 'back to Jerusalem.'

"7. They have endorsed, and, many of them, have adopted, the pride and folly of pompous, worldly titles.

"8. They have introduced and advocated that which they know is divisive of the church of God.

"9. They have refused to consider seriously any objection that is urged against the college to teach pupils in regard to religion, but endeavor to be artful dodgers of the real controversy.

"10. The presidents of those colleges recommend, and even require, their pupils to read much ungodly and insidious literature and thereby they train them to go in the way of ungodliness.

"11. They propose, in tenoning pupils in the Bible, to do that which can be better done, and more safely done, in the family, and in the church.

"12. Presidents of those colleges show, by the errors set forth in most of their catalogues, that they do not understand the proper construction of the English language, and, thus show that they are not fit for the positions they occupy.

"13. As schools, of the best kind, may be established, by those who are competent to do so, without pompous, worldly titles, those disciples who have adopted such titles in their schools, show that they are partakers of the pride and folly of the world.

"14. Their disposition to avoid affirming that their schools are scriptural, shows that they either do not regard them, as scriptural, or do not regard themselves as capable of defending scriptural institutions, and in either view of their condition of mind they are, evidently, unfit to occupy the position of educators.

"15. The chief advocates of colleges to teach pupils in religion, among churches of Christ, have adopted a course of unfairness, in controversy, which shows that they are not fit to be educators of the young, and those preachers who have endorsed that course have shown that they can not be, safely, recognized as safe preachers for the churches of Christ.

"16. I also arraign the advocates of religious colleges among churches of Christ on the offense of introducing an occasion for controversy and division, which has already done more harm than the colleges have, thus far, done good.

"17. They have, by their colleges, made themselves inconsistent, and weak, in condemning humanly arranged missionary societies, and other human devices, in religious work.

"18. In trying to defend their colleges they have adopted methods of reasoning, and evasion, that are common among the advocates of musical instruments in the digressive Christian Church.

"19. The spirit which they have manifested in trying to advocate and defend the mentioned colleges, shows that they are innovators.

"20. Finally, the so-called Bible Schools and Colleges, to teach persons in religion, among the churches of Christ, are unscriptural in name, in the use which is made of the Lord's money, in establishing and supporting them, in the use made of the time of preachers while teaching in them, in the pompous titles used by a majority of teachers in them, and which are conferred by most of them, and they are unscriptural in the use which is made of ungodly literature in them, and in the unsound speech used in the catalogues issued by several of them."

B. F. RHODES' SEVENTH REPLY AT HALE.

"Mr. Chairman, Gentlemen Moderators, Ladies and Gentlemen: Just while it is fresh on my mind I want to make this statement. I am authorized to make the statement in behalf of Brother Nay that he has been offered a commission from Brother Sommer if he would take subscriptions and collect. Now then, that is Brother Nay's statement. I don't defend it or don't undertake to say anything more about it. That is his statement and if Brother Sommer denies it, then it is a question of veracity between him and Brother Nay.

"Now, about the missionary societies. If this were, a debate about that I would be very free,—I could very freely enter upon the investigation of that subject, and I say that I will take care of all the missionary advocates that come my way, and they can have a debate out of me any time they want it, when I am at leisure, either with a proposition or without it, and I will undertake to take care of it.

"And now, about that long indictment. Of course, you understand that an indictment is not proof, and that is about all we have had,— charges. He has charged them, and that is about all there has been of it, just charges, and he has been charging us for seven years,—I mean those who work in these schools. For seven years he has been charging them with the misuse of a sacred name, but has not made an argument against it yet. It has been nothing but charge, charge, charge. He made a statement a little while ago that it is wrong to use the money, in his charge, but he has not up to the present time offered any proof whatever that it is wrong. He has offered none, none, none, and this audience knows he has offered none. We had a vague, indefinite promise that may be some time he will.

"Well, we had a discussion of the root word bapto, of baptism, and the derivatives, baptidzo and baptismo, and so on. Well now, that does not enter into this discussion, and all that he said on that point does not amount to anything. I said he used the wrong word. He says I don't have a library. I have the Greek Testament and as he can read Greek, I presume with ease, he can see whether he used the wrong word. The word is there and I can open it for him and show it to him if he asks it. I don't have a library,—I have not brought a library over here either. But when I began to study this question I looked up the word and it would seem to have been wise for our worthy respondent to have done so before he began to write upon it.

"Oh, yes, over at Odessa when I made that argument on the name I said I knew the argument that would be produced in answer, and I did. We have heard it now. In Deuteronomy it says, 'Swear by the

name of God," and Jesus Christ says, 'Swear not at all,' and others such as that. That scripture is all right, but all the legislation upon the subject of the use of a sacred name that we have heard, as it has been applied to this question, has been the legislating done by my worthy respondent, and not by the Lord Jesus Christ, and that is what I charged this morning,—of legislating or binding where God had not bound. Now then, I might, say that David had two wives, and reasoning as he has reasoned here, because he went back to the Old Testament, that therefore, we could have two wives ourselves. Of course not, for the law of Christ sets that aside. I didn't go back as a matter of authority, but as an illustration of God's use of sacred names in connection with other names or human names. There it stands, and I say my respondent is more particular than God, in what he said. Then he might go on,—they were allowed instrumental music under the old covenant. Now we have not,—certainly we have not, because Jesus Christ has legislated on the subject of music and He told us what kind to have. But Jesus Christ has not legislated on the subject of the name, that is the legislation of my respondent. That is the reason I object to it, that is it. There has not been a single serious attempt made yet to show that the term *Biblion* ever has been by a sacred writer applied to the collection of Holy Scripture,—not a single attempt made by ray respondent,—but he is presuming and acting as though he had established that fact. That is the whole thing,—vital to the whole question, and he has not attempted to show it. There is not a single instance in the whole book of God where the Greek term is applied to the whole collection of scripture. Now, another word was used, *grapho-hager*,—*hager-graphis*,—the whole writing. Now then, what do we find? Instead of us being sinners in the matter, if it be a sin,—I don't think it is,—but if it be a sin,—the word which the divine writers used when they referred to the whole collection was *hagergraphic*,—the whole writing,—and our friend has *Octographic*; 'octo,' that is the Greek word eight, for the eight writers, and *graphic*, a derivation or an anglicization of the Greek word *grapho*. Then *Octographic Review* would mean a review of the eight writings, and *graphic* is nearer like the Greek word *Grapho* than *Bible* is like the Greek word *biblion*. And *graphic* was used,—a word which the Greek writers did use to designate the whole collection of sacred writings, and they never did use *biblion*. They used it to refer to a part, but never did use the term to refer to the whole collection but they invariably used *grapho*. Now, if there is any sacrilege, if there is any sin and crime against God and man, if there is anything of the kind in the use of a sacred name attached to a, human enterprise, then my worthy respondent, on him lays the blame, on him press down the opprobrium in that matter and not upon us.

"I resent the statement that I am a standard,' he says. Well, he admits everything that I said for it. I said his use of the term *Bible* in connection with a noun following it was an assistance. I said that is how he used it. He used it without a hyphen, he used it as an adjective qualifying the noun, that is what he does in his own writings, in his own journal. Of course, he tried to throw the blame off on Sister Sommer, the proof reader or the typesetter, but from what I knew from his carelessness sometimes, I am not inclined to think that his case is made out. The man that will err so vitally on the point, as he has done as not to look at the Greek Testament,—if he can read Greek and I presume he can,—a man that will err so egregiously on a point will be liable to err in other things. I do not think Sister Sommer is to blame for all the blunders he may have made, if they be blunders in his work, or anybody else connected with the office. I don't claim it. I know it better than I use it; so does my respondent: I don't know who is, he did not say. My case is made out,—that is the

way he uses it. I don't claim to use correct English all the time,— we all know about the principles of the language better than is shown in our use of it. There is not anybody that don't understand that. But we have been indicted. We have been indicted for incorrect English and for being ignorant and not knowing enough to teach children, and all such things, as that you have heard. Those things have not been presented quite as hard as over at Odessa, but they have brought it in and introduced it. He says, 'I am not a standard.' We will see whether he does not think he was a standard or not. I quote from a letter in his handwriting:—Must thing of it, "in case your daughter spends more money than you think is necessary, find fault with him." Again, 'We should be educated that we may be men and women and not mere animals.' Of course, that has a familiar sound. What does all this imply? It implies that a daughter at Odessa college will be designated as 'him.' Now, that was taken from our catalogue of 1905-1906, and I am glad to say that indictment was made before this catalogue was out, but I am glad to say that that 'error,'—you know the question mark after the word 'error,'—stands in our latest catalogue, too, and I presume it will stand in the next issue of our catalogue, if we have anything to say on that subject. 'In case your son or your daughter spends more than you think necessary, find fault with him and not with us.' That is the point criticised, so we turn now to Rigdon's grammar of the English sentence, an authority on English used in a great many of the high schools, colleges, normal schools, wherever grammar is taught all over the land, north, east, west and south, every where,—rapidly growing in popularity, too, and so we read this rule: 'A pronoun agrees with its antecedent in person, number and gender. That is the general rule, but in applying this rule remember,'—and I rear! now from 'b' under that head,—'when a pronoun can not fully represent its antecedent in gender, the masculine should be preferred, as 'no boy or girl could do his work better.' 'No boy or girl could do his work better.' Just exactly the same thing as we find here. 'If your boy or girl,' or 'if your son or daughter spends more than you think is necessary, find fault with him.' You see the masculine pronoun is referring back to the antecedent. When it can't agree with both, the masculine pronoun is preferred, as 'no boy or girl could do his work better.' That is the standard authority, and I am prepared to say that this author does not stand alone. A great majority of the best authorities in grammar and rhetoric stand right together with him. Of course, Brother Sommer can brush it all aside because as a polemic disputant,—I don't know how he is any other way,—he stands above all law and authority and common sense, and laws are wrong and he is ipse dixit settling everything "ad settles it invariably right. Now, an attempt may be made to answer that, but if the attempt is like it was at Odessa I will take care of it.

"'Mental training.—perhaps my tongue slipped.' Will it slip more than once? 'My' tongue slipped more than once. I use the term 'my' in quotation marks this time. 'My' tongue slipped more than once during this discussion. 'Perhaps my tongue slipped.' And then followed a close discrimination between the commercial value and financial value of the paper. Oh no, the commercial value and the doctrinal value of the paper. Of course, the doctrinal value is quite different from its financial value, certainly that is so, but all the doctrinal value that he could possibly have in the 'Review, that is. its doctrinal rights, he could have for a few cents by investing in a copy of the Bible. No use to spend \$12, 000 investing in a religious journal for its doctrinal value when he could have gotten it all for a few cents by investing in a copy of the Bible. Now, who has been using subterfuge? I am not saying that he has, but who has,—I ask

the question. I am not like my worthy respondent, when I am in a polemic dispute I don't say that in every case that I am always right and my respondent always wrong,—I don't say that. But I ask you to be the judge as to who has been using subterfuge. By the way, my memory is not very long, but right on this commercial value,—on this commercial value it seems to me that the first article of value in any journal is its subscription list, and I have heard of men being accused of stealing, actually stealing, because they took a subscription list. I have heard that charge made, I have seen it made over and over again. Stealing a thing, that is a doctrinal value, I suppose. Well, I don't know about that.

"A bad case, a bad case.' Indeed, it seems to be a bad case. I believe I have gotten most all that has been said. Oh, yes, something here about reading from the catalogue of 1905-1906 that the man that is born of God and capable of becoming an animal or born with an embryo God, etc. As he seems to think Prof. Armstrong wrote that, and he is looking forward with very great delight to the time when he will get to expose Prof. Armstrong, I don't see why he should lug that in on me. But all of you understand the purport of that language, every one of you. We all know that in man there is that spark of spiritual life, the inward man. As Paul says, there is the outward man and the inward man. We all know that. There is the incorporeal as well as the corporeal man, we/all know that, and in any case we always interpret a man's language so as to make sense out of it rather than nonsense. We know that. Without education we are animals, and the attempt was made to show that Prof. Armstrong meant without the education that the college gives we are animals. Now, I know this audience knows that Prof. Armstrong docs not believe anything of the kind. 'Without education we are animals,' that is, the animal matter predominates, and because it does predominate without any education or development,—because of that fact, from the predominating characteristics of the animal over the spiritual or over the inner man,—it may be said, and with fairness, too, that the man is an animal. He is an animal man because he follows the animal nature,—the flesh and nature. And education,—'without education we are animals.' Education, in the mind of my brother here,—Brother Armstrong,—does not consist simply in what you get in college. He meant education in its broadest and most general sense. Many a man is educated who has never been in college, but he would have you think a. man who had never been in college is not educated, else why appeal to the grandfathers and grandmothers, to the great-grandfathers and great-grandmothers? (Here Mr. Sommer approached Mr. Rhodes with a catalogue in band.) 'We should be educated that we may be men and women and not mere animals.' We would add it several times, 'we should be educated that we may be men and women and not mere animals,'—'Certainly. Prof. Armstrong's father and mother are men and women without college education So are mine. So are most, at least, if not all of the parents of those making up the faculty of our school. I don't know whether they are, all or not, but most of them are without college education. Some of them had very limited education of a school sort at all. Docs he think that we intended to degrade our own fathers and mothers? No sir, nothing of the kind. And the whole dust and Confusion and noise on the subject was. an effort to throw dust in a polemical way.

"Anything that one Christian may do another Christian may help him to do.' We thought it was going to develop something, but it was the case if the mountain laboring and bringing forth a mouse.

"Right for a Christian to own a farm and to help others get a farm.' Wasn't that what was done with Brother Fujimori's farm? That was the way it was paid for. wasn't it? Nothing wrong about it.

If Brother Brown wants to own a farm it is perfectly right for his neighbors to help him,—who has a right to say nay? I have known men to stand good for them, and give them security and help them to get security. 'It is right for a Christian to have a wife, and right for him to call on other Christians to help him.' That is what my worthy respondent did. He had to call on somebody else to help him get her, of course he did. What docs he mean? Trying to make it ridiculous, that is all. And if it is right for a man to kiss his wife, and she is unwilling for him to kiss her, it is right for him to call on somebody else to help him to. Not to use violence, but to reconcile and persuade. What is wrong about it? It is the case of a man whose cause is sinking and he knows it, that is all. He knows it, he feels the weight of these things, and he sees that his cause is gone, and such conduct on the part of a disputant with the experience. and age of my respondent is, to say the least, very inappropriate. But, 'all the error and all the subterfuge is always on the side of my respondent.'

"Oh yes,— 'deed recorded the transfer of the property.' Of course it does. 'Contract in the form of a deed.' Certainly, certainly it is There has to be a deed to record the transfer of property every time. We have to submit to Caesar and conform to Caesar's legal requirements in regard to the transfer of property. Certainly we are under obligation to conform to those obligations of the law, and under obligation to God to do that. What is wrong about that?

"Now then, I want to call you to witness at the closing of these remarks, now at this time, that there has nothing been said on the subject of the name. I had to present it myself. Of course, he does promise something some time or other when he gets where the library is, but he does not need a library on this point. I should have supposed he had prepared for this discussion before he came here. Does he mean to admit he has been surprised? That he met something he did not think of? Did he expect we were ignoramuses and didn't know our business? He should have prepared anyway. It is the part of prudence in going into battle to get ready for it. I should have' thought the experience of my brother would have taught him that lesson. He will certainly know it alter this, and my contention stands,— has not been shaken, and everything I have said stands. He may indict us all,—and they are only incidentals, every one of those things of the many he read,—he may indict us with all his strength as well, as he has here done today, but it has no weight with the intelligent audience that thinks and discriminates. You know they are nothing but charges and can't stand. I met him on his chosen issues and he promised to answer them some time when he gets ready, or when he gets to his library. The same thing is true about the Lord's money. He has touched that, but how gingerly, and not only he has. but he indicated the saddest feature of the whole thing, for he indicated that we could not repent,—that we could not bring forth deeds worthy of repentance. Looking into our. hearts,—Judging our thoughts and our motives! I tell you I am as honest before God as I can be, and I am not rolling my eyes toward Heaven with very much of a holy look either. Is it wrong for a man to protest his honesty and sincerity and love for the truth? Is it wrong for him to appeal to the good in human hearts and ask them to receive the truth? Is it wrong to appeal for unity and peace and harmony? You know we are willing to make any sacrifice that we can make that does not involve a principle, in order to have peace and harmony, but my respondent has already placed himself on record that he does not know that there is anything that we could do to restore confidence in us. Repentance could not do it. because repentance is one of the some things. Does he mean to stand by that? Does he? The cause for which I plead is one that is near my heart, one that I love, one that engages my whole soul's de-

votion and interest,—I plead for righteousness and truth, for unity and peace and harmony, but I never shall consent to the absolute dictation of any one man. I say when a man presumes to bind where God has not bound, and presumes to go beyond what is written, in binding upon that, which is not required, that man is the one that God or the apostle meant when he wrote 2d Timothy, 3: 15 and Colossians, 2: 10. That is the man that is doing those things, that is what it is,— binding where God has not bound, accusing disciples of sacrilege, when he won't defend his reasoning on the subject of a sacred name. And you people have a right to his reason on that subject, and I have a right, and have pleaded for him to and kept wanting him to, but he says we shall not have them, or at least, has not shown them yet, and he has but one speech left. It would have been better to have introduced it earlier in the debate, because it is necessary for us to have time to consider it thoroughly. But I submit the floor."

DANIEL SOMMER'S EIGHTH SPEECH AT HALE.

"Mr. Chairman, Gentlemen Moderators, Ladies mid Gentlemen: There is another item that has been overlooked in the past, that I notice in my notes. 'It is better for Christians to teach fiction than for those who are not Christians.' That is the substance of one of his pleadings for fiction over at Odessa. He brought that up when we were in the debate over there, and said it was better to have Christians as instructors where fiction is recommended, so that we can in some measure, at least, counteract the influence. I said then, and I say now, that I would rather for. an ungodly man, a man of the world, to recommend a work of fiction to my child than for some Christian to recommend such a work, if a Christian would do any such thing. I would rather for an ungodly man to recommend the dance to my children, if I were rearing a family, than for a Christian to recommend the dance. Why? If an ungodly man recommends anything that is not right we can tell our child 'that is from the world,' but when one more reputable for religious character, and especially, one who professes to be a preacher of Christ, recommends anything of that kind, very likely the child takes the character of that one and arrays that character against us. You see what there is in that, just like everything else that my respondent says,—it needs only the TOUCH of ordinary criticism, and DOWN IT GOES.

"But he does not blush when he continues to go on with this. He says, 'granting that the name of the Odessa college is a blunder, what of it. Does it involve a principle?' Well, I say, just simply grant it, then. Giant that it is a blunder, does it involve a principle? It involves this,—that those who are at the head of that institution DON'T KNOW HOW TO NAME,—from the standpoint of English grammar, not to say more,—THE INSTITUTION OVER WHICH THEY PRESIDE. And the fact that it has a mixed name, in all probability, is due to my criticisms, and my respondent has been charging upon me that I have not brought the name forward. Yet everything I have written, to which he appealed, was written a year or two or three years before the Odessa institution began, and I was dealing with institutions which DIDN'T HAVE MIXED NAMES. Three-fourths secular and one-fourth religious, and yet they were called 'Bible Schools' and 'Bible College.' Here is what I wrote on the 47th page: 'A man may then call himself "reverend," "ambassador," "witness," "apostle" or by any other name which describes only one-fourth, or even one-tenth of his real character. But the assumption of high titles is one of the marks of the apostasy, and shall apostolic disciples pursue a course which will give them one of those marks? Bible things should be called by Bible names.

This was one of the wise sayings adopted early in the 19th century by those who endeavored to restore the New Testament order of things. That saying implies that things not strictly Bible-things should not be called by Bible names. This is the suggestion of common sense; it is the demand of common honesty; it is a requirement of truth; and it is the teaching of God's word.' So all that there is in the name he has over there at Odessa is arranged in such a manner as to show that he had regard for criticisms that I had previously offered. I intimated that or charged it, and he didn't deny it, and yet, as I stated, it violated grammar on the subject. Now, while I have this grammar question in hand, and this is my last speech, friends, I mention that my respondent read a rule, in a grammar that he eulogized very highly, in favor of the mistake I pointed out awhile ago, or rather, he brought it forward in order to show that he had a grammar in favor of an error that I criticised. Who made the grammar? Was he not a fallible man? Just so. Then why appeal on that after that manner, with this high confidence as though I had made a mistake? I told the people at Odessa that I had Rigdon's high school grammar, primary grammar and advanced grammar, of which he spoke, and I have examined them, and I say to you that Prof. Rigdon did not understand the philosophical construction of the English language. And if that is challenged by any one, or my respondent, and he will risk his reputation as a scholar on that subject,—if he will do that then we will have a controversy on that subject in. due time. I say he is an unphilosophical blunderer instead of being a philosophical grammarian.

"Rut let us glance a little further, ladies and gentlemen, and let us see if my respondent can read a rule in favor of this. On the 18th page of this book I read just for a little diversion. 'The total expenses for one year for regular literary work in Western Bible and Literary College is.' Let him read a rule of that kind,—'expenses is.' The word 'expense' has a well defined singular and a well defined plural. 'Expenses is,'—if that was a newspaper article I would not say a. word about it. I would charge it to the printer, but here is a document called a catalogue, which should be set forth in the perfection of English, if the author of the document knows what perfection of English is. And if he does not he ought to have somebody read his manuscripts for him. I glance back and I take this on the 8th page: 'Not only is the influence of the individual circumscribed by his intellectual development, but. also does the power and influence of every nation depend upon the mental development of its subjects.' Now there he has, 'but also does the power and influence of every nation depend,'—'the power and influence of every nation depend,'—what has 'also does,' to do in there? 'But also does the power and influence of every nation depend upon the mental development of its subjects.' I glance back, and I take in the introduction, or rather under the heading of 'Education,' just one other sentence: 'Since it is to the intellect that we trace the source of all that is noble and true, the college" keeps before its students high ideas of intellectual development.' I would like to have Prof. Armstrong,—as I hope to have at some time in the future,—where I can challenge him to show what that sentence means. I don't believe he can do it to save his life.

"At the beginning of my respondent's speech he says. 'I am authorized by Brother Nay to say he has been offered a commission.' If Brother Nay says that I do not question it, in view of the manner in which he broke down on the money question, the begging question.

"My respondent says, 'Indictments are only charges.' I make the indictments after I have proven the case. I then just sum up, that is what I did a while ago, and I calculate to do a little more of it after a while.

"He says, 'my use of bapto and baptidzo don't touch the case.' It does, by way of illustration. We have the syllable 'bap' in each word, and they both have the same force, and so we have 'bib' there in each word, which refers to books, and there we have the force of the word.

"He says, 'This legislation has been done by my respondent and not by the Lord Jesus Christ.' Let us see. Time will not permit me to go into that question, but let us now look at ACTS, 18th chapter, 3d verse,—'And because he was of the same craft, he abode with them, and wrought; for by their occupation they were tent-makers.' My respondent, referring to that verse, injected into it the idea of a financial agreement between Paul and those other tent-makers, and injected into it the question of getting money for the purpose of going on with his business there. The man who can interpolate that way into the Sacred Text ought not, dear friends, to lift up his head to make any such objection as that he has just mentioned.

"We look further and we find the following: 'We have been indicted for being ignoramuses.' Now, that is too strong. I say that these gentlemen don't understand the philosophical construction of the English language, and they are not fit for the purpose to which they have devoted themselves, but as for pronouncing them ignoramuses, I state to you respectfully that that is too strong a declaration, and the only reason this debate has continued is because those statements have been thrown out entirely too strong,—violations of the truth in nearly about every instance, and I have been called upon to correct them.

"My opponent says,. 'Could have gotten all the doctrinal value of the Review for a few cents by taking or getting a copy of the Bible.' Now, I suppose that he thought he had said something. The doctrinal value is the application which the Review makes of the doctrine of the Son of God to the present condition of things among mankind, just as the preaching of the gospel does. Its value consists not in repeating the scripture, but in making the correct application of that scripture to the present condition of things among mankind.

"On the idea that man has a little God in him, he says that in man there is that spark, the inner man, the incorporeal man. But what becomes of it if he is not educated ' Do you know why I confronted him with this catalogue and had him read a verse of it? He says, 'We should be educated that we may be men and women, and not animals.' He left the word 'mere' out, and then I brought it to him underscoring the word, and then he read it. We have to watch him, watch him, watch him, watch him. He tries in every possible way to break the force of the truth that is brought against him. I say with reference to that sentence that it is. a burning shame that any such sentiment as that was ever sent forth from a printing press any where in the United States of America, or any where else on the face of the earth. And that document is replete with just such sentences.

"Just here I am reminded of what took place the other day. I learned that a certain pupil was not encouraged to come back because of incapacity in grasping the books, grasping the lessons. We read on the 10th page, under the head of 'Industry,' the following: 'We believe that genius is hard work patiently continued in.' That" is false, though he may believe it. Genius is a gift of nature, and if genius is hard work patiently continued in, and a certain individual was disposed to be studious, why not give encouragement under that principle, for that one to go on and on, because 'genius is hard work patiently continued in?' Never was anything set forth on the educational question more **CERTAINLY AND ABSURDLY FALSE** than that declaration. Now then, if there had been more time and more opportunity to set this question before you, I would show you. friends, that that Odessa catalogue is as **ABSURD, AND INSIDIOUS, AND FALSE**, a document as, possibly, was ever issued on the educational question. But what

becomes of the spark? If he is not educated then he becomes a MERE ANIMAL. Could language be stronger? An education in what sense? He didn't say college education, but such as he calls education. He does admit in one place that one can be educated without going to college, but where? He is either to get it in college or somewhere else, according to the college advocates.

"He said it is right for a Christian to own a farm. I stated before that it is right for every Christian to own a farm and every Christian man to have a wife. The word 'every' was left out in the reference to this, and consequently an effort to make what I had said appear absurd. He said it was an effort of a man with a 'sinking cause,' and added. 'Nothing was said on the name that shakes his present position.' They have more of a mixed name at Odessa than they have at some other places, and who is to be thanked for it? They have a mixed name for a mixed institution, and who is to be thanked for it? All of these indictments, he says, are merely incidentals. I again say that these indictments, and I calculate to read an indictment of my respondent as a debater presently,—these indictments, he says, are merely incidents. Well, they are the result of what has been proven in the case.

"He said I spoke of them as though they could not repent. I didn't say that,—DIDN'T SAY THAT. I said, it is a question with me whether they could restore sufficient confidence, as far as I am concerned, to cause me to think that they are fit for that position, even if their motive would be accepted, and we would take them on the educational question. I now make my final arraignment of my opponent.

"1. I arraign my opponent on the charge (hat he violated truth when he said he did not know when or where the apostle Paul called for money to go into the tent business. The truth is he DID know that Paul NEVER MADE ANY SUCH CALL as far as the record informs us.

"2. I arraign my opponent on the charge that he falsely denied the statement that the Odessa college has been a begging institution, for he afterwards admitted that it had begged, and said he would 'quit begging if it would bring peace.'

"3. I arraign my opponent on the charge that his chief argument in favor of the College he represents is based on the supposed inconsistency of the Review's editor, though he admitted that the inconsistency of some man CAN NOT PROVE the mentioned college to be RIGHT.

"4. I arraign my opponent on the charge that as he admits that the Greek word for heresy means 'choice, option, faction,' he knows that his college is a heresy, because it is a matter of choice, and thus without divine authority, and is divisive in its results.

"5. I arraign my opponent on the charge that if he could not have found something, on the subject in controversy, in the Review he would have been divested of two-thirds, if not nine-tenths, of the matter in his speeches.

"6. I arraign my opponent on the charge that he misapplied Phil. 4: 8, when he said it is good to teach the things therein mentioned. Paul simply said, 'Think on those things.'

"7. I arraign my opponent on the charge that he added to the Sacred Text, of Acts 18:1-3, when he spoke of the money that it was necessary for Paul to have in order to go into the tent business.

"8. I arraign my opponent on the charge that he added to the Sacred Text when he spoke of the 'agreement' that Paul made with Aquilla and Priscilla in regard to tent-making, and said that it was equal to the agreement which the Odessa teachers have with each other.

"9. I arraign my opponent on the charge that he disregarded truth when he said that Paul's agreement with Aquilla and Priscilla in

regard to tent-making was equal, in point of organization, to the organization which is at Odessa in the College, for the Odessa agreement is in writing, and is recorded in the county records.

"10. I arraign my opponent on the charge that every quotation which he has made from the Octographic Review has been misconstrued by him in order to make a show of defense for the college he represents.

"11. I arraign my opponent on the charge that he has disregarded his promise to change his practice if he does not show that it is in harmony with the word of God, for he has failed to show that the college he represents is in harmony with God's word in any of its essential features.

"12. I arraign my opponent on the charge that he was guilty of subterfuge in all that he said about his opponent sending his children to a college.

"13. I arraign my opponent on the charge, that he violated truth when he denied my charge that he introduced his chart to show that the Review's editor is inconsistent.

"14. I arraign my opponent on the charge that he violated truth when he said that the titles A. B. and A. M., don't mean anything more than a certificate of promotion in a common school.

"15. I arraign my opponent on the charge that he violated truth when he said that I 'endorsed the Nashville School as all right for ten years.'

"16. I arraign my opponent on the charge that he admitted all I have said about the school he represents making a bid for popularity, for he said in regard to the fiction which that school recommends, that if it did not recommend such fiction there would be an objection to it.

"17. I arraign my opponent on the charge that he perverted Paul's words in Phil. 4: 9, when he said that that scripture justified the Odessa College.

"18. I arraign my opponent on the charge that he violated, truth when he said that the Review 'has any. amount of secular matter in it.'

"19. I arraign my opponent on the charge that he has failed to offer even one scriptural argument in behalf of his position, but he has depended wholly on subterfuge and sophistry.

"And what more need I say The time would fail me to tell of the gesticulations, and of the stamping and the stoppings and the various elocutionary performances that we have had here from my opponent, in order to impress the audience that he had actually found something, had actually ". aid something. The truth of the matter is, I am satisfied that when this debate shall be put in print those of you who will take the pains to read it will find, when you examine it with care, that there has NOT BEEN ONE SINGLE ARGUMENT worthy of any place before the reader in behalf of the Odessa institution, called the Western Bible and Literary College; and there has not been ONE SINGLE QUOTATION made from the Octographic Review, if you will take the pains to examine it, which has not been PERVERTED OR MISREAD, and furthermore, that there has NOT BEEN ONE SINGLE SQUARE, MANLY meeting of anything that, I have presented. But the entire effort has been to CAST RIDICULE, to OVERSTATE, to UNDERSTATE, or in some way or other to endeavor to break the force of what I have presented. And, consequently, you will be enabled to see that my respondent bus acted THE PART OF A SOPHIST from first to last, from beginning to end, and that is his character as a respondent. I learned after I went to Odessa that he was the best debater that the president of the Bowling Green college had ever turned out from, the institution, and now you will see what the best consists of, as far as that institution is concerned. You will see whether there has been anything like a really honorable, manly, meeting of the case, by saying I

pledge myself to show that the word of God authorizes this institution, either as a matter of duty, or as a matter of privilege, and I will give you the chapter and verse for it. But on the contrary, there has not been a single affirmation, and when I have assailed that institution I have found simply evasion,—EVASION, and at last, in order to have something resembling a debate it was necessary for me to come before the audience without a proposition from my opponents, and throw upon myself the twofold burden of AN AFFIRMATIVE, and likewise of AFFIRMING A NEGATIVE. To affirm a proposition devolves upon a man the burden of proof, but when he has to affirm, not that a thing is RIGHT, but that the thing he speaks against IS WRONG, then you see he has what may be called a laboring oar, in a heavy gale, and only upon this principle could we have anything resembling a discussion. Consequently, my respondent has come before you covered with what may be called POLEMICAL, ODIUM, if not POLEMICAL INFAMY. He has not the HONOR of affirming the position he occupies, but on the contrary has had the DISHONOR of appearing before you, not as an AFFIRMANT of his position, but as an OBJECTOR to my OBJECTIONS to his position."

B. F. RHODES' EIGHTH SPEECH AT HALE.

"Mr. Chairman, Gentlemen Moderators, Ladies and Gentlemen: In regard to that student that was not encouraged to come back, to whom do you refer,—the one that we were talking about at Odessa the other day?"

Mr. Sommer: "Yes sir."

Mr. Rhodes: 'Now, while I am on that point, I should have thought Brother Sommer would more than drip with polemical shame to introduce that subject after his conduct in the case in the former discussion. We were accused of refusing to allow, a young lady to come back there,—it was a certain orphan girl,—because she did not have any money to pay her way. We were accused of dishonor and I don't know what all. At least, the case was brought up, and it was charged that we would not allow her to come back because she did not have any money, and a charge was made against us. The facts are these.—he has referred to the case and I must treat it and his claim. Some persons know her, a good girl,—a conscientious, honest, faithful Christian girl, and I loved and respected her. She wrote to some of us and wanted to come,—that, was last, year,—she said she did not have the money to pay her way, and we took her and told her she could pay when she got able, if ever she did get able, and so far as we were able to see she might never get able, but we felt like we could, by making a great sacrifice that we could take her and keep her and help to start her in school, and we did so. Then when school closed, during the vacation she spent the time in Kansas City, I believe. Some time during the vacation she wrote to one of us and made application to come back and work her way through this year. We make provision for some girls to work their way through. When she wrote to Brother Gardner he had all the workers he could possibly take care of,—all he could use, and he told her there was no place open. We should have been willing to help her come again the second year without paying anything, taking her promise to pay, if we could have seen our way clear to do it at all, but there is a limit, you know, on the amount of the groceries you can buy and the amount of coal you can buy, and things of that sort, and we had to be governed by our financial limitations. We receive every year far more applications for work and things of that kind, than we can possibly supply, and it is a tribute to our honesty and honor in telling that she wanted to come back. We appreciate that fact and love it. Last year she did not find any place. Now he

comes and says she was not encouraged to come back because she did not have the mental power. I CHARACTERIZE THAT STATEMENT AS FALSE IN EVERY PARTICULAR. We did not discourage her on that account, though truly I should have been ashamed to have introduced this matter before this audience. You don't know the lady, I do. I know she is a good girl, and she is intelligent, but she did not have the acumen of some of the girls, but not on that account was she refused the privilege to come back again. It is FALSE, it is a SHAME, and a DISGRACE, and it ought to cover him with more than polemical infamy to come here with such a charge. It is but an index to his character as a polemical disputant. I am ashamed of him, and I feel that these brothers are ashamed of him. If not, why should not they be? I say the accusation is false,—as FALSE AS IT CAN BE. (Just here Mr. Sommer handed Mr. Rhodes a paper on which Mr. H. H. Tinsley had written, 'Bro. Nay says you said that was the reason,' and Mr. Rhodes read it aloud.) He says that D. W. Nay. said this is the reason,'—I don't know whether he did or not. Right now I know, so far as that is concerned,— I know that we did not discourage her from not coming on that account. I don't know what Brother Nay will say,—I know that was not the reason. I know the hearts of the teachers, or those who are responsible in the matter,—I know that that was not the reason. We are willing to bear with any one, and patiently bear with them, and keep at it and encourage and help along those that do faithful work, and that girl. always did faithful work,—always did. That was not the reason why she was not encouraged to come back.

"Acts 18: 3,—he says that I injected into that verse an agreement. Well, can two walk together except they agree? Can two walk together except they agree, and here was Paul and Aquila and Priscilla working together in the tent-making business, and certainly there was an agreement,—certainly there was. Isn't that manifest in the text,— of course there was an agreement. Can two walk together except they agree, is what (he prophet says. There were three working. together, and of course there was an agreement. But he says,—now then he, Brother Sommer, injected into that scripture a tent-making shop or something of that kind,—at the shop somebody could employ them to work, for you know his contention on that matter that they might have been employed by some man to do their work in another shop, and it would not require any money. So what about his injecting things into the text?,

"Now then, he docs admit finally that our name is not so bad as some other name of some other schools, but now why has a fight been waged upon us for the last two years with more bitterness, with more energy, and with more of polemical vituperation than any other school in the whole land? Why? Is it because that we are getting a little farther north? Is it because we were getting a little farther into his territory, as he thought? If that was not the reason, why is it? He admits that so far as the name is concerned,—and that was the chief objection,—that so far as the name is concerned we are better than any other.

"Elocutionary effect. Well, if I used any elocution I didn't know it. I am not striving for anything of that kind. I never did study elocution in my life. I believe it would have been a very great advantage if I had, but I never did study elocution.

"Well, there is one thing Brother Sommer gave me credit for being,—a good dodger, and that is, yon know, a pretty good reputation as a debater when it comes from your respondent. Whenever you hear a man go off and talk about 'he was the slipperiest dodger, I couldn't corner him,' and how he used subterfuge, you may know that the man has been whipped. That is the usual case.

"And so we were accused of fiction. Yes, but Brother Sommer can't get away from the fact that fiction has been recommended from his own enterprise, and this audience is not going to forget that, either."

Mr. Gray "I rise to a point of order, to correct that. He said that he took that out the first time he had an opportunity. He took that out."

Mr. Rhodes: "That just illustrates another thing, that as to whether fiction is a matter of judgment. Sister Sommer thought It was all right. Brother Sommer thought it was not all right. All his criticism is just a matter of judgment, that is all. I say it boldly that our fiction is no more ungodly than his. I say from every literary and artistic standpoint it is higher than "Uncle Tom's Cabin, and so stands when tested by the literary standards of the day.

"But our grammar. Yes, he says 'Rigdon is fallible. Of course, we did not claim he was infallible. Of course, it is understood that there is no one who is polemically infallible but our worthy respondent. Of course, he can say Rigdon is fallible, and so his statement can be set aside by ipse dixit of my friend,—he himself has said it, it is so. Rigdon is fallible and so it can be set aside. Challenges contest on grammar. If this was just to be a matter of contest on grammar I would never come over here. I am not concerned anything about that particularly, but we found that he stands in opposition to the whole authority on grammar. Of course, you can't try a man when he stands above all appeal with his ipse dixit. It settles the whole thing. And then he said that he never saw that term 'Bible class' used without a hyphen between the words. Says he never saw that article from the time it was written until it went to print. We can say the same thing about our catalogue. We never saw the article from the time it went into the printer's hands until we got it back ready to be issued. Of course, he wants to get off the subject and debate grammar and things of that kind. And he. makes indictments, but indictments don't prove anything.

"He said bapto is the root word, 'to dip,' and wherever you have 'bap' you have the root idea of that word. We don't know whether 'papto' is the root of that word or not. Wherever you have 'bib' that is the root idea and it carries the force right with it. It happened to be so with the case of 'baptism,' you know. It happened to be so in that case, but it is not so in every case. Some times the word loses its meaning entirely. So he has 'graphic,' so according to his own reasoning he has a sacred name, because he calls it Octographic, and you have the root word grapho. So he has a sacred name attached to his enterprise and he has been trying to convince the people all these years that it is a humanly coined word for a human enterprise, but according to his own reasoning he has a sacred name, because he has the root grapho,—graphic, there is the root grapho, so according to his own reasoning he has a sacred word there. And all these years, since 1883, and perhaps longer, he has been contending that he has a humanly coined word for a humanly coined institution or enterprise. Now then, that is enough on that point. We want to get hack to our summary and hastily close this discussion, and in doing so we notice first of all these admissions.

"Now then, he says that we have garbled and scrapped and all that. Now I say, and have said all along, that I did not put everything in the Review on that subject on these charts, every one knows that is so, but if in any specific case I have misquoted him, then he ought to point out that inaccuracy, but he has not done it, he has just made a general statement. 'Christians may band themselves together to teach secular knowledge. They may teach the Bible a part or all the time. They may do this to make a living or as an act of charity.'

And when it is admitted,—these are admitted,—then everything that is necessary to that work is carried along with it. For just the same when there is a command to meet, then all that,—everything that is essential to the meeting is involved,—'let the men meet.' When it is admitted that they may band themselves together to teach secular knowledge,' that they may teach the Bible a part or all the time, everything that is necessary to carry out that work is involved in that admission. Let him get out of it if he can. 'They may do this to make a living or as an act of charity.' And with the apostle Paul's example before us we may enter into this work, as secular work, for the purpose of furthering the cause of Christ, causing it no hindrance and setting an example in a secular employment. That is the apostle's example, but he says the apostle Paul didn't establish a school. Is not a school just as honorable as tent making? Is not a school just as honorable as publishing a religious journal? If establishing a school is cut out because the apostle did not establish them, then journalism is cut out because Paul never established a journal.

"The relation to the church. We have said over and over again it is not a church school,—not a church school, and it seeks to take no control over the church, not in any sense. Takes no control of preachers,—not in any sense.

"Education a need. Upon the very premises of my Brother's logic, in his laying down the fundamentals of his tract on the sacrilege of taking the Lord's money to establish religio-secular schools, he says that a man's needs,—that he is allowed to spend money for the needs of his family, and if an education is one of the needs, then he is allowed to provide for the education of his family, for he knew, friends, all that is the Lord's money and the use to be made of it. But he came into that and said there were the schools right at home that the State furnishes them with. Not satisfied with that, he sent his own boys to another school.

"No objection to the Nashville school until Bowling Green school started. That he for years never started any agitation,—let it pass all out of his mind. He knew the brethren were starting a school and supposed they wanted to teach the Bible; he found they were teaching other things. There was all the school and all the institution we have,—a few brethren banded together to teach the Bible and to teach secular knowledge. He said that was their business. It is our business. Said he never thought to investigate the subject until the school went to Bowling Green, and then he didn't raise any objection to the use of the money, and said in the letter to Brother Potter: 'I have no objection to offer on that subject.' But because Brother Potter did not heed his unsolicited advice about naming,—at least not following it,—that is why the fight began, and with all that bluster about name, he has not come out. and made an argument,—he has not come out and made an argument about the sinfulness of applying what he calls a sacred name to mixed institutions or to secular things. Has not made any argument against it.

"Another effort against begging. Well, now then, on that point we want to say if it would cause the confusion and dust and strife to cease, and restore peace and unity, we would never made another appeal to disciples of Christ,—not another one. We made that proposition, but our worthy respondent comes back at us and supposes we would lay aside some other things if it would bring peace, but he didn't say it would bring peace, and you noticed that. Now, who is stirring up strife and division and enmity and alienation of hearts? Who is it? Who is it that is going onward and abiding not in the truth? When there is binding where God has not bound, where there is placing restrictions that God has not restricted,—who is it that is going onward and abiding not in the truth, being more particular and more ex-

acting about the name than God Almighty ever was? Now, you people know that you have been led to believe that the name was the great objection to our school. You know that. But laying all these things aside he would indict us because we are not competent to teach, and the indictment has to go on our incompetency. Isn't that a matter for us, and our patrons and students? If we are so incompetent wouldn't they find it out? It seems to me so.

"I acted according to scriptural right in sending my boy to school.' Of course you did, and I am glad he said that. That proves you are acting according to scriptural rights in sending them to school. You can send them down to Odessa and not violate a single right. That is the right you have,—your privilege. We may not be so competent as some people to teach,—we know we are not above all the rules and standards of grammar. We will admit we feel bound by the rules of grammar and language. We may err sometimes in applying them, and I shall confess freely we sometimes,—often,—make little mistakes and errors and slips of the tongue, of course we do. But our students have not been complaining that we are too easy, or that they are not getting what they came for, and we have students from all over the country,—students that have been at other various State schools and private schools, and they don't complain. We have students that have taught and hold first grade certificates and they say the work is fine. Hold first grade certificates and they say the work is fine, and rejoice in it and are glad of it.

"After ignoring, as you know, the two fundamental things in this discussion,—the great things about which the fight has been made have been practically ignored, the use of the Lord's money in establishing religio-secular schools and the sinfulness of attaching a sacred name to a secular institution.—"

Mr. Sommer (interrupting): "I don't wish to be misrepresented so grossly. We just went after that money question last night until it made my respondent as white as a sheet, and the sweat stood out on his face and he was in confusion before this audience when we convicted him of the grossest inconsistency. I don't like to be misrepresented in the last speech."

Mr. Rhodes: "I don't want to misrepresent my worthy respondent. I esteem him as a brother in Christ and I hope I don't have a feeling that would lead me to misrepresent him, and I am sweating a little bit right now, but I don't feel like [am very greatly confused. Some times a horse puts on green spectacles,—I have heard of men putting green spectacles on a horse so that it would eat shavings for grass. They see the shavings green and take it for grass, and so the confusion may be in the other man's eye. I contend that from my point of view as a polemical disputant he has ignored these fundamentals, and I call this audience to witness that fact. You know that the great thing has been money and name, and polemically they have been ignored. He has not come out on it and fought on those lines. So far as the begging is concerned,—so far as the money is concerned, we have already acknowledged several times that if that will stop the fight and fuss we will not ask for another contribution. We stated that if that would stop the fight and fuss we will never take another cent from any congregation out of the church treasury. We made that proposition, but he tells you now that if we should do all of this, still the fight must go on, in spite of the fact that he offered no objection to Brother Potters use of the money that was in his hands, and assuredly he knew Brother Potter was not building that school to make a living.

"9th. He manifests his polemical infamy by continually condemning in others what he allows in himself. Now, that has been done over and over again.

"10th. He spent nearly all of his time on mere incidentals and paid no attention to the real issues. Now, I am making these charges . against him as a polemical disputant. I have not a word to say about him as a Christian character, I am only talking about him as a polemic, and these things are first.

"Now, about being pale last night. I could not see myself, perhaps I was pale, but you know there has been a great deal of pacing around on this platform towards my way, and a good deal of gritting of teeth and gritting of muscles, and so forth. However, I was not afraid, but now then, so far as that is concerned, I am willing to let that pass. I don't care anything for that, I am willing to let this matter rest with the judgment of these people. I appeal to the hearts that have been present and witnessed this discussion from the start,— I am willing to leave these issues with you. And I call on you to weigh and consider every fact, every argument, every thing that has been here advanced.

"Before we close we want to hastily go on a little further, and as I have already mentioned the most here we will not mention them again, but take the next chart. The objection has been raised to our school as an organization. I have brought this before you to illustrate what kind of an organization we have, and it was agreed that this would be equivalent if this man did not have titles,—pompous, worldly titles. But I now ask the question, if I was occupying that position,— I don't have any titles,—then it would be just the same, so far as the organization is concerned. The fact that a man has a title, A. M. or A. B.,—the fact that he spent two years or one year more than I have, that does not make it more of an organization. If I had spent one or two years more in college than I did I would have a title', too, but it don't make it more or less of an organization whether a man has finished a college course or not. It is the organization we are after, but this illustrates it and this other,—shall I say it?—is a polemical subterfuge. Has a publisher, has assistant head; has field editors, has business manager; has contributorial staff, has teachers; has religious matter, has religious matter; has secular matter, has secular matter; and you all know that these things are so, because you are quite well acquainted with the enterprise, and I am trying to illustrate that we don't have any more organization than he has, and it is made a strictly private enterprise that has been made to furnish work and support for Brother and Sister Sommer, and on the strength of that they receive gifts ranging from a few cents to a thousand dollars, as I have been informed. Now then, our work or enterprise furnishes work' and partly supports us and our families, too. I say it is a deadly parallel, and this audience knows it is. It illustrates just exactly the sort of an organization we have. I believe that is all I want to introduce upon that now, and finally the whole matter rests upon our incompetency as instructors. Our incompetency as instructors. Well, it seems to me strange that all of this confusion and dust for the last two years has been kicked up on account of our incompetency. Now, mind you, those who were present at Odessa, that I made the proposition then and there that whenever a number of men would come who are more competent than we are, and are willing to take our obligations, [for one am willing to step down and out and I am certain I speak the sentiment of all. We have no feeling against any one. I am sure that we all feel the same way. We are not envious of the prosperity of any other man or set of men. We are not envious of the prosperity of any other school,—not at all. We are willing to step down and out whenever we find men more competent that are willing to take our obligations and responsibilities. We will give them opportunity if they wish them."

APPENDIX TO THE FOREGOING DISCUSSIONS.

Alexander Campbell made that which may be designated an appendix to his publication of the debate between himself and Archbishop Purcell, of the 'Roman Catholic church. He did this in order to give his readers the benefit of certain facts and records which were not available in their most satisfactory statement in course of the debate. Besides there is a long "Appendix" to the Braden and Huey debate. In view of these precedents, and especially in view of the unfair course pursued by my opponent in the foregoing discussions, also in view of the unfair report made of those discussions in certain journals, I feel justified in making an "Appendix" to those discussions.

One of the documents not available by me in course of my discussion with Prof. Rhodes, was the "catalogue of the University of Kansas." On the basis of that catalogue, Prof. Rhodes tried to break the force of my charge against Prof. Armstrong, that he shows himself to be "a lover of worldly titles" by retaining the title "A. B.," which is covered by the title "A. M." I now have before me a copy of the "Catalogue" of the University of Kansas for 1905-1906, and I fail to find in it the title "A. B.," retained in connection with the name of any teacher in that University, who also has the title "A. M.," except to designate the time and place of receiving the "A. B." The same is true of the other titles, generally. They are recorded only in connection with the time and place of receiving them, and are, generally, separated from the name of the teacher by a period, thereby indicating that the mention of titles is only given as a record of historic facts in chronological order. In the entire list of names I fail to find anything, resembling this exhibition of vanity,'—"J. N. Armstrong, A. B., A. M.," which I find in the catalogues of the "Western Bible and Literary College." In view of this the reader can understand that the declaration of Prof. Rhodes concerning the catalogue of the University of Kansas, was strictly incorrect. It does not give the slightest precedent for Prof. Armstrong's vanity, as exhibited by his titles. Moreover, I have before me the latest catalogue of the Purdue University, situated at Lafayette, Ind., and it is entirely free from such vanity as "A. B., A. M." indicate as appended to Prof. Armstrong's name.

Taking the catalogues to which I have before me, as indexes to the catalogues of all other reputable institutions of learning, the reader can judge that Prof. Rhodes was wrong in his assertion concerning such institutions, and just here I mention that many years ago I had a debate with a Christian Church preacher, who was a genius in making erroneous, pert, reproachful and flippant, remarks concerning everything that was brought to bear against him. But even he was confused when convicted of a positive falsehood. My opponent in the discussions at Odessa and Hale reminded me of that Christian 'Church preacher, except that it did not confuse him to be convicted of a falsehood as a debater. For instance, when I fastened on him, as a debater, a falsehood of the most positive kind in regard to the Odessa College being a beggar, he seemed unusually pale for a minute or two, but quickly recovered himself, and made the flippant remark that he had "long since learned that it is not the thunder, but the lightning that kills." The reader will also recollect that when I explained how the book titled "Uncle Tom's Cabin" came to be advertised in the Review, and why it ceased, to be advertised, instead of accepting the explanation he said something about having thought that his opponent was not an ordinary man, but he now had to conclude that he was a "genuine son of old Adam" who said, "The woman thou gavest me," and wound up by saying that his opponent would have hard work to "make any one believe that he was under any woman's

thumb." All this he said to break the force of my explanation, which was to the effect that I did the very opposite of that which father Adam did. He YIELDED to the woman, while I PROTESTED, and my protest prevailed. I mention this as a sample of my opponent's style.

I was handicapped throughout the discussion, for I was bound by the rules of honorable debate, and by the dignity of my own position, to treat my opponent with manifold more respect than he deserved. He had entered the discussion on the negative of a negative, instead of entering it as an honorable affirmant of his real position, as he was logically and morally required to do. And, does the reader recollect that he said he expected to "take the lead in the oral discussion?" But I quickly drew on him his own letter in which he had refused to do so, and thus I convicted him of another falsehood. And does the reader recollect that in response to my remark that I was present "chiefly for the purpose of drawing discriminations and

offering criticisms," my opponent omitted the word "discriminations," and was disposed to ridicule me because, as he expressed it, I said I was there "chiefly to criticize," but said he was there "with a higher conception of the issues?" Well, that was his style. I don't think he represented what I said with entire fairness EVEN ONCE in our four days' discussion. He even reflected against my personal character in several instances. In one instance he clearly intimated that I had been excluded from the church of Christ, and had been in jail. Both of those intimations were POSITIVELY UNTRUE. A church of Christ never brought a charge against me, and I never saw the inside of a jail, even as a spectator. Thus it was throughout the discussions. My opponent was so inaccurate that I might have designated his mouth as a "slaughter house" for common veracity, and ordinary fairness, if I had been disposed to be severe. If any one doubts this let him read again the entire discussions, and he will be convinced that I have not misrepresented my opponent. Near the close of the discussion at Hale, he asked if I had been "surprised." I now confess that I was surprised, throughout the discussions, at my opponent's disregard for truth, as a debater, and at his capability of making pert, imprudent remarks. He added, subtracted, misrepresented, fabricated, or modified, in some way, on near or about every point in controversy, and then arrayed himself against his modifications of what I had said. By that means he filled his time, and occupied my time in correcting him. Nevertheless, the ORIGIN and PURPOSE of the Odessa School were set forth with considerable clearness. That PURPOSE we found was two-fold, namely, TO MAKE AN OCCASION to teach the Bible more effectively than can be done in the family and by the church, and TO FURNISH SECULAR EMPLOYMENT for certain preachers!!

In view of the clearness with which the mentioned issues were set forth, both at Odessa and Hale, I have much satisfaction in offering the foregoing discussions to the reader. I have satisfaction, likewise, because I question whether a college advocate can be found who, as a debater, is more unscrupulous in behalf of his cause than my respondent proved himself in his discussions with me, and, thus I question whether any one can be found who could be more effective in besmirching the truth when set forth against the educational idol that I oppose. All advocates of religio-secular colleges seem disposed to besmirch the journal, the men, and the truth, which they find in opposition to them. J. A. Harding led in this direction, when he published to his readers that the "most charitable view any one can take" of me is that I have "a disordered mind." Others have followed his example, and they all seem disposed to besmirch every character, and every truth, that is in op-

position to their darling device. By so doing they make a personal controversy of that which should be a discussion of subjects.

Here my appendix to the discussions at Odessa and Hale would end if certain publishers and preachers had not taken a prominent part in misrepresenting truth in regard to those discussions. Those publishers are F. L. Rowe, and W. F. Parmiter. The preachers to whom I refer are Prof. J. N. Armstrong and D. W. Nay. As for F. L. Rowe, publisher of the journal known as "Christian Leader and the Way," we should not, perhaps, expect anything better of him. But we ought to expect something better of W. F. Parmiter. By his paper he is supposed to represent the apostolic brotherhood in the west. But he seems to think that his mission is to publish anything which will be unfair and will stir hatred, and then, as a rule, he will refuse correction in his columns.

But I wish to otter to the reader Prof. J. N. Armstrong's report of the discussions between B. F. Rhodes and myself as it appeared in the LEADER-WAY. While reading that report I wish the reader to consider these questions:

1. In view of the fact that my opponent refused to affirm his position fairly and fully, but preferred to appear on the negative of a negative, did I not have the right to pursue my own course in offering my objections to the Odessa College?

2. Did I not present and discuss the ORIGIN and PURPOSE of the "Western Bible and Literary College," and did I not, to that extent, discuss "the issue?"

3. Is it true that I spent my time "criticising incidents, accidents, and circumstances, and matters of judgment," instead of discussing "the issue," as far as I saw fit to advance that issue in the oral discussions?

4. Is it true that "Sommer was un-Christlike in his spirit" in his discussions with Prof. Rhodes, especially when the misrepresentations and personal attacks made by Prof. Rhodes are considered?

5. Did the reader ever know any one to make a more inaccurate or one sided report than the one made by Prof. Armstrong?

But here is the mentioned report, in the fullness, as printed in the "Leader-Way."

RHODES-SOMMER DEBATE.

Being sure that many would be glad to hear about the debate between B. F. Rhodes and Daniel Sommer, on the "Bible School Question," I shall give a short report of it.

The discussion began here (Odessa), Monday, Feb. 18, and continued two days of four hours each. Sommer opened the discussion with a thirty-minute speech, and Rhodes followed with a speech of equal length. Thus it was continued through the debate.

The debate was well attended, and with intense interest the people listened to the disputants through every session.

Sommer is a debater of considerable experience, and has been preaching for thirty-seven years. Rhodes is 37 years old, and had never engaged in a debate before, save as a "school-boy." So, in these respects, Sommer had all the advantage, but since Rhodes stood for the truth involved in the question, he was more than a match for Sommer.

I suppose everybody, almost, that attended the debate was surprised at Sommer's effort. I thought he would, at least, make his position look plausible. Here at Odessa he made "no" attempt to discuss the principles on which he himself says our "sins" (?) rest, the misuse of the "Lord's money" and the misuse of the "sacred" word "Bible" in naming these schools. He made no attempt at defining the "Lord's money;" neither did he touch the name "Bible"

further than to indict us for using it as we do. But not one single solitary attempt did he make to prove his charge against us. Rhodes pressed him hard for proof at this point, but all that he obtained was a promise that he would take it up at Hale, Mo., where the debate was to be repeated. Notwithstanding the fact that brethren came here from two hundred miles away to see us convicted of "sacrilege" for use of the word Bible, they returned to their homes, without hearing one word in argument from Sommer on that subject. Rhodes finally exposed Sommer's false teaching on the "name," and pressed him for a reply, but the debate closed with nothing but a promise to consider it at Hale. This, no doubt, was a disappointment to many, for they could not attend the debate at both places.

He made a great effort to show that we were mercenary,—"begged" for money, and excluded poor students because they could not pay. In other words, he made no effort, to show we were sinners because we misused the Lord's money. In October, 1906, he said all he had ever said on this subject could be classed under two heads, name and Lord's money, and in eight speeches, of thirty minutes each, he refused to discuss the main points, although pressed on every hand for these things.

His effort here may be called a personal attack on us and our work. He said much of our incompetency. He declared our parallel reading to be ungodly fiction, criticised our lecture course, our entertainments, etc. He said that he should rather his child would be carried through a course of reading in ungodly fiction under an infidel or skeptic than under a devoted Christian. He tried hard to use the little differences of teaching in the church here against the school, as if the school were the cause of said differences. He tried to make it appear that "kneeling in prayer," "special providence," "opposition to right-hand of fellowship," etc., were doctrine peculiar to Bible-school work. Of course, all of this was easily met, and only manifested the weakness of his cause. He referred to the degree of B. L., B. S., B. A. and A. M. as "pompous titles." Thus he spent his time in the debate here criticising incidents, accidents, circumstances and matters of judgment.

Rhodes exposed all these things, and pressed him for a discussion of principles, but this pressing was vain. Sommer was unChristlike in his spirit. He has refused for months to recognize me as a Christian, and toward the close of the Hale debate he began to address Rhodes as "Professor Rhodes," and he addressed Rhodes' moderator, D. W. Nay, one of the most godly and consecrated men in all this country, as "Mr. Nay" from the first. That is a sin and a shame in Sommer, but it can not be helped; he seems determined to destroy himself.

The debate has been worth much to our school and to the church here. I believe it will prove a great blessing to the cause of truth throughout this country.

THE DEBATE AT HALE.

Thursday and Friday, Feb. 21, 22, the discussion was repeated at Hale, Mo. Here Rhodes pressed Sommer for his teaching on "the name" in every speech. In every way possible he tried to elicit this teaching from Sommer. But in no way could he be induced to "expose" our sins for giving a "sacred name" to a "religio-secular" thing. For nearly seven years brethren in Christ have been charged with "sacrilege" for so using the name "Bible," but when brought face to face with the condemned he refuses to teach on the subject, although pressed hard for it. His excuse at Odessa for not taking up this name business was that the debate was to continue at Hale, and his excuse at Hale was that he was to have a written discussion with

"Professor Armstrong' later, on this subject. On the money question he was also very light. He attempted no definition of the Lord's money further than the reading of a paragraph from his tract in which it is taught that taxes should be paid and the needs supplied, after which the rest should be given to the Lord.

To this Rhodes replied that a family's needs included education of the children, and this gave the parents the right to provide schools for them. To this Sommer never replied. Rhodes also showed that this idea of the Lord's money would allow no Christian to own more land than just enough to make a living. He touched the money question lightly, as Rhodes expressed it, "gingerly," but from every position he took he was routed. "He would not, and would not, and would not discuss principles, the essentials of the work."

Rhodes made the proposal that if "begging" was our "sin," and if it would settle the question and "bury the hatchet" we would never make another appeal for the work. But no attention, was paid to this proposal by Sommer. Sommer, in trying to sustain his "Lord's money" theory, said we were all agreed that the money put in the treasury on the first day of the week is the Lord's money, and yet that we have taken money contributed thus. Rhodes showed that there was no principle involved here, but proposed that we would never take another such contribution if this would restore peace among the disciples on the question. To this Sommer replied that we had been so mean already that he had lost all confidence in us, and he did not know whether we could do anything to reinstate us in his confidence. This is the spirit in which he treated every effort that was made to make peace and bring harmony among the disciples of Jesus. Instead of trying to bind up the breach, it seems to be his effort to broaden it. His moderator at Hale, Tom Gray, told me, on our way to Hale, that he believed union on the question could be established without sacrifice of principle on the part of either. But Sommer seems to make no effort to establish peace with those with whom he may disagree. He is self-willed and dictatorial. More than once in the discussion he said all truth was on his side and his opponent was wholly wrong. He said that one reason he did not like to debate was, that his opponent was always wrong.

A stenographic report was made at both places, and I hope some time you will have an opportunity of reading this discussion. In March the written discussion is to begin.

J. N. ARMSTRONG.

[Not satisfied with the foregoing report of the discussions at Odessa and Hale, as published in the "Leader-Way" for March 5, 1907, Prof. Armstrong, in a later number of that same paper, and then in the paper called "Primitive Christianity," offered another article to the public, which is here quoted for the reader's inspection. D. S].

THE CHURCH AT ODESSA.

Inasmuch as the church of God at Odessa, has been misrepresented in the Octographic Review, I want to give the facts as they exist.

It is wicked to misrepresent men, as such, knowingly, but to misrepresent the Church of God is very far worse. It has always been wicked in the sight of God to bear false witness against neighbors, and no doubt the false witnesses that testified against Christ at his trial committed a high crime in misrepresenting the Son of God, but they did it ignorantly in unbelief, and God had mercy on them.

But for men, professed friends, to bear false witness against the body of Christ, the Church of the living God, is a sin that should not go unnoticed by those that love God and his Church, I am sorry that

it is necessary to call attention to such a crime in the Church of God, but it becomes our duty to reprove sin in every form. We must "cry aloud, spare not." Sin is so malignant that even a "sin of ignorance" must be atoned for. God is intolerant of sin and his hot displeasure follows up the commission of sin.

Brethren Roberts and Sommer have grossly misrepresented the church here. Had they done this ignorantly, it would have been serious enough to demand a correction, but since they have done so against light and knowledge they have committed grievous sin.

Both of these brethren have persisted in saying that the church of Christ in Odessa is divided and that the "college advocates," as they stigmatize us, have caused this division. They persisted in this misrepresentation throughout the debate, in spite of the fact that they were corrected more than once by the elders or overseers of this flock. Here is the statement of the elders:

Odessa, Mo., Feb. 19, 07.

"To All Whom this May Concern:—

Greeting:—"This is to certify that the report that has been circulated that the Church of Christ is divided is untrue, and that we have publicly protested against such statements and do now jointly deny all such reports.

"Signed: B. G. Hayden, P. W. Adams, T. V. Foster, Elders of the Church of Christ."

This statement was read to them and yet they have gone so far as to publish to the world that we, the teachers of the school here, have divided the church. They have made this declaration in the very face of the elders, God's rulers. This is rebellion against God, and if these men are subject to any congregations, these churches should confer with the elders here as to the truth of my statement of the matter, that these brethren may be led to repentance, and therefore be saved.

There is no division in the church here, no differences save such differences as exist in all congregations of age.

It is true that we sometimes disagree in our "understandings" or "misunderstandings" of subjects, and we sometimes have warm, enthusiastic discussions in our meetings. We discuss our differences in love and with the best of feelings. For such meetings of investigations and dispute we appeal to the Bible for authority. When the church at Antioch disagreed about circumcision, they had no small dissension with Paul and Barnabas, and when the matter was carried before the church at Jerusalem, there was much discussion there. But had some one reported that the church at Antioch and the church at Jerusalem were divided, that one would have been a slanderer of the Church of God. In every church in the world where the Bible is freely and faithfully studied, there are differences of understanding on some points, and the discussion of such subjects is apostolic, if done in love.

I appeal to every one that may read this to think of the different discussions and disputes that you have heard in your classes, in your Lord's day meetings, etc. How many different positions are held by different members of your congregation? Have you any re-baptism people in your congregation? Anybody that believes the no-elder doctrine? Do any of you believe in appointing elders "by the laying on of hands?" Do any members of your congregation oppose "foreign" mission work? How many positions are held by members of your congregation on the Holy Spirit, and how many as to the sin against the Holy Ghost?

Of course, it would be better if these differences did not exist, but they do exist, and that too, among as loyal hearts as live in the world.

Since they do exist, the only way to deal with them is to study God's Word diligently, discuss the matter with love and forbearance, striving to keep the unity of the faith in the bond of peace.

Brethren Roberts and Sommer made an incorrect statement concerning the condition of the church here, and not only so, but they added to this sin by declaring that the "college advocates" are the cause of this so called division. Nothing could be further from the truth.

Every one of the items, with perhaps one exception, mentioned by these brethren as included in what they denominate "division" in the church (it is slanderous to speak of these things) was in the church before we came here, and the church was "divided" (?) over them before we came to this town.

For instance, a whole year before we moved here, the wife of one of the elders refused to cooperate with (he brethren in extending the "right hand of fellowship." I am told that she quit this several years ago. A family came to Odessa from Kansas before any of the "college advocates" moved into the town. Three out of four in this family were Christians, and wanted to work and worship with the brethren here, but they refused to receive the right hand of fellowship because they knew no Bible authority for it. The head of this house became a merchant in this town. A little later, but still before the arrival of these wicked "college advocates," a farmer and his wife moved here, and they also refused the right hand of fellowship because of lack of scriptural authority. Notwithstanding all these facts, the statement has gone forth that division exists over "teaching and practice of Bible College advocates which had not been taught and practiced there before the college came into their midst." Right hand of fellowship is said to be one of these things.

In the face of this statement, I want to say that if this subject has been mentioned by any public meeting save in a meeting that was specially convened by the elders on Monday afternoon, one of the objects of which was to consider this question, I do not know it. In this meeting we very reluctantly spoke after having been asked to do so. If I have ever mentioned the subject privately to any one who does not agree with me on it since I have been in this town, I do not now remember it. I believe every teacher in the school can say as much.

Further, division is said to be in the church at Odessa over the doctrine, "It is a sin to go to the polls and vote." There is not a shadow of a foundation for such a statement. There is not, and has not been, one particle of friction even, over this subject. The subject has never been discussed in this congregation, unless it was done before we came here. It has been incidentally mentioned in three or four different meetings Two of those times it was brought before the meeting by the elders. One evening the question of swearing and taking oaths came up, and I think some of us taught on this subject just as Bro. Sommer does. One of the elders, in his speech, introduced the subject of the Christian's relation to civil government.

On another occasion another one of the elders made a statement about as follows: "I have never known a strong politician to be a strong Christian." This man has never voted but once in his life, and he has been a member of the church for fifty years or more, and for years he has been considered an elder of this congregation. Another aged member of this congregation has for years kept himself from participation in political affairs. I think Bro. Boyer, a godly man, who has preached for this congregation for four or five years, holds the same doctrine as precious. In the face of all these facts, Bro. Roberts says this teaching and practice was introduced by the "college advocates," and that by this teaching and practice, the Church is divided. Remem-

ber, too, that he does this in rebellion to the elders of this congregation, for they entreated these not to misrepresent this church.

Another divisive doctrine and practice that we are accused of introducing into the congregation is "that God specially blesses his children in temporal things." This is a doctrine precious to my heart, but as it happens, there has not been the least friction, not even the semblance of a shadow of disturbance at this point. There are too many devoted men and women in this congregation, for me to believe that none of them have ever espoused and practiced, to some degree, this plain truth of God, this truth as plain as baptism for the remission of sins.

He who reports that there is division here on this subject is ignorant of the facts, or he slanders the body of Christ.

Again, we are accused of dividing the church by "the having of minstrel troupes and theatrical performances in the college building." This is, again, a misrepresentation of the facts. We have literary and musical entertainments, and school entertainments in our college building. No theatrical troupe has ever performed in our building. We permit nothing as an entertainment that is low or suggestive of evil. Sometimes there has been more "fun" than I myself approve. I am hard to please in an entertainment. It does not take much "fun" to be too much for me. If it is right for schools to give entertainments at all, we are not grievous sinners at this point, for our entertainments are "tame."

The thing over which such ado was made in the debate was the entertainment given in our chapel by the Hawthorne Musical Club. Many of you will remember having enjoyed the music made by these people. They visit all kinds of educational meetings, etc., and give the entertainment that they gave us.

Rut this is not the gravest charge brought against us concerning our entertainments. We are accused of dividing the church by these things. Listen to the facts, and see how much truth there is in this charge.

It is true that several faithful brethren here think it is wrong to have an instrument of music in the home. These brethren really believe instrumental music is of the devil,—wrong in itself. While this is true of these brethren, there are other faithful brethren here that have instruments in their homes and attend lectures, school entertainments, etc.' I held a meeting in this town a year before the school was established, and I found these different judgments among the brethren at that time. Yet this is one of the things that it has been said that we introduced. The church was getting along well before the college was located, "and is yet, with the exception of some division caused by teaching and practice of the Bible College advocates which had not been taught and practiced there before the college came into their midst."

When I buy a grammar I do not inquire into the religion of the author of the book, and when I buy sugar I do not inquire into the religion of the man who sells it to me further than to give preference at all times, and all places, to a child of God. When we want a lecture on educational lines we buy it from the man that has, and is able, to sell us what we want. Some of the lecturers that we have had may be digressives. I do not know, but they did not come among us as religious teachers, but as lecturers on educational themes, nor have we had a single lecture which tended "toward infidelity."

Another false charge. It seems to us that these brethren are working hard to save a lost cause, and, like drowning men, are catching at straws.

Our Sunday-Afternoon Meetings.—The church here has four regular meetings on Sunday afternoon. One of these meetings is held in a

school-house, three or four miles south of Odessa; another in a school-house six or eight miles nearly east of Odessa; another in the college chapel, one mile from the church-house; and still another in Bro. Dickinson's home, about two miles southeast of Odessa. In all of these meetings the regular worship is attended to, and the contribution taken at all of these places is turned into the hands of the elders of this congregation.

The Lord's Supper and the contribution are attended to at all of these places, because there are brethren near each of them that can not go to the church-house to worship.

Bro. Dickinson has an invalid daughter, one of the most godly women I have ever seen, which occasions the meetings in his dwelling. The neighbors are invited in, and taught the truth of God.

All members of the church that can be, are exhorted and besought to be present at the Lord's day morning meeting at the church-house, and as a result, this meeting is well attended. In the afternoon we are "scattered" into the four mission meetings, and at night we meet again at the church-house, where some one speaks the Word of God.

Some of the brethren objected to the having of the regular worship in these school-house meetings on the grounds that it might diminish the attendance and interest of the central meeting, but there has been no division over the matter and the congregation is working harmoniously together. The brethren co-operate in the work at all of these afternoon meetings, and as I have said before, the contributions are all placed into (he hands of the elders.

The man who reports that the church here is divided over these meetings, either speaks where he has no right to speak because of his ignorance, or he slanders the body of Christ.

At all of these meetings we have an opportunity to teach people that we can not reach at the central place, and we consider them all golden opportunities for sounding out the Word. The reference made to eating a piece of bread and drinking wine by an individual at home is another bare misrepresentation of fact and, seriously considered, is almost sacrilege.

Bro. Sparks, or Bro. "Sharp," as the typesetter made Bro. Roberts say, is represented as "fighting the college." I do not know what to say about this, for it may be possible that a man could fight a thing without its being known that he does so. If this can be done, this statement may be true. But if Bro. Sparks has been fighting the college, he has done it" behind our backs." He has patronized the school from the beginning, having a son with us last year, and one this year.

A desperate effort was made throughout the debate to make us responsible for a division that does not exist. We were held responsible for every difference of position and opinion held in the church.

Why were they seemingly so anxious to do this? Can it be that the wish was father of the effort? Are they trying to save a lost cause by assailing the men in the work rather than the work itself?

I have now given a plain statement of facts about the condition of the church here, and I have done it because the truth demands it. I hope all who are interested in the exaltation of the truth and the suppression of error will help us to get these facts before all Christians. If you will distribute copies of the paper in your congregation, I shall be glad to supply you with copies. The congregation has been grievously slandered, and I am. sure this will not go unnoticed by the God of all justice.

This slanderous report made in utter disregard of the entreaties of the elders is no small sin, and sin is sin even in Daniel Sommer and W. G. Roberts. The Church at large will be guilty if it condones the sins of these men.

Brethren who have influence with them should try to correct them.

J. N. ARMSTRONG.

In regard to the foregoing article I say this: I have received several letters from Odessa from two brethren, assuring that there is now serious difficulty in the church at Odessa because of Prof. Armstrong's misrepresentations in that article.

What W. G. Roberts thinks of that article from the pen of Prof. Armstrong is evident from the following document:

A FEW WORDS IN REPLY TO PROF. J. N. ARMSTRONG.

In "Primitive Christianity" April 16, Prof. Armstrong uses about five columns denouncing the writer and Bro. Sommer as wicked, sinful men and closes his long article by saying, "The church at large will be guilty if it condones (pardons R.) the sins of these men," thus denouncing every congregation and every member who endorses W. G. Roberts and Daniel Sommer. Prof. J. N. Armstrong has therefore drawn the lines between us. We will never say again, I suppose, that he is opposed to dividing the brotherhood over the college question. He says that we are "Bearing false witness," "sinners," etc. He charges us with "sin," "crime," "grossly misrepresented the church here," (Odessa), "committed grievous sins," "they persisted in this misrepresentation throughout the debate," "rebellion against God," "incorrect statement," "nothing could be further from the truth," "ignorant of facts," "another false charge," "like drowning men are catching at straws," (you see, we are catching at Prof. Armstrong—R.), "is almost sacrilege," "sin is sin even in Daniel Sommer and W. G. Roberts," "the church at large will be guilty if it condones the sins of these men."

Of the fifteen ungodly charges made against us I consider the last two the worst, if it be possible for one of these to be worse than another. But the congregations who may condone (pardon) the "sins" of Daniel S. and W. G. R. are also guilty. So you are in the same boat with us, and you see what kind of a boat he has us in. We are liars of the worst kind and you are no better than we. "Condone"—"To forgive, to pardon"—Webster.

Condone—to forgive.

So, according to Prof. Armstrong, there is no redemption for us, for he says, "The church at large will be guilty if it condones (forgives) the sins of these men." Oh, I suppose he would not say that God would not forgive us, but he warns the church at large not to forgive our sins. Hence no redemption for us so far as being forgiven by the church at large if we were guilty of the fifteen charges he brings against us, and we are the lying sinners he says we are. But then he says: "Brethren who have influence with them should try to correct them." I can't understand this. Does he mean to contradict himself? It looks that way to me. He says: "Brethren Roberts and Sommer have grossly misrepresented the church here. Had they done this ignorantly, it would have been serious enough to demand a correction, but since they have done so against light and knowledge they have committed grievous sin. Both of these brethren have persisted in saying that the church of Christ in Odessa is "divided" and that the "college advocates," as they stigmatize us, have caused this division. They persisted in this misrepresentation throughout the debate, in spite of the fact that they were corrected more than once by the elders or overseers of this flock.

Odessa, Mo., Feb. 10, 1907.

"To All Whom This May Concern—Greeting:

"This is to certify that the report that has been circulated that the church of Christ is divided is untrue, and that we have publicly pro-

tested against such statements and do now jointly deny all such reports.

Signed:

B. G. HAYDEN,
P. W. ADAMS,
T. V. FOSTER,

Elders of the Church of Christ."

Will you, Brother Armstrong, tell us the name of the preacher who wrote the above letter and took it to the elders and got them to sign it? I want to understand this before I speak in regard to this act. You say, "Both of these brethren have persisted" (continued steadily and firmly in the pursuit of"—Webster) "in saying that the church of Christ in Odessa is divided," etc. I challenge you, Bro. Armstrong, to put your finger on one—just one—statement of mine like the above, to say nothing about PERSISTING in saying such. Talk about MISREPRESENTATION. If you haven't misrepresented me I never was misrepresented in my life. I reported the debate but I did not say "the church of Christ in Odessa is divided." Here is what I said: "And before the college was located there the church of Christ was getting along fairly well and is yet, with the exception of some division caused by the teaching and practice of the 'Bible College' advocates," etc. By this statement I imply that the church was not divided, only in sentiment, and Prof. Armstrong informs us that it was in this article of his. Is it possible that a professor of a "Bible College" can't understand language any better than that. Did He do this through "ignorance" or was it a wilful misrepresentation? I DID NOT SAY THE CHURCH OF CHRIST IN ODESSA WAS DIVIDED. Will the Professor repent? We shall wait and see.

But what is worse, he says, "They persisted in this misrepresentation throughout the debate." I was not one of the debaters. Why charge me with this? On one occasion when Bro. S. was called down for charging them with divisive work I arose and asked if there was not division and if said practice hadn't been rebuked in public at church by some of their members, and one hi the audience said: YES, big and loud. I said, "Then Bro. S. is justified in bringing this charge." So this statement of Prof. Armstrong's is a reflection cast upon the old gray-headed brother who said "Yes." Why didn't the professor speak up and tell him he lied, as he is now accusing me of doing. Professor Armstrong, did that dear old brother tell the truth, or did he tell an untruth? When you brought this charge against me, why did you withhold my question and his answer? Say, why did you? In the name of reason, why did you? O, my soul! Who is guilty of misrepresentation? That debate is hurting the professor, and he can't keep still, it seems to me, but must try to help his brother out.

Did I, Prof. Armstrong, PERSIST in this "misrepresentation" throughout the debate? All, you know I did not. I was only a moderator in that debate, and I think, only mentioned it once and then only asked the question referred to and received the affirmative answer from the old brother in the audience. But you say we were corrected more than once by the elders. If the elders ever corrected me I never knew it. They never said a word to me about it as they themselves will tell you. If you mean that they corrected me "more than once" by having the letter read, then you are mistaken again. I think when the book comes out you will see that I only spoke of this the one time, and that the letter was only read once at Odessa. Will you, Prof. Armstrong, correct these wicked charges through the same paper I was so shamefully misrepresented in by you? You should remember that when I made mention of the things you taught that was causing division in sentiment that I was reporting the debate, hence made mention

of what I learned at the debate—of what came up in the debate. I ask, Bro. Armstrong, did I mention a single thing that did not come up in the debate? "The book will show when it comes out" is a statement I made two or three times. I did this that the reader might know that I was referring to things that come up in the debate. Why did you so unmercifully misrepresent me and accuse me and abuse me without giving the readers of the P. C. what I said? You admit that one of the items I referred to as being taught by you which seemed to be offensive to some of the brethren was never introduced till after the college was located there, but did not tell us which one it was. Why did you withhold this? You say, "But there has been no division over the matter and the congregation is working harmoniously together." It may be now, but it was not at that time. Bro. Armstrong admits that they called a meeting on Monday afternoon to consider some or one of these questions mentioned in the article I am now reviewing. I am only reviewing part of it, however. I may need to review the rest at some other time. One bright and very intelligent young man quit the school because he could not endorse their teaching and practice. Another old brother had publicly called a halt to some of these things at church and Bro. Armstrong knows it. But in the face of all of this he says "the congregation," (that means all) "is working harmoniously together."

But again the professor says: "The reference made to eating a piece of bread and drinking wine by an individual at home is another bare misrepresentation of fact and, seriously considered, is almost sacrilege." Yes, this is, I admit, a "bare misrepresentation of fact," but Prof. Armstrong is the guilty man, and not I. Just stay with this statement, Professor, for YOU ARE THE MAN. I never said "eating a piece of bread and drinking wine by an individual AT HOME." Why did you add "at home?" That means a great deal. Here is what I said: "Their teaching that an individual may, on Lord's day morning, take a piece of bread and some wine to eat and drink and thus worship ALL ALONE!" Why did you misrepresent me and garble my statement? I now challenge Prof. Armstrong to deny my statement. When he does I shall prove that they have not only taught it but have practiced it— not at home, but on the train. But I would better quit for I am about to tell who it was, and I know you would laugh if I should do so. I usually know what I am talking about when I speak.

W. G. ROBERTS,
Rippey, Iowa.

What the editor of the Review thinks of Prof. Armstrong's effort to defend the church at Odessa is somewhat indicated by the following document:

A NOTABLE CONFESSION.

Men who commit murder and deny it are, generally, very persistent in denying it while awake, and on their guard. On all occasions when questioned concerning their crime they will make denials most plain and positive. But the observation has been made that such criminals will sometimes confess their crime while asleep. In their dreams they are not on their guard, and their tongues sometimes confess the crime which is the burden of their minds.

On the same principle the religious hypocrite may profess his devotion to God and his word on all public occasions, and even on all private occasions when he is 'on his guard. But those who are permitted to hear his mutterings in his dreams are sometimes shocked by his confessions of the hollowness of his pretensions. Sometimes when he is awake, but is not on his guard, because impulse, or passion, controls him, he will say, or do, that which reveals his hypocrisy, and makes manifest that he is a wicked man.

With the facts and reflections, just recorded, before our minds let us consider a few sentences from the pen of Prof. J. N. Armstrong, in his recent article concerning "The Church at Odessa." In trying to defend that church against the charge of division over contending the right hand of fellowship, by reason of the influence of "college advocates," he expresses himself thus:

For instance, a whole year before we moved here, the wife of one of the elders refused to cooperate with the brethren in extending the "right hand of fellowship." I am told that she quit this several years ago. A family came to Odessa from Kansas before any of the "college advocates" moved into the town. Three out of four in this family were Christians, and wanted to work and worship with the brethren here, but they refused to receive the right hand of fellowship because they knew no Bible authority for it. The head of this house became a merchant in this town. A little later, but still before the arrival of these wicked "college advocates," a farmer and his wife moved here, and they also refused the right hand of fellowship because of lack of scriptural authority,

When I read the foregoing I thought "Poor Armstrong, his incaution lured him into the truth just once in his long, slanderous article." The word "wicked" in the last sentence of the foregoing is not quoted, but is HIS OWN, and, thus, without modification of any kind he speaks of himself and his colleagues as "wicked." I think he told the truth, judging by the article from which I have quoted, and much else that I have seen from Prof. Armstrong's pen. He charges us with being "wicked," but we deny it, and call for the proof. But he confesses that he and his associate "college advocates" are "wicked" persons. In view of this Bro. Roberts and I, whom he has unjustly assailed, can afford to rest undisturbed. Bro. Roberts wrote a convincing reply.

But, while attention is turned to this question I mention that I have been amused at the remarks of Prof. Armstrong and D. W. Nay, in regard to the course pursued in my discussions with Prof. Rhodes. They seemed to think, even as Prof. Rhodes did in course of our discussions, that the questions of MONEY and NAME were the only subjects that I ought to have talked about. In course of the debate D. W. Nay spoke to the Lord about another subject, but he has censured me because I talked of ORIGIN and PURPOSE, instead of MONEY and NAME.

Here is what Preacher Nay said to the Lord when praying at Odessa: "We are divided over whether we should send our children to a school presided over by brethren in Christ." But, though he told the Lord that, yet he certainly told him what was NOT TRUE. I would rather send my children "to a school presided over by brethren in Christ" than to any other school, other things being equal, and so would every other Christian. Why, then, was such a speech made to the Lord by D. W. Nay at Odessa? I don't know. I simply know that the information offered to the Lord WAS NOT CORRECT. If the prayer had said, "Lord, we are divided over the question, whether we should do evil that good may come," it would have been correct. That is the QUESTION, when stated in its most general form. But what will D. W. Nay now say since one of his supposed "brethren in Christ" says of himself, and of the other "college advocates" at Odessa, which included the author of the prayer we have been considering, that they are "wicked?" I don't know. They must settle that among themselves. But before we bid farewell to the "mild and gentle D. W. Nay," as some regard him, perhaps, I should give the reader a pen-picture of him as drawn by himself in a threatening letter addressed to me "Nov. 30, 1906." In the latter part of that letter he expressed himself thus:

"Bro. Sommer, I shall not argue this matter by correspondence, but again demand that you either prove these charges, in my presence, or

publicly apologize for them, for I most positively say that they are false and detrimental to my spiritual character, both as a Christian, and as a preacher.

Bro. Sommer, I will give you 20 days to give me your answer as to what you are willing to do, and then if you do not adjust this matter I shall lay the matter before the church of Christ and ask for protection against those who refuse to become reconciled to their brethren.

I will also prefer a charge of heresy, based upon your own statements in your tract "Colleges as Church Institutions" on pages 35-39.

And your teaching on marriage and divorce as recently appeared in the O. R. of the New Testament study.

Such teaching as above referred to is unsound, not taught in the New Testament scripture, nor by the church of Christ, hence an innovation."

I shall not comment on the foregoing except to say that it was AN EMPTY THREAT, and reveals the inwardness of its author. He threatened to charge me with "heresy," and said that my teaching on a certain subject, is "an innovation," yet addressed me as "Bro. Sommer." His "20 days" have passed nearly twenty times at this date! His prayer at Odessa that I have exposed, and his threat as above reported give an index to that which is covered by his outward smoothness! J. N. Armstrong includes him among certain persons whom he designates as "wicked." That is worse than I have said about him, though I regard him as a smooth slanderer, as one who denied the truth at Hale in regard to the Odessa College being a beggar, and as one who uttered an untruth in a certain prayer at Odessa. In due time I think the brethren will learn what he is.

Here I would end my APPENDIX if a certain editor had not made himself prominent in regard to the discussions reported in this volume, both by commenting on them editorially and by publishing the reports of Prof. Armstrong and D. W. Nay. In view of this I offer the reader, with but little change, a pen picture of that editor by making a reprint of an article which has been twice published, and which remains unchallenged, except by a few fallacious remarks from his pen. Consider with care, dear reader, and ask yourself whether the Brotherhood does not deserve a better man than the following picture indicates is now occupying its Western Editorial Chair.

THE SCHOOL CONTROVERSY.

In a recent number of a certain college-advocating journal, named Primitive Christianity, I find an article under the above-given heading, which I publish on another page. That, article seems chiefly directed against the Review, its editor, and supporters. In a previous number of that same journal its editor made the following charges against me, without quoting a sentence from my pen:

1. That I am "a false witness."
2. That I made an "assault" on him while I was at Sylvia, Kansas.
3. That I am guilty of advocating "false theories."
4. That I am guilty of "evil surmisings."
5. That I am guilty of "misrepresentations."
6. That I am guilty of "the misapplication of the language of the honored dead."
7. That I am guilty of "illogical reasoning" and "inconsistency about the Lord's money."

The reader will further bear in mind that without quoting a sentence from, my pen, the same editor, in his article under the foregoing heading, makes against me, and the Review, together with its supporters, the following serious charges:

1. He alleges that I have made a "false charge" "against" him.
2. He indirectly charges me, with hoping "to injure the interests of" his paper "and cast reproach against" his "influence as a Christian man."
3. He charges that I "hear false witness against brethren."
4. He charges that I have issued a "hull of excommunication."
5. He charges that my "conduct in this matter is perfectly ridiculous and merits the severest rebuke."
6. He charges that I have been guilty of "unrighteous denunciation."
7. He charges that I have been guilty of "absurdity" in this matter.
8. He charges that I have shown the "utmost disrespect for logical reasoning."
9. He charges against the Review's "editor and contributors" that they "condemn" themselves by "the arguments (?) they employ on the college question."
10. He charges that the Review "is guilty of unwise action and (is) responsible for the discord that exists."
11. He charges that "the issue raised by the O. R. is a false issue, and falsely charged against" his paper.
12. He charges that something which he calls my "injustice, provokes to severity."
13. He charges in regard to a certain position which he imagines I hold, that "the thought is simply too ridiculous to merit further notice."
14. He charges that certain O. R. readers "are trying to work up" "an ugly spirit."
15. He charges "the O. R." with making "the effort" "to create discord by making a religious issue" of the college question.
16. He charges "the Review" with "unrighteous conduct."
17. He charges, by intimation, that the Review's course, in regard to this "controversy" "is only a pretext, and that the real object is to injure" his paper, "and check the growth of" his "influence as an editor."
18. He charges that the Review has been guilty of "ungodly actions."

Dear reader, please bear in mind, and consider seriously, that the eighteen charges just enumerated, likewise the seven charges previously published against me, by the mentioned editor, have all been set before his readers without printing even one sentence from my pen! Twenty-five distinct charges he has made, against a brother editor, without permitting that editor to speak even ONE SENTENCE in his own defense!! In other words, he has arraigned me on twenty-five charges, all of which I regard as unjust, but he has not suffered me to make EVEN ONE PLEA, before his readers, in my own behalf!!! But, as I showed in the Review for June 13, when Bro. Parmiter wished to criticize a Catholic editor, he quoted that editor's own words before he commented on them!!! !

I shall not attempt to tell the reader how I am grieved over such mistreatment from a brother editor, and especially from one whom I would gladly regard as a brother in Christ. I am grieved over it for his sake, and for the sake of those of his readers who do not see the 'Review. To the extent that such readers have confidence in Bro. Parmiter, they will certainly regard me with contempt, and will thereby become my enemies, instead of being my friends. As a result they will, henceforth, be unwilling to receive from me any truth that I may offer them. But this is not all. I am grieved over Bro. Parmiter's course, in this controversy, because of the damage that it is doing, and will do, the cause of our Adorable Redeemer.

Over eighteen years ago I began to manage the Review, and since then I have controverted much with innovators, re-baptism extremists, order-of-worship specialists and various other errorists. About three years ago I began to write against the so-called Bible schools and colleges which have recently sprung up among churches of Christ. In course of the mentioned three years I have suffered more injustice from the advocates of such institutions than from all the other errorists with whom I discussed during the previous fifteen years!

Bro. Parmiter's last paragraph in the foregoing article reads thus:

If any object to being included in my statements on the grounds of having made no such statement in the case, I reply, their influence goes with the actions of the paper unless they speak to the contrary. The action of the paper as a paper involves all connected with it, hence I regard all in that light.

Now, reader, please consider that, according to the foregoing paragraph, every writer for this paper is involved in its course, "unless" he speaks "to the contrary." Suppose that this is true, is it not, on the same principle, equally true of the P. C. ? Certainly. What then becomes of all of Bro. Parmiter's denials in regard to the part which he has taken in this controversy? (See the second paragraph of the foregoing article, and in many other places.) Is not Bro. Parmiter one of the writers for the P. C.—even the chief writer for its columns? Has he not opened the columns of his paper to Prof. J. N. Armstrong, and others, to advocate a certain college to be established and supported by the church? In the mentioned advocacy of that college has it not been revealed that the church is called on to furnish the men, the money, and the pupils necessary to make it a success? Bro. Parmiter certainly will not deny what is involved in these inquiries. Does not "the action of the paper" which he controls involve him as its owner and chief writer? Certainly. Why then does he say, "Our readers know I have taken no part in this controversy, save to deny the false charges made against me by the editor of the O. R. and his endorsers?" What kind of reasoning is it which exempts Bro. Parmiter from responsibility for "the action" of the P. C., but holds "every writer" for the O. R. responsible for its "action?"

Bro. Parmiter states that "several months ago a school was proposed at Detroit, Mich." To say the least of such a statement, it is not correct. That which was proposed by the church of Christ in Detroit is not a "school" in any ordinary sense of that word, and Bro. G. A. Klingman has denied that any "school" has been established by the church there. The first sentence of the announcement from Detroit reads thus: "The church of Christ, of Detroit, Mich., purposes offering free to all, instruction in the Bible, including reading courses in Hebrew, Greek, and English." All else that the mentioned "announcement" sets forth was simply an amplification of the first sentence. Therefore all efforts to show that I have endorsed a "school" in Detroit are pitiable.

But here is something more that is pitiable. Bro. Parmiter says, of himself, in his article, "I would not discourage any gift in the church lest I might, in part, mar the perfection of her fellowship. God has marked no limit, why should I?" Reader, this is all wrong. God HAS MARKED A LIMIT both in amount and direction of giving. Christians are required to give, for certain ends, as they are prospered, and thus according to that which they HAVE and not that which they DON'T HAVE. (See 1 Cor. 16: 1, 2, 17; 2 Cor. 8: 12.) These scriptures show that Christians are to give for the benefit of poor saints, and for the support of a gospel preacher. But where is the scripture which indicates that Christians should give to establish an institution which is chiefly secular? It is not found in the Bible.

But this is not all. If Bro. Parmiter "would not discourage any gift in the church," then he would not advise a church to refuse bestowing a gift to assist in a festival to raise money for church purposes. Our brother seems to be nearly always in error in his writings on this subject. And then, in order to overbalance these errors, he appeals to his past record and says, "I challenge every man on the O. R., and every writer in that paper, all of whose influence is now against me, by reason of the ungodly actions of that paper, to show a better record morally or religiously, or greater fidelity to God's word, or a more careful knowledge of the truth, or greater respect for careful and logical reasoning so essential to correct understanding."

Suppose that I would accept this "challenge." My first response would be a reference to Ezek. 18: 24, and I would add that the principle set forth in that verse is true in the gospel age (See Rev. 2: 5). Those scriptures teach that previous righteousness will not cause the Lord to disregard present, or future, wrongs. Then my second response would be that Bro. Parmiter has besmirched me and the Review before his readers with twenty-five unjust charges without publishing a sentence from the Review in regard to the matters involved in his charges! My third response would be that the Jewish law, the laws of Pagan Rome, likewise of Papal Rome, would give an accused man the privilege of speaking in his own defense before pronouncing a sentence of condemnation against him. My fourth response would be that all sectarian books of discipline, likewise the military, the civil, and criminal codes of law, in every civilized country, will permit a man to speak for himself, before condemning him. Finally, I would state that the New Testament writers, generally, set forth what those whom they condemned have said, or did, before they condemned them. But all this has been ignored by Bro. Parmiter, and he has, editorially, bucked and gagged me, while he has laid on the editorial lash! ! He has beaten me openly, and unheard, before his readers.

I have not been guilty of such injustice as that, nor has any other person whose name is on the Review staff. On the contrary I have published in full all that I have criticised of Bro. Parmiter's writings, and, as a rule, have published it twice—first in the article from him, and then I have copied it in my article reviewing him. Is there any comparison between such fair and generous conduct on my part toward him, and this unjust conduct toward me? No. But there is a STRIKING CONTRAST.

Bro. Parmiter places the use of human speech, preaching the gospel, the use of the pen in advocating truth, and building colleges on the same basis! Yet he writes about "logic"! The use of human speech, the preaching of the gospel, and the use of the pen in making known truth, are all divinely ordained, and divinely exemplified. But what shall we say of the church of God going into the college business? It is neither ordained nor exemplified in the word of God! ! Such reasoning is like that of the innovators who class preaching the gospel and organizing missionary societies in the same catalogue!!! What shall we say of such reasoning? It is digressionism—first, middle, and last.

And what shall we say of the position which requires its advocates to resort to methods and measures which indicate a lack of strict regard for truth and righteousness. For instance, Bro. Parmiter makes the charge that "the Review" is "responsible for the discord that exists" on the college question. This is exactly the charge which advocates of instrumental music and missionary societies make against those who oppose them. Such a charge is an earmark of an innovator, and that earmark is manifested by Bro. Parmiter. To what class does he belong? The reader can judge. Innovators quite generally charge those who oppose their devices with responsibility for all the "confusion" which results from the introduction of those devices, and a cer-

tain editor, who opened his paper to the advocacy of colleges, declares that the Review, by its opposition to colleges, is "responsible for all the confusion that exists" on the subject! But who splits the log—the man that drives the wedge, or the man who says, "Don't drive it?" The reader can judge, and by so doing can decide who tells the truth in regard to "responsibility for the confusion that exists" on the college question.

But just here I am reminded that certain advocates of colleges charge that those who oppose colleges manufacture the division wedge and drive it! This shows where such advocates belong, for it is exactly the charge which innovators, generally, make against all apostolic disciples!!

In view of the foregoing statements of facts, and truths, the readers of this paper need not be surprised if I should soon decide not to notice anything which college advocates may say against me. They use methods of controversy in which I cannot follow them, because I cannot descend to their methods and measures. By their personalities they damage themselves, and the Redeemer's cause, more than words can express, or their future good works will enable them to balance. But this is always the result, when men DETERMINE to defend that which is INDEFENSIBLE, in order to make a show of defense they erect an altar of injustice from which the smoke of the priest, and not of the intended victim, ascends. Thus it is in this college controversy. For what can compensate a man, or his cause, for the loss of character suffered by such injustice as Bro. Parmiter has been guilty of in his arraignment of me before his readers, on twenty-five charges, without publishing a sentence from my pen? !!!

In my first article reviewing Bro. Parmiter, I said that J. N. Armstrong had "slain" him, by a certain article which he had published in behalf of the Odessa institution, and I have not seen any reason for changing my mind on that subject. But I have not ceased to grieve over the saddening event.

DANIEL SOMMER.

And, now, reader, you will need to wait for the written discussion between Prof. Armstrong and myself in order to learn more of the conflict that is raging between truth and error in regard to Religious Colleges to teach persons in religion, and to furnish secular employment for certain preachers. I have not the slightest fear in regard to the final convictions of all who are sufficiently fair-minded to investigate each question with care. In the discussion between Prof. Rhodes and myself, the questions of ORIGIN and PURPOSE were examined. In the discussions between Prof. Armstrong and myself, the questions of MONEY and NAME and COMPETENCY will be examined. In that discussion, even as in those between Prof. Rhodes and myself, the question of personal veracity is tested. A cause that requires its advocates to become what the apostle John would call "liars" in order to say something in its behalf is a bad cause. Yet the so-called Bible College Cause can not be easily exposed because there is a popular prejudice in its favor.

The Bible College, so-called, sometimes known as "Bible School," is like a lady who is very excellent,—in name and appearance. The words "school," "college," and "Bible" are all popular, and when the word "Bible" is united with the word "school" or "college," then "Bible School" or "Bible College" is the result. This result appears well, and implies well. When spoken of, under the figure of a woman, this result may be designated,—MISS BIBLE COLLEGE.

The name which Miss Bible College wears makes for her many friends, and her appearance is such that some of her friends become unreasonable in their devotion to her. They seem unwilling to listen to any criticism concerning her origin, or her behavior, because they

are blinded by her name and appearance. When told that she ignores her mother on certain occasions they resent the charge as a slander. When told that she was born out of wedlock, and that she is an illegitimate, they become enraged. When informed that she sometimes acts the part of a beggar and a liar, they set themselves to destroy the influence of those who impart such information. They declare them to be possessed of a "disordered mind," or liken them to a cowardly "dog," or by some other besmirching or degrading speech they endeavor to break down the witnesses who testify against Miss Bible College.

But the facts show that Miss Bible College is sometimes a reckless and shameless asserter of falsehood. At one time she says, "We never begged." Then when convicted of begging she does not blush, but simply says, "If it will cause opposition to cease we will never beg another dollar." At one time she says, "Because of my religion I appeal for your help," and at another time she says, "I am not a religious institution." At one time she says, "The fiction I recommend is not ungodly." At another time she says, "It is not more ungodly than some other kinds of fiction."

Nor is this all. At one time she denies that she prepares her pupils for the theatre, and at another time she has a theatrical performance under her own supervision. At one time she rolls her eyes heavenward and professes great love for truth and devotion to the Bible, while at another time she adds to the word of God, and disregards common veracity. She refuses to affirm her innocence, but unscrupulously misrepresents those who charge her with offense. Her chief defense against her accusers is in the counter accusation which she, falsely, makes that they are as bad as she is. When it suits her purpose she says, "My opponent assumes infallibility," and at another time she says, "My opponent will not say that he never makes any mistakes." Thus, like Solomon's "strange woman," "Her ways, are moveable, that thou cans't not know them" (Proverbs 5: 6).

In harmony with her unlawful origin, Miss Bible College is engaged in trying to form a union between the Church and the world. When I first began to form her acquaintance I did not know as much about her, as I do now, nor did I know fully the disposition of those who plead her cause. If I had known them I would have written to C. C. Potter, of Bowling Green, Kentucky, a very different letter from the one I addressed to him several years ago.

Miss Bible College is of a missionary disposition, and tries to convert the world by conforming to the world. For further information concerning her, the reader, is referred to a volume, titled "Mr. World and Miss Church-Member." That volume will make good reading concerning Miss Bible College until the Skirmish between the REVIEW'S Editor and the President of the Odessa College will appear in printed form. Then my readers will more fully understand than they now do, that even if Miss Bible College would change her name and quit begging, yet she would not be worthy of the confidence, of Christians.

The reader has noticed that I have, generally, made mention of the discussions between Professor Rhodes and myself as "Skirmishes," also that I have designated my discussion with Professor Armstrong as a "Skirmish." My reason for so doing is that the word "debate," among religious people, generally means a polemic battle with lines of battle well drawn and defined in one or more definite, affirmative, propositions. But when I learned that the advocates of Religio-secular Colleges lacked sufficient conviction and courage to affirm their position fairly and fully, as they were morally and logically bound to do, I decided that I would yield to their suggestion to discuss our differences without a proposition from them, and have, what I desig-

nated, "a running fight." I was well aware that such a discussion would be unsatisfactory, yet I thought that I could bring out sufficient fact and truth, even in "a running fight," to show that the Colleges I oppose are UNSCRIPTURAL and their advocates are UNRELIABLE. Their chief dependence from the first has been an effort to show that the OCTOGRAPHIC REVIEW is secular as well as religious. But the truth is that every angle at which the REVIEW touches secular affairs is only INCIDENTAL, while the angle at which the Colleges I oppose touch secular affairs is ESSENTIAL. Their method of reasoning would make the Bible a religio-secular book, and the church a religio-secular institution. It would even make the apostles religio-secular characters because they wore clothing and sandals that, perhaps, were not made by religious hands. But the institutions I oppose are THREE-FOURTHS SECULAR, and, therefore, are CHIEFLY SECULAR, and ESSENTIALLY SECULAR, and one of the purposes in establishing them was to FURNISH SECULAR EMPLOYMENT FOR CERTAIN PREACHERS.

In conclusion I wish to say, that I regret, more than words can express, the personalities which have been introduced into the discussions of the College Question, as thus far conducted. But I insist that I am not responsible for them. My opponents on this question have assailed me personally, and with one accord they have made, and persisted in, gross misrepresentations. As a result I have been under the necessity of suffering those misrepresentations to remain unexposed, or to expose them. I could not afford to let them remain unexposed, and in exposing them the character, for veracity, of those who made them has been involved. Therefore they, and only they, are responsible for the personalities which have been introduced into this discussion. The reader will please bear this in mind.