

Harding University Scholar Works at Harding

John Allen Chalk: Personal Correspondence

John Allen Chalk

10-15-1968

From/To: Reuel Lemmons (Chalk's reply filed first)

Reuel Lemmons

Follow this and additional works at: https://scholarworks.harding.edu/hst-chalk-personal

Recommended Citation

 $Lemmons, R.~(1968). From/To: Reuel Lemmons~(Chalk's reply filed first). Retrieved from \ https://scholarworks.harding.edu/hst-chalk-personal/6534$

This Letter is brought to you for free and open access by the John Allen Chalk at Scholar Works at Harding. It has been accepted for inclusion in John Allen Chalk: Personal Correspondence by an authorized administrator of Scholar Works at Harding. For more information, please contact scholarworks@harding.edu.



The state of the s

915 677-3522 / BOX 2439 / ABILENE, TEXAS 79604



Radio and Television Programs

October 15, 1968

Mr. Reuel Lemmons
Firm Foundation
P. O. Box 61
Austin, Texas

Dear brother Lemmons:

Thank you so much for taking the time to reply to my recent letter. I was so happy to get your further thinking on the matter of racial discrimination within the Church. I do appreciate your thinking about it, and am in complete accord with you that we must not single out this one sin and spend all our time on it to the exclusion of other sins just as glaring and weaknesses just as great.

Your balanced view of this matter is deeply appreciated by me. I look forward to many fruitful associations in the future and pray God's blessings on your special editorial responsibilities.

Fraternally yours,

John Allen Chalk Radio Evangelist

JAC:hm

Church of Christ

P. O. BOX 633 DURANGO, COLORADO 81301

October 9,1968

John Allen Chalk Box 2439 Abilene, Texas

Dear John Allen-

Your letter was forwarded twice and finally reached me here in Durnago, Colorado, where I am in a meeting this week.

I always appreciate your letters, and you hve been of great encouragement to me on more than one occasion.

On the matter about which you wrote---my editorial on the moral crisis---in some ways I agree with you, and in some I do not. I had no reference, I will be quick to say, to speeches you have made when I refered to some of them as "inflamatory". I have attended only a few of the meetings on race relations---one in Chicago and one in San Diego. In Chicago we were informed that if we did not meet certain demands that the black brethren would pull off ant that there would be two seperate brotherhoods. This speech was inflamatory. If reports are true one or two of the Atlanta speeches bordered on it.

Yes, I would make plenty of distinction between conviction of sin and an inflamatory speech. And I will just have to differ with you on whether I have encouraged continued prejudice and sin on the race question. I just simply do not believe that it overshaddows all other sins at the moment. I am firmly convince that there is far more sin in the church on a number of things, including covetiousness malice, and even adultry than on "respect for persons" That there is some of that I do not deny, but do not intend to get drawn into a special campaign against this one sin.

I would camppign against all sin in the church, and do. I am just not overly excited about this one to the exclusion of others. I think it is no worse and no better than the others.

Yours in the Faith,

Reuel Lemmons