

# Contending FOR THE Faith™

FOR THOSE WHO LOVE THE TRUTH AND HATE ERROR

## AN E-MAIL EXCHANGE BETWEEN DAVID P. BROWN/H. DANIEL DENHAM AND JIM E. WALDRON FOR THE PURPOSE OF PERSUADING WALDRON TO DEFEND PUBLICLY HIS DOCTRINE THAT MAN'S LAW COUNTERMANDS GOD'S LAW—ESPECIALLY AS IT PERTAINS TO MARRIAGE, DIVORCE AND REMARRIAGE

P. O. Box 1010  
Crossville, TN 38557  
November 20, 2008

Brother Daniel Denham  
607 72<sup>nd</sup> Street  
Newport News, VA 23605

Dear brother Denham,

Your article in the October 2008 edition of *CFTF* came out while I was in India I noted that you took about eight full columns to answer the six hundred words or so that I had in *Bulletin Briefs* and expressed the idea that there was a dearth of material in my article. You seem to be aware of the *Hicks-Waldron Debate* and you may have seen the group of letters and articles, entitled, *Waldron Missions*; but in case you haven't I am enclosing one.

This should give you even more material at which you may aim, for in it you will find articles by brothers Eddie Whitten, James C. Mattenbrink, an extended article by me on the controversy, and one by brother Mike Glenn. There is also an exchange of letters between me and brother Terry Hightower, your compatriot in this controversy. At the end there is a copy of a letter by me to brother David P. Brown.

In Christian Love,  
/s/ Jim E. Waldron

November 25, 2008  
607 72<sup>nd</sup> St.  
Newport News, VA 23605

Mr. Jim E. Waldron  
P.O. Box 1010  
Crossville, TN 38557

Dear brother Waldron,

I appreciate your prompt response. I hope and trust that the work in India is prospering and thriving as the Lord would have it to do.

I also thank you for the packet of material enclosed with your very brief letter.

However, I already have that material and am well familiar with it. In fact, it was not only with reference to the most recent article on MDR in *Bulletin Briefs* that my *CFTF* article was written, but it was also penned with these materials especially in mind as they did not really address the specific points raised in my article. The *Bulletin Briefs* article, though, highlighted the fact that you have chosen to make a fellowship issue out [of] the matters over which we disagree and thus occasioned my response. You cannot repeatedly make false accusations and expect not to have to give some

(Continued on page 3)

### IN THIS ISSUE

*AN E-MAIL EXCHANGE BETWEEN BROWN/DENHAM AND WALDRON...1*  
*EDITORIAL – CIVIL LAW AND GOD'S LAW—DAVID P. BROWN.....2*  
*NEW BRAUNFELS, TEXAS CHURCH LECTURES ADVERTISEMENT.....15*

# Contending FOR THE Faith™

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

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

## SUBSCRIPTIONS RATES

Single Subscriptions: One Year, \$14.00; Two Years, \$24.00. Club Rate: Three One-Year Subscriptions, \$36; Five One-Year Subscriptions, \$58.00. Whole Congregation Rate: Any congregation entering each family of its entire membership with single copies being mailed directly to each home receives a \$3.00 discount off the Single Subscription Rate, i.e., such whole congregation subscriptions are payable in advance at the rate of \$11.00 per year per family address. Foreign Rate: One Year, \$30. NO REFUNDS FOR CANCELLATIONS OF SUBSCRIPTIONS.

## ADVERTISING POLICY & RATES

**CONTENDING FOR THE FAITH** was begun and continues to exist to defend the gospel (Philippians 1:7,17) and refute error (Jude 3). Therefore, we are interested in advertising only those things that are in harmony with what the Bible authorizes (Colossians 3:17). We will not knowingly advertise anything to the contrary. Hence, we reserve the right to refuse any offer to advertise in this paper.

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

All advertisements must be in our hands no later than two (2) months preceding the publishing of the issue of the journal in which you desire your advertisement to appear. To avoid being charged for the following month, ads must be canceled by the first of the month. We appreciate your understanding of and cooperation with our advertising policy.

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

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

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

## Editorial...

### CIVIL LAW AND GOD'S LAW

The exchange of e-mails beginning on the first page of this issue of *CFTF* came to an end when the last certified letter from Brown/Denham to Waldron was refused by Waldron, stamped accordingly on the envelope and returned to us. This is the letter that begins on p. 13 and ends on p. 15 of this paper. Thus, brother Waldron refused to affirm in public debate exactly what he teaches, which error precisely stated is: *The Scriptures teach that every divorce granted by civil courts is also granted and honored in the sight of God.* Nevertheless, he and certain others continue to teach a doctrine that, if true, makes null and void the exceptive clause of Mat. 19:9, which clause is emphasized in the following quotation of the passage.

**...Whosoever shall put away his wife, except it be for fornication, and shall marry another, committeth adultery: and whoso marrieth her which is put away doth commit dultery.**

If civil law and court decrees based thereupon have the authority to nullify God's law, then homosexual conduct/marriages, abortion and no telling what else are made acceptable to God simply and only by them becoming the law of the land. With what is going on in this nation today, Waldron and those who *think(?)* as he does have laid and continue to lay the ground-work for all kinds of error to be accepted in the church by it simply becoming the law of the land. *No more mendacious and destructive doctrine has been propagated than the erroneous doctrine affirming that whatever is legislated into law or decreed by the courts is also granted and honored in the sight of God.* But, it is the case that Jim E. Waldron believes (a mental action) and teaches (though he is not the only church member to do so) that a civil court can issue a decree of divorce in a case where there has been no fornication and said human decree is so powerful that it rends asunder that which *only* God could join together (Mat. 19:6). Are Waldron and those who agree with his error so stubbornly blind that they refuse to see that if the foregoing is the case concerning who is and who is not divorced before God, then the same is the case concerning man's laws and court decrees pertaining to who may or may not marry and/or when two persons are married along with any other sin that man legalizes? Indeed, Waldron will oppose homosexual marriages in the exact same way that we oppose them—**arguing that man's law cannot nullify God's Law.** *No one is so blind as he who refuses to see.*

—David P. Brown, Editor

(Continued From Page One)

accounting on the basis of those accusations.

You make reference to the *Hicks-Waldron Debate*, of which I am indeed familiar. There are several statements that you make in the debate that are at odds with your current position, whether you realize that or not. Perhaps, you are also unaware that your moderator for that debate, the late Roy C. Deaver, was also one of my instructors in Bible and Greek. The position that I hold and that I have held for over 30 years I learned from him. It has been reported that you boasted that if Guy N. Woods, who also held the same view, were alive today that you would mark him as a false teacher and withdraw from him. Jim, brother Woods held that view as long as I knew him. I read of his position as early as 1976 from the *Gospel Advocate*, then edited by B.C. Goodpasture who endorsed Woods' position himself. Why did you not take brethren Woods, Goodpasture, and Deaver to task on the matter while they were still in the land of the living, if you knew of their position? Many other faithful Gospel preachers through the years have also held the same position, and good brethren did not fall out over it! Why have you taken it upon yourself to cause this current division? I suspect that you will deny being the cause of it, but the facts of history say otherwise. I can document from the writings of good brethren over the past 200 years what I am saying. There are many faithful brethren today who hold your basic view but who refuse to make it a test of fellowship and do not label those holding the view which other faithful brethren and I hold as liberals, false teachers, et al.

Perhaps you are also unaware of Dub McClish's extensive exchange with Eddie Whitten, and of Eddie's failure to answer the questions and refute the arguments put to him by Dub against the position taken in the very same article by Eddie which you reference in your letter. If you need a set of this material, it can be provided. Also, you may be unaware of the fact that Mike Glenn's material was forwarded to me by brother Dave Watson some time ago. I have long held in my possession a thorough response and refutation of that material for publication. Glenn's material actually poses more problems for your own view than of which you may be aware. I also have thoroughly examined the Mettenbrink material. There is nothing in it either that truly refutes the position I hold or addresses the specific matters and questions that I raised in my *CFTF* article. The subterfuge of offering this packet and its non sequiturs instead of a thorough response and answer to what was actually posted in my article simply will not get the job done, brother Waldron. I could just as easily with a wave of my hand make similar assertions on your material. However, I have actually bothered to answer you. Throwing such dust in the air and then claiming not to see is not worthy of the function of a Gospel preacher. 1 Thessalonians 5:21-22 and 1 Peter 3:15 apply as much to you as anyone else.

Neither your *Bulletin Briefs* article nor the materials you sent touch topside, bottom, or edge of the questions asked in

my article and its specific points. Simply asserting that they do is no real answer. So, let us lay aside such attempts to avoid the force of these things which my article broaches and test our respective views. In view of the fact that you have vehemently made a point of marking those who disagree with your views on these matters and calling for them to be treated as matters of faith, we are ready, even as was intimated in the article, to meet you in a four night oral debate on them. Brother David P. Brown has kindly consented to represent the position that we hold to be the truth on this aspect of MDR. I call upon you then to submit propositions that accurately reflect your position in opposition to that which we hold. We will do the same. Other details of the debate, including time, venue, arrangements, rules, and so on, can be negotiated over the next few exchanges. In the course of these exchanges, David will be, of course, necessarily involved. We will thus be patiently awaiting your reply.

Your's in Christ,

Daniel Denham /s/

Ph. #: (757) 245-6866

Email: Hdaniel\_denham@yahoo.com



P.O. Box 1010  
Crossville, TN 38557  
December 4, 2008

Mr. Daniel Denham  
607 72<sup>nd</sup> Street  
Newport News, VA 23605

Dear Brother Denham,

It is my hope and prayer that you and your family are well. In reference to your letter of 25 November in which you propose a debate I will need to get back to you on the particulars of that project, which seems like a good idea. However, for now I must return to India on the 11<sup>th</sup>. Although this trip will be a short one, I will need to return in the New Year as the schools of preaching require much attention during the first half of the year, but as noted I will get back to you.

Yet, it is imperative that I respond to one portion of your letter before it goes any further. I refer to your statement:

It has been reported that you (Waldron) boasted that if Guy N. Woods, who also held the same view (that I hold), were alive today that you would mark him as a false teacher and withdraw from him.

I do not know who "reported" such to you, but I want you to know that it is a false statement—a pure fabrication. After a brother by the name of Bryan Moody introduced the name of brother Woods in the mini-debate at the White Oak church in January 2006, I responded, but said no such thing as your anonymous source claimed.

(Continued from page One)

The manner in which you made the charge it is very much like that made against to Nehemiah. As it is written;

Then Sanballat sent his servant to me as before, the fifth time, with an open letter in his hand. In it was written: It is reported among the nations, and Geshem says, that you and the Jews plan to rebel ... (Neh. 6:5-6).

Sanballat said, "It is reported" and you say, "It has been reported." What's the difference? In light of your anonymous source you might be interested to know of an illustration we use in Asia to condemn the practice of some who anonymously smear good brethren. The illustration involves what Trajan, the emperor of Rome from 98 to 117 AD and a pagan wrote to the Younger Pliny while the latter served as the Imperial representative in Bithynia and Pontus. Pliny had written the emperor asking his judgment as to what to do in light of anonymous attacks on Christians. Trajan's reply:

But pamphlets circulated anonymously must play no part in any accusations. They create the worst sort of precedent and are quite out of keeping with the spirit of our age (The Letters of the Younger Pliny, translation by Betty Radice, Penguin Books Ltd, Harmondsworth, Middlesex, England, copyright 1969, Letter # 97, p. 295).

In Christian Love,  
/s/Jim E. Waldron



December 22, 2008  
607 72nd St.  
Newport News, VA 23605

Mr. Jim E. Waldron  
P.O. Box 1010  
Crossville, TN 38557

Dear brother Waldron,

I am sorry for not responding sooner to your letter of December 4th. I went out of town shortly upon its arrival for about a week and have been caught up into other activities going on with my work here since my return.

I received with gladness of heart your decision to engage in a public debate on the issues that divide us on MDR. As brother David Brown will be the representative affirming the view that both he and I hold, then I am sending him a copy of your correspondence accepting the debate as well as a copy of this letter. He needs henceforth to be included directly in any exchange involving the debate and the negotiations relative to propositions and logistics.

I am glad to hear from you that you never said that if brother Woods were alive today you would have to withdraw from him. That having been said, it still does not address the fact, as I have noted, that brother Woods taught the same view that I hold to in 1976 in the Gospel Advocate and with the approval of B. C. Goodpasture. Further, I learned it at the feet

of Roy C. Deaver and William S. Cline while a student at the Bellview Preacher Training School in Pensacola, FL back in the 1970s. Roy even served as your moderator for the debate with Olan Hicks. Yet, there has been no word from you, of which I am aware, opposing the view until quite recently by comparison. If these men were alive today (as well as a number of others of whom I can provide documentation) and were still teaching the same thing they taught then, would you mark them as false teachers and withdraw from them if they refused to give up that teaching? This, I believe, is the central issue of the matter, at least as pertains to the subject of fellowship. There are brethren who hold your scruples on the matter but who refuse to bind them as a matter of faith. While they will advise those who seek their advice along the lines of your view, they will not withdraw from those who hold to the view I have enunciated in CFTF or who, in their own studies, come to hold that view. So, again, I ask, if you are willing to make your position a test of fellowship, which seems to be the implication of your periodic statements on the subject?

I most eagerly await your reply and the commencement of negotiations on the aforementioned terms of the debate. I hope the trips to India will bear fruit to God's glory and honor.

Your's in Christ,  
Daniel Denham /s/



P. O. Box 1010  
Crossville, TN 38557  
January 3, 2009

Brother Daniel Denham  
607 72nd Street  
Newport News, VA 23605

Brother David Brown  
P.O. Box 2357  
Spring, TX 77383

Dear Brothers in Christ,

As we enter a new year it is my hope and prayer that you and your families are in good health. On November 25, 2008 brother Daniel Denham in a letter proposed a debate related to the different views that we hold on MDR. In part he wrote:

... we are ready, even as was intimated in the article (CFTF, October 2008), to meet you in a four night oral debate on them. Brother David P. Brown has kindly consented to represent the position that we hold to be the truth on this aspect of MDR. I call on you then to submit propositions that accurately reflect your position in opposition to that which we hold. We will do the same.

In my response on December 4, 2008 to his letter I explained

that I was scheduled to leave for India on the 11th and would get back to him. In light of that I have enclosed the proposition (#1) that I would expect to uphold and a second (#2) that you might consider defending. The two propositions (two copies of each) are on different pages in order that you may sign to deny the one that I propose to defend and return it to me; then either sign to affirm the second one or present your own for my consideration.

Concerning the four nights' debate I would like to suggest that we have two nights in Knoxville as we live just forty miles west of it and I have worked in the area off and on since 1963; then a week later have two nights in Spring, TX.

Concerning the dates as I indicated in my letter to brother Denham during the early part of the year much attention must be given to the schools of preaching with which I work in India. Thus the late summer, perhaps the last two weeks of August, would fit into my schedule. If this is possible and if it fits your schedule we could use August 17th and 18th in Knoxville on the first proposition and then debate the second one the 24th and 25th in Spring.

Concerning the opportunity to put the debate in sound recording, DVD or similar format and to be printed I would like that responsibility as it is my practice to produce such and make them available at cost or without charge. If this is agreeable to you then I would make the copies of either available to you at cost.

As brother Denham indicated other aspects of the debate can be arranged.

In Christian love,  
/s/ Jim E. Waldron

PROPOSITIONS (sic) 1

Resolved: The Bible teaches unscriptural divorce between a husband and wife renders any succeeding marriage to another invalid and adulterous in the sight of God as long as the original parties live.

Affirm: /s/Jim E. Waldron      Date: Jan 4, 2009

Deny: \_\_\_\_\_      Date: \_\_\_\_\_

PROPOSITIONS (sic) 2

Resolved: The Bible teaches that a person arbitrarily put away (divorced) for an unscriptural reason over his or her objections, may, after the former spouse remarries or otherwise commits adultery, claim a scriptural divorce and marry another without sin.

Affirm: \_\_\_\_\_      Date: \_\_\_\_\_

Deny: /s/Jim E. Waldron      Date: Jan. 4, 2009

January 23, 2009

Mr. David P. Brown  
25403 Lancewood Dr.  
Spring, TX 77373

Mr. Daniel Denham  
607 72nd St.  
Newport News, VA 23605

Mr. Jim E. Waldron  
P.O. Box 1010  
Crossville, TN 38557

Dear brother Waldron,

We hope and trust that this letter finds you and your family well. We are in receipt of your letter of January 3, 2009. We are appreciative of the time constraints involved in your mission work. We too face numerous constraints. We therefore would rather consider dates for the debate approximately a year or so away from the present, due to already existing commitments for 2009.

Since you do not desire the debate to be in Crossville, we are agreeable to one debate in Knoxville, TN, but we also propose a second debate on the same propositions, spaced by a couple of months or so a part, somewhere in the Austin, TX area. We will be able to make arrangements for the debate in Austin, TX area. The reason we propose this second debate is this, we want this issue to be discussed in two areas of the country where we know there is much interest in it.

The Spring elders have approved the use of the Spring building for the debate in Texas. However, Spring is located in the greater Houston area where liberalism dominates the area churches. Therefore, we do not think a debate on this subject would be of much interest to the liberal mind-set permeating this part of Texas. Since all of us desire to have the debate(s) in a place(s) that will allow for the best interest and attendance possible, we would like to have a second debate in the Austin, Texas area.

The matter of the propositions is, at present, the most crucial point to settle. All other considerations can be addressed after this has been settled. As to the propositions, it is clear that you do not seem to understand the real difference between our respective positions, despite your agitation of the issue of MDR. Both propositions you suggested are inaccurate and unacceptable, besides the fact that they are worded in such a fashion as clearly to create prejudice against our case. We are in basic agreement with the specific parameters of your proposed affirmative proposition. The affirmative that you have sought to ascribe to us does not properly reflect our position, and we certainly do not accept the parameters it seeks to bind upon us. It would seem that you would have us specifically to affirm your own opinions about our position, rather than what we actually believe and teach.

Furthermore, the two propositions do not even address the central issue broached by brother Denham in his October

2008 *CFTF* article in response to your position. You claimed to have read the article when you sent your packet of materials to him with your first letter in this exchange, but obviously, brother Waldron, you missed the central force: the role of civil law as it pertains to MDR in the sight of God. This is the heart of the dispute. Does a civil divorce that is not on the grounds of fornication implicitly sever a Matthew 19:6 (God-joined) marriage? The material from your co-worker, Mike Glenn, which material you implicitly endorsed by sending it to brother Denham, especially reinforces the perception that you hold that it indeed does. We suggest therefore two alternative propositions that more directly address this matter and its implications, rather than skirting the former to make some oblique approach to the latter. These are listed on a separate page with brother Brown's signature in each appropriate place.

Brother Waldron, if you are not interested in addressing the central point of disagreement, then simply say so. If you choose this course, however, you will leave many of us wondering about your reason for all of "the sound and fury" against what you seemingly do not wish legitimately even to understand! It simply does not make any sense that you would spend your time attacking a view that you have no real intention of engaging in an appropriate arena.

Also, in an earlier letter brother Denham asked you specifically if you would withdraw from Guy N. Woods, B.C. Goodpasture, and Roy C. Deaver over this aspect of MDR were they still living, as all three of these brethren went to their graves holding to the very same view in this regard that we affirm? Yes or no? That is not a difficult question to answer. You took great umbrage that someone would accuse you of having said that you would do so. You compared your accusers to Sanballat in Nehemiah 6 – quite a serious charge! But whether you specifically said it or not, the essential point is whether or not the statement accurately reflects your sentiments on the matter. Sanballat's story had no factual basis, either in actuality or in intent. The Jews had no intention of rebelling against Persian authority. Thus, the situations are not the same. What would be your attitude and fellowship practice concerning these good men if they were still alive, teaching what they taught in life and what we also continue to teach? If you would still be in fellowship with these brethren in spite of their MDR views, why do you insist on your disruptive demagoging of those who agree with them and who are yet alive? Dodging the question is not an answer, and only calls into question your own integrity.

Since brother Brown checks the *CFTF* post office box but every few days, we request that correspondence to him be sent directly to his home address, which is posted under his name above. Awaiting your reply, and

Your's in Christ,

/s/ David P. Brown

/s/ Daniel Denham

Brother Jim:

If acceptable to you please sign propositions and, of course, keeping your own copy, please return a copy of same to David P. Brown and a copy to Daniel Denham. Whatever other response you may have please send it to Daniel Denham with a copy of it to David P. Brown at the following addresses. Thank you very much. –DPB & DD

David P. Brown  
25403 Lancewood Dr.  
Spring, TX 77373

Daniel Denham  
607 72nd St.  
Newport News, VA 23605

### Propositions for Debate on MDR

1. **Resolved:** The Scriptures teach that a Matthew 19:6 God-joined marriage remains intact in the sight of God when a civil divorce has been granted on grounds other than fornication.

**Affirm:** /s/ David P. Brown  
David P. Brown

**Deny:** \_\_\_\_\_  
Jim E. Waldron

2. **Resolved:** The Scriptures teach that every divorce granted by civil courts is also granted and honored in the sight of God.

**Affirm:** \_\_\_\_\_  
Jim E. Waldron

**Deny:** /s/ David P. Brown  
David P. Brown



P. O. Box 1010  
Crossville, TN 38557  
February 23, 2009

Brother David Brown  
25403 Lancewood Drive  
Spring, TX 77373

Dear Brother Brown,

It is my hope and prayer that you and your loved one are well.

1. Concerning the location: You wrote, "Since you do not desire the debate to be in Crossville, we are agreeable to one debate in Knoxville, TN, but we also propose a second debate on the same propositions, spaced by a couple of months or so a part, somewhere in the Austin, TX area."

Response: Please do not let my suggested (sic) to use Knoxville as a reason to remove the debate from your own locale to Austin. Although Crossville is some 80 miles from the nearest airport—Knoxville, and I live only about forty miles from the airport please be assured that we are quite willing for the debate on our end to be in Crossville. Your controversy with the brethren at the school in Austin has not taken place in a corner and I will not agree to be a part of a debate that brings you to their door step when it needs to take place in Spring where you are. You brethren proposed the debate and, if you desire to have it, let it be in Spring and Crossville.

2. Concerning the question of two debates:

Response: You spoke of restraints on your time and I had spoken of such about my own time, thus I see no need to have two debates as the one can be video taped and sent out to those who wish to see it. As I indicated I am willing to produce such at cost or free, simply for postage. We can have two evenings here and two there. As to the date, perhaps next year (2010) February 15-16, here and 22-23 there or vise (sic) versa.

3. Concerning the propositions: You wrote. “As to the propositions, it is clear that you do not seem to understand the real difference between our respective positions, despite your agitation of the issue of MDR”.

Response: The truth of the matter is that I do “understand the real difference between our respective positions.” That I first learned when I read the article you published by brother Terry Hightower (*Contending for the Faith*, September 2002). In fact I had never heard the term “mental divorce” until he named it in reference to the doctrine you and he hold. As I informed him I did not see his article until the second week of May 2003 due to my scheduled trips abroad. Thus my entering into the conflict did not take place until you and he opened the ball in the autumn of 2002.

My proposition is right on target: “Resolved: ***The Bible teaches unscriptural divorce between a husband and wife renders any succeeding marriage to another invalid and adulterous in the sight of God as long as the original parties live.*** And that is what I will affirm.

But you write, “We are in basic agreement with the specific parameters of your proposed affirmative proposition.” If that is the case then just sign on the affirmative line below and we can shake hands on that.”

Affirmative: \_\_\_\_\_ Date: \_\_\_\_\_

Concerning your own proposed affirmative you need to word it in such a manner that shows that you do believe the concept that one who is arbitrarily put away (divorced) against his or her will may claim a scriptural divorce after the departing mate commits adultery.

4. You also wrote, “despite your agitation of the issue of MDR....”

Response: Let it be known that I did not begin to publish articles dealing with yours (sic) and brother Hightower’s “mental divorce” doctrine until nearly nine months after you published his assault on brother Jim Mettenbrink’s article. Even then my first response was a personal letter. So who has been agitating on the subject?

5. You wrote, concerning my use of Nehemiah 6:5-6: “You compared your accusers to Sanballat in Nehemiah 6 – quite a serious charge! But whether you specifically said it or not, the essential point is whether or not the statement accurately reflects your sentiments on the matter.”

Response: Brother Denham wrote, “*It has been reported ...*” “but he didn’t indicate number, but you reveal there were “accusers” (plural). As I affirmed in my letter to brother Denham I said no such thing about brother Guy N. Woods and I certainly did not “boast” of such as the slanderer claimed. It was pure fabrication; to be more firm it was a lie. Brother Denham’s repeating of such was gossip with no revelation of whom the perpetrator(s) was/were. You said I made “*quite a serious charge*” concerning the slanderer. Did you reprove those (you used the plural) who generated the lie?

Paul told the saints in Corinth that the household of Chloe had told him of the contentions among them, but our brother Daniel Denham did not even lend me that courtesy. As I pointed out to him, even the pagan Emperor Trajan warned Pliny the Younger of the danger of using anonymous reports. My illustration from Nehemiah was on target like a smart bomb being dropped on one of Saddam Hussein’s palaces.

The approach that you and brother Denham have taken is, Waldron you ought to say it. To be very specific when the debate takes place I will speak clearly on this matter, but I am not fool enough to answer such prior to the debate for you to use or misuse as you see fit.

To summarize:

- 1) I will not agree for the debate to take place in Austin.
- 2) I have signed the proposition that I will affirm. If you agree with it as you say you do, then sign the affirmative yourself, otherwise sign to deny it.
- 3) This will be my last letter to respond to any “arguments” or questions that you put forth. I must leave for India on Wednesday (25th) and I do not have the time or inclination to carry on a tit for tat by mail.
- 4) Let us get on with the arrangements for the debate.

In Christian love,

/s/ Jim E. Waldron

Copy to Brother Daniel Denham

607 72<sup>nd</sup> Street

Newport News, VA 23605

April 9, 2009

David P. Brown  
25403 Lancewood Dr.  
Spring, TX 77373

Mr. Jim E. Waldron  
P.O. Box 1010  
Crossville, TN 38557

Dear brother Waldron,

We do hope and trust that this letter will find you and your family well. We are in receipt of your letter of February 23rd and will respond to each of your points, including your summary seriatim.

(1) As expressed in our previous letter, it is our desire to hold the debates where they have the most likelihood of drawing a larger audience and doing the most good. That you suggested having it at Knoxville as opposed to Crossville really does not matter to us one way or the other. Either venue would do. In the case of a debate in Texas on the subject, for the reasons already outlined, a debate in the Austin, TX area would be better attended. The brethren at New Braunfels, Texas have graciously offered their commodious and comfortable facilities for the effort. A debate at New Braunfels would be solidly endorsed and supported by the eldership and membership of the Spring congregation. So what is the problem with having it there? Knoxville and New Braunfels would be ideal with both Crossville and Spring well represented at each respectively.

That you are hesitant to air the matter of MDR within ear-shot of the brethren at Southwest in Austin is quite strange, as it is the case that Terry Hightower's article, to which you responded, was actually published by *CFTF* in answer to the Southwest church's agitation of the issue. In fact, the September 2002 issue was occasioned by the Stan Crowley error that has been well-documented. The matter of MDR had been a point of division on the part of SW as far back as 1992 and had been accelerated in the years directly leading up to Terry's article in 2002 by the explicit teaching of brother Crowley, as one of Southwest School of Bible Studies' students. Some in support of SW's view had frequently claimed that the Mettenbrink article had never been answered and was, in truth, unanswerable. Terry proved both points to be wrong. The Southwest brethren were involved in the matter all along. That you obviously chose to jump into the fray on their side is evidenced by your own admission in the February 23rd letter to be responding to Terry's article. Again, to borrow the quaint phrase, your action "did not take place in a corner."

We indeed "proposed the debate," but that does not obligate us to dance to whatever tune you wish to pipe. While we are more than willing to negotiate where and when the debate is to occur, as the following will show, we will not be dictated to concerning it. This is an arrangement between

equals, brother Waldron, and your involvement on the side of SW is just as pertinent to our differences as any other factor in the negotiations. This is not a marble-shooting contest, where one can just pick up his taws and ducks and go home because he cannot just set everything up the way he wants it to be. We are not here to play games, but to defend the truth and expose error. If you are not serious about that, then say so and we will address the matter through other means.

Brother Waldron, we are confident that you agree that it is as sinful to make a law that God did not make as it is to set aside one that He did make. If you are serious about the matter and truthful about your statement regarding the September 2002 *CFTF*, then you should have no real problems identifying with the SW folks and Stan Crowley on the issue. The fact that you have expressed an obvious hesitancy to do so speaks volumes.

(2) Furthermore, the idea of one debate split between two quite separate locales is, to be frank, quite absurd. The logistics of such are simply not manageable or reasonable. The requisite travel scheduling and coordination, the packing up, setting up, arrangements for, and transferring of materials, not to mention the travel arrangements for others assisting or otherwise interested in the debate, render that format totally unacceptable. Yes, we are all very busy, but we are, on our part, certain that we can make the much easier accommodations necessary for two debates, given the sufficient time of a couple of months or so between them, rather than splitting one debate into two separate locales. The issue is that important that time can be made for both debates. Two complete debates would also prove more beneficial and effective in making the case for the truth on the subject in the two geographical areas principally concerned with it. Many who would want to attend the debate in Knoxville or New Braunfels would most certainly like to hear both sides of the issue in affirmation while the matter is still quite fresh on their minds. Transcribed and recorded debates are definitely valuable, but the live program is far more effective in presenting the truth and exposing error. And, besides, the former things can still be done so as to preserve the debate for posterity and make it available to others unable to attend. The eyewitness accounts of the Wallace-Matson Debate, for example, show more emphatically the forceful effect that brother Warren (who interestingly held to the same view we espouse on MDR) had in refuting Matson's atheism. The specific dates can be worked out in due course to accommodate your work in India and otherwise, just as it can to accommodate our efforts in other venues.

(3) Concerning your assertions on the propositions themselves, we are still too far apart to have a done deal on anything. In all kindness, brother Waldron, you apparently do not grasp "the real difference between our respective positions," despite your claims to the contrary. As noted above, Terry's article was printed in *CFTF* not only as a response to the Mettenbrink article, but also contextually in response

to the agitation of the issue in Texas by Crowley and SW, especially by several of their graduates. This has been well documented. You need to go back and re-examine not only the September 2002 issue of the paper but also several issues that preceded and followed it dealing with the issue of civil law's relationship to the Bible doctrine on MDR. That you read the article shows that you were aware of this background, at least in part, before getting involved in the matter. It was this aspect of things which also occasioned Daniel Denham's article offering the challenge to you. You are evidently in agreement with SW, at least in large part, as to the role of civil law, especially as evidenced by the materials you sent brother Denham in response to said article. Brother Waldron, you are indeed tied to the SW situation, despite your attempt to distance yourself from it by your last letter.

You should be aware that some of these brethren had been agitating the matter since 1992 and had exacerbated it during Stan Crowley's days as a student at the school and also as a member of the Buda/Kyle congregation, which he actually divided over the issue. Crowley is on record as claiming that his peculiar view is so important that it is worth dividing the brotherhood over, brother Waldron! Is your view so important as well?

Jim, in order for you to have jumped into the middle of this particular MDR controversy in the way that you now implicitly admit, you surely must have known something of the Crowley doctrine and the involvement of SW in the same. That you do not desire to bring it "to their door step" must not therefore be the real reason why you oppose having it in the Austin area. Their "door step" is the source of the current controversy. In fact, you have already brought it "to their door step" in some measure yourself, by your own admission, in your attempt to answer Terry Hightower and in your persistence in fomenting strife over the subject at least since then. Perhaps, you are unaware that Terry also provided material to SW and Joseph Meador, then director of the school, prior to 2002 to present the opposing view in an attempt to quell their agitation of the subject that had been going on for some time. We can cite several documents and materials dating from that period of time put out by SW graduates marking as "false teachers" and such like those who would not accept their self-contradictory assertions.

Also, regarding the term "mental divorce," several antis had been using it for some time prior to Terry's article, which in reality was based on his Florida School of Preaching lecture addressing this issue which they were agitating at the time. Terry simply used the term rhetorically, just as we all have on occasion used the terms legalism and legalist in sermons, lectures, and articles. Have you never retorted to liberal claims, "If you define that (i.e. the necessity of keeping God's commandments) as 'legalism,' then so be it"? The retort is a rhetorical device for effect. It stresses that simply redefining something subjectively does not refute or nullify its essential nature ("A rose by any other name would smell

as sweet"). This is called in logic the Law of Identity. A thing renamed is still the same thing, regardless of whether the name is objectively based or subjectively asserted. Calling the view you oppose here "mental divorce" does not make it so. In fact, as will be shown in debate, should you decide to "screw your courage to the sticking place," to borrow another line from Shakespeare, you will see clearly that the same charge can be made with equal—if not greater—force against your own view. Are you willing to test it?

As to your request that we sign your affirmative proposition and shake hands on it, you evidently did not catch the force of the adjective basic modifying the noun agreement. You have committed the either/or fallacy. It is not simply then a matter of accepting or rejecting your proposition, which is not precisely stated. Such attempts at sophistry are unbecoming to one who proposes to engage in reasoned discourse. Again, as we noted, your proposition would be true only as far as strict adherence by definition to Luke 16:18 and Mark 10:11-12 goes, but you know, as well as we do, that the issue actually revolves around the application of the exceptive clause with regards to civil law in Matthew 5:32 and Matthew 19:9. Your proposition makes no provision for the exceptive clause, much less as it pertains to civil law, other than in your mind. Further, you have not even specified what you mean in your proposition by such terms as unscriptural, divorce, any succeeding marriage, invalid, and especially the term adulterous. The SW brethren, for example, have frequently used the term adultery, as well as its cognates, to refer to something other than a sexual sin. Also, if a couple divorced for an unscriptural reason, could they remarry one another? That would be, given what you have said elsewhere, a "succeeding marriage." Brother Waldron, we do not intend to enter a debate wherein the opposing party reserves the right to define his proposition only as it strikes him for the transient occasion. Surely, like us, you are not desirous of a battle over semantics, which is why propositions must be precisely stated and defined up front. The only statement we would sign then relative to your proposition is that statement which we have already made, and that is assuming only a strict definition of terms — "the specific parameters" to which we referred and which you have ignored. We suspect that such really does not suit what you wanted out of your ploy. Would you agree to sign approvingly the proposition we submitted for ourselves to affirm? If not, why not? If you agree with it, then why not sign it? If you do not agree with it, then why not deny it? "What's sauce for the goose is, at the very least, salad dressing for the gander." There is one large difference, however.

**THE 2008 BOUND VOLUMES OF CFTF ARE  
HERE. WRITE, PHONE OR E-MAIL US TO-  
DAY FOR YOUR COPY. WHY NOT ORDER  
AN EXTRA COPY FOR A FRIEND?**

Our propositions actually do address the essential differences between us. We suspect that the real reason why you will not sign them is because they are so precisely stated that those who hear the debate will be thereby clearly able to discern the truth of our position. If you are unwilling to affirm our wording of your position, then submit a proposition that genuinely reflects your view (as laid out in your own materials and those which you sent to Daniel) on the role of civil law relative to MDR. You know quite well that Daniel's article, which offered the challenge to debate, dealt with that specific point on MDR.

Regarding our own proposition, we do not intend to affirm that which we do not genuinely believe or one that is based on your false perception of what we believe. And, why would you want us to do so? Would you be willing to affirm in a debate with a Baptist preacher, "The Scriptures teach that we can earn our salvation by being baptized for the remission of sins"? If you are serious about debating, then sign the one we have agreed to affirm, which is clearly at odds with your view. Why do you insist that we affirm your perception rather than our actual position? For one expressing an interest in debating the matter for the good of the brotherhood, such raises questions in our minds as to your own sincerity about solving and settling the matter scripturally. We have never said nor intimated that we "believe the concept that one who is arbitrarily put away (divorced) against his or her will may claim" anything – much less "a scriptural divorce after the departing mate commits adultery." The charge is spurious and shows that you either do not know what our position is, despite your claims that you do, or else really do not care and have your own personal agenda to promote.

(4) The point regarding your agitation of the issue was addressed in some measure above, but it bears some repeating that you jumped into the midst of the controversy involving Stan Crowley and SW in your response to Terry's article. Your latest letter admits the same. It is also a fact that you also have not ceased since then to promote your own view and label those like Terry as "heretics," "false teachers," and such like. Furthermore, your previous sponsoring congregation in Dunlap, TN was split over your MDR doctrine when Freddie Clayton and other brethren would not allow it to go unchallenged. When did that split occur, brother Waldron? Could it have been in 2004 or even earlier in 2003? We know that in September 2003 you published the article by Eddie Whitten, which ostensibly answered what he wrongfully terms "the Waiting Game" and what you have dubbed "the modified waiting game." We also know that in 2004 you began circulating a tract that on one key point attacks what you believe to be the "Guy N. Woods view," as some have termed it. There was also the meeting in 2005 at White Oak in Chattanooga, where it was made obvious that you would not back off on the matter. Then there are the packets of materials that you continue to send out agitating the issue, including the issue of *Bulletin Briefs* occasioning broth-

er Denham's article in *CFTF*. No, Jim, feigning the injured party will not work. It does not fit the facts of the case.

But your response in the February 23rd letter raises yet another question: Are you implying that you would have not become involved at all in opposition to the view that Woods taught and we hold if Terry's article had never been written? In other words, are you affirming that it was Terry's article that made the issue a matter of obligation and, otherwise, you would have treated it as a matter of option? Hmmm? If you answer, "yes," then let us shake hands and you cease to be involved in the matter. If you answer, "no," then you need to repent of your attempt at deception on the matter and get on with defending what you really believe, including what you really believe relative to the matter of number (5) below.

(5) Again, we have already answered your quibbling and fussing about the accusation brought to your attention by brother Denham relative to brother Woods' position. He did exactly what he ought to have done – come to you and asked if it were true. It is neither slandering nor gossip-mongering to ask if the accusations are true, Jim, but simply seeking verification from the alleged source. Now, you have denied that you said that you would withdraw from Guy N. Woods if he were alive today and were still teaching the same thing on this subject that he taught in life. The parties who made the claim will be notified of your denial of the same. However, Jim, have you ever made any statement to the effect that brother Woods was a false teacher for teaching the doctrine? We have not failed to notice that you seem steadfastly determined to refuse to answer whether you would in fact do so today, if such were the case, and that not only concerning brother Woods but also with regard to B.C. Goodpasture, who approved and edited brother Woods' article in his 1976 *Gospel Advocate* article teaching the view, and Roy C. Deaver, who held that same view even at the time he served as your moderator in your 1977 debate with Olan Hicks. He was an adjunct teacher at Bellview and taught the view both publicly and privately, Jim. You claim that it is a lie that you "said" you would withdraw, but is it a lie that you would in fact withdraw from these men for teaching this same doctrine were they still alive? Would you mark them as "heretics" or "false teachers"? We suspect your unwillingness to answer without equivocation shows that the whole matter is worrisome to you for whatever reason.

The report to Paul by the household of Chloe provides only an account of an optional action that may be followed in handling such matters. The same apostle writing even in the same book does not specifically identify who informed him of the brother who had his "father's wife" in 1 Corinthians 5:1. Also, in the case of the problem between Euodias and Syntyche, Paul only records that he had heard of it and tells them how to correct it without identifying the source of his information (Col. 4:2). No, Jim, you fired a dud rather than a smart bomb. You are not Nehemiah, being beset by

the heathen to compromise the Truth. Nor are you Emperor Trajan seeking to find real evidence of the truthfulness of accusations floating around Asia Minor before taking action, and you most certainly are not a U.S. Navy pilot attacking the palace of Saddam Hussein to destroy an ungodly despot. Couching your actions in such imagery is, to say the least, self-serving. Your intimation that you obviously feel that your opponents are to be so demonized is itself also quite telling. Your charge and attempted comparisons come across as whining and wheedling to avoid the central issue of whether you believe our differences constitute a fellowship issue. Instead of addressing the point, you seek to lambaste us for asking about it and seeking explicit clarification of just where you stand on the issue (especially since you have made a point of stressing that you only got involved in the MDR disputes after reading Terry Hightower's article in *CFTF*). Strange behavior either way one tries to spin it. Why complain about Terry's article, as though you would have never raised opposition to the doctrine if it alone had never been written, but then refuse so much as to state unambiguously that you would gladly maintain the lines of fellowship with Woods, Goodpasture, and Deaver despite their holding to the same view? Strange, strange indeed!

As to your summary, the following points are in order:

1) The debate in Texas ought to be at New Braunfels. The good brethren there have already consented to the use of their building, which provides both a commodious venue for a discussion of this nature. We have made no secret about the role that SW in Austin has played in fomenting strife on this very subject. We have openly exposed and opposed their error in doing so. As your latest letter indicates, you are clearly aware of this conflict. Does it not make sense then to hold the debate in the very area most affected by the conflict? What is the purpose of any debate, if it is not to address the subject in dispute fairly and openly and in a way

easily accessible by those most interested and affected by it? Your protest against having it at New Braunfels appears, at least on the surface, to be contrived and without basis. We, however, have no problems with the Tennessee debate being either in Crossville or Knoxville, though Crossville would actually provide 'a more central location in that part of Tennessee and a facility of more than sufficient size, the airport advantage of Knoxville notwithstanding.

2) Again, relative to your affirmative proposition you commit the either/or fallacy. It does not address clearly and precisely the issue between us, and we are not going to spend our time chasing rabbits because you refuse to be precise and account for the force of the exceptive clause relative to this dispute. On this point, we are at an impasse, unless you can come up with a precise affirmative that addresses the exceptive clause in view of the role of civil law. In all other matters, we are in agreement relative to the basic rule set forth in Luke 16:18 and Mark 10:11-12, as we have noted.

3) You stated: "This will be my last letter to respond to any 'arguments' or questions that you put forth." Brother Waldron, where is the first letter in which you have really even begun to answer any arguments or questions we have raised on this issue?! Brother Denham wrote a rather lengthy article with specific charges and forceful questions that you have not dealt with even one whit in our exchange.

The questions we have raised on the subject in our own letters, you have virtually ignored. You have spent most of your space carrying on about the story that you had said you would withdraw from Guy N. Woods as though some great injury has been done to you. Yet, you have continuously refused to answer the simple question of whether or not you would withdraw from Guy N. Woods, B.C. Goodpasture, and Roy C. Deaver, if they were alive today. We are persuaded that you know better than to do so, and if you were as confident in your position as you appeared to be in your *Bulletin Briefs* articles the debate would have already come and gone. The ball is in your court as to whether or not you

## FREE CD AVAILABLE

*Contending for the Faith* is making available a CD-ROM free of charge. *Why is this CD important?* **ANSWER:** It contains an abundance of evidentiary information pertaining to Dave Miller's doctrine and practice concerning the re-evaluation/reaffirmation of elders, MDR, and other relevant and important materials and documents directly or indirectly relating to the Brown Trail Church of Christ, Apologetics Press, Gospel Broadcasting Network, MSOP, and more.

To receive your free CD contact us at *Contending for the Faith*, P. O. Box 2357, Spring, TX 77383-2357, or email us at [dpbcftf@gmail.com](mailto:dpbcftf@gmail.com).

**If you desire to have a part in the distribution of this important CD you may make your financial contributions to the Spring Church of Christ, P. O. Box 39, Spring, TX 77383.**

## 2009 SPRING CFTF LECTURES

CDs, DVDs, MP3, & VIDEO RECORDINGS

ORDER FROM:

**Jim Green**

**2711 Spring Meade Blvd.  
Columbia, TN 38401**

**PHONE: (931) 486-1364**

**[www.jgreencoc-video-ministry.com](http://www.jgreencoc-video-ministry.com)**

**e-mail: [jgreencoc1986@yahoo.com](mailto:jgreencoc1986@yahoo.com)**



David P. Brown  
25403 Lancewood Dr.  
Spring, TX 77373

Daniel Denham 607 72<sup>nd</sup> St.  
Newport News, VA 23605  
June 5, 2009

Mr. Jim E. Waldron  
P.O. Box 1010  
Crossville, TN 38557

Dear brother Waldron,

Why are you so averse to answering quite simple questions? Could it be, perhaps, that you do consider brother Woods' teaching on the matter to be false doctrine? If he was not a false teacher, then neither are we, as we are simply teaching what he taught. If what we teach is false doctrine according to you, then you must conclude that brother Woods was likewise teaching false doctrine, for he taught just what we are teaching. If the latter is your perception of things, then either you would have to fellowship Woods, despite believing him to be a false teacher, or you would have to refuse to fellowship him on that very basis. No, brother, you did not "nail" it "as pure fabrication and gossip." You merely sought to divert the issue. You understood all too well the force of the point.

Also brother Denham discussed the subject at some length with brother Woods when Daniel lived in McMinnville, TN. Woods often provided helpful insights on the subject and much helpful advice relative to the Greek constructions of Matthew 5:32 and Matthew 19:9. Further, brother Woods' close friend and biographer, Harrell Davidson, also affirms the same thing as we do concerning brother Woods' teaching. So if you are seeking to spin it some other way, then you are attempting to paddle upstream without a paddle.

We can also well understand why you have a problem addressing this subject in general and have chosen the avenue of running from the debate challenge by demanding obviously disingenuous and prejudicially loaded propositions that touch neither top, side, edge, nor bottom of what we in fact believe and the real issues between you and us on MDR, instead of dealing with the issues at hand. Your hubris in demanding that we must deny a proposition that we believe within the parameters we have stated and also that we must affirm your misperception and asinine caricature of what we believe concerning Matthew 19:9 is beyond belief. It is evident that you insist on debate on your terms alone.

Such is not the challenge that was issued to you by Daniel. You have admitted that the affirmative you insist on for your part of the debate is the same proposition you affirmed against Olan Hicks. Jim, neither of us is Olan Hicks, nor is either of us in agreement with any of his many errors.

Your pretending that we are is simply dishonest. Daniel, a couple of years ago, specifically refuted at the Spring lectures, which David Brown directs, much of the Olan Hicks doctrine along with the current errors you and the brethren at Southwest are teaching on MDR. In fact, Jim, Olan Hicks would be far more inclined to accept your view relative to civil law than to agree with us. He, like you, believes that a civil divorce that is not on the grounds of fornication severs a Matthew 19:6 marriage bond. In fact, he uses that as a major springboard into his liberal views on MDR. Either you are not nearly up on the current positions being taken by the liberals like Hicks or you simply refuse to see the correlation between your respective views. Both of you have civil law trumping God's law, despite your claims to the contrary!

Your own moderator for the Hicks debate, Roy C. Deaver, was in agreement with our position. Brother Denham studied under Roy, and learned of this position originally from him during the same timeframe in which Roy was serving as your moderator to refute Olan Hicks' false doctrine! Clearly, Roy did not believe that your proposition in any way contravened what we are teaching on the role of civil law in the Bible doctrine of MDR! We will therefore leave it to readers of this correspondence to determine whether you really intended to answer this matter in debate, or any where else for that matter.

The challenge that was issued to you concerned the specific position and issues that Daniel clearly described in his *CFTF* article, which occasioned your initial letter. He gave a series of specific questions that you have completely ignored, and we suspect really do not wish to have to answer, especially in a public setting. If you, therefore, cannot or will not deal with those issues, then simply say so, and stop feigning concern and horror over what we teach. Obfuscation does not constitute refutation, Jim.

It seems to us as well that you either do not understand the real issues concerning the relationship of civil law to the Bible doctrine on MDR, despite your pontifications on the subject, or you do understand them and realize that you were not truly prepared to defend the error you have taught and endorsed in this regard. You have indeed stirred up this issue, as many brethren in East Tennessee can well attest. Your reputation relative to the Dunlap situation has spread far and wide. You have even implicitly admitted that you jumped into your attack on Terry Hightower's article knowing of the situation then going on with the false teaching coming out

**FIRST 35 YEARS OF *CFTF* ON DVD**

**\$50.00**

**ORDER FROM**

***CFTF***

**P. O. Box 2357**

**SPRING, TX 77383-2357**

of Southwest in Austin, TX on the subject, which means you knew that you were in some measure aiding and abetting the error of Stan Crowley and the SW elders and faculty on MDR. Yet you claim that you did not want to “bring this” to their doorstep!

In your previous letter of February 23rd, you implied by the very statement you now cite in your letter of May 25th that you have been answering, if not answered, our arguments all along. We challenged you to show where you have been doing so. This is set forth in precise terms as the reason we responded contrary to your obvious wishes. We called your hand on the matter. Obviously, you, as we, are at a loss as to where that evidence is to be found. Ignoring the point does not make it go away!

We have repeatedly refuted your diatribe concerning the Hightower article. Your insistence on trying to “spin” the issue in such a prejudicial way, rather than address the points that were specifically and precisely put to you relative to your claims and misrepresentations evidences that you are not really serious about dealing with the position forthrightly. The record shows that neither we nor brother Hightower have endorsed your fictitious and fanciful misperception of things depicted in your use of the buzzword, “mental divorce.” As to this phrase, we noted that it has been in use as a flawed and biased pejorative for some time among some of the antis, as a way of not having to address the real issues involved. Neither they nor the brethren at Southwest, who took up the same diatribe, could answer Terry’s material. And so it is the same for you. It is much easier to avoid a subject if you can mischaracterize so as to confuse the simple. In fact, we have copies of the White Oak meeting that you participated in concerning MDR back in January 2001. It was noted that such expressions as mental divorce and the waiting game were misrepresentations and mischaracterizations of the view you were attacking. It is interesting that in that meeting you brethren from Crossville seemed to back off from their use. One of your number offered a bit of an apology for using them explaining that he was just looking for some way to describe the view and that he did not mean anything disrespectful or deceitful about it. But now you persist in using these buzzwords, when you have been rebuked and reproved for their inaccuracy and duplicity. Why did you back off then, but are now insistent on using such in your *Bulletin Briefs* and with us? Was it because you knew that you could not snuff the brethren gathered on that occasion by demonizing the position by such a banal and sophomoric ploy without undermining your efforts to co-opt their support for your crusade? Yes, Jim, some squirrely ideas (and “rabid” ones at that) are definitely running amok on these matters but only such things as may be found on the Cumberland Plateau or in the city of Austin, Texas.

As you are the one who has brought this correspondence to a close, we will content ourselves with continuing to expose your error through the medium that occasioned

your aborted sortie to the polemic platform. However, if you determine at some future point to deal with the subject substantially through the offering of serious propositions addressing our differences, then we will be more than willing to have the door of negotiation on the same reopened. But as long as you insist on trying to make this a dispute over whether or not fornication is the only divinely–authorized ground for putting away, then you are chasing rabbits. We are in agreement on this point! It is the application of the exceptive clause to the entirety of the text which is at issue in this regard. Again, you either do not grasp this pertinent fact or you do and are being disingenuous about the whole matter. If the latter, then shame! The damage that you have done to the cause of Christ through your false teaching on MDR and matters related thereto in East Tennessee alone is horrendous. If you did it knowing that you were wrong, then it is not only horrendous but monstrous.

Also, if you persist in assigning to us a position that we do not hold and that you cannot prove from our own material to hold, then you do so dishonestly and deceitfully. Rest assured that we will fully expose your dishonesty in this regard. You cannot prove that we hold to the nonsensical notion you have ascribed to us. Further, in making your hypocritical claims you have placed yourself by your own writings in a worse position than you realize. If you would simply take the time to really think about your own explanation of things, you would realize the absurdity and mendacity of your criticisms of the opposing view. We intend to give you all the exposure that you so richly deserve and obviously, by your despicable attacks, desire.

Jim, you asserted in your letter to Terry Hightower that a woman who was being put away by her husband on grounds other than fornication while he himself was guilty of fornication could claim that the divorce was actually her putting him away for his fornication. The only difference is that you say she must sign the unscripturally obtained divorce document. Somehow mystically it now becomes the instrument of a Scriptural divorce for fornication! Now, brother Waldron, how in the world could she claim that to be the case, given your position? We have read what Woods would have called your “lame logic and fallacious reasoning” for it. But, Jim, the claim would not be in the divorce suit filed by the husband and duly registered with the court as being on the grounds of fornication. It would not be part of the decision of the judge, especially in no fault states. Neither would it be gavelled to be the case by him, nor even entered into the court records as having been granted to her on said grounds. The fact is the only place it would be as far as civil law is concerned is in her mind according to your assertion. Thus, Jim, you are the one affirming, as per your OWN definition, “mental divorce”!

Furthermore, Jim, many states and countries do not require the signing of any formal document. The case after adjudication is settled as far as the civil law under such con-

ditions is concerned when the judge or magistrate makes his ruling. In many cases only social custom is used as the basis for both marriage and divorce. There are no legal procedures followed under such circumstances. As you yourself have noted, in some cultures simply jumping over a broom by a couple is the only ceremony involved in formulating a marriage. In many cultures it has been the practice (and in some it still is the practice) for a couple to be divorced simply by abandonment of the conjugal home by either party, usually the wife, or by eviction of one of the parties by the other, usually involving the man evicting the woman. What document in such cases is to be signed, Jim? Is the whole matter pertaining to cause then just a matter of what is in the mind of the specific party or parties involved? If yes, then you have just forfeited your entire position! Is that an “Amen” or an “Oh, me” that we hear coming from Crossville, Jim?

All things being Scripturally equal, it is God who actually severs the bond when the innocent party puts away the guilty fornicator. This has always been our position. It cannot be severed arbitrarily by either of the human parties to the marriage, which fact is directly at odds with much of the material you sent to Daniel, in particular the material from Mike Glenn. You once knew this truth and affirmed it in your debate with Hicks, despite your attempt to spin the history of that debate in keeping with your newer position. Where did you get this new doctrine, Jim? Did it come from the influence of some brethren in the Atlanta, GA area who held to it back in the 1980s? Nevertheless, you are now compelled to hold that whatever the civil judge decrees is what goes as concerns the nature and validity of the putting away. Yet this position is at odds with some of the statements you made in your letter to Terry. You do not seem the least bit aware of this self-contradiction and the logical dilemmas it creates for you. Further, you seem also totally unaware that Eddie Whitten holds that a civil divorce that is not for fornication does not sever the marriage bond and that both parties

are still bound to one another in the sight of God despite it. This is especially interesting in view of the material you sent to Daniel from brother Glenn, your co-worker at Crossville. His affirmation of the fictitious three-covenant theory of marriage and absurd assertion that “man’s law triggers God’s law” on MDR, we suspect, you would not like to have to deal with in debate as well. His view is even wackier than yours, if that is at all possible!

Jim, it really is somewhat surprising to us that you even have gone this far in discussing (if it may be called a discussion) the matter with us in view of the obvious false, foolish, and self-contradictory nature of your own position. It is no wonder to us that now you seek to run off and hide from the controversy which you have stirred. It appears that you were never really prepared to deal with it in open and honest debate. Further, it also appears that you really do not even have a settled position on the role of civil law relative to MDR – you simply promote whatever seems to be convenient for the occasion. If an article by Eddie seems to do your dirty work, then you publish it, but you are also just as willing to promote the error of Mike Glenn on the subject, despite their mutual incompatibility. But, as though that were not enough, you have no problem fellowshipping Southwest and others who endorse or support the absurd and egregious errors of Stan Crowley, as in the case of your upcoming participation with Bryan Braswell on the Mid-Ark Lectures in October of this year, while daring to castigate and condemn us for consistently teaching just what Guy N. Woods and Roy C. Deaver taught on the subject of MDR. If we were as haplessly confused or intellectually jaded as you evidently are on the matter, then we too would be hesitant to debate the issue.

Yours for the Cause,  
 /s/ David P. Brown  
 /s/ Daniel Denham

## NEW BRAUNFELS, TEXAS LECTURESHIP

September 18-20, 2009

### *Practical Lessons From The Book of Revelation—Part II*

**Fri., 7:00 PM:**

*Great Lessons From The Rev.* —**Dub McClish**

**Fri., 8:00 PM:**

*And They Overcame* (Rev. 12 & 13)—**David P. Brown**

**Sat., 9:30 AM:**

*Blessed Are The Dead Who Die In The Lord* (Rev. 14)—

**Johnny Oxendine**

**Sat., 10:30 AM:**

*Song of Moses & The Lamb* (Rev. 15 & 16)—**Dub McClish**

*Lunch 11:20 – 12:45 PM*

**Sat., 1:00 PM:**

*Called, Chosen, and Faithful* (Rev. 17)—**Gene Hill**

**Sat., 2:00 PM:**

*Babylon is Fallen* (Rev. 18 and 19)—**John West**

2:50 – 3:30 PM: *QUESTIONS & ANSWERS.*

**Sun., 9:30 AM:**

*The Books Were Opened* (Rev. 20)—**Michael Hatcher**

**Sun., 10:30 AM:**

*Heaven* (Rev. 21 and 22)—**Lynn Parker**

**Sun., 1:30 PM:** *Twisting Revelation – False Doctrines—*

**Don Tarbet**

Accommodations for RV’s are available. ♦ Lessons will be available on the internet and DVD. ♦ For more information, call 830-625-9367 (ch. building) or 830-639-4234. ♦ The church of Christ at New Braunfels meets at 255 Saengerhalle Road, New Braunfels, TX.

## Directory of Churches...

### -Alabama-

**Holly Pond**—Church of Christ, Hwy 278 W., P.O. Box 131, Holly Pond, AL 35083, Sun. 10:00 a.m., 11:00 a.m., 6:30 p.m., Wed. 7:00 p.m., (256) 796-6802, (205) 429-2026.

### -Colorado-

**Denver**—Piedmont Church of Christ, 1602 S. Parker Rd. Ste. 109, Denver, CO 80231, Sunday: 9 a.m., 10 a.m., 6 p.m., Wed. 7 p.m. www.piedmontcoc.net, Lester Kamp, evangelist. (720) 535-5807.

### -England-

**Cambridgeshire**—Ramsey Church of Christ, meeting at the Rainbow Centre, Ramsey, Huntingdon. Sun. 10, 11 a.m.; Wed. (Phone for venue and time); www.Ramsey-church-of-christ.org. Contact Keith Sisman, 001.44.1487.710552; fax:1487.813264 or Keith Sisman.net. Research Website of 1,000 years of the British Church of Christ; www.Traces-of-the-kingdom.org and www.Myth-and-Mystery.org.

### -Florida-

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

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

### -North Carolina-

**Rocky Mount**—Scheffield Drive Church of Christ, 3309 Scheffield Dr., Rocky Mount, NC 27802 (252) 937-7997.

### -South Carolina-

**Belvedere (Greater Augusta, Georgia Area)**—Church of Christ, 535 Clearwater Road, Belvedere, SC 29841, www.belvederechurchofchrist.org; e-mail belvecoc@gmail.com, (803) 442-6388, Sun.: 10:00 a.m., 11:00 a.m., Wed. 7:00 p.m., Evangelist: Ken Chumbley (803) 279-8663.

### -Oklahoma-

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

### - Tennessee-

**Murfreesboro**—Church of Christ, 1154 Park Avenue, Murfreesboro, TN 37129, Sun. Bible class 9:00 a.m., Worship 10:00 a.m., Fellowship meal 11:00 a.m., Devotional 12:00 p.m.; Wed. Bible Study 7:00 p.m. For directions and other information please visit our website at www.murfreesboro-churchofchrist.org. evangelist, Steve Yeatts.

### -Texas-

**Denton area**—Northpoint Church of Christ, 5101 E. University Dr. (Greenbelt Business Park). Mailing address: Northpoint Church of Christ, Greenbelt Business Park, 5101 E. University Dr., Box 6, Denton, TX 76208. E-mail: northpointcoc@hotmail.com. Sunday: 9:30, 10:30, 1:00; Wednesday 7:00. Contact: Dub McClish: 940.323.9797; tgjoriginal@verizon.net.

**Evant**—Evant Church of Christ, 310 West Brooks Drive, Evant, TX 76525. Office: (254) 471-5705; Jess Whitlock, evangelist (254) 471-5717.

**Houston area**—Spring Church of Christ, 1327 Spring Cypress, P.O. Box 39, Spring, TX 77383, (281) 353-2707. Sun. 9:30 a.m., 10:30 a.m., 6:00 p.m., Wed. 7:30 p.m., David P. Brown, evangelist. Home of the Spring Contending for the Faith Lectures beginning the last Sunday in February. www.churchesofchrist.com.

**Hubbard**—105 NE 6th St., Hubbard, TX 76648, Sun. 9:30 a.m., 10:30 a.m., 6:00 p.m., Wed. 7:00 p.m. Delbert J. Goines; DJGoines@Valornet.com.

**Huntsville**—1380 Fish Hatchery Rd. Huntsville, TX 77320. Sun. 9 a. m., 10 a.m., 6 p.m., Wed. 7 p.m. (936) 438-8202.

**New Braunfels**—225 Saenger Halle Rd. Sun: 9:30 a.m., 10:30 a.m., 1:30 p.m. Wed. 7:30 p.m. Lynn Parker, evangelist. (830) 625-9367. www.nbchurchofchrist.com.

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

### -Wyoming-

**Cheyenne**—High Plains Church of Christ, 421 E. 8th St., Cheyenne, WY 82007, tel. (307) 638-7466, Sunday: 9:30 a.m., 10:30 a.m., 6:00 p.m., Wed. 7:00 p.m., Tel. (307) 514-3394, evangelist: Roelf L. Ruffner