

Abilene Christian University

Digital Commons @ ACU

Stone-Campbell Books

Stone-Campbell Resources

1945

[Wallace-Hardeman correspondence, May 19, 1945-October 3, 1945]

Foy E. Wallace Jr.

Nicholas Brodie Hardeman

Follow this and additional works at: https://digitalcommons.acu.edu/crs_books



Part of the [Christian Denominations and Sects Commons](#), [Christianity Commons](#), and the [History of Christianity Commons](#)

Recommended Citation

Wallace, Foy E. Jr. and Hardeman, Nicholas Brodie, "[Wallace-Hardeman correspondence, May 19, 1945-October 3, 1945]" (1945). *Stone-Campbell Books*. 426.
https://digitalcommons.acu.edu/crs_books/426

This Book is brought to you for free and open access by the Stone-Campbell Resources at Digital Commons @ ACU. It has been accepted for inclusion in Stone-Campbell Books by an authorized administrator of Digital Commons @ ACU.

The correspondence within is not published for general distribution. A limited number of copies have been printed for the purpose of answering numerous inquiries concerning the matters contained in the exchange. The extent of the circulation of these letters will be restricted to the number of inquiries necessary to answer, and the misrepresentations necessary to correct.

May 19, 1945

Dear Bro. Hardeman:

It is true that you have had no letter from me in many months; my long silence has not been due to any mere neglect, or any lack of desire to write you. I have often wanted to write, but have felt an extreme reluctance to do so since learning that you have rather freely alluded to my private letters to you, quoting them to young preachers in FHC, to individuals in Nashville, and even making it possible for reference to their contents to be published recently in the paper at Montgomery. You can see this would force a recession on my part from the former freedom I felt in writing to you as to a trusted and confidential friend, and would compel me to write you, with deep sorrow in my heart, as one to whom every remark must be carefully guarded lest it be misused. I have waited purposely so as to be fully assured concerning the things about which I desired to write, and to make certain that my personal feelings, wounded though they might be, would in no way whatsoever intrude themselves into the things I felt it necessary to say. This letter which I now write has been most carefully studied, and is certainly not written in what anyone could describe as haste. Your last letter—the fourth from you since I had replied—is the occasion for my finally bringing myself to put into words the deep hurt which I have silently carried in my heart these many months. Believe me, I feel a disappointment, a loneliness, and an emptiness of soul as I write you that is simply impossible to describe.

I

Before making further reference to the matters which have affected me so personally, I will mention your request that I recommend a Wilcox protege for work in Detroit. T. C. Wilcox knows the church in Detroit will not accept any man he recommends; he knows also he has no influence whatsoever with me in persuading me to recommend a man. So he writes you to write me to ask the Detroit church to employ a man whom he knows they would not have in a thousand years if they were aware of the circumstances under which he was secured! Brother Hardeman, you cannot but be aware that this sort of "politics" is utterly nauseating to me—and I think to any Christian. I am disappointed that you would cooperate with T. C. Wilcox in such a scheme, and am certainly far from complimented that either of you would think I might be willing to become a party to such a deception of a faithful church.

In connection with this request of yours I am reminded of the criticism you made of me to Brother Akin some months ago in which you lamented that I had permitted myself and the Bible Banner to become too much involved in local squabbles among the brethren and in the churches. In spite of that criticism, however, you yourself have in a number of instances late-

ly sought to encourage me to enter into the very sort of thing you "regretted" to Brother Akin. For example, the Union Avenue squabble over McMillan when you sent me a batch of matter which had been given publicity in Memphis newspapers suggesting that I should give it attention in the Bible Banner. You did become involved in this mess, as did H. Leo Boles, C. E. W. Dorris, and others—but I felt it was none of my affair, and stayed out. In the same category is the Pepperdine College matter. The first information I received concerning that rumor was mailed to me out of your office by your secretary, with the notation that it would be "good matter for the Bible Banner." Your present letter inviting me to come to Henderson to discuss with you certain dangers which you think you see in the other colleges is of like character—an apparent effort to use me and the Bible Banner in waging battles which you and others are unwilling to undertake yourselves. Would you be willing to lead the fight against these dangers in an article bearing your signature? If so, why do you not do so, since almost any paper in the brotherhood would gladly publish such an article from you? If you are **not** willing to oppose these dangers yourself, why do you want **me** to do so? It is with inexpressible sorrow I have been forced to realize a fact which has been apparent to others for a long time, namely, that you and others of my friends have habitually **used** me in unsavory maneuverings of this sort. Indeed, I have been in too many instances pushed to the front by my friends to be shot at, only to have these same friends vanish when the firing began, and if not actually to join in the criticism against me, at least to acquiesce when others attacked. If your being president of a school would prevent your speaking out against the dangers in the schools (as you once told Brother Akin and me) then my being editor of a religious paper would, on the same ground, make it improper for me to deal with the errors in the teachings and policies of other papers.

Unfortunate social and moral conditions at Pepperdine College are certainly not to be condoned, but, frankly, Brother Hardeman, I believe you are in a better situation to deal with the rumors concerning FHC than with those concerning Pepperdine College. For the same sort of rumors are current against both schools—and have been against FHC for several years. For instance, against FHC there are rumors of homosexuality and other perversions of various sorts in the boys dormitory, rumors among ex-students of how a certain bachelor faculty member who lives in the dormitory has been repeatedly received into the room of the matron of the dormitory long after the students have all retired and the lights are out, sometimes as late as 2:00 o'clock in the morning, rumors and much criticism of a looseness on your part which some have construed to indicate an intimacy between you and certain girls and women con-

nected with the school wholly beyond the bounds of propriety. Then there has been widespread resentment at what has seemed to be favoritism and discrimination in the administration of the school; for instance, there are fine young gospel preachers who are making an excellent record in their work and who command the respect and confidence of the brethren where they labor who have been expelled from FHC on charges which they emphatically deny, and for which no proof has ever been forthcoming, while other boys from the dormitory are reported to have gone to Jackson, bought liquor there, got drunk, and even brought liquor back with them into the dormitory while the administration winked at their offenses and took no action at all. It would be highly dangerous for you to give too much publicity to the rumors concerning other schools when the rumors concerning your own school are such as could be fanned into a flame overnight. If a fight is to be made to clean up the moral and social conditions of the schools, and if you are to lead in the fight, then it seems imperative that your first attention be given to FHC.

Under the circumstances, brother Hardeman, I am not disposed to become involved in the numerous local problems which you have presented to me—the Memphis affair, the Pepperdine scandal, recommending a Wilcox appointee to an unsuspecting church, and entering into a private discussion with you about conditions in other schools. If the criticism you made of me to Brother Akin was sincere, you must admit the wisdom of my refusing to let you involve me in any of these various matters.

II

It is with much reluctance that I mention the matters affecting me personally. My preference would be to ignore them completely, but in fairness to you, and to give you a full and honest picture of the situation as I have been compelled to view it, I will point out the following: (1) the attitude of the young preachers coming out of FHC is more bitter toward me personally and more antagonistic toward the Bible Banner than that manifested by the students coming out of any other college among us; (2) your references to me in your classes and in private interviews with many of your students have resulted, whether you intended it so or not, in my being seriously discredited in the eyes of those students as well as in the sight of some of my friends who on occasion have visited your school; (3) friends of mine, on talking with you privately, have received the definite impression that you were seeking to weaken their faith in me, and have asked me pointedly concerning your attitude toward me; (4) evidence coming to me from Nashville of your misuse and perversion before some of your friends there of statements made to you in confidential correspondence passing between us has been too complete to be rejected.

As an example of the first and fourth items above, one of

the most capable preachers in Alabama, who is a friend of yours as well as mine, has told me that every FHC boy whom he has seen lately was full of bitterness toward the Banner and was "chuckling with glee" over the way in which you had turned down my "call for help" on the government question. This preacher friend asked me pointedly if I had appealed to you to help me in the controversy. When I told him I had not, he said that you were so reporting it and were quoting from a private letter from me to you. In view of what he said, I submitted to him the letters I had written you, and your letters to me, and asked him if he could get any such impression from the exchange. His reply was that the contents of the letters were entirely different from what was being quoted. The report seems to be current in and around Nashville that I had all but come to you on bended knees to be rescued from utter defeat!! You know, Brother Hardeman, that I did not appeal to you for help—I had plenty already—but the sum and substance of my letters to you were simply an appeal to cast aside "diplomacy" long enough to take a public stand in keeping with your private convictions on a number of things. The government question was mentioned only incidentally, because I knew what your real convictions were on that question, and I was concerned about it since many people on both sides of the issue were claiming your support. In your letter to the Draft Board at Okmulgee, Oklahoma, you state very clearly that your convictions are "otherwise" to those held by the conscientious objectors, yet certain brethren in Nashville are receiving much comfort from the belief that you are in harmony with them on the government controversy. To me that course is not **diplomacy**—it is **duplicity**. If I were disposed to use your letters as you have used mine, could I not tell the brethren around the country (whether friends or enemies of yours) that you had called on me to come to Henderson and "help you out" in the college fight?

As an example of the second and third items above, one of your students told me that in a recent class session in which you were warning young preachers against the danger of financial involvements you had used my name as an example of a preacher whose reputation was ruined by indebtedness. In this same class sat two of my very best friends—Brother and Sister G. G. Henry. I asked Brother Henry about the remarks the young preacher told me you had made. He verified the report, and although he did not believe you were malicious in your use of my name, he could see how seriously your statements would compromise me in the eyes of those who did not know me and who were unacquainted with the circumstances. I will add that if your design **had** been malicious, it could not have been more effective. The slurring editorial in the Gospel Advocate some months ago, filled with innuendoes and insinuations about my being a "better grammarian than financier" could, not possibly do

me as much harm as could the remarks you made in your class room, coming as they did from you. Certainly I have not been as successful financially as you and Brother Goodpasture. And truly I rejoice that both of you have been spared the hardships and heartaches I have known in an effort to provide for myself and those dependent on me an honest living. I might remind you, however, that while I was preaching the gospel in the hard and difficult fields of the east, often receiving barely enough to pay my railroad fare, and while I was working night and day in preparation to meet the attacks of the premillennialists against the church, you were engaged in breeding and selling fine horses (sometimes receiving more for one horse than I would be given for a whole year's work of preaching the gospel) and Brother Goodpasture was living a life of relaxation and luxury in Atlanta.

In contrast to the treatment I have been given by you and other members of your faculty before your classes has been my practice all through the years of defending you against the attacks of your enemies and against the ever current rumors concerning your character. When you had your tragic controversy with Brother Freed, and your enemies were taking advantage of that unfortunate affair to attack you, it was I who defended you vigorously and in one instance at least (Longview, Texas) prevented one of your meetings from being cancelled. But you have not reciprocated even to the least degree in recent attacks that have been made against me. Suppose I had, to the contrary, before various groups of young members of the church including young preachers, in warning them against indiscretions that would ruin their reputation, called your name as an example? What would have been the obvious effect? I believe this is a parallel. As the matter stands I have been branded an "agitator" in FHC classes by Brother Brigance and have had my integrity discredited in some of your classes—this in spite of your earnest assurance that you would dismiss instantly any member of your faculty who would make a character reflection against me before any class. It is a known fact that in all your student bodies of recent years there have been no small number who were present solely through my personal influence. Some of these students and their parents, after becoming acquainted with the school, have expressed their astonishment that I was giving such vigorous support to FHC (even to the point of offending other schools) when that institution harbored such a prevailing spirit of antagonism against me.

These, Brother Hardeman, are things that weighed heavily on my mind and heart the past few months and have distressed me much.

III

There are some things with reference to our relations to Brother Akin that I want to mention. I am not un-

mindful of your friendship for and influence with Brother Akin, and am fully conscious of what occurred back in 1936 and 1937. I shall always be grateful to him, of course, for the help he gave me, and to you for your part you had in it. But I cannot but feel that you have been unethical in your representations of that matter before your classes and in your private conversations with some of my friends in your office. You have left the impression that Brother Akkin's philanthropy in my behalf was due altogether to his friendship for you. The fact is that Brother Akin was a steadfast friend of the Wallaces for many years before he ever knew you. My father taught him out of the digressive church, and saved his soul. Brother Akin has often expressed to me his undying love and gratitude to my father for this cause.

As for my own relations with him, they extend back as far as my earliest recollections as a preacher, and we have always been confidential friends. Some years ago he told me that he wanted to educate some young preachers, and had about decided to send them to Abilene Christian College, unless I knew of a better place, and that he would leave the decision up to me. My reply was, "Brother Akin, I advise you to send the boys to N. B. Hardeman at Henderson, Tennessee, if you wish to make straight gospel preachers out of them." This was before he was personally acquainted with you, and he knew little or nothing of your school. It was through my personal influence that J. W. Akin became interested in FHC, and had I not done what I did then, FHC would not have his support today.

Personally I have always been forthright and straight-forward with Brother Akin on all issues. He has known at all times exactly where I stand. Diplomacy has never entered into my relations with him—or with any other. Where some have thought it "diplomatic" to remain silent on controversial questions, or even with a calculated carefulness to speak on both sides of the issue, I have been unable to do otherwise than to speak frankly what was my deepest conviction—regardless of the effect it might have on financial support for the Bible Banner from any individual or source.

As an example of what I mean by "diplomacy" may I call to your memory your complete endorsement of Brother C. Nichol's book, "God's Woman" and your statement that you intended to adopt it as a textbook in FHC. Then after you became aware of Brother Akin's attitude toward the matter, you performed a complete reversal. Later you promised Brother Akin in my presence that you would make a public withdrawal of your endorsement of the Nichol book; this you never did. Indeed, you could not have done so, Brother Hardeman, without perjuring your soul, for we all know that you hold the same views as Brother Nichol and R. L. Whiteside on the issue involved; but you have allowed J. W. Akin to believe that you do.

not agree with Nichol and Whiteside. You know as I do that because of his convictions on this subject Brother Akin has withheld endorsement of C. R. Nichol; yet you—holding the same views as Nichol—still retain his support. This is an enigma to me. You may call it **diplomacy**; I call it **deception**.

To me my friendship for J. W. Akin is too sacred to be put on a pecuniary basis. I have never taken advantage of his love and loyalty to try to angle contributions from him. I do recall the remark you have often made to me that "Brother Akin's all absorbing desire to go to heaven is the most effective avenue of approach to secure contributions from him." I was shocked and stunned at what I considered such a coldly calculating analysis of the best way to capitalize on the God-given instinct of a good man's heart, and I could not but feel that in your efforts to sell Brother Akin a \$200,000.00 ticket to heaven you might be in grave danger of forfeiting your own.

Brother Hardeman, this letter has not been easy to write. But I have sincerely tried to submerge and ignore every feeling of personal hurt or sting I may have felt, and have written in the earnest hope that you might be aroused to the point of forgetting "diplomacy" and speaking out boldly on every question on which you have convictions. The church is surely coming into one of the most dangerous and critical periods in all her history. She will need, as never before, the unflinching courage and uncalculating support of men who are willing to risk everything in her behalf. There is a universal criticism throughout the brotherhood that FHC students are **not** being given that sort of training and example. They are going out with an attitude entirely too political; they look around to judge the effect of it before speaking out boldly in defense of truth. Surely you cannot be unaware of the deep concern which has long been felt that FHC does less to encourage a fervent and heartfelt love for the Lord and his church than any school among us. The general spiritual apathy of the church in Henderson (no Sunday night and prayer meeting services, for instance) is having an unwholesome effect on the student body, and has become a subject of general comment among the brethren. Justly or not, you are getting the blame for it since it is generally thought that the church in Henderson is about what N. B. Hardeman makes it, you being the leading spirit of the town, the school, and the church.

I plead with you to awaken to a realization of the situation that exists. You have already passed the allotted span of normal life; I am no longer a young man. Surely it is time when both of us should be emulating J. W. Akin's "all absorbing desire to go to heaven." It is not time to be looking for earthly advantage, reward or prestige. A dozen more years will probably find you on the other side; my friends tell me that unless I work under less pressure I am pretty certain not to reach my

three score and ten. And regardless of age, neither of us has even an annual lease on life. These last years, above all others, ought to be free of earthly ambition. They should not be characterized by politicking for personal advantage. Your **example** before your students now will be worth infinitely more than any teaching you can possibly give by word of mouth. You cannot be ignorant of the almost unanimous feeling among your FHC students of many years that while they have respected your intellect and ability, they have not been impressed with your devotion to the church and unselfish adherence to principle. Too many of them have felt that you never took a stand on an issue until you had determined which way the wind was blowing. As a result of this it is a matter of general knowledge that you have been unable to hold the affection and maintain the personal confidence that students usually feel toward the head of an institution which has moulded the whole course of their lives.

Finally—regardless of whatever personal evil has been done to me, or the scars I may carry as a result of it, my chief concern is for the welfare of the church. This is infinitely more precious to me than any personal fortune. The realization that I was being attacked in the house of my friends has brought me one of the most searing disappointments I have ever experienced. Yet, as God is my witness, my feelings are those of hurt and disappointment rather than of bitterness and ill-will. I have been absolutely honest with you in this letter—diplomacy has no part in it. Indeed, in all the years of our acquaintance I have never intentionally deceived you on any question or issue that may have come up. You know I have not, and you know you can also believe me when I say that I bear you no ill-will. I would so much like to see FHC accomplish the purposes for which Brother Akin, Brother Comer and others have contributed so generously; I want to see devoted, consecrated young gospel preachers coming out from its halls in whom the love for Christ has been so deeply implanted that they never count the cost when his cause is at stake. As the school is being presently conducted I am certain those ends are not being achieved. I shall pray fervently that this letter may have some influence in effecting a change. Ignoring and forgetting all injury I have suffered, I assure you of my earnest prayers, and a helping hand in every worthy way.

—Painfully, but faithfully and fervently,
Foy E. Wallace, Jr.

May 29, 1945

Mr. Foy` E. Wallace, Jr.
Oklahoma City, Oklahoma
Dear Bro. Foy:

I have read your recent letter most carefully. I am surprised at what you have to say and at the indictments you bring. I had no idea that you felt as your letter indicates.

In sending you the Wilcox letter I did only that which he requested, knowing that you would handle it as you thought best. The paper clippings regarding church troubles would, I thought, be of interest to you. It never occurred to me that such would be offensive. Hereafter I will refrain from all such.

In making a talk to our young preachers regarding business matters, I urged them to look after all details and to make no debts which they could not pay because such would hurt not only them but the cause in general. I did mention your name as an example of one good preacher who was severely criticised because of just such matters. Since all of your affairs had been discussed publicly and privately and also in our papers, I did not think that I was doing you an injustice. In that same connection I remember to have said that all of your debts had been paid and that you had put to silence your enemies. I do not believe that I ever made a statement regarding Bro. Akin as you have put it. This would not only have been "undiplomatic" but exceeding foolish.

My horse dealings have been quite expensive and the deals I have made have brought me out about even financially. My profit has been in the pleasure of developing them.

You call attention to my promise to Bro. Akin regarding Bro. Nichol's book. I wrote an article explaining my attitude, which was that I did not endorse Bro. Nichol's suggestions regarding ladies dresses, paint, powder and so on but I only meant to endorse his exegesis of certain scriptures. I am not unaware of the fact that you have made numbers of definite promises and pledges to Bro. Akin and also that you definitely promised to write an article carrying apologies for your attacks upon brethren. I have every right and reason to believe that very few, if any, of your business promises have been fulfilled. "This is an enigma to me." "You may call it **diplomacy**; I call it **deception**."

I feel certain that no one has ever read your private letters to me. I can't recall such. When asked time and again about my attitude toward the articles you have written I have said that you criticised me for remaining silent while you waged the fight on the war question. I have also said that it seemed that both you and Bro. Cled were trying to line me up as a partisan in this matter and that I have consistently refused to become such. I do not consider this matter as a church affair at all and I have not allowed myself to have a part in a discussion, which, in my

judgment, has perhaps done more harm than good. My letter to the draft board in Oklahoma is perfectly consistent.

I am sorry, Bro. Foy, to believe that you count every man an enemy who does not share your opinion and line up with you in every fight you may wage. The stand I have taken on all matters affecting the peace and harmony of the churches is well understood and needs no comment from me.

The indictments in other matters of your letters are based solely upon rumors, which unfortunately for you, are the opposite of the truth. I do not care to "galvanize such into respectability" by any further answer.

I am glad to tell you that the church here is in fine shape. You say that you prevented the brethren at Longview from canceling my meeting and that I had never showed any appreciation of the same. In this you are again mistaken. I held a meeting at McLemore Avenue in Memphis last summer. The one you were to hold during this month had been announced. Brethren talked to me about the advisability of their canceling it due to reports that had come to them concerning you. I urged and insisted that they pay no attention to such rumors. I have, therefore, paid you back in full and the meeting you have recently held at McLemore Avenue was possibly due to what I said in your behalf.

You have ever been a good friend of mine and of this school. Students have come to us as a result of your influence. For this I shall ever be grateful. I take it that you can no longer lend your support to us. I regret this far more than I can express. Regardless of all you have said and the way you may feel, I shall ever appreciate the good work you have done. I still think you can be worth more to the cause than a house and lot in Henderson, Texas. When the final account is given, you should have due credit for the fight you have made against Premillennialism and many other "isms," that have sought to destroy the church of our Lord.

You have now committed yourself against every school among us and I am sorry you can not recommend either of them to boys and girls who may ask you about such. You should bear in mind that perfection does not attach to all of us here. "We also are men of like passions with you." We have never tried to put on an extra pious air but teach our students to be just what they are. We are not hypocritical. We pay our debts; make good our word; and all critics are urged to make personal investigation from our citizens here and from the church as to our interest in the work of the Lord.

I may differ with you on many points but above the differences and the shortcomings that I may see in you, I shall ever appreciate your labors and wish for you every good thing that is right and proper in His sight.

Faithfully yours,
N. B. Hardeman.

July 18, 1945

Dear Bro. Hardeman:

I wrote you previously not in bitterness nor in any spirit of personal resentment, but rather with a heavy heart as one whose confidence had been abused and who was deeply hurt at such treatment. I felt that our long and intimate friendship not only justified and made possible such a letter, but demanded it. It was my fervent hope that that letter might help you to see the injustice you were doing me, and cause a change both in your attitude toward me and (more important) in the influence and example you were setting before the young preachers in your classes.

Needless to say your reply was deeply disappointing. Its tone of coldness, with an undertone of spite and bitterness toward me, together with an utter failure to reciprocate the spirit in which I wrote, and the open hostility you manifest, are direct evidence that my surmises were wholly correct. You have been one man outwardly, another man inwardly, in your relations with me.

I

You say in sending me the Wilcox letter you did only that which he requested. Of course. That was my point. Wilcox asked you to get me to recommend a man to a church when he knew that church would **never** have the man if they knew he was a Wilcox protege. You said in your letter, "I think you would make no mistake," "We can recommend him most heartily," "Please write Bro. Wilcox or Bro. Keenan." And you wanted me to play politics with you and T. C. Wilcox in a scheme to deceive a faithful church. I insist again that this is the sort of backstage maneuvering which I loath—and which every Christian ought to despise. It is, indeed, "exceeding" offensive to me.

The paper clippings you thought would be "of interest" to me. You intimate that that was your only reason in sending them; you had no desire at all to see me use any of that material in the Bible Banner—for that would be doing the very thing you criticized me to Bro. Akin for doing, "meddling" in other people's problems. Next you will be saying that the notation on the papers, "Good material for the B. B.", was put there by your secretary without your knowledge or consent. You should inform your secretary that you would regret very much to see the Bible Banner "meddle" in such messy matters.

II

To me it seems incredible that any man of good will could be so blind as to fail to see the personal harm that would result from your public discussion in your classes of "my affairs," financially speaking. I believe even you could see the point if our positions were reversed, and I should be making a public example of you, warning young preachers to be careful in their contacts with women so as to avoid the sort of "rumors"

which have so seriously crippled your usefulness in the church. However much I might defend you and however vigorously I might declaim that your enemies had exaggerated the reports, can you not see that even the mention of your name in such a connection would do you irreparable harm?

There is, however, a more sinister angle to this comparison. You say, "I have every right and reason to believe that very few, if any, of your business promises have been fulfilled." Clinton Davidson himself never made a more vicious statement about me than that. Though professing to be my friend, you reveal an utter cynicism in that statement that equals, if not surpasses, anything the Davidson movement ever circulated. I have not believed the reports circulated about you. Time and again, in one state after another, I have defended your reputation; I have let no one attack you in my presence. When brethren came with what they declared was "irrefutable proof" of your incontinence in illicit affairs with women, I have refused even to listen to them. I would not "galvanize such into respectability" even to the extent of giving it a hearing. Yet at the very time I have been so vigorously defending you, you seem to have become convinced deep down in your heart that I was wilfully untrustworthy, and one whose word was worthless. You reveal your true estimate of me in saying, "I have every right and reason to believe that very few, if any, of your business promises have been fulfilled." When G. G. Henry sees that statement from you, he will no longer have any reason to doubt that your use of my name was "exceeding" malicious—and subtle.

And if that is truly your estimate of me, how has it been possible for you to recommend me to the churches as you say you have done? How could you encourage any congregation to call a man for a meeting when you actually believed that man was one who would fulfil "very few, if any" of his business promises? Do you think for one moment that I could have defended you and encouraged churches to use you if I had believed you were the prodigious fornicator and lecherous satyr you were pictured as being? You know I could not. Yet you, though believing me to be little "if any" less than a swindler in my financial dealings, claim to have encouraged the churches to continue to use me. Is that politics—or what?

Your paragraph concerning the horse dealings is interesting. I had thought you raised them for profit; but you declare you have done it only for pleasure. That makes it even more unbecoming that the president of one of our schools, a man who can afford to invest thousands of dollars in a mere hobby for pleasure and entertainment, and who has been made the personal recipient through inheritance of an individual fortune of considerable magnitude (Bro. Comer's for instance) should find it in his heart to criticize the financial struggles

of any earnest gospel preacher. I will just remind you again that while you and Brother Goodpasture were living in luxury and ease, neither of you raising a hand to stay the threatening storm of premillennialism, there were others of us working in the hard fields of the nation, often at tremendous sacrifice, preaching the gospel of Christ and making diligent preparation to wage the battle which you yourself say "saved the church from premillennialism."

III

There are several things regarding our relations with Brother Akin which you seem to have forgotten. Whether your statement regarding his "all absorbing desire to get to heaven" as "the most effective avenue of approach to secure contributions from him" was "undiplomatic" or "exceeding foolish" (or both) is beside the point. You **did** make such a statement to me—not once only, but repeatedly. And my memory of it is so vivid that I would be willing to put your words in quotation marks and declare under oath that that was what you said. On the other hand, I flatly deny ever making a promise, or even an intimation of one, that I would apologize for "attacks" in the Bible Banner on "certain brethren." Your reference to this is revealing. Just who are the "certain brethren" to whom **you** felt apology should be made? Clinton Davidson? Dr. George Benson? Dr. Brewer? Or do you refer to our replies to Brother Brigrance' attack on us? If so, for your information, Bro. Akin told me he thought Brother Brigrance received what he deserved, and you yourself advised him to "close up like a clam" when he asked your advice on what he should do about the articles in the Bible Banner. Brother Akin doubtless told you of our conversation with reference to the future service we both desired the Bible Banner to render the cause. It was his judgment that the personal element which had entered into the discussions had been given sufficient attention, and that in the future the discussions should be confined to the issues, avoiding as far as possible all personalities, making it clear to our readers that it has never been our purpose to engage in personalities for the sake of attacking men; that such has been done only when the issue required it; and that it was our desire to keep the Banner as free in the future of such personalities as our enemies would permit us. Brother Akin himself suggested, however, that such a statement should not be allowed to leave the impression that "the gap was down" for personal attacks on us without any reply from us. In all this I fully concurred; and could cite you to the issues in the Bible Banner in which such statements were made. Your effort to make this a parallel with the sudden reversal of your decision to use "God's Woman" as a text-book in F. H. C. but your subsequent failure to fulfill your promise to Brother Akin to withdraw your endorsement of the book is certainly wide of the mark.

Brother Akin has indeed been generous with me, and my appreciation has been unbounded. But may I remind you that where he has given me a hundred dollars, he has given you and F. H. C. a thousand. Indeed, he has given you personally even more than he realizes. For it is the talk of the brethren generally that you have pulled one of those "smooth" deals of diplomacy in arranging the fund in such a way that the preacher boys get only the barest minimum of help from the fund, while all the "velvet" goes to the school. For it is the tuition that is paid by the fund, not the board and room. Any preacher who could raise enough to pay for board and room could surely scrape together enough extra dollars to pay the tuition. But the pittance which they receive from the fund is almost a mockery—and is hedged about with so many restrictions and such conditions that it places any young man who accepts it at a distinct disadvantage during the early years of his preaching. Indeed, instances are known in which deserving young gospel preachers have refused to attend F. H. C. under the Akin Fund plan because they were unwilling to "mortgage" their future in any such fashion. So that instead of the Akin Fund being a genuine help to worthy young men, as you are administering it, it has served only to fatten your own purse.

IV

I believe you must realize that your promise to Brother Akin concerning the endorsement of "God's Woman" has never been fulfilled. Our whole conversation at Eureka had to do with woman's place in the church, not merely with the length of her dresses, powder, paint, and such. Because he has a deep seated conviction that Brother Nichol's position on I Corinthians 11 and other passages is unscriptural, Brother Akin was distressed at your endorsement. He felt you must share Nichol's ideas. That you did share them (and still do, as all your student preachers well know) is evident from the endorsement you gave his book: "I have read carefully 'God's Woman.' This is a most thorough discussion of what the Bible says about women. The arguments are clear and logical. The author does not evade such difficult passages as I Cor. 14:34, 35 and I Tim. 2:11, 12. He does not share the opinions held by many commentaries. I verily believe he has gone to the heart of what Paul had in mind and brought forth the truth. This book will serve as a text in Freed-Hardeman College. I commend the book to all interested in learning about 'God's Woman.' " That was your endorsement prior to our conversation with Brother Akin; that was the endorsement you promised to withdraw. And that is the endorsement Brother Nichol still carries in his advertisement of the book. I have been where circulars were received from him this very month with that endorsement from you. And I know C. R. Nichol well enough to declare that not one single letter would come from his address with your en-

dorsement **after** you had withdrawn the endorsement. You made Bro. Akin a faithful promise to withdraw the endorsement. Men who knew you said at that time that you would not do so. You did not do so. Really, Brother Hardeman, did you intend to do so at Eureka Springs, or were you stalling Brother Akin off?

V

You are quite wrong in saying that I have "committed" myself against every school among us. If your charge should be true (which it emphatically is not) the only difference between us would be that you have committed yourself against every school among us—save one. Would you be willing to "recommend" Harding College? Lipscomb College? Pepperdine College? You have personally tried to involve me in a fight against every one of them at various intervals. I am not against the colleges. That is an old, old charge which has often been made. I have never been against them; I have never committed myself against "either of them." There was a time when I was definitely committed **for** one of them, but that certainly did not mean that I was committed against "either" of the others. When young people come to me in the future asking me to suggest which of the schools they should attend, I will tell them frankly that there are good points and bad points in "either" of the schools, and that so far as I am concerned, I see little to choose between them. "Either of them" will do as well as any of them. Instead of my being committed against the schools the very opposite is true. There is only one school where you think young people might profitably go; as for me, I have no preference. Unlike you, I am not committed against all the schools but one; nor have I made "indictments" against any of them—including yours. I merely called your attention to the indictments coming from you with the warning that the same sort of rumors were being circulated against your school as against the others. If you refuse to "galvanize into respectability" the rumors against your own school by "any further answer," why could not the other schools, on the same basis, refuse to "galvanize into respectability" the rumors against them by making an answer?

In your letter to me of May 2 you state "I regret to learn of what has been said regarding Pepperdine College. . . These are matters that I would like to discuss with you." It seems that you wanted to "galvanize" these rumors against George Pepperdine College. I shall not permit you to shift me into a prosecution of any of the schools. My former letter merely called your attention to the danger of your initiating a campaign against the other schools on the basis of such rumors as mentioned in your letter to me of May 2, and as contained in the "Good material for the B. B." document mailed to me from your office when your own school was vulnerable on the same basis, or at least the

victim of the same type of rumors. If you can ignore the rumors against yourself and your school with good grace, would not the same policy permit the other schools to do likewise? And why should I prosecute them at your suggestion in the Bible Banner when you say that such rumors should not be "galvanized into respectability" by an answer?

VI

You say you cannot recall anyone's ever having read the letters I sent you. Perhaps they have not actually read them, but it makes little difference whether they see the paper or not, for they are able to make quotations from them almost verbatim. And they are so certain that you are "on their side" that they use these quotations from my letters openly, even printing them in their papers. If you did not reveal the contents of the letters, how was it possible for such quotations to be made? You "refuse to line up" as a "partisan" in the matters confronting the church, yet you let both sides believe they have your full endorsement and support! What about your famous post-card boast? Can you tell us what you believe on the government question, or the Christian's part in the war on a post-card, and answer the question without evasion or fence-straddling? If you can, will it make you a partisan? Why not let the whole church have your position in unequivocal terms?

Your letter to the draft board you declare to be "perfectly consistent." Well, in that letter you say you are stating "the policy of the Church of Christ" on the war question. If what you state is the "policy of the Church of Christ," then surely every Christian ought to agree with it. In that letter you definitely "line up" as being "otherwise" than a conscientious objector to the Christian's participation in the war. Does that make you a partisan? If this is not a "church matter," then why did you take it upon yourself to give the draft board "the policy of the Church of Christ"? Instead of your letter to the draft board being "perfectly consistent" it is perfectly ridiculous. Even your phraseology, Brother Hardeman, is sectarian and unscriptural, and your "policy" is exactly that—policy and not principle.

Far be it from Cled and me to try to "line you up" as a partisan in this matter. It was Brother Brigrance, your own colleague, who embarrassed you "in this matter." Neither Cled nor I had said or written one thing in your direction until Brother Brigrance' attack on us forced a reply, which Brother Akin said he merited. He said, furthermore, that he was glad we did it. Instead of your "consistently" refusing to become a partisan, you have very inconsistently become a partisan on both sides. You have followed the same course on this question that some whom you have "severely criticized" followed on the premillennial question. If this question should become as clearly defined before the brotherhood as has premillennialism, many are

wondering what your "policy" would be.

VII

That I have been deceived all along in your personal estimate of me is apparent from your letter. You believe me to be one who keeps "few, if any" of his business promises. You doubt my sincerity and impugn my integrity. The only thing for which you give me any credit at all is the fight on premillennialism—a fight in which you publicly joined **after** it was evident which way the wind was blowing. You assert that your "stand" on "all matters" is "well understood" and "needs no comment," but if you would put your ear to the ground, you would hear plenty of comment from others. Such a course is an easy way out, but it does not answer questions. In the same connection you say that all your "critics" are "urged" to come to Henderson and make an investigation, but what school is there among us that could not and would not say the same?

Finally, you say that you "may differ" with me on "many points," and apparently my "shortcomings" have been a favorite topic in your class discussions. I was not aware of the existence of such differences. What are these differences? In all our long and intimate acquaintance you never once hinted of them before. With reference to my "shortcomings" I daresay there is not another college president among us with the possible exception of your contemporary, Dr. Benson, who would permit my name and character, or that of any other man, to become a topic for class discussion in the school. Such a thing would be considered even by non-christian institutions as a wholly unethical thing.

As poignant as is the pain of realizing your attitude, I am nevertheless glad that I am no longer in darkness as to my status with you, or in ignorance of the attitude of your school which I have so long and so often defended and befriended. While I have lost in you and your school a friend, you have not made in me an enemy. I shall simply strive to ignore the situation as best I can for the sake of the cause, and shall continue as in the past, regardless of friend or foe, to face every issue forthrightly. This, I believe, will be "right and proper in His sight."

Faithfully,
Foy E. Wallace, Jr.

July 25, 1945.... ..

Mr. Foy E. Wallace, Jr.

Oklahoma City, Ola.

Dear Bro. Foy:

I am just in to have your letter of recent date. I have neither the time nor the disposition to enter into a discussion of the matters you mention. I am truly sorry that you feel toward me as your letter indicates. I know how easy it is to hear of a thing through second or third hands and then to put an interpretation upon it never intended by the original.

Many of the items you mention could be easily made clear if we could talk about them direct. I have never sought to injure you in any way, whatsoever. The reverse has always been my attitude.

I have said that I thought you had made mistakes in some of your attacks upon brethren and in some of your articles. I have also referred to your business deals and have used such as an example of how a good preacher may be careless along these lines. I do not believe that any harm will come to you as a result of what I had to say. You should know that all brethren freely talk about these matters and it is nothing new to any one.

In spite of the many criticisms you offer, I am disposed to overlook the same and I will not allow you to make me an enemy. I shall continue to recommend you for meetings wherever and whenever the occasion calls for such.

t I wish for you every success. Faithfully yours,

N. B. Hardeman.

August 3, 1945

Mr. N. B. Hardeman, President
Freed-Hardeman College
Henderson, Tennessee
Dear Brother Hardeman:

There is no desire "whatsoever" on my part to force you "into a discussion of the matters mentioned" but your rejoinders to my letters carry a vein of implications that cannot be "overlooked" and to which in a final word, I am compelled to reply for the sake of keeping the record sufficiently clear to speak for itself in the event of necessity.

1. In reference to what you call my "business deals" you have said "I have every right and reason to believe that few, if any, of your business promises have ever been fulfilled." That statement is false. You have neither right nor reason to believe or say any such thing. But appearing innocent of any reflection on me, in the face of that statement, you say that you are "truly sorry" that I feel toward you as my letter indicates. What attitude toward me on your part does your statement indicate? Reversing the case, as I have insisted, how would **you** feel toward **me**? There can be no compromise in the statement you have made. It draws an issue, and a very serious one. You should either retract it or go all the way with Clinton Davidson.

You say that you have not sought to injure me in these things. Would you consider it an injury to you if I should make an example of you before various audiences when teaching against certain indiscretions with which you have for many years been charged? "You should know that all brethren freely talk of these matters and it is nothing new to anyone."

When you "referred" to my "business deals" did you think of those indiscretions in conduct with which you have so often been charged and "use such as an example of how a good preacher may be careless along these lines"? Are you in your own heart sufficiently without blame to even cast a stone?

It would be far easier for me to explain your criticisms of my "business deals" than it would be for you to explain the criticisms of some "deals" with which you have been charged. It is not in the spirit of retaliation that I press this point, but rather to make you see, if I can, the perfect puerility of your insistence that you do "not believe any harm" could come "as a result" of your course in this matter. Even so, my whole point in the matter is not that I am concerned over the "harm" or the "injury" that may be done to me but rather the deep disappointment I am experiencing in the knowledge that you have been one man to me inwardly but another outwardly.

The inconsistency of your thinking that I should support your school, use my influence to send students from the homes of my

friends to your school instead of to some others, to have them hear in the class-room my reputation impeached and my character discredited, is amazing. Yet you see no "injustice" and acknowledge "no wrong" in the matter. It is generally known that your own success in business has been due to good fortune; and for one who has been so fortunate as to become financially independent by gifts and bequests, to criticise in class-room and conversation the misfortunes of a fellow-preacher, comparing your successes with his reverses, comes with "exceeding" poor grace.

2. You say: "I have said that I thought you had made mistakes in some of your attacks upon brethren and in some of your articles." On this point I believe I have every "right and reason" to ask you when you began to "think" that? To what "attacks" upon what "brethren" do you refer? You wanted me to attack other schools and sent me "good material for the B. B." from your own office for that purpose. You wanted me to attack conditions at George Pepperdine College and sent me that messy stuff to put in the Bible Banner, and you have all the time encouraged me to wage a fight against Harding College with strong intimations at times that you would like to see me "attack" David Lipscomb College. I believe that I now have the right to insist that you name the "attacks" and the "brethren" to whom you refer. Really, Brother Hardeman, is it not a fact that your objection to "some of your attacks upon brethren" dates from our reply to the attack that Brother Brigance made on "the Wallace Brothers"?

3. You say: "In spite of the many criticisms you offer, I am disposed to overlook the same and I will not allow you to make an enemy of me." To which I reply that I am not the source of the "many criticisms" which I "offer" you. They are matters concerning which "all brethren freely talk." I merely called your attention to them when you wanted me to publicize the same type of rumors against another school which you consider a rival. You are ignoring the point and attempting to make it appear that I am the author of such criticisms. But it is not a lack of mental dexterity that causes you to miss the point. You know the source of these "many criticisms" quite as well as I do, and you should have been mindful of them before your office mailed me that "good material for the B. B." against another school. And now you would lecture me about "attacks" upon "brethren"!

Though you charge that I count every man who "disagrees" with me as "an enemy" the evidence will show, in this instance at least, that "the reverse has been my attitude." I came straight to you with these matters, as a man and a Christian should. Why should that "make" of you anything other than what you already were? No one can read my letters and say that I have written you as an enemy.

4. You say that you have "neither time nor the disposition" to discuss these matters with me, but you appear to have both the time and the disposition to discuss "these matters" in your classes. It is not difficult, however, for me to understand why you do not wish to "enter into a discussion of," or attempt to explain such matters as your dilemma of your sudden reversal on the indorsement of "God's Woman," and why; your request for me to become a party to a political scheme you were aiding T. C. Wilcox to work on an unsuspecting church in Detroit; your effort to use the Bible Banner as a medium for circulating slanderous rumors against another college; your attempt to involve me in a local church wrangle where you have some personal interest, the McMillan-Memphis episode; and—that embarrassing Draft Board letter in which you volunteer to state "the policy of the Church of Christ." These matters, I must admit, are difficult to explain in the light of your criticisms of me.

There is no doubt in my mind that you both see and feel the force of the parallels that I have drawn in these matters; and it is my opinion, based on the evasive phraseology of your own letters, that it is "neither time nor disposition" that restrains you, but the realization that you cannot "enter into a discussion" of them without admission of your violation of all honor and ethics in the course you have pursued. To say that you have "neither time nor disposition," aside from being too trite, is not true. You have a stenographer at your beck and call, and it would require no more time for you to say the proper things in these matters than you have consumed in your repetition of unkind, unethical and untrue implications.

In a final word, had your closing remarks been accompanied with the slightest indication of a change in your own course and conduct, I would have responded accordingly and in the same measure. But to me, friendly gestures are empty when they are made with efforts to justify contrary actions. This is not a matter of becoming enemies. Rather is it a matter of friendship, the which I cannot accept from any man on the basis of consenting to allow him to make a political football of me, to be kicked around at his good pleasure. My name and character are as sacred to me as yours could ever have been to you; and you have no more right to discredit me before your classes than I would have to scandalize you before my audiences.

Politicians play friendships against diplomatic advantage and disadvantage, but that is not my idea of things. Men who are not friends need not necessarily become enemies, but friendship must exist on a mutual basis. It is not a one-way thing. It works both ways, but it does not work both ends against the middle. Nor does friendship exist in mere favors exchanged, marked "paid in full." I would not sell my freedom of thought and action, my honor and my conscience, for a million times the

value of a "house and a lot in Henderson" of which you are wont so frequently to remind me, as though by some sort of "deal" I am not my own but am bought with a price. No man of principle could so much as hint of friendship on a bought basis.

You are wrong in this matter, Brother Hardeman. Since you are not big enough to make proper amends, then the least I can ask of you is that you be honorable enough to discontinue the subtle references to me in your classes; just do not mention me at all. In your offer to "continue" to "recommend" me, either with or without reservations, you pay me no compliment and do yourself no credit in the light of all that you have said. Knowing this, I could not accept an invitation on such a recommendation. It would be purely political. Not being a politician myself, I have nothing to offer you in return, and you have nothing that I want on such a basis.

Trusting that you may yet see these things as they really are, and that you may do what is right about them I am,

Faithfully yours and His,

Foy E. Wallace, Jr.

Mr. Foy E. Wallace, Jr.,
Oklahoma City, Okla.

August 7, 1945

Dear Bro. Foy:

I am in this morning to find your letter. The quotation you make in the first paragraph was based upon a statement made to me by one of your benefactors and best friends. He told me of the many relations he had had with you, of the notes you had signed, and definite promises made. He also said that, through the years, you had failed to make good on practically everything you had promised. This, in substance, was the occasion for my remark. He also told me that he had asked you to write an article apologizing or modifying some attacks made in your paper, and that you definitely assured him such would be done, but in this, you had absolutely failed. You know whether or not these things are true. My statement was based upon these remarks made to me and were intended to be limited to that. I repeat that it has never been my intention to injure you, and I do not believe that what I have said to young men in our classes had that effect, unless some boy wanted to create a difference between you and me.

Were you to lecture to young preachers and say to them that reports of indiscretion had been made about some of our very best preachers, including N. B. Hardeman, and you then warned them to be exceeding careful, I would not think of being offended at you, nor would I consider that you were trying to do me an injury. That is the light in which you ought to view whatever remarks I made.

In your second paragraph, you ask: to what attacks I refer? This, I have answered in the above. The matter with Bro. Brigrance had no effect upon me whatsoever, either way.

Your references to politicians is purely gratuitous. I could but be amused at your criticisms of the way the school has handled its donations. There have been possibly one hundred friends who have sent money to us, but it remains for you, alone, to criticize the way such has been handled. If those who gave it are satisfied with our handling of the funds sent, it seems to me that you should, at least, withhold your verdict. Our records are open and we have done exactly with such funds as were promised to those who have donated the same.

At your request, I shall do my best to avoid mentioning your name hereafter. This, I regret, very much. I may be forced to adopt Bro. Tant's method when he agreed never to mention baptism during an entire meeting.

I think you are unnecessarily wrought up and I repeat that I do not intend to share the feeling that your letter indicates. I have never attacked you nor have I ever said one word, the intention of which was to do you injury. If such has been the result, I regret it.

Faithfully yours,

N. B. Hardeman.

September 9, 1945.

Mr. N. B. Hardeman,
Freed-Hardeman College,
Henderson, Tennessee

Dear Brother Hardeman:

It has not been possible until now to reply to your latest communication. Your effort to lay the blame for your statements on Brother Akin is more cowardly than your class room criticisms of me. It was you who made the unqualified charges in your letters. You would now recede from them without retraction, seeking to shift the responsibility by shunting them off on Brother Akin. Had you not, yourself, been quite "wrought up" you would never have made the statements you now disclaim. They are false; and I believe you knew them to be false when you made them. They are character attacks less bold but no less subtle than the attacks of that element which you have apparently joined, representing a complete reversal of your attitude, evidently dating from the articles in the Bible Banner exposing the faculty of your school on an issue concerning which you did not want your personal views known.

No notes exist between Brother Akin and me, but when I think of the note you secured from him with a degree of guile, the return of which he requested when he realized the "business deal" you had manipulated, it strongly suggests that you are not the one to be talking of "notes" and "promises." The same is true of your references to "attacks." I know what Brother Akin said to me; and it was not what you have said. But as I think of that typewritten matter against another school which came to me from your office, marked "good material for the Bible Banner" your lecturing me concerning attacks on others can be regarded only as sheer and crass hypocrisy. You are not the one to be talking of "notes" and "promises" and "attacks." It appears to me that you should drop those subjects.

Your cautious admission that the public mention of your name as an example of indiscretions with women would do you no injustice is quite interesting. A case may test the candor of your capitulation on this point. When Floyd A. Decker warned the young preachers against such indiscretions in an address before your students, it was not necessary to use the "Tant method" in a reference to you, for when he exclaimed, "Young men, keep your hands off the women!" all eyes turned upon you, and it was reported that your face became "exceeding" red. Your reluctant acknowledgment on this point amounts to a confession of the many such indiscretions with which you have "through the years" been charged, a confession no one ever expected you to make, and is the unmistakable evidence of your frustration and embarrassment in the matters that are being pressed upon you.

It did not "remain" for me to criticise either your handling of funds or your handling of women. It merely remained for me to mention the current talk as a reminder that it is imprudent for you to initiate attacks on another school, as you have upon various occasions sought to do through the Bible Banner, while at the same time criticising me to my back to Brother Akin and to others. If you believe, as you said, that I should "withhold" criticisms of you, it would seem to me that you should have withheld your criticisms of me. It is a poor rule that does not work both ways. You are simply being fed out of your own spoon; if you do not like it, I suggest that you change the spoon.

If there were anything about this whole matter amusing, I myself "could but be amused" at seeing how quickly you took up the reports on your methods of securing and appying funds. Of the others you said that since they were "based" upon the "mere rumor" you would not "galvanize them into respectability by an answer.." This one, then, must be based upon more than rumor as you quickly "galvanized" it by "an answer." It has been a general saying that you have "feathered your own nest." There are many rumors concerning the "many relations" various ones "have had" with you "through the years," but these rumors did not originate with me. "You know whether or not these things are true."

Your record as a politician speaks for itself. The newspapers have more than once connected your name with complimentary political activities, and brethren have complained that the church was being hurt by your politics. It has been a common comment among the politicians that Hardeman votes the "Campbellites" in West Tennessee like Crump votes the "niggers" in Shelby county. Your letter to the Draft Boad was itself a political document, claiming the high prerogative of stating the "policy" for the whole "Church of Christ." Both your qualifications and your right to do such a thing may well be questioned. If for no other reason, no man would be qualified to write the policy for the church who refuses to state his own position to the church. When a man who takes as big a hand in politics as you do, withholds his position on the government question in order to stand in with certain groups in the church, he is playing politics with both the church and the government, and to call him what he is, simply a cheap politician, could not be "gratuitous."

That portion of your letter which attempts to turn the whole matter off as a joke is not impressive. If these things were no more serious with me than they appear to be with you, I could meet your levity with jocularly less hackneyed. But with me, these matters are not frivolities, and you cannot jest them away with a sort of Charlie McCarthy laugh on a remark too trite to

tickle anyone else. It seems to be a habit of yours to become facetious when you ought to be serious. Under some circumstances, jocosity is clever, but at other times it is stupid.

If it is true that you do not "share the feeling" that my letters indicate, it is due to the obvious reason that I have given you no occasion to do so. Your claims of good feeling and good will toward me, viewed in the light of the things you have done and said, appear to be the old tactics of offering me sugar in one hand while you throw acid in my eyes with the other. You could have ameliorated the matter had you been so disposed, but your spirit throughout has been that of superiority, assuming the right to belittle another, void of humility to admit an error or rectify a wrong, even now intimating your intention to continue anonymously the course you have so inconsistently sought to justify. You have thus made an issue of my character. But I would be willing to compare my personal record of moral conduct and of honesty of dealings with yours, you beginning where you please, and I would begin in the vicinity of Henderson, Tennessee. Several good men in the church have written me letters saying that "hundreds would rise overnight" to assist me whenever such is needed.

I have challenged your right to smear my name and reputation in your classes. It is not a matter of personal harm that concerns me, but rather the low thing that you are doing. If it is your decision to offer no assurance that this method shall be discontinued, I have no further overtures to make to you, we have simply come to the parting of the ways. It is my conviction that some of your trustees, knowing them as I do, will not approve the course you have pursued. You have revealed where you stand in reference to me, and what my status is with the school that I have so often befriended and defended. It has confirmed the warning that men who have known you for years have repeatedly given me, that N. B. Hardeman is a friend to no man beyond the use that he may make of that man. I was loathe to believe it, but I am convinced that it is true. Being no longer in the dark, I can be governed accordingly in what I may do or say.

Regretfully,
Foy E. Wallace, Jr.

Sept. 15, 1945

Mr. Foy E. Wallace, Jr.
Oklahoma City, Okla.,
Dear Bro. Foy:

I am just back from Memphis to have your letter. I am sorry that you have the attitude this letter evidences. It is really hard for me to believe that you feel as your statements indicate. I think you are making much ado over a small affair. It just looks like that you enjoy a personal argument. I am glad to say that I do not covet such matters.

When you are in this section, come to see me and I have an idea that after discussing a number of things, you will have a different attitude. It takes a good while to build up friends, and I regret the loss of any. It is my avowed purpose to try to so live that when I come to pass on, no man can say "I have lost an enemy."

I hope all may be well with you.

Faithfully yours,
N. B. Hardeman.

September 27, 1945

Mr. N. B. Hardeman,
Henderson, Tennessee
Dear Brother Hardeman:

I am not "just in" from anywhere, but I have your latest and I answer to assure you that I do "really" feel exactly as my statements indicate. I do not doubt that to you it is "a small affair" for you to discredit my name in your classrooms, but I want you to know that it is no small thing to me. The only small thing about it is the smallness of your actions in the whole thing. I repeat that you have no more right to discredit me before your classes than I would have to scandalize you before my audiences.

Your remark on "personal arguments," like your reference to "attacks on brethren," is just another absolutely untrue and wholly unnecessary assertion, the same in character as others you have made in this correspondence. In view of your own efforts to involve me at various times and in various ways in arguments with others over matters to your own interest it comes with more and more poor grace for you to talk of "attacks" and "arguments."

You refused to name **what** attacks, on **what** men, for to do so would reveal where your actual sympathies are. Though you do not "covet such matters" personally, you have instigated them by persuading others to pull your chesnuts. I shall continue to remind you that while you were avoiding making enemies you were trying to use me to do and say things in the B. B. which you were yourself unwilling to say or do. Thus, while you express an "avowed purpose" to avoid making enemies, you have been quite willing for me to make enemies on your behalf and on the behalf of your school—only then to take up a dagger and stab me in the back. So, on this point let me add that while I do not hope to live without enemies, it is my "avowed purpose" that none may ever say when I "pass on" that "he betrayed a friend."

You would now make it appear that I have sought to inveigle you into a personal argument, when, as a matter of fact, my letters to you have been in protest of your own words and actions. I came to you in the right manner and in the right way. You replied with various statements and implications of studied aspersion. One by one you have receded from your every assertion without honorable retraction, shifting from one thing to another, and finally ignobly shunting the responsibility off on a mutual friend and benefactor. That was the climax of all the unworthy things that you have said and done.

You have been unable to escape the parallels and now assume the attitude of injured innocence, and your efforts to justify your course are pitiable for a man of your intelligence. Once your statements were answered you made no reply, simply because you have none to make. Now you seek to ignore

the whole thing and minimize it all with a "come to see me" gesture. I attach no importance to myself; neither do I attach that much importance to you; and I have too much self-respect to belittle myself in coming to your office to discuss matters in which you are, yourself, the offender and aggressor. "Coming" in this case should be done by you. Already I have gone far beyond what should be demanded in these matters involving your own unethical behavior. If you are satisfied with the status—then it is **status quo** with me. You will not find me groveling at your feet for favor which I certainly shall not seek. I know of nothing in reason or ethics that would require me to come to see you at your office in Henderson, Tennessee. It is this feeling of self-importance on your part that has caused you to persist in a course which "it is really hard for me to believe" you do not know to be wrong. No, I will not come to Henderson to see you. But if I were in your place, having treated a true friend as you have treated one, I would crawl across the continent to see him and make amends. I would not do to an enemy what you have done to a friend. It is true that it takes "a good while to build up friends" but stabbing one in the back is the sure way to "lose any." You can neither build nor hold them by such methods.

I hate to say it—but my confidence in your ideals, your ethics, and your sincerity has been broken. To say that it is a disappointment, a very bitter disappointment, is a mild expression of my innermost feelings.

In sincere regret,

Foy E. Wallace, Jr.

Sept. 28, 1945

Mr. Foy E. Wallace, Jr.
Texarkana, Texas
Dear Bro. Foy:

I have yours this morning, in which you continue to repeat that which I have disclaimed, viz.; that I have paraded your name to your discredit. I certainly have done no such thing. When I referred to the matter, I knew that Bro. and Sister Henry were good friends of yours, and certainly I would not have tried to injure you in their presence.

Everybody knows your status and all about your having taken advantage of the bankrupt law and that Bro. Akin paid your old obligations and settled everything for you, in full. All of this was at my suggestion to Bro. Akin. Just why you think I would try to injure you is strange to me. I have no personal or unkind feeling toward you whatever and you are missing the mark, wholly, in continuing such an accusation.

I deny, most positively, having betrayed you and what I said, and the connection in which it was said, has never hurt you one particle, nor was anything made known that had not already been published in the papers and freely discussed by both your friends and enemies.

My inviting you to come by, sometime when convenient, carried no implication that I wanted you to humble yourself or bow before me. I repeat that I am sorry your reaction to all that I have said is as you state.

I see no use for furthering a correspondence and I indulge the hope that time may help to overcome your present feeling.

Faithfully yours,
N. B. Hardeman

October 3, 1945

Mr. N. B. Hardeman,
Henderson, Tennessee
Dear Brother Hardeman:

It is quite evident that so far as inducing you to do anything right about matters involved in this exchange, there is "no use furthering a correspondence," but you have written at sufficient length to reveal the real spirit in you. In view of your attitude, I wonder why you ever entered into a correspondence by even answering my first letter, because your answers have served no good purpose but rather added to the things which you had said in classroom and conversation previously. It is bad enough for you to do as you have done in these matters, and it is far worse to attempt to justify yourself. Now you want to quit, and I don't blame you. But you have started something which you cannot order stopped at your will. It takes help to turn some things loose.

You disclaim "parading" my name to my "discredit" and assert that you would certainly not have "tried such in the presence of" my friends. But you did just that, more than once. The occasion upon which G. G. Henry was present was only one of many. You would be surprised to learn how many instances of such have been reported to me by reliable brethren. The use of what you claim has already been known and discussed would furnish you no excuse to perpetuate such in your classrooms. Even the tone and the manner of your references to it in your letters indicate clearly your own attitude. My friends understood then, and still do, why it was necessary to resort to legal relief and protection for a time; they knew my motives and intentions and were in full sympathy with the purposes; but no friend would make the use of it that you have made and are making.

Reversing the case again, should I see in my audiences some of your friends and should call your name as an example, for instance, of moral misconduct, with which you have often actually been charged, for me to then "disclaim" any intention of "parading" your name to your "discredit" would be absurd. If you should object in such a case, I could with equal consistency quote your words:

"I deny most positively having betrayed you and what I said, and the connection in which it was said, has never hurt you one particle, nor was anything made known that had not already been published in the papers and freely discussed by both your friends and enemies."

Having previously admitted, as you did, that you are an example of indiscretions with the womenfolk, it would not be amiss to pass that word on to teachers and professors in other colleges that would not object to knowing your admission, also to various

preachers in the churches, and let them all begin making mention of your name in such connection, since you insist that there is no injustice in such. It would be very interesting indeed to know what your reaction would be. I do not think you are the smartest man in the world, as some do, but you are not so dull of mind as not to be able to see the significance of this parallel.

As for Brother Akin doing what he did at your suggestion, I again remind you that all that he has ever done for you or your school is the result of my suggestions to him. Time was when my advice would have directed his financial liberality to other schools than yours. This you know, but this you also ignore, and would leave the impression on all that your own influence with Brother Akin was the original factor. The truth is that not one dollar of J. W. Akin's money would have gone to you or to your college had it not been for me.

The liberality bestowed by Brother Akin upon both of us has been for the sake of the cause. He regarded it as an investment. There is no actual difference in the purposes of his contributions, whether to me or to you, but where he has invested one dollar in me and my work, he has invested one thousand dollars in you and your school, and your remarks on this score are thoroughly unbecoming and ill-bred. It seems that you cannot separate anything from the political. It was at that time and in that connection that you had plans involving the Gospel Advocate. Men of integrity and discrimination told me then that your suggestions to Brother Akin were all a part of a plan of yours to get control of the Gospel Advocate through Brother Akin and me and by having me obligated to you, as editor, the Advocate would be under your direction and at your command. I discounted these opinions then, but in the light of developments, I would not put it past you at all. I have wondered if Brother McQuiddy did not sense something of that sort as a reason for receding from his commitments to you. As you have shown yourself to be so political in everything, I regret ever having accepted a favor at your hands and I will never do so again—never.

The spirit of your assumed prerogative to make an example of the name and affairs of another and your effort to justify doing so in this correspondence, set you out as the autocrat you have been said by many to be. It appears to confirm the feeling of so many that Brother A. G. Freed was crushed by such treatment at your hands and went to his grave broken-hearted. These same brethren have repeatedly warned me against such treatment at your hands, insisting that N. B. Hardeman is a friend to no man beyond his selfish ambitions and political interests.

It is by no means certain that even your own financial record will bear close scrutiny. In other ways, Brother Hardeman, it is known to all that your mistakes have been many.

Charges against your name and character through many years have come from every section where you have gone, and you have left a long trail of ugly reports and alleged indiscretions with women. Humility would demand that you "take heed unto thyself," amend your ways, and try to go to heaven, rather than in a proud and haughty spirit of conceit to be making an example of others, in your classrooms.

You have not been smooth enough, with all your diplomacy, to conceal your purposes in these things, for not less than a dozen different brethren have told me of your use of my name upon different occasions and in different ways, and they have all said with one accord that they could see through your feigned friendship the evident design of such. You have not deceived anyone of discernment by your tactics.

For months I have felt deeply hurt, and approached you in my first letter as an injured friend. Your reply only added insults to injuries, accompanied by insinuations and implications, in an effort to justify your crime against confidence and friendship. But my feelings are altogether different now. This correspondence has turned my disappointment into disgust and my hurt into utter contempt for your conduct in this matter. It is generally known that you have avoided hard fields and personal sacrifices and have lived in plenty, having inherited various fortunes and having been the recipient of many generousities from well-to-do men, all of which makes your criticism the more unbecoming and ill-bred, lacking altogether your boasted culture and breeding.

Since you appear to be so utterly devoid of a sense of ethics toward another, I am sorry that I cannot "indulge the hope that time" may change your own way of doing and therefore "help to overcome your present feelings." Frankly, as I now feel, since I know the treatment to expect at your hands in your classes, I shall maintain an entirely different attitude toward anything that you may say or do. I shall simply regard such exactly as I do the same sort from other sources and shall consider and treat it accordingly. But I do not believe you will profit thereby, as you evidently think you will. Farewell.

Sincerely,

Foy E. Wallace, Jr.

NOTE

After this correspondence was closed by Brother Hardeman's own request, he apparently took advantage of my last letter being made final by its being signed off "farewell," and I received from him a long communication reiterating all of the insinuations, inuendoes, jabs and stabs of all his other letters. It was, in fact, but a combination and repetition of all his other letters, and exceeded them in austerity and the attitude of superiority which he had maintained throughout. In the character of them all, he added insults to injuries and pursued

the artful manner characteristic of Hardeman smoothness, of handing me sugar with one hand but throwing acid in my eyes with the other. I made no answer to the letter. It deserved none. And is not printed here for the reason that it would only begin all over again a correspondence which was closed at his on instance.—F. E. W. Jr.