

Banner of Truth

August 2000

The Community Church (No. 2)

Gary McDade

Editor's Note: This is the second and final part of the above article. We encourage our readers to read the first part as carried in the [July issue of Banner of Truth](#), to get a clearer picture of this innovation.

The Purpose Driven Church discussed "The Core" members. "The 'Core' is the smallest group, because it represents the deepest level of commitment. They are the dedicated minority of workers and leaders, those who are committed to *ministering* to others."¹⁶ Compare *The Purpose Driven Church's* explanation of the "cell" groups with the Strategic Statement of Ealy and Hicks:

One of the sayings I quote to our staff and lay leaders repeatedly is, "Our church must always be growing larger and smaller at the same time." By that I mean there must be a balance between the large group celebrations and the small-group cells. Both are important to the health of the church.

Large group celebrations give people the feeling that they re a part of something significant. They are impressive to unbelievers and encouraging to our members. But you can't share a personal prayer request in the crowd. Small affinity groups, on the other hand, are perfect for creating a sense of intimacy and close fellowship. It's there that everybody knows your name. When you are absent, people notice.¹⁷

Third, in *The Purpose Driven Church* Rick Warren gave a copy of a letter he sent out to the Saddleback area of Orange County, California. This letter is reproduced in its entirety, followed by a letter Ealy and Hicks mailed out to the Cordova area. The letters are the same, only the names have been changed, thereby proving the Cordova Community Church's dependence on *The Purpose Driven Church* as a pattern or model to be followed.

March 20, 1980

Hi Neighbor!

AT LAST

A new church designed for those who've given up on traditional church services! Let's face it. Many people aren't active in church these days.

Too often. . .

The sermons are boring and don't relate to daily living

Many churches seem more interested in your wallet than you

Members are unfriendly to visitors

You wonder about the quality of the nursery care for your children

You think attending church should be enjoyable?

WE'VE GOT GOOD NEWS FOR YOU

SADDLEBACK COMMUNITY CHURCH is a new church designed to meet your needs in 1980s. We're a group of friendly, happy people who have discovered the joy of the Christian lifestyle.

At Saddleback Valley Community Church you

Meet new friends and get to know your neighbors

Enjoy upbeat music with a contemporary flavor

Hear positive, practical messages which encourage you each week

Trust your children to the care of dedicated nursery workers

WHY NOT GET A LIFT THIS SUNDAY?

I invite you to be my special guest at our first public celebration service **EASTER SUNDAY**, April 6 at 11:30 a.m. We are currently meeting in the Laguna Hills High School Theater. If you don't have a church home, give us a try!

DISCOVER THE DIFFERENCE!

Sincerely,

Rick Warren, Pastor18

Now, compare the letter Ealy and Hicks mailed to the Cordova area:

March 26, 1998

Hi Neighbor!

AT LAST!

A new church designed for those who've given up on traditional church services and stuffy settings! It's true, isn't it. Many people aren't active in church these days.

WHY?

Too often people feel . . .

The sermons are boring and don't relate to daily living

Many churches seem more interested in your wallet than you

Members are unfriendly to visitors

Uncertain about the quality child care activities

Churches are self-centered

WE'VE GOT GOOD NEWS FOR YOU!

CORDOVA COMMUNITY CHURCH, a church of Christ, is a new church designed to meet your needs into the 21st century. We're a group of friendly people who have discovered the joy of the Christian lifestyle.

At Cordova Community Church you will:

meet new friends and get to know your neighbors

enjoy meaningful worship with a contemporary flavor

hear positive, practical and relevant messages of encouragement

involve children in various activities

serve the disadvantaged in our city

WHY NOT GET A LIFT ON EASTER?

We invite you to share our first public celebration service Easter Sunday, April 12 at 10:00 a.m. We are currently meeting in the Cordova Harding Academy gym. If you don't have a church home, give us a try! Nursery provided.

SHARE THE EXCITEMENT!

Sincerely,

Gary Ealy (garyealy@aol.com; 737-9330)

John Mark Hicks (hicksjm@hugsr.edu; 761-1350, ext. 124)

The format of the letter which appeared in *The Purpose Driven Church* has been retained by Ealy and Hicks with only slight changes to the wording to accommodate the identity of the Cordova Community Church. These brethren are brazen in following the pattern of denominational preachers while dealing despairingly with the Lord's pattern in the New Testament for the churches of Christ.

THE CONSENSUS CLOSE BY

A recent development that has passed by unnoticed by most members of the church in Memphis is a clear statement of general acceptance of fellowship with the Cordova Community Church by several local congregations through announcement of and participation in a "Day of Praise." The "Day of Praise" was held Sunday, April 2, 2000 at Harding Academy on Cherry Road. Ken Young and the Hallal Singers were the featured praise team. A statement within the published announcement that should be of particular concern in this present study is: "Sponsored by White Station, Highland Street, Sycamore View, Brownsville Road, and Cordova Community."¹⁹ Other area churches which participated in promoting the "Day of Praise" in addition to those sponsoring congregations already mentioned were: The Goodman Oaks Church of Christ,²⁰ the Great Oaks Church of Christ, ²¹ the Park Avenue Church of Christ,²² the Raleigh Church of Christ,²³ and the Ross Road Church of Christ.²⁴ This marks the coming out event of joint participation among the churches of Christ in Memphis with the Community Church. The precedent has now been set; all who now speak out against the Community Church may expect to be anathematized by the majority of the congregations in Memphis.

THE CURRENT COLLABORATION OF THE CONSPIRATORS

The Christian Chronicle is published by Oklahoma Christian University. It is Edited by Bailey B. McBride. Glover Shipp is the Senior Editor. It is published monthly and has a worldwide readership. In the March and April 2000 editions a four-part presentation strongly favoring the Community Church movement shows that currently the best known expression of the Community Church is the model of Bill Hybels out of Barrington, Illinois, near Chicago, called The Willow Creek Community Church. Along with his wife, Lynne, Hybels has written "The story and vision of Willow Creek Community Church" titled, ***Rediscovering Church***. However, a Baptist preacher named Rick Warren, while denying cloning Willow Creek, has built The Saddleback Community Church in Orange County, California, which closely parallels Willow Creek and has written a more understandable guide for duplicating the Community Church titled, ***The Purpose Driven Church***. These works are acknowledged within *The Christian Chronicle* feature articles as the sources from which the Community Churches are finding expression among churches of Christ.

However, in the four articles there is not one word of refutation of their erroneous origins. As evidence, read the inflammatory opening statement where ***The Purpose Driven Church*** is introduced by Flavil Yeakley, who is a "professor in the College of Bible and Religion at Harding University, Searcy , Ark. He directs the Harding Center for Church Growth Studies. He began preaching 50 years ago and has been involved in church growth research for thirty years. He wrote:

Then the big one—Rick Warren's book ***The Purpose Driven Church*** tells the story of the Saddleback Community Church, Orange County, Calif. Rick is a Baptist, and his church is a Baptist Church, but he wanted to reach out to the unchurched and felt that the name "Baptist" might be a barrier.

This approach is a step in the direction of non-denominational Christianity, and I think that

Stone, Campbell and other Restoration Movement pioneers would rejoice to see this development. It is not enough, but it is a step in the right direction.²⁵

"Non-denominational Christianity" has now been redefined by the church growth expert to mean increased subtlety through hiding denominational doctrines and practices by generalizing the name from Baptist to Community Church. Truly, anyone seeking "the salvation which is in Christ Jesus" would be hard pressed to be drawn to a church wearing the name "Baptist" which is nowhere found in the Bible. Surely, an imposing barrier has been erected by those who wish to advance their cause under that unscriptural banner. Why would anyone familiar with God's word or in the process of examining God's word accept the Community Church name which likewise is absent from the pages of inspiration? How easily some are toppled from the correct and eminently Scriptural name, "*the churches of Christ salute you*" (Rom. 16:16). The name Church of Christ has been opposed by denominationalism all across the years, and one of the apparent reasons for it is due to pride on the part of those wearing unscriptural names in religion. Simply put: They cannot find their names in the Bible. It is a mark of undisguised compromise to retreat from the name of the Lord Jesus Christ which inspiration has applied to his blood-bought church. What an egregious oversight since the church is the Lord's bride and since for the church He died, if He failed to give her His name. That is one obvious nightmare with which denominationalism has been struggling since its inception.

These are denominational churches loosely affiliated with the group from which they came which merely have shrouded themselves with the name "Community Church." The cardinal rule among them is to appear non-traditional. They are characterized by a casual dress code, "contemporary" music, non-distinctive public speeches which endeavor to focus the attention of the assembly on a celebration-type atmosphere, inter-denominational acceptance, small group organization, personal testimonies, praise teams, and in their beginning stages a brazen acceptance of financial support from churches they intend to take over.

The Christian Chronicle speaks in the most glowing terms of the Community Church, with only the exception of a very few scant references to the contrary. Of the six articles on the subject in the March edition one writer ventured to ask a few questions and even he dared not speak one word of criticism, just alarm while advising a "wait and see" posture. Also, of the writers selected one has helped plant a Community Church in Searcy, Arkansas, another presented the view that "this change is our historical commitment to nondenominational Christianity." Another said he believes their purposes to be "God-given," and yet another currently is the minister for a Community Church in Amarillo, Texas. In the April edition no less than fourteen Community Churches are referenced, not counting multiple references to Willow Creek and Saddleback. Among the names are Christ's Community Church, Oak Tree Church, New Covenant Christian Fellowship, Servants of Christ, and Grace Church. States in which the churches mentioned are located are Alabama, Arkansas, Georgia, Michigan, Tennessee, and Texas. A more complete listing of Community Churches may be found in Mac Lynn's directory of churches of Christ for the year 2000, but Lynn has dropped "Church of Christ" from individual listings, making the number of Community Churches difficult to find. Also, he has not offered a designation in the front of the directory noting those who are Community Churches, like he has with the non-instrumental, one, cup, etc. An array of preachers following the Community Church pattern were promoted in the April article, including those who split a church in the Dallas Metroplex. Additionally, the editor of the feature, Lindy S. Adams, provided

the web site addresses for Willow Creek and Saddleback, facilitating their use. Two of the writers are professors at Harding University, one is adjunct instructor for Harding Graduate School of Religion in Memphis, one is president of Rochester College in Michigan, one is connected with Lipscomb University, one is a retired faculty member of Southern Christian University, two are self-styled church growth experts, and, as mentioned earlier, several are ministers for Community Churches. The selection of people with connections to schools supported by churches of Christ who will not oppose the Community Church to write the articles facilitates the movement by lending the impression of acceptability to the articles.

The editor of the features is laboring under at least two misconceptions regarding the church of Christ. **One**, in the introduction Adams wrote, ". . . the church they worked diligently to create. . ." Men did not create the church of Christ; it is of divine origin (Eph. 3:9-11, 4:1-5, 5:23-25). Without doubt this misconception is why such liberties are being taken with regard to the church. The view seems to be if men created the church of Christ and it is not now what men want it to be, then just simply change it to fit the wishes of men today. **Two**, denominational church growth models can be adapted and altered to cause the churches of Christ to grow. The church of Christ is not a denomination (Col. 1:18; Eph. 4:4). The one responsible for its growth is God himself (I Cor. 3:6-9). The method of its expansion is the preaching and teaching of the word of God (Mk. 16:15; Acts 6:7). The church growth expert who teaches at Harding and has helped start Covenant Fellowship Community Church wants the readers to believe these Community Churches are "still within the 'Church of Christ mainstream.'" How can anyone expect that to be so when they do not even so much as retain the name Church of Christ. Their attempt at worship and congregational organization is a departure from the truth, yet they demand their followers to insist that they are center of the strait and narrow road. A Christian may have no fellowship with the unfruitful division of denominational darkness (Eph. 5:11). Their means and methodologies have nothing to offer the Lord's people (I Thess. 5:5). Light and darkness have no communion (2 Cor. 6:14). Brethren need to wake out of sleep, get back to teaching and preaching the word of God, and Christ will give all the light needed to advance His cause (Eph. 5:14).

THE CRUSHING OF THE CORRUPT PATTERN

Four suggestions are offered on how to defeat the Community Church movement. **One**, expose the error of the Community Church and those favorable to it. It is right to be "*set for the defense of the gospel*" (Phil. 1:17). Paul left Titus in Crete to set things in order, hold fast the faithful word, exhort and convince the gainsayers, stop the mouths of the gainsayers, and rebuke them sharply (Tit. 1:5-13). Jude 3 still calls for an earnest contending for the faith. **Two**, refuse to fund the Community Church movement by withdrawing personal and financial support from those congregations and schools promoting the Community Church. Philippians 1:5 and 4:15 proves that those whom we support financially we are fellowshiping. If one is contributing into a church treasury, he is in fellowship with that which is supported out of that treasury. When the leadership of a local congregation is dedicated to the planting of Community Churches all of the members of that congregation are responsible for the planting of the Community Churches. By withdrawing personal and financial support from that congregation the movement will be thwarted. The Community Church begins as a parasite feeding off a thriving organism. A

paradoxical phenomenon is occurring with the Community Church. Older, established churches of Christ are funding the vehicle of their demise when they support this error. It is very sad to note that if this continues, the children and grandchildren of members of the churches of Christ will not know the truth about the church of the Bible, because the Community Church advocates are changing everything about it under the pretense of church growth.

Three, evangelize the lost (Matt. 28:19-20). No matter what the problems and challenges faced by the churches of Christ, the gospel of Christ must continue to be preached to a lost and dying world. Many problems and challenges besieged the early church, yet the gospel was advanced to the point that Paul could write in Colossians 1:23, that every creature under heaven had the opportunity to hear it. The method authorized by God to reach lost souls is preaching (I Cor. 1:18-21). Imagine if *The Christian Chronicle* were dedicated to such a noble purpose instead of promoting the latest denominational craze. The millions who could be taught the Bible through that paper who are instead being coaxed into error make these developments all the more a shame. **Four**, edify those who are Christians (Eph. 4:15-16). Paul said that by edifying "*That we henceforth be no more children, tossed to and fro, and carried about with every wind of doctrine, by the sleight of men, and cunning craftiness, whereby they lie in wait to deceive*" (Eph. 4:14). Through edification the Christian dons the whole armor of God in which he stands against the methods of the devil (Eph. 6:11).

THE CLARION CALL TO THE CORRECT PATTERN

God has always had a pattern He has expected faithful men and women to follow. Hebrews 8:5 reads, "*Who serve unto the example and shadow of heavenly things, as Moses was admonished of God when he was about to make the tabernacle: for, saith he, that thou make all things according to the pattern shewed to thee in the mount.*" The apostles' teaching must be followed as a pattern of righteousness. Paul wrote, "*Howbeit for this cause I obtained mercy, that in me first Jesus Christ might shew forth all longsuffering, for a pattern to them which should hereafter believe on him to life everlasting*" (I Tim. 1:16). Even the righteous living of the Christian must conform to God's revealed pattern. Again, Paul said, "*In all things shewing thyself a pattern of good works: in doctrine shewing uncorruptness, gravity, sincerity*" (Titus 2:7). Christians must obey God rather than men (Acts 5:29; Heb. 5:8-9; Gal. 1:10).

THE CONCLUSION

The Community Church pattern with its erroneous doctrine poses a threat to the churches of Christ. At a time when society in general seems to be moving farther and farther away from receptivity to the Scriptures, some brethren are appealing to denominational successes to glean numbers and dollars in the false assumption they are thereby bringing glory to God. Perhaps this exposure of the pattern now being used and some of the brethren following this false way will serve as a call for some to return to God's way and a solemn warning for all to "*speak as the oracles of God*" (I Pet. 4:11).

1511 Getwell Road

Memphis, TN38111

ENDNOTES

16. *The Purpose Driven Church*, p. 134.
17. *Ibid.*, p. 326.
18. *Ibid.*, p. 194
19. **Server**, a Weekly Publication of the Church of Christ at White Station, Vol. 47, No. 13, March 29, 2000, p. 1.
20. *The Oak Leaf*, Vol. XVIII, No. 13, March 17, 2000, p. 3.
21. *Notes*, Vol. 9, No. 13, March 29, 2000, p. 3.
22. *Park Avenue News*, Vol. XXII, No. 7, March 27, 2000, p. 4.
23. *Raleigh Memorandum*, Vol. 37, No. 6, March 15, 2000, p. 3.
24. *In Touch*, March 2000, p. 3.
25. *The Christian Chronicle*, Vol. 57, No. 3, March 2000, p. 18.

Paul's Plea To Brethren At Corinth

John Q. Mitchell

During the time of Paul, Corinth was the largest and most materially flourishing center in Southern Greece. Due to the mobility of the population, which consisted of business men, sailors, government officials and others, the city was cut off from the inhibitions of the settled society. Moreover, to make matters worse, religious prostitution was commonly practiced in connection with the temples of the city. From the social mobility and the evils of religious practices, there arose a general corruption of society. Yes, Corinthian morals became a byword even in pagan Rome. To "Corinthianize" became a synonym for bodily immorality. Is it any wonder that Paul had much to say about the unity and sacredness of the physical body in his first Corinthian letter (I Cor. 12:14-27)?

When we place in juxtaposition the human body and the spiritual body of Christ we will doubtless come away with the knowledge that both require unity and synchronicity in order to have orderly functions. Since our aim in this discussion is to focus upon the body of Christ we will now speak to the requirements for unity in that body, according to Paul's plea to the brethren

at Corinth, as set forth in I Corinthians 1:10: *"Now I beseech you, brethren, by the name of our Lord Jesus Christ, that ye all speak the same thing, and that there be no divisions among you: but that ye be perfectly joined together in the same mind and in the same judgment."* It was in the midst of Corinth, the very center of social and spiritual corruption, that a congregation of the Lord, the church of Christ, if you will, existed.

Should not this church of the Lord have been a beacon of light for its external and unholy surroundings? Absolutely! But instead, it was a congregation divided by factions (I Cor. 1:12). Such a manifestation was then, now and always inimical to congregational unity. In that some claimed to be of Paul, some of Apollos, some of Peter, and thank God, some of them said they were of Christ, points out the fact that unity did not exist among brethren at Corinth, and cannot exist at any other congregation of the Lord's people when plagued by internal discord. There must be sameness of mind, yea, and sameness of speech, for inherent in the absence of unanimity of mind, judgment and speech is a divided church.

Paul not only delivered an unmistakable admonition, nor an uncertain injunction vis a vis the transgression of factionalism, but also roundly condemned these factions for elevating men like Cephas, Paul and Apollos to a status which these men neither desired nor of which they were worthy.

Brethren, let us be vigilant and guard against things that are conducive to division, such as the trends toward modernism and insidious liberalism. Our example is Christ, and He is not divided (v. 13). Surely, God will bless us for *"Endeavoring to keep the unity of the Spirit in the bond of peace"* (Eph. 4:3), striving always to preserve the ancient purity and apostolic simplicity of the church of God, of which division and strife are the very antithesis. May God help us to promote godly things, things which promote congregational solidarity and not the division which is so destructive.

251 S. Walnut Ave., Apt. 148

San Dimas, CA 91773

A Word Of Heartfelt Thanks

Since my wife, Naomi, and I began work with *Banner of Truth* about nine years ago we've had so many things for which to be sincerely thankful. Since our thanks have not been expressed as often as they should, we're taking this opportunity to sort of catch up in doing so.

In the first place, we thank God that we've been blessed with a state of health which has enabled us to continue our work. Though I have spent almost a week in a hospital in a foreign country (Philippines and Ukraine) on two occasions, my health appears quite good now. Naomi has had some medical problems but her condition appears to be improved.

Second, we thank our brethren, both individuals and congregations, who have supplied the necessary finances to make our work possible. It is a great encouragement not to have to worry about finances. So many brethren have been and continue to be "*fellowhelpers to the truth.*" This generous support leads us to believe that our work is needed and appreciated by concerned brethren.

Third, we thank the many brethren from all across our country, and from some foreign countries, who have commended *Banner of Truth* and expressed their thanks for our stand for the truth. The negative responses received are less than five percent. We do expect some.

Fourth, we are thankful for our brethren who are unafraid to "*Contend for the faith*" (Jude 3), and are willing to let their voices be heard in the support of the truth and in opposition to every form of error. Just think what godly elders can do for the cause of Christ when they fulfill their God-given roles. We have a special thanks for our sisters in Christ, some in their golden years, who are deeply concerned about the evil which is invading the church in such frightening proportions. Some of these sisters are unafraid to speak up in behalf of God's truth when it is violated. Though women cannot take a public stand from the pulpit, they can voice their concern in a more private way. Our heart goes out to those sisters who in some instances are treated unkindly by elders and others who will not "*stand fast in the faith*" (I Cor. 16:13).

In the fifth place, we are thankful for help in getting *Banner of Truth* ready to mail each month. A number of brethren from the Hickory Grove and Dexter congregations contribute many hours of physical labor in this work.

We are not unmindful, but thankful, for those who contribute material for the paper.

Naomi and I are thankful for the many prayers offered in our behalf. Please let those to continue.

Last but not least, we thank the Hickory Grove congregation for serving as the sponsors of the *Banner of Truth* work. Through this means the Hickory Grove church is reaching people in nearly every state in the U.S. and in a number of foreign countries. Well over 5,000 copies of B.O.T. go out each month, and our circulation is growing.

For the cause of Christ,

Walter and Naomi Pigg

A Vivid Example Of A Liberal's Mentality

In the following discussion we are using the word "Liberal" to mean: 1) One does not have to have Bible authority for things believed and practiced in the area of spiritual matters. 2) One who takes the position that silence allows the doing of things which are not mentioned in the Bible. 3) One who avers that spiritual things are justified by the Bible when they are not. Taken as a whole, the liberal believes he is not bound by what God says in His word, but is at liberty to believe and practice that which is not authorized, which according to New Testament teaching is error or sin. The liberal does not "Take God at His word."

The effect of the insidious liberalism, which has swept over the Lord's church like the prairie fires of the old west (fires of liberalism are still burning) has been virtually incomprehensible. The body of Christ is bleeding profusely. The extent of the harm done can be accurately assessed only by our Lord, but even with our limited knowledge it is clearly evident that the well-being of the Lord's church has never before in our lives been so adversely affected. Many, many of the congregations which were sound forty or fifty years ago are now in the liberal camp.

With the current promotion of liberalism the prospects for a turnaround are indeed very slim. With the influence of such things as: 1) Our schools. 2) Convocations such as Jubilee and the Tulsa Workshop and others of the same stripe. 3) Along with liberal elders and preachers. 4) Plus a church membership which to a great degree wants to be entertained and never reminded of responsibilities, the situation will most likely only worsen. This doesn't, however, relieve the serious-minded Christian of the responsibility to stand up for the truth of the gospel and oppose every false way.

Truth-loving Christians are perplexed as to why anyone with a knowledge of the truth would turn from it and opt for that which is error. Remarks similar to the following are often heard: "I just don't see how anyone who knows the truth could turn from it into error." The following question is quite often posed: "How can a person go into error when he knows the truth?"

I don't profess to have a perfect answer as to why people with a knowledge of the truth

go into liberalism. But it should not be a matter of surprise that people do so. Paul warned that some would "*depart from the faith*" (I Tim. 4:1), and that some would not "*endure sound doctrine*" (2 Tim. 4:3). A number of other warnings are given, but still it is hard to understand why people do it, and just what takes place in their minds. I believe we can be safe in saying there are some things which cannot be in the minds of those who go into liberalism. Consider the following as examples: 1) That this would be showing love for God. We show love for God by "*keep[ing] his commandments*" (I Jno. 5:3), not by rejecting them. Jesus said, "*If a man love me, he will keep my words*" (Jno. 14:23). The sin of liberalism is that it doesn't keep God's commandments. 2) That it will prevent the practice of sin. The very nature of sin is "*the transgression of the law*" [God's law] (I Jno. 3:4). 3) That it is showing respect for God's word. The very core of liberalism is showing disrespect for God's word, not respect.

On the other hand, there are things which could be in their minds. The following are a few of the possible ones: 1. It allows men to do the things which please them, rather than God. 2. It avoids differences with denominational friends. 3. Allows preaching a "positive doctrine." 4. Unity is so important that it should be sought at the cost of truth. 5. It will encourage more praise from people of like mind. 6. It allows relegating matters of faith into the category of "tradition" or "opinion."

It is evident that various factors are involved in people's adoption of liberalism, but I'm thoroughly convinced that a serious examination of **A Liberal's Mentality** will shed some important light on the matter. That is exactly what I plan to do in the following discussion. It is increasingly evident that those of a liberal persuasion have a mind-set which goes a long way in accounting for their actions, as if they are programmed to act in a certain way, and that without consideration of God's word.

As a case in point I shall consider a number of things from a strong critic of **Banner of Truth**, as set forth in e-mails to me. This individual's name is Chris George, of the Mt. George Church of Christ. He says he is a preacher, who has preached at one place for fifteen years. According to him, those of his family and those of his wife's family are active members of the church and have been for years. From what this preacher has written we are going to consider a number of things which appear to be very much a part of his mentality, or his mind-set. The first thing we call attention to is:

1. The Attacking Of One Who Stands For The Truth. It is a very common thing for one who is liberal in his thinking to launch an attack against those who stand uncompromisingly for the whole truth of God. When this happens there is often reason to believe that the one doing the attacking is resorting to this tactic due to a lack of Bible evidence to back up whatever it is that he stands for. It is very conspicuous when the criticism is not based on what God's word teaches. To attack seems to be in the mind of the liberal when they are questioned. We shall point this out from what Chris has said. We note this first paragraph from his first E-mail:

I have read several of your articles. I wish for just once you would practice what you preach. You gave a list of unscriptural practices in worship. None of which has any scripture that speaks against it. Many of the practices that you denounce are simply your traditions. And just because a "denominat-ion" does it doesn't necessarily make it wrong. They read and study the Bible the same as you do. (From E-mail, Aug. 10, 2000)

From the above you will note: 1) That I'm accused of hypocrisy, that of not practicing what I preach. You will also note that not one thing is offered as evidence in his accusation. 2) He accuses me of denouncing practices which "are simply against" my "traditions." Again, you will note that not one practice which I was said to denounce is specified in the above paragraph.

In the above e-mail Chris asks, "Are you God that you can say that a singing group or drama group cannot be edifying?" He also asks, "Do you think that God wants you to neglect the poor and the lost in favor of pursuing your personal agenda?" Could it be that my motives are being judged? Does Chris know that I've spent more than five years of my life out of this country, trying to reach the lost?

On Aug. 11, Chris sent an E-mail to Garland Robinson. On Aug. 12, the E-mail was forwarded to be by Chris, with these words: "I am forwarding this email I sent to Bro. Robinson because it speaks to the same issue. Thank you for reading this." Inasmuch as the E-mail is directed to me as well as bro. Garland Robinson, I will consider the attack which is made in this letter, in addition to that mentioned above. Note the numbered examples: 1. ". . . your attitude and approach to answering questions is neither honest or open and in fact seems calculated to be offensive." 2. "You have consistently raised an offensive and divisive voice over issues that have nothing to do with the Bible or salvation." 3. "...You have no right to be mean or cruel when you do it [contend for the faith]." 4. "You have a wonderful forum to save souls over the internet. Why not use it to the glory of God and not delight Satan with your tearing apart the Lord's church." 5. God's grace and mercy are there for you as well brother - repent of your heart that is immersed in the gall of bitterness. . . ." 6. Addressed specifically to me, Chris says: "Your spirit and tone of your response is not very nice. . . . but when you used these snide remarks and talk down to people in such an unchristian tone, I cannot find Jesus in it at all. Please pray about your anger and bitterness. . . Think about your reason for writing in this style. Do you really think that souls will respond to that type of angry holiness. . . Surely we can at least attempt to be nice."

The above is a clear example of a liberal making it appear that one who attempts to stand fast in the faith and contend for the same, is the villain or culprit. It is evident that specifics are not given and valid evidence is lacking to back up the accusations. It appears to me Chris doesn't like those who stand for the truth when he doesn't. That he doesn't stand for the truth, we will show clearly. (*Page 10*)

2. Things About Which God's Word Is Silent Are Permitted. In the paragraph from the Chris E-mail quoted above we note this statement: "You gave a list of unscriptural practices in worship. None of which has any scripture that speaks against it." In the first place, things are authorized by what God's word says, not by what is not said. The apostle Paul says, "*And whatsoever ye do in word or deed, do all in the name of the Lord Jesus, giving thanks to God and the Father by him*" (Col. 3:17). To do things "in the name of the Lord Jesus" is to do so by His authority. Those who "*transgresseth, and abideth not in the doctrine of Christ, hath not God. . .*" (2 Jno. 9). The *doctrine of Christ* is made known to us by what God's word says, not by what it doesn't say. Who would take issue with this?

One would think that a preacher of fifteen years would have learned this basic fundamental, that things are authorized by what God's word says, not by silence. God-approved faith comes from the hearing of God's word (Rom. 10:17), not from silence. Denominational people have been using the erroneous reasoning that "silence gives consent" for a long time; it is

only in more recent times that our liberal brethren have been following suit.

Just think, if all things are permitted in worship which the scriptures do not speak against, as Chris reasons, all manner of things could be done. All manner of mechanical instruments of music could be used. Lemonade, Coke and cheese could be used on the Lord's table. Incense could be burned. A number of heathen practices in worship could be put to use, such as the sexual provocation which is some times a part of the Hindu's worship. The scriptures do not speak against such things, though scriptural worship is set forth by what God's word says (Jno. 4:24). Worship "in truth" rules out such things as the above. But Chris doesn't reason that way. This he makes clear in the following statement, "You also have every right not to sing during the Lord's supper or to clap during a song, or to sing only old songs or not to have a gym, but brother, I have them because the Bible is silent on all these issues." More and more we are seeing the practice of all manner of things about which the Bible is silent. The error of this is that God's authority is cast aside and rejected. God authorizes only by what He says.

If the silence of the scriptures allows unmentioned practices in worship, as Chris contends, would not the same principle be true in areas of serving God, other than worship? Of course it would. This would allow such things as: sprinkling for baptism, "baptizing" of infants, appointing a "Pope," forming a Baptist Church, a missionary society, raising funds with whatever means, the providing of all manner of secular activities by the church, and an endless list of other things. How can anyone believe "silence of the scriptures" permits the doing of unmentioned things, still claim to have any respect for God's authority? Yet, Chris says, "I have a deep and abiding love for the Word of God. I read it 'religiously.'" The mind-set which denies the absolute authority of God's word allows one to give way to his own subjective desires and opinions.

3. The Doing Of Some Unscriptural Things Is Justification For Doing Other Unscriptural Things. It is hard to imagine anyone using the above reasoning to justify things which are clearly unscriptural, but some of a liberal persuasion actually do this very thing. A few years ago the argument was being made that since the church engages in congregational singing, which some claimed was unscriptural, then the use of instrumental music could also be used, though it is unscriptural. Consider the following from Chris, from his E-mail of August 22, 2000:

Here is a list of things used in the church today that have no scriptural basis for their use: church buildings, pews, song books, elevated pulpits, air conditioning, electric lights, baptisteries (heated). Think about it. Who made the decision that these things are acceptable other (sic) innovations are not?

The above is from a man that has been preaching at one place for fifteen years. Yet, he is saying that since we use the things which he says, "have no scriptural basis," we have a right to use other things which have no scriptural basis, such as singing during the Lord's supper, clapping during singing, and a gym. If this reasoning is valid, then we can engage in some unscriptural things and by virtue of that practice, engage in whatever other unscriptural practices we desire.

The problem with the reasoning in the above quotation from Chris, is that the things he mentions as having "no scriptural basis," are indeed authorized. These things are involved in carrying out the Lord's will in teaching, preaching, and acts of worshipping God. The command to assemble implies a place to assemble. Seating is conducive to better participation in spiritual

activities. Song books contribute to better singing. Elevated pulpits contribute to better receptivity by the audience. Air condition and electric lights enable the audience to see during darkness and be more comfortable when participating in activities. A heated baptistry makes the act of baptism more comfortable in a physical way. Though people can engage in worship without the things mentioned above, just think how the various activities in doing God's will would be adversely affected if: People had to meet outdoors with no seats, sing without song books, listen to a speaker who could not be seen by many in the audience, suffer from intense heat in hot summer, refrain from meeting when light was needed to see, and break the ice during the winter time to baptize. Good judgment is involved in the above things.

The point is that expedients which are implied in the carrying out of God's will are authorized. Things which are not involved in carrying out God's will are not authorized. The church is no where authorized to provide entertainment for its members. Family Life centers are for the pleasure and enjoyment of the people. The same thing is true of instrumental music, the use of entertainment groups in drama, choruses, and other group singing.

Innovations which are for the entertainment of people are not authorized. If they are? Where?

4. The Lord's Church Must Change As Society Changes. It has been mainly during the past two or three decades that we have heard the cry from an increasing number of brethren that the church must change with society, or to fit the culture. The following quotation from Christ shows exactly where he stands on this erroneous idea:

Now we live in a leisure society. We don't have to spend long hours in work and subsistence. Entertainment is a part of our every day lives. We watch T.V., listen to the radio, go to the movies, play sports or watch sporting events. People who provide these activities are heroes. (to most people) When we are trying to reach the lost people in the world today, we cannot use the same methods that we used in years past. Because the PEOPLE are DIFFERENT! It is not unscriptural to provide activities that people would find in the world such as sports, music, drama, etc. with a Christian message. Paul said, "I have become all things to all men so that I may win some."

There you have it! The church may provide what people in society like. People are "different," and the gospel as it was delivered by Paul and others will no longer work. How can a professed believer of the Bible believe such a thing as this? Just think what this idea of error would do to God's word! With all the different societies in the world, and with the changes which are continually taking place, who in the world would know what version of the gospel to follow? I don't think it would be the least bit facetious to ask: To whom could we look for true spiritual instruction if the above were true? Would Chris George be able to fill this role?

CLOSING REMARKS

We have not tried to deal with everything with which we disagree, in the E-mail from Chris George. But what we have considered says plainly that this person, and others who think like him, have completely rejected God's word as the supreme and complete authoritative and all-sufficient revelation from God. A growing number of people are thinking in this same way. People who think this way are so often inconsistent, as in the following from Chris: "I believe we would all be better off to be like brother T.B. Larimore and simply preach the gospel and leave

off the opinions and judging." It is evident from the far-out opinions stated and the many judgments expressed that Chris is not yet ready to abide by what he thinks would be best.

Walter W. Pigg

Viewing Marriage Through a New Set of Lenses

Alan Adams, Assistant Editor

Very shortly the second of my four children will in the same year have committed themselves, and have been joined by God, to a mate. Prior to 1997 my knowledge of marriage was: 1) What I had learned from observing the marriage of my parents, grandparents, siblings, friends and so on. 2) What I had learned from twenty-two years of marriage to my Susan. 3) What I had learned from counseling soon-to-marry and already-married couples, and, 4) What I had learned from God's Word and the writings of men on the matter. The Year of Our Lord 1997 has brought to bear for me yet another purview on this most solemn matter, the marriage in March 1997 of my little girl, Rachel Naomi, to Anthony Petrochko, and the marriage of my first born, Walter Justin, to Jordana Tonn. Please indulge me as I remark on a medley of things that I have done, things that I wish I had done, and things I shall do.

PERMANENCY. I have taught my children that a man and a woman are "joined together" by God (Mt. 19:6) when they marry; and that being so "joined," no man has the right to "put asunder." I have taught them that Jesus, who has "authority over all flesh" (Jno. 17:2), and who wields that authority though His "new testament" (Mt. 26:28), says that only *death* (Rom. 7:1-4) or *fornication* (Mt. 19:9) will free the survivor or the aggrieved one from that former bond allowing them to be joined to "another." I pray God that I may never, even for love (albeit misguided) of my children, equivocate or weasel on the clear teaching of Jesus in this matter

UNITY. The most serious relationship of all is the one wherein we are "joined to...him who was raised from the dead (Rom. 7:4). Only herein do we realize the ultimate truth spoken by God through Hosea: "And I will betroth thee unto me for ever, yea, I will betroth thee unto me in

righteousness, and in justice, and in lovingkindness, and in mercies" (Hosea 2:19). Jesus is the marvelous "bridegroom" (Jno. 3:29), and the "church" is His wife of whom it is said, "Christ also loved the church and gave himself up for it" (Eph. 5:25).

Little wonder then that the Holy Spirit uses the relationship between Christ and His church as the pattern to be followed by husbands and wives in marriage (Cf. Eph. 5:21-30). "In Christ" (2 Cor. 5:17), "in the light" (I Jno. 1:7), "in the teaching of Christ" (2 Jno. 9), there is "fellowship one with another," and with "both the Father and the Son." How tragic to contemplate a lifelong commitment to a person of whom none of these things is true. Brothers and sisters, especially the young and unmarried: **Do not give your heart to someone who doesn't love the Lord and/or is not married to Him.** To do so is to automatically forfeit a complete and happy marriage, and to risk the loss of your own soul, that of your spouse, and future children.

Christ, the "husband," is not tolerant of competition, thus Paul says, "I am jealous over you with a godly jealousy: for I espoused you to one husband, that I might present you *as* a pure virgin to Christ" (2 Cor. 11:2). Maintaining and manifesting greater love for the Lord will be difficult enough when married to a Christian; it will be burdensome and dangerous when married to one who is not a Christian.

Please, I beg, do not make the foolish mistake of thinking, I will convert my love after the nuptials. With equal feeling, I beg, do not make the foolish mistake of haranguing or cajoling a present or prospective mate into "getting baptized." Baptism, which "doth now save you" (I Pet. 3:21), is the "interrogation of a good conscience toward God, through the resurrection of Jesus Christ." It is to be undertaken only by those convinced of sin (Ac. 2:37), and who submit to baptism, thus "calling on His name" (Ac. 22:16) with view toward "remission of your sins" (Ac. 2:38). With a present or prospective mate, Peter says, "even if any obey not the word, they may without the [our translations should here read "without a word," AA] be gained by the behavior of their wives" (I Pet. 3:1). Inspiration certainly implies that the same procedure should be followed by a husband in a similar predicament.

AUTHORITY AND SUFFICIENCY. With the marriage of my children, I've experienced a sense of panic, looking back and thinking I should have done more and better to instill within them an implicit trust in the Word to provide—**not** some answer, or an answer, but—**the** final and sufficient information on how to deal with marriage, overcoming its problems, and achieve the bliss it is to bring.

I'm not a great fan of much, even most, of what today passes for Counseling. I'm all for biblical counsel such as that described by Paul: "And I myself also am persuaded of you, my brethren, that ye yourselves are full of goodness, filled with all knowledge, able also to admonish [*noutheteo*: warn, instruct, advise; in other words, "counsel," AA] one another (Rom. 15:14). Like lawyers, counselors are so thick you can't stir them with a stick. Ironically, however, the number of dysfunctional, messed-up people and marriages continues to soar. Need we even mention the divorce rate? There's such a need for Bible believers to act like it: that is, act like they believe the Bible.

Beautifully couched right in the middle of our Bibles is the greatest counseling manual the world will ever see. It is made up of five chapters called: Job, Psalms, Proverbs, Ecclesiastes

and The Song of Solomon. *Job* teaches us about steadfastness in the midst of trial and suffering. With unparalleled rhyme and descriptiveness the *Psalms* sing to us with poems and odes that stir every human emotion. The pithy *Proverbs* give us morality at our fingertips. Was there ever a time with a greater need to cut our the pusillanimous "compassion" for people who are messing up their lives, those of others, and society with their sinful behavior, and to show Christ-like love for them by getting to the point with Proverbs. *Ecclesiastes* is that great chapter on value. As young people marry and start looking toward careers and purpose in life, "the Preacher" (1:2) is simply begging them to listen to his life's story, and draw some conclusions—yea, the only warranted conclusion—he came to draw (12:13-14). Just listen to the incessant whining of the Baby Boomers (my generation) with their two garages, two cars, and two kids. They have created for themselves a life built on and around crisis. Listen to madam Hillary speak of health care crisis; food safety crisis; environmental crisis; child care crisis; race crisis, *ad infinitum*. I would that not only the First Couple, but all people learn the lesson of such "vanity and striving after the wind" (Eccl. 1:14). Then there is the *Song of Songs* with its intimate portrait of passion, ardor, loyalty, and love. No professional with a shingle can say it better than, "I am my beloved's and my beloved is mine; He feedeth *his flock* among the lilies" (Song. of Solomon 6:3).

SEPARATION. The Lord said, "...a man leave his father and mother, and shall cleave to his wife, and the twain shall become one flesh: so that they are no more twain, but one flesh." Some see in this "cleaving" the sexual union and procreation. Whereas it is granted that these are privileges or blessings of marriage, I believe both the "leaving" and the "cleaving" under contemplation are **prior** to and **not** concomitant with the "bed" of marriage (Heb. 13:4). There must be a point in time when the man consciously and openly "leaves" the prior parent/child relationship and sustains a new relationship with "his wife." He "cleaves to his wife" and the two are "joined together" by God. Being thus joined, they are "no more two, but one flesh." Now as a **consequence** — not the **cause** — of being "joined together," "the wife hath not power over own body, but the husband: and likewise also the husband hath not power over his own body, but the wife (I Cor. 7:4).

One does **not**, upon marriage, cease being the child of his "mother and father" (Cf. Mk. 7:10-12) yet, in some sense he does "leave" his parents that he might "cleave unto his wife. For example, though a "child...*is to obey his parents*" (Eph. 6:1), yet when marriage is entered, new roles of headship and subordination are taken on (Eph. 5:22-23). This newly joined couple must learn that their allegiance, devotion and love must now have their primary focus on the mate to whom they have given themselves. Parents, as hard as it is, must learn, cultivate and practice what the French call *laissez faire* attitude where the married children are concerned.

Nothing can be so damaging to a marriage as a man or woman who can't cut the apron strings, or parents who can't let their children go. **Never**, to another talk about marriage, problems, or your spouse without your spouse's knowledge and consent, not even to Mamma and Daddy. Never make comparisons such as: Mama did it this way, or, That's not the way Daddy would do it.

This is a difficult lesson to learn for all parties involved. In a normal family, the foremost woman in the life of a young man has been his mother. Naturally, much of what he thinks of womanhood, femininity, and the role of a wife and mother, comes from his twenty plus years with his mother. And likewise, a young woman's father has, for better or worse, patterned her

thinking about manhood, masculinity, and the role of a husband and father. Yet, each party to the new relationship of marriage must now learn to turn their total devotion and attention to a new man and a new woman. In all-too-many instances, it may be necessary for them to, at best, alter, or at worst, completely reject and abandon what they have learned about Man and Woman from their parents.

Too many men have unfortunately learned from mothers to be whimpering sissies who need someone to tell them, "It's all right, it's their fault" when they have failed. Too many women have learned from their fathers that they are to be doted upon little princesses who can pout and cry when they don't get their way. Some men learn from their fathers that a "real man" is a swaggering, even abusive, dictator. Some women have learned from their mothers, "No man is going to rule me."

Mothers and fathers can naturally be called upon to lend a helping hand, but they should not be viewed as they once were. They are no longer allowance givers, clothes-washers, meal-preparers, or errand runners. Nor, when children come, are they *ipso facto* baby-sitters or child care centers. I don't care how politically *uncorrect* it is: the Scriptures teach that it is a man's job to provide for "his own household" (I Tim. 5:8), and that it is a woman's job to, among other things, "love their children," and be "workers at home" (Tit. 2:4-5). A man is to love his wife as "Christ also loved the church" (Eph. 5:25). He is to "nourish...and cherish..." her (v. 30), "giving honor unto the woman, as unto the weaker vessel" (I Pet. 3:7). A woman is to "love," be "in subjection to," "fear" [Greek, *phobeo*, in the sense of "reverence and respect," **not** physically cower before], and "obey" her husband (Tit. 2:4-5, Eph. 5:33; I Pet. 3:6).

Our society has largely rejected God's plan for marriage. Some of the results are: Divorce, abortion, child-rearing by grandparents, child abuse, juvenile crime, sexual *disorientation*, and more and more government involvement in what should be family matters. Just as Paul speaks of homosexuals "receiving in themselves the recompense of their error which was due" (Rom. 1:27), so families and society as receiving the "just recompense" which comes from abandoning God's plan for marriage.

PITFALLS AND MISTAKES. It's pretty well universally recognized that the two greatest sources of problems in marriage are: money and sex. With good clear Bible teaching on both matters, coupled with parental application and explanation of the same, these need not to be great problems.

As to food, clothing, and shelter, the Lord said, "your heavenly Father knoweth that ye have need of these things" (Mt. 6:30). Our Father has provided a world wherein "all these things" can be obtained, but has regulated our habitation such that only through "labour" and "work" (Eph. 4:28; I Thess. 4:11-12) can man realize what has been provided for him. Along this line of thinking about the pursuit and possession of "things," let us realize,

1. They are after all "things." Many parents by word and deed have inculcated upon the minds of their children that getting more and more stuff is what life's all about. Consequently, their children come to think that what the Bible teaches on the relative value of "things" is merely poetic theory (Cf. Lk. 12:13-21; Mt. 19:21; 2 Pet. 3:10, I Jno. 2:15-17; I Tim. 6:7-8).

Think of the parents who are as proud as peacocks of their children who are honor

students, talented in the arts, or good at sports. They will spend much time, money, and effort to see that Johnny and Susie have the best opportunities and tools by which to succeed. They wouldn't dream of such secular pursuits taking a back seat to Christian worship and service. Proof? Look around at the children who aren't in Bible study because they have so much homework. Look at children doing their homework right in the middle of worship or Bible study. It is the height of folly to imagine that these children are going to grow up to "seek...first the kingdom." There is a direct correlation between this and the thinking that more stuff means more happiness. This leads to another thought.

2. We must learn to live within our means. I know way too many young couples who sink themselves into debt up to their eyeballs so they can have their dream house. They create a life style that requires two incomes to feed it. Consequently mothers are unable to fulfill their Scriptural responsibility to be "keepers at home" (Tit. 2:4). These are, ironically, the same people who often complain the loudest about hard times and throw dust into the air and then complain that they can't see. These are the people who have no time for each other and their families. They are the people who say, Amen, when they hear President Clinton talking about government-sponsored child care for working mothers.

We must always be responsible for paying our bills. It is immoral to "owe" people (Rom. 13:8), that is, to owe them in the sense of not paying as they have agreed. Credit cards are being pushed now harder than ever. Even dead people get pre-approved credit. The temptation is to "get stuff" now, and pay later. This thinking is a recipe for hardship, and ultimately a source of marital strife and discontent.

Mothers should allow their daughters to see years of womanly care of the home, frugal use of money and things. Fathers should allow their sons to see years of manly providing an income for the home, paying bills, and saving. Children should hear their parents unashamedly say, "We can't afford that." Children who are given everything they see will demand that it always be so. How quickly do the feelings of passion and romance dissipate when covetous young lovers meet life head on!

Parents could give their children such a head start on marriage by showing them through years of example and teaching that God must come first, that God has rules for family organization, and that we must work and live responsibly.

We now direct our thoughts to Number 2, on the marital pitfalls and mistakes chart: sex. Surely, no topic has been so subjected to extremes: all the way from the salacious and the purient on the one end to the squeamish and prudish on the other, from the bathroom wall to the stuff that PLU (People Like Us) just don't talk about. Both extremes are sad, unscriptural and consequently sources of *non*fulfillment, unhappiness, and even disaster in marriage. As in all matters "that *pertain* to life and godliness" (2 Pet. 1:3), in this important matter of human sexuality, we must go to the One who created it. Study of His revelation will show that he has no little to say on the matter. Let's note a few points:

1. Sex is good in the sense that all that God created is "very good" (Gen. 1:31). "For every creature [Greek, *kitsma*: created thing] of God is good, and nothing is to be rejected, if it be received with thanksgiving" (I Tim. 4:4).

2. Sex is good only when it involves the place and people so assigned by God. As to the place in which God intended it, the Spirit says, "*Let marriage be had in honor among all, and let the bed be undefiled: for fornicators and adulterers God will judge*" (Heb. 13:4). As to the people for whom God designed it, marriage occurs when God joins a "male" and a "female" in that relationship (Mk. 10:6-9). So we see that sex as God intended it involves the specific *parameter* of marriage, and specific *people* namely the aforementioned joined-by-God male and female.

Any sexual activity occurring other than within this parameter and involving other than those people is "fornication" (see I Cor. 6:9; Jude 7), which means "illicit sex." Since sex, as God intended it, may occur only between a man and a woman joined in marriage, any sex between a married person and someone other than the one to whom God has joined him/her is "adultery." It is not an "affair," nor is it "love," it is adultery. ([Contd. Sept. B.O.T.](#))

104 S. Willow St., Cowan, TN 37318

READERS' RESPONSE

"I want to commend you on the Banner of Truth. The articles in your paper are much needed in this day. I especially liked the article in the June issue. There are so many misconceptions of the church. I recommend every member of the congregation to read it... Keep up the good work - **Claude Reese.**" - **AR.** (*It is certainly true that many no longer understand, or acknowledge, the true nature and purpose of the Lord's church. The denominational concept is being adopted by a great many - Ed.*)

"I am a preacher of Kahelele church of Christ. The main theme of my letter is to request Banner of Truth. If it is possible please send it monthly. Please Sir remember me much with Banner of Truth. I appreciate your god work you are doing all over the world. Please keep on doing such good work. God bless you and keep you in good health. You are in my daily prayers. Yours in Christ, - **Bless Soko.**" - **Malawi, Africa.** (*It is encouraging that quite a few people from Africa have a great interest in God's truth, and want to receive Banner of Truth. I would that all our brethren here in the U.S. had that same interest. Just yesterday I learned of a congregation to which a bundle of BOT is sent monthly. The paper is made available **only** to those who request a copy. It is not put out for people to take freely - Editor*)

"Brother Pigg, Thank you so much for sending the May 2000 issue. Here's a very small donation to a wonderful publication, Yours in Christ - **Bill Milner.**" - **British Columbia.** (*It is good to hear from someone in B. C. Thanks for the check to help in our work. - Editor*)

Editor's Note: *Readers' Response* will be continued in the next issue of BOT. We've run short on space.

Editor's E-mail: < wpiggbot@apex.net >

B.O.T. can be viewed on bro. David Lemmons' web at: <
<http://www.hcis.net/users/dlemmons/BOTlist.htm> >

Readers may get on David's **LemmonsAid E-mail** by sending an E-mail to the address below:

< LemmonsAid-Subscribe@ListBot.com >

Has your address changed? If so, please let us know.

Don't miss an issue of B.O.T.!!!