

# Contending FOR THE Faith™

FOR THOSE WHO LOVE THE TRUTH AND HATE ERROR

## APOSTASY AND RESTORATION

Ian McPherson

Christ established His church in the New Testament era through the power of the Holy Spirit on the Jewish Day of Pentecost just fifty days from his death. When people were baptized for the remission of their sins the Lord added those who were saved from their sins to His church (Acts 2:38, 41, 47). The Apostle's doctrine formed the basis of its teaching (Acts 2:42). The church continued to grow in Jerusalem, and when persecution came it scattered. The gospel spread from Jerusalem to Judea and then Samaria and to the uttermost parts of the earth (Acts 1:8). Ultimately, within the first century the gospel was preached to every person under heaven (Colossians 1:23).

The church that was established was not a denomination but it was planned in the eternal, omniscient, and omnipotent mind of God (Ephesians 3:10), purchased by the blood of Jesus Christ (Acts 20:28) and brought into force through his resurrection from the dead and exaltation in heaven on the first Pentecost day following Christ's resurrection and ascension to His Heavenly Father and ours (Acts 1:9-11; 2; Ephesians 1:19-23).

Denominations came into existence many hundreds of years later as a result of preachers and others losing their love for the truth, and the courage to preach sound doctrine. Over centuries the church of the Bible fell away from its original form which resulted in hundreds of sects, or denominations, being formed. (This falling away is described in detail in I Timothy 4:1-5 and II Thessalonians 2:1-12). Apostasy happened gradually, but came about because people lost their love for the truth and preferred to have their ears tickled (II Timothy 4:4). This short lesson is a description of how the church fell away from the truth how denominations came into existence and how diligent Bible scholars found their way back to the truth and, thus, to the Lord's church.

### DEVELOPMENT OF CATHOLICISM

The first area of apostasy was in organization. Local congregations of the New Testament church were fully organized when they had "**elders in every church**" (Acts 14:23). This system went unchanged until an elder from the church at Antioch by the name of **Ignatius** (circa A.D.

50-117) thought that it would be more advantageous to call the chairman of the board of elders a "bishop". "Elder" meant an older distinguished person, and "bishop" meant "overseer". These both refer to the same office. (II Timothy 3:1-8, Titus 1:5-9) The Greek words which describe them are used interchangeably (Acts 20:28). After the trend introduced by Ignatius, the church gradually became centralized.

*First*, Bishops from local congregations began meeting together and making decisions on behalf of their allotted areas known as a diocese.

*Second*, people began trying to trace a fictitious line of bishops back to the apostolic era, and power hungry bishops began pointing to Peter as the Chief Apostle and to Rome as the seat of religious power in the Church. For over 500 years many other innovations characterized the apostasy. Finally out of that apostasy full-fledged Roman Catholicism came to be.

In A.D. 606, Boniface III was the first to successfully claim to be Universal Bishop of the church. The pope eventually took on the title of "Most Holy Father", which is a title that only belongs to God. The Bible forbids men using religious titles (Matthew 23:5-11). Christ is the only head of the church (Ephesians 1:20-23; Colossians 1:18).

The trend towards papal power and the apostasy of the church was originally generated by Emperor Constantine. He was sympathetic with Christianity and did good things of which we, as a church, reap the benefit today. For example he stopped persecution of the church by issuing the Edict of Milan in A.D. 313. He also made Sunday a holiday, thus enabling Christians more liberty to meet for worship through the day instead of in the night after work (Acts 20:7). However, over all, Constantine had a disastrous affect on the apostate church.

His influence caused it to become a political institution instead of a religious one. Also it became materialistic instead of evangelistic. Constantine gave much state money to build beautiful buildings, thus putting the emphasis on the meeting place of the church instead of the assembly itself. He said:

(Continued on Page 5)

# Contending FOR THE Faith™

David P. Brown, Editor and Publisher  
jbrow@charter.net

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-in-Chief 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.

## 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...

### WHAT NEXT?

The following announcement appeared in the bulletin of the Forest Hill Church of Christ, "*The Forest Hill News*," Page 3, November 15, 2005.

#### IN THE AREA

South Germantown Road church of Christ,  
family and Friends Day,  
Sunday, November 20, 2:30 p.m.  
Speaker: Jerry Taylor of Abilene, Texas.

At this writing it has been a few days over two months since the preceding announcement appeared in the Forest Hill church bulletin. We have waited this long to write about this announcement to see if any explanation of why it appeared in *The Forest Hill News* would be forthcoming. To date we have seen nothing from the powers that be at the Forest Hill congregation to explain why the announcement appeared in *The Forest Hill News*. Why would any faithful congregation advertise any church or gathering having Jerry Taylor of Abilene, Texas as the speaker? The preceding question will take on much more significance after you read the following information about **Jerry Taylor** of Abilene, Texas.

#### WHO IS JERRY TAYLOR?

Jerry Taylor is Assistant Professor of Bible at Abilene Christian University. He came to ACU after...

being involved in congregational ministry in Georgia, North Carolina and Texas. He teaches general education Bible classes. He graduated from Southwestern Christian College with a bachelor's degree in Bible in 1984. He received his Master of Divinity degree in 1988 as well as his Doctor of Ministry degree in 1995 from Southern Methodist University. He is one of the organizers of the annual *New Wineskins* Ministers Retreat.<sup>1</sup>

Taylor "was recently presented the Outstanding Leadership Award at the NAACP National Convention. A frequent speaker at college and church conferences around the country, Jerry is known for his engaging and challenging oratory. He is a remarkable preacher in the spirit of the prophets and the Sermon on the Mount."<sup>2</sup>

Taylor is scheduled to speak at the Rochester College 9<sup>th</sup> Annual Sermon Seminar, May 22 – 24, 2006. The speakers scheduled to be with Taylor in this seminar are: Stanley Hauerwas, the Gilbert T. Rowe Professor of Theological Ethics at the Divinity School of Duke University; Charles L. Campbell, the Peter Marshall Professor of Homiletics at Columbia Theological Seminary in Decatur, Georgia; Warren Carter, Professor of New Testament at Saint Paul School of Theology; Dennis Dewey, itinerant, international, and ecumenical

Contending for the Faith—February/2006

ministry of story telling; **Richard T. Hughes**, Distinguished Professor of Religion and Director, Center for Faith and Learning, Pepperdine University; and **Dean Smith** who has...

served with the Chicago based Human Rights Advocacy Council, the Bioethics committee of a San Antonio hospital, and that city's Metropolitan Ministries, a nationally recognized ministry for the homeless. Dean has preached and taught at Pepperdine, ACU, and Rochester College lectureships and currently ministers for the University Avenue Church of Christ while teaching, preaching at the Austin Graduate School of Theology (a Presbyterian School), Austin, Texas.<sup>3</sup>

Last, but not least among apostate brethren appearing on the Rochester College seminar, is Rubel Shelly, who, for 27 years preached for the Woodmont Hills Church of Christ (Nashville) and taught at Lipscomb, Vanderbilt School of Medicine, and Tennessee State. He became Professor of Religion and Philosophy at Rochester College in 2005. If you did not know, Rochester College is supposed to be affiliated with the churches of Christ.<sup>4</sup>

On August 24, 2005 Taylor spoke to the Richland Hills congregation, Richland Hills, Texas. Richland Hills is located North of Fort Worth, Texas. This is where Rick Atchley is the preacher.<sup>5</sup> One cannot get much more liberal than this crowd.

Taylor has written for the liberal publication *New Wineskins*. His article is entitled "Jesus Shows Us How to Respond to Injustice"<sup>6</sup> He also has an audio presentation for the on-line publication of *New Wineskins*. His audio presentation entitled "Racial Reconciliation" is dated 11/03/2005.<sup>7</sup> *New Wineskins* is a publication of The Zoe Group, Inc. The executive director is Eric Noah-Wilson. The publisher of *New Wineskins* is Larry Bridgesmith; senior editors: Mike Cope, Rubel Shelly; managing editor: Greg Taylor; editors at large: John Ogren, Thom Lemmons, Darryl Tippens, and Lynn Anderson—A bigger nest of apostates never existed.<sup>8</sup>

Liberal senior editor of *New Wineskins*, Mike Cope, credited Taylor with starting a conference on racism because of "heavy" criticism from the "more conservative side of Churches of Christ." Cope stated:

This conference was started by my friend Dr. Jerry Taylor and some of his friends as a place of fellowship for preachers in African-American Churches of Christ who had received heavy criticism from the more conservative side of Churches of Christ. The retreat speakers are very prominent in African-American Churches. Over the past few years the retreat has begun to be more interracial, and this year's meeting is intended to further that goal (it is held at Richland Hills Church of Christ, a white church).<sup>9</sup>

**WHY WOULD FAITHFUL BRETHERN  
ADVERTISE SUCH A PERSON AS  
JERRY TAYLOR AND THE CHURCH**

## In This Issue...

APOSTASY AND RESTORATION IAN McPHERSON	1
EDITORIAL... WHAT NEXT? DAVID P. BROWN	2
FROM J. A. HARDING LLOYD CLINE SEARS	6
THERE WILL BE NO SUCH SECESSION FOY E. WALLACE, JR.	7
"COME FORTH MY PEOPLE" DUB McCLISH	8
THE DISARMAMENT MEETING AT DETROIT FOY E. WALLACE, JR.	9
Q&A ON THE RISE OF THE CHRISTIAN CHURCH GUY N. WOODS	11
RESTORATION REFLECTIONS... HEINOUSNESS OF REJECTING THE RESTORATION PLEA PAUL VAUGHN	13
SKILLMAN AVENUE CHURCH OF CHRIST'S JOINT WORSHIP SERVICE WITH DEMONINA- TIONS MARVIN L. WEIR	14
MACK LYON AND THE EDMOND CHURCH OF CHRIST BEN JUSTICE	15
THE KETEF HINNOM SCROLLS AND RELIGION IN ANCIENT JUDAH GARY YOUNG	18
SPIRITUAL INSIGHTS FROM GODLY WOMEN... WHY ME? LAVONNE JAMES McCLISH	20
THE LAST WORD... 1906-2006: THE CONTINUING APOSTASY KENT BAILEY	21
CARTOON	

### THAT WOULD HAVE HIM?

It may be that some will opine that this is not the same Jerry Taylor as the ACU professor. However, we emailed the ACU Taylor to determine whether the Taylor appearing at the South Germantown Road congregation was or was not the Taylor from ACU. Please note the following e-mails.

At 12:37 PM 1/18/2006, you wrote:

Dear Sir:

Just inquiring to see if you are the same Jerry



Taylor that spoke on Nov. 20, 2006 at the South Germantown Road Church of Christ.

Sincerely,  
David Brown

\*\*\*\*\*

From: Dr. Jerry A. Taylor

Date: Wednesday, January 18, 2006, 1:13 PM

To: David P. Brown

Subject: Re: Speaker at South Germantown Road.

Hello David,

I am Jerry Taylor and I did speak at the South Germantown Road church of Christ on Nov. 20, 2006.

Jerry Taylor

For those who do not want to believe what the previous e-mails reveal about Jerry Taylor speaking at the South Germantown Road congregation, let them contact the South Germantown church or Taylor for themselves and find out.

I know it is emphasized in the classes at MSOP that bulletin editors have a responsibility to be particular and discerning about what is advertised in the bulletins they edit. I also know that mistakes will be made no matter how careful and meticulous one is. However, I also know that when a mistake is made, especially of the caliber error herein noted, a correction should have been made in the very next issue of *The Forest Hill News*. The error is compounded when (1) it is the only area church meetings advertised in that issue of the bulletin and (2) the recent change in attitude of at least some at MSOP toward confronting error and defending false teachers. Surely, someone caught the mistake (if it was a mistake). But, if someone saw the mistake, why was it not corrected? Or, maybe the people involved in putting out the bulletin had no idea who Jerry Taylor is, or the caliber church that would invite him to participate in their program. Whatever the case it remains to be corrected in the same venue it was made. Remember, brethren, "Do not use them if you do not know them" is a good "rule of thumb" in selecting speakers and writers. It seems to me that this "rule of thumb" should guide us in whom and what we advertise. Also, when we make a mistake we ought to correct it as best we can in the same manner and place it was made. This has long been and is the policy of *Contending for the Faith*.

#### **IT IS BALANCED ADVICE BECAUSE**

#### **IT IS TRUE TO THE BIBLE**

Back in the dark ages of January 1982 in *The Spiritual Sword*, Volume 13, Number 2, page 48, the editor of the journal at the time, the late Thomas B. Warren, printed the following question/answer articles from Roy C. Deaver. Garland Elkins was the journal's associate editor. Obviously brother Elkins was in full agreement with the sentiment expressed in the articles and with Warren

printing the two articles in *The Spiritual Sword*.

#### **QUESTION: SOME PREACHERS AND CHURCHES ARE "ISSUE ORIENTED." IS THIS AS IT SHOULD BE?**

The word "issue," in the context of the question, means "a point, matter, or question to be disputed or decided."

Every accountable person in the world is obligated to be sincerely concerned about the truth. Each one (every one) must be sincerely concerned about what the Bible teaches on every subject (or topic) with which it deals. And, every child of God must be meaningfully concerned about any position or doctrine which is out of harmony with or contradictory to the Bible teaching. Obviously, therefore, every preacher, every church, and every Christian must be "issue" oriented.

—Roy Deaver

#### **QUESTION: WHEN AN EDITOR WRITES AN EDITORIAL "BLACK-LISTING" THOSE WHO "CONTEND EARNESTLY FOR THE FAITH," IS HE NOT BEING GUILTY OF THAT WHICH HE CONDEMNS?**

Obviously, yes. There are brethren among us who want to fellowship everybody excepting those who do not want to fellowship everybody. They want to tolerate everything and everybody excepting those who won't tolerate that kind of toleration. They want to include everything and everybody excepting those who don't want to include everything and everybody.

I know of one brother who has become an "extremist" in his fight against "extremists." "...**thou therefore that teachest another, teachest thou not thyself**" (Romans 2:21).

—Roy Deaver

#### **WOULD YOU SAY THAT THE PRECEDING ARTICLES ARE BIBLICALLY BALANCED OR BIBLICALLY OUT OF BALANCE?**

#### **ENDNOTES**

<sup>1</sup> <http://www.acu.edu/academics/cbs/dbmm/faculty/taylor.html>

<sup>2</sup> <http://www.rc.edu/sermonseminar/presenters.html#campbell>

<sup>3</sup> Ibid.

<sup>4</sup> Ibid.

<sup>5</sup> <http://www.rhchurch.org/audio.php?pagecount=5&a=1&b=2>

<sup>6</sup> [http://www.wineskins.org/filter.asp?SID=2&fi\\_key=34&co\\_key=317](http://www.wineskins.org/filter.asp?SID=2&fi_key=34&co_key=317)

<sup>7</sup> <http://wineskins.alsw.com/page.asp?SID=2&Page=223>

<sup>8</sup> <http://www.wineskins.org/page.asp?SID=2&Page=33>

<sup>9</sup> <http://mikecope.blogspot.com/2005/08/to-follow-this-blog-you-might-want-to.html>

—David P. Brown, Editor

My most intense desire is to erect beautiful edifices upon that consecrated spot....Take every care and precaution that these edifices may not only be magnificent, but that they may be incomparably superior to all the most beautiful structures in the world.

Another detrimental thing Constantine introduced into the apostate church was the first human creed. This was composed in A.D. 325 by Alexander, Athanasius and Constantine, with the purpose of settling a dispute between bishops on the nature of the Godhead. From this time onward, the church could not function without creeds. These authoritative statements eventually were enforced by acts of parliament, and those who did not agree with them were called heretics. The debate on the Godhead, and the nature of Christ eventually led to authoritative statements such as Mary being unscripturally called "Mother of God".

Once the Roman Catholic Church came into existence the popes eventually became even more powerful than Emperors. Pope Innocent III (1198-1216) claimed he had the power to depose any emperor on earth whether they were Roman or not. During his reign, papal power was at its strongest point ever. Popes were able to exert this power for three reasons. First, the belief that God had established a line of authority from Peter, and that the pope sat in Peter's chair. Second, the pope could excommunicate Emperors if they did not yield to their wishes. Third, the pope could order priests to refuse emperors priestly duties such as serving mass, performing marriages or burying the dead until the ruler repented. Emperors believed that they would be doomed to hell if these privileges were withheld.

Throughout history many Ecumenical Councils met and many began to enforce doctrines foreign to the Bible. Some of them were, temporal power of the Pope (A.D. 730), adoration of Mary and other saints (A.D. 788), mechanical instrumental music (A.D. 666), adoration of the cross, images and relics (A. D. 788), marriage of priests forbidden (A.D. 1079), rosary beads (A.D. 1090), sales of indulgence (A.D. 1190), sacrifice of Mass (A.D.1215), transubstantiation of bread into the actual flesh of Jesus' body (A.D.1215), auricular confession to the priest (A.D. 1215), purgatory proclaimed (A.D. 1438), "tradition" held equal with the Bible (A.D. 1545), apocryphal books added to the Bible (A.D. 1546), immaculate conception of Mary (A.D.1845) and the infallibility of the Pope (A.D. 1870).

#### **PROTESTANT REFORMATION**

In the movement known as "The Protestant Reformation" Martin Luther, a Catholic monk in Germany came to the forefront of this effort to reform Roman Catholicism. On October 31, 1517 Luther challenged to debate the Catholic Church on ninety-five areas where they had strayed from the Bible. He was excommunicated from the Catholic Church and, thus, the beginning of the first Protestant denomination was begun. He did much good for Christianity. He translated the Bible into German, thus putting the Bible in the hands of the people, and opposed Papal authority. Unfortunately, he did not go far enough. The Augsburg Confession, which was a summation of Luther's beliefs, was drawn up and men continued to follow creeds instead of the Bible.

Although Luther, in his writings, pleaded with men not to call themselves Lutherans, this is exactly what his followers did. This was in direct contradiction with I Corinthians 1:10-12 which forbids the following of men. This trend continued for centuries, and stopped men's search for truth. Dozens of different leaders emerged after this, starting different churches and drawing up different creeds. They called their groups by different names to distinguish them from others. This resulted in hundreds of sects (denominations) being formed.

John Calvin, another reformer, became the town dictator of Geneva in 1541. He ruled with an "iron hand." Under his dictatorship, people were not allowed to swear, play dice, gamble or sing indecent songs. Except for spies, no one was allowed out in the streets after nine o'clock at night. He also systematized doctrines that were originally taught by Augustine of Hippo (354-430 A.D.). This doctrine became known as "Calvinism" after John Calvin. The doctrine teaches a false concept of the Sovereignty of God. It teaches that men can do nothing whatsoever in order to be saved by God. This led Calvin to believe that some people are "predestined to be lost" and others to be saved, and there was nothing at all that anyone could do about damnation or salvation. He was so powerful that he could force people to accept his teachings or be put to death. Calvin executed 57 men between the years of 1542-1546 and banished seventy-six others who did not follow his theology.

#### **RESTORATION**

With the introduction of the printing press, the Bible became much more available to the common man. This caused many to question Calvinism and many other human philosophies. Men began to hunger for truth. This resulted in men in different places desiring to go back to the Bible alone for religious authority. They desired to restore the New Testament church which had become lost in the confusion of denominationalism. Restoration principles began in England and Scotland, but ultimately took solid roots in the United States of America as people migrated from England looking for freedom in the new land.

#### **RESTORATION IN THE UNITED KINGDOM**

In 1669 there were churches meeting under the name "Church of Christ" in Lancashire. They practiced immersion, partook of the Lord's Supper weekly and had elders and deacons. John Glas of Scotland advocated that there was a New Testament pattern for all teaching. He stressed weekly observance of the Lord's Supper, and believed that each New Testament congregation was autonomous. Other groups similar to this also emerged in the United Kingdom.

#### **RESTORATION IN THE UNITED STATES**

A preacher by the name of **James O'Kelly** left the Methodists in 1799. He introduced three primary restoration principles into the North Carolina area. (1) The use of the name "Christian" for God's people. (2) The Bible as the only creed. (3) The right of private judgment. Another man, Elias Smith in 1802 began a

group with five members. It was called "The church of Christ" and the members were called "Christians". He began an influential journal called "*The Herald Of Gospel Liberty*" which contended for restoration principles.

Barton W. Stone (1722-1844) denounced the *Westminster Confession*, and denominationalism. He then formed a group called "The Springfield Presbytery", but soon realized this was just establishing another sectarian body. This body was soon dissolved by the writing of "*The Last Will And Testament of the Springfield Presbytery*". One item of this document said:

That the people henceforth take the Bible as the only sure guide to heaven, and as many as are offended with other books which stand in competition with it, may cast them into the fire if they choose, for it is better to enter into life having one book than having many to be cast into hell.

Independently of Stone, Thomas Campbell and his son Alexander migrated from Ireland and began a sweeping movement to restore the church of the Bible. Later the Campbell's met up with the Stone movement and together began establishing churches after the New Testament pattern throughout the United States and ultimately throughout the world. "These churches met for worship each Sunday (Acts 20:7), were independently ruled by elders (Acts 14:23) and baptized by immersion for remission of sins (Acts 2:38).

#### RESTORATION IN AUSTRALIA

The churches of Christ in Australia are a result of the restoration principle. These came originally through brethren migrating to Australia from the British Isles. There was also an indigenous movement begun by Stephen Check (1852-1883) whose family came from England and settled in Launceston, Tasmania when he was two years old. He came out of the Congregationalist Church and began a completely independent group of churches which eventually found they were identical to other churches of Christ and joined together. Unfortunately most of these deserted the restoration plea through influences of liberalism and eventual joined mainstream denominationalism. There are, however, many churches in Australia who continue to worship and serve the Lord according to the ancient order as autonomous self-governing congregations. They often call themselves Church of Christ (non-denominational) to distinguish themselves from their more liberal ancestors.

#### PRINCIPLES OF RESTORATION

Non-denominational churches of Christ today exist according to the same principle. It is important to realize that neither Stone nor Campbell established the church. All these men did was sort through the confusion of denominationalism and plant the pure New Testament seed in the hearts of the men of the generation. The principle of restoration is seen in the parable of the sower and the seed. When Christ explained the parable to his disciples, he said "**The seed is the word of God**" (Luke 8:11). Therefore, whenever the word of God planted in human hearts it produces

only Christians who are members of the church that Jesus established through the power of the Holy Spirit on the day of Pentecost. Seed always produces only after its kind (Genesis 1:11).

—5 Enderley Crt.  
East Devonport TAS 7310  
AUSTRALIA

## FROM J. A. HARDING

LLOYD CLINE SEARS

In the long and sometimes bitter fight to keep the disciples faithful to the Scriptures a friend of James A. Harding asked him to avoid personal controversy in opposing error and innovations. But Harding doubted if such a course were possible.

These innovators are amiable fellows if you keep out of their way and don't interfere with their plans; but if you do, they strike you with all the power and venom that is in them. My friend knows the power of this kingdom of the clergy, and he dreaded to see me enter into conflict with it. I, too, dreaded it when I first began to write for the press. I felt that I was entering upon a life of conflict that would probably wax hotter and hotter till the end. It would have been much pleasanter to have sought out a "Pastorate" and to have settled down to a quiet, inoffensive humdrum life, with a good salary.

But Harding's conscience would not permit the havoc being wrought in the church without speaking out with all the power he possessed. In large measure it was the influence of James A. Harding, David Lipscomb, the *Gospel Advocate*, and the *Firm Foundation* that kept the great body of the disciples in the South loyal to the ideal of Christian unity emphasized by Jesus and his apostles (Lloyd Cline Sears, *The Eyes of Jehovah* (Gospel Advocate Company, Nashville, Tennessee, 1970) p. 94).

—Deceased

Please Notify  
*Contending For The Faith*  
Of Your Address Change  
Send Changes To:  
*Contending For The Faith*  
P.O. Box 2357  
Spring, TX 77383



## THERE WILL BE NO SUCH SECESSION\*

FOY E. WALLACE, JR.

The above caption is taken from an editorial in the *Firm Foundation* by brother G. H. P. Showalter in reference to the efforts of James D. Murch and other digressive leaders, aided by Claud F. Witty, to “beguile” churches of Christ by their so-called, but misnamed, National Unity Meetings. brother Showalter’s editorial is a strong statement of the right attitude toward the unity question—the Bible attitude. It is characteristic of the writings of brother Showalter covering more than a third of a century when he takes up his pen to deal decisively with a vital issue.

### “THE UNITY MOVEMENT”

In another column (see page 2) the *Firm Foundation* is giving space to an article offered by Claud F. Witty and James Def. [Deforest, Editor] Murch proposing a consideration of the question: “What Is This Unity Movement?” brother Witty sent to me the manuscript some weeks past and I am aware that it has not received the prompt attention that its authors might reasonably expect. brother Witty in a personal letter accompanying the article says, “I know that you have not shown much interest in the movement, but I would like for you to let your readers know what the movement is.” To the contrary I am interested. I am, at all times, deeply concerned in any and all practical and Scriptural effort extended toward the unity of God’s people. “Movements” are sometimes dangerous. If one is, religiously, in the right place the less “movement” the better. If he wiggles about he is in danger of getting off the position that God desires and requires, and which alone is acceptable to him.

It is, of course, accepted without argument that God’s people should be united. No one will deny that. But it is quite a different thing to say that anything unscriptural should be tolerated in order to unity. Any unity consummated at the expense of recognition of and acceptance of either the teaching or practice of things not authorized in the New Testament is clearly a unity not of the kind for which the Lord prayed. To believe on Christ clearly cannot mean an acceptance of a part that he requires, and a rejection of the rest. It seems not to have occurred to some who are enthusiastic for “unity” that the really safe road to unity is the elimination of a lot of things that God has not required at our hands. Unscriptural teaching and practice connected with or introduced into the churches are responsible for the divisions that have separated and in many instances alienated a once united and happy people. To say that we can be united as long as these departures from God go uncorrected is to say that convictions must be stifled and compromised, and God’s word disregarded if only it may result in unity. The best way to bring about the unity that God desires and that our Savior requires is to be set about to eradicate from the churches and from the practice of professed Christians all of those things that are without divine authority and that are hence sinful in the sight of God.

The Pauline teaching on unity was addressed to the local congregation. He nowhere talks of a unity that would

bring about an ecclesiasticism. He does not call for that type of consolidation that would merge the different local churches into some sort of an organized brotherhood.... But the whole situation would have been different entirely had it been a dispute arising from following after false teachers who are introducing heresies. Paul would never have advised the brethren at Corinth to disregard such cause of division. He did not fail to approach problems of this order and to declare himself in no uncertain terms. “False teachers” have always been the bane of the church. They have always—from the earliest history of the church—brought about division for the simple reason that truth has no part with error, Christ has no part with Belial, nor he that believeth with an infidel. Paul may be quoted:

**Be not unequally yoked with unbelievers: for what fellowship have righteousness and iniquity? Or what communion hath light with darkness? Or what concord hath Christ with Belial? Or what portion hath a believer with an unbeliever? And what agreement hath a temple of God with idols? For ye are a temple of the living God ; even as God said, I will dwell in them, and walk in them ; and I will be their God and they shall be my people. Wherefore come ye out from among them, and be ye separate, saith the Lord, and touch no unclean thing; and I will receive you, and will be to you a Father, and ye shall be to me sons and daughters, saith the Lord Almighty. Having therefore these promises, beloved, let us cleanse ourselves from all defilement of flesh and spirit, perfecting holiness in the fear of God (II Corinthians 6:14-7:1).**

To be acceptable to God we must rid ourselves of (a) defilements of the flesh, all fleshly lusts that war against the soul—all sins of the body that pollute, corrupt, and destroy, and (b) of all defilements of the spirit, that is all false doctrine. Paul teaches that we should cleanse ourselves of all teaching and practice that is after the doctrines and commandments of men and not after Christ.

The church to be united must be purified. The cleansed, purified part of it is united already in Christ. They are calling for peace. But purity must precede peace. The wisdom that is from above is first pure, then peaceable (James 3:17). Purity first, then peace. We ought to be anxious for peace, but not so anxious for it that we would compromise the truth or unite with those who do. In the days of Jeremiah the prophet the ancient people of God had rejected him and his word so that of them it is said, “**from the least of them even unto the greatest of them every one is given to covetousness; and from the prophet even unto the priest every one dealt falsely.**” And just there it turned out that there were appeasers who were wanting peace. Of them the Lord said: “**They have healed also the hurt of my people slightly, saying Peace, peace, when there is no peace**” (Jeremiah 6:13, 14; 8:10, 11). There are times when God wants war,

not peace—opposition, not submission—separation, not unity. Whatsoever is not of faith is sin, and nothing unauthorized in the New Testament can be, to us, a matter of faith.

The Christian church people are not themselves united. In fact they are hopelessly divided. And with what particular section, branch, schism or faction do they want us to unite? Dozens of their churches now practice the so-called “open membership” doctrine. They accept into their full-fellowship people who have never been immersed. Into their membership are enrolled persons who come from the various sectarian religious bodies who practice sprinkling and pouring, and “are satisfied with it,” and have never been baptized—just been sprinkled or had water poured on them. I wonder if Brother Witty expects his cloak of unity to be big enough to encompass them. I believe brother Murch himself does not indorse such practice. If he does he will correct me. And if he does, brother Witty is certainly tying himself up with a most shameful corruption of the sound doctrine of Christ. And does he expect the churches of Christ who are earnestly contending for the faith once for all delivered to the saints, to be beguiled into a realm of religious practice that operates without the support of faith? There will be no such secession among the loyal churches of Christ—of that I am certain—and all the unity meetings and love feasts of misguided brethren will fail.

Paul said, “**We have the mind of Christ**” (I Corinthians 2:16). Also, “**Let this mind be in you which was also in Christ**” (Philippians 2:5). This shows that when Paul says, “**Be of the same mind in the Lord**” (Philippians 4:2, et al), this can be effected only by all having the mind of Christ, and this is the possible basis for unity. If we are going to be united, and all be of one mind and one heart, it can be effected only by all having the mind of Christ and this can be, only when we accept what he says and do as he requires. Unity must have a foundation on which to rest, and this, to believers, is, and necessarily must be, the word of God. --G. H. P. SHOWALTER, in *Firm Foundation*.

The above words of brother Showalter will carry weight. We recommend that brother Witty read them to his next Unity Meeting. For instance this passage: “There are times when God wants war, not peace--opposition, not submission--separation, not unity.” Then another passage: “brother Witty is certainly tying himself up with a most shameful corruption of the sound doctrine of Christ.” And yet another passage: “There will be no such secession among the loyal churches of Christ . . . and all the love feasts of misguided brethren will fail.”

That editorial will do great good and we put in our bid for more of the same order.

\*Foy E. Wallace, *The Present Truth*, pp. 729-732.

—Deceased

## “COME FORTH, MY PEOPLE”\*

DUB MCCLISH

Those who are determined to faithfully serve God sometimes find themselves allied with those who decidedly are not. This applies to many members of congregations that still wear the name “church of Christ,” but have ceased to be concerned with Scriptural authority for their teaching or practice. What are faithful saints who are in a congregation whose elders and preacher are not at all concerned with abiding in the “old paths” to do? The Lord’s answer is clear: “**Come forth, my people, out of her, that ye have no fellowship with her sins, and that ye receive not of her plagues**” (Revelation 18:4).

One stated purpose for exiting such an institution is to avoid fellowship with its sins. One has fellowship with such a church by means of financial support. One who remains in such a church also has fellowship with its error and evils by means of implicit endorsement. In spite of energetic argument by the liberals, it is folly to deny the connection between fellowship and endorsement. If one participates with (for such is the definition of “fellowship”) those who are teaching and practicing error, he is tacitly endorsing (agreeing with and encouraging) their error. He is lending his name and whatever influence for good he might have to efforts that oppose the Gospel. To remain a part of such a congregation is thereby a manifestation of support for it. This is why John wrote that we were neither to open our homes nor extend cordial greeting to false teachers, for to do so is to partake in (i.e., have fellowship with) their evil works (II John 10-11).

All of the objections one might register to the elders and preacher concerning unscriptural doctrines and practices in a digressive church are rendered mute when one stays there in spite of them. In fact, somewhere along the line it becomes hypocritical to continue to object if: (1) it is seen that no repentance of the error and evil is forthcoming, and (2) the objector stays in spite of apostasy. The message of such behavior to liberal preachers and elders (and all other observers) is that the objector is not really very concerned after all.

Brethren who object to and do not agree with much of what is going on in the congregation of which they are members need to understand that merely registering an objection and then staying there is not enough. Like it or not, as long as one is a member of an apostate church he is endorsing its apostasy!

\**The Edifier*, May 17, 1990, p. 2.

—908 Imperial Drive  
Denton, TX 76209

---

“The division is here. I and those who stand by the Word of God have done nothing to excite or foster it except to stand by the Word of God and, incidentally, on the ground the fathers of the Reformation occupied” (David Lipscomb, “Divisions,” *Gospel Advocate* 50, number 17 (April 23, 1908), p. 265).



## THE DISARMAMENT MEETING AT DETROIT\*

FOY E. WALLACE, JR.

That travesty on Unity recently staged at Detroit by some more or less prominent leaders of the Christian Church and some officious, self-appointed would-be pilots among us, has received the publicity its wily promoters have sought, without which they could not have forwarded their subtle schemes. As a “union meeting” it appears to have been a great triumph, but as a unity meeting it was a fiasco—a complete flop.

A look at the personnel will be enough to convince anybody who has kept informed and grounded in the faith that it was a weak affair, with the digressives decidedly in the advantage. Take a look at them: Claud F. Witty, J. N. Armstrong, E. L. Jorgenson, Don Carlos Janes, and officials of Harding College, Searcy, Arkansas. Men upon whom the cause has depended for defense and to whom a faithful church has looked for leadership in many impending crises were conspicuous by their absence. Hardeman, Srygley, Whiteside, Boles, Nichol, Showalter; these men were not there. Others who were there, and were expected by some to make this the last unity meeting, evidently did not arise to meet the need, as future “unity meetings” are already being planned. Wavering, compromising, side-stepping, love-making, were the order of the day. Direct discussion and debate of the actual issues were banned; in fact, it was declared that such was not the way to unity. It was a disarmament conference.

### THE SCRIPTURAL ATTITUDE

There is precept and example in the Word of God for the scriptural attitude toward those who have spoiled the unity of the church by their innovations. For a precept take a serious look at Romans 16:17: **“Now I beseech you, brethren, mark them which cause divisions and offenses contrary to the doctrine which ye have learned; and avoid them. For they that are such serve not our Lord Jesus Christ, but their own belly, and by good words and fair speeches deceive the hearts of the simple.”** No passage could better describe the purposes of these “unity” and “fellowship” meetings, nor better define the character of these leaders. It is pitiable that some brethren have apparently been deceived by their “good words and fair speeches.”

If fellowship can be extended in such meetings as this to those who have been “marked,” according to Romans 16:17, as dividers and offenders contrary to the doctrine we have learned, then it was wrong to mark them. If it was right to mark them, they should be avoided, and it is wrong to fellowship them. The Detroit mutual admiration convention is a new slant on how to mark and avoid **“them which cause divisions and offenses contrary to the doctrine”** we have learned.

An example of what our attitude toward such “unity” and “fellowship” meetings should be, is found in the ancient case of Nehemiah. At the first the Samaritans thought Nehemiah’s effort to rebuild the wall of Jerusalem was too feeble to oppose. They ignored him. They scoffed. Tobiah, the Ammonite, said, **“Even that which they build, if a fox go up, he shall even break down their stone wall.”** So said and did the digressives at the start. Seeing, however, that Nehemiah’s work was succeeding and **“the breaches began to be stopped,”**

Contending for the Faith—February/2006

the Samaritans **“conspired all of them together to come and to fight.”** Thus did the digressives in their later attempts to sustain their cause in debate. They launched a mighty fight. The great J. B. Briney labored hard to prove apostolic example for instrumental music in the church. O. E. Payne, with the indorsement of Briney and the *Standard*, battled for the music to the tune of *“psallo.”* But they could not take their own arguments seriously. *Psallo* did and did not prove it, as it could be either with or without; so they abandoned the fight. Now, like the strategy of Sanballat, they say, **“Come, let us meet together.”** Nehemiah said, **“They thought to do me mischief”**; but brother Armstrong calls them his “big-hearted Christian Church brethren” and stretches out his arms to them. Nehemiah sent back the word, **“I am doing a great work, so that I cannot come down: why should the work cease whilst I leave, and come down to you?”** Of course, Nehemiah did not have such a farsighted leader like Claud F. Witty to advise him that he should go, that such a meeting was the veritable “promised land” and if they could only “walk the wire” with Sanballat in such a meeting, they could possess the land! The promised land of compromise! That also is a new wrinkle on the promised land.

The strategy of these digressive Samaritans and Sanballats today from first to last has been uniformly true to form. Strategy has ever been the weapon of digression. But *wire-walking* is not the method of meeting *wireworking*. It was just such a thing—a great “unity meeting”—that brought the wily schemes of digressive leaders into the open about fifty years ago in Texas, when they ripped the church open by their meetings. They are up to no good thing now.

The fact that the *Christian Standard* heralds a great victory at Detroit is a fair indication that the meeting was a failure for the cause of truth. The editor of the *Standard* has celebrated their victory in several editorials, and his writers are holding a jubilee in the columns of that paper. Victory to digression is defeat to the Cause of the New Testament. The utter failure of the meeting for New Testament unity is seen in viewpoints of the articles in the *Standard*. They do not see themselves giving up their practices. They see opposition to their innovations crumbling, and large “contingents” or “groups” of the “conservative brethren” coming over to them. By unity they mean uniting with them, and that is all they have ever meant. Take a look at some of their articles.

### “GETTING BEYOND THE SLOGAN”

Under this caption the *Standard’s* editor discusses the restoration plea, “Where the Scriptures speak let us speak, and where the Scriptures are silent let us be silent.” He says our differences are over the interpretation of this human slogan. He would thus detract from his practice to a slogan. But it is their practice, not a slogan, that has divided the church. The slogan as worded by Thomas Campbell, while he was yet a Presbyterian, was incidental; but the same principle worded by Simon Peter, called to be an apostle of Jesus Christ, is inspired: **“If any man speak, let him speak as the oracles of God.”** What the editor brands as a human slogan is not a

human principle. The real issue is—Is it true or false? Who is conforming to it, and who is not? Edwin R. Errett says it really means: Where the Bible speaks let us be silent; but where the Bible is silent we may speak—because we are not bound! Strange juggling it is, indeed, that makes even a human slogan “really mean” just the opposite of what it says. But here a divine precept speaks again: “**That ye may learn not to go beyond the things that are written.**” (I Corinthians 4:15) Does that read like we may speak where the Word of God is silent? The only conclusion to be reached from the objections of the *Standard* and the “unity conference” to the restoration slogan is that they do not want to “speak where the Bible speaks and be silent where the Bible is silent.” They break down and admit that they have been speaking where the Bible is silent, but inform us that they aim to keep it up.

The restatement of the slogan decrees that where the Bible is silent we may speak. This is their defense of instrumental music now-down to date. It is their admission that the Bible is silent on the use of instrumental music in the church of Christ. A vital admission, indeed. What becomes of O. E. Payne’s book on “*psalmo*” which makes the music mandatory? Did the Hardeman-Boswell debate in Nashville kill that argument? A. D. Rogers and Homer Strong made their whole fight for the music in the Bentonville (Arkansas) debate on *psalmo*, and now the Unity Conference and the *Christian Standard* have kissed it goodbye! What about the apostolic example argument of the great Briney? If instrumental music comes under the “silence slogan,” then there is no apostolic example for it, and Briney was wrong. His favorite argument is “gone with the wind.” We knew all the time that it was all wind. What about the church-heaven argument by John W. Tyndall. If music comes under the “silence slogan” then it is not in the church-heaven, even if heaven is the church, as Tyndall contended. The admission is a complete surrender of every argument that has been offered and every effort that has been made to make instrumental music scriptural. It is a concession that every argument they have ever offered was wrong. Now, will the *Standard’s* editor, Edwin R. Errett, stand by these admissions? Speak up, brother Errett--what were you saying?

If editor Edwin Errett and the *Standard* stick to their statements there is only one issue now, namely: Does the silence of the New Testament authorize the use of instrumental music in the church? I hereby accept the negative of this proposition, and ask the editor of the *Standard* to defend his affirmation either in the *Standard* or on the polemic rostrum. This will clear the issue and would either expedite or ignite the unity movement.

#### “AUTHORITY OF CHRIST IN AREAS OF SILENCE”

Now comes W. R. Walker, in the *Standard*, saying: “I am persuaded that Christ has authority in ‘areas of silence,’ in every situation concerning which he has left no direct teaching, has bestowed upon me this authority to act for myself . . . absolute loyalty to the authority of Christ requires that we respect that congregational liberty which he has granted in those areas where he has left no plain instructions.” That was the keynote of the Unity Conference in Detroit. It is in complete harmony with Claud F. Witty’s announced *wire-walking* policy which would allow each congregation in the

“United Church” to determine for itself the use or non-use of instrumental music, without destroying fellowship between them all. Yet these “unity brethren” resent any intimation that they would sell the church down the river!

If W. R. Walker has the authority from Christ to “act for myself” in “areas of silence,” so does every man, Jew, Catholic and pagan. It looks more like acres of silence, when we begin to inspect the field. What a sweeping apology for innovation! What a religion, when such authority to “act for myself” is adopted by all! There are some passages of scripture that were evidently put on record to govern “areas of silence.” One of them reads, “**Whosoever transgresseth (goeth onward) and abideth not in the doctrine of Christ, hath not God.**” Another one reads, “**That ye may learn not to go beyond the things that are written.**” There are many such passages. They allow no human authority whatever. They permit no man to act for himself in any matter of worship and doctrine.

But the “authority of Christ in areas of silence” by the *Standard* is further concession that Christ “left no plain instructions” and “no direct teaching” for instrumental music in the church. So *psalmo* does not teach it. There is not a precept, not an example, not a word, in all the Word of God for its use, by their own admissions. They locate it in a vast “no man’s land,” which they call “areas of silence,” where the Methodists get infant membership and sprinkling, and where the Catholics get holy water, incense and kissing the pope’s big toe! These are weighty admissions from the *Standard* and will have distinct bearing on the future discussions of these issues.

#### “RAPPROCHEMENT AT DETROIT”

Under this somewhat dramatic title James Deforest Murch, brother Witty’s main side-kick, adds flavor to the union meeting salad dish. Some of the meanings of “rapprochement” are, reunion, concord, harmony, meeting half-way, etc. They evidently had “rapprochement at Detroit”! The *Christian Standard* relates that brother H. H. Adamson, in a spectacular moment, placed the Bible on the desk and took his position four feet from the Bible on one side, at the same time asking James DeForest Murch to take a position four feet from it on the other side. brother Adamson then said that he would not go to Murch and Murch would not come to him and proposed that they both move over to the Bible, and shake hands. So they met half-way. That was rapprochement at Detroit! The *Christian Standard* says that it was “very impressive.” But to us it seems a mockery of unity, child’s play, a sham, a travesty, on the teaching of the New Testament. By this “very impressive” performance, brother Adamson admitted that he was as far from the Bible as was James D. Murch. What is brother Adamson practicing that puts him four feet from the Bible, the same distance from it that Murch was? What does he propose to give up when he “moves over” to meet Murch half-way? If he says nothing—then the whole thing was a sham. But if he meant it—then it means compromise. Rapprochement! We expected better things of brother Adamson.

For wavering, compromising, conniving with error and innovation, there has not been the equal since digression swept so many brethren off their feet, when they went with the tide. As for the digressives, the attitude expressed in their articles

is proof that they are still digressives. It may be summed up as follows:

1. Their sophisticated interpretation of the restoration slogan.
2. Their loose references to the authority of Jesus Christ and the New Testament.
3. Their expressed sentiments in favor of the unity meetings assuming the form of delegate conventions, clothed with official rights.
4. Their plea for congregational liberty to use instrumental music in the church and other innovations.
5. Their same old nomenclature in the use of “conservative” and “progressive” terms, showing that they regard the non-use of the instrument as non-progressive.
6. In short, the fact that they have yielded no point intentionally, have no intention of doing so, and are only making monkeys out of a few of our brethren who think they are doing something spectacular, shows that the digressives are still digressive.

Instrumental music has never been the real issue. The real issue is the authority of the New Testament. The music question is only the horse they rode out on. If the music question should be eliminated, the actual issue would remain and manifest itself along other lines, centering in whatever particular thing they regarded the most convenient.

\*Foy E. Wallace, Jr., *The Present Truth*, pp. 470-476.

—Deceased

---

---

## Q&A ON THE RISE OF THE CHRISTIAN CHURCH\*

GUY N. WOODS

**“What were the basic causes of digression which led to the introduction of instrumental music into the worship, and other departures from the truth resulting in the formation of the Christian Church denomination?”**

Shortly before the turn of the present century [1900, editor] a movement originated in the church of Christ that resulted in what is commonly known as the Christian Church. The view is widespread that the cause of this schism and resultant division was instrumental music in the worship and societies in the work of the church. Technically speaking, this is incorrect. True, these were major differences between those who adhered to the original pattern of things and those who went out from us; yet instrumental music and the societies were effects rather than causes—symptoms of a spiritual malady chronic and fatal in its nature.

Dr. A. W. Fortune, sometime professor in the College of the Bible, Lexington, Ky., and “pastor” of the Central Christian Church of that city, in his book, *“The Disciples in Kentucky,”* sets forth the factors which led to the division as follows:

The controversies through which the Disciples have passed from the beginning to the present time have been the result of two different interpretations of their mission. There have been those who believed it is the spirit of the New Testament church that should be restored, and in our method of worship the church must adapt itself to changing conditions. There have been those who regarded the New Testament church as a fixed pattern for all time, and our business is to hold rigidly to that pattern regardless of consequences. Because of these attitudes, conflicts were inevitable, (Page 383.)

This is, we believe, a fair and impartial statement of the divergence of views that obtained then, and are now characteristic of the two groups. Because of these differences in attitude toward the Scriptures, it was, as Dr. Fortune suggests, inevitable that division should come; and it came shortly before the turn of the present century. Those who had worked

and worshiped together in an effort to plant again the cause of primitive Christianity in a land torn by division and cursed by denominationalism, divided among themselves, and the result was that another denomination came into existence! Ironically enough, those whose avowed mission in life was the utter destruction of all denominations became but another denomination, and thus built again the things they had once destroyed? Today the Christian Church admits its denominational status, and glories in the fact!

Instrumental music and the societies were, therefore, simply symptoms of the disease which lurked unseen—outward manifestations of an inward attitude wholly foreign to that which had characterized the Restoration Movement in its inception. Nor did this difference in attitude toward the Scriptures originate with this movement. It is the same as that which occasioned the famous controversy between Luther and Zwingli: whether we are at liberty to do anything not expressly forbidden, as Luther contended, or are bound by what is written, and must, therefore, do nothing for which there is not a “thus saith the Lord,” or an approved apostolic precedent, as Zwingli argued. This, too, is the point of issue between those who insist that the Bible, and the Bible alone, is a sufficient rule of faith and practice, and those who consider it a book of raw principles only, and therefore, adaptable to changing times and conditions. The former have always repudiated creeds, confessions of faith, and church manuals, while the latter have not hesitated to advocate them—indeed, to urge them as legitimate instruments to adopt the truth to present-day conditions. This is the door through which instrumental music, missionary societies, creeds, infant sprinkling, sprinkling and pouring as substitutes for baptism, and many other things admittedly not taught in the New Testament, were brought in. While all have not been as frank as Mr. Beecher, the eminent denominational preacher of an earlier generation, who said he practiced infant baptism for the same reason that he used an ox yoke—he had tried them and both worked—it is yet a fact



that this is the real reason why so many things unauthorized by the Scriptures are practiced without question today.

Such an attitude is, of course, wholly foreign to that which characterized those who launched and fought the early battles of the Restoration Movement. Those pioneers of the faith were determined to do nothing for which there is no express command or approved precedent; and they were willing to speak only when the Scriptures speak and remain silent where the Scriptures are silent. So long as these principles were adhered to, unity prevailed, and the cause of primitive Christianity spread with a rapidity equaled only by that of the apostolic age. The Christian Church of today is therefore, a total apostasy from the teaching of **Campbell, Stone, Scott, Lard**, and the others who were in the forefront of the effort to restore New Testament Christianity to the world. This, we believe, will not be seriously questioned by many of those who belong to that institution. Certainly those who boast of their denominational status will not insist on maintaining harmonious views with a man who required a daily paper in New Orleans to publish a correction of a statement representing him as the “head and founder” of a great denomination! Declaring that they did him too much honor—that he had always repudiated all human heads and names for the people of the Lord—Alexander Campbell demanded and received a correction of the notice erroneously inserted. Contrast Mr. Campbell’s attitude with that of “Dr. Harwood Miller,” the “permanent pastor” of the National City Christian Church:

Denominations and sects are not wholly or even largely the product of human pride and prejudice and unbrotherliness—a thing entirely wrong could not long endure by the devotion of men—it is unthinkable to condemn all sectarianism as sinful.

The real cause of division in the body of Christ was, therefore, an abandonment of the principles which had hitherto motivated us. Those who no longer looked upon the New Testament as an all-sufficient guide and rule of faith and practice did not scruple to demand things unauthorized therein, while those who clung tenaciously to the all-sufficiency of the Scriptures as stoutly resisted them; and division was, therefore, inevitable. This, indeed, has been the cause of all departures from the faith since the days of the apostles. Those who regard the Bible as a complete revelation for all time cannot, in conscience, add to or take from its

teaching in the smallest particular; while those who consider it as only a mass of raw principles to be worked into shape to fit changing conditions are not restrained by the injunctions it contains against adding to or taking from the holy word, and do not hesitate to do so when the exigencies of the hour seem to suggest it.

This fact is remarkably illustrated in the man who was responsible for first introducing an instrument of music into the church of Christ, L. L. Pinkerton. Said Dr. Fortune: “Dr. L. L. Pinkerton is credited by some with having been the first to make this departure when he introduced a melodeon in the worship of the church at Midway (Kentucky—G.N.W.)” The article on ‘Churches of Christ’ in *Religious Bodies*, 1926, makes that the beginning of the controversy. This statement is made: “The question as to the use of instrumental music of the church became an issue as early as 1859, when a melodeon was placed in the church at Midway, Ky.” (“*Disciples in Kentucky*,” pages 372, 373.) The attitude of this man (on whom rests the obloquy of corrupting the worship of God) toward the Scriptures will appear from the following: In 1869 Pinkerton and Shackelford began the publication of the Independent Monthly. In an article on “Bible Inspiration” he denied the theory of plenary inspiration, and criticized Milligan’s “*Reason and Revelation*,” and said that young preachers who were taught that Psalms 137:9 was inspired would “perpetuate a great many follies in his name.” In an article on “No Immersion-No Membership in a Church of the Reformation” he took the position that while he would only teach and practice immersion, he would be willing to let a man settle the question of baptism for himself. He said he would not thrust his translation of a Greek word between a man’s conscience and his God!

The Christian Church defection thus grew out of a difference in attitude toward the Scriptures. This being true, instrumental music and the societies, plus many more recent innovations, were natural developments, logically to be expected. Unity need never be expected until we come to see eye to eye on the value of the sacred Scriptures.

*\*Questions and Answers: Open Forum, Freed—Hardeman College Lectures, Volume One, pp. 194-196.*

—Deceased

---

---

**Often have I said, and often have I written, that truth, truth eternal and divine, is now, and long has been with me the pearl of great price. To her I will, with the blessing of God, sacrifice everything. And on no altar will I offer her a victim. If I have lost sight of her, God who searcheth the hearts, knows I have not done it intentionally. With my whole heart I have sought the truth . . . (Alexander Campbell, “A Demand for Justice from Editors in General and Mr. Brantley in Particular,” *Millennial Harbinger* 1 (1830), p. 97).**

## HEINOUSNESS OF REJECTING THE RESTORATION PLEA

PAUL VAUGHN

The Restoration Plea is a petition to return to God's original plan for the church of Christ given in the New Testament. All who advance this plea believe that God's way is the best way for man. The only way man will be acceptable to God is to follow His instructions. Peter said, **"If any man speak, let him speak as the oracles of God; if any man minister, let him do it as of the ability which God giveth: that God in all things may be glorified through Jesus Christ, to whom be praise and dominion for ever and ever. Amen"** (I Peter 4:11). **"Speaking the oracles of God"** is expressing the words given by the heavenly Father through the inspiration of the writers of the Bible. This will enable man to be equipped on his earthly pilgrimage for true worship, salvation of his soul, the pattern of the church, and the moral standard that only is acceptable in God's sight.

When man looks to God's Word for guidance, he glorifies God, giving honor and magnifying Him before the world. Seeking to follow only the New Testament gives respect to Jesus. Looking to Jesus as the Savior of the world, the head of the church, and the only way to Heaven, brings glory and honor to God.

### IMPLICATIONS OF THE RESTORATION PLEA

Encouraging mankind to restore the pattern for Christianity implies that Christians in antiquity drifted into a state of apostasy. They turned their backs on the utterances of God that were able to guide them through life.

Paul spoke of this apostasy. **"Now the Spirit speaketh expressly, that in the latter times some shall depart from the faith, giving heed to seducing spirits, and doctrines of devils"** (I Timothy 4:1). History teaches that men began to slowly slip from the moorings of the Scriptures for their own desires, passions, and thoughts. The doctrines of men became the standard and not the doctrine of Christ. Each step took them further away into religious darkness. Thus the Restoration Plea was needed to bring man back to the light of the gospel.

### THE ANCIENT ORDER

The Restoration Plea began to develop in the early 1800's with the writing of *The Last Will and Testament of the Springfield Presbytery* in June 1804 and *The Declaration and Address* in September 1809. Sectarian attitudes began to fade away. Religious leaders chose to call themselves "Christians" and abandon denominational teaching for the teaching of Christ in the New Testament. They chose to sacrifice all the doctrines of men for the cause of truth.

In 1823, Alexander Campbell began the publication of *The Christian Baptist*. Through this paper Campbell advanced the Restoration Plea. In the prospectus of the paper Campbell said,

The **'CHRISTIAN BAPTIST'** shall espouse the cause of no religious sect, excepting that ancient sect called **'CHRISTIANS FIRST AT ANTIOCH.'** Its sole object shall be the eviction of truth, and the exposure of

error in doctrine and practice.<sup>1</sup>

Campbell's position was the advancement of the Restoration of New Testament Christianity. In 1824 he started a series of articles titled, "A Restoration of the Ancient Order of Things." In these articles Campbell fought long and hard for the Restoration of the Ancient Order. In the first article he said, "A Restoration of the ancient order of things is all that is necessary to the happiness and usefulness of Christians."<sup>2</sup>

All that was needed in the 1800's to restore the church of Christ was the New Testament and a willing mind to follow it. The early restorers understood the seed principle and the Restoration Plea is an example of their desire to follow only the Bible.

### THE SIN IN REJECTING THE PLEA

There have been and are some Christians who have rejected the Restoration Plea. They seek to follow the whims of men instead of the will of God. When Christians reject the Restoration of the Ancient Order it is heinous, outrageously evil, and an abomination in the sight of God, because the plea is for Christ, His preeminence, His authority, and His rule in the church.

Let every person who wishes to please God respect the Restoration of the Ancient Order. We live in modern times and many are seeking to modernize the church to gain favor with the world. There are some things that can be modernized, but the teaching of Christ is not one of them. Let us resolve to keep the Restoration Plea before our eyes. When it comes to the teaching and practices of the church of Christ, if there is no authority in the Scriptures for an act, we must stay away from it! In doing so we plea for Christ, His church, and His authority. Jeremiah said, **"O LORD, I know that the way of man is not in himself: it is not in man that walketh to direct his steps"** (Jeremiah 10:23). The same is true today.

### ENDNOTES

1. Alexander Campbell, *The Christian Baptist*, Vol I, Gospel Advocate, Nashville, p. 4.
2. Alexander Campbell, *The Christian Baptist*, Vol. II, Gospel Advocate, Nashville, p. 136.

—1415 Lincoln Road  
Lewisport, KY 42391

**The Southside Church of Christ in Carlsbad, NM is seeking a sound, spiritually mature preacher. For more information contact Bill Fangio at [bfangio@celtechspace.com](mailto:bfangio@celtechspace.com) or call 505-887-2044 weekdays.**

# SKILLMAN AVENUE CHURCH OF CHRIST'S JOINT WORSHIP SERVICE WITH DENOMINATIONS

MARVIN L. WEIR

In my possession is a copy of the bulletin (Vol. 13, No. 20, June 1, 2005) of the Oak Cliff Christian Church meeting at 1222 Kiest Blvd. in Dallas. At the top of the front page is the following announcement:

## Stone-Campbell Reunion Worship

Sunday, June 5, 2005, 5 p.m. – 7 p.m.

Skillman Church of Christ

Heirs of the vision of Barton W. Stone and Alexander Campbell will rekindle a vision of community and cooperation as we gather together to worship the God who makes us one. Sisters and brothers from the Churches of Christ, the Christian Churches/Churches of Christ and the Christian Church (Disciples of Christ) will celebrate our common heritage and our distinctive ministries across the Metroplex.

The Senior Minister, Rev. Steven Digby, has this comment on the back of the bulletin:

We Disciples of Christ are part of a tradition that began with two objectives, restoration of New Testament primitive Christianity, and unification of the body of Christ. Sadly, for more than a century, we have fallen far short of those objectives. Our strangely fascinating history is one of great success matched with failures. As the years which followed the early days of the movement passed, different parts of our tradition focused on one or the other objective. The Disciples have had our preoccupation with *unity*. We have clung fondly to Barton Stone's words, "*Let unity be our polar star.*" We have made significant contributions to the ecumenical movement. I have regretted that in our efforts to bring the various parts of the church together, we have often overlooked our brothers concerned with the restoration aspect of the movement. Our divisions have weakened us all.

A number of years ago, in Mississippi, I participated in a time of worship consisting of people from the non-instrumental Churches of Christ, Independent Christian Churches and our own Disciples of Christ tradition. While there are many things over which we have historically disagreed, and we still have many differences, there was a sad sweetness to our gathering. One of the ministers wept in the pulpit, saying we belonged together. While we have many differences, we do all belong to the body of Christ.

This Sunday afternoon at Skillman Avenue Church of Christ, we have an opportunity (sic) share together in a very special way. I hope you will be part of this significant family reunion.

Those in the Dallas area know all too well the congregation that meets at Skillman Avenue. They are not on the Lord's side, and neither are they any more the Lord's church! They no doubt feel right at home with members from the ultra liberal Disciples of Christ denomination. One verse of Scripture describes well both the Christian church and the congregation meeting at Skillman Avenue. "**They went out from us, but they were not of us; for if they had been of us, they would have continued with us: but they went out, that they might be made manifest that they all are not of us**" (I John 2:19).

Space limitations will allow only a few observations regarding Steve Digby's comments. *First*, if the Disciples

of Christ truly want to restore New Testament Christianity and unify the body of Christ, they go about it in a strange way. They have incorporated just about every innovation imaginable into their worship services. Where is Bible authority for women preachers, women elders, instruments of music, unity in diversity, etc.? No, the Disciples of Christ are interested in going far beyond New Testament Christianity!

*Second*, he mentions the Disciples "preoccupation with unity." This lip service sounds good. But two sentences later he says, "We have made significant contributions to the ecumenical movement." The dictionary defines the word ecumenical as meaning, "concerned with establishing or promoting unity among churches or religions." Is this Biblical unity for which the Lord prayed (John 17:20-21) and the apostle Paul demanded (Ephesians 4:3)? Far from it! One cannot be committed to the cause of Christ and contribute to the ecumenical movement — the very thing that New Testament Christianity is opposed to.

*Third*, he regrets their "efforts to bring various parts of the church together." Let me speak clearly — the Christian church and Disciples of Christ are not a part of the Lord's church! They apostatized long ago and formed a man-made denomination.

*Fourth*, he states that he regrets that they "have often over-looked our brothers concerned with the restoration aspect of the movement." How can one have Biblical unity if he is not interested in or overlooks the restoration of New Testament Christianity? This shows that all most folks care about is "unity in diversity." In other words, you worship your way, I will worship my way, and we will agree to disagree!

The Skillman Avenue congregation does not deserve to wear the name church of Christ. They are in full-blown apostasy. It is sad that they have so much in common with the Disciples of Christ and the ecumenical movement.

Amos asks a pertinent question that deserves an answer even today. "**Shall two walk together, except they have agreed**" (Amos 3:3)? Skillman Avenue plans a "**Stone-Campbell Reunion Worship**" service with denominational churches. Do you read of worship service in the Bible that wears the name of some man or men? The Bible teaches our worship is to honor God and Christ.

I did not attend this gathering, and I do not regret it! A faithful Christian cannot fellowship a work of darkness (Ephesians 5:11) Moreover, a loyal soldier of the cross must reprove workers of darkness. Skillman Avenue is much more interested in fellowshiping error than they are in reproving error.

—815 Southwest 42nd Street  
Paris, TX 75460



# MACK LYON AND THE EDMOND CHURCH OF CHRIST

BEN JUSTICE

I want to be in fellowship with all who are in fellowship with God. I never want to be in fellowship with those who are not in fellowship with God. The Bible issues this command: “**Now I beseech you, brethren, mark them which cause divisions and offenses contrary to the doctrine which ye have learned and avoid them**” (Romans 16:17). And, “**And have no fellowship with the unfruitful works of darkness, but rather reprove (lit. expose) them**” (Ephesians 5:11). Exposing error is never personal but purely doctrinal.

On the former Let Us Reason List (a discussion forum over the Internet), on March 15, 2005, one brother asks:

Brethren, I am in need of some help. In the past few weeks, I have been involved in many conversations concerning Mack Lyon and the “In search of the Lord’s way” TV program. In the past few days, I have sent an e-mail to the program to ask some questions and have received no reply. Can anyone give me some information concerning what is going on with Mack, the TV program and the congregation supporting the effort?

Many are aware of the fact that Mack Lyon airs every Sunday. His program is called *In Search of The Lord’s Way*. The Edmond Church of Christ, located in Edmond, OK, oversees this work. Without a doubt, the Edmond congregation is unsound. The evidence is simply overwhelming. An investigation into their website revealed very quickly that they are not worthy of fellowship from sound brethren and congregations. And, if the congregation is unsound, then what does this say about the work they oversee, *In Search of The Lord’s Way*? And, what does it say about Mack Lyon? If the congregation is unsound, then the work is also unsound. Note the following things from their website.

## Close Ties With Oklahoma Christian University

Only those who have their head buried in the sand don’t know about the liberalism that currently plagues OCU. Either that or they simply have not been informed. OCU continually has false teachers speak there. One good brother, who preaches in Elk City, OK, has thoroughly documented the false teachers and teaching that have come out of OCU. He documents that they used Dan Bouchelle (preacher at the Central church in Amarillo, TX) as a lectureship speaker in 2005. He has bragged about his fellowship with denominations. He documents that Glenn Pemberton, a professor at OCU asserts that the book of Jonah is a “myth”. Another teacher by the name of Curt Nicum endorses the TNIV (Today’s New International Version).

For years, *In Search of The Lord’s Way* has had a luncheon held on the campus at OCU. This year, they changed from a luncheon to an evening dinner so that more folks could be there. Of course, Mack spoke at the dinner. In 2004, Mack cancelled their annual luncheon during the OCU lectureship. He did this because of the protests coming from a large number of preachers over the use of false teachers they invited to speak. According to this same brother mentioned above, “Mack’s rationale was that last year’s lectureship was ‘divisive.’ Notice, he didn’t object to a specific speaker or any speaker’s error.” Mack agreed to jump back in bed with the liberals at the 2005 dinner. He assured everyone that he was going to say some things that needed to be said. Mack’s speech at the dinner was entitled “Truth Is Fallen In The Streets.” I have the transcript and

have read his speech. The speech was a good one in that it addressed post-modernism and the moral decline of America. However, Mack touched neither top, side, nor bottom of any of the compromisers and false teachings occurring at OCU. The same brother mentioned above went to the speech and personally heard what Mack had to say. He noted that “Mack was silent as a tomb about any false teaching at OCU...” The fact is, Mack won’t say a word about these things, because the Edmond church is so closely allied with OCU. In fact, Glover Shipp is one of the elders at the Edmond congregation. Shipp was the former editor of the *Christian Chronicle* (a paper put out by OCU), which has long been a mouthpiece for every liberal and false teacher in the church.

At the Edmond congregation, they have a big children’s ministry program. One thing that is a part of the children’s ministry is Camp Impact. Their website reports, “Oklahoma Christian University is the site of this great work of camp for children that have completed 3<sup>rd</sup>—6<sup>th</sup> grades”.

## Children’s Ministry

I wish to elaborate further concerning Edmond’s “Children’s Ministry.” They have a “Children’s Bible Hour,” otherwise known as “Children’s Church.” Their website states the following:

One of the highlights of our Children’s Ministry is Children’s Bible Hour. Children ages 3 years old through 2<sup>nd</sup> grade enjoy this exciting worship time designed just for them. Lively singing helps children learn more about God’s love and his work in our world. Puppet friends teach valuable lessons from God’s Word; children have opportunities to serve by bringing pennies for the penny jar and food for the Hungry Hippo. Children’s Bible Hour is offered each Sunday during the second worship service and the evening service.

Concerning Edmond’s Vacation Bible School, their website states:

We are proud to offer one of the most unique and exciting Vacation Bible Schools around: Children from 3 years old to 5<sup>th</sup> grade are the focus of our whole church family each year at this time. Nightly drama presentations teach the selected Bible story.

The above reveals that the Edmond congregation has no problem with puppets and drama presentations. These things are nowhere authorized in the New Testament.

The Edmond congregation also has another program for their young people, called “Leadership Training for Christ,” or LTC for short. Their website states:

LTC...is aimed at developing Christian leadership skills in young people. Our teens spend weeks in preparation for various events like Bible Quiz, Puppets, Chorus, Drama, Art, Bible Reading, Song Leading, and Sermon Delivery. On Easter weekend, we travel to Tulsa for the big LTC Convention.

## Immorality At The Edmond Church

I saw an appalling thing on Edmond’s website. There is a picture of seven people. There are four men and three women. Three of the four men have no shirts on and one woman has a bikini top on. Get this: They named this page of their website

“**sexycampers.**” This is beyond despicable. These people look no better than the world, in fact, they are no better than the world. Appalling indeed!

### **The Use of Non-Christians**

The Edmond church is “ministry oriented.” They have “ministry that” and “ministry this.” As noted above, they have “Children’s Ministry.” They also have “Campus Ministry,” and “Family Life Ministry.” On their “Ministry Highlights” page of their website, it is noted that they use “*Financial Peace University*.” Nationally known financial counselor Dave Ramsey teaches a course on finances. I personally have listened to Dave Ramsey for many years on the radio and his material is absolutely excellent. He has written some excellent books that I encourage everyone to read. However, he has absolutely no place in the Lord’s church for he is not even a Christian. He belongs to a denominational church in Nashville, TN. I have heard many times from Dave Ramsey on the radio teaching that Christians have an obligation to ‘tithes’ and many other false doctrines. Why in the world would a congregation of the Lord’s church use non-Christian, denominational people to teach for them? May I ask at this point, How can a congregation support *In Search of the Lord’s Way*, even though the overseeing congregation is liberal? To support one is to support the other!

### **The Edmond Church Solicits and Receives Funds From Liberal Churches**

It is true that the Edmond congregation gladly receives funds from anybody, even rank liberals, for the support of *In Search Of The Lord’s Way*. Brother Dennis Sargent (whom this congregation supports in Pomeroy, OH) wrote the following:

Not too far from Pomeroy is the congregation that serves to receive all the funds from area congregations who wish to support the *Search* program. Never once have I seen any qualifying statement, soliciting participation from only sound brethren and congregations.”

Brother Dennis also stated:

The receiving congregation for our area of the country is itself liberal. The TV scrolls the names of numerous erring congregations, mostly moderate but some even rank liberals; all of which send monies to support *Search*.

The Bible teaches that fellowship between brethren consists of giving and receiving (Philippians 4:15), and since we are to have no fellowship with the unfruitful works of darkness (Ephesians 5:11), how then can a congregation solicit and receive funds from erring congregations? If it doesn’t make any difference, then we could solicit and receive funds from any denomination. If not, why not?

### **Mack Lyon’s Fellowship With Error**

Mack Lyon regularly fellowships Oklahoma Christian University - an ultra liberal school. However, this is certainly not all that has been documented by sound brethren. It has been documented that Mack Lyon is erring with regard to the Christian Church. In August 2004, Brother Darrell Broking wrote Mack an e-mail asking questions concerning his teaching and practices regarding events which had recently transpired with the Christian Church in Adairsville, GA. Brother Broking wrote the following.

Brethren, I just received the latest issue of *The Search Light* and noticed that someone who is unnamed, my guess is that it was Mack, went to Adairsville, GA, where viewers of *Search* from the Christian Church denomination came/are coming “to the church of Christ.” My question is how did they/are they coming to the church of Christ? Are they being baptized according to the Scriptures or are they simply repenting of being in

error?

Darrell questioned Brother Lyon as “...how does one come out of the Christian Church denomination into the Lord’s church?” Mack Lyon wrote an e-mail back to Darrell. Darrell then e-mailed Mack again with further questions. Mack responded back. It was apparent after having personally read this e-mail exchange myself that Mack considers those in the Christian Church as “erring brethren” who only need to repent of worshipping in error. In other words, Mack does not believe they must be baptized. In this e-mail exchange it is obvious that Mack had led those Christian Church folk to believe their “baptism” was scriptural and that they needed only to repent of having worshipped in error. Too, the Northside brethren at Calhoun, GA know very well what took place there at Adairsville. They, in fact, had some involvement in trying to clear up the confusion that Mack caused.

Way back in 1999, Mack Lyon was exposed and marked in *Contending For The Faith* for speaking alongside false teachers. One such false teacher was Steve Flatt - the President of the ultra liberal David Lipscomb University. Steve Flatt has spoken alongside Rubel Shelly and other rank liberals at the now defunct Nashville Jubilee. It is documented that Mack spoke at the Lipscomb lectures, commending them for their “strong stand” and “contributions to the Lord’s cause.”

### **Mack Lyon’s Exchanges**

There have been several letter exchanges between brethren and Mack Lyon. Several brethren have written him asking him questions. In reading Mack’s replies, it is quite apparent that Mack takes great offense in anyone questioning him. He will promptly rebuke you and give you a good slap on the hand. One brother stated that Mack’s reply to his letter was “very angry and inconsistent with his ‘public’ persona!”\*

On September 3, 2003, Brother Ken Chumbley, local evangelist for the Belvedere congregation in Belvedere, SC, wrote Mack asking him some very important and pertinent questions. Brother Chumbley asked about the introduction to the *Search* TV program. In the introduction, one will notice that there is a statement that says, “The Bible is a revelation of God’s way.” As brother Chumbley aptly pointed out, “That statement is erroneous. The Bible is not ‘a’ revelation of God’s way, but ‘the’ revelation of His way.” Brother Chumbley also asked Mack several questions about fellowship. For example:

Does the Edmond church support the stand of the *Christian Chronicle*? Also, does Bailey McBride, the current editor, have his membership at the Edmond church? Does the Edmond church have fellowship with the church at Quail Springs that is known for its fellowship with denominationalism and has been featured prominently in the *Christian Chronicle*? Have the elders of the Edmond church spoken out against this false teaching of the Quail Springs church? Further, what association or fellowship does the Edmond church have with those involved with Oklahoma Christian University?

Brother Chumbley also asked these same questions directly to Mack. Brother Chumbley asked legitimate questions. If the Edmond congregation (and Mack) want congregations and brethren to support *In Search of The Lord’s Way*, then they owe it to the brotherhood to answer these questions. Mack Lyon did write brother Chumbley back. Here is the crowning jewel of Mack’s reply to brother Chumbley. Mack let it be known that he did not want what he had written to be publicized. The Belvedere congregation was supporting *In Search of The Lord’s Way*, but after having read Mack’s response and noting

that the tone of his letter was combative and that he outright avoided answering their questions, they promptly ceased their support of this work. However, brother Chumbley wrote a response back to Mack. Brother Chumbley rightly asked Mack,

Why would you not want brethren to know what you have written? Might it offend some of your friends and supporters? Could such damage your ability to raise funds because of the nature of the matters discussed?

I believe brother Chumbley hit the nail on the head!

The above examples are just a few of the many angry replies of Mack to other brethren. This is typical, though, of the “loving” liberal. It is unfortunate that congregations continue to support *In Search of The Lord’s Way* with Mack Lyon and the Edmond church of Christ. It may be true that many are not aware of their errors and compromises. However, when an eldership (leadership) of a congregation is not aware of these things, then shame on them! They ought to be! They might take the time to thoroughly investigate works before deciding to support them. But, many have the attitude that “the end justifies the means? Many look at Mack’s work as getting the truth out to the world, and so, it is worthy of support, no matter what compromises are present. Brethren, this is the devil’s doctrine, yet many brethren have swallowed this lie hook, line, and sinker. I will admit that I have never heard Mack preach any error, but this is not the issue. The issue is fellowship! Fellowship is truly one of the biggest issues facing the Lord’s church today. Let me personally say that I have absolutely no ill will against Mack Lyon. This isn’t about personalities; it’s about the Truth! It is my firm conviction, based upon the evidence, that Mack Lyon or the Edmond church of Christ should in no way be supported by sound brethren!

\*The documentation of this fact and other matters relating to Mack Lyon is available from David B. Watson, P. O. Box 690, Sapulpa, OK 74067, dbwatson@swbell.net. —*Editor*

—10008 Moss Oak Rd.  
Sullivan, MO 63080

**James H. Stark in the 1875 Christian Record succinctly wrote: ‘THAT CALF!’ ‘WORSHIPPING MACHINE!’ ‘PRIDE’S BUGLE HORN,’ ‘THE ORGAN’ Organ of what? Of love, charity and meekness? No, organ of petty strife, feud, rivalry, and disunion. Just so long as we tolerate instrumental music in worship, in the house of the Lord, that long may we expect emulation and strife among the brethren. Have we not as much Scripture for a praying machine as for a singing machine. We surely have, for the law of the Lord, does not recognize or prohibit either (James H. Stark, “Pride’s Bugle Horn,” Christian Record 2, Number 8, 5d ser (August 1875) page 473. As quoted in J. E. Choate and William Woodson, *Sounding Brass and Clanging Cymbals* (Williams Printing, Nashville, Tennessee, 1991), p. 44).**

## CONTENDING FOR THE FAITH SPRING LECTURESHIP BOOKS



- 2006 “Anti-ism-From God or Man?” \$17.00
- 2005 “Morals-From God or Man?” \$17.00
- 2004 “Judaism-From God or Man?” \$17.00
- 2003 “Islam-From God Or Man?” **Out of Print**
- 2002 “Jehovah’s Witnesses” \$16.00
- 2001 “Mormonism” **Out of Print**
- 2000 “Catholicism”\* \$16.00
- 1999 “Pentecostalism” **Out of Print**
- 1998 “Premillennialism” \$14.00
- 1997 “Calvinism” **Out of Print**
- 1996 “Isaiah” Vol. 2 Chapters 40-66 \$12.00
- 1995 “Isaiah” Vol. 1 Chapters 1-39 \$12.00
- 1994 “The Church Enters the 21st Century” \$12.00



SEND ALL ORDERS WITH PAYMENT TO:  
(add \$3.00 per book S&H •TX residents add 7.25% tax)  
CONTENDING FOR THE FAITH • P.O. BOX 2357 • SPRING, TEXAS 77383-2357



# THE KETEF HINNOM SCROLLS AND RELIGION IN ANCIENT JUDAH

GARY YOUNG

One of the most exciting finds in archaeology in recent years has been the discovery of the Ketef Hinnom scrolls, two tiny silver amulets which were discovered in a rock-cut Jerusalem tomb in 1979. The tomb was from the period of the later Judahite monarchy, in other words from the period covered in our Bibles by the books of II Kings and II Chronicles, and was located on a rocky rise overlooking the Valley of Hinnom in southwestern Jerusalem (Barkay 1992: 139-48). The two amulets were rolled up strips of silver, which had been worn around the neck of the deceased either in life or in the tomb, or possibly both (Barkay 1992: 192). When after a very long and painstaking process they were unrolled, one scroll (Ketef Hinnom I) measured 95mm by 25mm, while the smaller (Ketef Hinnom II) measured 38mm by 12mm.

## The Text of the Ketef Hinnom Scrolls

The significant thing about these scrolls is the inscriptions which were found on them. The inscriptions in both cases contained a version of the Aaronic blessing of Numbers 6:24-26, here cited as it is in the King James Version: **“The Lord bless thee, and keep thee: The Lord make his face to shine upon thee, and be gracious unto thee: The Lord lift up his countenance upon thee, and give thee peace.”**

Due to the fact that the tomb from which the amulets came dated from the royal period, it was immediately realized that these texts were the earliest recognizable citations of the Biblical text in existence. While liberal and modernist scholars had been claiming for years that the Biblical text as we know it was only a product of the post-exilic, perhaps even the intertestamental period, here was concrete evidence that the written text of the Law of Moses, or at the very least this part of it, had been in existence before the exile, hundreds of years before the liberals were claiming. Israeli archaeologist Gabriel Barkay, the excavator of the tombs, dated them as seventh century B.C. (Barkay 1992), while Yardeni dated it slightly later, in the sixth century (Yardeni 1991). In either case, however, the status of the scrolls as the most ancient witness to the antiquity of the Biblical text was sure. They are unequivocal evidence that the liberals were wrong: the Biblical text was in fact in existence and in circulation hundreds of years before the time the liberals claimed it had come into existence: just, of course, as the Bible itself had always told us.

Naturally such an important find could not go unchallenged by the forces of liberalism and modernism for long! Soon it was claimed that the texts were in fact from the Hellenistic (intertestamental) period, based upon the fact that the tomb had been used again in that time period, and Hellenistic artifacts were indeed found in the tomb (Renz 1995: 447-56). Once again, as with several other significant Biblical artefacts which have recently been discovered, the liberals attempted to water down the obvious impact of the find by bringing its antiquity and/or its authenticity into question. Eventually, a complete reappraisal of the archaeological context combined with a fresh analysis and micrographic photographing of the scrolls themselves was conducted in order to determine their

actual date.

Barkay and the group of scholars working with him examined the scrolls and their archaeological context very closely, demonstrating their antiquity by means of a close study of letter and grammatical forms, the surrounding material in the tomb, and several other techniques (Barkay *et al.* 2004: 46-55). Finally, this gathering of eminent scholars came to the conclusion that the Ketef Hinnom scrolls date from the horizon between the sixth and seventh centuries BC, that is the last years of the Kingdom of Judah before its final fall to the Babylonians in 586 B.C. (Barkay *et al.* 2004: 55). In Biblical terms this was a period dominated first by the righteous King Josiah, followed after his death in 608 B.C. by his less successful (and far less godly) descendants Jehoahaz, Jehoiakim, Jehoiachin and Zedekiah.

As a part of this study, the scholars made use of new highly detailed photographs of the scrolls taken in 1994. Using these photographs, they were able to prepare and publish a new and much more detailed text of the scrolls, which is reproduced below. In this text, we see that there is a good deal more information than just the text of Numbers 6:24-26, significant though that is. The larger scroll, called Ketef Hinnom I, reads as follows in English translation:

[...] YHW ... the grea[t ... who keeps] the covenant and [g]raciousness toward those who love [him] and those who keep [his commandments ...]. The Eternal (?) [...]. [the?] blessing more than any [sna]re and more than evil. For redemption is in Him. For YHWH is our restorer [and] rock. May YHWH bles[s] you and [may he] keep you. [May] YHWH make [His face] shine.... (Ketef Hinnom I (Barkay *et al.* 2004: 61)).

The smaller scroll, called Ketef Hinnom II, reads as follows:

[For NN (the son/daughter of) xxxx]h/hu. May h[e]/sh[e] be blessed by YHWH, the warrior and the rebuker of [e]vil: May YHWH bless you, keep you. May YHWH make his face shine upon you and grant you p[ea]ce. (Ketef Hinnom II (Barkay *et al.* 2004: 68)).

Note: YHWH refers to the tetragrammaton, the four letter Hebrew name for God which is rendered as “Jehovah” in the ASV and “LORD” in the KJV and most other versions. Square brackets indicate letters reconstructed by the editors, parentheses indicate explanatory text not in the original, NN indicates an unknown name, xx and ... indicate missing or unreadable letters.

## The Scrolls and Religion in Ancient Judah

In addition to their eloquent witness to the antiquity of the Biblical text, the Ketef Hinnom scrolls also provide us with a good deal of information about the practice of religion in the Kingdom of Judah at this time. As we will see, the information provided by the scrolls effectively refutes modernist theories concerning the origin and practice of Judahite worship of God in the royal period, and in many cases it confirms the Biblical

description of these things. Thus, while it is still certainly true that the Ketef Hinnom scrolls constitute our oldest direct witness to the text of Scripture, and thereby demonstrate the antiquity of that text, their demonstration of the historical accuracy of Old Testament Scripture in fact goes a good deal further than that.

One of the most notable features of these texts is the presence of several “confessional statements” about God in them. While the readings of some of them are difficult, those we can read are immediately recognizable as statements which are in many cases similar, or indeed almost identical, to statements taken from the Scriptures. These therefore demonstrate that these Scriptural concepts were known and could be alluded to by people living in the Kingdom of Judah in the late seventh/early sixth centuries B.C. (Barkay *et al.* 2004: 68). In so doing, of course, they once again demonstrate the antiquity of Scripture and its existence (and wide distribution) at a time centuries before the modernists will even (still!) admit that they existed! To take one example, consider the text of Deuteronomy 7:9: “**Know therefore that the Lord thy God, he is God, the faithful God, which keepeth covenant and mercy with them that love him and keep his commandments to a thousand generations.**”

This passage is immediately reminiscent of the opening lines in Ketef Hinnom I: “who keeps the covenant and graciousness toward those who love [him] and those who keep ...”. It is quite evident that the inscriber of the scrolls is referring to this passage, showing that it must have been in existence and in circulation at the time of the scroll’s manufacture. This is of course very significant because many modernists claim that the book of Deuteronomy was only written in the reign of Josiah (they claim that it was the scroll “discovered” in the Temple in II Kings 22:8), while others go even further, alleging it to have been a post-exilic product. However, Ketef Hinnom I shows us clearly that the book was already in existence and well-known in Judah at the very time at which, according to the modernists, the book was only just being “discovered”! Evidently, the claims of the modernists are nonsense: Deuteronomy was already in wide circulation and well known outside the Temple and royal court at this time, which of course fully accords with the Biblical claim of Mosaic authorship of Deuteronomy.

Consider also the texts of Daniel 9:4 and Nehemiah 1:5, both of which make very similar statements to Deuteronomy 7:9 and which again demonstrate the wide use of such confessional statements about God at this time. (Daniel was active in Babylon at the same time period from which the Ketef Hinnom scrolls come, and Nehemiah was active more than a century and a half later). In addition, a perusal through the text of the scrolls brings out numerous other statements about God which will be immediately recognisable to the modern Bible student: for example, the descriptions of God as “rock” and “restorer”, the statement that “redemption is in Him”, the epithet “warrior” (essentially the same as “Lord of hosts”) are all clearly of Scriptural origin, even if they are not direct quotations.

Another feature of the texts is that they tell us a good deal about the practice of religion in ancient Judah. One of the main tenets of the so-called “Deuteronomist” position is that the whole doctrine and “history” of “Yahwism” (their

term) was imposed from above during the reign of Josiah, and it was fundamentally only a religion of the royal court and the Temple (Finkelstein & Silberman 2001). They claim that the book discovered in the temple in Josiah’s reign was the book of Deuteronomy, which they claim was actually *written* at that time, and that the resulting religious reforms then inspired the writing of Joshua, Judges, I & II Samuel and I & II Kings. For an effective critique and refutation of this position see Kitchen 2003: 464-8.

The Ketef Hinnom scrolls, as we have already established, were written at this very time – around the time of Josiah’s reign. At this time, according to the Deuteronomists, the religion of “Yahwism” was being imposed from the top down by Josiah’s court, and was almost entirely a concern of the royal court and the Temple. However, this is not the kind of religion we see in the scrolls. They were from a private burial; there is no evidence whatsoever for their association with royalty. Their use as amulets for personal wear indicates that the worship of God at this time was deeply ingrained in society, and that these individuals were aware of a personal and immediate relationship with God, irrespective of and unrelated to the royal court. In short, religion at this time was clearly a matter of individual piety and devotion to God, not just a national cult confined to the palace at Jerusalem (Barkay *et al.* 2004: 68). This, of course, is precisely what the Bible tells us: religion in ancient Israel, while being conducted at a national level was also a matter of individual devotion and obedience to God and His Word (Deuteronomy 6:4-9). The existence of the Ketef Hinnom scrolls is an irrefutable witness to the existence of personal piety at a household level in the Kingdom of Judah at this time, in a way that is immediately recognizable to the modern Christian and completely consistent with the Biblical text.

These two tiny silver scrolls, now on show in the Israel Museum in Jerusalem, represent therefore one of the most important and exciting finds in modern archaeology. Despite their diminutive size, the mighty blow that they have dealt to the minimalists and modernists is undeniable. Not only are they the most ancient Scriptural manuscript in existence, they are also the earliest independent witness to the practice of individual religion in ancient Judah: a witness which is, moreover, entirely in agreement with the Biblical text.

#### ENDNOTES

Barkay, G. (1992). “The Priestly Benediction on Silver Plaques from Ketef Hinnom in Jerusalem” *Tel Aviv* 19: 139-92.

Barkay, G., A.G. Vaughn, M.J. Lundberg & B. Zuckerman (2004). “The Amulets from Ketef Hinnom: A New Edition and Evaluation” *Bulletin of the American Schools of Oriental Research* 334: 41-71.

Finkelstein, I & N.A. Silberman (2001). *The Bible Unearthed*. New York.

Kitchen, K.A. (2003). *On the Reliability of the Old Testament*. Grand Rapids.

Renz, J. (1995). *Handbuch der althebräischen Epigraphik* Vol. 1 Fasc. 1. *Der althebräischen Inschriften, Text und Kommentar*. Darmstadt.

Yardeni, A. (1991). “Remarks on the Priestly Blessing on Two Ancient Amulets from Jerusalem” *Vetus Testamentum* 41: 176-85.

—1 Clarke Crescent  
Wantirna South VIC 3152  
AUSTRALIA  
[mail@eastsidecofc.org.au](mailto:mail@eastsidecofc.org.au)

## WHY ME?

LAVONNE JAMES MCCLISH

Many of you who read this have heard or read about the experiences of Bob Spurlin, who was a Gospel preacher for thirty years, until he contracted multiple sclerosis. He is paralyzed from his neck down, and is, of course, unable to care for himself—much less to preach or to teach. That is, he is unable to preach and teach in the usual way, but his mind is still clear, and he can still speak. He is also able to write by using a special computer, and he has written several books and numerous articles. The sale of his books provides a small income for him and his family, supplementing what his wife Beverly earns.

As if his physical disability were not enough, their daughter Bethany was killed in an automobile accident at the age of sixteen. This calamity hit them with devastating results, coming so soon after his diagnosis. Of course his work as a preacher was finished. But in everything I have read that Bob Spurlin has written, I have never once read, “Why me?” Beverly lovingly cares for her husband without complaint; I doubt she would ever be heard saying “Why me?”

The Spurlin family have become an inspiration to us. I can think of several other families as well who have been dealt harsh blows, and yet they don’t complain. They cheerfully accept their burdens, carry on their work and the day-to-day practice of their Christianity, thereby becoming a shining example for others. They would never think of asking, “Why me?”

Some Christians believe God is punishing them if some tragedy or a catastrophic illness strikes them or their families. Even the apostles, while Jesus was still with them on the earth, did not have a clear understanding of God’s ways of dealing with men. They asked Jesus, concerning the man born blind, “**Master, who did sin: this man, or his parents, that he was born blind?**” Jesus answered, “**Neither hath this man nor his parents sinned: but that the works of God should be made manifest in him**” (John 9:2–3).

As far as we know, Job, throughout all of his trials, never had the question “Why me?” answered for him. Because we are privileged to see behind the scenes—knowing the Devil’s challenge to God that he could induce Job to sin—we know that none of the things Job suffered were brought on by his sin. God was allowing Satan to test and try Job, and Job passed the test. “**Naked came I out of my mother’s womb, and naked shall I return thither; the Lord gave, and the Lord hath taken away. Blessed be the name of the Lord**” (Job 1:21).

Is our suffering here on this earth a part of “bearing the cross” for Christ? It could be. It could also be that we are suffering just because we are human beings. We suffer the same pain, physical and emotional, as other people do, because our ancestors Adam and Eve sinned in the Garden of Eden. They brought on us all of the evils of all kinds that plague earthly creatures, because Satan tempted them to disobey God. God had already promised them that they would die if they ate of the forbidden fruit, but Satan convinced Eve that

she would not die, and that the fruit would make her wise, as God is wise. She bit, swallowed the bait, and ever since then, we bear the punishment (not the guilt—there is a vast difference) meted out to the first man and woman and all of their descendants.

A little more than a year ago, I was told that I have Mantle Cell Lymphoma, a very rare and very aggressive cancer of the lymphatic system. There is no cure. Because Mantle Cell has only fairly recently been isolated as a separate form of non-Hodgkins lymphoma, very little research has been done in this field (according to information I have found on the Internet). Consequently, there is no cure. One drug, Rituxan (specific for Mantle Cell), has been developed, and has prolonged the lives of those who are treated with it. However, the life expectancy of patients, after treatment, is still only two to four years. I have been in remission since last November, but my oncologist keeps reminding us that it is “when” it comes back, not “if.” We never know what we will do or how we will react when we are put to the test. We might learn a lesson from Peter, who boasted to his Master that he would go with him to the point of death rather than forsake him (Matthew 26:35). When push came to shove, Peter learned that it wasn’t as easy as it seemed.

As I was struggling to assimilate this information about the lymphoma, along with the full import of it, I can remember thinking that I should not ask “Why me?” I must accept patiently whatever life hands me, depending on God for strength: “Why not me?” Am I any better than all of the other sufferers from this disease, or from any number of other incurable diseases? I am not being punished for my sins (although, being weak, I do sin). I certainly have no excuse for blaming God. Mantle Cell Lymphoma did not come from God; it came from the devil.

Years ago, when I was young, my family lived in the same town as did a teacher and promotional director of a Christian college, also in that town. He was one of these people who was always bombastic, exuberant, enthusiastic, and positive; he didn’t accept “no” for an answer. Many people were baptized after hearing his powerful sermons and being touched by his emotional appeals. He continually preached that Christians should have no fear of death. In fact, they should look forward to it. After all, they would be stepping into Paradise. He was correct in his preaching, but he was a bit over-confident concerning his own strength. When he developed cancer and knew that the time of his departure was at hand, he was terrified. It is true that “**God hath not given us the spirit of fear, but of power, of love, and of a sound mind**” (II Timothy 1:7) and that “**Perfect love casteth out fear**” (I John 4:18). But, no matter how much effort we put forth, as long as we are in this earthly tabernacle, we will fail. We will have weaknesses. All of us need to consider ourselves, lest we also be tempted (Galatians 6:1).

When we are tempted to ask “Why me?” when life deals us pain and sorrow, let us strive to say, instead, “Why not me?” Why should I expect to escape trial and suffering, as long as I am a resident of this world?

—908 Imperial Drive  
Denton, TX 76209



## ***The Last Word...***

# **1906—2006: THE CONTINUING APOSTASY**

KENT BAILEY

Before the mid—point of the nineteenth century, apostasy had found its way into the ranks of God's people. During the early days of the movement to restore individuals to the New Testament church, the New Testament pattern was set forth precisely regarding The Plan of Salvation, the nature and organization of the church, the worship and work of the church as well as all principles concerning godly living.

With the introduction of the Missionary Society and mechanical instruments of music into the worship of the church, such resulted in a cleavage from which there has been no recovery. Both apostasy and false doctrine knows no stopping place. The problems regarding The Missionary Society concept and the usage of mechanical instruments of music in the worship only brought in additional digression.

While these initial problems were (and are) serious issues, they are only the symptoms of digression. The source of the real problem is disrespect for the very essence of Bible authority. When the authority of the Scriptures is disregarded, individuals will adopt any practice that is not explicitly condemned and thereby open the floodgates to a host of false doctrines and sinful practices. Church History attests to various problems relating to the One-Man Pastor System, acceptance of Denominational Baptism, Pre-millennialism, Fellowship with Denominations and false teachers among brethren as well as a host of other problems.

By 1906, the division which had been growing over a number of years, was fully realized and recognized in the religious census, as reported by J.W. Shepherd, where churches of Christ and Christian churches were recognized as being two opposing groups. Even with such open division recognized there have always been bleeding heart liberals willing to extend fellowship to even Satan himself.

Various attempts to compromise God's truth by extending fellowship to false teachers have taken place from the beginning of the Christian Church apostasy and that continues even until now. History records such efforts as the James D. Murch Unity Meetings of the 1930s and the Alan Cloyd—Rubel Shelly—Don DeWelt axis of evil during the 1980s. Brethren have fallen prey to the false notion that the only difference between churches of Christ and Christian churches is the difference regarding the usage of mechanical instruments of music. Nothing could be further from the truth! Even if it were the case, that would be a significant difference that would shatter Biblical fellowship. However, the differences are more numerous than just the mechanical instruments of music question. The truth of the matter is that many of our own people have swallowed Liberalism hook, line, and sinker, and have no better understanding of Bible authority than those in the Christian churches.

In June of 2000, representatives from liberal churches of Christ, Disciples of Christ, and Independent Christian churches met together to promote unity among themselves and call for open fellowship. During this meeting the participants signed a statement confessing that they had been guilty of the

sin of division and of maintaining a spirit of division.

David Lipscomb University hosted a 2002 Seminar For Preachers. The speaker for this event was Fred Craddock, a liberal Disciples of Christ preacher from Blue Ridge, Georgia.

*The Christian Standard* (the most prominent publication of Independent Christian churches) published an "apology" from the well known apostate Mike Cope, preacher for the liberal Highland Church of Christ in Abilene, Texas. In his "apology" Cope called for "mutual forgiveness" and set forth an appeal for Christian churches and liberal churches of Christ to practice open fellowship with one another.

*The Stone-Campbell Journal*, another liberal cooperative effort among professors from various Christian Church colleges and seminaries as well as professors from the theological garbage heap of universities among our own people have joined Mike Cope in singing his song of compromise and apostasy. This journal will sponsor an annual conference at Cincinnati Bible Seminary March 31-April 1 of 2006. Clark Pinnock, a liberal denominational theologian, will be a guest lecturer at this scheduled event.

### **THE ACU CONNECTION**

Whenever liberal and apostate efforts are being thrust upon the Lord's church, one can always be certain that Abilene Non-Christian University will always be found in the vanguard of those seeking to lead brethren away from the truth. An announcement was recently made that the Restoration Forum usually conducted in October every year has been rescheduled for February 19-22 of this year. Like all of the other forums one will note an additional effort of merger between the liberals of both churches of Christ and Christian churches.

### **ADDITIONAL EFFORTS**

In keeping with the spirit of both liberalism and apostasy, Rubel Shelly will speak at the Ozark Christian College Preaching And Teaching Convention February 20-22. This is the educational institution where the first Alan Cloyd—Rubel Shelly—Don DeWelt apostasy forum was conducted in 1984. Similar cooperative efforts will be conducted at the Tulsa Workshop in March as well at the North American Christian Convention June 27-30 in Louisville, Kentucky.

### **A STRANGE TURN OF EVENTS**

In the November 15, 2005 issue of the Forest Hill News (bulletin for the Forest Hill Church of Christ in Memphis, Tennessee) the following item was announced:

#### **IN THE AREA**

**South Germantown Road church of Christ,**

**Family and Friends Day,**

**Sunday, November 20, 2:30 p.m.**

**Speaker: Jerry Taylor  
of Abilene, Texas**

Forest Hill Church of Christ (home of Memphis School of Preaching), even going back to former years when it was known as Knight Arnold Church of Christ, has in the past

been outspoken in its opposition to the New Hermeneutic and various change agents. I have spoken at the MSOP Lectures in past years regarding such apostasy in general and in opposition to Independent Christian churches in particular. After taking a strong stand in these areas for the cause of truth those brethren have now compromised the faith in linking up with a false teacher like Jerry Taylor and a known liberal church like South Germantown Road.

Just who is Jerry Taylor? Taylor is a member of the Bible faculty at ACU. He is a known active change agent pushing the New Hermeneutic agenda. Rochester College, located in Rochester Hills, Michigan, has him slated to be a guest lecturer at their upcoming preaching seminar along with Richard Hughes from Pepperdine University and Rubel Shelly (now on the faculty at Rochester College) along with several denominational preachers, who are professors in various denominational seminaries. This can be verified at the Rochester College website at [www.rc.edu/sermonseminar/presenters.html](http://www.rc.edu/sermonseminar/presenters.html).

In years past brother Curtis Cates has published some excellent material in exposing the heresies of Rubel Shelly. Now he favors Forest Hill in promoting one of Shelly's cohorts of error in coming to Memphis to preach in a liberal church. If brother Cates wants to be consistent he at least ought to publish a public apology to Rubel Shelly and admit that Forest Hill and MSOP are now lined up with ACU and the Change Agents. Curtis, do you plan on bringing in Jerry Taylor, Richard Hughes, Rubel Shelly and a host of denominational preachers to lecture to the students at MSOP? If not, then why promote such liberals in the greater Memphis area?

In the December 2005 edition of the *Yokefellow*, Garland Elkins wrote an excellent article concerning the Silence of the

Scriptures. In this article brother Elkins correctly argued that liberals in the church attempt to prove their case in the exact manner in which Christian Church preachers do. He stated:

For over half a century this writer has been hearing the Christian Church make the above arguments, and for the same length of time we have refuted them. It should be pointed out that error is no less error because it is taught by one of our brethren. The only difference is the degree of harm....

Barry Grider, preacher for Forest Hills, and Curtis Cates need to pay close attention to what brother Elkins has written. In light of the recent "goings on" at Forest Hill perhaps a debate can be arranged between Barry Grider and Garland Elkins. I shall offer my services to moderate for brother Elkins. Perhaps we can persuade Curtis Cates to moderate for brother Grider.

Brethren, do not expect those at Forest Hill or MSOP to make any response to the situation with which we have dealt. Please keep in mind that rather than being seekers of truth these individuals are politicians. Politicians never deal with any controversy in an open manner. Rather than dealing with the relevant issues openly they make under-handed attacks in back rooms. They hate precisely worded questions and will not give specific answers. They seek to destroy those with whom they differ rather than deal with the facts of a given situation. They seek to intimidate and crush rather than to make correction. However, we shall not be intimidated and shall press the battle. We cannot do otherwise, so help us God!

—124 Executive Meadows  
Lenoir City, TN 37771  
[KBailey385@aol.com](mailto:KBailey385@aol.com)

**ORDER YOUR  
COPY TODAY!**



2006  
**CONTENDING  
FOR THE FAITH**  
SPRING CHURCH OF CHRIST  
LECTURESHIP BOOK

**"ANTI-ISM"  
FROM GOD OR MAN**

**\$17.00  
PLUS \$3.00 S&H**

SEND ALL ORDERS WITH PAYMENT TO:

(Add \$3.00 per book S&H .

TX residents add 7.25% tax)

**CONTENDING FOR THE FAITH**

P.O. BOX 2357 • SPRING, TEXAS 77383-2357

## DISCUSSION GROUP

*Contending for the Faith magazine announces the formation of a computer based discussion group called ContendingFTF, hosted at Yahoo.com. This discussion group is for members of the church of Christ only. Among the purposes for starting such a discussion group is to provide a forum to discuss Biblical doctrine, defend the Truth, and review current issues among churches of Christ. You are invited to join this group and participate in the discussions. ContendingFTF is "FOR THOSE WHO LOVE THE TRUTH AND HATE ERROR."*

**To subscribe to ContendingFTF  
send an email to:**

**[ContendingFTF-subscribe@yahoogroups.com](mailto:ContendingFTF-subscribe@yahoogroups.com)**

# 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.

**Somerville**-Union Church of Christ, located on Hwy 36, one mile east of Hwy 67, Somerville, Alabama, Sun. 9:30 a.m., 10:30 a.m., 6:00 p.m., Wed. 7:00 p.m., Tom Larkin, evangelist, (256) 778-8955, (256) 778-8961.

**Tuscaloosa**-East Pointe Church of Christ one block from Exit 76, off I-20, I-59, Sun. 9 a.m., 10 a.m., 6 p.m., Wed., 7 p.m. Abiding in God's Word—The Old Paths. U of A student, visitor, or resident? Welcome! Andy Cates, evangelist. (205)556-3062.

## -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](http://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](http://www.Traces-of-the-kingdom.org) and [www.Myth-and-Mystery.org](http://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](mailto:ocoeechurchofchrist@yahoo.com), [www.ocoecoc.org](http://www.ocoecoc.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.

## -Georgia-

**Cartersville**- Church of Christ, 1319 Joe Frank Harris Pkwy NW 30120-4222. 770-382-6775, [www.cartersvillechurchofchrist.org](http://www.cartersvillechurchofchrist.org). Sun. 10, 11a.m., 6:30 p.m. Wed. 7:30 p.m. Bobby D. Gayton, evangelist- email: [bdgayton@juno.com](mailto:bdgayton@juno.com).

## -Indiana-

**Evansville**-West Side Church of Christ, 3232 Edgewood Dr., Evansville, IN 47712, Sun. 9:00 a.m., 10:00 a.m., 6:00 p.m., Wed. 6:30 p.m., Larry Albritton, evangelist.

## -Louisiana-

**Chalmette**-Church of Christ, 200 Delaronde St., Chalmette, LA 70044. Mark Lance, evangelist, (504) 279-9438.

## -Massachusetts-

**Chicopee**-Armory Drive Church of Christ, 26 Armory Drive; Chicopee, MA 01020, in-home, (413) 592-4834, Ken Dion, evangelist.

## -North Carolina-

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

## -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](mailto:lawson@starnetok.net).

## - Tennessee-

**Lenoir City**-Lenoir City Church of Christ, 1280 Simpson Road West, P.O. Box 292 Lenoir City, TN 37771 . Sun. 9:30, 10:30AM, 6:00PM, Wed. 7:00PM., Kent Bailey, Evangelist Tel: 865-986-3223 or 865-986-5698).

**Murfreesboro**-Church of Christ, 837 Esther Lane, Murfreesboro, TN, 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.murfreesborochurchofchrist.org](http://www.murfreesborochurchofchrist.org). evangelist, Steve Yeatts.

## -Texas-

**Denton area**—Northpoint Church of Christ. We are currently meeting at the home of Shawn & LaDawn Hale. 227 Aubrey, TX 76227. Contacts are Shawn Hale (940)365-5997.

**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](http://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, evangelist; [djgoines@writeme.com](mailto:djgoines@writeme.com).

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

**Hurst**-Northeast Church of Christ, 1313 Karla Dr., P.O. Box 85, Hurst, TX 76053. Sun. 9 a.m., 10 a.m., 6 p.m., Wed. 7:30 p.m. (817) 282-3239, Toney Smith and Dan Flournoy, evangelists.

**New Braunfels**-1130 Hwy. 306, 1.5 miles west of I-35. Sun: 9:30 a.m., 10:30 a.m., 6:00 p.m. Wed. 7 p.m. Lynn Parker, evangelist. (830) 625-9367. [www.nbchurchofchrist.com](http://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., 5:00 p.m., Wed. 7:00 p.m., Tel. (307) 635-2482. evangelist: Tim Cozad.

**HELP US GROW!  
SIGN-UP AT LEAST FIVE  
NEW SUBSCRIBERS  
TO CFTF IN 2006  
SEND SUBSCRIPTIONS TO:  
P.O. 2357  
SPRING, TEXAS 77383**



STEVEN B. CLARK'S

HEH-HEH... IF I CAN'T DECEIVE CHRISTIANS THROUGH "MODERN-DAY REVELATIONS" OR IF I CAN'T TRICK 'EM WITH DENOMINATIONAL CREED BOOKS, I'LL GET 'EM THROUGH PERVERTED VERSIONS OF THE BIBLE!

DEITY OF CHRIST DENIED - NEW WORLD TRANSLATION, JN. 1:1

INSTRUMENTAL MUSIC ALLOWED - AMPLIFIED NZ, EPH. 5:19

BORN A SINNER - LIVING BIBLE AND NW, PSA. 51:5

SALVATION BY FAITH ONLY - LIVING BIBLE, JN. 1:11-12 RSV, ROM. 11:20 MOFFATT, GAL. 2:16



LORD'S SUPPER ON SATURDAY NIGHT - NEW ENGLISH BIBLE AND TODAY'S ENGLISH VERSION, ACTS 20:7

JESUS IMPALED ON A STAKE - NEW WORLD TRANSLATION, MATT. 27:32-35

Contending for the Faith  
P.O. Box 2357  
Spring, Texas 77383

PRSRST STD  
U. S. POSTAGE  
**PAID**  
DALLAS, TX  
PERMIT #1863